

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at California State University Bakersfield

February 2015
Overview of this Report

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at California State University Bakersfield. The report of the team presents findings based upon a thorough review of the Institutional Self-Study reports, supporting documentation, and interviews with representative constituencies. Based upon the findings of the team, an accreditation recommendation is made for this institution of **Accreditation**.

Common (NCATE Unit) Standards and Program Standard Decisions For all Programs offered by the Institution

	Initial	Advanced
1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Met	Met
2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Met	Met
3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Met	Met
4) Diversity	Met	Met
5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Met	Met
6) Unit Governance and Resources	Met	Met
CTC Common Standard 1.1 Credential Recommendation Process	Met	
CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	Met	

Program Standards

Programs	Total Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject, with Internship	19	19		
Single Subject, with Internship	19	19		
Education Specialist: MM, with Internship	22	22		
Education Specialist: MS, with Internship	24	24		
Education Specialist: Clear Induction	7	7		
Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder	3	3		
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	32	32		

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

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

Institution: California State University Bakersfield

Dates of Visit: November 16-18, 2014

**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 entire team regarding the six NCATE standards is that all standards are **Met**. The decision of the team regarding the parts of California's two Common Standards that are required of NCATE accredited institutions is that both standards are **Met**.

Program Standards

Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total team membership was provided for California State University, Bakersfield. Following discussion, the team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns, or not met. The CTC 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** and that all program standards are **Met** the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation**.

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

Initial/Teaching Credentials

Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject including Internship

Single Subject
Single Subject including Internship

Education Specialist:
Mild/Moderate including Internship
Moderate/Severe including Internship

Advanced/Service Credentials

Education Specialist
Clear Induction

Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder

Pupil Personnel Services
School Counseling

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- California State University, Bakersfield be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, Bakersfield continues 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.

Accreditation Team
Joint NCATE-CTC Accreditation Team

NCATE Co-Chair:

Shawn M. Quilter
Eastern Michigan University

California Co-Chair:

Jo Birdsell
National University

NCATE/Common Standards Cluster:

Rick Eigenbrood
Seattle Pacific University

Maureen D. Gillette
Northeastern Illinois University

Helene Mandell
University of San Diego

Marita Mahoney
California State University, San Bernardino

Programs Cluster:

Vicki Graf
Loyola Marymount University

Gay Lynn Pendleton Smith
University of Phoenix

Diana Wheeler
National University

Staff to the Accreditation Team

Katie Croy, Consultant

Lynette Roby, Consultant

Documents Reviewed

Institutional Self Study Course Syllabi and Guides Candidate Files Program Handbooks Survey Data Candidate Performance Data Biennial Reports and CTC Feedback Program Assessment Preliminary Findings Program Assessment Summaries	Candidate Work Samples Advisement Documents Faculty Vitae University Annual Reports University Budget Plan CSUB Websites Accreditation Website Program Evaluations Meeting Agendas and Minutes University Catalog
--	--

Interviews Conducted

	TOTAL
Candidates	202
Completers	52
Interns	29
Employers	40
Institutional Administration	7
Program Coordinators	26
Faculty	19
Adjunct Faculty	26
CalTPA Coordinator	8
Advisors	43
Field Supervisors – Program	47
Field Supervisors - District	14
Credential Analysts and Staff	12
Advisory Board Members	36
Other	14
TOTAL	575

Note: In some cases, individuals may have been interviewed more than once (e.g., faculty) if they serve in multiple roles.

The Visit

The California State University, Bakersfield site visit was held on the campus in Bakersfield, California from November 16-18, 2014. This was a joint NCATE/CTC accreditation visit, utilizing

the Continuous Improvement model for NCATE. The site visit team consisted of two co-chairs, one working with the NCATE team and one working with the CTC team, two California BIR members who served on the NCATE team reviewing the NCATE Unit Standards (Common Standards), and, because of the size and number of programs and pathways, three Program Standards members. Two Commission consultants accompanied the visit. The NCATE and CTC teams met jointly on Sunday, November 16, 2014 and participated in interviews with constituents beginning on Sunday afternoon. Interviews continued throughout Monday November 17, 2014. A mid-visit report was completed on Monday afternoon. On Monday evening, the full team met to discuss findings and make decisions on standards. The exit report was conducted at 11:30 a.m. on Tuesday, November 18, 2014.

The Administrative Services Credentials are on Inactive Status at the request of CSUB. Appropriate notification to CTC was sent. In addition, interviews were conducted with program completers who discussed the “teach out” plan. Other interviews included local superintendents who are discussing the new Administrative Services Credential standards and how they might be implemented in a new program design in the future.

I. Introduction

I.1 Brief overview of the institution and the unit

Founded in 1970, California State University, Bakersfield is a comprehensive public university located in the San Joaquin Valley of California. Enrolling over 8000 students, CSUB is one of the 23 campuses that is part of the California State University system. CSUB offers graduate (30 master's degrees) and undergraduate programs (91 bachelor's degrees) from its four schools: 1) Arts and Humanities, 2) Business and Public Administration, 3) Natural Science, Mathematics, and Engineering, and 4) Social Sciences and Education. The institution is fully accredited by the Western Association of School and Colleges. The campus is located between Fresno and Los Angeles - a region heavily engaged in the agrarian and energy industries. Bakersfield is a racially and ethnically diverse community, including relatively large immigrant and migrant communities.

The professional education unit is headed by the dean of the School of Social Sciences and Education. Its mission is to provide high quality programs in professional education and the social sciences, which prepare students to create positive social change. Faculty members seek to offer excellent instruction, research experiences, and experiential learning as a means of preparing students for lifelong learning to meet the evolving needs of society. The School aims to offer high quality programs that are recognized locally (i.e. CSU system) nationally, and internationally. The School will provide professional leadership that improves the quality of social life and education for the region. The unit offers initial teacher credential programs at its Bakersfield and Antelope Valley campuses in the areas of multiple subjects (i.e. elementary), single subject, special education mild-moderate, and special education moderate severe. Both campuses also offer advanced programs in the areas of school counseling and educational specialist (i.e. special education). There are also master's programs on the main campus in

school counseling, curriculum and instruction, and special education. Though there were programs in educational administration, the unit has phased these programs out.

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

The state partnership provides for a joint visit. A team from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) worked alongside the Board of Examiners (BOE) team to complete program-level reviews. Two of the 5 BOE team members were state team members. As such, the two state team members are from California and have completed BOE training. The CTC (state) team chair coordinated all activities with the chair of the BOE team, both before and during the onsite visit. There were no deviations from the state protocol for the California Commission for Teacher Credentialing.

I.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

Programs are offered at the Antelope Valley (AV) campus. Interviews of faculty, staff, students and alumni were all completed on the Bakersfield campus as representatives from AV constituents came to the Bakersfield campus during the onsite visit.

I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

There were no unusual circumstances during the visit.

II. Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P–12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

II.1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The unit's conceptual framework reflects the "confluence" of cognitive, social, affective, and psychomotor domains. Faculty members seek to nurture and promote the intellectual growth and the emotional, social, and physical wellbeing of all candidates and students with a focus on diversity and equity. The knowledge base is a blend of content and professional knowledge and skills that is informed by research, appropriate professional standards, and practitioner knowledge. In terms of dispositions, the unit expects its candidates to demonstrate professionalism, reflection, and ethics within the context of a student-centered practice. Diversity proficiencies are embedded in existing signature assignments, including the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA).

Candidates are expected to be digital citizens who can use technologies as learning tools, as well as demonstrate appropriate information literacy for their program of study. Furthermore,

all candidates are expected to demonstrate behaviors and attitudes in their performance-based assessments (i.e. signature assignments) that support the notion that, "all students can learn." Interviews with all stakeholder groups support the view that candidates know and practice the knowledge and values espoused in the conceptual framework.

NCATE STANDARDS/CCTC 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.

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 1 was validated in the exhibits and interviews.

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

The Site Visit team worked in collaboration with the team representing the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), who found all initial and advanced programs under review, were aligned with state standards. The onsite state team conducted a thorough examination of all programs leading to a California credential. It was determined, in collaboration with the CTC team, that the Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist initial, Education Specialist Clear (advanced with autism approval), and Educational Counseling programs met state standards for content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and pedagogical skills. All data presented in the offsite report were validated through examination of documents in the addendum, examination of data on site, and in interviews with faculty, staff, current candidates, completers, alumni, employers, and school partners. The CTC does not address dispositions so this report will contain a separate section on initial and advanced dispositions.

