

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the  
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at  
California State University, East Bay**

**Professional Services Division  
June 2018**

**Overview of this Report**

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at California State University, East Bay. The report of the team presents the findings based upon a thorough review of all available and relevant institutional and program documentation as well as all supporting evidence including interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation** is made for the institution.

**Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions  
For All Commission Approved Programs Offered by the Institution**

	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	X		
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	X		
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice		X	
4) Continuous Improvement	X		
5) Program Impact	X		

**Program Standards**

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Multiple Subject	6	6		
Preliminary Single Subject	6	6		
Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate	22	22		
Preliminary Education Specialist Moderate/Severe	24	24		
Autism Spectrum Disorders Added Authorization	3	3		
Early Childhood Added Authorization (Inactive)	4	4		
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	5	5		
Preliminary Administrative Services Credential	9	9		
Clear Administrative Services	5	5		
PPS School Counseling	32	32		
PPS School Psychology	27	27		

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Speech Language Pathology	16	16		

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 documentation and evidence
- 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, East Bay

**Dates of Visit:** April 29 – May 2, 2018

**2017-18 Accreditation**

**Team Recommendation:** Accreditation

<b>Previous History of Accreditation Status</b>	
<b>Date</b>	<b>Accreditation Status</b>
<a href="#"><u>April, 2009</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Accreditation with Stipulations</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>May, 2011</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Accreditation</u></a>

**Rationale:**

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel. 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:

Program Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for all programs offered at California State University, East Bay.

Common Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that four of the Common Standards are fully met for California State University, East Bay. *Common Standard 3: Course of Study, Fieldwork, and Clinical Practice* is **Met with Concerns**.

Overall Recommendation

The accreditation team verified that California State University, East Bay and its programs, when judged as a whole, met or exceeded the Commission's adopted Common Standards and Program

Standards applicable to the institution. The team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation**. On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to offer the following credential programs and to recommend candidates for the appropriate and related credentials upon satisfactorily completing all requirements:

Multiple Subject

Preliminary Multiple Subject  
Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern

Administrative Services

Preliminary and Intern  
Clear

Single Subject

Preliminary Single Subject  
Preliminary Single Subject Intern

Pupil Personnel Services

School Counseling and Intern  
School Psychologist and Intern

Education Specialist Credentials

Preliminary Mild to Moderate Disabilities  
Preliminary Moderate to Severe Disabilities

Education Specialist Added Authorizations

Autism Spectrum Disorders  
Early Childhood (Inactive February, 2018)

Other Teaching Credentials

Reading and Literacy Added Authorization

Other Related Services

Speech Language Pathology

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- California State University, East Bay be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, East Bay continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

**Accreditation Team**

Team Lead:

**Christine Zeppos**  
Brandman University

Common Standards:

**Anne Weisenberg**  
California State University, Stanislaus

**Mike Kotar**  
Retired, California State University, Chico

Programs Cluster:

**Donna Glassman-Sommer**  
Tulare County Office of Education

**Candace Poindexter**  
Loyola Marymount University

**Caron Melblom-Nishioka**  
California State University, Dominguez Hills

**Veronica Escoffery-Runnels**  
University of LaVerne

Staff to the Visit:

**Teri Clark**  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Jake Shuler**  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

### **Documents Reviewed**

University Catalog  
Common Standards Submission  
Course Syllabi  
Candidate Files  
Fieldwork Handbooks  
Follow-up Survey Results  
Needs Analysis Results  
Program Assessment Feedback  
Program Review Feedback

Survey Data  
Field Experience Notebooks  
Course Matrices  
Advisement Documents  
Faculty Vitae  
College Annual Report  
Databases  
TPA Data  
Course Scope and Sequence

### Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	99
Completers	93
Employers	29
Institutional Administration	14
Program Coordinators	25
Faculty	22
TPA Coordinator	3
Mentors/Coaches	5
Field Supervisors – Program	42
Field Supervisors – District	42
Credential Analysts and Staff	2
Advisory Board	8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>384</b>

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

### Background Information

In 1959, The State College for Alameda County opened its doors to 300 students. Four name changes later, California State University, East Bay (CSUEB) serves approximately 15,000 students. The Hayward Hills campus, on 342 acres, includes ten major buildings. Cal State East Bay also has campuses in Contra Costa County, Oakland, and online. CSUEB offers fifty baccalaureate degrees, 37 masters degrees, and one doctoral degree and is fully accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The university is organized in four colleges: Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS), Business and Economics (CBE), Science (COS), and Education and Allied Studies (CEAS).

CSUEB is proud of a highly diverse student body: 73% of current students identify as either Hispanic/Latino (34%), Asian (24%), African American/Black (11%), Multiple Ethnicity (6%), Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (1%), or American Indian/Alaska Native (.5%). (See <http://www.csueastbay.edu/ir/> for more institutional data). CSUEB is located in a vibrant, forward-thinking region, featuring thriving urban communities and some of the most innovative businesses in the world. Graduates have distinguished themselves in a number of fields.

## Education Unit

The CSUEB Professional Education Unit consists of 12 Commission-approved programs, all of which are housed in the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS) except one, Speech/Language Pathology, which is in the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS). The Unit's credential programs are housed in four academic departments:

- (1) Communicative Sciences and Disorders (CLASS: Speech/Language Pathology)
- (2) Educational Leadership (CEAS: Preliminary Administrative Services, Clear Administrative Services)
- (3) Educational Psychology (CEAS: Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate Disabilities; Educational Specialist, Moderate/Severe Disabilities; Autism Spectrum Added Authorization; Early Childhood Added Authorization [inactive February 2018]; Pupil Personnel Services, School Counseling; and Pupil Personnel Services, School Psychology)
- (4) Teacher Education (CEAS: Multiple Subject Teaching, Single Subject Teaching, Reading and Literacy Added Authorization)

In the spring 2018 quarter, the unit included 35 total faculty in the following categories: tenured, tenure-track, or Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP). In the spring 2018 quarter, the unit employed 104 adjunct faculty in the lecturer classification. Though many lecturers teach program courses, a large percentage focus solely on field supervision.

A true sense of unit identity has evolved over the years, primarily through the Accreditation CEAS Team (ACT) which includes the program coordinators of all Commission-approved programs. ACT is chaired by the unit's Accreditation Coordinator, who reports directly to the head of the Professional Education Unit, the CEAS Dean. In April of 2016, CSUEB officially withdrew from the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Thus, from that point forward, the Professional Education Unit includes only the university's Commission-approved licensure programs.

The chart below provides data on the number of program completers during the 2016-2017 academic year and the number of candidates enrolled in the Unit's programs during the current academic year, 2017-2018. During the 2016-2017 academic year, a total of 391 candidates completed credential programs. To date, 352 of the 2016-2017 candidates applied for their credential(s) and were recommended by East Bay. This academic year, 2017-2018, there are 498 candidates enrolled in the Unit's programs.

**Table 1**  
Program Review Status

<b>Department</b>	<b>Program Name</b>	<b># of Program Completers (2016-17)</b>	<b># of Candidates Enrolled (2017-18)</b>
Teacher Education	Multiple Subject	106	96
	Single Subject	98	124
	Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	9	20
Educational Psychology	Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate	19	16
	Education Specialist, Moderate/Severe	1*	9
	Autism Spectrum Added Authorization	0	1
	Early Childhood Added Authorization (Inactive, Feb 2018)	0	0
	Pupil Personnel Services, School Counseling	12	15
	Pupil Personnel Services, School Psychology	10	13
Educational Leadership	Preliminary Administrative Services	95	118
	Clear Administrative Services	14	46
College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences	Speech Language Pathology	27	40

\*No Applicants were accepted for Moderate/Severe for this year

### **The Visit**

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.



## **Multiple Subject/Single Subject Credential and Multiple Subject/Single Subject Internship Credential**

### **Program Design**

The Multiple Subject/Single Subject Credential program at California University, East Bay is offered in the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS). The Chair of the Department of Teacher Education has administrative authority over the program, although Multiple and Single Subject Program Coordinators, who report directly to the chair, oversee the operationalization of the program. The programs are continually monitored by the program coordinators, program placement coordinator, and faculty who ensure that programs reflect a purposeful, interrelated, developmentally designed sequence of coursework and clinical practice experiences for candidates. In conducting the affairs of the department, the chair consults with the associate dean and with faculty, both formally and informally. The faculty makes policy recommendations to the chair as verified by interviews with the department faculty and program coordinators. Policies concerning the credential programs in the Department of Teacher Education are established through a process of shared governance both within the department and with input from associated school districts. Department faculty and program coordinators verify that this process of shared governance is an effective system. All policies are discussed at department faculty meetings which include adjunct as well as full time faculty. The Multiple Subject and Single Subject Program Coordinators also communicate with supervisors, candidates, and school administrators verified through interviews with the department chair, program coordinators, and supervisors. Interviews with two placement coordinators confirm that they report to the chair and work with districts to secure placements for candidates.

The development, implementation, and evaluation of the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential programs are a collaborative enterprise between the faculty in the CSUEB Department of Teacher Education and personnel from local school districts. As noted by the chair of the department, the Campus Committee on Professional PreK-12 Education also provides a forum for representatives from other CSUEB departments and local school districts to consider issues relating to the Multiple and Single Subject Credential programs. The Council meets annually in both Contra Costa and Alameda County and is chaired by the dean.

Coursework for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs are organized in cohorts of approximately 20 – 35 candidates who enter in either summer or winter quarters and follow a defined sequence of classes. Completers, current candidates, the Multiple Subject Coordinator, and the chair all agree that the cohort model is very effective and is one of the greatest strengths of the program. The coursework is centered in four-quarters, or one calendar year. Upon successful completion of the professional preparation program, candidates are eligible for either a Preliminary Multiple Subject or a Single Subject credential. Coursework for all candidates is organized into four categories: 1) Foundations and General Pedagogy courses, 2) Subject Specific Curriculum & Instruction courses, 3) Field Experiences courses, and 4)

Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) Orientation and Submission courses. This was verified by a document and syllabi review.

