

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at
California State University, Dominguez Hills**

February 2012

Overview of This Report

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

**Common (NCATE Unit) Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For All Programs Offered by the Institution**

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

Program Standards

| Programs | Total Standards | Program Standards | | |
|---|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| | | Met | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
| Multiple Subject, with Internship | 19 | 19 | | |
| Single Subject, with Internship | 19 | 19 | | |
| Preliminary Education Specialist: MM, with Internship | 22 | 22 | | |
| Preliminary Education Specialist: MS, with Internship | 24 | 24 | | |
| Preliminary Education Specialist: ECSE, with Internship | 26 | 26 | | |
| Education Specialist: MM, Level II | 12 | 12 | | |

| Programs | Total Standards | Program Standards | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | Met | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
| Education Specialist: MS, Level II | 11 | 11 | | |
| Education Specialist: ECSE, Level II | 7 | 7 | | |
| Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder | 3 | 3 | | |
| Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education | 4 | 4 | | |
| Bilingual Authorization | 6 | 6 | | |
| Designated Subjects: Adult Education | 19 | 19 | | |
| Preliminary Administrative Services | 15 | 15 | | |
| Professional Administrative Services | 9 | 9 | | |
| Pupil Personnel: School Counseling | 32 | 32 | | |
| Pupil Personnel: Child Welfare and Attendance | 8 | 8 | | |

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

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

Institution: California State University, Dominguez Hills

Dates of Visit: November 6-8, 2011

**Accreditation Team
Recommendation:** Accreditation with Stipulations

Rationale:

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

Common Standards

The decision of the team regarding the six NCATE standards is that four of the standards are **Met** and two of the standards are **Met with Concerns** (NCATE Unit Standards 2 and 6). The decision of the team regarding the sections of CTC Common Standards 1 and 6 that are not reflected in the NCATE Unit Standards are **Met**.

Program Standards

All program standards for all credential programs were found to be met.

Overall Recommendation

The recommendation of the merged team for **Accreditation with Stipulations** is based on the fact that two of the NCATE/Common Standards are *Met with Concerns*

Following is the proposed Stipulation:

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

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

Initial/Teaching Credentials

Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internships

Single Subject
Single Subject
Single Subject Internships

Education Specialist Credentials

Preliminary
Early Childhood
Early Childhood Intern
Mild Moderate Disabilities
Mild Moderate Disabilities Intern
Moderate Severe Disabilities
Moderate Severe Disabilities Intern

Designated Subjects Adult Education

Advanced/Service Credentials

Administrative Services
Preliminary
Professional

Pupil Personnel Services
School Counseling
Child Welfare and Attendance

Education Specialist Credentials

Level II
Early Childhood
Mild Moderate Disabilities
Moderate Severe Disabilities

Added Authorization in Special Education*

Autism Spectrum Disorder
Early Childhood Special Education

Bilingual Authorization-Spanish*

** These programs are newly approved and do not have program completers at this time. Therefore the programs were included in the site visit as was possible, but there are no program reports.*

(2) Staff recommends that:

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

Accreditation Team

| | |
|--|--|
| NCATE Team Leader/Co-Chair | Sue George Missouri State University |
| California Co-Chair: | Bonnie Konopak, Retired California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo |
| Common/NCATE Standards Cluster: | Gary Railsback Point Loma Nazarene University |
| | Kathy Theuer Brandman University |
| | Thomas White Lynnwood Elementary, Edmonds WA |
| | Laura Glass University of Delaware |
| | Elizabeth Ralston East Tennessee State University |
| Programs Cluster: | Peggy Kelly California State Polytechnic University, Pomona |
| | Carol Robinson-Zanartu San Diego State University |
| | Princess Solomon Riverside COE |
| Staff to the Accreditation Team | Teri Clark, Consultant Karen Sacramento, Consultant |

Documents Reviewed

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Institutional Report | Field Experience Notebooks |
| Course Syllabi and Guides | Schedule of Classes |
| Candidate Files | Advisement Documents |
| Program Handbooks | Faculty Vitae |
| Follow-up Survey Results | College Annual Reports |
| Needs Analysis Results | College Budget Plan |
| University Catalog | Website |
| Meeting Agendas and Minutes | Program Evaluations |
| Biennial Reports | Program Assessment Narratives |
| CTC Feedback to the Biennial Reports | Program Assessment Feedback |

Interviews Conducted

| | Team Leader | NCATE/ Common Standards | Programs Cluster | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|
| Candidates | 10 | 15 | 96 | 121 |
| Completers/Graduates | 8 | 0 | 38 | 46 |
| Employers of Graduates | 2 | 7 | 0 | 9 |
| Institutional Administration | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Program Coordinators | 6 | 4 | 16 | 26 |
| Program Faculty | 13 | 4 | 67 | 84 |
| Adjunct Faculty | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| University Supervisors | 0 | 19 | 53 | 72 |
| District Employed Supervisors | 0 | 15 | 15 | 30 |
| Advisors | 3 | 0 | 8 | 11 |
| Credential Analysts | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Totals | | | | 414 |

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

INTRODUCTION

A. The Institution

California State University, Dominguez Hills (CSUDH), a four-year public university, is located minutes from downtown Los Angeles in the city of Carson. CSUDH was founded in 1960 and has a strong commitment to diversity, being one of the most ethnically diverse universities in the United States. CSUDH offers 45 undergraduate programs and 24 masters degrees and certificate and credential programs. CSUDH is accredited by WASC.

Among the most ethnically-diverse universities in the United States, its student population is 45.0 percent Hispanic; 23.1 percent African American, 16.8 percent White, 12.0 percent Asian, 0.4 percent American Indian, and 2.7 percent two or more races. Nearly 44 percent of the students at CSUDH are first-generation college students. In Fall 2010 the university enrollment was 13,854, with 3,031 students in graduate or post-BA programs. During that academic year CSUDH conferred 2,309 degrees.

The CSUDH mission is to provide education, scholarship and service that are, by design, accessible and transformative. The vision statement articulates CSUDH's commitment to diversity, technology, and sustainability with a link to surrounding communities as seen through candidate campus life and strong academic skills.

B. The Unit and Programs

The School of Education (SOE) is the professional education unit and is housed in the College of Professional Studies with the School of Nursing and the School of Health and Human Services. Within the SOE there are two divisions and one department. The Teacher Education Division contains the following credential programs: Multiple Subjects, Single Subjects, Special Education (mild/moderate, moderate/severe, and early childhood) with a corresponding masters program. The Graduate Division has the following credentialing programs: Pupil Personnel Services—School Counseling, Educational Administration and five masters degrees. The Liberal Studies Department, which offers the undergraduate program for multiple subject and special education candidates, is also in the College of Professional Studies. This configuration has been in place since January 2009, when the College of Education was merged with the College of Health and Human Services. The College of Professional Studies has an Acting Dean and each school has an Acting Director/Associate Dean. Dr. Cynthia Grutzik is the Acting Director/Associate Dean of the School of Education.

The SOE works with other departments in the institution that offer single-subject majors with education options. The University Committee on Educator Preparation (UCEP) includes faculty members who represent the various departments/programs. These departments and programs are involved in subject matter preparation and/or teacher preparation. The UCEP informs the university community of initiatives, policies, and regulations from the State Board of Education, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and the CSU Chancellor’s Office that have a direct impact on educator preparation and coordinates efforts in responses to these groups.

The SOE offers both initial and advanced preparation programs, as well as degree programs. Table 1 shows programs, enrollments, and completers in the SOE for 2009-10.

Table 1: School of Education Programs and Candidates, 2009-2010

| Program Name | Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted | Number of Completers (2009-10) | Agency Reviewing Program |
|--|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Initial Certification Programs | | | |
| Multiple Subject | 116 | 92 | CTC |
| Multiple Subject INTERN | 8 | ** | CTC |
| Single Subject | 84 | 123 | CTC |
| Single Subject INTERN | 39 | ** | CTC |
| Early Childhood SPE | 7 | 23 | CTC |
| Early Childhood SPE INTERN | 15 | ** | CTC |
| Mild/Moderate SPE | 35 | 65 | CTC |
| Mild/Moderate SPE INTERN | 82 | ** | CTC |
| Moderate/Severe SPE | 12 | 20 | CTC |
| Moderate/Severe INTERN | 28 | ** | CTC |
| Advanced Certification Programs | | | |
| Pupil Personnel Services | 199 | 162 | CTC |

| Program Name | Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted | Number of Completers (2009-10) | Agency Reviewing Program |
|--|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Administrative Services Tier I | 171 | 188 | CTC |
| Administrative Services Tier II | 31 | 27 | CTC |
| Early Childhood SPE Level II | - | 13 | CTC |
| Mild/Moderate SPE Level II | - | 14 | CTC |
| Moderate/Severe SPE Level II | - | 21 | CTC |
| Other Licensing Programs | | | |
| Designated Subjects Adult Educ. | 129 | 50 | CTC |
| Child Welfare & Attendance | 33 | 31 | CTC |
| Bilingual Authorization: Spanish | BCLAD in 09-10: 66 admitted | | CTC |
| Added Authorization: ASD | 6 | | CTC |
| Integrated Option: blending BA + Multiple Subject Credential | 20 | - | CTC |

** Interns are only counted as Completers when they are recommended for a Preliminary Credential.

C. The visit

The California-NCATE protocol specifies that a joint team conduct the accreditation site visit. The NCATE portion of the team, including two Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) members familiar with Commission on Teacher Credential (CTC) Common Standards, addressed the NCATE standards, and a CTC/BIR program cluster reviewed those programs leading to a California credential. The visit was conducted under NCATE's Continuous Improvement model. The team worked collaboratively and the co-chairs jointly conducted the pre-visit and the visit with assistance from the state consultants. In addition, a CTC Commissioner joined the visit as an observer. There were no deviations from the state protocol.

The Conceptual Framework

The unit is guided by a conceptual framework developed in 2001 and revised in 2010 and 2011. The 2011 revision has been fully implemented into course content and field experiences as of the fall of 2011. The mission, vision, and philosophy are built on a foundation of providing rigorous and relevant accessible programs, preparing knowledgeable professionals to develop learning environments that foster student achievement, and demonstrating student improvement in urban environments.