The Educational Administration program was not examined as this program had been placed on a moratorium by CSUB and was officially closed down as of August 2014. While data were provided for this program in the initial IR, the unit head notified the CTC in the 2014 biennial report that all candidates were advised of the closing and given a completion date. No new candidates have been admitted and all candidates who had been in the program have completed the required coursework.

The only program not examined by the CTC team was the master's degree in Curriculum and Instruction (advanced). Data presented in the IR and addendum was verified through interviews with candidates and faculty. Additional data on dispositions and an employer survey were provided in the addendum exhibits. It was determined that candidates are prepared for the advanced degree with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to continue as professional teachers. Candidates described the program as relevant, rigorous, and comprehensive. This program is entirely on-line and candidates appreciate the opportunity to complete their degree in this format. Candidates indicated that they are supported by faculty, provided with immediate feedback on their work, and are able to apply their new knowledge in their classrooms.

The unit has strengths in preparing both initial and advanced candidates with the knowledge and skills necessary to be successful teachers for all students. Pass rates on standardized tests, the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA), and program-based assessments generally exceed 80 percent on a continuous basis. If the pass rate for one quarter does not exceed 80 percent, faculty members and administrators immediately take steps to rectify the situation. The unit offers test preparation sessions for all state-mandated content tests. Additionally, there are TPA seminars and orientation sessions that provide candidates with the maximum assistance that is allowed in the TPA process.

For each data-set presented, there was often a very small number of candidates who were not successful on all or part of a required assessment. The offsite report raised concerns about how candidates who were not successful on key assessments of knowledge, skills, and dispositions were remediated or counseled out of the program. The IR addendum explained the process of assisting candidates who are having difficulties with knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Procedures for the development of Candidate Improvement Plans (CIPs) were explained in the addendum. Program coordinators verified the process during interviews and examples of CIPs for initial and advanced programs were provided on site to the team. Additionally, interviews with the admissions advisors, program advisors, and credential reviewers provided convincing evidence that candidates in all programs leading to a credential are carefully monitored and receive extensive support. Close collaboration (e.g., monthly meetings, informal discussions) exists between advisors and faculty so that candidates are successful. This collaboration allows for issues or problems to be identified and remediated. Finally, the unit is a member of the Cal State Steering Committee where the TPA coordinators meet to discuss strategies for helping candidates succeed on the TPA. As a result of working with this consortium, faculty members have designed a pre- TPA protocol that provides candidates with feedback on early TPA work. Candidates confirmed that if they perform poorly on these tasks, they receive an e-mail and a message in their e-portfolio account that requires them to come in for remediation prior to completing their "high stakes" TPA during student teaching.

All programs, initial and advanced, use the same six unit-wide dispositions. The offsite report noted a concern related to the collection, analysis, and use of dispositional data. Specifically, data provided for the offsite report was general (i.e., dispositions met or not met), but did not include an analysis of individual dispositions, nor were procedures for working with candidates

who exhibit dispositional issues explained. Interviews with faculty members and documents provided in the addendum exhibits and on site provided convincing evidence that dispositions are being collected in every course and are being disaggregated across the six dispositions.

Disaggregated dispositions data for each program were provided in the addendum and at the on site visit. Data are reported as "met" or "not met," even though the faculty use a three-point rubric. At least 99% of candidates across the entire unit received a "met" in all six dispositions. Faculty described this as a result of setting clear expectations for dispositions on the syllabi and through on-going communication with candidates.

Despite the fact that data is being collected in every class, the use of "met (target)" or "not met (unacceptable)" as a two-point option when the form contains a three-point scale (target, acceptable, not acceptable) does not allow faculty to pinpoint dispositional areas that may need attention. When discussing Candidate Improvement Plans, faculty members were able to describe several different types of dispositional issues that warranted a Candidate Improvement Plan. It is very difficult to identify these types of issues through the use of dispositional data because almost every student received a "met" on the two-point scale. Course faculty and school partners are working very hard to complete dispositional forms, but the data being collected are not always providing program faculty or the unit with the type of data that would assist programs and the unit in identifying areas that may need attention.

The offsite team requested information related to how unit members assure that the programs across both campuses and on-line are of the same quality. The IR addendum explained, and it was confirmed on site, that full-time, tenure-track were hired for the Antelope Valley (AV) campus. Each campus has a program director, advisors, and field placement coordinators who work together regularly. It was obvious from interviews conducted on site that faculty and staff from both campuses worked extremely well together. Faculty members communicate regularly and meet in person or via Skype or Polycom. Almost all faculty in the multiple and single subject initial programs teach on both campuses. The unit supports unlimited travel for faculty at AV to attend meetings and events in Bakersfield.

Importantly, the same signature assignments, syllabi, and course-embedded assessments are used on both campuses. Data from signature assessments are disaggregated by campus and shared with program faculty and administrators. Policies and procedures are clear and well-known to faculty and staff on both campuses. It was clear from interviews with faculty and administrators that close collaboration exists between the Bakersfield and AV campuses.

Additionally, interviews with faculty and candidates indicated that when data indicate a need at AV, they receive equal consideration in the allocation of instructional resources. An example of this occurred when faculty determined that the AV programs needed increased technology resources. The unit head, upon the recommendation of the entire faculty, purchased i-Pads for the AV campus.

Technology is an area of strength for the unit. In interviews, candidates note that they are able to use technology in their schools, classrooms, and job sites. Candidates in every program, initial and advanced, could cite multiple examples of how they are effectively being prepared to infuse technology into their work and use technology as a teaching-learning tool. Candidates in initial and advanced programs stated that they hoped the emphasis on technology continued because they feel that there is an ever-increasing need for them to be, as one candidate stated, "21st century teachers."

The offsite report noted that the California Teacher Quality survey of graduates and their employers had a very low return rate. A question was raised about how program faculty members use these data for program improvement. Interviews with faculty and administrators as well as an examination of program assessment documents provided evidence that faculty understand the need to increase the return rate if they are to have meaningful results from this survey. This was selected as a goal for the coming year and faculty members have begun to strategize about ways to increase the return rate on this survey. Currently, there was little evidence that faculty are using trend data, even with a low return rate, to inform programs.

Additionally, the Curriculum and Instruction (advanced) program and the Counseling program (other school professionals) provided only one year of employer survey data. The Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs confirmed that only one year of data were available. Faculty members are aware of the need for ongoing data collection from employers and program completers related to the performance of program completers once they are employed in the field.

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

1.2.a Movement Toward Target. Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable

1.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit collects and reports candidate and program data quarterly related to the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for candidates to be effective in their programs and for faculty use in continuous improvement. Data provide strong evidence (i.e., high pass rates on state-mandated exams, TPA, and embedded assessments) that candidates have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be effective in their chosen field. Candidates report they receive immediate feedback, that they are aware of their progress on a continuous basis, and are assisted in areas where they may experience difficulty. Initial and advanced candidates feel well-supported in their programs. Resources have been allocated to ensure that the candidates at AV perform at the same level as candidates in Bakersfield. Faculty work together across campuses to ensure that candidates are supported equally and the data indicates that they are successful in this endeavor.

The unit provides support for candidates, rigor in the assessment of candidates' knowledge and skills, and technology integration with an emphasis on using technology as a teaching-learning tool.

2.2 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.2.a What AFIs have been removed?

Not applicable

2.2.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

Not applicable

2.2.c What new AFIs are recommended?

None

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 1 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 1 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 1: 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?

The unit's assessment organization structure is facilitated by the Unit Assessment and Data Coordinator who manages and coordinates assessment activities by course and program. Data collected is prepared for program coordinators and program faculty. Results are reviewed at meetings of the programs, departments, and the Professional Education Unit (PEU) Advisory Board at their quarterly meetings.

