

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at University of San Diego

February 2012
Foreword

The following report for the Accreditation Site Visit at the University of San Diego, held on November 6-9, 2011 is presented in a much different format than other NCATE/CTC joint visit reports. Because of the pilot nature of this Transformation Initiative visit, NCATE chose to alter the format for its report, building only on the Offsite Visit Report, rather than combining in one comprehensive narrative, the presentation of the evidence of both the offsite visit and onsite visit. Because the NCATE report serves in lieu of the CTC Common Standards report, a brief explanation of the NCATE process and organization of that portion of the document that follows is necessary.

The NCATE review includes an offsite visit process that results in an offsite visit report with concerns and questions raised, an IR Addendum that responds to the questions and concerns raised in the offsite visit report, and the onsite visit process. Typically, all of these pieces of information and evidence collected results in one comprehensive document summarizing standard findings at the conclusion of the site visit. However, because the Unit Accreditation Board receives the myriad documents related to each site visit (offsite visit report, IR Addendum, and site visit report) in order to inform their decision, this NCATE team was asked to pilot a new process which would result in a document that simply builds on the previous process. Taken by itself, the onsite visit report would not provide sufficient information for the COA to understand the standard findings of the team and to make an informed decision about accreditation.

To address this piloting of a new report format by NCATE, the CTC team lead and staff had to add information from the offsite visit report to the onsite visit report in order to provide the COA with enough information to make an informed accreditation decision.

For California's report purposes then, the information in the offsite report needed to be incorporated into a comprehensive document for COA. In the following report, Sections delineated as .1 to .3 in each standard area (for instance, 1.1 to 1.3 for Standard 1) reflect information gathered from the offsite report process. It is important to understand the Offsite Report findings are *necessarily* preliminary and incomplete, and that they often make reference to evidence the team *did not find*—because the onsite visit had not yet occurred. This is followed by a listing of the concerns and/or questions the BOE team felt needed to be addressed in the IR Addendum and/or at the onsite visit.

Sections .4 of each standard on are the team's findings from the IR Addendum and onsite visit. The language in the italics represents the question or the concern raised by the offsite visit team and the language in regular font that follows represents the evidence or information confirmed by the onsite visit team as it relates to that question or concern.

Additional discussion of this format and context will be provided at the COA meeting.

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at
University of San Diego**

Professional Services Division

February 2012

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at University of San Diego. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation of **Accreditation** is made for the institution.

**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		
NCATE Decision	Met	Met
State Team Decision	Met with concerns	
3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practices	Met	Met
4) Diversity	Met	Met
5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance and Development	Met	Met
6) Unit Governance and Resources	Met	Met
CTC Common Standard 1.1 Credential Recommendation Process	Met	Met
CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	Met	Met

Program Standards

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject	19	19		
Single Subject	19	19		
Education Specialist: DHH Level I/Preliminary	11	11		
Education Specialist: MM Level I/Preliminary	12	11	1	
Pupil Personnel Counseling: School Counseling	32	32		

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Administrative Services, with Internship	15	15		

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 (*see Foreword to this item*)

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

Institution: University of San Diego

Dates of Visit: November 6–8, 2011

**Accreditation Team
Recommendation:** Accreditation

Rationale:

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

Common (NCATE Unit) Standards

The decision of the state team regarding the six NCATE standards is that all standards are **Met** with the exception of NCATE Unit Standard 2 (CTC Common Standard 2) which is **Met with Concerns**. The decision of the team regarding the parts of California's two Common Standards that are required of NCATE accredited institutions is that both standards are **Met**.

Program Standards

Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total team membership was provided for each of the programs. Following discussion, the team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns or not met. The CTC Team found that all standards in all programs are **Met** with the exception of Program Standard 2, Program Design, in the Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate, Level I/Preliminary, with Internship, which is **Met with Concerns**.

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of program documentation, evidence provided at the site, additional information provided by program administration and faculty, and interviews with candidates, program completers, faculty, administrators, employers and other stakeholders. Due to the finding that all Common Standards were met with the exception of one Common Standard identified as *Met with Concerns* and all Program Standards were met with the exception of one program standard which was found to be *Met with Concerns*, the team unanimously recommends an accreditation decision of **Accreditation**.

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

Initial/Teaching Credentials

Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject

Single Subject
Single Subject

Advanced/Service Credentials

Pupil Personnel Services
School Counseling

Administrative Services
Preliminary, with Internship

Education Specialist Credentials:

Level I/ Preliminary

Deaf and Hard of Hearing,
with Internship
Mild/Moderate Disabilities,
with Internship

Staff recommends that:

1. University of San Diego's response to the preconditions be accepted.
2. University of San Diego be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
3. University of San Diego 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/CTC Co-Chairs:

Tim Letzring
University of Mississippi

Mark Cary
Davis Joint Unified School District, Retired

NCATE/CTC Common Standards Cluster:

Cynthia Barta
Clark Middle School, Shawnee, Kansas

Joel Colbert
Chapman University

Marilyn Draheim
University of the Pacific

Harold London
De Paul University, Chicago, IL

Douglas Warring
University of St. Thomas, Minneapolis, MN

CTC Programs Cluster:

Jody Daughtry
California State University, Fresno

Sharon Jarrett
Los Angeles Unified School District

Robert Perry
Los Angeles Unified School District

Marcel Soriano
California University, Los Angeles (Retired)

Staff to the Visit

Cheryl Hickey, Administrator

Marilynn Fairgood, Consultant

Documents Reviewed

Site Visit Documentation	Biennial Report
University Catalog	Biennial Report Feedback
Common Standards Narrative	Field Experience Notebooks
Course Syllabi	Schedule of Classes
Candidate Files	Advisement Documents
Follow-up Survey Results	College Annual Report
Needs Analysis Results	College Budget Plan
Program Assessment Feedback	TPA Data
Program Information Booklet	

Interviews Conducted

	Common Standards Cluster	Program Sampling Cluster	TOTAL
Candidates	31	39	70
Completers	23	31	54
Employers	15	19	34
Institutional Administration	28	2	30
Program Coordinators	5	10	15
Faculty	28	39	67
TPA Coordinator	1	3	4
Advisors	5	2	7
Field Supervisors – Program	16	14	30
Field Supervisors - District		30	30
Credential Analysts and Staff	6	1	7
Advisory Board Members	9	2	11
Education Department Assessment Coordinator	1		1
Totals			360

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

**Table 1
Program Review Status**

Program Name	Number of program completers (2009-10)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (10-11)	Agency Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject	25	98	CTC
Single Subject	20	52	CTC
Education Specialist DHH, Level I/Preliminary, with Internship	5	11	CTC
Education Specialist: M/M, Level I/Preliminary, with Internship	16	19	CTC
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	23	45	CTC/CACREP
Preliminary Administrative Services, with Internship	13	23	CTC

The Visit

The University of San Diego site visit was held on the campus in San Diego, California from November 6-8, 2011 and, for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing credential program, at the John Tracy Clinic in Los Angeles on October 21, 2011. This was a joint NCATE/CTC accreditation visit, piloting the Transformation Initiative model for NCATE. The site visit team consisted of a Team Lead, two California BIR members who served on the NCATE team reviewing the NCATE Unit Standards (Common Standards), four program sampling members, and two NCATE members of the NCATE staff. Two Commission consultants accompanied the visit. The NCATE team, the California team lead and Commission consultants participated in the off site visit in June 27, 2011. California team members interviewed program directors via phone call in the week prior to the visit. For the site visit, the California state team began meeting on Sunday morning and interviews with constituents began on Sunday afternoon. Interviews continued Monday and follow up phone calls were conducted on Tuesday morning. A mid-visit report was completed on Monday evening and provided via e-mail to the Associate Dean. The exit report was conducted at 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 8, 2011.

I. INTRODUCTION

I.1 Brief overview of the institution and the unit.

In 2005, the School of Education at University of San Diego changed its name to School of Leadership and Education Sciences (SOLES). SOLES is home to two education departments (Leadership Studies and Learning and Teaching) and two related program areas (Counseling and Marital and Family Therapy). These departments and programs offer a total of 13 degree programs with multiple specializations, as well as 15 credential and certificate programs. SOLES is also home to undergraduate minors in Leadership Studies, American Humanics, and Naval Sciences. The head of the professional education unit is the dean of SOLES. As the unit head the dean is responsible for the administration of all initial and advanced programs related to educator preparation in the unit.

Each identified program has an assigned program director, or co-directors, responsible for the integration and oversight of program activities within the unit. These individuals may also serve as the content area advisor for candidates enrolled in their program. The unit utilizes an Advisory Council consisting of faculty from both the School of Arts and Sciences and SOLES. The unit has recently created a Teacher Education Network (TEN) focusing on the connection between the Arts and Science areas and the teacher preparation process.

Total enrollment for SOLES as of fall 2011 was 651 students, with 549 graduate students and 102 undergraduate candidates. The unit utilizes 41 full-time faculty that are tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track. The unit also utilizes affiliate faculty members from other units on the campus as well as adjunct faculty as needed.

SOLES also is home to ten academic institutes and centers. These include the Autism Institute (2005), Character Development Center (1995), Center for Education Policy and Law (2007), Center for Student Support Systems (CS3) (2003), COMPASS Family Center (2006), Educational Leadership Development Academy (2001), Global Center (2001), The Caster Family Center for Nonprofit Research (2004), Leadership Institute (2000), and the Manchester Family Child Development Center (1989).