The philosophy of the unit, developed by faculty, contains a commitment to advancing student learning, providing strong leadership, and creating supportive learning environments. Additionally, there is a strong link to diversity as seen through teaching and candidate learning both on campus and in the field.

Part of the conceptual framework contains core belief statements which are embedded in key themes and define the values that underlie the work of the unit. These core beliefs with supporting research include:

- **Access** to quality education where each child is entitled to a caring, competent, and qualified teacher using **responsive pedagogy** with strong background in content and an expectation that all students can learn (Bandura, A. (1986); Banks, J.A. (2002); Darling-Hammond, L. (1997); Dewey, J. (1916); Goodlad, J. (1994); Kozol, J. (1991); Sizer, T.R. (1984); Artiles, A.J. , Ortiz, A.A., & Griffin, J.E. (Eds). (2002); Bos, C.S. & Vaughn, S. (1998); Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L., & Stecker, P. (2010); Gay, (1997); Gollnick, D. & Chin, P.C. (2001); Turbull, A., Turnbull, R., Shank, M., & Leal, D. (2002)).
- The use of **reflective practices** on what is learned and how to apply to current theories and research through continual **professional growth** to demonstrate continuous improvement are other core beliefs (Bruner, J. (1960); Darling-Hammond, L. (2010); Sergiovanni, T.J (2000); Bandura, A. (1986); Berliner, D.C. & Calfee, R.C. (Eds). (1996); Eisner, E. (1994); Schon, D.A. (1983)).
- Finally, **collaboration between stakeholders** is necessary to transform schools. (Darling-Hammond, L. (2010); Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L.; & Stecker, P. (2010); Fullan, M. (2001); NCATE (2010)).

With each belief statement the unit has delineated dispositions that accompany the content of the statements. Candidates demonstrate their dispositions through interactions with peers, faculty, staff, supervisors, and school professionals. Dispositions are also seen through coursework and fieldwork.

These dispositions include:

- Know, understand and appreciate their students and their families;
- Approach learners with patience, empathy, and fairness;
- Have high expectations for all learners, especially those in high-need schools;

- Regard diversity as an asset, and be willing to dialogue about differences;
- Show commitment to identifying and reducing educational and social disparities and injustice;
- Reflect on their own biases, strengths, challenges, learning and goals;
- Collaborate and interact effectively with other professionals;
- Solve problems through appropriate and professional interactions with peers, faculty, staff, and school personnel;
- Seek knowledge, information, and perspective on the world as lifelong learners;
- Hold themselves to high ethical and professional standards, and show pride in their profession.

All initial and advanced certification programs are designed to meet state-approved standards that delineate the range of knowledge, skills, and dispositions each candidate is expected to develop. These proficiencies are assessed through key assignments and culminating assessments embedded in each program. Credential programs are reviewed by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and these proficiencies are assessed as part of that ongoing accreditation cycle.

In the unit and in each program, data are collected, analyzed, and used to inform teaching, clinical practice, and service to candidates. In addition, these data are used in many ways each year: CTC biennial reports, university program review assessment documents, NCATE Institutional Report, Title II and PEDS reports, WASC Reports, Chancellor's Office reports and faculty research. Data are used to review each program including a review of candidate competence, implementation of mission and vision, and evaluation of staff, faculty, administrators, and impact on the greater Los Angeles area. The unit has developed a framework for a unit assessment system that has been fully implemented by some programs for program improvement but has not been consistently implemented in all programs.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

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

The evidence presented in the Institutional Report (IR), the electronic exhibit room, interviews with candidates, program completers, program faculty and site based faculty provides an overview of the performance assessment data that support knowledge and skills for each program. The unit has recently updated the conceptual framework and identified professional dispositions that are in the process of being developed by programs.

Multiple Subject/Single Subject Preliminary Credential

CSUDH utilizes the California 13 Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) developed by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) for basic programs that describe candidate competence in relation to content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and professional knowledge and skills necessary to be recommended for and awarded a state teaching preliminary credential. The CTC also mandates that an approved instrument be used to determine sufficiency of competence in relation to each of the TPEs. CSUDH's School of Education (SOE) has chosen to use the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) as their measure of student competence in relation to the TPEs.

The Multiple Subject/Single program utilizes the TED Exit Survey that provides information about candidates' content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and skills. This program utilizes the PACT to demonstrate candidate professional dispositions at the end of the program but does not systematically assess dispositions throughout the program.

In addition, basic program candidates including those in special education programs must successfully demonstrate competence in relation to subject matter-content knowledge through passage of the California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET), and competence in basic skills through passage of the California Basic Education Skills Test (CBEST). Candidates in the Multiple Subject program must also demonstrate competence in the teaching of reading/language arts through successful passage of the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA), a state developed and managed assessment.

Special Education

The unit has three approved special education credential programs – Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe and Early Childhood. California adopted new program standards in 2009 and the unit is in the process of transitioning to these new program standards. The revised preliminary credential programs were approved through the university's curriculum review process in December 2010, and admissions to this program began in Spring 2011 based on initial approval of the program's Transition Plan by the CTC. The unit reported data that reflects the program as it was offered in 2009-10 and earlier, and in Prompt 2 described the changes made as

part of the revisions, which were implemented beginning Spring 2011. The second level credential in Special education is teaching out current students and has not submitted to the state the program proposal under this updated standard. The special education program has collected and analyzed student performance assessment data for the preliminary programs but did not disaggregate them by level (Level I and Level II) or delivery model (Intern or traditional student teaching). Assessment data for the Level II program was not systematically collected, analyzed or used for candidate performance or program improvement.

The Preliminary special education credential program has both intern and traditional credential program pathway options. In comparing these delivery models between 2008-2011, the intern program supported 269 candidates and the traditional student teaching model supported 62 candidates. Due to the severe economic crisis in California's public schools, the number of displaced credential teachers has reduced employment opportunities for interns. With this reduction in hiring opportunities between 2008-2010, Moderate/Severe candidate intern pathway enrollment fell from 24 to 11 and Early Childhood Special Education intern pathway fell from 19 to 8. Conversely, the number of candidates enrolling in the student teaching option has increased from just 2 in 2008-09 to 16 in 2010-11 for Mild/Moderate, and from no candidates in Early Childhood Special Education in 2008-09 to 15 in 2010-11. The program has not analyzed its performance assessment data by delivery model (intern or traditional).

Educational Administration

The Educational Administrative services program offers two credentials, the Tier I (preliminary) and Tier II (Clear). At the site visit after consultation of the NCATE policy on add-on and endorsement programs it was determined that the Administration Tier II program did not fall under the NCATE review due to limited coursework for the credential.

The preliminary administrative credential utilizes a number of assessments that confirm that candidates have content knowledge and skills required for beginning principals. The program utilizes the six California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) and the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. This certification program is also combined with an MA in Education, so candidates must take a comprehensive examination. All candidates are also required to submit an Electronic Portfolio that is viewed as significant part of the candidate's on-going professional development. The program did not provide at the site visit a minimum of three years of candidate performance data that was aggregated for the program.

Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) Credential

Candidates in the PPS program are assessed in multiple ways – first in an introductory course and during fieldwork through a competency rating form completed by the site supervisors for each of the required competencies; and in the Comprehensive Exam. Any candidates receiving a below average rating must remediate the particular weakness noted. Interviews with candidates, program completers, program faculty and review of the Biennial Report Feedback from CTC did not provide evidence that the program collects and analyzes candidate performance assessment data that is used to improve the program. The program did not provide at the site visit a minimum of three years of candidate performance data that was aggregated for the program.

In addition to the above named credential programs, the unit offers three graduate programs focused on P12 educators that do not include a teaching credential. The M.A. in Education masters-only options extend the knowledge of teaching and learning for practicing educators. These three programs did not present at the site visit the three years of candidate performance data from multiple measures that was collected, aggregated and analyzed for program improvement.

Multicultural Education

The Multicultural Education MA Program prepares school leaders to support the success of today's diverse urban schools and their student populations.

Curriculum and Instruction

Candidates in this MA Program develop the advanced knowledge and skills to design, implement and evaluate programs that enhance classroom teaching, while also enhancing their value as instructors.

Technology-Based Education

Candidates emerge from this MA Program well prepared to design, develop, evaluate and integrate technology-based learning tools, projects and experiences into the classroom learning process.

Dispositions

The unit's professional dispositions have been recently developed and are articulated in the conceptual framework but have not been fully implemented and measured at multiple times during the program. Interviews with faculty and program coordinators confirmed that these newly adopted dispositions are measured in one program and other dispositions in another program but that there is no systematic method to determine that each of these dispositions are evident to candidates in all programs and how they are utilized to provide feedback to candidates at multiple times through the program.

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

The unit has experienced a great deal of turnover in upper level administration and in the SOE and based upon interviews with faculty and program coordinators, has decreased the emphasis on an assessment system that was considered stellar by the previous site visit team and peer institution. Just prior to the development of the Institutional Report the unit began to refocus on an assessment system that would provide demonstration of candidate performance of content knowledge, content pedagogy, and professional dispositions. Each program has developed key assessments that are utilized in courses and fieldwork to provide feedback to students and to program coordinators about student progress.

The Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs have a wide variety of specific measurements in their program through the use of the PACT, RICA, CSET and fieldwork to demonstrate that the programs utilize assessments to demonstrate that candidates meet standards related to knowledge, skills and dispositions. The programs in special education, Pupil Personnel Services, Educational Administration and the M.A. degree programs without a state credential have

embedded assessments in required courses that are used to provide feedback to individual students. Interviews with candidates, program completers, and employers confirm that the students have the content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge for their work.