The Unit Assessment and Data Coordinator manages and coordinates all assessment activities. While program faculty are responsible for developing course signature assignments and aligning signature assignments with the Conceptual Framework and 8-point Assessment System, the Unit Assessment and Data Coordinator work closely with program coordinators to ensure consistency across all courses. The Unit Assessment and Data Coordinator is also responsible for maintaining the signature assignments and scoring rubrics in LiveText, and

ensures all signature assignments are aligned with the conceptual framework and 8-point assessment system.

In addition to course signature assignments, the Unit Assessments and Data Coordinator works with the TPA Coordinator and TPA Lead Assessor to implement the CalTPA via LiveText for the Multiple Subject credential program and Single Subject credential program. Candidates submit their CalTPA via LiveText, and assessors are randomly assigned to score using LiveText. The Unit Assessments and Data Coordinator extracts CalTPA scoring results from LiveText to provide to the TPA Coordinator and TPA Lead Assessor, while the TPA Coordinator is responsible for tracking faculty scoring calibration results.

For initial programs, candidate exit surveys and one-year follow-up surveys are managed by the CSU Chancellor's Office with local campus assistance from the Unit Assessments and Data Coordinator. When the results of these surveys are provided to the campus, the Unit Assessments and Data Coordinator summarizes the results for the program coordinators.

For advanced programs, candidate exit surveys and alumni surveys are coordinated by the Unit Assessments and Data Coordinator using SurveyMonkey and Qualtrics. The goal is to use Qualtrics for all advanced programs exit and alumni surveys in the future.

The Unit Assessments and Data Coordinator reports out aggregate results on candidate assessment by program. These results can also be examined by campus, delivery method (face-to-face or online), and diversity.

The Units Assessments and Data Coordinator is responsible for compiling and reporting data for California Teaching Commission (CTC) requirements, Title II requirements, PEDS, CSU Chancellor's Office requests, Center Teacher Quality (CTQ) requests, and all requests from the PEU Dean and faculty. The Unit Assessments and Data Coordinator is developing a credentials module to address reporting needs to CTC, CTQ, and Title II that will be more streamlined and efficient than the current system using MS Access. The Unit Assessments and Data Coordinator provided a demonstration of LiveText and the beta-version of the under-development credentials module.

While the unit chose to use LiveText as the platform to track assessment of candidate performance, CSUB has recently adopted TaskStream for program reporting for WASC requirements. Faculty from advanced programs reported TaskStream was a valuable resource for faculty to share syllabi and assignment descriptions and criteria. All faculty, including adjuncts, have access to LiveText, TaskStream, and BlackBoard data resources. Currently, unit faculty members do not use TaskStream for annual or biennial program reporting. Instead, this is done in MS Word. The Unit Assessments and Data Coordinator will prepopulate the report templates with results on candidate assessments and faculty will complete the report narrative.

In the open faculty forum, faculty members mentioned they receive candidate performance results reports (e.g., dispositions, TPA, co-teaching) prior to each quarterly program meeting, to

allow time to review, reflect, and prepare for discussion items prior to the actual department meetings, so that program meeting time was spent in meaningful and reflective discussion instead of attempting to interpret the results.

Program coordinators, program faculty, and departments reported that each group reviews all candidate performance results looking for potential trends, and to identify areas of strength and opportunities for improvement. Numerous examples were provided from all programs for using data to drive program changes. For example: the Special Education program coordinators described using the Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ) results to design a course assignment to address low scores on the CTQ regarding information about community resources; the TPA Coordinator and TPA Lead described adjustments to faculty training to score the TPA; and, the Multiple Subjects and Single Subject faculty described not only reviewing candidate performance data (e.g., dispositions, CTQ Survey, CSU Exit Survey, Co-Teaching data) in their program meetings but also sharing these results with their district partners to ensure the programs were producing candidates with strengths needed in the districts. Faculty from initial programs described that the unit has moved from collecting any data to data that are meaningful for the programs and faculty. Faculty members from all programs described using data-driven decision-making as they wrote their program changes to switch from a quarter system to a semester system. This involved not just redistribution of credit units, but course redesign. Faculty members from both the initial and advanced programs also commented on the ease of data accessibility (e.g., from the Unit Assessments and Data Coordinator, in program and department meetings, on BlackBoard). As described in the IR Addendum, following the reorganization of the School of Sciences and Education, the Unit Assessment Committee was dissolved and replaced by a unit-level review.

Faculty members from the initial and advanced programs described examples of how the unit used data to make evidenced-based changes. For example: faculty members described data revealing a discrepancy in available technologies between the main campus and the AV campus, resulting in resources allocated to address this discrepancy; sharing of best practices especially in programs with a fieldwork component; and, results of the Unit Operations Survey for online C&I candidates leading to changes in faculty response time to email inquiries, and additional feedback and comments to candidates' postings on discussion threads. The unit has also taken steps to eliminate bias in assessment through the use of course-based signature assessments and rubrics, including a unit-wide disposition assessment and rubric. The Unit Assessments and Data Coordinator works to ensure consistency across course and programs in assessment of candidates, works with program coordinators and faculty to maintain signature assignments and rubrics, and follows up with program coordinators and faculty to ensure all candidate assessments are completed and submitted. Programs continue to refine their candidate assessment measures, and are working to ensure all assessment instruments provide meaningful data. For example, results for the assessment of candidates' dispositions consistently revealed dispositions were successfully met by 100% of candidates regardless of their stage in the program (dispositions are assessed by course faculty on every candidate in every course). While faculty from both initial and advanced programs described they expected their candidates to always display the dispositions, the programs do not track candidate

disposition change or progression over time in the program. A faculty member from an advanced program recognized this limitation and recently piloted a pre- and post-assessment of dispositions in her courses. The faculty member described finding these results especially useful when shared with candidates. Based on these preliminary results, a second faculty member is also now piloting a pre- and post-assessment as well. These faculty will be sharing their results and experiences with unit faculty in the hope of further advancing assessment of candidate dispositions.

Faculty members, candidates, site supervisors, and advisors in the Educational Counseling program identified an area of opportunity for improvement in fieldwork observations. They noted fieldwork evaluations and observations would be more accurately completed and provide more meaningful results if the rating scales provided descriptives for each rating level. They described in a few cases they were asked to rate candidates on a Likert scale with no rating descriptors or anchors provided to give meaning to the ratings. Faculty members and site supervisors indicated this issue needed to be addressed at their program meeting.

Faculty members from the initial programs described having resources available through the CSUB Center for Teaching and Learning for professional development for both skill development and research. The Unit Assessments and Data Coordinator serves as an assessment resource for both initial and advanced programs.

Candidate complaints and grievances initially follow an informal process within the School of Social Sciences and Education. Candidates first bring their complaint to the faculty member for resolution. If no resolution is achieved, the complaint is forwarded to the program coordinator, department chair, and dean for resolution. At that time, the dean will request an off-campus mediator to work with the candidate to achieve resolution. If no resolution is reached, then the candidate may file a formal complaint following university policies. The School of Social Sciences and Education maintains records of candidate complaints and documentation of their resolution which the site visit team was able to review.

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

2.2.a Movement Toward Target. Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable

2.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit has established the position of a Unit Assessments and Data Coordinator to coordinate and manage candidate assessment activities for both initial and advanced programs. Candidate assessment results are regularly provided to program faculty, departments, and the unit for review, analysis, and data-driven decision-making for program and unit improvement. Signature assignments and scoring rubrics have been established and aligned to the conceptual

framework and the unit's 8-point assessment system to assess candidates at program entry, midpoint, exit, and completer follow-up. Candidate assessment results are reported out and reviewed at appropriate program, department, and PEU meetings for continual monitoring of candidate performance, sharing of best practices, and to identify opportunities for improvement

2.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

Initial and Advanced: Data on candidate performance are not systematically summarized and analyzed.

Rationale: Educator preparation programs have multiple years of candidate performance data. These data are summarized by a staff member and analyzed by unit faculty when appropriate.

2.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

Not applicable

2.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

None

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 2 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 2 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 2: 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?

CSUB School of Social Sciences and Education has strong field experiences and clinical practices in all of their programs. There have been major improvements in this standard since the last accreditation review. In the initial programs, one of the best examples is the development and implementation of a Co-Teaching Model for all teacher education candidates. The university has demonstrated its support of this initiative by funding two part-time positions of Co-Teaching Coordinator, one on the Bakersfield campus, and another in Antelope Valley.