Current candidates, the chair, and program coordinators confirm that fieldwork is woven throughout the program beginning with observations and participation while teacher candidates are engaged in initial coursework. This is followed by full-time student teaching designed to meet the needs of each program throughout the public school year. Multiple Subject candidates have two placements, one in a K-2 grade classroom and one in a 3-5 grade classroom, while Single Subject candidates are placed in both a middle school and a high school assignment. Interns meet the field experience requirements in their own classrooms (with an additional alternative grade placement during a school break). A review of the syllabi and interviews with current candidates and recent completers all verify that course instructors present educational theory, while field supervisors observe its application in the classroom. Student Teaching Seminars provide a forum for candidates to reflect on their practice and clearly realize the connections between content, teaching, and learning.

The Department of Teacher Education has an advisory committee made up of school district personnel (human resources personnel, principals, teachers), and alumni, which meets annually as noted by the department chair. It was confirmed by the program coordinator and placement coordinator that they communicate regularly with district partners and university supervisors on a variety of topics including but not limited to candidate performance and program improvement. These discussions are communicated regularly to the chair, again verified through interviews with all stakeholders involved. Faculty sit on many advisory councils for partner school districts, such as induction advisories and pathway advisories.

### **Course of Study**

An asset of both the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential programs at CSUEB is the concurrent nature of course work and field experiences. The preliminary credential program design weaves clinical practice and field experience throughout the course of study. Syllabi and document review, current candidate and recent completer interviews all confirm that during the fall, winter, and spring quarters, candidates are concurrently enrolled in coursework and fieldwork. Candidates complete fieldwork as either student teachers or interns.

An extensive review of syllabi for both programs and interviews with current candidates confirm that the delivered courses show a developmental sequence with TED 5351 Psychological Foundations of Education and TED 5311 Classroom Environment courses, forming the foundation of the first quarter. Also, during this initial quarter, Multiple and Single Subject candidates all take a literacy course and a class addressing English learners appropriate for their specific credential level.

The second quarter includes TED 5378 (Multiple Subject) and TED 5314 (Single Subject), which focus on teaching special populations and emphasize the principles of universal design for

learning and lesson design for each level. This quarter also includes single subject methods and TED 5357- Curriculum and Instruction in Science, Health and Safety, as well as a continuation of the class for English learners for multiple subject candidates. Current candidates and recent completers noted that the emphasis on working with English learners was a definite strength of the program.

The third quarter continues building on the previous learning in both programs by addressing math and reading curriculum for multiple subject candidates, while single subject candidates concentrate on a continuation of their content area studies and TED 5318- Professional Responsibilities. The final quarter allows the multiple subject candidates to address Visual and Performing Arts and Physical Education while single subject candidates take additional content methods classes in addition to the TED 5211- Computer Technology class, which was taken by the multiple subject candidates during their first quarter.

Program completers and current candidates confirm that the course of study has been designed to enable them to experience a variety of different teaching situations by being placed in two different settings for their clinical practice. Coursework and field assignments are clearly connected and sequenced as verified by a review of the syllabi and interviews with faculty, program coordinators, current candidates and recent graduates. Interviewees also stated that the courses taken allow candidates to gain a firm foundation on a perspective of social justice and developmental issues in education, as well as provide an opportunity for candidates to develop as reflective practitioners.

Program completers and current candidates stated that they were well informed about the program requirements prior to beginning their coursework. Both completers and current candidates confirm that program coordinators interview candidates, provide student teacher orientations, and share general program information, requirements for candidates, state requirements, and other program expectations. University supervisors verify that the program coordinators hold informational meetings twice a year and agreed that the collaboration with the department is beneficial in their ability to support the program's expectations.

### **Candidate Competence**

Document review, as well as interviews with the chair and program coordinators, confirm that candidate performance in the Multiple and Single Subject programs is based on multiple assessments at various transition points throughout. The comprehensive assessment of candidates includes (a) grades on specific course assignments, (b) assessment of candidate performance in field experiences, (c) RICA, (d) Content Area Tests (CATs) in math, science, and social studies which also prepare candidates for PACT, and (e) PACT.

A fair, valid, and reliable assessment of the candidate's status with respect to the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) is embedded throughout the programs' design and assessed by faculty during coursework and the university supervisor and cooperating teacher during clinical

practice. This was verified by interviews with program faculty, program coordinators, and university supervisors. An extensive review of the syllabi confirm that all course assignments are aligned with the TPEs and include a variety of avenues for candidates to establish their competence: reflective essays, responses to classroom scenarios, technology-based projects as well as unit and lesson plans. Interviews with Multiple Subject faculty, both fulltime and adjunct, as well as with program coordinators confirm the strong connection between course development and the TPEs. Current candidates and recent graduates agree that they have multiple opportunities at various points in the program to practice, develop and demonstrate competency in coursework through the administration of Content Area Test (CATs), clinical practice, and through completion of the PACT. The CSUEB Teacher Education Department provides a great deal of support to prepare candidates for success on the Performance Assessment for California Teachers as verified by program coordinators, faculty and PACT coordinators. PACT orientation classes conducted by trained instructor/assessors are provided throughout the year. Following submission of PACT, recent completers and current candidates report that they typically received feedback in no more than 4 weeks following timely submission.

A review of the evidence and interviews with the program coordinators and university supervisors confirmed that cooperating teachers are appropriately qualified to supervise candidates and that thoughtful consideration is given to match candidates with cooperating teachers. However, several of the neighboring districts used for student teaching and intern placement manage the placement of student teachers independent of the university. Interviews confirm that university supervisors formally observe candidates four to five times each semester, give candidates written observations, feedback and recommendations at a post-conference for each observation. Recent graduates and current candidates indicate that the level of support provided by the supervisors, cooperating teachers, and faculty has been invaluable in their preparation. Supervisors from all levels meet each semester for training and to confer about candidates as they move from beginning clinical practice to advanced clinical practice. Interviews with supervisors, program coordinators, and program faculty confirm this critical interaction. University supervisors also collaborate with cooperating teachers and prepare a final summative assessment each semester based on the TPEs.

### **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for the preliminary Multiple Subject/Single Subject credential programs.

## **Reading and Literacy Added Authorization**

### **Program Design**

The Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA) is offered through the CSU East Bay Department of Teacher Education (TED) under the auspices of University Extension. Since September 2017, a new coordinator has lead the program and reports to the Chair of the

Department of Teacher Education. The chair has authority over the program and reports directly to the Dean of the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS), as well as to the associate dean. With input from the faculty, the coordinator makes policy recommendations to the TED chair, who provides great support for the program according to an interview with the program coordinator. Both the coordinator and the chair communicate collaboratively with the Credential Student Services Center (CSSC), which is in charge of all credential documentation. The chair, dean and the program coordinator regularly communicate with University Extension and CSU East Bay Graduate Programs administrators as verified by interviews with the Chair and Program Coordinator during the site visit.

Stakeholders to the RLAA program include the TED and RLAA faculty, students, program graduates, and representatives from local school districts. These stakeholders have not met as a formal advisory body for several years due to change in leadership but is currently being reconstituted for future stakeholder input. The RLAA faculty meet to collaborate on program effectiveness, goals, and improvement. The department chair and program coordinator confirmed that the development, implementation, and evaluation of the RLAA are collaborative enterprises between the faculty in TED and reading faculty.

The RLAA program is a cohort model; one cohort of 20-25 candidates is admitted per year. Candidates are usually full-time teachers in school districts in Alameda, Contra Costa, and other San Francisco Bay Area counties. Document review and interviews with the program coordinator confirm that candidates can earn the M.S. degree with the successful completion of three additional graduate courses (12 units which includes a capstone project) and 13 post-baccalaureate units which candidates may either bring in from a recent accredited credential program or meet through approved electives.

### **Course of Study**

The RLAA can be completed in one academic year, which includes one summer. To earn the RLAA, candidates first complete a series of five four unit courses (20 units) beginning in the summer. Classes are offered in a hybrid format, with approximately 60-70% of classes face-to-face and the two remaining classes via online instruction. Upon successful completion of this coursework and three or more years of classroom teaching, candidates can be recommended for the RLAA. The sequence of coursework is carefully structured to provide an effective integration of theory and practice. Current candidates, recent completers, and a review of the program documents confirmed that the progression of coursework begins with a summer reading clinic which allows candidates to have hands-on experiences working with diverse students and an opportunity to implement current strategies. The program then progresses to advanced integration of all of the components of reading.

Extensive review of the syllabi confirm that all courses are designed to provide candidates with multiple opportunities to apply the knowledge and skills acquired in their coursework. Interviews with current candidates and a review of the syllabi verify that candidates develop knowledge and

skills and gain new understandings of the developmental process of reading as well as the specific components of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency and comprehension. A review of course syllabi and an interview with the program coordinator verify that the courses in the RLAA program address one or more critical areas, including: promoting a culture of literacy; planning, implementing, and assessing literacy instruction; and assessment and intervention.

A review of program documents and course syllabi verifies that the program adequately provides opportunities for candidates to review current research on elements of an effective culture of literacy at the classroom, school, district, and community levels. For example, in the course entitled Culture of Literacy: Focus on Diversity (TED 6220)-, candidates learn to develop a culture of literacy that capitalizes on students' diverse knowledge and skills, and learn to support second language development while planning, implementing and assessing instruction for students in diverse ethnic, cultural and socioeconomic groups.

Review of the course syllabi verified that candidates write a paper discussing how they support high academic expectation in terms of student literacy as well as describing the culture of literacy they have created in their own classroom and/or school in TED 6253 – Literacy Research and Methods 2: Comprehension. In TED 6231- Literacy Assessment and Intervention I, candidates also complete the Site Based Data Analysis project which includes examining the role of student motivation in the assessment process and determining whether scores can be attributed to the level of motivation and student engagement.