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

The unit has recently acquired an electronic web-based assessment system (Taskstream) that is currently been utilized by the preliminary credential programs (Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Special Education) and has identified a part-time Assessment Coordinator to work with the Director to assist the unit in the development of an assessment system that collects, aggregates and disaggregates by program performance assessment data. The unit has also developed exit surveys for programs that are gathered by a web-based survey system. Both of these accomplishments will assist the program to demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Based upon interviews with candidates, program completers and employers the unit prepares candidates that critique and are able to reflect on their work within the context of student learning. They establish educational environments that support student learning, collect and analyze data related to student learning, and apply strategies for improving student learning within their own jobs and schools.

Discussions with faculty and program coordinators confirmed that the unit is moving toward developing a program review process that will include candidate assessments, scoring guides, performance data, and other program documents that respond to professional standards for national and/or state review.

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

The unit's conceptual framework that focuses on preparing educators for urban schools is well articulated and affirmed by candidates, program completers, and employers. Candidates in all programs were enthusiastic about the strong preparation that they received in the program

The Urban Teacher Residency Program and the Transition to Teaching Programs provide a highly supportive experience for Math and Science Teachers in Secondary education. The unit has a well defined pathway from undergraduate programs into these credential programs.

The Educational Administration program offers several different unique and highly regarded programs meeting the need of urban schools and Charter schools.

1.5. What AFIs have been removed?

AFIs corrected from last visit:

None

1.5 What AFIs remain and why?

None

1.6 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI

The unit does not regularly and systematically assess professional dispositions of program candidates.

Rationale

The unit has identified professional dispositions tied to the unit’s conceptual framework but has not developed a unit wide system to collect, analyze, aggregate and disaggregate this data.

Recommendation for Standard 1

Initial Teacher Preparation **Met**

Advanced Preparation **Met**

California Decision: **Met**

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

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

The Unit Accreditation System (UAS) is designed to address key questions centered on program improvement and the School of Education (SOE) mission and vision. The acting director/associate dean serves as the director of evaluation and unit head. The assessment coordinator reports to her and manages program data housed in online systems. They, along with program coordinators and department chairs, are members of the Evaluation Committee that

meets monthly to engage in assessment activities. Meeting minutes illustrate how they work toward improving the Unit Assessment System (UAS). An interview with committee members revealed that they are currently discussing upcoming reports and the data they would like to collect, and a goal is that the committee would analyze unit-wide data (e.g., exit survey data).

The UAS document shows when data are collected, who collects them and who reviews them. The UAS diagram shows a plan for how the data would be regularly and systematically collected, compiled, analyzed, used and fed back into the system to improve the collection of data. Data are collected at the candidate level for all programs, but collected inconsistently at the program and unit levels. The Unit Assessment Center, the SOE Student Services Center, Center for Teacher Quality, Academic Affairs and Institutional Research, Assessment & Planning (IRAP) are the offices that compile, clean, distribute and store the data.

Interviews with program coordinators and department chairs confirm that they discuss candidate data and some program data at program faculty meetings and use data to revise courses and programs. The director of evaluation shares exit data at SOE faculty meetings and the director's cabinet discusses enrollment and admissions data. Minutes from the special education faculty and Teacher Education Division (TED) faculty meetings describe discussions about data, revisions to courses and programs and changes to assessment plans. Minutes from the former College of Education Technology Committee illustrate how they reviewed data from the faculty needs assessment survey and revised their College of Education technology plan.

The unit produces several reports about the programs every year. The university follows the new California accreditation cycle for their credential programs wherein program coordinators submit documentation according to the requirements of the seven-year cycle to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). The Director summarizes the data from the biennial reports and submits an Institutional Summary and Plan of Action. At the university level, the chancellor of CSU requires annual progress reports through the Improvement and Accountability Plans (IAPs) for the multiple subject/single subject (MS/SS) and special education (SPE) programs. In addition, the university program review guide describes the Program Effectiveness Assessment Tool (PEAT) provided by IRAP that department chairs of degree programs (e.g., M.A. programs) use to submit annual PEAT Reports, an augmented PEAT+ Report in year 3 and a self-study report at the end of the six-year cycle. The UAS document shows that the Director/Associate Dean assembles the data for and writes several federal, state, university and accreditation reports. Examples of IAP progress reports for the MS/SS programs, PEAT+ reports for the M.A. programs and program effectiveness reports for the college and TED confirm the unit's submission of reports.

The flow of data from the "data compiled" phase to the "data analyzed" phase in the UAS diagram is not streamlined. There are many offices that collect data and both the Director/Associate Dean and department chairs must sometimes approach these offices for data; the data flow is not systematized. The evaluation committee does not currently analyze data at the "data analyzed" phase. The director of evaluation is the primary consumer of data for the numerous reports that she writes in the "data used" phase. Members of the evaluation committee were not able to articulate who is engaged in the "data components and systems evaluated" phase of the assessment system. Because the UAS is not fully implemented, the unit is not able to

systematically analyze and evaluate data for unit operations and improvement.

Table 2 in the IR shows multiple initial and exit assessments for each program that provide comprehensive information on applicant qualifications, competence of graduates and program quality. The initial preliminary credential, educational administration (EAD) and pupil personnel services (PPS) programs also have multiple, performance-based transition assessments to evaluate candidate proficiency. Candidates in the M.A. programs apply for advancement to candidacy for their transition point and the new SPE assessment timeline shows the transition points that the SPE-Level II candidates will complete. The three M.A.-only programs do not have multiple, performance-based key assessments during the program.

Alignment matrices and assessment rubrics show that courses and key assessments in the MS/SS, SPE, EAD, PPS and M.A. in Technology-Based Education programs are aligned with the conceptual framework and professional and/or state standards. The exit assessments in the three M.A.-only programs (curriculum & instruction, multicultural education and technology-based education) are aligned with the M.A. common standards, which are three university goals with their corresponding objectives. The new dispositions are aligned with the state Teacher Performance Expectations for the MS/SS programs and with assessments in the other programs except Special Education and EAD.

Three years of data for all programs was not provided in the offsite or onsite exhibit rooms. MS/SS data in the 2009-2011 biennial report and program surveys (exit, graduate and employer) are disaggregated by program and by delivery model. The SPE data are not consistently disaggregated by program (early childhood, mild/moderate and moderate/severe), delivery model (traditional and intern) or level (Level I, Level II and MA). Comprehensive exam, exit and graduate survey data were available for all advanced programs, but employer data was not available for the PPS and M.A. in curriculum and instruction and technology-based education programs. Interviews and the biennial reports confirm that the PPS and EAD programs do not systematically aggregate candidate performance data.

The MS/SS Program Assessment document explains how faculty ensure the fairness, accuracy and consistency in the evaluation of the PACT assessments by maintaining qualified trainer-of-trainers for each of the credential areas, calibrating faculty who teach courses that include the content area tasks (CATs) and teaching event and double scoring 10 percent of the CATs and teaching events. Rubrics are used in the MA program comprehensive exams and key assessments in the advanced programs to promote reliability in the scoring of the assessments.

MS/SS candidates who fail the PACT teaching event must reteach and resubmit it and those who fail one task in the Teaching Event must revise the task according to specific guidelines. Advanced candidates can retake their comprehensive exam once according to the University Catalog. In addition, PPS candidates who receive a below average rating on the fieldwork competency form must remediate the particular behavior.

Candidates may submit a Petition for Exception if they would like an exception to a university policy. The Student Rights & Responsibilities Handbook includes the grade appeal policy, student grievance procedures and a process for filing discrimination, harassment and retaliation

complaints. A sample of a student petition for reinstatement in a program and a student grade appeal confirms that student complaints are addressed and filed.

TaskStream is the online data management system for the MS/SS, and SPE programs and PPS have two assessments in the system. The assessment coordinator also stores unit documents in TaskStream, such as meeting minutes and syllabi. Faculty and candidates have access to this system. The assessment coordinator expressed the goal of having all programs include their signature assessments and at least three embedded assessments in TaskStream. Currently, the coordinator stores and distributes the exit survey data for all programs.

PeopleSoft provides reports about admissions, enrollments, candidates and demographics. SurveyMonkey is used for all surveys for the unit (exit, graduate, employer, diversity and faculty) and for surveys in the PPS and EAD programs. The SOE student services center uses an access database to create credential and admissions reports.

The paperwork to inactivate the Autism authorization was submitted in October 2011. The data for the new bilingual authorization will be disaggregated in the future.

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

The unit instituted major changes to the structure of the Unit Assessment System (UAS) and to the technology used within this system since the previous visit. These two changes are in addition to many course and program changes.

The annual reports show that the former College Evaluation Committee consistently reviewed and improved the UAS each year in many ways, including aligning the initial and advanced program assessments with the conceptual framework, developing new procedures for collecting and reporting data for new grants and ensuring the use of surveys. The evaluation center was re-structured and is now the Unit Assessment Center. The Assessment Coordinator is a new position that is half of a full-time lecturer's workload. The coordinator works with the Director/Associate Dean and two part-time student assistants, and they form the new Unit Assessment Center.

When the unit adopted the PACT assessments for the MS/SS programs, they also invested in TaskStream as their data management system. The annual reports describe the development of the online archival and reporting systems, where gradual improvements were made by adding programs, grants and assessments to the systems each year. PeopleSoft is also a new technology that is used for the collection and reporting of data.

The onsite exhibit room provided examples of program data analysis and resulting revision in EAD, SPE and M.A. programs. CCTC Biennial Reports illustrate how some of the credential programs regularly summarize and analyze data, identify strengths and areas to improve, create action plans and make program changes grounded in data, such as revising syllabi to incorporate PACT rubric elements (MS/SS) and revising the comprehensive exam (SPE). The annual reports describe program changes in the M.A. programs, such as the TBE faculty changing the capstone

assessments from the thesis to a portfolio based on exit survey data and the C & I faculty developing a new set of rubrics for the CUR 519 action research project. The 2009-10 School of Education, TED and University Curriculum Committee documents show that the initial and advanced programs submitted new/revised course and revised program proposals during this year.

In addition, the college created a new conceptual framework and list of common dispositions and are currently aligning them with assessments.

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

Does not apply.

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

The team did not identify any strengths.