This has been highly successful with all constituencies reporting nearly 100% implementation. Even special education candidates, who are working as intern teachers of record, are learning co-teaching methodologies to be used with other classroom support personnel. The advanced

programs, School Counseling and the Curriculum and Instruction Master's certainly meet this standard but not at the same target level of the initial programs.

CSUB has strong relationships with local school districts as supported by interviews with representatives from the school districts and the university. Detailed MOUs for both student teachers and interns are in place with many of the local school districts. There are strong partnerships between several of the districts and the university, which include comprehensive connections for early fieldwork, student teaching and internships. Moreover, the university has received several grants in partnership with local school districts that has served to strengthen their relationships.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

3.2.a Movement Toward Target. Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Candidates, faculty members, master teachers, university supervisors, advisory committee members, employers and CSUB administrators all reported widespread implementation of the co-teaching models for all teacher candidates. In methods courses, teacher candidates learn about co-teaching models and have opportunities to "practice" in both stages of student teaching. Nearly all master teachers attend both "Co-Teaching" professional development sessions as well as "Triad Training" professional development prior to working with student teachers. Moreover, following a faculty retreat where co-teaching implementation data was reviewed, the program faculty developed a data driven plan of attack, which included a variety of strategies to address issues that were raised. One issue—the need for improved communication from the university has been addressed by email blasts sent out by the Co-Teaching Coordinator, as well as setting up an optional discussion board on their Blackboard site.

In fall 2014 the Educational Counseling program implemented site supervisor training. A professional development session was held on campus and many of the site supervisors attended. For those who were unable to attend, program leadership sent out the training materials in a format that could be viewed as an independent tutorial. In addition to the site supervisor training materials, a revised handbook was developed and widely distributed.

The non-credential advanced programs—Master of Arts in Education with both the Curriculum and Instruction, and Special Education concentrations—meet this standard, not through traditional field experiences but through course assignments that must be completed in the field. Since the majority of these candidates are practicing teachers, they are able to complete these field-based assignments in their own classrooms.

3.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The initial programs are addressed at the target level. The multiple and single subject programs, as well as the special education programs have made major strides in improving the quality of their candidates' field experience. The development and implementation of the co-teaching

model for student teaching has widespread buy-in and support from all constituencies. Interviews with candidates, faculty members, master teachers, university supervisors, advisory committee members, employers and CSUB administrators indicate this major change has had a positive impact on the quality of the field experiences and clinical practices within the programs. Based on the evidence in the written documentation and supported by interviews, the team sees the initial programs moving toward target at the "developing" level. Additionally, the evidence shows that the advanced programs have not yet made significant improvements in the approach to field experience and clinical practice and can be rated at the "emerging" level.

3.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

Not applicable

3.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

Not applicable

3.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

None

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 3 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 3 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 3: 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?

Evidence from interviews with faculty, staff, candidates, and graduates support the contention offered in the IR and IR Addendum that diversity proficiencies related to effective service for students from P-12 students are integrated throughout each of the unit's initial and advanced programs. Assessments of the diversity competencies are integrated throughout the program and include signature assessments, a disposition assessment, program completion surveys, graduate follow-up surveys, and field experience evaluations. Interviews with faculty and the

Unit Assessments and Data Coordinator indicate that faculty regularly review assessment outcomes related to diversity and make program changes when needed. One example of such a change include program changes based on data which indicated that initial teacher education program completers did not feel prepared to work with ELL learners. Interviews with faculty, candidates, and graduates for both initial and advanced programs confirm that candidates have ample opportunity to interact with candidates and faculty from diverse background. Additionally, the team was able to confirm through interviews that candidates do their field experiences/clinical practice in settings that not only have students with gender and ethnic/racial diversity, but also work with students who represent linguistic, cultural, and SES diversity. The local P-12 service area is highly diverse with regard to the aforementioned factors, and this was reflected in all of the interviews.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

4.2.a Movement Toward Target. Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable

4.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Based on interviews with faculty, both initial and advanced programs regularly review data related to diversity and make program changes when indicated by the assessment results. The adoption of the TPA in the initial teacher education program added an additional assessment of diversity proficiencies in the initial teacher education programs.

4.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

Not applicable

4.3b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

Not applicable

4.3c What new AFIs are recommended?

None

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 4 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 4 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 4: 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?

The Professional Education Unit (PEU) is comprised of nineteen full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty, all with either a Ph.D. or Ed.D. The unit also employs 5 full-time lecturers and 48 adjunct faculty, six of whom also serve as student teaching and intern supervisors. Evidence provided in the IR (Exhibit 5.4.a.8) and interviews provide support that all faculty hold appropriate professional qualifications and experiences relevant to their assignments in the initial teacher preparation program or one of the advanced programs. Criteria for selection of adjunct faculty and lecturers are presented as part of the IR, and interviews provide support that procedures are in place to assure that adjunct faculty are aware of the conceptual framework and expected professional standards, including required signature assignments.

Procedures for faculty evaluation are presented, along with faculty performance expectations for teaching, scholarship and service, are included in both the IR and IR Addendum. Full time faculty and lecturers complete an annual report summarizing teaching, scholarship, and service activities which are reviewed by the dean and relevant chair for the purpose of generating ideas to support the faculty member in each area. Faculty are also evaluated as a regular part of the university's tenure and promotion process which includes reviews by faculty peers, the appropriate chair, the dean, the University Review Committee, the provost, and the president. Adjunct faculty are reviewed every three years by the appropriate chair and the dean with focus on course evaluations (Exhibit: Addend_S5_Lecture Evaluation Form).

Interviews provide evidence that faculty members are engaged in collaborative partnerships with school partners. One specific example of this partnership is the ongoing work with districts to implement the Co-Teaching Model in student teaching. Candidates across all programs indicate that faculty regularly model the use of technology in their courses and as a result are very well prepared to use instructional technology in P-12 classrooms.

Interviews with faculty and evidence presented in the IR Addendum confirm that the unit and the university provide faculty with support for professional development, with the unit providing up to \$600 annually for conference paper presentations and \$300 to support conference attendance. Additional funding is available annually for professional development and research from the unit and university. At the university level, support for faculty development include grants from the provost's office and competitive mini-grants from the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC). A summary of grants received by faculty was provided as part of the IR Addendum. Part-time faculty are able to participate in various professional development activities offered by the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center. In addition, part-time faculty are invited to any professional development activity offered by the unit. For

example, a number of part-time faculty have participated in the Teacher Quality Partnership workshops offered by the unit.

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

5.2.a Movement Toward Target. Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable

5.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Interviews with faculty confirm that the unit and university have implemented a number of strategies to support new faculty which includes mentoring, course release, and additional support for professional development for new faculty. At the university level, the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) has employed a Director of Instructional Development to support faculty in providing effective learning environments. In 2012-13, the unit offered professional development opportunities to the faculty and candidates funded by a Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) Department of Education federal grant. The focus of the grant is to continue to reform the teacher credential courses, expand the professional development opportunities for candidates and district partners, and implement the St. Cloud co-teaching model for the student teachers.

Interviews with faculty provide evidence that faculty are receiving adequate financial support for professional travel and conference attendance. Faculty also indicated there is a high level of collaboration between faculty across different programs that allows for continuous improvement in teaching, program revisions, and scholarship. Faculty feel respected and supported in all aspects of their work by the unit's administration.

The unit has a systematic and comprehensive evaluation system which includes regular and comprehensive reviews of the professional education faculty's teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty engage in regular collaboration with their peers, unit leadership and their respective guilds.

5.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

Not applicable

5.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

Not applicable

5.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

None

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 5 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 5 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 5: 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?