The unit moved into its current location, Mother Rosalie Hill Hall, in 2007. The building was built specifically for SOLES and the faculty assisted in the design of the building. The response for Standard 6 will cover this facility further.

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

This was a joint visit utilizing the California state protocol. According to the California protocol, NCATE is voluntary. As a result, units have the option to utilize the NCATE unit standards in lieu of the California Common Standards, provided that areas not addressed in NCATE standards are addressed as a part of the NCATE Standards response. The joint team of both NCATE and CTC members reviewed these common elements with respect to this protocol process. As the

protocol states, the NCATE team deferred to the CTC team when addressing program standards. The joint team was able to follow all elements of the California State protocol.

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

The unit offers one program on another campus. A state team member visited that site--the John Tracy Clinic on October 21, 2011, prior to the site visit at the main campus.

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

No extenuating circumstances affected the conduct of this visit.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK. Overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

SOLES arrived at its 2004 conceptual framework following a two-year process involving faculty debate, dialogue, and revisions. The ACE acronym, developed in 2004, still guides the work in the unit. While the framework has not changed since 2004, the unit did indicate new developments in SOLES and USD, and new research has deepened and refined the knowledge base supporting the conceptual framework. The three key components of the conceptual framework are:

Academic Excellence, Critical Inquiry, and Reflection: Candidates in the unit will demonstrate the knowledge and the ability to represent content accurately by applying effective strategies and techniques in their field of study, by actively engaging in reflective activities, by critically analyzing their practice, and by applying higher order thinking skills to a wide array of investigative pursuits.

Community and Service: Candidates in the unit will strive to create and support collaborative learning communities in their classrooms and their professional fields of practice by bridging theory and practice and engaging in community service.

Ethics, Values, and Diversity: Candidates in the unit will understand and adhere to the values and ethical codes of the University, of the schools they work in, and of the professional organizations to which they belong. They will support the creation of inclusive, unified, caring and democratic learning communities that value each individual regardless of background or ability, and they will equitably support student learning and optimal development. (2004).

III. STANDARDS

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

1.1 Offsite Report: Statement about the evidence

The School of Leadership and Education Sciences (SOLES) at the University of San Diego is piloting the new NCATE Transformation Initiative review for its next accreditation cycle. They have chosen improvement of clinical experiences for teacher candidates as the focus of the review.

Since the last review, three initiatives in SOLES have changed: 1) internationalization of all programs; 2) growth of collaboration around action research; and 3) evidenced-based decision making through program assessment and participation in the Eduventures Schools of Education Learning Collaborative. The changes in these initiatives were adequately explained in their Transformation Initiative Institutional Review. Initiatives 2 and 3 are particularly important for Standard 1 and will be carefully reviewed in their TIIR as well as during the on-site visit.

Revisions of the SOLES Assessment System have also been made since the last visit. Since Standard 1 is closely related to Standard 2, it is appropriate here to describe changes to the Assessment System that impact Standard 1. First, a full-time Director of Professional Services was hired to reorganize the clinical experiences for teacher candidates, including, but not limited to the 'Taskstream' Accountability Management System (AMS) for organizing and assessing student work and the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), which serves as the summative assessment for teacher candidates. Second, a Director of Assessment was hired to work with all program faculty members on program assessment and documentation for accreditation and accountability. This person was also charged with integrating the SOLES independent data system into the USD data system, Banner.

All programs have posted student learning outcomes and mapped the assessment of those outcomes to the appropriate courses in the curriculum. Exit surveys and clinical assessment forms have been migrated to Qualtrics, a survey tool that provides greater analytic capability than Survey Monkey, which was used previously.

All initial programs evaluate candidates at several points. Initially, applications are reviewed by at least 2 faculty members followed by a structured interview for those applicants who are moved forward after their application is evaluated. Once in the program, candidates are assessed on embedded signature assignments in each of their courses and, prior to student teaching, through conversations with faculty who review candidate progress and at a faculty meeting, in which faculty discuss candidates who might need additional support and/or are not ready for student teaching. Finally, candidates are assessed as they reach the end of the program. They must pass the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET) and the Performance Assessment for

California Teachers (PACT). Special Education candidates have several culminating assessments that approximate the data from the CSET and PACT.

For advanced programs, the admissions assessment is similar to that used with initial programs. In addition, applicants for administrator programs are also observed in their classrooms by the program director, and the observation ratings also contribute to the decision to accept.

School counseling candidates complete several assessments during the first year in the program, which are summarized in the Clinical Instruction Benchmark Assessment prior to fieldwork. Candidates in the education master's programs also have specific course-embedded assessments that are used to assess candidates' content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and dispositions.

There have been some refinements to the candidate assessment process since the last accreditation visit. First, candidates in the M.Ed. and M.A. programs complete an action research project, which serves as the culminating assessment. Second, candidate dispositions are assessed by the SOLES PEU Dispositions Assessment, which was developed by faculty and is administered at three points in the program: in the application phase, mid-point (prior to student teaching and internship) and at the end.

The implications of the Transformation Initiative, "Connecting Aspiring Leaders and Teachers," are significant to Standard 1. Three research questions are identified along with the methodology for answering them. Question 1 is: What are the effects of systematic, highly articulated early field experiences on teacher candidates' preparation for, and performance in student teaching? Several data sources are identified including PACT scores and supervisor and master teacher evaluations. The second question is: What does the mentoring relationship between aspiring leaders (master teachers) and teacher candidates look like, how are each of the participants affected, and how does it improve Education Leadership Academy (ELDA) classroom practice? Data sources to answer this question include participant journals, focus group interviews, and video recordings of mentor-mentee sessions. The third question is: How does the participation of teacher candidates in early field experiences affect the host school, and thereby, student learning? For this question, the institution did not include specific strategies on what data will be collected and what methodologies will be used to collect those data.

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

1.3 Feedback on correcting previous *areas for improvement* (AFIs). No areas for improvement were identified in the previous visit.

1.4 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard (*italics*); team findings from the onsite visit (plain text)

(1) *The dispositions assessment, SOLES PEU Dispositions Assessment, appears not to be used for initial teacher preparation programs.*

The SOLES PEU Disposition Survey was created, but was only used in the Counseling program in the Fall 2011. It is scheduled for implementation in other programs in the Spring of 2012.

- (2) *Data presented in Standard 2, Exhibit 5 are not adequately explained. The graphs need further explanation. **Rationale:** Team members may not be familiar with PACT and will need to have the scoring procedures and results fully explained.*

Data presented in Standard 2, Exhibit 5 were adequately explained, and the PACT assessment system appears to be an effective tool for the assessment of both multiple and single subject teacher candidates.

Evidence to validate during the onsite visit (*italics*); team findings from the onsite visit (plain text)

- (1) *Clarification of requirement for multiple and single subject candidates to pass CSET prior to student teaching?*

The review of teacher candidate handbooks made it clear that all candidates must pass CSET prior to beginning their student teaching.

- (2) *Clarification of the summative assessments for Special Education M.Ed. and credential candidates. What are the assessments that approximate the data from the CSET and PACT for the culminating assessments?*

PACT is not a California requirement for special education candidates. However, the special education faculty believe that PACT is an important assessment of candidate competence and have developed a set of Centerpiece assessments, grounded in the California Teacher Performance Expectations, that are embedded in coursework. These assessments provide useful data similar to that of PACT.

- (3) *Why were there so many unacceptable scores in 2007?*

Based on a second review of the data at the onsite visit, it was clear that an error was made in the initial analysis. In fact, there were no unacceptable scores in 2007.

- (4) *Explanation of the 2009-10 PACT Score Summary and bar graphs included in Standard 2, Exhibit 5.*

The 2009-10 PACT Score Summary and bar graph data included in Standard 2, Exhibit 5 were adequately explained and the PACT assessment system appears to be an effective tool for the assessment of both multiple and single subject teacher candidates.

- (5) *Clarification of the inclusion of the Ph.D. program in the NCATE review. Shouldn't this program be included in NCATE's definition of the "unit"?*

NCATE uses a fifty percent rule, (i.e., if less than 50% of the candidates in the program are in P-12 education, then the Ph.D. program is not included), which is the case herein. As of August 2011, only 14 of 88 (16%) doctoral candidates were P-12 educators.

- (6) *Samples of candidate work (e.g., action research projects, theses, portfolios). How does candidate work reflect candidates meeting expected proficiencies?*

Based on an examination of the candidate action research projects and interviews in which candidates described those projects and their alignment with program proficiencies, it was concluded that the projects reflect candidates' meeting those expected proficiencies.

- (7) *Follow-up data from employment supervisors for advanced graduate programs. What data from these surveys exist? How do faculty and the unit use these data? What have they learned from the data?*

A systematic follow-up survey of employment supervisors for advanced graduate programs does not exist.

- (8) *Updated follow-up survey data from the biennial report due August 15, 2011. What did graduates of the Administrative Services Credential program report on the survey? How are faculty members using these data?*

There are ample data collected by the Administrative Services credential program, and those data are used to systematically improve the program. Multiple measures include, but are not limited to, a formative portfolio in which all program assignments are aligned with the California administrative standards; a comprehensive evaluation by both the university supervisor and mentor principal based on rubrics aligned with those same standards; and a culminating presentation and defense of the portfolio.