AFI 1

The unit does not have a minimum of three years of candidate performance data for all of its programs and assessment of unit operations.

Rationale

Three years of data for all programs was not provided in the offsite or onsite exhibit rooms. Interviews with program faculty and coordinators confirm that data was not systematically collected in some programs.

AFI 2

The advanced programs do not regularly and systematically aggregate and analyze performance data to improve candidate performance, quality and unit operations.

Rationale

The three M.A.-only programs (Curriculum and Instruction, Multicultural Education and Technology-Based Education) do not have multiple, performance-based assessments during the program. The comprehensive exam is a key assessment in the three programs, but the only other key assessments are the CUR 519 Action Research project for the Curriculum and Instruction program and the technology portfolio for the Technology-Based Education program. Data were not provided for the latter assessments. The lack of key assessments does not permit the regular and systematic collection and analysis of performance data.

Interviews and the Biennial Report feedback confirm that the Educational Administration (EAD) and Pupil Performance Services (PPS) programs do not systematically aggregate

candidate performance data. Specifically, PPS and EAD programs provided individual candidate data instead of aggregated data. There was no performance data available for the Special Education-Level II programs.

AFI 3

The Special Education programs do not consistently disaggregate candidate data by program (Early Childhood, Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe), delivery model (traditional and intern) and level (Preliminary, Level II and M.A.).

Rationale

The Special Education data in the offsite and onsite exhibit room were not consistently disaggregated by program, delivery model and level. The biennial report feedback and interviews with program faculty and coordinators verify this finding.

AFI 4

Although programs are involved in the collection of data, the unit does not systematically analyze and evaluate those data for unit operations and improvement.

Rationale

The Unit Assessment System (UAS) has been designed, but not fully implemented. The UAS diagram indicates that the Director/Associate Dean, dean and evaluation committee will analyze unit level data. Interviews revealed that this committee does not currently analyze data and the Director/Associate Dean will engage in the “data components and system evaluated” activities in the future.

Recommendation for Standard 2

Initial Teacher Preparation
Advanced Preparation

Not Met
Not Met

California Decision:

Met with Concerns

Rationale:

Aggregated candidate performance data were not presented for all programs in the Biennial Report nor at the site visit. The data collected and analyzed do not provide information on unit operations, evaluations or improvement. (Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation)

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

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

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

Program documents and interviews with clinical coordinators, faculty and school administrators indicate that the unit collaborates with administrators and other district personnel to select student teaching placement sites as well as design, deliver and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice. School sites serve as host sites for the *Teaching Practices Seminar* (TED 433/353) course for candidates in the multiple and single subject programs and *Experiences in General and Special Education* (SPE 556) course for candidates in special education programs and provide opportunities for candidates to conduct classroom observations in a variety of settings. Interviews with school administrators and student teachers reveal that school sites often allow candidates to participate in trainings with school staff and the unit often invites master teachers and support providers to workshops on campus. The Urban Teacher Residency (UTR) program represents one of many Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) initiatives undertaken by the unit. It represents a partnership between the university and Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) that provides opportunities for single subject math and science candidates to complete a full-time, year-long residency in urban schools within LAUSD. The Master Teacher Fellows Grant provides training to master teachers in math and science to enhance their knowledge and pedagogical skills as well as their coaching abilities. These master teachers are paired with student teachers in local high schools.

Initial preparation programs include a sequenced series of field experiences designed to help candidates develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Placements are made in settings that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender and socioeconomic groups. Candidates in the multiple subject, single subject and special education programs participate in three phases of fieldwork and must meet program-specific criteria in order to advance to the last phase of the program, student teaching. During field experiences, candidates collect and examine data on student learning.

Field experiences are also integrated into advanced programs. Candidates in the Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) program participate in a sequence of structured fieldwork and candidates in the Educational Administration (EAD) credential program complete field-based assignments in each of the six courses as well as completing a year-long field based project. Field-based assignments are also an integral part of the masters programs in Curriculum and Instruction, Technology Based Education and Multicultural Education.

Fieldwork supervisors, master teachers and support providers for the Multiple, Single and Special Education programs must meet specific qualifications to serve in these roles and participate in training. They evaluate candidate performance using multiple measures. Supervisors conduct observations and complete formative and summative evaluations of candidate performance. Interviews with fieldwork supervisors and clinical coordinators and

program documents provide evidence that supervisors participate in calibration exercises using the assessment tools provided. Multiple and single subject candidates complete the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) teaching event, an extensive summative assessment, during their final phase of student teaching/internship. Candidates in the advanced programs complete field-based projects and utilize rubrics to evaluate the key assignments.

Interviews with candidates indicate that fieldwork supervisors provide regular and continuing support for student teachers and interns through a variety of methods. They observe candidates and conference with them throughout student teaching/internships. Candidates attend seminars organized by clinical coordinators and receive peer group support. If problems arise each program has a process in place to help resolve issues.

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

As noted in the IR, initial certification programs have undergone several changes or improvements with regard to field experiences and clinical practices since the last accreditation visit. In the fall of 2008, the faculty conducted calibration training for fieldwork supervisors in the use of the Teacher Performance Expectation-based fieldwork rubrics and also conducted PACT training for all fieldwork supervisors in the fall of 2008. TaskStream is being used to collect and analyze data for the PACT and from field experiences. In the summer of 2010, the Teacher Education Division (TED) also began the first cohort of its Urban Teacher Residency Program (UTR). Faculty are exploring the possibility of providing training for master teachers through an online module and the unit recently received a Master Teachers Fellows Grant designed to provide training for high school master teachers in math and science. The special education program has been redesigned to meet new state standards. In addition, release time of 12 units per semester was recently approved for Clinical Coordination and a Clinical Coordination Team was recently assembled to share information, school site contacts, strategies and assessment tools. Advanced programs also made some changes. The PPS program increased the number of units required for the fieldwork course so candidates get more of an opportunity to work with experienced counselors and the field based project for the EAD program has been refined.

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

Not applicable

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

The unit and its school partners share expertise and integrate resources to support candidate learning. Both field experiences and clinical practice extend the unit's conceptual framework into practice through modeling by clinical faculty and well-designed opportunities to learn through doing. Field experiences allow candidates to apply and reflect on their content, professional, and pedagogical knowledge and skills in a variety of settings.

Candidates in programs for other school professionals participate in field experiences and clinical practice that require them to design, implement, and evaluate projects related to the roles for which they are preparing.

3.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.5.1 What AFI's have been removed? No previous AFI's

3.5.2 What AFI's remain and why? No previous AFI's

3.5.3 What new AFI's does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFI's may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.) None

3.6 Recommendation for Standard 3

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

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| State Decision: | Met |
|------------------------|------------|

Standard 4: Diversity

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

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

The unit demonstrates a commitment to diversity. The conceptual framework specifies the dispositions related to diversity that the unit expects from its candidates. These include:

- knowing, understanding, and appreciating their students and their families;
- approaching learners with patience, empathy, and fairness;
- having high expectations for all learners, especially those in high-need schools;
- regarding diversity as an asset;
- demonstrating a willingness to dialogue about differences;
- showing commitment to identifying and reducing educational and social disparities and injustice;
- reflecting on personal biases, strengths, challenges, learning, and goals;
- collaborating and interacting effectively with other professionals.

At both the initial and advanced levels, the unit’s curriculum addresses diversity. At the initial level, candidates are required to learn elements of state law that pertain to student rights. Candidates’ lesson plans must be inclusive and are required to be differentiated for English learners and special populations. Course readings and observations focus in part on understanding the principles of culturally responsive pedagogy. During field experiences, candidates are required to describe the school community and its diversity, complete a “Family History Project” and review census data and school demographic data, as well as district and school-site plans for supporting English learners. Additionally, candidates must complete an in-depth assessment of an individual learner. Fieldwork evaluations assess candidates’ planning and instruction in the area of diversity. Examples of work on display at the site visit clearly demonstrated that candidates were not only aware of the diversity in their students, but they were using sound strategies to meet the needs of these students.

Special education candidates also complete a textbook analysis focused on multicultural perspective, a language activity portfolio with strategies appropriate for children with special needs and diverse language skills, a home visit to learn more about a student’s culture, background, and family structure and a comprehensive curriculum that includes community-based components to demonstrate understanding of culture. Candidates also develop lessons that differentiate instruction for students with disabilities and students learning English.

At the advanced level, candidates in the Pupil Personnel Services program examine their own value systems and learn how their values were influenced by culture, language, gender, immigration status, and national origin; they collaborate with diverse peers on course projects;

and complete field experiences in diverse settings. Counseling candidates have additional practicum courses designed to provide practice for candidates to assess their cultural background, values, and mores. Advanced candidates in the Educational Administration Program also work with diverse language groups using adopted curriculum materials; write a personal code of ethics; observe diversity-related issues and address these with colleagues during their field work; write a reflective essay on responsive leadership; and study and apply legislation related to students with special needs.

The unit's surrounding area is predominately populated by low-income Hispanic/Latino and African American families, and the unit fully utilizes the diverse student population in which candidates conduct field experiences. Candidates report that they were deliberately placed in diverse settings for field experiences, and if anything, were mildly concerned about their preparation for working with affluent students. This diversity includes race and ethnicity, English learners, and students with disabilities.

Candidates have ample experiences working with diverse faculty within the SOE, both on-campus and in the field. Data shows that candidates are working with faculty from three or more ethnic groups, including Whites (60%), Asian (8%), Black or African American (12%) and Hispanic/Latino (8%). The disparity between these proportions and the makeup of the candidate population is an issue that the unit plans to address, although current budgetary realities have put recruiting and hiring new faculty on hold.

Unit candidates are a diverse group. In combined initial and advanced programs:

- 41% of the candidates are Hispanic or Latino
- 29% are White
- 19% are Black or African American
- 10% are Asian.

Interestingly, while Blacks, Whites and Asian populations have relatively the same proportions in both initial and advanced programs, the Hispanic/Latino population comprises 55% of the initial candidates, but only 33% of the advanced program population. This disparity might be explained by the fact that many Hispanic/Latino candidates are the first in their family to attend college.