The unit has the leadership, budget, and infrastructure to provide coherent unit planning for the entire unit. Interviews with faculty and staff suggest that there are regular meetings of key personnel to address advising, credentialing, curriculum, and policy issues. Since the last NCATE visit, the unit has added advisors, improved collaboration among faculty through various grant and teaching initiatives, and started having yearly unit-wide meetings to consider continuous improvement opportunities. Collectively, these efforts have created an environment where information is shared effectively and candidates are well-served. Interviews with candidates and program completers corroborated the finding that improvements in planning and coherence are apparent to all stakeholders. Candidates and program completers alike commented on the consistency of information and advising, the availability of faculty and staff members to support their development, and the overall quality of their educational experiences as CSUB. It is important to note that interviews with various faculty and staff groups suggested that the leadership of the School of Social Sciences and Education, particularly the dean, has created a positive culture focused on the development of competent educators. All indicators suggest that the unit has the leadership and authority to plan and implement effective educator preparation programs. Indeed the president of CSUB described the dean as a transformational leader who has resolved cultural and quality issues in four short years.

Interviews revealed the Teacher Education Advisory Council is a thriving group that includes several staff members from local P-12 schools, two department chairs from the School of Social Sciences and Education, and a few faculty members from the professional education unit. This group has met quarterly for several years. In addition to discussing practical matters such as student teaching placements, this group has reviewed exit survey data from candidates, recommended curriculum changes (i.e. improving the action research project in the graduate

class), and discussed how the California version of the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) can be used for the new teacher induction process. Programs such as special education and counseling have their own advisory groups, which provide additional opportunities for the unit to collaborate with its school and community partners in meaningful ways. On an ongoing basis, P-12 partners are involved in program design, implementation, and evaluation.

One area the unit has improved since the last site visit is academic advising. The university has added program advisors to undergraduate programs in initial certification. A cadre of advisors, faculty members, and credential analysts are available to help candidates move from pre-candidacy through credentialing. These advisors have developed advising materials and programs to make sure candidates are able to make informed decisions about their programs of study. The availability and effectiveness of these support structures was corroborated during interviews with candidates, specifically student teachers and interns, revealed that their advising needs have been met in all programs. Faculty members support advising for the initial teacher preparation program as needed.

Interviews with the interim vice president for academic affairs and the president of CSUB indicate that the unit has sufficient budget resources to effectively operate its educator preparation programs. The budgeting process is based on full-time equivalent students with additional support provided to the School of Social Sciences and Education for programs with clinical components, such as psychology and the initial teacher preparation program. Faculty and staff members provide input on academic budgets through the University Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee. Faculty workloads are consistent with California State University practices as well as accreditation expectations for educator preparation programs.

Interviews with all stakeholder groups suggest that the unit has ensured equity of resources across its Bakersfield and Antelope Valley campuses. This theme surfaced in each of the interviews. In addition, the unit has made considerable efforts to insure that advising and curriculum are the same on each campus.

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

6.2.a Movement Toward Target. Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable

6.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

With active advisory boards and annual meetings of the professional education unit faculty and staff, the unit has improved its ability to plan and implement effective educator preparation programs. The dean of the School of Social Sciences and Education has effectively led the unit for over four years. Based on interviews with various stakeholders, it appears that a shared governance structure is in place to make sure the unit delivers effective educator preparation

programs that meet state and national standards. It is also clear that systems and personnel are in place to support the programs within the unit, with specific improvements in advising and credentialing support for initial candidates. One of the key indicators of the improvement in governance and authority to run an effective educator preparation unit, was the consistency of answers across all stakeholder groups and programs, within this large and diverse professional education unit.

6.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI Initial and Advanced: Unit leadership and authority arrangements do not result in coherent planning.

Rationale: The unit has the leadership and authority to plan effectively. Personnel processes, faculty/staff committee activities, as well as data from the unit assessment system suggest that the unit is engaged in coherent planning. These systems and processes suggest sufficient leadership and authority exists to run effective educator preparation programs.

AFI Initial and Advanced: The student advising system is inadequate in the single subject and special education programs.

Rationale: Advising system improvements include additional staff members, regular staff meetings and information-sharing, as well as improvements in information consistency. These changes provide for an advising system that appears to be effective.

6.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

Not applicable

6.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

None

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 6 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 6 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 6: Met

CTC Common Standards requirements not reflected in NCATE Unit Standards

1.5 The Education Unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

CSU Bakersfield implements and monitors a credential recommendation through the credentials office. Interviews with the credential analyst, faculty and candidates confirmed that the process was thorough and accurate. There are credentials evaluators who work with candidates in their admissions materials. In addition, they monitor candidate progress throughout the program, send information to candidates and share the information with faculty advisors. Upon program completion, candidates complete an on-line application. The credentials analyst reviews the application and files to ensure that all requirements have been met. Clear evidence was provided at the visit to confirm that admissions and credentialing procedures are highly integrated and carefully monitored.

6.1 Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development.

Interviews with program completers, candidates and faculty confirmed that qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants. Candidates receive advice and assistance in the areas noted above. Personal development is provided through the application and assessment of the unit's dispositions. In addition, there is a process for notifying candidates in need of assistance and developing a Candidate Improvement Plan.

6.2 Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements.

Information on all programs is available through the university catalog, program and university web sites, and print materials. In addition, candidates receive e-mail messages that provide updates on where they are in the program, what needs to be done next and anything else that requires their attention.

6.3 The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.

The unit has clearly-defined support and assistance systems in place for all credential programs. Program faculty provide direct support to candidates who may be experiencing difficulty in meeting coursework requirements. Interviews with candidates and program completers indicated a high level of support and assistance from program faculty, university supervisors, and fieldwork supervisors in all programs. Interviewees repeated made references to individual faculty or supervisors who went above and beyond the required assistance. A remediation process is in place to assist struggling candidates. Candidates who are unable to successfully complete program requirements after remediation are counseled out of the program.

Findings:

Standard 1.5: **Met**

Standard 6.1 – 6.3: **Met**

PROGRAM REPORTS

Teaching Credential Programs

Preliminary Multiple Subjects and Single Subject Credential Programs

Program Design

The Multiple (MS) and Single Subject (SS) Traditional and Intern Programs prepare candidates to teach in multiple or single subject classrooms. Interviews with the Program Director, Credential Analysts, and credential staff confirm that upon completion of the program coursework and fieldwork, candidates have the knowledge, skills, and ability to work with diverse populations, including English Language Learners and students with special needs. The preliminary teacher preparation programs are based on a theoretical framework of developmental theories and reflective pedagogical framework. The California State University Bakersfield's mission and goals also inform the vision and focus of teacher preparation as noted below:

- Candidates apply theoretical and evidence-based foundational knowledge in their professional practice.
- Candidates effectively and proactively participate in the teaching profession and the organizational system of schools.
- Candidates apply appropriate theories, principles, and strategies in teaching English Language Learners (ELLs) through English Language Development (ELD) and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE).
- Candidates engage in standards-based instructional decision making that provides equal access to the core curriculum for all students.
- Candidates develop a student-centered sensitivity to ethnic, racial, gender, exceptional, and low socio-economic groups.
- Candidates, as reflective practitioners, use assessment and knowledge of appropriate strategies to facilitate high achievement for all students.
- Candidates employ strategies that address developmentally appropriate practices and reflect their sensitivity to cultural differences and global perspectives.
- Candidates effectively integrate appropriate technology into their teaching and into their students' learning.

Interviews with the MS/SS Program Chairs and faculty confirm an ongoing system that directs leadership and faculty to discuss program design and strategies that meet program improvement goals and facilitate data-supported change. Other stakeholders include partner districts, Kern County Superintendents of K-12 School Districts, Bakersfield Community College, and departments from the undergraduate teacher preparation track who make up the Teacher Education Advisory Committee (TEAC). Interviews with TEAC members confirmed their role in

review of programmatic information (TPE results, disposition reviews, signature assignments, exit survey data, and unit operation survey data) which are used to inform decisions around program improvement and candidate competencies, such as the development of a disposition rubric, a co-teaching model, and a change to a weekly full-day field experience with each course. Additional interviews with faculty, program coordinators, and candidates supported the changes instigated around full-day field experience and the co-teaching model.

Program directors, faculty, alumni, and candidates discussed the design of the program to move candidates from a beginning stage of knowledge and skills to a proficient stage of professional knowledge and skills. As stated in the Program Handbook, candidates spend three or more quarters in teacher preparation that focuses on Teacher Performance Expectations, technology in instruction, and assessment of student learning, English Language Learners, and reflective practice. Candidates move from an introductory stage of professional development in the foundational courses to a stage of pedagogical practice and demonstration in the three successive stages of the program. This scaffold program design is appreciated and applauded as indicated in interviews with MS and SS students, and interns currently in Stages II and III.