Because candidates in the program are employed as full-time K-12 teachers, there are no traditional field placements. However, a review of course syllabi, and interviews with current candidates and recent completers confirm that course fieldwork assignments are designed to provide candidates with opportunities to work with students of different age and grade levels. For example, in the two summer clinic experiences, candidates work with one lower elementary and one upper grade student for ten hours of direct intervention.

Course syllabi, interviews with current candidates and recent completers, and a discussion with the program coordinator indicate that fieldwork and practicum experiences are closely related and woven into the program, including the initial clinic experience which focuses on English Learners and beginning readers. A review of the syllabus verify that fieldwork activities and assessments are embedded within all RLAA courses in a cyclic fashion. Other fieldwork experiences include action research in TED 6020- Research in Education and signature assignments that focus on the major components of reading instruction. Interviews with the coordinator and current candidates confirm that throughout the program they are exposed to numerous assessments used to the strengths and needs of readers as well as readings that expand their knowledge base. As an example, TED 6231 Reading and Language Arts: Assessment I, requires candidates to evaluate assessments, and analyze data from both informal and formal assessments. Candidates then use assessment results to plan and implement intervention lessons in TED 6231 Reading and Language Arts II: Assessment and Intervention. These

assignments, verified by course syllabi and interviews, provide an opportunity for candidates to become proficient in formative and summative assessments.

### **Candidate Competence**

A review of the syllabi confirm that candidates are continually assessed for program competencies via course assignments and signature assessments. Current candidates and recent completers confirm that they received information about program requirements and assessments during the program orientation prior to entry. Along with a detailed website and handbook, current candidates verified that they were informed about, and provided with, detailed guidelines, rubrics, and other resources to assist them in understanding and successfully completing the course and program requirements. Syllabi review verified that for signature assignments, candidates received a scored rubric, while reading completers confirmed they received instructor feedback for all course assignments.

### **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization program.

## **Education Specialist, Mild to Moderate Disabilities Education Specialist, Moderate to Severe Disabilities Autism Spectrum Added Authorization**

### **Program Design**

The Education Specialist credential programs at California State University, East Bay are housed in the Department of Educational Psychology. The special education program cluster includes the Preliminary Mild to Moderate Disabilities and Moderate to Severe Disabilities Education Specialist credential programs, and an Autism Spectrum Added Authorization program. Candidates may also pursue a Masters of Science in Special Education. The Early Childhood Added Authorization program is currently inactive.

Somewhat unique to the CSUEB Education Specialist programs is the requirement that applicants hold a valid California Multiple or Single Subject teaching credential in order to be considered for program admission. Candidates who do not already hold a credential may enroll in a dual credential program known as TED/SPED. Candidates in the dual credential program work towards the Multiple Subject or Single Subject credential and the Education Specialist credentials simultaneously during the seven-quarter program. Candidates holding a Preliminary Multiple or Single Subject credential can complete their coursework in six quarters. As the older Level I and Level II Special Education Authorizations were phased out, CSUEB made the decision to no longer offer the Clear Education Specialist credential programs.

## **Course of Study**

Candidates in the Education Specialist Credential program complete a range of 70-75 quarter units during the six or seven-quarter program to earn the credential. Candidates are assessed at various points throughout the credential program. A variety of projects, presentations, and authentic assignments, with scoring rubrics, are used to assess candidate performance in coursework. Candidates in the Mild/Moderate credential program complete eleven key assignments. The scores that they receive on these assignments serve to demonstrate their individual acquisition of knowledge as they learn and grow as a special educator. Dual credential candidates complete two quarters of student teaching in a general education setting during their first year in the program. This occurs prior to engaging in four quarters of fieldwork and student teaching in settings with students with exceptionalities. The faculty indicated that data from student surveys has informed changes in practice at course, program, department and college levels.

Approximately 20 students completed one of the three Education Specialist Credential programs in 2016-2017 and 26 are enrolled for the 2017-2018 academic year. Faculty regularly review data collected across the credential and added authorization programs and use the information to inform modifications and program improvement. Examples of program improvement based on feedback are the addition of content dealing with mental health to various courses in the Mild to Moderate Disabilities program and the addition of an additional course in the Moderate/Severe program (EPSY 6127, Instructional and Behavioral Support: Mild/Moderate Disabilities) that deals with mental health and strategies for managing student behaviors.

The Autism Spectrum Added Authorization recently went inactive. Candidates took four courses that are part of the Mild to Moderate Disabilities and or Moderate to Severe Disabilities coursework to complete the authorization. The Autism Spectrum Added Authorization standards are embedded in the content and assignments of the course materials. This was evidenced through course syllabi.

## **Candidate Competence**

As noted in the Program Assessment documentation and confirmed during interviews, "Candidate competence is assessed throughout the program through participation in class activities, presentations and discussions, written assignments including case studies and assessment/intervention reports, and candidate created instructional programs, lessons and units as well as key or Signature Assignments. Candidate competence is concurrently evaluated through performance on field-based assignments, fieldwork and throughout the student teaching experience. Field-based assignments are evaluated by the course instructor; fieldwork and student teaching performance is evaluated by the Master/Cooperating teacher and the University Supervisor, all of whom have the same credential that the candidate is seeking"(p159). It is further described that, "The evaluation of candidate performance is both formative, with an emphasis on mastery learning and summative demonstration of candidate's competence"(p.164). During the visit, faculty shared information about the online fieldwork



evaluation tools. The team also found evidence of student feedback that was provided through survey data and they heard from faculty and candidates about in-class evaluation methods, as well as the creation of corrective action plans as needed. Feedback from community stakeholders was noted in the form of both formal and informal advisory committee meetings.

The Program Assessment Document states and it was confirmed through interviews that, “Candidate performance is assessed throughout the programs through a variety of observable and measurable means including performance on course assignments and activities, instructor observations, evaluation of course assignments, job related artifacts, and candidate performance in the field” (p160). Candidates referred to the practical application of assignments and faculty noted the intentional connection of course content, seminar activities and assignments to the field.

Candidates in the Mild to Moderate Disabilities credential program create an electronic portfolio that is organized around the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTPs) and provides the candidates an opportunity to highlight their unique knowledge and skills related to the standards. Rubrics are used to evaluate the portfolios. The electronic portfolio review is accomplished prior to being recommended for the credential. Candidates in the Moderate to Severe Disabilities credential program engage in the development of signature assignments related to the CSTPs and TPEs that are reviewed by program faculty prior to being recommended for the credential. Additionally, candidates engage in self-reflection that, along with a synthesis of teaching and fieldwork evaluations, become the basis for the bridging document that they develop in consultation with their mentors and University supervisors. Candidates in both the Mild to Moderate Disabilities and the Moderate to Severe Disabilities credential programs also prepare a bridging document that they will use during their induction programs.

It has been reported and was verified during the visit that there are multiple points through the program for faculty and university field supervisors to discuss candidate competencies and needs. It was also noted and confirmed through interviews that candidates have ample opportunities for guidance and advisor support. If necessary, corrective plans are actively developed that involve the candidate, university supervisor and master teacher.

During on site interviews, faculty demonstrated passionate interest in all aspects of program development, improvement, management and candidate success. Candidates indicated a feeling that they were well prepared for work in the field of Special Education. They commented repeatedly about the extent of faculty commitment to their success, both professional and personal. Candidates indicated that while the course work was rigorous, and at times the sequence of courses and the amount of courses required per quarter was daunting, they came to see why the program design “made sense.” It was also noted by both completers and current candidates that faculty are responsive and will work to modify the sequence and timeline if necessary for individual needs. Additionally, candidates noted that even though the staff was

small they “made it work” for students, and they “wished that there was more support for the faculty.”

### **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for the Education Specialist, Mild to Moderate Disabilities, Education Specialist, Moderate to Severe Disabilities, and Autism Spectrum Added Authorization programs.

## **Speech Language Pathology Credential**

### **Program Design**

The Speech Language Pathology credential program at California State University, East Bay is housed in the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences in the Department of Communication Disorders (CLASS). The Masters in Speech Language Pathology is required for recommendation for the Speech Language Pathology Services credential.

Faculty communication is reportedly regular and takes the form of conversations, emails and weekly department meetings. Additional meetings between clinical supervisors and program leadership are generally held twice a quarter at the mid and ending points.

### **Course of Study**

Candidates in the Speech Language Pathology program complete 78-quarter units of coursework, 74 of which are also masters degree courses. Candidates must be admitted to the masters program simultaneously. Candidates who do not have an undergraduate degree in communication disorders are admitted conditionally. Once the prerequisite level courses are successfully completed, conditional status is removed.

The required coursework exceeds the standards set by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA). An example of this includes the establishment of the course entitled “School Based Issues in Speech Pathology (SPPA 6228), which was developed in response to candidate concerns that they needed more preparation for Individualized Education Program (IEP) development, collaboration in the schools, and the use of district special education data management systems. Another example can be found in the intentional embedding of materials and discussions related to cultural and linguistic diversity. It was noted that this represents a commitment to the mission of the College of Education and the university with respect to equity and social justice. Faculty also noted the need to constantly update course content to reflect the rapid advances in technology and the impact on interventions in Speech/ Language Pathology. As an example, faculty described a survey created

to assess candidate needs and a detailed process that was developed to evaluate and then download useful Speech Language apps.

### **Candidate Competence**

Candidates are regularly assessed throughout the program. They are assigned supervisors for all clinic/therapy experiences and meet with them regularly to discuss and review interactions. Additionally, onsite experiences are videotaped. This allows the student opportunities for self-reflection and modifications as therapy sessions progress. Assessment measures are integrated and periodic and involve regular evaluation during at least three transition points through the candidates' program. Assessment measures involve the use of key assignments as well as clinical evaluations and a final Praxis assessment as an exit exam. Candidates meet and review their evaluations with their supervisors often. Interviews with current candidates (27) and alumni (10) indicate unanimous appreciation for the preparation and support received as students. The Speech Language Pathology program compared their data across programs and found no difference among responders related to gender, ethnicity or age, but did note higher competency scores for interns.