- (9) *Clarification of the data being collected for research question 3 for the TI. What data and methodologies will be used to answer this question? How will data from early field experiences be tied to student learning?*

The TI methodology is not yet developed enough to measure the impact of early field experiences on P-12 student learning. This is a very complex question that needs a significant amount of additional consideration regarding the choice and design of the research methodology.

- (10) *Data for the 2010-11 Action Research Summary. How are these data being used? What is the unit learning from these data?*

After extensive interviews with multiple stakeholders and a review of the action research projects, it was concluded that the action research project data are used to make changes in both classes and programs. For example, candidates in the Masters Credential Cohort program develop action research projects in their second semester of student teaching that are collaboratively developed with input from cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and methods instructors. Based on an evaluation of the projects by faculty, adjustments are made in the methods classes and in program components, as appropriate.

- (11) *Report by the NCATE Ad Hoc PEU Dispositions Committee, in collaboration with the Student Success committee. How has the disposition component evolved across the PEU?*

The SOLES PEU Disposition Assessment Survey was developed and field tested, but has not been fully implemented. Implementation is set to begin at the end of the fall 2011 semester.

1.5. Summary of significant improvements/strengths related to this standard since the previous visit

The unit has made significant changes in the programs since the last visit that relate to both Standard 1 and, to a greater extent, to all other NCATE unit standards. Improvements and strengths include first, and foremost, the new Mother Rosalie Hill Hall and the consolidation of SOLES faculty within that building. Other strengths include the unit's focus on internationalization in all programs, the inclusion of action research projects in select programs, and the implementation of the Performance Assessment of California Teachers (PACT) summative assessment system.

1.6. Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable: Not applicable to this standard

1.7. Areas for Improvement

New Areas for Improvement

AFI	AFI Rationale
1. Employer satisfaction with advanced program graduates is not currently assessed. (Advanced only)	Data from employers of advanced program graduates are not collected. Therefore, there is no way to know how well the programs do in these two areas.
2. Candidate dispositions are not currently assessed systematically. (Initial Teacher Preparation & Advanced)	The SOLES PEU Disposition Assessment Survey was developed and field tested, but has not been fully implemented.

1.8 BOE Team Recommendation for Standard 1

Initial Teacher Preparation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable

State Team Decision: Standard Met

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

2.1 Offsite Report: Statement about the evidence

The unit has worked to implement an effective system to collect and organize candidate performance data. The Unit Assessment System (UAS) is organized in multiple levels. The Office of Assessment Support helps coordinate program assessment and oversee assessment documentation at the program level. The Director of Assessment Support, which is now a full-

time position, works with faculty in all programs throughout all aspects of the assessment process. In addition, two faculty members, one from the Department of Learning and Teaching and one from the Counseling program, have as part of their responsibilities development of assessment activities and coordination of these activities with the Office of Assessment Support.

The UAS includes both common and unique components for both initial and advanced programs. The Biennial Reports submitted to CTC clearly show that the programs have rubrics and other standardized measures of candidate competence and program effectiveness. Each initial licensure program is organized around Decision Points as illustrated in the respective tables that demonstrate the timing, the measure, key assessments, and the expected outcome. Decision point data for the past three years are accessible for certification programs via the Biennial Reports. Additional evidence is needed for data of non-certification programs, mostly at the advanced level. While it is clear that course outcomes align with the conceptual framework, it is not as clear how the actual candidate assessments align with the conceptual framework.

For initial programs, the assessment system utilizes what the unit calls Embedded Signature Assignments. These are aligned with California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and assessed utilizing rubrics through TaskStream. Initial candidates must also complete the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET), for which the aggregated pass rate has exceeded 85 percent for the last three years. The unit also utilizes the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), which is a comprehensive assessment system for teacher candidates.

It is evident from the aggregated data that rubrics are utilized for assessments both at the initial and advanced levels. Exhibits reviewed by the team provide some explanation on how the unit has taken steps to eliminate bias and improve fairness, as well as inter-rater reliability. However, samples of all rubrics were not included in the online exhibit collection. The entry level rubrics for initial were accessible, but those that are embedded into TaskStream were not. Reviewing those additional rubrics will assist the team in verifying these concepts, and also ensure that the rubrics are aligned with the Conceptual Framework. Syllabi for all courses were updated and clearly reflect the themes of the Conceptual Framework. Candidate assessment during coursework provides a mechanism for monitoring candidate progress for both formative and summative purposes.

The assessment system follows outlined procedures for data collection, aggregation, disaggregation, analysis, and dissemination. While documents indicate how this process is designed to be used, it is important that the team have evidence for how the process is actually implemented. For example, while it is clear that the PACT data is collected for initial candidates, the team needs to seek evidence of data analysis, faculty meetings examining all assessment results, and decisions made in response to the data. Online exhibits included some examples of changes made based on program and unit data, which is a very good start. Confirming those changes and eliciting additional examples at the onsite visit will enable the team to confirm that the assessment system is being implemented as designed.

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

2.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs): No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit.

2.4. Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

Areas of Concern related to continuing to meet the standard: None were cited in the offsite BOE report.

Evidence to validate during the onsite visit (*italics*); team findings from the onsite visit (plain text)

(1) *Effectiveness of the assessment system in allowing all stakeholders access to data. How does the system facilitate feedback to candidates, advisors, program managers, departments, and the unit?*

The Office of Assessment Support provides summary reports to program directors, department chairs, faculty, and advisers, who are faculty members in the respective departments. Programs use TaskStream and/or Qualtrics, a survey tool for collecting surveys from graduating students, alumni, and employers. The Director of Assessment has prepared reports showing trends over the past three years in twelve areas of the PACT assessment for the initial teacher preparation program. Credential programs have entry assessments, midpoint assessments, and exit assessments. The initial teacher preparation programs have assessments that are coordinated with the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) system, including Embedded Signature Assessments, Contact Area Assessment Tasks, and a Performance-based Teaching Event. Advanced degree candidates in initial teacher education get detailed feedback on their performance related to program standards and student learning outcomes assessed at midpoint through the Action Research proposal in EDUC 500 and the completion of the Action Research Project with a faculty mentor. Furthermore, the number of candidates in programs is small, so that candidates receive regular and detailed feedback.

Review of the Biennial Reports revealed a lack of data for the Administrative Services program. Program data over the past years are collected, but some of the data are not systematically included in the unit electronic system; some constituencies did not know about the findings from the program assessments. Also, interviews with some faculty, advisory board members and candidates revealed that data from the Administrative Services program are not systematically shared. Cooperating teachers and adjunct faculty in the initial teacher preparation programs were not informed about the findings of evaluations from candidates, for example, about their performance in their program teaching roles.

(2) *Consistency of the implementation of the assessment system across all programs at the initial and advanced levels, including non-certification programs at the advanced level. What are the assessments used for programs that do not lead to a credential? How are those data compiled, aggregated, and used by the unit?*

Program faculty members who support the action research initiative in Master's degree programs explained the use of the Conceptual Framework in developing and aligning an assessment system across programs. Advanced programs include Master's degree programs in teacher preparation, TESOL, Literacy and Culture, and Curriculum and Instruction, and

advanced credential programs in school administration (Administrative Services Credential, Tier I, Preliminary) and school counseling (Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling). The midpoint assessment for candidates in these programs is the action research or thesis proposal, addressed in EDUC 500 (Research, Design, and Methodology). The course instructors compile the data and share it with the Office of Assessment Support. The lead instructor also reports the data each term at a faculty meeting. Candidates who successfully complete the research proposal advance to candidacy for the Master's degree, and the department head sends each candidate a letter notifying them of their status. Each year two or three candidates require additional time to complete an acceptable proposal and they are given an incomplete in EDUC 500 for the term. They are mentored by the course instructor and their faculty advisors and usually complete the proposal successfully within the first few weeks of the next term.

The primary capstone assessment for Master's candidates is either the Action Research Project or the thesis. Two faculty members read each action research project, and the program faculty have developed a rubric for scoring the projects. They calibrate each year in order to ensure reliability.

- (3) *Operation of the unit assessment system. How does the system work? What are the assessment procedures? What are the timelines for data collection? How are data aggregated, disaggregated, analyzed, etc.? What reports are generated for what purposes?*

Programs for the Professional Education Unit use an assessment process that is similar for both initial and advanced programs. The unit has diagrams to show the overall assessment process. The conceptual framework—aligned with ethics outcomes, i.e., academic excellence, critical inquiry, reflection; community and service; ethics values and diversity, (known as ACE)—sets the foundation for program specific candidate learning outcomes. State standards promote the development of candidate learning outcomes. Program faculty and the assessment director created a cycle of steps including curriculum mapping and identification of assessments, collecting data, analyzing data, summarizing results, and applying results to making programmatic changes. The unit has a yearly cycle of assessment procedures. Initial teacher preparation programs have assignments and assessments that provide evidence that candidates are meeting California state standards, California Teacher Performance Expectations, and the California Performance Assessment. The MAT, M.Ed., Master's credential cohort (MCC), and the PPS School Counselor programs also include an action research requirement. Action research is developed in stages aligned with coursework in these programs.

- (4) *Alignment of rubrics and resulting data with the conceptual framework. How is the conceptual framework reflected in the assessment system?*

The unit's conceptual framework and the ethics outcomes known as ACE are evident in the unit assessment system. As examples, rubrics for the initial teacher preparation programs were developed by the PACT consortium and were found aligned with the unit's conceptual framework.