As candidates advance in the program, syllabi confirm that theory and practice merge into field activities and signature assignments that allow the candidate to develop pedagogical competencies. Faculty interviews and course syllabi verify the signature assignments embedded in coursework throughout each stage of the program design. Interns interviewed mentioned the opportunity to make immediate application of these signature assignments in their current classroom. Field experiences are also embedded in coursework and provide candidates an opportunity to analyze, reflect, and utilize various teaching strategies. Candidates and faculty both confirmed the value of these field experiences in correspondence to their current coursework, merging theory and application.

Interviews with interns, program coordinators, and a review of the Intern Handbook confirms that interns complete 120 hours of pre-service including classroom management and planning, developmentally appropriate teaching practices, pedagogy and communication skills, including reading, with 45 of these hours in Teaching English Learners. These hours are met through coursework or modules. An interview with the County Office of Education Intern Director described modules that assist candidates in obtaining pre-service hours and allowing students to enter an Internship as early as Stage I. Intern candidates must enroll and stay active in credential courses each quarter and are assisted and advised by the University Intern Support Team who aligns with the CSUB Internship Transition Plan.

Course of Study

Program stages and coursework are sequenced and mapped to offer introductory, development, and mastery of Teaching Performance Expectations, use of technology in instruction, assessment of student learning, preparation to teach English Learners and students with special needs, and reflective practice. As stated in the Program Handbook and confirmed through faculty and candidate interviews the sequencing of courses in the MS/SS Program is specifically designed to move candidates from a beginning level (Foundational Stage and Stage-

l) of knowledge and skill development to an intermediate level (Stage II), where the candidates begin to apply (demonstrate understanding through practice) their knowledge and skills by engaging in a variety of signature assignments and fieldwork activities that are intended to build their knowledge, skills, and dispositions for teaching. A demonstration of mastery and continuous development occurs in student teaching (Stage III) of the program. According to student teachers, faculty supervisors, and cooperative teachers, candidates spend 10 weeks developing proficiency in the Teaching Performance Expectations and are evaluated and guided by a Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor during the student teaching stage of the program.

Faculty interviews acknowledged the design of the Multiple and Single Subject Program which includes a developmental sequence of carefully planned and substantive field experiences in schools that are screened and selected by the MS/SS Field Placement Coordinator. The *EDTE 300 – Early Field Experience* requires candidates to participate in 45 field experience hours to firmly evaluate their choice to enter the teaching profession prior to beginning the foundational courses. The Program Directors and credential staff explained the remaining field experiences are tied to sequential foundational courses and stages. The *EDSE599 and EDEL499 – Student Teaching* is a culminating clinical experience with a minimum of two weeks of full-day teaching responsibilities over a 10-week clinical experience. Alumni and current student teachers reported that the program design with integrated field experiences prepared them for their student teaching experience. Course syllabi and interviews with faculty and students confirmed the program provides opportunities for candidates to increase their knowledge, skills, and understanding to teach diverse students, integrate technology for classroom instruction, and teach students with special needs through an alignment of coursework and field experiences.

University supervisors and cooperating teachers confirmed that candidates are trained in a co-teaching model prior to a student teaching assignment. The triad of university supervisor, cooperative teacher and candidate discussed how they meet for a student teaching orientation of expectations and responsibilities. This triad works together for student success by observing, reflection, and coaching best practices. Site administrators and cooperative teachers indicated candidates were well prepared during the student teaching experience (Stage III) in professionalism, teaching English Learners, use of technology, content knowledge, and lesson planning.

Course syllabi and interviews with faculty and students confirmed the program provides opportunities for candidates to increase their knowledge, skills, and understanding to teach diverse students, integrate technology for classroom instruction, and teach students with special needs through an alignment of coursework and field experiences.

During interviews candidates and completers discussed a strong appreciation for the expertise of their faculty members, in addition to the application of theory in the field placements in areas such as technology and Common Core. Many completers reported their ability to assist seasoned teachers at their current sites in both the areas of technology and Common Core and attribute this knowledge to faculty expertise and curriculum.

University Supervisors, intern candidates, and program coordinators discussed how interns complete the course sequence as traditional candidates; however, they may also be eligible for an internship as early as Stage I. All interns indicated during interviews that they were assigned a university supervisor to observe, coach, and evaluate the intern as well as conference with the assigned district mentor. The credential staff confirmed intern program requirements such as field experience, signature assessments, and progression requirements are consistent with traditional students.

Assessment of Candidates

In an effort to determine the effectiveness of the program and candidate competencies, credential staff, program coordinators, and course syllabi verified that candidates are assessed on their pedagogical competence at the course level (signature assessments and field experience) and program levels (CalTPA). The 2014 Biennial Report showed the Teaching Performance Assessments, the course signature assignments, and TPE-based fieldwork evaluations are the main measures of candidate competencies. Candidates' assessments occur in each of the four stages of the program as outlined in the Program Handbook and syllabi. Candidate outcomes are the deciding factor for a candidate's advancement or exit through each stage of the program. The credential staff confirmed they record and review candidate progress, as well as advise candidates on their program and credential requirements. This includes the scored results of the TPA according to the TPA Coordinators.

Syllabi showed course embedded signature assignments and field experiences which are designed to assess the candidates' pedagogical skills with evaluations housed in LiveText. Listed signature assignments in course syllabi include lesson planning and design, assessing student reading levels, unit plans, classroom management, student assessment, and modifying assessment and instruction to meet all student needs. During interviews interns reported using these signature assignments immediately in their own classroom setting.

According to interviewed faculty and university supervisors, candidate dispositions are evaluated by faculty members, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors in every stage of the program. Faculty Meeting Minutes stated faculty review the dispositions rubrics and field experience assignments to assessment candidate knowledge and skills, and program effectiveness quarterly.

The CalTPA tasks are used to assess candidates' mastery of program competencies. The Program Handbook shows TPA task 1 and 2 are completed during the corresponding Stages I and II. Tasks 3 and 4 are completed in Stage III – Student Teaching. Students and university supervisors discussed the difficulty of completing Tasks 3 and 4 in only 10 weeks of student teaching. These TPA tasks are grounded in the philosophy that early and continued exposure to critical factors proven by research to enhance teacher effectiveness is the best approach to achieve teacher quality and facilitate student learning. Interviews with TPA coordinators affirmed oversight of assessor qualifications, 15 percent blind scoring, calibrations and recalibration of assessors, and security of TPA materials, student videos, and permission slips. The 2014 Biennial Report clearly links the TPA results to program modifications and the

development and implementation of a TPA rubric to provide useful candidate competence data.

Data from key assessments are analyzed by faculty annually, as stated in Faculty Meeting Minutes, and presented at a department data retreat, "Closing the Loop", where an action plan is created for immediate implementation to improve program and candidate outcomes. During interviews faculty confirmed changes, as a result of the data reviewed at the retreat, that included specific EL planning, combined content and methodology teaching, use of Common Core, and deliberate attention to Teacher Performance Expectations.

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.**

Education Specialist Credential Programs Mild to Moderate, and Moderate to Severe

Program Design

The Special Education program at CSU Bakersfield made the transition from a Level I credential program to a Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate/Severe program in fall 2010. A CTC approved Added Authorization in Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) was initiated in January, 2011, which will be discontinued shortly given the reduced need for the program due to the fact that the ASD standards are now embedded in the current Education Specialist program.

The Program has a Director to coordinate the program at the Bakersfield campus. The Antelope Valley campus is directed by a Program Coordinator.

Candidates choose either the Mild/Moderate or Moderate/Severe traditional or intern credential program. As indicated on the Program website, the intern program can take up to two years to complete the Preliminary Credential program with field supervision throughout the program. The traditional program includes 53 quarter units of coursework in general and special education across three developmental phases and student teaching with a Master Teacher and University Supervisor. Upon completion of the Preliminary Education Specialist Program candidates have the option to continue with the Clear Induction Credential Program.

Interviews conducted with the Program Director, Program Coordinator, faculty, employers, and completers and review of documents such as Special Education Program Handbook confirm the overall design of the Program. It is a student-centered program with strong relationships with

local school districts. The Program collects data on the program in order to evaluate and continually improve the Program.