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

In addition to plans to recruit and hire a more diverse faculty, the unit has other initiatives in regards to continuous improvement in diversity. The unit has increased its emphasis on diversity, especially in regard to working with English learners and students with disabilities, by strengthening the standards and culminating assessments in the area of diversity in recent years. Specifically, candidates are required to submit demographic data along with instructional plans when completing high-stakes and culminating projects.

The unit has also taken steps to address issues related to candidate diversity. The Diversity Workgroup, which has replaced the long-standing Diversity Committee, has recently taken a

fresh look at diversity issues and has initiated discussions with candidates regarding the recognition of diversity in unit teaching practices, as well as conversations about grouping within classes; the control of classroom conversation and the exercise of power; capturing dispositions towards diversity in the field-based assessment program; reducing bias and hegemony in unit assessment practices; and the role of second language learners in instructional planning.

Unit faculty regularly engage in open discussions and share strategies for developing culturally competent educators. For example, a faculty member affiliated with a local charter school led a recent series of discussions around the issue of how best to work with African American students and candidates.

Finally, the university as a whole has an extraordinarily high number of students who need remediation in math and English. Given that many of these students are Hispanic/Latino, and learning in a second language, the Office of Student Affairs has initiated a program utilizing unit candidates to support their peers who need remediation.

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

Not applicable

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

The unit has capitalized on its situation within a very diverse geographical area by providing field experiences that enable candidates to interact with P-12 students from a broad range of diverse groups. Moreover, the unit has gone beyond simply placing candidates in diverse, urban settings; candidates are encouraged to reflect on and refine their own beliefs and attitudes about diversity and re-examine the role of education as a force for social justice.

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

| | |
|-----------------------------|------------|
| California Decision: | Met |
|-----------------------------|------------|

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

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

5.1 Overall Findings

The unit includes 95 faculty, including three assistant professors, 15 associate professors, 19 full professors, 19 field supervisors, 8 full-time lecturers, and 31 part-time lecturers. The exhibit *Professional Education Faculty Qualifications and Experiences* lists faculty by name, highest degree/institution, assignment, rank, tenure track status, scholarship. All tenure-track and tenured faculty hold a doctorate; all field supervisors and lecturers hold a masters degree, and over 40 percent hold a doctorate. The 36 vita included in the exhibits were reviewed for relevant P-12 experience and credentials. In the initial programs (Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Special Education), nearly all faculty reported P12 teaching experience, while 30 percent reported having a credential. In the advanced programs (Pupil Personnel Services, Educational Administration) and MA programs (Curriculum & Instruction, Multicultural Education, and Technology-Based Education), 50 percent of faculty reported relevant P-12 experiences, while 30 percent reported having a credential. The unit provided a statement regarding the required qualifications of school faculty involved in the unit's initial programs for student teachers and interns. Classroom teachers who supervise candidates in school settings must be fully licensed to teach in California, have three years of teaching experience, and be recommended by their school administrator.

Faculty workload is 15 units per semester, with 12 units for teaching/supervision and three units for service, and faculty assignments are made based on content expertise and experience. Faculty are highly involved in clinical practice with their candidates, either supervising, teaching courses at school sites, and/or leading fieldwork seminars. One-third of full-time faculty serve as field supervisors in initial and advanced programs, and one-third provide professional development to school district personnel. These efforts reflect the unit's conceptual framework with its emphasis on community engagement in urban settings. The unit cites a 2010 *Faculty Survey* as evidence that faculty use a variety of teaching strategies that model best practice. These practices include strategies that require reflection, analytical thinking, and the use of technology. Interviews with faculty and candidates confirm that faculty model best practices, particularly in regard to technology and diversity. Since the previous NCATE visit, the unit has reduced its candidate enrollment and faculty positions as a consequence of budget cuts. Given that there are fewer part-time faculty, more full-time faculty have assumed supervisory and other clinical roles. The unit reports that this shift in assignments has strengthened the connection between coursework and fieldwork and has allowed faculty to share expertise by teaching across programs.

A review of faculty vita, *Samples of Faculty Scholarly Activities*, and *Professional Education Faculty Qualifications and Experiences* shows that most faculty are actively involved in scholarly activities related to their fields of specialization. Primary activities include journal and book publications, conference and other scholarly presentations, and grant proposals and awards. Many of these activities reflect the urban context of the unit, and include the federally funded

Transitions to Teaching grants, Integrated Special Education and Teacher Education Program (ISTEP) grant, and Math/Science Teacher Initiative (MSTI) grant. In addition, a review of faculty vita shows that faculty are extensively involved in service and collaborative activities. At the School of Education and university levels, faculty contribute to a variety of committees; examples include instruction (e.g., Center for Teaching and Learning), research (e.g., Human Subjects), personnel (e.g., Retention, Tenure, and Promotion), and operations (e.g., University Planning). They collaborate with their P-12 stakeholders on a range of partnership programs, professional development activities, school/district advisory boards, action research projects, and other endeavors; examples include the Charter and Autonomous School Leadership Academy (CASLA) and Urban School Leadership (USL) program. Faculty also provide leadership to their professional organizations, such as the California Council on Teacher Education and Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development at the state level, and the American Educational Research Association and Council for Exceptional Children at the national level.

The unit conducts systematic evaluations of faculty performance, primarily through Performance & Teaching Evaluations (PTEs) and the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RPT) process. PTEs are course evaluation forms completed by candidates and collected on two courses every semester. The exhibits included the results of one course evaluation for one instructor. In addition to PTEs, the RPT process includes other measures of instruction such as curriculum development and advising, as well as information on scholarship as defined by the unit, and service to the university and professional communities. Important aspects of the RPT process are a personal philosophy statement and performance analysis by the faculty member. The Teacher Education Division (TED) and Graduate Education Division (GED) have RPT documents that reflect expectations of their respective division, the unit, and the university. Data regarding faculty evaluations are not aggregated, but are used to inform discussions between faculty and program administrators. Further, the results of these evaluations are considered in the promotion and tenure process. Part-time faculty are evaluated by program chairs on a regular basis. Clinical supervisors are evaluated by the candidates they supervise with these evaluations then reviewed by the appropriate clinical coordinator.

The unit reports that professional development is provided through internal seminars. In 2007-08, TED faculty participated in trainings by IRIS (IDEA'04 and Research for Inclusive Settings) and ISTEP (Integrated Special Education Teacher Preparation) on learners with special needs. They also attended seminars on RTI (Response to Intervention) and best practices for teaching English learners. In 2008-09, they attended presentations on CSU initiatives on closing the achievement gap and on literacy instruction, as well as participated in workshops on differentiating instruction and literacy strategies. In addition, the annual reports show that in 2006-08 TED faculty participated in the Performance Assessment of California Teachers (PACT) training for the new state assessment of initial candidates. In 2010-11, these faculty had access to videoconferences on learners with special needs and English learners. In the Educational Administration program, faculty have participated in program evaluation each summer as a professional development activity. The 2010 *Faculty Survey* was cited as evidence of recent unit support for professional development in the areas of technology, field supervision, working with English learners, and cultural diversity.

5.2 Continuous Improvement:

The faculty in the professional education unit have made progress in the delivery of instruction that emphasizes reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, diversity, and technology. Candidates report that faculty model excellence in teaching and that they are therefore well prepared for field experiences and student teaching. Recent graduates also report that they were prepared well for success in teaching. Faculty are regarded as excellent instructors committed to the success of their candidates. Further, numerous examples were cited to illustrate that both faculty and support staff care deeply about students and work diligently to help them succeed.

5.3 Movement to the Target Level:

Not applicable to this standard.

5.4 Strengths:

Professional education faculty collaborate closely with P-12 practitioners and are actively engaged in a community of learners. They provide leadership in the profession. Further, professional education faculty value candidates' learning and are valued for their competence and their caring.

5.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

5.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

NA

5.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

NA

5.5.3 New AFIs?

No

5.6 Recommendation for Standard 5

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

| | |
|-----------------------------|------------|
| California Decision: | Met |
|-----------------------------|------------|

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

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

Overall Findings

The College of Professional Studies (CPS) contains the School of Education (SOE), the School of Nursing, and the School of Health and Human Services. The dean of CPS oversees the day-to-day activities of the college. The dean meets regularly with the directors of the schools and the college financial manager. They discuss schedules, plans for resource allocation, and common concerns. They have the primary responsibility and authority for planning, delivering, and operating all programs for the preparation of candidates. The head of the professional education unit is the acting/associate dean of the College of Professional Studies.

Within the SOE, there are two divisions and one department. The Teacher Education Division (TED), headed by two co-chairs, contains the programs in Multiple/Single Subject credentials, Special Education credentials, and a master's degree in Special Education. The Graduate Education Division (GED), headed by a chair, includes Educational Administration (M.A. program and credential in EAD), Pupil Personnel Services credential (M.A. program and credential), and a master's degree in Education with three options. The Liberal Studies Department (LBS) is led by an assistant chair and includes a B.A. in Liberal Studies (not a credential program).

Through interviews the faculty expressed concerns about the instability of administrative positions. Many administrators in the unit have been in an "acting" role for several years. Additionally, in 2009 there was a restructuring of programs at CSUDH with the elimination of the College of Education merging it with the School of Nursing and the School of Health and Human Resources. The president, provost, and dean of CPS stated they are currently interviewing for a provost and after this hire is confirmed the new provost will replace or retain other administrators who are in "acting" roles. This would include the acting dean and associate dean of CPS.

As stated in the IR and confirmed in interviews, many faculty in the unit are involved in academic decisions within the institution primarily through their roles on the University Committee on Educator Preparation (UCEP) and the University Curriculum Committee (UCC). The UCEP was formed in 2005 to keep the university community informed on policies, recommendations, and information from the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and the chancellor's office. Membership includes representatives from each subject matter preparation area as well as the SOE acting director/associate dean, credential analyst, and co-chairs of the Teacher Education Division. The UCC includes representatives from each program in the university and reviews curricular proposals brought by faculty. The process begins with faculty and continues through different committees until it receives the approval from the provost, president, and chancellor's office.