- (5) *Data trends for the advanced programs. How are these data used for improvement of candidate performance and programs?*

Program documentation and interviews verified that faculty has made changes in courses for the M.Ed. programs based on the Action Research Summaries from 2010-2011. Faculty

members reported that they examined candidate performance on specific criteria and recognized that candidates needed more guidance to develop higher quality research questions for their projects. Instructors for a course, EDUC 500, have changed their approach to teaching about the identification of an important research question as candidates develop their action research proposals. Faculty advisers found that they needed to participate more directly with individual candidates to help them to develop their methodology and assessment for the first stage of the action research.

Approximately eight years ago, program faculty wanted to change from portfolios to action research in the Master's programs. This change has led to an improvement in candidates' attention to research and practice. Also, the recent focus on action research has led to the development of a local action research network and to presentations at conferences devoted to action research.

(6) *Use of assessment for improvement at the unit level. What evidence exists on how the unit has utilized assessment data? How does the UAS assess unit operations?*

The initial teacher preparation program's adoption of the PACT assessment system has helped to guide faculty to areas that need improvement, such as candidates' attention to academic language in their teaching, and to changes in the early field experience or practicum prior to student teaching. Modifications were made to program coursework and activities. Candidates report their satisfaction with having more experience in school settings and with small group teaching opportunities prior to student teaching. Unit documents confirm that the Dean and faculty agreed on the need to improve faculty advising in response to survey results across programs that were critical of faculty advisement of candidates.

The unit assessment system uses TaskStream and/or in Qualtrics (a survey tool in which they built many fieldwork assessments, as well as surveys for graduating candidates, alumni, and employers) for data collection, management of assessments, and facilitating the development of reports. The unit monitors candidates' exit survey data for trends across the unit. The Office of Assessment Support summarizes data from these sources and develops reports for faculty, program directors and department chairs. Trend data are also summarized for each program. Summaries are shared with the Dean and Associate Dean to look for patterns across the professional education unit.

(7) *Unit's handling of candidate complaints. What is the complaint review process? What records exist?*

During interviews, representatives of the unit explained the avenues available for candidate complaints, including the SOLES Graduate Student Association (SGSA), consisting of elected candidate representatives, as one vehicle "for raising issues of *general* concern to candidates." The policy states that the "SGSA President's report of candidate activities and issues is a standing agenda item at monthly SOLES faculty/administrator meetings. When *individual* candidate complaints are governed by another University or SOLES policy, the complaint is handled in a manner consistent with that policy. Examples include, but are not limited to, grade grievances and complaints of harassment or discrimination. Complaints about courses, other than grade grievances, are brought first to the instructor of the class in question to seek resolution through a face-to-face discussion. If this meeting does not resolve the candidate's concern he or she meets with the appropriate program director or department chair to seek assistance. If, after taking this step, the candidate's concern is still unresolved,

he or she contacts the Associate Dean of SOLES who works to resolve the issue in conformance with the policies of USD, SOLES, and the student's program. The Associate Dean, during an interview, confirmed that she maintains records of candidate complaints and the unit's responses in her office.

- (8) *Candidate assessment of courses/faculty (evaluation instrument is located in Exhibit 5 but no results were found). What data are available related to these assessments? What has the unit learned from these assessments?*

The Dean's office collects and archives candidate evaluations of all tenure track faculty members' teaching. Department chairs also review candidate evaluations and communicate and discuss concerns about candidate teaching evaluations with tenure track faculty members during planning and evaluation meetings.

During the onsite visit, team members were able to review candidate evaluations of faculty teaching. Evaluations from Spring Semester 2011 were provided with information in the IR Addendum.

The unit guidelines for faculty evaluation indicate that tenure-track faculty are required to present data from their candidate course evaluations in their files for reappointment, tenure and promotion. Faculty members write a reflective statement about their teaching related to findings from student course evaluations. Faculty use course evaluation data as they file for reappointment during their second, fourth and sixth years of service and for promotion and tenure review.

2.5. Summary of significant improvements/strengths related to this standard since the previous visit

Changes in the assessment system for the initial teacher preparation include the PACT system for candidate assessment. The implementation of this system of assessments has benefitted the programs and the unit enabling them to identify areas for improvement for candidates and program courses, field experiences, and candidate knowledge and skills. Programs that use Action Research reported satisfaction with the development of this form of research on contextual practice and the potential that it has for program assessment and improvement. The Office of Assessment Support and its director provide a system for data management, analysis, and reflection for unit programs.

2.6. Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

Unit programs have developed some assessments related to their focus on their research questions in the areas of practicum and field experiences and the development of partnerships with school sites.

2.7. Areas for Improvement

New Areas for Improvement

AFI	AFI Rationale
1. The assessment data for the Educational Administration program for Administrative Services are not integrated into the unit's electronic data management system.	Review of the Biennial Reports revealed a lack of data for the Administrative Services credential program. Program data over the past years are collected, but some of the data are not systematically included in the unit electronic system. Some constituencies did not know about the findings from the program assessments.
2. Program data are not shared regularly with faculty and candidates in the Administrative Services credential program.	Interviews with some faculty, advisory board members, and candidates revealed that data from the Administrative Services credential program is not systematically shared.
3. Course evaluation data are not shared with university supervisors and cooperating teachers in the initial teacher preparation program.	Cooperating teachers and program adjunct faculty for the initial teacher preparation programs were not informed about the findings of evaluations by candidates, for example, about their performance in their program teaching roles.

2.8. BOE Team Recommendation for Standard 2

Initial Teacher Preparation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable

State Team Decision: Met with Concerns

Rationale

The assessment data for the Educational Leadership program (Administrative Services) are not integrated in the unit's electronic data system, limiting the use of those data in program and unit evaluation and improvement efforts.

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 Offsite Report: Statement about the evidence

The unit has carefully reviewed the data collected from observation instruments used in pre-practicum, practicum, and internship fieldwork and assessed the appropriate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Determinations were made to be more proactive in the application of coursework and field based experiences. The unit was able to hire administrators to serve as the Director of Assessment Support and the Director for Professional Services respectively. In summer 2009 the department hired the outgoing Director of the Teacher Preparation and Student Support Division for the San Diego Unified School District to work with programs.

The unit works closely with its P-12 school partners and has developed affiliation agreements and criteria for partnerships and selection of school personnel to work with candidates. Student teaching, supervision, and clinical placement contracts are in place and jointly negotiated. While field placements vary by program, each program utilizes similar considerations and agreements with partner schools and sites. Field experiences in all programs provide candidates with the opportunities to demonstrate the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions for their program. They also afford ample opportunities to experience all types of diversity and to engage in reflection and the use of technology.

Fieldwork manuals and practicum guides are available for all licensure areas; candidate handbooks and forms are also available. Evaluations exist for each program, all courses, and field based experiences. The unit's candidates are provided with opportunities for reflection in their class activities and field experiences and through their development of formative and summative assignments and projects, such as program portfolios.

The institution utilizes the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) for Multiple Subject/Single Subject credential candidates and is part of the PACT consortium.

As part of the Transformation Initiative, the first group of elementary teacher education candidates was purposefully placed at the same site (i.e., Balboa Elementary school) for the 50-hour practicum in literacy in 2009-2010. Faculty voted for an increase in the number of hours in the student teaching seminar (from 2 to 3) to permit more time to emphasize PACT competencies. The Director of Professional Services was given the additional responsibilities of overseeing secondary (single subject) and elementary (multiple subject) coursework, as well as the field experiences. In late Fall 2009, faculty specified a preferred sequence of coursework for elementary, secondary and special education teacher candidates.

In 2009-2010, school counseling faculty increased the rigor of their field experiences by incorporating action research into their field experiences.

Prior to launching its collaboration with the Education Leadership Academy (ELDA), Learning and Teaching had already begun to take steps to improve early clinical experiences. Two pathway managers serve as liaisons with area schools for placement of candidates in clinical experiences,

particularly student teaching placements. Clear criteria for field placement sites and demographic profiles of participating schools have been developed. Improvements in clinical supervision include the assignment of supervisors to candidates in early practicum experiences and use of only appropriate subject-specific specialists assigned to supervise secondary candidates during student teaching.

In fall 2010, faculty decided to more closely align the assessment of embedded signature assignments with the expected performance areas on the PACT. Two elements of the evaluations are being affected: the criteria and the rating scale. Faculty members have examined PACT outcomes data for the past two years to determine areas of weakness so they can make changes in their courses to strengthen candidate learning in these areas. The faculty teaching the foundations courses and the methods courses has transitioned from a 6-point rubric to a 4-point rubric for consistency with PACT. Since California requires all Multiple and Single Subject teacher candidates to pass a culminating performance assessment to receive a credential, and USD is a member of the PACT consortium, the ELDA program has decided to train its administrative services credential candidates in the PACT system and have them calibrated for reliability so that they may participate in evaluating Learning and Teaching candidates' PACT submissions. This training and practice will afford them multiple opportunities to deeply explore the professional development of novice classroom teachers.

The Transformation Initiative requires collaboration with K-12 schools in San Diego County and collaboration across programs at USD. The developing relationship with Balboa Elementary School is the prototype for other relationships USD plans to establish. Balboa Elementary is enhancing the partnership in 2010-2011 by including a research experience for USD candidates. Balboa mentors are guiding USD candidates to develop case studies by gathering diagnostic data about children and then using this information as the basis for differentiating instruction. This new research component will form stronger relationships between the elementary school staff and university candidates. The Department of Learning and Teaching is now working to reach out to other schools in the area led by principals who are administrative services credential program (ELDA) graduates to build similar relationships and high quality clinical sites for candidates.