During the off-site interview, it was noted that during the 2016-2017 AY, 100% of the candidates who took the PRAXIS exam passed. During on campus interviews, faculty explained a shared vision for program planning, candidate development, support as well as assessment of candidate competence.

### **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for the Speech Language Pathology program.

### **Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services Credential**

The Department of Educational Leadership (DEL), within the College of Education and Allied Studies is committed to supporting the development of bold, socially responsible leaders who serve a highly diverse student population, including English Learners, students living in poverty, foster care students, and all students and families who may be under-served due to issues of race, class, immigration, religion, gender identity, high mobility, disability, or special status. DEL faculty are committed to providing a coherent fieldwork experience in the Administrative Services Clear Credential (ASCC) program and providing seamless support for candidates who completed the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) program and continue to participate in the two-year induction program. To support this integration, faculty have participated with coaches in a number of activities including Coaching for Equity Training & Follow-up Workshop and Quarterly Coaching Meetings.

## **Program Design**

### **Preliminary Administrative Services**

Within the CEAS and the DEL, the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and the PASC Coordinator work with full-time faculty, coaches (university supervisors), adjuncts and district partners to provide an ongoing support system for PASC candidates in addition to communication and collaboration with surrounding districts. In interviews, completers stated they felt there was a strong system of support in CSUEB's hybrid and face-to-face structured program.

The credential and degree programs within the DEL provide a cohort structure where candidates enter the program at the same time and move through the program together. They are in the same cohort for their core classes, creating a community of learners and leaders. Both current candidates and completers describe their cohorts as a very strong component of the program. They often work with members of their cohort outside of their core courses such as meeting before class to work through issues encountered in their online course. Candidates and completers described their discussion groups as a community of learners and leaders who work together collaboratively, supporting each other in professional growth. Candidates appreciated how they meet face to face to discuss assignments before their online classes. Additionally, they rely on their discussion groups to problem solve complex issues addressed in core classes. Professionals emerge from these cohort communities prepared to serve as transformational leaders.

Both completers and current students valued the focus of the PASC's program equity lens woven throughout their fieldwork activities and coursework. Stakeholder interviews resonated with the same message. One superintendent from a neighboring large district reported that he hired most of his new administrators from CSUEB because the equity training the new administrators received from this program prepared them better than other programs and assisted in meeting the current challenges in low performing schools.

The program's equity model clearly is the framework that guides the development of the program. Stakeholders and candidates all spoke highly of how the equity plan is a guide for candidates with signature assignments to serve underrepresented groups in a leadership role.

Faculty members work collaboratively with coaches and candidates both supporting and advising candidates throughout the three quarters it takes to complete the PASC. Candidates, coaches and faculty reported regularly scheduled meetings and shared commitments to candidate progress.

### **Clear Administrative Services**

The Clear Administrative Services Credential Induction Program Coordinator, the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and the PASC Program Coordinator work with full-time

faculty, coaches, adjuncts and district partners to provide an ongoing support system for Administrative Services Clear Credential (ASCC) candidates. Frequent and purposeful communication occurs based on scheduled meetings and shared commitments to candidate progress.

The program is designed to embody a data-informed decision-making process that guides continuous improvement. The CSUEB program consists of a field-based academic program leading to an Administrative Services Credential in two years. Educational leadership students also have the option of completing a Masters in Educational Leadership and/or a doctoral degree in Educational Leadership for Social Justice. The credential and degree programs within the Department of Educational Leadership follow the cohort model. A cohort is a group of professional educators who enter the program at the same time and are placed into a group for their core classes.

### **Course of Study**

#### **Preliminary Administrative Services**

Review of the PASC course schedule and interviews with candidates, completers, and faculty verified the sequence of course work and its connection with fieldwork experience. Candidates and completers in interviews indicated that they selected the CSUEB program to pursue leadership development through the lens of social justice and equity. Candidates and completers verified the on-going feedback on their leadership development occurs within the development of their Equity Plan. Candidates and district mentors described a self-selection process for fieldwork placement typically being held at their site. In interviews, the coordinators and chair of the department identified a 3-way meeting in fall quarter with the candidate, university coach, and district/site mentor that is held to outline a leadership project, create a plan to complete fieldwork activities, and discuss the candidate's strengths & needs for further experience.

The California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs) are addressed in the fieldwork activities. Candidates and completers described fieldwork activities as very practical and tied to the CAPEs. The University coach and district mentor monitor the candidate's leadership project and fieldwork activities throughout the year. Program coordinators reported and candidate completers confirmed that coaching conversations with the university coach occur and that the coach provides substantive written feedback on the candidate's fieldwork reflections each quarter. The completers and candidates discussed benefits from peer feedback and collaborative work groups. Candidates and completers highlighted the value of peer groups within the cohort meeting before their face to face class to examine and clarify class topics addressed in the online class the candidates were simultaneously enrolled in. During the interviews, the candidates noted their appreciation for the faculty who serve as advisors. The personal attention from faculty was discussed as extremely valuable in providing ongoing and substantive comments on key assignments, advisement, and consistent follow up in keeping the candidates on track.

### **Clear Administrative Services**

The CSUEB program consists of a field-based academic program leading to a Clear Administrative Services Credential in two years. Completers in the clear program also indicated their cohorts created a community of learners and leaders who worked together collaboratively, supporting each other during rich, intense experiences in professional growth. Completers explained they were prepared to serve as transformational leaders.

As ASCC cohort leaders teach either a Year 1 or a Year 2 three-quarter course sequence that provides face-to-face meeting times for candidates throughout the school year. Fieldwork coaches also attend these sessions. Both candidates and completers felt their fieldwork and coursework assignments were aligned to build candidates' experience with and understanding of the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL). Both candidates and completers found their coursework, discussions, and assignments were relevant and connected to their field experiences. The CPSEL portfolio includes summative CPSEL reflections with artifacts/evidence from the field. Each seminar session focuses on the need to identify and better serve under-served student populations.

### **Candidate Competence**

#### **Preliminary Administrative Services**

Assessments of the PASC program include a CAPE Formative Assessment, a CAPE Summative Portfolio, a CAPE Fieldwork Assessment, an Equity Plan, an Efolio, and the sharing of their research project at the Leadership Institute.

The university coach and district mentor monitor job-embedded tasks to determine if there are developments that are appropriate to incorporate into a candidate's Individual Induction Plan (IIP) when the completer moves into the Induction program. They also provide direct communication regarding candidates' ongoing progress throughout the candidate's program.

### **Clear Administrative Services**

Interviews with completers and candidates confirmed that the induction program coordinators advise candidates and develop an Individual Learning Plan (ILP). Upon entry in the program, a meeting with the university coach, district mentor, and candidate is convened to develop the ILP. The key question addressed is: What does the candidate need to know and be able to do in order to lead effectively in his/her current position? In addition, the candidate submits a CPSEL Self-Assessment portfolio that consists of Part 1: Individual Learning Plan (ILP) and Part 2: Narratives with Three Pieces of Evidence for Each Narrative.

The university coach and district mentor monitor job-embedded tasks to determine if there are developments that should be incorporated into a candidate's ILP. They also collaboratively provide direct communication regarding candidates' ongoing progress throughout the two years of induction.

Coaching activities and monthly seminars are aligned to address and assess candidates' competence in relation to the CPSEL as documented in first and second year portfolios. Coaching activities include: face to face meetings, observation cycles, electronic conversations, role play scenarios, analysis of written documents and communications, debriefing, and planning sessions that support individual candidates' acquisition of skills and understanding of the CPSELS.

Candidates and completers spoke highly of the Equity Plan, which is initiated in the preliminary program and continued in the clear program. Furthermore, candidates and completers spoke of the value of the e-portfolio that is scored with a rubric. The candidates use the Description of Practice (DOP) to self-assess their level of practice. Candidates attend the university's Leadership Institute to present their research. Lastly, candidates complete an exit interview assessment process that is also used for the purpose of collecting data.

### **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for both the Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services Credential program.

### **Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Credential**

The School Counseling program at California State University, East Bay is housed in the department of Educational Psychology within the College of Education and Allied Studies. The program is unique in offering three outcomes: rigorous studies toward a M.S. in Counseling, professional training toward the PPS Credential in School Counseling, and clinical training and experience toward the Marriage and Family Licensure as specified by the BBS (Board of Behavioral Sciences).

Based on California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Standards and the American School Counseling Association National Model (ASCA), the School Counseling program emphasizes academic, career, and social-emotional program development for pupils. Within the program, a strength-based philosophy and focus on candidate development of content knowledge, professional skill, and program disposition is emphasized.

### **Program Design**

The school counseling program is strongly field based and encompasses course assignments specifically designed to be carried out in field settings. Currently based on the quarter system, the program requires two years of full-time attendance to complete the 117 units of course work (plus 3 prerequisite courses). All courses are planned in a hierarchical sequence, in order to encourage students to structure their knowledge in a constructive manner. Resultantly, from the point of admission to the point of graduation, every student completes a tiered and organized sequence of courses.

Each year within the program, candidates are placed in a fieldwork setting for a combined total of 900 hours. The configuration of fieldwork hours differs for both first and second year candidates due to required hours in the college Community Counseling Center (CCC). First year candidates are required to complete all fieldwork hours (450) within a PK-12 school setting. Second year candidates complete the same number of fieldwork hours (450) but participate in PK-12 fieldwork settings for 250 hours and engage with clients in the CCC for 200 hours.

The program is currently co-coordinated by a program coordinator and the chair of the department who are responsible for program operations, including course scheduling, faculty-student and program-district communication, student outcome learning data collection, and facilitation of training. Administrative oversight of the program rests with the department chair and the Dean of the College of Education and Allied Studies. In maintaining an effective program, it is evident that the leadership recognizes the importance of addressing program and candidate needs. Resultantly, faculty in the school counseling program meet regularly to discuss ongoing program needs and to monitor student progress.