The state of California has been in a budget crisis and this has affected support to public institutions of higher education. In 2009-10, faculty, staff, and administrators took a ten percent pay cut in the form of furlough days. The CPS cut course offerings by eight percent and no sabbaticals or travel money were provided to faculty. In 2009-10, release time for department chairs and program coordinators was reduced. There was a hiring freeze in 2008 which resulted in many “acting” administrators. A search for a CPS dean began in fall 2011. In 2010-11, some travel money became available, no furlough days were taken and some release time was reinstated.

The CPS oversees the budget for teacher education and the SOE does not have an individual budget. The provost oversees the budget process working closely with deans, associate deans, and directors. To help in financial planning, the provost, financial managers, deans, and associate deans develop the Academic Resource Planning Report. The report shows numbers of faculty, courses, units, and numbers of majors. Additionally, the report shows total program costs and cost per student.

The SOE faculty has grants totaling \$17 million in funding. Most grants have funding built in to support faculty release time, travel, and supplies. Indirect costs are returned to the college, the program, and the principal investigator.

During the last few years, enrollment in SOE programs has declined. One of the reasons has been the availability of fewer positions for graduates in the area.

There are 39 full-time instructional faculty (lecturers, assistant, associate and full-professors), 19 field supervisors, and 31 part-time lecturers. Full-time faculty engage in teaching, scholarship, and service activities. The university has a workload policy that stipulates full-time tenure-track and tenured faculty are assigned 15 units per semester. This includes four courses and three units of service. Faculty are involved in supervision of candidates in the field, teaching courses at school sites, or working with candidates in fieldwork seminars.

Although professional development opportunities exist, most are done internally or through the California State University System and are limited in scope and content. The Center for Teaching and Learning which supported faculty development was eliminated in 2010.

Faculty and candidates can access the library and information technology. Most faculty use Blackboard for posting class materials. The campus has been upgrading the website and web-based services and uses it for recruitment and outreach. In 2010, the campus converted all student email accounts to Gmail (Google).

A new library wing was opened in 2010 providing more resources, study space, and computer labs. There is not an education curriculum area in the library. The SOE houses the Literacy Center which provides resources for candidates in language, literacy, and reading instruction. It contains textbooks, children’s books, and current research in the area of literacy. In the Literacy Center candidates can use computers and other technology tools. Faculty may reserve the Literacy Center for class use.

The campus has several computer labs with information technology resources available for candidates and faculty. Over half of the classrooms assigned to SOE faculty are technology enhanced classrooms and faculty continue to get new computers even with the budget crisis.

The acting director/associate dean of SOE has primary responsibility for all areas of program and unit assessment including completing reports for the CSU Chancellor's Office, state, federal, university, and accreditation agencies. The acting director/associate dean also serves as NCATE coordinator, and director of evaluation. There is a part-time assessment coordinator who primarily serves as a data manager for TaskStream and Survey Monkey for exit surveys.

The technology that supports the unit assessment system includes Taskstream and PeopleSoft (campus-wide data management system). PeopleSoft provides information about admissions, enrollments, candidates, demographics, and registration.

Continuous improvement

The unit ensures candidates have access to admissions, transfer and grading information, grievance procedures, disability and health services, and tutoring procedures and policies through a variety of sources including the catalog and university website.

In the 2004 NCATE visit, an area for improvement was noted with insufficient advisement services for candidates in Initial Programs. To address this, as stated in IR, and confirmed with candidates and faculty, the SOE restructured the Student Services Center by adding a supervisor and seven staff to handle credentialing and admissions. There also has been training in customer service to better serve candidates and faculty. Advisement sheets are available for candidates to detail the sequence of courses and prerequisites required. In addition to advisement, the following offices provide a wide array of services to candidates:

- 1) Student Support Services: for a cohort of first generation college students: tutoring, mentoring, advisement, and cultural experiences.
- 2) Career Center: psychological counseling; career counseling
- 3) University Advisement Center: initial advisement for freshmen and transfer students
- 4) Center for Learning and Academic Support Services: tutoring
- 5) Student Health Services: psychological services and services for candidates with disabilities
- 6) Admissions Office: admissions
- 7) Disabled Student Services: assisting candidates with disabilities
- 8) Human Resources: candidate grievances

As one of the schools in the CPS, the SOE has autonomy in making decisions about course offerings and basic expenditures. When comparing the total allocation provided to each college, the College of Professional Studies receives more funding per position than other college except for the College of Business Administration and Public Policy.

The acting director/associate dean has implemented various procedures that have improved faculty attention to candidate assessment, increased communication with faculty and other

administrators, designed the unit accreditation system and provided leadership in accreditation efforts.

6.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard.

Not applicable to this standard

6.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs corrected from last visit:

1. Advisement for candidates is not consistent, accurate, timely, or reliable

Rationale

SOE restructured the student services center by adding a supervisor and 7 staff to handle credentialing and admissions. There also has been training in customer service to better serve candidates and faculty. Advisement sheets are available for candidates to detail the sequence of courses and prerequisites required.

New AFI

1. The unit does not provide adequate resources including sufficient personnel to implement the unit's assessment system.

Rationale

There are insufficient faculty and staff to assist in the implementation of the unit assessment system. The acting director/associate dean of SOE serves as director of evaluation but has multiple additional responsibilities. The assessment coordinator is only part-time and has primary responsibility for managing data entry and output for TaskStream.

Recommendation for Standard 6

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

California Decision: **Met with Concerns**

Rationale

Sufficient resources are not allocated for effective operation of the unit assessment system. (Common Standard 3: Resources)

CTC COMMON STANDARDS NOT ADDRESSED BY NCATE UNIT STANDARDS

CTC Common Standard 1.1

Met

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

Findings:

The unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that all candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements. The SOE Student Services Center includes three credential analysts who are current on state credentialing requirements and who are responsible for compiling and reviewing all materials necessary for credential recommendations. Each program has a checklist of all requirements, including coursework, field experiences, assessments, and other documents, that faculty and candidates use to monitor candidate progress through the program and that the credential analysts use at program completion. To be recommended, the candidate completes an application form and provides all necessary materials to the credential analyst who reviews and verifies the information and then submits the electronic application to the CTC. An interview with one credential analyst confirmed the process is in place and is working smoothly. The three credential analysts are responsible for cross checking recommendations for accuracy.

CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Met

Qualified members of the Unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist in their professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The Unit provides support to candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.

Findings:

After general advising from the Student Services Center, candidates are assigned a faculty advisor who stays with them throughout their program. Faculty advisors provide information on the requirements for the credential and monitor candidates' progress toward completion of the program. In addition, candidates are given program handbooks and other materials, including comprehensive checklists, with pertinent information. Additional assistance is available from the Student Services Center which includes an information assistant, lead advisor, and credential analysts as they begin to compile documentation for a credential recommendation. Interviews with candidates confirmed that the advising process is in place and supports the candidates as they progress through the program. Interviews with faculty and the SOE director confirmed that some candidates who did not meet requirements for a variety of reasons had been counseled out of the program.

Multiple Subject Credential Program and Internship Single Subject Credential Programs and Internship

Program Design

CSUDH provides two distinct pathways to earning a multiple or single subject credential: university intern and traditional student teaching. The distinction between each pathway centers on the manner in which the field experience takes place. Intern candidates are working in their own classrooms while completing coursework; their classrooms are their field experiences sites under the supervision of an on-site mentor and a university supervisor. Traditional program candidates complete their student teaching in a public school with the support of a cooperating teacher and university supervisor; the school site does not employ teacher candidates in this pathway.

Each program pathway provides coursework and fieldwork in a sequence designed to gradually build teacher candidate competence to meet the standards. For each program, there are three programmatic phases with unique assessments for transitioning from one phase to the next: Phase 1 – prerequisite competencies; Phase 2 – pedagogical methods and early field experience; and Phase 3 – continuing methods and culminating fieldwork. The program is designed to meet the needs of candidates who are also working or transitioning into teaching from other careers.

Following completion of the prerequisites (Phase 1), each program is designed to be completed in two academic semesters if candidates are enrolled as full-time students. Candidates who are not able to progress at that pace consult with a faculty adviser to create a map for program completion while retaining the three-phase organization of the program to comply with the benchmark assessments.

Course of Study

Common Prerequisites – All candidates complete a common core of courses as part of Phase 1: (1) Educational Psychology, covering major theories of cognitive, social, emotional, and physical development of children and adolescents; (2) the group of courses---Language Learning, English/Language Arts I (Multiple Subject) or Reading in the Content Area (Single Subject), which cover all aspects of the development of linguistic research and theory through reading and writing in the content areas; and (3) Classroom Management, which introduces philosophies, cooperative learning theory, and peer counseling in classroom management.

Multiple Subject – In Phase 2, teacher candidates take pedagogy courses in each of the basic disciplines – Language and Literacy (2 courses), Mathematics, Science, and Social Sciences. Additionally coursework is completed in teaching in an urban multicultural setting, and healthy environments. Coursework in the arts and PE can be taken at any time in the program.

Single Subject – In Phase 2, teacher candidates must successfully complete coursework in Secondary Reading, Multicultural Education: Urban Context, Secondary Teaching Methods, and Healthy Environments: Secondary while either concurrently engaged in an early field practicum or as a university Intern. Teacher candidates in Phase 3 complete the program while in full time student teaching or as a university intern teacher while also completing the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT).

For both the multiple and single subject program candidates, tasks that support successful completion of the PACT are scaffolded throughout the programs.

In the traditional programs, candidates complete a structured field experience during Phase 2 that ties directly with the concurrent coursework. The program selects schools in which candidates observe and participate in classrooms. The classrooms are examples of good practice, illustrating the implementation of strategies taught in the courses. Candidates have a specific task to complete during this early practicum.

Student teaching is completed in a multicultural setting chosen by the unit with cooperating teachers who meet pre-determined criteria and are approved by the school district. University supervisors are trained in the cognitive coaching model and the Teaching Performance Expectations in order to effectively assess candidate development as they conduct a minimum of five formal visits during the semester.