At the secondary level, USD has a developing relationship with the innovative, highly regarded High Tech High (HTH) middle and high schools whose flagship campus is conveniently located nearby. In addition to the placement of practicum and student teacher candidates, USD and HTH have held joint PACT assessor training sessions and plan to become involved in scoring each other's candidates' PACT submissions in the future. USD faculty members have provided professional development for HTH teachers and the Director of Professional Services is a member of the HTH advisory board.

While field placements and internships vary by program, they utilize similar considerations and agreements with partner schools and sites. All candidates are required to take coursework in multicultural and diverse issues and working with English Language Learners and to engage in field work in highly diverse settings. Ethics, values, and diversity are core components of the program. Field experiences in all programs provide candidates with the opportunities to demonstrate the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions for their program. They also afford ample opportunities to experience all types of diversity and to engage in reflection and the use of technology.

3.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard

The University of San Diego agreed to be part of this the Transformation Initiative because of its belief that the set of assessments that PACT provides allows both faculty members and teacher candidates a very accurate assessment of the knowledge, skills and abilities that beginning teachers should possess. Faculty determined that the teacher candidate data from the PACT would permit a more careful examination of areas of strength and weakness for candidates. It appears from the materials reviewed and interviews held at the site visit that the institution is making successful progress toward the target level on this standard.

3.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs). No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit.

3.4 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard. None were cited in the offsite BOE report.

Evidence to validate during the onsite visit (*italics*); team findings from the onsite visit (plain text)

(1) *Involvement of the unit and school faculty in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the P12 school-based programs.*

The unit works closely with school partners to provide a variety of field experiences at multiple points in their candidates' professional preparation. It appears that most of the programs supervise the field experiences, although some special education candidates stated that field experiences were less organized and more observational. Advanced candidates typically conducted their field experiences within their existing classrooms.

(2) *Placement decisions. How are student teaching placements jointly decided by the unit and schools?*

The unit works closely with its school partners and has developed affiliation agreements and criteria for partnerships and selection of school personnel to work with candidates. Student teaching, supervision, and clinical placement contracts are in place and jointly negotiated. A list of schools with active agreements is listed in Standard 3 exhibit 1 and samples of MOU's and contracts were available at the onsite visit. While field placements vary by program they utilize similar considerations and agreements with partner schools and sites. The unit sends out requests to principals who then review the materials and determine if placements are available. If there are appropriate placements, agreements are negotiated with the respective school. While some partnerships are being developed, no Memoranda of Understanding (MOU's) for these were evident.

(3) *Relationship of field experiences to courses. How are field experiences integrated into courses to allow candidates to fully utilize what they are learning in P-12 schools into their courses and what they are learning in their courses into work in P-12 schools?*

Field experiences are integrated into specific courses, and assignments are tied directly to the field experiences. This approach allows candidates to examine what they are learning, discuss possible scenarios, and develop strategies to better accommodate the needs of learners. All courses in the multiple and single subject program have required field assignments and teacher candidates complete 125 hours of practicum during the methods courses. The field experiences are supervised by the university and the P-12 school. In addition the candidates conduct full-day, full-time student teaching for a semester while attending seminars at the university. Advanced candidates conduct their field experiences in their existing classrooms. If advanced candidates are not in classrooms, appropriate placements are located for them.

- (4) *Field experiences required of advanced candidates. What specific field experiences do advanced candidates participate in and how are they integrated with coursework?*

Advanced candidates typically perform field experiences within their own classrooms. Those advanced candidates who do not have classrooms are assisted by the unit in finding suitable sites to work with students. Advanced candidates are required to conduct Action Research projects that demonstrate application of learning and impact on their students or setting.

- (5) *Diversity of the fieldwork settings. How diverse are these settings?*

Fieldwork settings that are utilized by initial and advanced programs are in highly diverse settings. While field placements and internships vary by program, they utilize similar considerations and agreements with partner schools and sites. All candidates are required to take coursework in multicultural and diverse issues and working with English Language Learners in addition to engaging in fieldwork in highly diverse settings. Ethics, values, and diversity are core components of the program. Field experiences provide candidates with the opportunities to demonstrate the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions and all types of diversity as well as engage in reflection. Additional sites are actively sought and developed to provide candidates with a variety of experiences.

- (6) *Collaboration of candidates and clinical faculty on reflection and student learning. How do candidates work collaboratively with other candidates and clinical faculty to critique and reflect on each other's practice and their effects on student learning?*

Candidates have seminars during clinical practice/practicum and discuss issues and critique each other's practices. While candidates are engaged in their student teaching or practicum they are afforded opportunities to share information in seminars. The candidates in advanced programs also conduct action research projects and share their findings with other candidates and persons from the public who are notified of the presentations and who may attend the presentations. There is also an annual conference sponsored by the institution where candidates can share the results of their research.

- (7) *Role of clinical sites in helping candidates develop proficiencies related to student learning. How do candidates develop and demonstrate proficiencies that support learning by all students?*

Field experiences provide opportunities for candidates to collect data on P-12 student learning or comparable clients' assessments, analyze and reflect on that data, and use the results of that analysis and reflection to improve their practice. Field experience courses require candidates to define objectives for students, select appropriate assessment strategies, reflect on the results of the assessment and modify their practice accordingly. For example,

Multiple and Single Subject credential candidates engage in analysis of student work contextualized in planned and taught lessons in their first practica or first semester of student teaching and the PACT Teaching Event in the second. In both cases, assessment results are used as a basis for reflection and to determine next steps for teaching.

3.5. Summary of significant improvements/strengths related to this standard since the previous visit

In addition to efforts undertaken as part of the Transformation Initiative, three unit-level initiatives have changed SOLES since the last NCATE/CTC visit: 1) internationalization of all programs; 2) growth of collaboration around action research including the development of an annual international conference; and 3) evidence-based decision making through program assessment and participation in the Eduventures Schools of Education Learning Collaborative. The three initiatives developed from strategic plans and objectives at both the university and school levels.

3.6. Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

The unit has not adequately addressed the research questions posed for the unit’s transformation initiative. These questions need modification, clarification, and action. The IR and responses indicate that the unit has not collected any data (due to begin spring 2012) on the impact of early field experiences on schools and P-12 student learning. It appears that almost all of the items listed in the timeline should occur on a regular basis for NCATE and CTC accreditation. At this point, the continuous improvement option with the movement of elements of Standard 3 toward target would accomplish the same outcomes the unit has demonstrated to date.

3.7. Areas for Improvement: None

3.8. BOE Team Recommendation for Standard 3

Initial Teacher Preparation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable

State Team Decision: Standard 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 Offsite Report: Statement about the evidence

The unit's conceptual framework (CF) aligns with the institution's beliefs regarding diversity. The university community is sustained by, and committed to mutual respect, safety and inclusion for all forms of diversity, including but not limited to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, ability, and socioeconomic status. Unit faculty members ensure that its CF and course offerings develop candidate's knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to facilitate learning for all students. The third part of the unit's CF is directly related to ethics, values, and diversity. Candidates in the unit are expected to understand and adhere to the values and ethical codes of the university, the schools they work in, and of the professional organizations to which they belong. Candidates are expected to support the creation of inclusive, unified, caring and democratic learning communities that value each individual regardless of background or ability, and they will equitably support student learning and optimal development.

A review of curriculum components and proficiencies in the required courses for both the initial and advanced programs reflects the attention given by the unit to ensure that candidates become effective teachers of diverse students. In all of the teaching credential programs, candidates' core courses focus on becoming effective teachers of diverse students. In-class and online assignments require candidates to draw on their own experiences as they respond thoughtfully to their content related to working with diverse students. All initial candidates are required to successfully complete a course on strategies and pedagogy for teaching English Learners. Candidates in special education have very specific coursework that prepares them to work with P-12 students who have mild/moderate disabilities or who are deaf and hard-of-hearing. Special education courses also emphasize the importance of working with families, schools, and communities. Foundation courses for advanced candidates in school counseling are designed to increase awareness of the effects that culture, community, socioeconomics, and disability have on P-12 student behavior in schools. Advanced candidates in the administrative services credential program examine their stated and implied attitude and expectations about race, gender, ethnicity, culture, sexual orientation, religion, and socioeconomic status during coursework.

As a part of each program, course-specific assessments and programmatic elements that target diversity are embedded in the curriculum. In addition to course related assignments and their assessment, each program uses instruments that contain items to assess attitudes and behavior related to working with diverse students, their families, and the community. Many of these are related to fieldwork for each of the specific programs. Faculty members determined that they wanted to create a common assessment instrument to assess the candidates' attitude toward an expression of diversity to be used across the unit. Because each program has different expectations of its candidates, individual items were designed using broad terms for dispositional attributes, such as "values diversity" and "persists" so that the terms can be operationalized for each program. The assessment will be completed by faculty at three points in the program: the application phase, mid-point (prior to clinical practice or internship), and at the end of the program. Some programs plan to have candidates complete it and compare faculty and candidate responses. The implementation of a unit wide assessment will permit a unit analysis versus individual program analyses. Assessment instruments, scoring guides, and data on candidate scores related to diversity were provided.