Communication from the program to candidates is enabled via use of the University's BlackBoard electronic system where they are notified about program announcements, training resources, receive required forms and/or requests for information. Additionally, district information such as field-placement presentations is also posted. Within the college, the coordinator collaborates with multiple offices including the credential analyst and Student Services. Other programs on campus are included within the communication loop and contact occurs at quarterly meetings of the Campus Committee on Professional PK-12 education. Communication with the institution at large regarding annual student learning outcomes and program changes is facilitated by the coordinator through the university's annual Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) Report.

Part of the stated mission of the school counseling program is to promote social justice and democracy by preparing knowledgeable and competent professional school counselors who advocate care and support for all students and engage in participatory leadership to help all students reach high academic expectations. In recognition of this mission, within the most recent two years the program has made modifications to a course in order to foster discussions and employ assignments to address the need for meaningful candidate participation in the area of career counseling/development within coursework assignments and site-based field work activities. Candidates are required to develop a Support Personnel Accountability Report Card (SPARC) for their respective fieldwork site and submit the SPARC to the California Department of Education for review. The SPARC engages the candidate in identifying the career and college readiness at their site via the production of an artifact that becomes part of the Professional Practice Portfolio. This learning is also further grounded in an assignment which requires candidates to assess career center at their fieldwork site as a Linked Learning activity. Candidates, completers, and fieldwork supervisors report that the coursework completed within



the program supports their acquisition of skills and their ability to appropriately apply learned theories to the variety of on-the-ground situations faced within the school setting.

Institutionally, the program is required to move from the current quarter system to the semester system of course matriculation. This change will take place fall 2018 and the program has developed plans to address this change. Candidates have been verbally notified of the change and will be invited to a planning meeting prior to the close of the current quarter where faculty will address questions and concerns.

An evident part of the program's continuous improvement cycle is the inclusion of candidates as a stakeholder group. Candidates and completers report they feel their comments and concerns are heard and purposefully considered by the program coordinator and faculty. One way this occurs is through the Cohort Student Representative meetings where candidates are able to freely provide input to the program and present areas of concerns. Candidate input is also actively sought through quarterly student course evaluations, and annual program evaluations (courses, university supervision, and advisory support).

Stakeholders external to the program such as school counseling supervisors, completers, coordinators of counseling services, and district lead counselors are invited to become Advisory Committee members. This committee meets annually and provides input on student trainee performance, program communication and structure, and changes that impact candidate preparation. Interviews with these stakeholders confirmed the program's consistent and open lines of communication.

Review of all documents and interviews with candidates and faculty members including field supervisors and administrators provide evidence of a well-constructed credential program. Candidates and completers report being well prepared for field placement and counseling work in schools armed with theoretical and professional knowledge gained from their tenure in the program. They report overall consistency of good quality teaching in the program and appreciation for the support and guidance provided by faculty and field supervisors. Commentary from fieldwork site supervisors, lead school counselors, and coordinators of counseling services confirm candidate's skills and abilities observed in the field. These professionals report that the program consistently produces candidates who demonstrate the ability to deliver effective services to children, families, and teachers and who also display good collaborative consultation skills with the ability to integrate and proactively apply their knowledge, skills, and dispositions in school contexts.

### **Course of Study**

Courses are aligned for admission to the program and applicants must complete three prerequisites prior to being accepted into the program. Candidates and completers report that although fulfilling the prerequisites was initially daunting, they believe it is an indication of the importance the program places on student preparation. Once accepted into the program,

candidates through their coursework, field work, and experiences in the CCC develop a set of competencies to effectively collaborate with others in and beyond their school communities, ensure opportunities for meaningful participation for all students, and commit to lifelong professional development.

The program is strongly field-based, with course assignments specifically designed to be carried out in field settings. Program faculty are dedicated to providing students with experiences that are appropriate to their particular level of readiness, with the difficulty and complexity of assignments increasing steadily as candidate's progress through the program and grow in their training. The integral nature of fieldwork within the program was noted both by candidates and field work supervisors who commented that the assignments which are completed within the field settings provide the candidates with the opportunity to fully conceptualize theories they are learning within the classroom, integrate that knowledge, and apply it in school contexts.

First year school counseling candidates are required to complete a total of 450 hours in within the PreK-12 school setting where amongst other responsibilities, they gain knowledge and demonstrate skill through the implementation of guidance lessons, review of case studies and collection of data to determine the effectiveness of the services they provide. Second year candidates complete a total 450 fieldwork hours via a combination of hours within the CCC (200) and participation in the PreK-12 fieldwork setting (250). Also, within the 450 hours, second year students are responsible for not only completing similar activities as first year students but they must also specifically engage in parent training, client advocacy work, and work with students/clients who are culturally different from themselves.

The program has a pre-approved list of site agreements (or Memoranda of Understanding) with multiple highly diverse school districts in the region and many of the potential site supervisors are program graduates. Candidates have the option to select a field placement/internship site from among the agreement list provided by the program. However, they also have the option to choose a school that is not on the list and establish a new site (with Coordinator approval). Candidates are able to gain experience in working with English learners and students from a wide variety of cultural backgrounds. Through field work coupled with coursework, students are able to practice cultural competency throughout the program.

In meeting with program coordinators, it was evident that they are committed to candidates developing sound professional values in concert with the acquisition of professional knowledge. In order to facilitate this process, they emphasize the importance of supervision. Each candidate receives weekly supervision from both the site supervisor and university supervisors and quarterly advisement from the program coordinator. Additionally, through Annual Reviews, university faculty provide feedback to each candidate regarding their professional progress. Site supervisor evaluations are provided to first and second year students at the end of each quarter using the respective First Year Fieldwork Evaluation, and Second Year Advanced Fieldwork

Evaluation forms. Data from evaluations is aggregated and analyzed to make program recommendations to enhance candidate learning.

Communication between the university supervisors and site supervisor is key. In conversation with site supervisors they confirmed sufficient and effective channels of communication between both groups and a responsiveness from the university if candidate dispositional or other issues arise at a site so as to ensure that both the candidate and the district participate in a mutually beneficial experience. Formal contact between university and each field-based site supervisors occur via calls and e-mails at the beginning of the quarter. Multiple contacts to monitor candidate progress and share any university or district concerns as applicable occur at least twice per quarter during the fieldwork assignment.

Informal contacts between university and site supervisors also occur as necessary to address questions. In addition to candidate specific communication, site-based supervisors are invited to offer additional comments or suggestions for improved student progress and suggestions for program improvement in the formal Fieldwork Supervisor Evaluation.

In interviews, candidates reported being well prepared for fieldwork in schools through a combination of their coursework and experience in the CCC. Candidates commented upon a number of classes such as; Fieldwork Supervision, Counseling Across Cultures, and Micro Counseling, as courses that were pivotal to their learning.

### **Candidate Competence**

Candidate performance is based on multiple assessments beginning with admission, and continuing throughout the program during appropriate transitions, and at the completion of the program. The Commission's School Counseling Standards areas are integrated into the program. Core Knowledge Base and Foundations, as well as Professional Skills and Training are introduced to candidates, initially assessed, and are anchored to training and assessment standards and ethical professional practice throughout the program. Both formally and informally, all candidates receive evaluations from field supervisors and university supervisors. Additionally, each candidate is assessed through the Professional Practice Portfolios and the Praxis II exam in school counseling.

Candidates are assessed for program competencies, skills/knowledge, and program dispositions through formal evaluations completed by the site supervisor via the Fieldwork Supervisor Evaluation form at the end of each year they are in the program. These evaluations occur by means of a combination of feedback mechanisms including supervisor rating forms, telephone, and face-to-face contacts between university and field site supervisors. Additionally, documentation of intern performance is provided in the Professional Practice Portfolio which demonstrates candidate competence in a variety of areas. The portfolios are evaluated by program faculty utilizing the portfolio rubric for evidence of skills competency.

The Praxis II - Professional School Counselor exam is also utilized within the program to assess candidate competence. Candidates must earn a passing score on the Praxis II exam to demonstrate their competence in school counseling prior to completion of the program.

In addition to completion of the Professional Practice Portfolio, second year students complete an Exit Interview with program faculty. The interview involves a collaborative dialogue and provides the candidate with a platform to share evidence of their professional growth and the impact they have had in the schools where they have served during their two years within the program. The Professional Practice Portfolio includes key assignments and evidence of candidate's professional development illustrating their practice and competence as a beginning school counselor.

Candidates and completers report a clear understanding of assessment requirements and expectations. In interviews, candidates indicated that both faculty and the program handbook prepared them at each level of the assessment process. Both groups reported that they felt confident in their understanding of program requirements for matriculation in and completion of the program.

### **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for the Pupil Personnel Services, School Counseling program.

## **Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Credential**

### **Program Design**

The School Psychology program at California State University, East Bay is housed in the department of Educational Psychology within the College of Education and Allied Studies. The program is certified by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and offers rigorous studies toward the masters degree in Counseling, professional training toward the PPS Credential in School Psychology, and clinical training and experience toward the Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT) Licensure specified by the California Board of Behavioral Sciences.

The program is based on 175 quarter units of course work (plus 5 prerequisite courses) and requires full-time student attendance. Fieldwork hours differ for both first and second year candidates due to required hours in the college Community Counseling Center (CCC). First year candidates are required to engage in 120 hours of fieldwork at the CCC and 360 hours in a school fieldwork setting. Second year candidates engage in all fieldwork within a school setting and complete a total of 528 hours. During the culminating field experience in the third-year, candidates complete a full-time 1200 hour school-based internship.

The coordinator of the School Psychology program is responsible for program operations, including course scheduling, admissions, faculty-student communication and program-district communication, student outcome learning data collection, and facilitation of training. Administrative oversight of the program rests with the department chair and the Dean of the College of Education and Allied Studies.