The unit has two unique grant-funded programs that support secondary math and science teachers. Teacher candidates who qualify as interns become part of the Transition to Teaching (TTT) program. Single Subject teacher candidates in math and science who prefer a year of support participate in the Urban Teacher Residency (UTR) program. In each case, grant funds supply both stipends and significant additional support for teacher candidates. Single subject teacher candidates not in the sciences or mathematics may become interns or continue through the traditional student teaching model. The assessment process for all single subject candidates is the same regardless of the pathway of completion.

School-based master teachers in all programs participate in professional development to prepare them to work effectively with candidates consistent with the expectations and purposes of the program. University supervisors and faculty communicate regularly with school-based master teachers about program procedures and expectations, and intervene to address concerns and problems.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

Candidates are continuously engaged in activities and assignments that provide both formative and summative assessment of teaching competence. Signature assignments for multiple subject candidates include: (a) analyzing student work samples in reading and language arts, (b) creating an integrated unit plan incorporating at least three subjects, (c) teaching and videotaping a mathematics lesson, and (d) assessing student learning following teaching lessons. Single Subject candidates complete signature assignments that require them to diagnose students' learning needs, create a unit plan, teach to the plan, videotape a related lesson, assess student learning, and analyze student work samples.

As candidates move into fieldwork, university supervisors/mentors and master/cooperating teachers also provide formative and summative assessment of candidate performance. Using a four-point scale, university supervisors and cooperating teachers/mentors provide assessment of candidate performance on each TPE. In addition, feedback is also provided when assessors use the TPE-based assessment tool at the end of each field experience. Data is collected through a commercial electronic tool to enable the unit to ensure documentation of candidate competence.

Candidates who do not meet the TPEs according to the standards for coursework and fieldwork in any phase are permitted to repeat the TPE-related courses and field experiences. Course grades are tied to successful completion of the signature assignments.

The culminating or summative assessment is the PACT. Candidates are permitted two opportunities to pass the PACT. The unit has a very high first-time pass rate on first time PACT.

For credential recommendation, the unit requires: (1) minimum GPA 3.0, (2) course-based signature assignments receive a passing score, (3) successful completion of fieldwork/student teaching including meeting the phase-appropriate TPEs, and (4) passing all areas of the PACT.

Findings on the Standards

Following a review of the institutional report, biennial reports, program assessment document and response as well as exhibits and interviews with faculty, staff and candidates, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Education Specialist Credential Programs Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, and Early Childhood Special Education, Preliminary and Level II

Program Design

The Programs provide credentials in three specialty areas: Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), Moderate/Severe (M/S) Disabilities, and Mild/Moderate (M/M) Disabilities. Each credential area offers two delivery options (intern or student teaching) and a Master of Arts degree. Within each option, two different levels exist: Preliminary Credential and Level II Credential. In total, the Special Education program offers nine different credential options, one Added Authorization program (ECSE) and three Master's Degree options. Due to employment trends, many more candidates are completing the student teaching option than in the past. As a result, there have been adjustments in the courses and units offered in these programs.

The Special Education Program has revised the course requirements for the Education Specialist Credential Program in Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe, and Early Childhood Special Education in response to new standards adopted by CTC in 2008. In addition to modifying course content, the program increased the number of required units. This need for additional coursework was due to movement of required content from the Professional Clear credential (Level II) to the Preliminary credential. The program indicates that the modifications and additional requirements have broadened the experiences of credential candidates and provided a more thorough preparation for work with infants, preschoolers, and K-12 students across the respective credential pathways.

The Special Education programs are organized to ensure effective and efficient program management and responsiveness to candidates' needs. Upon acceptance into the program, candidates attend an orientation. After orientation the candidates are assigned an advisor and complete their program plan. Clinical Coordinators organize and facilitate field experience

assignments, provide seminars to candidates, master teachers, and supervisors. They also assign master teachers and fieldwork supervisors. The program ensures field experiences cover the range of teaching contexts.

The Special Education Program does not have three years of aggregate data pertaining to unit evaluation and improvement, though evidence shows that candidates' progress is carefully monitored and assessed by their advisor at key transition points throughout the program up to and including signature assignments and exit requirements for completion. Student Services Center personnel verify that candidates have completed all program requirements prior to being recommended for the credential.

Department faculty are recruited from respected institutions, bringing their expertise and infusing their scholarly work into each of the specialty content areas of Early Childhood, Mild/Moderate disabilities and Moderate/Severe disabilities. The program's part-time to full-time faculty ratio has decreased with the addition of two tenured-track faculty returning from administrative appointments. The number of course sections taught by part-time faculty has been reduced to less than 22%. The majority of the Special Education Program faculty also serve as interns and student teacher supervisors.

Course of Study

Core Courses: Candidates in all three credential areas meet foundational standards through the core courses. Prior to enrolling in core courses, all candidates complete prerequisite courses in an emphasis area (e.g. Early Childhood, Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Moderate/Severe Disabilities). Core courses prepare candidates to: (a) adapt instruction, (b) provide behavioral and academic interventions with intensity, (c) utilize assistive technology to support students with disabilities both with instruction and communication, and (d) implement Individualized Education Program (IEP) Plans. Candidates also complete core courses in reading and mathematics methods, which are taught by general education faculty.

The CSUDH Special Education Programs require early and summative field experiences. The field experiences build on the previous coursework and observations in a variety of general and special education contexts. Faculty work to ensure that each candidate has a variety of field experiences that reflect the range of settings, ages, and disabilities. The faculty work very closely with local school districts to appropriately match and place candidates for field experience and student teaching assignments.

All candidates and program completers interviewed indicated that orientation, staff and faculty advisement, course content relevancy and rigor, field experience, and seminars are clear strengths of the Special Education Programs at CSUDH. Candidates also felt that supervisors, master teachers, and support providers/mentors provided timely and invaluable support. Candidates did identify that course availability has become a recent concern.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

All credential program candidates must be formally recommended for the credential by Student Services personnel. The recommendation is based on the chair's assessment that the candidate has successfully completed all prerequisites and program requirements.

Candidates' competencies are assessed at key transition points that occur throughout their program. These transition points include program entrance requirements, passage of content and method courses, transition to field experience, exit from field experience, and exit from program. Satisfactory completion of coursework assures that the standards associated with each course have been met. Performance summative evaluations completed during student teaching provide a means of assuring that candidates have demonstrated competence in the knowledge and skills in actual instructional settings.

Candidates struggling to meet competencies receive assistance from advisors, master teachers, and supervisors. The initial assistance consists of observations from other university supervisors who provide additional feedback to the candidate, master teacher, and supervisor about strategies to inform improvement. If the candidate is unsuccessful with implementing recommendations then a contract is initiated and the candidate is not allowed to move forward in the program until the items in the contract have been successfully completed.

Findings on standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all the program standards have been met.

Designated Subjects Adult Education Credential Program
(Level I / Preliminary)
(Level II / Clear)

Program Design

The Adult Education Program is a 13 unit two-level program jointly administered by the College of Professional Studies (School of Education) and the College of Extended and International Education. The two-level program is designed to prepare teachers for successful teaching careers at community adult schools, and is aligned with the six California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). The program design provides candidates the opportunity for practical experiences and information about contemporary conditions and issues.

The CSUDH Adult Education program addresses the 1993 standards and will no longer be eligible to admit candidates after January 1, 2013. To continue to offer an Adult Education program after 2012, CSUDH will need to submit a proposal that addresses the Commission's 2010 Adult Education Standards.

Course of Study

The Level I program requires 6 units of study and must be completed within the first two years of holding the Preliminary credential. The program emphasizes topics and practices specific to academic, ESL, parent education, vocational and non-academic subjects. Level II courses

provide advanced preparation in the selected area. These courses must be completed before the end of the fifth year holding the preliminary credential. In addition, health and computer literacy are required for the clear credential.

Required field experience (24 hours) allows candidates to observe as well as to practice skills, and to reflect on the experiences. The majority of time is focused on the individual's specific field of interest (i.e., ESL, reading comprehension, a specific academic content area, or vocational education) but candidates are encouraged to observe in a variety of adult education settings. Each candidate compiles a portfolio to document his or her field experiences as a summative assessment. The portfolio includes examples of needs assessments, lesson plans, reflections on the practice teaching experiences from the field experiences as well as a resume, letters of recommendation and flyer for a class the candidate would like to promote.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

Candidate assessment is guided by a Learning Assessment Plan based on the six CSTP standards that is developed for each candidate. Eleven key indicators are evaluated with 5 point rubrics on the Assessment Plans. Candidates are provided the rubrics prior to submitting the assessment plan. Formative evaluations occur within classes, and the capstone portfolio serves as a summative assessment, demonstrating competence in key standards.

In the most recent Biennial Report, the program acknowledges that insufficient aggregated candidate data are present, and there are plans to address this as the program is redesigned.

Findings on standards:

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

Administrative Services

Preliminary Credential

Professional Credential

Program Design

Administrative Preliminary Credential Program

The mission of the Educational Administration Program (EAD) is to prepare educational leaders to transform California schools. The program emphasizes the implementation of rigorous results-based, interrelated learning experiences in high priority, under-performing schools and schools that experience high turnover of school administrators. The program has four key characteristics: (a) targeted work in urban diverse districts with culturally and linguistically diverse populations; (b) a competency base and requirements in two sets of standards: the CTC preliminary content standards, and the ISLLC standards; (c) the application of theoretical issues in practical settings; and (d) a strong performance component. As supported by program graduates during interviews, stakeholders (e.g., partners and others in the field) directly contribute to ongoing program improvement. For instance, they provide case scenarios, recommend new readings, and other means. Graduates appraised their program experience as a supportive "family" environment.

The EAD Tier I Program is designed as a cohort model. Collaboration with colleagues and reflection on personal work and on work of cohort colleagues are integral, as is the goal of learning to provide meaningful leadership in diverse schools. Cohorts of approximately twenty students are divided into smaller reading groups, which serve as tightly constructed learning communities and support groups. Coursework is delivered through an integrated in-classroom, on-line and fieldwork structure (50%-25%-25%).