Candidates have the opportunity to interact with university faculty who are diverse. Specifically, fall 2010 demographic data show professional education faculty members for initial programs are 83 percent (n = 49) females and 17 percent (n = 10) males. With respect to race and ethnicity, nearly 70 percent, or 41 of 59 of the professional education faculty members teaching the initial programs, identify themselves as White, one professional education faculty member self-identified as American Indian or Alaska Native, six self-identified as Asian, six self-identified as Black or African American, four self-identified as Hispanic or Latino, and one self-identified as two or more races. Demographics for the faculty members who teach the advanced programs are 80 percent (n = 51) females to 20 percent (n = 15) males. With respect to race and ethnicity, slightly over 70 percent, or 47 of 66 professional education faculty members teaching in advanced programs identify themselves as White, one faculty member self-identified as American Indian or Alaska Native, four faculty members self-identified as Asian, eight faculty members self-identified as Black or African American, four faculty members self-identified as Hispanic or Latino, one faculty member self-identified as two or more races, and one faculty member self-identified as race/ethnicity unknown. For the university as a whole, 46 percent of its faculty members are female, while 54 percent are male. With respect to race and ethnicity, nearly 78 percent of university faculty members as a whole are White, two (.51%) faculty members self-identified as American Indian or Alaska Native, 32 (8.1%) faculty members self-identified as Asian, nine (2.29%) of the university faculty members self-identified as Black or African American, 27 (6.8%) of the university faculty members self-identified as Hispanic or Latino, two (.51%) of the university faculty members self-identified as two or more races, one (.25%) of the university faculty member self-identified as race/ethnicity unknown, and 15 (3.82%) of the university faculty members self-identified as non-resident alien. Data on the unit's faculty who have knowledge and their experience working with P-12 students from diverse groups was not available in the electronic exhibits.

Candidates also have the opportunity to interact with school-based faculty who are diverse. Demographic data on school-based faculty who supervise clinical practice were collected and indicated 91 percent are female and nine percent are males. With respect to race and ethnicity, the data shows that 66.67 percent of the school-based faculty self-identified as White, 3.039 (n=1) percent of the school-based faculty members self-identified as Native American or Alaska Native, 3.039 percent (n=1) of the school-based faculty members self-identified as Asian, 12.12 (n=4) percent of the school-based faculty members self-identified as Black or African American, 12.12 (n=4) percent of the school-based faculty members self-identified as Hispanic or Latino, and 3.039 (n=1) percent of the school-based faculty members self-identified as two or more races.

Currently, the university and unit are involved in efforts to recruit and select highly qualified faculty committed to the mission of the university, including its goal of “creating a diverse and inclusive community.” The Dean, in consultation with department chairs or program directors, appoints faculty search committees. Faculty search committees include members from diverse gender and ethnic/racial groups and a candidate representative. The unit's commitment to a diverse faculty includes an effort to recruit through various publications. Full time faculty positions are posted in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* as well as selected journals with a diverse focus and readership such as *Diverse Issues in Higher Education* and *Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education*. Department chair and program directors consider diversity in making decisions to hire adjunct faculty members. The Department of Learning and Teaching, in particular, has significantly increased the diversity of its clinical experience supervisory faculty.

Information on the unit's effort to retain diverse faculty was not available in IR or electronic exhibits.

Candidates have various opportunities to interact with peers who represent diverse groups and backgrounds. Opportunities for the unit's candidates to interact with diverse peers occur during various coursework activities and group assignments. The university also moved forward in its goal of creating a more culturally diverse and culturally competent community through the creation of an advisory board on diversity, which led to the creation of a Campus Center on Inclusion and Diversity. The Campus Center on Inclusion and Diversity is a place where issues related to inclusion and diversity can be conceptualized, assessed, nurtured, cultivated, promoted, celebrated, and shared.

Initial teacher preparation candidates' demographic data for fall 2010 show 82.4 percent female and 17.6 percent male candidates. With regard to race and ethnicity, 60 percent of the initial teacher candidates self-identify as White, 2.4 percent self-identify as Asian, 3.04 percent self-identify as Black or African American, less than one percent self-identify as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, 20.8 percent self-identify as Hispanic or Latino, 2.4 percent report their race/ethnicity as two or more races, 1.6 percent self-identify as nonresident alien, 6.4 percent self-identify as race/ethnicity unknown. Advanced candidates' demographic data for fall 2010 was reported as 84.79 percent female to 15.21 percent male candidates. With regard to race and ethnicity, 44.7 percent of the advanced teacher candidates self-identify as White, less than one percent self-identify as American Indian or Alaska Native, 5.99 percent self-identify as Asian, 6.45 self-identify as Black or African American, 1.38 percent self-identify as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, 22.12 percent self-identify as Hispanic or Latino, 5.99 percent self-identify as two or more races, 4.61 percent self-identify as nonresident alien, and 8.29 percent self-identify as unknown race/ethnicity. Demographics data for all students in the university for fall 2010 show 56.88 percent female and 43.12 percent male. With regard to race and ethnicity, 50.4 percent of the students self-identify as White, less than one percent self-identify as American Indian or Alaska Native, 7.54 percent self-identify as Asian, while 2.23 percent self-identify as Black or African American, less than one percent self-identify as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, 15.12 percent self-identify as Hispanic or Latino, 4.8 percent report their race/ethnicity as two or more races, 4.89 percent self-identify as nonresident alien, and 7.16 percent of the students self-identify as race/ethnicity unknown.

The unit has taken a proactive approach to attract, recruit, and retain candidates from diverse groups and backgrounds through a variety of methods. In regards to recruitment, the unit actively promotes its program offerings via the web, graduate fairs, and local events, to students from underrepresented communities. In addition, the unit's outreach and recruitment is actively involved in a forum for diversity in graduate education. This collaborative endeavor offers biannual graduate fairs in several locations within the state. The event solely targets students from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds. Future recruitment initiatives are being planned by the unit to attract low-income and first-generation students. The unit believes it is imperative that it offers a welcoming environment for this population along with providing social and academic support to ensure candidates leave having had a positive experience. In an effort to retain diverse candidates, the unit has sponsored events, course offerings, workshops/trainings, diverse faculty, and support for diverse groups. A variety of financial and institutional support is also offered by the unit to help retain candidates from diverse backgrounds through the diversity scholarship fund. Two groups have been designed to recruit, support and retain Black/African

American and Chicano/Latino/ graduate students. The two groups uphold the values of family, culture, and academic excellence through the promotion of scholarship, community engagement and mentorship.

The unit's intention is not only to provide field experiences that are carefully and systematically chosen, but also to transform their relationship with their school partners to bridge the traditional dichotomies of academic and practitioner knowledge, theory and practice, and university and school cultures. Clear criteria for field placement sites and demographic profiles of participating schools facilitate the individual placement of candidates. Field sites are selected carefully to provide candidates experience with P-12 students and clients reflecting the full range of cultures, ethnicities, and academic abilities. Field experiences are designed to allow candidates to experience, first-hand, the varieties of diversity represented in the schools and community agencies that serve the local area. All candidates complete at least one practicum and/or field experience in a setting with adults and children reflecting the ethnic and cultural diversity of the local area, in a hard-to-staff school, or in a school with large numbers of English language learners. The field sites are expected to pair them with experts who have the pedagogical, professional and cultural competence to work effectively with these diverse populations. Specifically, all teacher credential candidates in all areas are required to have at least one extended field experience in a school where at least 50% of the population is ethnically/culturally different from the candidate. All M.Ed. and M.A candidates are prepared to be part of a global learning community by completing requirements for international study. To meet this requirement, many advanced candidates study abroad, comparing curriculum, pedagogy, and classroom management in the United States with that of another country. Examples of some recent courses in which advanced candidates learned in other countries or participated in some sessions abroad were provided.

All counseling internship placements involve diverse regional school settings where candidates are evaluated on their ability to work effectively with diverse students. The preliminary and professional administrative services program provides experiences for their candidates that include school visits and apprenticeships working with a diverse population of K-12 students. The programs require onsite P-12 experiences that target a specific culture in the local region. Candidates must plan and conduct meetings with parents and with the community of the schools where they are apprenticed.

Evidence was provided on how initial and advanced candidates use feedback from peers and supervisors to reflect on their skills of working with diverse populations. Examples provided were related to coursework, field experiences, and clinical practices. Feedback examples were program specific on how initial and advanced candidates use information from peers and supervisors to reflect on their skills for working with diverse populations.

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

4.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs corrected from last visit:

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
Field supervisors for the single and multiple subject credential programs do not reflect the diversity of the region they serve.	ITP,ADV	Good faith efforts have been made to hire field supervisors for the single and multiple subject credential program to reflect the diversity of the region they serve.

4.4. Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

Areas of Concern related to continuing to meet the standard: None were cited in the offsite BOE report.

Evidence to validate during the onsite visit (*italics*); team findings from the onsite visit (plain text)

(1) *Unit's faculty knowledge and experiences working with P-12 students from diverse groups. What knowledge and experiences with students from diverse groups have faculty had?*

Unit faculty members' knowledge and experience working with P-12 students was made clear in the onsite interviews with faculty members and candidates. An examination of faculty member CVs in the IR Addendum provided data on their experience in working with diverse populations. The data indicated most of the faculty members have had experience working with P-12 students in an urban setting at some point in their careers.