The stated mission of the school psychology program is to prepare participatory leaders, committed to professional excellence, social justice, and democracy who will influence a diverse and interconnected world. In order to facilitate this mission, the coordinator meets with program faculty every Wednesday morning during the academic year to discuss university coursework and fieldwork, student progress and concerns, and preparation planning.

Communication from the program to candidates is enabled via use of the University's BlackBoard electronic system where they are notified about program announcements, training resources, receive required forms and/or requests for information. Additionally, district information such as field-placement presentations is also posted. Within the college, the coordinator collaborates with multiple offices including the credential analyst and Student Services. Other programs on campus are included within the communication loop and contact occurs at quarterly meetings of the Campus Committee on Professional PK-12 education. Communication with the institution at large regarding annual student learning outcomes and program changes is facilitated by the coordinator through the university's annual Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) Report.

Over the recent two years the program has modified the culminating Professional Practice Portfolio through the integration of a problem-solving model into all case studies. Resultantly, within the portfolio, interns now clearly demonstrate their ability to conceptualize the essential challenges of cases, collect data to understand the problem, devise best practice approaches to address the issue and evaluate the impact of services provided. Evidence of the application of this change was evident in the commentary of both candidates and fieldwork supervisors who report that the course work within the program provides a rich theoretical foundation through which Interns are able to understand various real-world situations and appropriately employ practical solutions.

Institutionally, the program is required to move from the current quarter system to the semester system of course matriculation. This change will take place fall 2018 and the program has developed plans to address this change. Candidates have been verbally notified of the change and will be invited to a planning meeting prior to the close of the current quarter where faculty will address questions and concerns.

Input from essential stakeholders is an evident part of the program's continuous improvement cycle. Candidates and completers report they feel their comments and concerns are purposefully considered by the program coordinator and faculty. One way this occurs is through the quarterly

student representative meetings with program faculty where candidates provide program feedback, present program strengths and areas for growth and concern. Additionally, candidate input is actively sought through: quarterly course evaluations; annual student surveys of field supervisors and field placements; and annual student program surveys in which students anonymously provide feedback on coursework, university supervision, and training support.

External stakeholders such as fieldwork site supervisors, completers, coordinators of student services and lead school psychologists are invited to become Advisory Committee members. This committee meets annually and provides feedback on candidate trainee performance, program communication and structure, and changes that impact candidate preparation. They also provide suggestions regarding school district needs. Interviews with these stakeholders confirmed the programs consistent communication

Utilization of the cohort model within the program was repeatedly commented upon by completers, and candidates, as being one of the many strengths of the program. Both groups reported that they received support from faculty, but also significant support from the peers within their cohorts. This cohort support was enhanced by two separate department-approved and student lead initiatives: The Social Justice League and the Buddy program. The Social Justice league is a formal student organization that engages in community service through empowering people to work toward positive social change and social justice. The informal Buddy Program pairs each incoming candidate with a current candidate. Both initiatives routinely act as ways to inform first year candidates of program requirements, advice, and encouragement. The mentorship process engendered by both initiatives is an efficient way to bridge continuity across all three years of the program.

Document review and interviews with candidates, completers, and faculty, provide evidence of a well-designed program. Candidates report that they feel confident and prepared for the demands of being a school psychologist in diverse and challenging schools not only as a result of the coursework they have completed but also because of their fieldwork experiences at school sites and within the Community Counseling Center. Additionally, candidates and completers commented upon the strength and flexibility of program leadership and their appreciation for the consistent support offered by program faculty. Fieldwork site supervisors, lead psychologists, and coordinators of student services confirm candidates assertions and report that the program consistently produces candidates who demonstrate and engage in culturally responsive practices, utilize data to collaboratively problem solve, and view all students, families, and communities through a resiliency and strengths-based lens.

### **Course of Study**

Prior to entering the school psychology program, candidates must demonstrate a foundation in basic psychological concepts by completing five prerequisite courses. Once accepted into the program, each candidate develops a set of competencies to effectively work with students, families, and communities with variable cultural linguistic diversity, socio-economic status levels,

and learning abilities through coursework, fieldwork experiences and clinical hours in the university Community Counseling Clinic.

Within the first year of the program, candidates are required to complete 120 clinical hours in the CCC. The clinic serves as a setting where candidate's development of foundational counseling skills and understanding of theoretical orientations learned within courses are grounded in real world experiences with the families, children, adults, and couples that come into the clinic. Academic coursework taken in the first two years is coordinated with field placements so that candidates can employ intervention, assessment, consultation/collaboration, and program development skills in K-12 schools. Additional knowledge and skills in law, ethics, social justice and advocacy are also practiced. Completers and candidates confirmed that the combination of theoretical knowledge and practical application in fieldwork and clinical settings supported their learning and helped to build confidence in their growing skills, especially during the internship year.

Candidates engage in field-based activities in all areas of professional training throughout their tenure in the program and complete a total of approximately 900 hours of supervised field experience within the first two years of the program and 1200 hours of supervised internship in the third year.

The program has a pre-approved list of internship agreements (or Memoranda of Understanding) with more than 30 local, highly diverse school districts in the region and many of the potential site supervisors are program graduates. Candidates have the option to select a field placement/internship site from among the agreement list provided by the program. However, they also have the option to choose a school that is not on the list and establish a new site (with Coordinator approval). Candidates are able to gain experience in working with English Language learners and students from a wide variety of cultural backgrounds. Coupled with coursework, students are able to practice cultural competency throughout the program.

Each candidate receives weekly supervision from both the site supervisor and university supervisor and quarterly advisement from the program coordinator. Additionally, Annual Reviews provide university faculty feedback to each candidate regarding professional progress. Site supervisor evaluations are provided to first and second year students at the end of each quarter using the respective First Year Fieldwork Evaluation, and Second Year Advanced Fieldwork Evaluation forms. Interns are evaluated by their site supervisors via the Third Year, Intern Fieldwork Evaluation form. Data from evaluations is aggregated and analyzed to make program recommendations to enhance candidate learning.

University supervisors communicate formally via calls and e-mail with each site supervisor regarding candidate progress and university-district concerns at least twice a quarter during the fieldwork assignment. Multiple informal contacts also occur as necessary to address questions. Interviews with university based and site-based supervisors confirmed sufficient and effective

channels of communication between both groups and a responsiveness from the university if candidate dispositional or other issues arise at a site so as to ensure that both the candidate and the district participate in a mutually beneficial experience. Site based supervisors also provide quarterly suggestions for program improvement in the formal Fieldwork Supervisor Evaluation.

In interviews, candidates reported being well prepared for fieldwork in schools through their coursework and experience in the CCC. Candidates commented upon a number of classes such as: Micro Counseling, Fieldwork Supervision, and Practicum in Report Writing as courses that were pivotal to their learning.

### **Candidate Competence**

In addition to assessments within coursework, candidates are assessed for program competencies, skills/knowledge, NASP training standards for graduate preparation, and program dispositions and aptitudes throughout their tenure in the program. Both formally and informally, all candidates receive evaluations from field supervisors and university supervisors. Additionally, each candidate is assessed through Formative and Professional Portfolios for fieldwork/internship, and the Praxis exam in school psychology.

Candidates receive formal evaluations from the site supervisor through completion of the Fieldwork Supervisor Evaluation form at the end of each year they are in the program. During the second year in the program, candidates begin developing a Formative Portfolio to represent their acquired skill and knowledge. As a third-year, full-time intern, candidates are evaluated by means of a combination of feedback mechanisms including supervisor rating forms, telephone and face-to-face contacts between university and field site supervisors, and the documentation of intern performance provided in the professional portfolio which demonstrates their competence in a variety of areas. The portfolios are evaluated by program faculty utilizing the portfolio rubric for evidence of skills competency.

Candidates must earn a passing score on the Praxis II exam at or above the National score of 147 to demonstrate their competence in school psychology prior to completion of the program. Upon passing the Praxis II the student is eligible to apply to become a Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP).

The final Exit Interview assessment is for third year internship students only and is the culminating dialogue with faculty members or university supervisor regarding the development of the candidate's professional identity and practice as a professional school psychologist. The Exit Interview involves a collaborative review of specific self-assessments the candidates Professional Portfolio that will include key assignments and evidence illustrating the candidates practice and competence as a beginning school psychologist.

Candidates and completers reported a clear understanding of assessment requirements and expectations. They indicated that both faculty and the program handbook prepared them at



each level of the assessment process. Both groups reported that they felt confident in their understanding of program requirements for matriculation in and completion of the program.

### **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology program.

## Common Standards

### **Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation**

**Finding: Met**

The programs at California State University, East Bay College of Education and Applied Studies are grounded by a mission and vision which are well aligned with California's adopted standards and curricular frameworks. The vision articulates a commitment to exemplifying the ideals of social justice and democracy, distinguished by excellence in teaching and scholarship, vibrant programs, and graduates who are powerful forces in their communities. The mission is to prepare collaborative leaders, committed to professional excellence, social justice, and democracy, who will influence a diverse and interconnected world. Both the vision and mission are infused throughout the preparation programs. Stakeholders who were interviewed (employers, administration, faculty, candidates, and completers) were able to articulate the importance of the unit vision and mission in guiding their work and personalized their commitment in many different ways. Completers, for example, mentioned how they not only see themselves as experts in understanding social justice and democracy, but must be the change agents and advocates in transforming their schools and communities in that regard. The unit also articulates important values: Excellence in Teaching and Scholarship; Collaboration and Partnership; Assessment and Evaluation; and Equity and Diversity, which were also acknowledged by completers and employers as areas of strength of the unit.