Program Directors indicated that The Program identified future areas of improvement which include strengthening the Program's content on classroom management, development of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), and strengthening performance of candidates on the RICA. This is based on exit interviews and additional sources of data.

The Program has a Community Advisory Board (CAB) which meets twice a year and consists of administrators from local school districts, a CSUB special education program graduate, a current student representative, and program faculty to provide advice about the program design.

Course of Study:

As indicated in the interviews with the Program Director, Program Coordinator, as well as in the Special Education Program Handbook, the candidates in the Specialist Programs for the Mild/Moderate/Severe Disabilities Credentials progress in three developmental phases in order to address the following areas: Professional, Legal and Ethical Practices; Educating Diverse Learners; Effective Communication and Collaborative Partnerships; Assessment of Students; Using Educational and Assistive Technology; Transition and Transitional Planning; Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning; Preparation to Teach Reading/Language Arts; Preparation to Teach English Language Learners; Typical and Atypical Development; Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning; Curriculum and Instruction of Students with Disabilities; and Creating Healthy Environments.

During Phase I: Foundation and Basic Understanding, candidates demonstrate knowledge of historical foundations and basic understanding of special education. It is critical for candidates at this level to develop a basic understanding of: (a) characteristics of students with Mild/Moderate/Severe Disabilities; (b) research in learning theories and instructional practices both in general education and special education; (c) communication and collaboration issues; (d) issues related to the curriculum and instructional adaptation for special needs students (K-12); and (e) educating diverse learners from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Interviews with candidates, program coordinators, and faculty supported the fact that the candidates gain such understanding through their coursework on campus as well as through their observation and participation in the public school settings.

During Phase II: Skills Development, credential candidates acquire specific knowledge and skills for assessing and teaching special needs students, and behavior and classroom management through their coursework with built-in field experience components. Teacher candidates are required to complete a comprehensive assessment report in EDSP 510 (Assessment) and a behavior management plan in EDSP 505. Interviews with candidates, faculty, and program coordinators indicated that candidates learn and are required to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in instructional strategies and curriculum modifications/accommodation in methods classes (EDSP 545-M/M & EDSP 632-M/S).

In the third and final stage of the program (Phase III: Culmination and Field Experiences), candidates internalize what they have learned and experienced during the first two phases. The framework for the third level is a half-time student teaching in a general education classroom setting and a full-time student teaching in a special education classroom setting. Candidates reported that they have ample opportunity to demonstrate their competence in assessment, curriculum planning/ instruction, and classroom and behavior management strategies. Throughout field experiences, candidates are supported by a local district master teacher and a university supervisor who indicated during interviews that candidates were well prepared for the classroom. Program Coordinators, the Handbook, and Intern Candidates indicated that they are required to complete six intern seminars (EDSP 636 A through F) in lieu of student teaching. During intern seminars, candidates share their successes and/or concerns with other candidates and university field experience supervisors that are designed to assist transition from the role of student teacher to the role of professional.

In interviews with District administrators and District mentor/cooperating teachers, it was noted that the School District Support Providers are assigned by the district in collaboration with the University Supervisor and must hold at least a credential in the field that the supervisee is pursuing. Assignments of Support Providers may vary based on District requirements. In the case of intern candidates, the school district assigns a mentor to the intern in the intern program. Both University Supervisors and local District mentor/cooperating teachers reported that they collaborate and work to provide guidance and advisement related to each candidate's field experience progress.

Interviews with the Program Director, Program Coordinator, University Supervisors, District Administrators, and Mentor/Cooperating teachers confirmed the sequence of the program as well as the selection of fieldwork sites and mentor/cooperating teachers. Interns are observed one time every ten weeks but more often if a candidate needs additional support. Traditional candidates are observed three times during the General Education fieldwork and five times during the Special Education fieldwork. There is ongoing communication between the University Supervisor and the Master Teachers and District Support Providers that allows for additional support to be provided as needed if candidates are struggling.

In interviews, both candidates and program completers note that the individual attention provided to candidates through advisement sessions and support in the field are strengths of the program. An additional strength cited by program completers is the emphasis on Positive Behavior Support. Candidates stated that they are prepared with the most current evidence-based practices including co-teaching with general educators.

There is a strong emphasis on theory and practice as stated by employers. Candidates are well prepared to take the role of Education Specialists in the employing districts as described by the employers and are highly sought after.

Assessment of Candidates

Interviews with Program Director, Program Coordinator, Program Advisors, and candidates indicated that each candidate's competence and progress are evaluated throughout the program: (1) admission to the program, (2) quarterly review of each candidate's course work performance, and (3) during and at the conclusion of field experience and/or student teaching. Candidates are notified via orientation and again during an individual program planning session that they need to meet and maintain the following academic standards:

- GPA of 3.0 or "B" average in coursework after admission.
- Earn a grade "C" or higher in a course.
- Earn a grade "B" or higher in a student teaching course (EDSP 625/635/636A-F)

Candidates are required to repeat a course in which they earn a grade of "C-" or lower. Candidates whose GPA falls below a 3.0 are placed on academic probation and required to raise their GPA within one quarter. If candidates do not maintain 3.0 GPA over two quarters, they are dismissed from the program.

The 2014 Biennial Report indicated that dispositions are a major component of how candidates are assessed throughout the Program in addition to the candidates' performance on Signature Assignments. These dispositions are: Professional collaboration; Reflective practitioner; Ethical professional; Students/client centered; Professional leader; and Professional competence. Candidates are assessed on these dispositions by each course instructor and Program faculty meet with each candidate who does not meet the expectations to discuss actions for improvement. Each instance is also discussed at a monthly department meeting.

Interviews of employers, credential candidates, program adjunct faculty, and Mentor/Cooperating teachers indicate that the program is of high quality and is very effective in assessing the progress of the candidates. There are multiple points of assessment of the candidate throughout the Program and steps are taken to address any areas of concern.

Findings on Standards

After review of the Institutional Report (IR) and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that **all program standards are met.**

Clear Education Specialist Induction Credential Program

Program Design

The Clear Education Specialist credential program was approved in August 2012. This program replaced the Level II program and accepts new candidates who possessed a preliminary Education Specialist or a Level I credential starting in fall, 2012. The Program has a Director to coordinate the program at the Bakersfield campus. The Antelope Valley campus is directed by a Program Coordinator.

Candidates continue their credentialing program by taking Clear credential coursework following the completion of the Preliminary Program. The majority of the Clear credential courses are designed as field-based seminars that are online or blended courses. Course assignments provide opportunities for candidates to apply theoretical knowledge to practical classroom situations through case studies, designing behavior intervention plans, developing an in-service module and conducting action research. The demonstration of the majority of course competencies takes place in the candidate's classroom.

Candidates in the program select one of three emphasis areas on which to focus. These areas are Positive Behavior Support, Specialized Curriculum and Instruction, and Focus on Autism. Interviews with Candidates, Program Completers, Faculty, and Support Providers indicated that at the completion of the Clear Program, Graduates demonstrate the following knowledge and/or skills:

- Implement the most effective assessment and instructional research based practices to meet the needs of exceptional individuals and their families.
- Develop collaborative partnerships with educators, families, service providers, and other professionals to provide the home, school, and community programs to meet the special needs of exceptional individuals.
- Value the cultural and linguistic diversity of exceptional students and their families in making relevant assessment, placement, and programming decisions.
- Advocate for and promote self-advocacy among persons with exceptionalities. Furthermore, they will be able to critically analyze current practices and engage in activities to improve and advance the profession and their own professional development.

Within each of the three options in the clear program, five courses are prescribed and recorded on the candidate's program plan. The two courses (EDSP 570 and EDSP 585) in Option III are a part of Added Authorization in Autism program. Candidates can obtain an Autism Authorization (AA) along with a Professional Clear credential when they complete an AA program. The unit total for the five courses is 14 to 15 units depending on the selected option. The program is typically completed within three quarters.