(2) *Assessment of candidate proficiencies for working effectively with P-12 students from diverse racial and socioeconomic groups. What assessments provide these data? What do the data indicate about candidates' ability to work effectively with students from diverse groups?*

Multiple and Single Subject credential candidates are assessed by university supervisors during their field experience and clinical practice placements on four items with respect to diversity and consideration for all students. Data were summarized for 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 on these four items and indicated candidates do have the knowledge and proficiencies for working effectively with P-12 students from diverse racial and socioeconomic groups.

Six specific items are used by supervisors to evaluate the special education teacher candidates for diversity and consideration for all students. Data were summarized for 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 on these six items and indicated special education candidates also have the knowledge and proficiencies for working effectively with P-12 students from diverse racial and socioeconomic groups.

Candidates in the Administrative Services credential program are assessed using the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL). Data were summarized for cohorts 7, 8, and 9 on standard 4 that assess candidates' respect for collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. Other multiple measures including coursework, field

experience, clinical practice, and portfolio assessments are also used to evaluate and confirm each candidate's knowledge about working with diverse populations.

For the M.Ed. and MAT. programs, candidates conduct their action research projects in diverse school settings. However, prior to fall 2011, the abilities of candidates to work with diverse school population were not formally assessed. The unit anticipates using the PEU Dispositions Instrument to assess candidates in the K-12 research setting, beginning with fall semester 2011.

(3) *Examples of the unit's effort to retain diverse faculty. How does the unit plan to retain their current diversity? What are the unit's recruitment plans and efforts?*

The unit has engaged in good faith efforts to recruit, support, and retain faculty and candidates from underrepresented populations. Interviews with the university staff indicated that the unit is leading the way for the rest of the university in efforts to recruit and retain faculty and candidates from underrepresented populations. Part the unit success in reaching faculty and candidates is due to their high profile work in creating a culturally inclusive environment. One example of the ways the unit supports faculty and students from underrepresented populations are by hosting an annual festival that celebrates holidays from diverse traditions, cultures and religions. The unit also provides support for their Latino Graduate Student Association and the Black Graduate Student Association. Efforts include the opening of the Center for Inclusion and Diversity which works university-wide to support the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty members. The unit also has developed a strong relationship with the United Front Multicultural Center, to provide support for candidates from underrepresented populations.

The unit's goal is to recruit and select highly qualified faculty committed to the mission of the university, including its goal of "creating a diverse and inclusive community." Search committees are appointed by the Dean in consultation with department chairs or program directors. The dean has made gender and ethnic/racial diversity in committee composition a priority. Full time faculty positions are posted in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* as well as selected journals with a diverse focus and readership such as *Diverse Issues in Higher Education* and *Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education*.

(4) *Determination of candidate placements for each field experience and clinical practice. How are decisions about placements made? What is the involvement of the unit and school partners?*

The Director of Field Experiences, faculty, and building level administrators determine the placements for the field experience and clinical practice according to the IR Addendum and onsite interviews with faculty and candidates. At the end of each semester, candidates, faculty and university supervisors evaluate the onsite supervisors as well as the school site. These data are reviewed to inform the decision as to whether the unit will use the placement site and/or site-based supervisor again. The Director of Assessment compiles overall data from the candidates' responses. Beginning fall 2012, the process will utilize electronic format for evaluations of the onsite supervisors.

(5) *Tracking of placements of candidates with P-12 students from diverse groups. What system does the unit use for tracking these placements?*

During the course of candidates' field experiences and clinical practice they are required to interact with a diverse population of students. Before candidates are placed at a site, the Director of Field Experiences accesses the schools' demographics from various websites. The candidate's previous placement history is also taken into consideration before an assignment is made to insure that candidates have various opportunities to work with diverse P-12 student populations. A record of each candidate's placement is recorded on a spreadsheet which is made available to all faculty members to ensure that candidates experience a wide variety of school settings and diverse P-12 student populations.

4.5. Summary of significant improvements/strengths related to this standard since the previous visit

The unit has increased its pool of school partners to give candidates experiences in settings that reflect the ethnic diversity of the area. A plan was developed to ensure that candidates have experiences with a wide range of students, including ethnically diverse students, English learners, and students with special needs.

The Department of Learning and Teaching has also increased resources for its school reform work with an urban partner school to build a research agenda focused on improving student performance of its diverse student body.

Internationalizing the curriculum was identified as a new strategic goal for the unit. Each program area has designed international experiences for both candidates and faculty. Candidates in all Master's degree programs are required to have an international experience. A grant was received to help the unit faculty prepare to meet the increasing need for K-12 teachers who think globally, have international experience, show competence in a foreign language, and, most importantly, are able to incorporate these aspects into their teaching. The grant will foster international emphasis as curricular changes are made for Single and Multiple Subject credential programs.

The unit's programs have actively recruited faculty and candidates who reflect the ethnic diversity of the region. Contacts are made with undergraduate programs and with local schools to introduce potential candidates to the programs available in the unit. The unit has made a concerted effort to increase the diversity of university supervisors, which reflect the diversity of the county.

4.6. Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable: Not applicable to this standard

4.7. Areas for Improvement

Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

AFI	AFI Rationale
Field supervisors for the Single and Multiple Subject credential programs do not reflect the diversity of the region they serve.	The unit has made good faith efforts to hire field supervisors for the Single and Multiple Subject credential program to reflect the diversity of the region they serve.

4.8. BOE Team Recommendation for Standard 4

Initial Teacher Preparation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable

State Team Decision: Standard 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 Offsite Report: Statement about the evidence

Exhibits provided by the unit show that professional education faculty members in the unit are qualified for their teaching assignments and other responsibilities. The Faculty Qualifications Table (Exhibit 5.1) demonstrates both relevant education and experience for most faculty members listed. Faculty vitae were not included in the electronic exhibits. A significant number of faculty members have relevant P-12 experience. The table also identified whether a faculty role was instructor, supervisor, or both. This made it clear the faculty should have contemporary experience. It appears those serving in supervisory roles do possess the requisite K-12 experience, but a review of faculty vitae would support this finding further.

The institution has a policy outlining the evaluation of teaching that involves two primary components. The first is an online course evaluation completed by candidates within each section of a course. Faculty members have access to this information during the following semester, including both scaled responses to survey items and comments. Exhibit 5.5 contains the aggregated data for spring 2010. The second component of faculty teaching evaluation is the SOLES Faculty Planning Document (Exhibit 5.5). This requires faculty to indicate the expected learning objectives for each of the classes taught. Data indicating how this form actually works could be helpful for the onsite visit team. The course syllabi also clearly demonstrate how each course aligns with the unit's conceptual framework. Each syllabus has a section entitled "Course Goals and Objectives" and these are outlined under the three conceptual framework headings of Academic Excellence, Critical Inquiry and Reflection, Community and Service, and Ethics, Values and Diversity (ACE).

The electronic exhibits also included evidence of faculty engagement in scholarship activities. Exhibit 5.3 lists articles, book chapters, conference presentations, grants, and editorial work by program and faculty. This summary chart focuses on 2007-2008. Either a more recent report or a review of the vitae will confirm that this part of the standard is being met.

Unit faculty is supported with opportunities for professional development. Exhibit 5.6 lists the forms of professional development available to faculty, including internal grants, sabbatical, program speaker series, and the Dean's speaker series. There is evidence in the electronic

exhibits of some of these events taking place. Additional evidence showing the level of actual participation would help the team in this area. It is not clear how professional development needs are determined. Evidence linking professional development to faculty need based on evaluations would help the onsite team. The institution website also lists a number of centers for faculty development, including the Center for Educational Excellence, Center for Community Service-Learning, Experiential Learning and Adventure Center, Academic Technology Services (ATS), the United Front Multi-Cultural Center, and the Counseling Center.

There is clear evidence of professional travel support for full-time faculty. It is clear that all faculty members receive a specified amount and that new faculty members (defined as in their first 3 years of teaching) have access to additional funds.

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

5.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs): No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit.

5.4. Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

Areas of Concern related to continuing to meet the standard: None were cited in the offsite BOE report.

Evidence to validate during the onsite visit (*italics*); team findings from the onsite visit (plain text)

(1) *Faculty vitae for additional evidence of scholarly and/or creative activity. What do the faculty vitae show in regard to faculty qualifications and scholarship?*

Through interviews, review of updated faculty vitae, and a scholarship report for the unit, there is evidence that unit faculty have sufficient scholarship for the type of institution. These multiple forms of evidence demonstrate faculty engage in presentations in their field as well as publications in both practitioner and research journals.

(2) *Relationship of teaching and learning to the conceptual framework. How is the conceptual framework reflected in faculty teaching?*

The unit indicated that “all course syllabi” utilize the conceptual framework by connecting the ACE framework (Academic Excellence, Critical Inquiry and Reflection; Community and Service; and Ethics, Values and Diversity) to the student outcomes. While the vast majority of syllabi do make this connection clear and most programs utilize a consistent template for making this connection, a few syllabi did not reference the ACE framework -- EDUC 334/534 and LEAD 551 are examples.

The unit’s connection of the conceptual framework to learning was demonstrated in interviews with faculty, candidates, and graduates. Candidates articulated the ACE framework and made clear connections to assignments. For example, one professor from Philosophy who teaches a foundations course for the unit demonstrated how assignments in his class connect to the Critical Inquiry element of the conceptual framework. Similarly, a graduate from the Educational Administration program noted how part of the field experience

in a school connected to Service.