Interviews with the Campus Committee on Professional K-12 Education, a committee of unit leaders, leaders outside of the unit, and faculty across colleges, confirmed that unit regularly involves faculty, instructional personnel and relevant stakeholders in the unit, along with coordination and the decision making for all educator preparation programs. In addition, interviews and document review from the CEAS Accreditation Team, which has representatives from every program and includes credential staff, highlights the extensive conversations, review of data, and action taken through support by the unit leadership and university, in improving educator preparation. For example, stakeholder interviews confirmed that the process of data review, faculty discussion, along with discussion in the CEAS Accreditation team was followed by a recommendation of a faculty hire. The funding of a Speech Language Pathology position with specialization in bilingual education was implemented as a result of this process. Suggestions for both program and process improvement were noted by both committees and examples of programmatic changes and resource allocations accordingly were also confirmed. P-12 stakeholders are frequently brought into relevant discussions, such as ensuring candidates are placed in diverse settings, which were noted by faculty, program coordinators and employers. As was noted by the CEAS Dean and confirmed in staff interviews, staff are involved in unit discussions and described their input as valued in decision making and unit efficiency, when appropriate, such as in the development of the new staff structure.

Interviews with employers, program coordinators, faculty, and the dean confirmed that the unit faculty and instructional personnel collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings through various formal and informal activities. A unit-wide Superintendents Forum garnering feedback occurred

recently, and program advisory boards have operated in a variety of formats and frequency over the past several years which provide input and feedback for continuous improvement of educator preparation. An example of stakeholder input was identified by the SLP Program Chair and then confirmed by faculty in interviews, which noted feedback from the employers on lack of preparedness of candidates in school settings, specifically a request for greater preparation and management of IEPs and in the use of the special education database systems and collaboration. This feedback resulted in the unit developing an optional elective course to address this need. While the PPS/PPSC program advisory board meets regularly and documents feedback, the other program advisory boards, which include school superintendents, principals, and service professionals from multiple districts, are held less frequently or with less documented feedback for continuous improvement; however, evidence provided in document review, interviews with employers, program coordinators and faculty confirmed the frequent informal communication in each program was occurring and recommendations for program improvement were subsequently made. In addition, program coordinators, employers and faculty confirmed that in the administrator preparation programs, valuable meetings occur between program faculty and districts on a rotating basis to hear superintendents or assistant superintendent of human resources' feedback on cooperating teacher placements, needs of the districts, and areas requiring program improvement. The Hayward Promise, a \$30 million partnership grant to offer wrap-around services and support to several local districts, is an example of the highly collaborative discussions and partnerships between the unit and the P-12 community. Documentation of the regularity and the systematic collaboration memorializing the improvements made based on the feedback would improve this area.

The unit has robust institutional support from the university. The Office of the Provost supports the unit through grant writing support and extensive faculty development support and activities. The CEAS dean confirmed that faculty receive annual professional development stipends for research and conference attendance, and that new faculty receive additional added support and personal mentoring to ensure their success. Document review and interviews with the provost, deans, and faculty confirmed that there are sufficient resources to administer the programs in the unit. Self-Support Program competitive funds are also available to the unit to provide additional monetary support. Staff stated during interviews that they are provided with what they need to be able to advise and support candidates. Across programs, candidates confirmed that they are receiving the necessary support to complete the program.

The unit is led by the CEAS dean; however, the Speech Language Pathology Preliminary Credential is housed outside of the CEAS in the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences. It was confirmed in interviews with the Provost, the CLASS dean, and the CEAS dean, that the CEAS dean is the unit head for all Commission-approved programs and influences the hiring, budget, and curriculum as needed to ensure adherence to Commission standards. All three individuals highlighted the positive collaboration, trust and respect for each other, along with the common goals of providing high quality faculty and programs, as the primary reasons for success of resource sharing and support for program in different colleges. The provost and deans confirmed there is

a process to ensure adequate resources are allocated to serve three goals: the college has what it needs to ensure quality and demand, retention of students, and candidate program completion. While community feedback about demand for programs, specifically Speech Language Pathology and Special Education, was not readily apparent as being shared with the provost, the CEAS and CLASS deans were each aware of the community feedback and have concrete reasoning for lack of expansion, or new plans for expansion, to address the community needs.

The recruitment of diverse faculty and the faculty development to support them are best practices at CSUEB. Document review and provost, dean and faculty interviews confirmed a true commitment to diversity and professional development support. In recruitment, when a faculty line is approved, the University Diversity Officer and a trained diversity advocate are assigned to guide and monitor the processes throughout the search to ensure all reasonable efforts are made to ensure both diversity and excellence in each unit hire. Administrators can declare a failed search if the applicant pool is not diverse. As stated previously, extensive faculty development support is offered to faculty to ensure retention and success in their positions.

Extensive document review and interviews with the provost, deans and faculty confirmed that faculty and field-based supervisors are evaluated by a variety of means depending on program to ensure only qualified personnel are retained. All faculty are evaluated using a university evaluation system. Candidates and completers confirmed that they completed course evaluations and, in most cases, evaluations of their university supervisors. The CEAS Accreditation Team confirmed that the data is reviewed systematically at the program level. While interviews confirmed that the data is reviewed, there are some uneven processes in the area of clinical supervision and the monitoring of clinical practice.

Document review and interviews with administration and staff confirmed staff of the Credential Student Service Center (CSSC) has the responsibility for maintaining records for all programs in the unit. The credential analysts in the CSSC serve as the authorized representatives to recommend candidates for the credential and there is a process in place to ensure candidates have met all the requirements for the credential. Candidates in the teaching credential programs are tracked by credential analysts upon admission throughout the program and verify that candidates have met all requirements prior to being given whole class instruction responsibilities. In all programs, requirements are tracked by the credential analyst using an electronic system supported by the university internally-developed Credential Candidate Database. CSSC staff report to the Associate Dean of CEAS who ensures that the process for credential recommendations is followed. Interviews confirmed that the credential analysts are highly trained and regularly attend Commission-sponsored conferences and activities. At the conclusion of the program, the credential analyst reviews each candidate file and recommends qualified candidates. Candidates confirmed the process for the credential recommendation and also stated that the credential analysts are easily accessible to provide advice and assistance.

**Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support****Finding: Met**

Interviews with staff, faculty, and candidates, and review of documents indicate that the unit recruits and supports candidates in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success. Clear criteria for admission to each program based on multiple measures of candidate qualifications are communicated through application materials, information meetings held during each open application period, and on unit and program websites. Informational videos explaining programs, admission criteria, and the application process and forms are available online.

The unit has written and disseminated a plan focused on recruiting and admitting candidates to diversify the educators prepared by CSU, East Bay. Program coordinators explained that a historic role for the campus has been to serve traditionally underrepresented students. To implement the diversity recruitment plan, the unit is providing additional financial assistance for candidates, additional contacts and mentoring for applicants from underrepresented groups, involving program completers from underrepresented populations in candidate recruitment meetings and informational videos, and scheduling information meetings in communities with greater population diversity such as, nearby tribal lands and rural areas. Additional examples of steps taken to implement the diversity plan include a Commission-sponsored Classified to Teacher project in which the unit partners with school districts to provide needed pipeline services such as small group advising and preparation for subject matter exams. The unit is also a partner with California State University, Northridge on the Kellogg Foundation sponsored Future Minority Male Teachers of California project, and has started a campus chapter of EduCorps. EduCorps is a CSU initiative to increase the number and diversity of students entering CSU teacher preparation programs.

The unit surveys applicants for diversity. The diversity report available at the time of this review provided baseline data for each program that will be used to assess changes in diversity of candidates and measure the effectiveness of diversity recruitment activities going forward. In interviews, employers reported appreciation at being able to hire teachers from CSU East Bay who reflect the diversity of students in their classrooms and are already community members, stating that these teachers are key to the success of their schools.

Policies and requirements communicated through program personnel, handbooks, and websites, as well as clearly identified support personnel that include program coordinators, faculty, supervisors, staff, and department and unit administrators are available to ensure that candidates are guided to success. Program personnel reported on the steps they take to ensure success; candidates, in interviews, confirmed that they are well supported by program personnel.

Systematic processes for monitoring candidate progress through each professional preparation program are in place. The Credential Student Service Center maintains databases for monitoring student progress, tracking completion of requirements and success in courses and field experiences. Program coordinators, faculty, and university-based supervisors also monitor

student progress and provide assistance to ensure success. For candidates who need additional assistance in successfully meeting program and credential requirements, an improvement plan process is available to support candidates and help them focus on areas needing improvement. Examples of improvement plans were inspected that clearly identified actions candidates were to take and how they would be evaluated. In interviews, program coordinators described actions that are taken to help students succeed including the use of formal improvement plans.

**Standard 3: Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice**      **Finding: Met with Concerns**

A review of Common Standards and Program Review documents provided evidence that CSUEB programs follow a cohort model where candidates have multiple opportunities to learn, discuss, and practice the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students. Although programs follow a cohort model, flexibility is provided when needed. Through interviews, completers reported that when they needed to step away from their program for a while, they were able to. Faculty supported them, kept in touch, counseled, and rooted for them to finish. These completers reported that they were put into a new cohort and were able to finish their program.

Completers and current students reported that the coursework sequence and the clinical experiences were good with the exception of some education specialist candidates who suggested that the assessment course should be offered earlier in the program. Additionally, Multiple Subject and Single Subject candidates reported that the computer class was outdated. Completers and current students reported that university supervisors and coordinators provided ample support and advising and felt that they were prepared for the rigor of the program. In an effort to support students, many programs offer multi-platform courses in order to meet the needs of all of their students.

Clinical experience and coursework are aligned and follow a progression as candidates move further into their programs. Clinical practice occurs throughout programs and, in most cases, aligns with what they are doing in class. Candidates reported that the connections were intentional and supported them in the classrooms.

District level administrators reported that CSUEB candidates receive great preparation and are highly sought for positions. One district reported that 90% of their Multiple Subject teachers graduated from CSUEB. They also agreed that the unit focus on equity was evident and made graduates well prepared to work in diverse communities. Employers reported that many CSUEB graduates eventually end up in leadership roles.