Each cohort begins with a one to two day “boot camp.” Candidates and graduates report that this introduces them to the overall design, requirements, resources, support mechanisms and web pages that serve as a reference for them throughout their program. They are supported and evaluated by a mentor on a school site, and a cohort leader faculty member from CSUDH. A year-long field-based project integrates knowledge, skills and dispositions across coursework. Their core courses are structured in five-week intensive segments. Faculty interviewed reported that as the cohort moves from course to course, instructors meet with one another to pass on information about the cohort group. They also introduce the candidates to the next instructor for the purpose of letting the candidates know about the cohesion across the program.

Administrative Services Professional Credential

The Tier II program is designed around the six CPSEL standards and conceptually grounded in the notion that leadership is taught as a defined set of skills and attitudes. Their design is predicated on developing reflective administrators who are able to monitor their own leadership practices and analyze and discuss their practice throughout the program. The program emerged from an alliance of local school district administrators with the CSUDH. The collaboration continues as the advisory board, drawing from local districts, helps frame curriculum, supervisor selection, and assessment and administrator competence. It is an induction model, and is offered in the summers out of the Extended Instruction Component of the University.

Similar to the Tier 1 program, Tier II integrates the use of face-to-face instruction with on-line formats and a field-base leadership project. It is designed to prepare school leaders to confront issues of equity achievement gaps, scarce resources, hard to staff schools, and underperforming teachers and staff. In addition, the program prepares candidates to lead in ways that positively impact teaching and learning, school culture, and community involvement. Interviews with faculty made it clear that they work closely with district leaders to respond to the needs of the community as well as the needs of their candidates. For instance, they responded to the need for leadership in the new charter and choice schools by obtaining a large grant that supports these endeavors.

Course of Study:

The Tier 1 program is a two-semester sequenced program in which each of 10 courses is integrated with the fieldwork. Each course balances on-line and fieldwork components with its face-to-face component. Year-long field-based projects (FBP) as well as Individual Plans (IPs) are designed in the first semester to support development of all competencies. Through this integrated instruction, complemented with reading and discussing on line some forty books on leadership and related topics, candidates work to meet the competencies.

In their first semester, candidates take 11 units of leadership coursework and 2 units of fieldwork. In the second semester they take an additional 11 units of coursework and 2 units of fieldwork. Following this total of 26 units as a cohort, each candidate must take three additional classes for the master's degree. Within their fieldwork, they plan a Field Based Project (FBP) to demonstrate competence. One graduate provided an example of a project in which he had used school data to identify a project within his school, located in Watts. His English learners were not achieving at the expected level. Because EAD candidate projects are expected to try to change adult behavior, he worked with the teachers to implement research-based strategies (e.g., Marzano) and develop weekly benchmarks to track progress. Data on student outcomes and teacher perceptions were presented to his committee to demonstrate knowledge and skills.

Candidates self assess their plans and goals, as well as their dispositions at the beginning, middle and end of the program. Candidates present their site research through the use of sophisticated multi-media. Using data, they do pre and post-assessments of their work.

The Tier II program works on an induction model. Thus, Individual Induction Plans (IIP) are developed with mentors from the school sites (usually principals), and are highly individualized. Candidates may use either university or non-university resources to develop competence in the thematic areas. The IIP provides opportunities for the candidates to assess their own skills, to develop a plan for improving them, and to assess their competence as it relates to state standards. Individual areas of interest emerge, which guide their seminars, panel discussions and readings and are aligned to one of the six CSPEL's for the needs of that cohort. One third of their program is field-based, in which they plan and implement a FBP project to impact student achievement (problem centered site-based work). University supervision occurs two to three times per year and there is an onsite mentor.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

The Tier I program evaluates candidates with both formative and summative measures. The program considers within-course assessments to be formative. This includes two case studies, a critical and creative literature review, professional readings, instructor-designed activities and final in-basket scenarios. In this venue, faculty members and fieldwork mentors provide feedback in writing to the candidates.

Summative candidate assessment is centered around two reflective essays with documentation. The first is connected with their FBP, which must address all six standards and uses an evaluation rubric. The FBP report is evaluated by the faculty cohort leader and by the mentor. The second is an electronic portfolio submitted on a CD or flash drive to the cohort coordinators. The portfolio provides evidence of candidates meeting standards and readiness for recommendations for the credential. It also documents leadership experiences and contains candidate reflections.

Tier II program candidates are assessed individually by their administrator mentor on site in collaboration with the faculty member. When all competencies are deemed to have been met, the recommendation is sent to the credential analyst. Pre- and post-assessment are integrated into the coursework. Most data are qualitative. Although faculty members discuss and make

changes in their programs based on individual and informal feedback, neither program has aggregated data for the purpose of program improvement.

Findings on Standards:

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

**Pupil Personnel Services Credential Programs:
School Counseling
Child Welfare and Attendance**

Program Design:

The PPS Program at CSUDH is a combined master's degree and credential program and is a counseling program designed to serve not only K-12 schools, but colleges, universities, public and private agencies. The design provides a broad conceptual base focused on self-awareness and reflective practice upon which the acquisition of, specific counseling skills, is built.

The School Counseling preparation program prepares candidates with knowledge and skills to promote academic, social-emotional and career development for diverse pupils in public schools. Candidates and graduates interviewed affirmed a strong base in individual and group counseling, and commitment to strong and culturally appropriate communication skills with students, staff and administrators. The program admits candidates twice a year and is not structured into cohorts; thus, candidates complete the program at varying intervals. Candidates have a "first year" coursework as prerequisite to the more advanced courses, as well as one practicum experience. Following successful completion of this, candidates qualify for the master's degree. After qualifying for the master's degree, candidates complete their fieldwork and earn the PPS School Counseling Credential.

The Child Welfare and Attendance Specialization authorizes work specifically related to student attendance, truancy prevention and remediation. The program is designed as a two course "add on" to the PPS School Counseling Program in which candidates are prepared to be effective leaders, change agents, problem solvers, counselors, consultants, and advocates for children and adolescents. In a two course sequence and fieldwork component candidates attain knowledge and understanding of the core areas of CWA programs that includes history, philosophy and trends in child welfare and attendance.

In the School Counseling program the core faculty is comprised of, three tenure-track professors and one full time lecturer. The program is led by a coordinator. In Child Welfare and Attendance, one part time faculty lecturer instructs both classes. Faculty and lecturers confirm that they regularly communicate with each other about programmatic and candidate issues.

Course of Study

The School Counseling Credential requires 51 units of study and includes completion of the master's degree. Prior to entry into the program, candidates complete 3 prerequisite units in

Special Education. During their first semester, they must complete PPS 525, Group Dynamics for Personal Growth, in order to remain in the program. In addition to serving as an introduction to the profession and to group dynamics, this course serves to screen for and teach about dispositions appropriate to the profession.

Coursework is organized into Core, Foundations, and Advanced Counseling areas, followed by a capstone comprehensive requirement or thesis. This sequence is followed by six units of field experience. The core and foundations courses (27 units) may be taken in any order. During this preparation candidates become knowledgeable in a range of areas, from counseling theory to consultation, diversity, legal issues and career development, as well as program development and evaluation. Fifteen units in advanced counseling coursework introduce candidates to counseling techniques, violence prevention, crisis intervention and practicum in which they can apply prior knowledge. Each succeeding course has prerequisites that must be satisfied before enrollment.

School Counseling candidates are required to complete 600 hours of field experience supervised by a PPS credentialed site supervisor and University supervisor following completion of their master's degree requirements. During this experience, candidates practice a full range of school counseling functions under supervision. Some candidates alternatively participate in a paid internship setting. Prior to this, candidates take a practicum in which they complete 100 hours of experiences to become familiar with the roles and responsibilities of a school counselor. Embedded in the practicum experience candidates complete several 'shadowing/observation requirements including attending student study team (SST) and individualized education program (IEP) meetings, conducting classroom guidance lessons, providing direct services to students, and observing 504 or behavioral support plan (BSP) development and conduct workshops.

Child Welfare and Attendance candidates may enter the program if they are in the PPS program at CSUDH or have completed a PPS credential at another institution. Candidates in the CWA program build on knowledge of legal and procedural strategies to maximize school attendance, prevention and intervention methods; using funding resources as well as community services and resources; and managing CWA programs. Candidates take two courses, *PPS 557 Child Welfare and Attendance* and *PPS 558 School Attendance Improvement and Truancy Remediation: Prevention and Intervention* (one being offered the first time in spring of 2012), and complete 200 hours of field experience. Candidates may opt to enroll in this specialization concurrent with or following successful completion of the PPS program. Until now, it has been a one-course program. However, the second course has been approved and will be offered in spring of 2012. Faculty members report that budget constraints moved this program from the main campus PPS to Extended Studies.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

School Counseling Candidates are assessed for knowledge and skills within their courses. In addition four major assessments measure knowledge, skills and dispositions. The first performance measure begins with the rubric-based assessment of dispositions in the mandatory course PPS 525. Midway through the program, candidates enroll in practicum, and are assessed by site supervisors on their performance in developing guidance units, action research and readiness for advanced coursework. Prior to awarding the master's degree, all candidates must

pass the comprehensive exam, evaluating their content knowledge using essays and multiple-choice questions. Finally, they are assessed on their performance with a competency-based performance assessment of their work in the field, assessing their performance on each standard. A portfolio documents their completed requirements for the credential. Program faculty report that it is due to decreased resources these data sources are not aggregated and analyzed for the purpose of program improvement.

Child Welfare and Attendance evaluates candidates within the courses for content knowledge and on a performance measure of competency attainment within their fieldwork. Rubrics guide the evaluations. Within courses they use quizzes, discussions, reflective journals, and reports of fieldwork. Four projects serve as major assignments, and include such things as writing small grants to fund retention programs. Data from these assessments are not aggregated or analyzed for program improvement.

Findings on Standards:

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