Interviews with the Program Director, Program Coordinator, employers, current candidates, and advisory board members support the finding that the Clear program is well designed. The Program has a Community Advisory Board (CAB) which meets twice a year and consists of administrators from local school districts, a CSUB special education program graduate, a current student representative, and program faculty who provide advice about the program design. At each Spring Quarter meeting, the Community Advisory Board members are asked to participate in the Program Effectiveness Survey. The survey results are reviewed by the special education program faculty and inform the improvement of the program. There is also a CAB that meets bimonthly in the Antelope Valley and follows the same structure and process.

Course of Study

Course assignments and experience in the Clear program are designed to expand candidate competencies through action research, case studies, advanced lesson planning, behavior intervention plans, and strategy and curriculum evaluation. In-service training workshops, comparative research study, and professional development activities allow the candidate to focus on the emphasis area selected by the candidate and outlined in the program plan. Furthermore, the candidate's individualized induction plan (IIP) constructed with the support provider and the university supervisor promotes opportunities to gain additional expertise in an identified competency area.

Throughout the clear credential program, candidates receive support from a university supervisor and a district support provider. Collaboration among the three begins early in the program through participation in a three way conference in the beginning of the program (EDSP 650) and continues at the end of the program (EDSP 695). Candidates are current teachers and required to reflect and build on their knowledge and skills as a classroom teacher throughout their clear program. The course content enables the candidates to develop expertise as needed in the following areas of communication and collaboration, formative assessment, pedagogy, and equity for all students through universal access.

In addition to the required coursework, candidates who possess a Level I credential must fulfill the CTC Level II requirements that include technology competency, completion of a health course and a current CPR certificate.

During Phase I of the clear program, candidates establish their professional direction by setting their performance goal in the Individualized Induction Plan (IIP). During Phase II, candidates further their knowledge and skills in their identified focus area such as specialized curriculum and instruction, research in special education, characteristics and instruction for students with autism, advanced behavioral and environmental supports, and/or participating in non-university professional development activities. During the final phase of the program, candidates are required to demonstrate their professional competency through evidence of IIP completion. Candidates' competencies are assessed quarterly and at the end of the program by reviewing and evaluating their electronic portfolios that include signature assignments from all clear program coursework.

Clear Credential candidates report that the courses and fieldwork are of high quality and very effective in their development as reflective special education professionals. They appreciate being able to apply the coursework in their own classrooms while having the support of both the University Supervisor and District mentor. Candidates identified their specific areas of concentration based on their own self-assessment and found this to be especially helpful in their professional development.

Employers of the candidates also stated these candidates are of exceptional quality based on their coursework and field experiences completed and that they would like to hire as many of the candidates as possible.

Assessment of Candidates

There are several designated checkpoints for review of each candidate's competence and progress: (1) admission to the program, (2) quarterly review of each candidate's course work performance, (3) collaborative three-way meetings, and (4) during and at the conclusion of final Professional leadership seminar (EDSP 695). Candidates are required to submit a capstone signature assignment for each course to an electronic portfolio (LiveText). Each signature assignment is assessed by instructors. Candidates' professional portfolios are assessed in the final course, EDSP 695 (Professional Leadership Seminar).

Candidates are notified via orientation and again during individual program planning that they need to meet and maintain the following academic standards:

- GPA of 3.0 or "B" average in coursework after admission.
- Earn a grade "C" or higher in a course.

Candidates are required to repeat a course in which they earn a grade of "C-" or lower. Candidates whose GPA falls below a 3.0 are placed on academic probation and required to raise their GPA within one quarter. If candidates do not maintain 3.0 GPA over two quarters, they are dismissed from the program.

The 2014 Biennial Report indicated that candidates' dispositions are a major component of how candidates are assessed throughout the Program. These dispositions are: Professional collaboration; Reflective practitioner; Ethical professional; Students/client centered; Professional leader; and Professional competence. Candidates are assessed on these dispositions by each course instructor. Program faculty meet with each candidate who does not meet the expectations and discusses actions for improvement. Each instance is also discussed at a monthly department meeting. Data from the Biennial Report also note points of assessment of the candidates and data based actions taken within the Program to address areas for improvement.

Quality and effectiveness of candidate assessment

Interviews with employers, credential candidates, and Program faculty indicate that the Program is of high quality and is very effective in assessing the progress of the candidates. There are multiple points of assessment of the candidate throughout the Program and steps are taken to address any areas of concern.

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.**

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Credential Program

Program Design

The Educational Counseling Program is a 72 unit Master of Science program offering two areas of concentration: School Counseling (PPS Credential) and Student Affairs in Higher Education, leading to preparation in a college or university setting. There are currently approximately 80 students in the combined programs.

The program is administered by two full-time directors who report to the Department Chair. Both Directors have terminal degrees and are qualified to teach in their respective discipline. An interview with the Program Directors and faculty confirmed the responsibilities of the directors include: recruitment, program and academic advisement, course scheduling, program development, oversight of Practicum and Internship students, credential recommendation, and full-time instruction. There are currently three (3) adjunct instructors who teach courses and are also site supervisors. Adjuncts are evaluated by students at the end of each course, and yearly by Department Directors as confirmed by interview with faculty and students.

Students may enter the program each quarter and usually follow a sequential Program of Study. Some students may have entered the program with specific licenses/credentials that allow them to waive some courses. This is determined at the Introduction Orientation meeting that is held at the beginning of each quarter and is mandatory for all incoming students.

A review of documents confirmed an introductory course, Department website, a Fieldwork Handbook, and on-going Department advisement are all available to students if programmatic questions should arise.

Interviews with Program Directors, employers, site supervisors, and candidates, as well as documents confirm the overall quality and effectiveness of the design of the program. The program is student centered with emphasis on service to local school districts. A strong community alignment was verified by interviews with employers, supervisors, and candidates. An Advisory Board consisting of school site supervisors, university adjuncts, and employers meets quarterly to assure a flow of information between the university department and the local school districts. Interviews confirmed the areas of discussion have covered topics such as improved procedures for interns, use of collected data, and current trends in schools.

Course of Study

Candidates complete fourteen courses focusing on core and specific counseling issues with a 100- hour Practicum and 600- hour Internship. A review of the Course of Study identifies the specific courses and field-work expectations. Most candidates plan and complete the program within two years; some candidates may take three years depending upon their individual work schedules outside of the university.

The courses are developmentally sequenced beginning with such techniques as “observational skills” (EDCS 502) and working through specific counseling procedures and theories (EDCS 515, EDCS 532, and EDCS 645). Emphasis is placed upon multi-cultural techniques (EDCS 505) and services to at-risk students (EDCS 601).

The program is designed to reflect the standards of the National American School Counselor Association (NASCA), Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) counseling associations, as well as the State of California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

The Educational Counseling program requires a minimum of 600 hours of field experience in two levels of education, with emphasis on culturally diverse sites. Site supervisors (school counselors working at the specific school) evaluate the candidates at the middle and ending of each quarter as verified by interviews with program directors, candidates and supervisors. Website and Handbook confirm candidates must maintain a 3.0 GPA, have a passing score on CBEST, and meet the evaluation criteria in order to continue in the fieldwork experiences. Interviews with supervisors and candidates confirmed an individualized plan is developed at the beginning of the fieldwork experience and reviewed each quarter thereafter. Specific skills and tasks are identified as those to be completed during each quarter.

Assessment of Candidates

A review of syllabi and interviews with candidate and faculty confirm the assessment process throughout the program: during the admission process, prior to advancement to candidacy, in individual courses, and prior to recommendation for a credential (beginning, middle, and end of program). The assessment tools include signature assignments, evaluations, interviews, surveys, and dispositions. Dispositions are completed by instructors throughout the course sequence and reviewed by the Program Directors. The results of the dispositions are shared with each candidate as verified by students and faculty interviews.

Course syllabi indicate a variety of assessment tools that are used by instructors in their classes. These include: quizzes, video-taping, demonstrations, written assignments, and tests. Each candidate’s GPA is tracked by their academic advisor (Director) who meets with them quarterly to discuss progress toward candidacy.

Documents, interviews and program directors confirmed that fieldwork experiences are assessed by school site evaluators on a quarterly basis. A Likert-scale evaluation form is completed seven times throughout the courses with scores averaged for final results. A threshold score of 3 out of 6 must be obtained. Advisement takes place if a lower score is received as confirmed by students and supervisor interviews.

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.**