Program and placement coordinators work with district partners to select school sites and site-based supervisors. Initial program completers and current candidates have more than one placement where they have the opportunity to work with different grade levels and different schools that provide them with diverse experiences. A review of vitae and placement lists revealed that school-based supervisors held the appropriate credentials and experience.

Current candidates and completers in special education reported that their site-based supervisors were highly skilled and respected in their districts and community. Many were past graduates from CSUEB and also taught courses in the program. Speech Language Pathology site-based coordinators have additional requirements required by their profession that are also met.

Documents reviewed and interviews with site placement coordinators confirmed that they place candidates with site-based supervisors and use the criteria for the program established by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Documents provided evidence that CSUEB offers a variety of trainings and workshops for their supervisors/coaches and site-based supervisors. Depending on the program, most supervisors are trained. Most programs have handbooks or videos, or institutes to orient the site-base supervisors to their role. Some districts have socials to introduce all parties to each other and orient them to their roles. During interviews, many supervisors confirmed that they were given materials or training on their roles.

Some current Multiple Subject candidates reported that the site-based supervisors were not very knowledgeable about the program or their role and there was little communication between them and the university supervisor. Some PASC district mentors reported that they were not clear about their roles. The program detailed activities and the amount of time candidates should be working with their coach and district mentor. In interviews, some district mentors stated that they were not aware of this. According to program leadership, coaches should give packets to district/site mentors and three-way evaluations should be done at the completion of program, but some district mentors, candidates, and completers did not describe this component of fieldwork assessment in interviews. Fieldwork evaluations were also a part of the program review documents, but not shared with district mentors who were interviewed.

Faculty, including university supervisors, are evaluated at the end of each term. However, there does not seem to be consistent evidence across all programs that site-based supervisors are evaluated. Completers and current candidates reported that they did not provide feedback on their site-based supervisors.

Current candidates and completers did report that if there was a problem during placement they contacted their university supervisor or coordinator and, in most cases the matter was resolved. Fieldwork and clinical practice are evaluated via survey at the end of the program for all programs. Data is shared at the unit and program level for program improvement.

Programs included evidence of candidate placements that identified school sites, supervisors, assignments, etc. Many programs have more than one placement that allows them to work with a range of students. If a first placement does not reflect the diversity of California's students, the second one will. This is part of the CEAS mission and they are very intentional about it. District administrators all reported that completers were ready to work with a range of students.

## **Rationale**

The findings in the report were developed based on multiple sources of information across the team members. The information was triangulated across completers, district mentors, and university supervisors.

Relevant language from Common Standard 3 - "Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner"

Training and Orientation of Site-Based Supervisors – The Preliminary Administrative Services (PASC) program documents include a fieldwork table that details the activities and amount of time candidates should be working with their coaches and district mentor. Some district mentors (site-based supervisors) indicated in interviews that they were not aware of this information. According to the program leadership, coaches should give packets to district mentors and should conduct three-way evaluations at the completion of the program. In the Preliminary teacher preparation programs, the majority of site-based supervisors reported that the university supervisor sat down with them to explain the expectations of them as a cooperating teacher but a small group of site-based supervisors report that this did not take place. There is a lack of evidence that all site-based supervisors are oriented and trained for their role as is required by the standard.

Systematic Evaluation of Site-Based Supervisors - Faculty, including university supervisors, are evaluated at the end of each term. However, there does not seem to be consistent evidence that site-based supervisors are evaluated formally or informally across programs as is required by the standard. Completers and current candidates reported that they did not evaluate the site-based supervisors in a number of the programs.

## **Standard 4 – Continuous Improvement**

**Finding: Met**

Review of documents and interviews of faculty, staff, candidates, and stakeholders indicated that the unit has implemented a continuous improvement process. A unit assessment system chart that identifies personnel, their roles and responsibilities in assessment and evaluation, and the sequence of steps for data analysis, reporting, and identifying and implementing program and unit improvements was provided among the accreditation documents. Interviews with unit administrators and staff confirmed that the assessment system is operated through a multi-year schedule of activities.

Since 2009, the unit has conducted three program improvement cycles. Each cycle includes annual collection of data, review and updates of program and unit improvement plans, identification of annual unit improvement objectives, and review and updating of unit assessment outcomes. Currently, three-unit assessment outcomes evaluate achievement of the unit mission, vision, and values. Five additional outcomes are directly based on the 2015 Common Standards. Data sources for each unit assessment outcome are identified in the



Schedule of Assessment Activities. Data sources include assignments completed by candidates, performance assessments, and field and clinical experience evaluations. The unit utilizes a campus designed Credential Candidate Database to manage most assessment data on credential candidates. This database interfaces with the CSU East Bay student information system to pull in data such as candidate grades in courses. Programs within the unit also evaluate signature assignments through the campus learning management system (LMS). The LMS database is capable of drawing in this information. These databases make information readily available for several types of analyses, comparisons across years, and evaluation purposes. The unit has staff available to assist in creating assessment reports from the databases. Assessment reports were among the accreditation documents made available, and some of the capabilities of the databases were demonstrated during the visit.

The Speech and Language Pathology program has some unique data needs. To meet these needs, the program adopted the CALIPSO application that manages candidate hours and clinical and practice evaluations. Data is made available for analysis and program improvement as well as student progress monitoring. The application was demonstrated during the visit. The program is in the final stages of transitioning all candidates to the CALIPSO application.

Follow-up surveys of program completers, cooperating teachers, supervisors, and employers, including data from CSU Center for Teacher Quality surveys, CTC Credential Program Completer Surveys, and CSU East Bay designed exit surveys for each credential program are analyzed and contribute to continuous improvement processes. The unit also attempts to keep track of the districts of employment of program graduates and uses various means to collect program impact information. Interviews with unit personnel, including the accreditation director and staff, indicated these types of data contribute to the ability of the unit to identify areas for improvement goals.

In an effort to better understand program impact, the unit conducted an in-depth three-year follow-up study of one cohort (N=22) of credential program completers. This study involved outreach to maintain contact, tracking of employment and retention, and interviews. Additional data sources are also available including surveys of applicants, faculty professional accomplishments, and anecdotal reports of professional successes and impacts by individual alumni and faculty.

The operation of the continuous improvement system was described in an interview with the Accreditation CEAS Team, a standing committee of the unit that includes among its members department chairs, program coordinators, and unit staff. For example, exit data analyzed by the Accreditation Team identified a need across programs to better prepare candidates to serve special education students. In collaboration, the team developed Saturday sessions that brought in special education personnel as presenters, served candidates from across programs, included a follow-up field-based assignment, and after two years contributed to the rationale for hiring of two new special education professors who are now working across preparation programs.

## Standard 5 – Program Impact

**Finding: Met**

CSUEB ensures that all candidates who are recommended for a credential have the required knowledge and skills identified in the Commission’s standards. Each program is implementing assessments to verify that the candidates have the knowledge and skills. The credentials office has processes in place to ensure that only those candidates who have completed all requirements are recommended for the credential. A credential analyst reviews all data and then a second credential analyst verifies the recommendation.

CSUEB has been working diligently on how to demonstrate that their unit and programs are having a positive impact on candidates, completers, and schools. The accreditation website showcases a variety of ways that CSUEB impacts teaching and learning in schools. As they are learning more, they are adding more information that shows the impact they are having. The administration is planning on sharing this information with all of its stakeholders. Interviewees discussed numerous ways in which they felt that CSUEB completers were making a positive impact. Below are a few of the impact examples that were shared:

- Completers felt that specific learning from courses and instructors led to improved teaching and leadership opportunities. Many candidates become leaders in their district and provide professional development workshops based on their preparation. Many completers reported what they learned in initial programs led to master’s thesis projects where data was collected on the impact they were making. They also felt that they were able to become better advocates for students based on understanding politics and systems learned from courses.
- District administrators shared that a positive impact has been the strong partnership between the university and the districts. These partnerships have made an impact on recruiting and retaining personnel. Most CSUEB completers remain in the profession. Partnerships have led to grant opportunities that help in many programs across the unit. The Hayward Promise Neighborhood is an excellent example of how the CSUEB programs are making a positive impact on the community. They also reported that candidate’s knowledge of CCSS and use of technology has made a positive impact on the current teachers in the field as well as the students. Producing well prepared candidates that are diverse and from the community that return to teach, counsel, and lead in those communities has been a huge impact and was a key to success.
- Speech Language Pathologist School Based Supervisors (supervisors) felt that the impact the program and candidates had was being able to maintain their therapy schedules even when being pulled to attend IEPs or observe students. Many SLP supervisors reported that some candidates have specific low-incidence training that they have been able to learn from. Their use of technology has also been helpful. These interns have even been asked to conduct professional development for the district SLPs to teach them what they’ve learned.

- Another impact on student learning was the number of bilingual SLP candidates that come from the programs. This has been very helpful at most school sites where the SLP was not bilingual. They were able to help communicate with parents. In regard to the SLP program, the Dean says the number one positive is the faculty of the program. They are young, good researchers and dedicated teachers, grant writers, generally go-getters.
- Administrative Credential candidates have shared their work in the schools and at board meetings and have even helped to shape policy.
- The Center for Research, Equity and Collaborative Engagement (CRECE) program has encouraged partnerships in research between schools and candidates, especially in the administrative services programs and the candidate's Equity plan.
- The Lifescaping Project is a compilation of writing from candidates that are shared at leadership institutes and at school board meetings.
- A current Education Specialist candidate shared that she is already making an impact at her charter school site by sharing things she has learned in the program and helping with curriculum decisions.
- The unit's focus on social justice is also helping candidates be advocates for all children. PPS candidates reported that they had counseling opportunities in the community.
- The Credential Office Manager stated that she is impressed by the number of CSUEB credential graduates that get their undergraduate education at East Bay, initial credential, later an admin credential, and stay in the area for work. She believes that close to 50% may be working in the area. Several have been awarded Teacher of the Year.