- (3) *Participation of faculty in professional development activities. What is the process used to determine professional development needs of faculty. How many faculty members have been engaged in professional development activities?*

Vitae, interviews with faculty, and examples of the annual faculty planning documents demonstrated a process for faculty development. The faculty indicated that it was faculty-led. One example provided involved a faculty request for technology training. As a result, the unit funded technology training specific to faculty needs. In addition, vitae demonstrated faculty members are engaged in professional development activities through attendance at regional and national conferences.

- (4) *Data on course evaluations by candidates. What data have been collected from candidates about faculty teaching? How are these data used?*

During the onsite visit, the team received access to candidate evaluations of faculty teaching from the spring 2011 semester. The team confirmed that the Dean's office collects candidate evaluations of all tenure track faculty members' teaching. Department chairs confirmed their access to and review of candidate evaluations and communicate and discuss concerns about candidate teaching evaluations with tenure track faculty members during planning and evaluation meetings.

According to interviews and documentation in faculty handbooks and tenure and promotion guidelines, non-tenured tenure track faculty must present data from their candidate course evaluations in their files for reappointment, which occurs during their second, fourth and sixth years of appointment. As part of this process, junior faculty are required to write a reflective statement about their teaching that includes discussion of candidate evaluations.

The team found evidence that the Dean's office and department chairs review all adjunct faculty evaluations, and interviews with adjuncts did suggest they have access to the evaluation results. However, as mentioned in Standard 2, data from evaluations of university supervisors and cooperating teachers are not shared with these instructors.

- (5) *SOLES Faculty Planning Document. How is this document used? What data are generated from it?*

During the onsite visit, the unit provided the team access to three spring planning documents created by tenured and tenure-track faculty each year. These three examples demonstrated the faculty activity for the year, including teaching load, service, scholarship, and administrative duties. Also included were specific questions of how the faculty member planned to help the unit achieve the two goals of focus from the strategic plan for the year. Based on interviews with chairs, unit administrators, and faculty, this document is used for individual tenured and tenure-track evaluation to improve teaching, scholarship, and service.

5.5. Summary of significant improvements/strengths related to this standard since the previous visit: No significant changes were reported.

5.6. Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable: Not applicable to this standard

5.7. Areas for Improvement: None

5.8. BOE Team Recommendation for Standard 5

Initial Teacher Preparation	X Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	X Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable

State Team Decision: Standard Met

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

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

6.1 Offsite Report: Statement about the evidence

The School of Leadership and Education Sciences (SOLES) is one of the five professional schools at the University of San Diego. All Professional Education Unit operations are overseen by the Dean’s Office, with the Dean having responsibility for all academic and administrative operations, including management of all fiscal, curricular, administrative, operational, personnel, research, grants, and student issues for the school. This structure ensures that the unit has the leadership and authority necessary to plan, deliver, and operate all programs for the effective preparation of candidates. The Dean is assisted by an Associate Dean, an Assistant Dean, and a Budget and Operations Manager. The Dean’s office is also supported by four executive assistants and a half-time graduate assistant.

The Associate Dean oversees the Director of Assessment Support, who works with all program faculty members to ensure that candidate learning outcome assessment leads to continuous improvement of SOLES programs. The Associate Dean also oversees the full-time Credential Analyst, who maintains candidate credential records and ensures that all candidates complete all credential requirements.

Within the Department of Learning and Teaching, the Director of Professional Services oversees the Multiple and Single Subject Credential programs, including coordination of field experiences for teacher candidates and the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). The director is assisted by one full-time program specialist and two part-time pathway managers, who serve as liaisons with regional schools. The PPS School Counseling and Administrative Services credential programs share a full time Director of Field Experiences, who works with regional schools to arrange practicum and internship placements for candidates. In addition, the director serves as liaison between program faculty and on-site supervisors and coordinates on-site assessment of candidates.

Information on unit programs is widely available in both print and online forms, and is updated regularly. A review of materials on program websites, in the university catalog, and in informational brochures indicated that recruiting and admissions practices—as well as program requirements—are clearly and consistently described. Program web sites also include information

on advising services and schedules for informational meetings. Once admitted into programs, candidates are provided with regular academic advising and have access to a wide range of other support services, including learning resources, financial aid, health, disability, and counseling services.

Operations and projects in SOLES are currently funded by five sources: the general operating budget, endowment funds, grants, gifts, and support from other campus units. The annual operating budget provided by the university for 2010-11 was \$8.9 million and is allocated for core programs and a revenue-based budget for SOLES special programs (reduced tuition programs). The budget contains all day-to-day operating costs, including assessment and professional development costs. The Dean and a faculty representative sit on, and are voting members of the university budget committee, and the Budget and Operations Manager also attends as a staff member. Between the 2006-07 and 2010-11 fiscal years, the SOLES budget has grown from \$7.65 million to \$8.92 million, while student FTEs have remained relatively stable—ranging from 953 to 990 during that same period. The budget for professional development has grown from roughly \$85,000 to \$110,000 during this period, and the budget for assessment has grown from roughly \$73,000 to \$135,000.

The annual SOLES budget is supplemented significantly by endowment funds and government, foundation, and industry grants. University policy sets an annual spending allowance for endowed funds, which currently is roughly \$191,000 based on SOLES endowment of just over \$4.9 million. Endowment purposes range from operational funds to scholarships to endowed program chair salaries to professional development. Current open grants promoting research and scholarly activities in SOLES total just under \$3.6 million.

The unit also benefits from other departmental budget allocations from the university for information technology services (providing a designated desktop support technician, a computer leasing program, and software site licenses), library services (providing a SOLES designated librarian), and Provost's Office support (providing a wide variety of funding for faculty development).

Prior to the fall 2009 (Leadership Studies) and 2010 (Learning and Teaching), the annual full-time assignment for tenure-line faculty was 18 units per year. Faculty may decide to have intersession and/or summer teaching as part of their 18-unit workload. In fall 2009, Leadership Studies faculty load changed to 15 units per year, due to the demand of working with Ph.D. students. In fall 2010, the workload policy also changed in the Department of Learning and Teaching; however, not for all faculty members. Given that some faculty members were hired when the criteria for promotion and tenure were heavily weighted towards (1) teaching and (2) service, it was decided that several faculty would maintain an 18-unit load. Thus, they are not penalized in merit pay assignment, which places scholarship on par with teaching. Currently only three Learning and Teaching faculty have an 18-unit load while all other faculty hold a 15-unit load. In addition, all first year SOLES faculty, regardless of rank, carry a 12-unit load. When faculty have special research and/or grant related duties (e.g. editing a journal), additional release time is awarded as appropriate to the work load responsibilities. A summary of unit faculty workloads for spring semester 2010 indicates only two faculty with loads exceeding nine units.

In 2007, SOLES moved into its new home, Mother Rosalie Hill Hall, an 80,000 square foot building with wireless access throughout, a fully equipped auditorium, an executive training classroom, seven large classrooms, six seminar rooms, media resource centers and various study/project areas for students' use. Both the auditorium and executive training classroom are fully equipped with SMART technologies and video conferencing and recording capabilities. The large classrooms are configured with "advanced" level technology, including ceiling mounted projectors, laptop hookups, DVD/VHS players, wireless Internet, overhead transparency, SMART board and symposium (interactive screen), document camera, and microphone. Seminar rooms, designed for more intimate settings and interaction, contain "standard" level technology, which is similar to "advanced," but does not include a SMART board, document camera, or microphone.

Media resource centers within Mother Rosalie Hill Hall include two walk-in computer labs equipped with dual-boot Mac computers offering a wide range of Mac- and Windows-based software. The larger lab is equipped with 32 individual stations, a printing station and is sometimes reserved for academic and training classes while the smaller lab is equipped with 24 stations and is dedicated solely to walk-in service. Included with the resource centers are observation/recording rooms for clinical work where candidates are able to observe and record private interview sessions for later discussion and analysis and a learning lab that houses testing and other reference materials for student use.

The unit's commitment to technology as a way to support and foster new and innovative teaching, learning, and research is evident not only in the school's new facility, but also in the significant funding provided by the Dean for faculty development, and the infrastructure and technology support services provided by the university.

SOLES faculty and candidates have access to all resources in the Helen K. and James S. Copley library, which houses an extensive collection of books and bound periodicals and includes subscriptions to 2,500 journals as well as collections of reference works, government documents, pamphlets, newspapers in many languages, and rare books. It also houses the university's media software collection. SOLES has a dedicated librarian who works with unit faculty and students, as well as those from the Psychology Department in the College of Arts and Sciences. A library computer system, SALLY, offers access to all of the library's books, journals, and media collections, as well as the collections of the Legal Research Center.

Copley library is open 117 hours each week, and library faculty members provide extensive reference service and individual student support. The libraries at USD are members of the San Diego Library Circuit Consortium, which maintains a database linking four university libraries and the San Diego County Library. This consortium enables candidates and faculty to access library materials from other campuses through a delivery system that provides timely movement of materials from one campus to another.

In addition to its own collection and The Library Circuit, Copley Library has Internet connections with academic and large public libraries throughout the world and with major bibliographic and information databases. The university makes this information available through the World Wide Web both inside the library and also in the dorms, offices, and homes of USD students and faculty.

The unit has a team of administrators, faculty, staff, and candidates dedicated to supporting the use of technology for distance learning. Resources within SOLES include SMART classrooms with video conference capabilities and a dedicated Audio Visual Technician and Support Specialist. Most of the classes are web enhanced, and the unit currently offers 2-3 courses per year that are delivered completely online. SOLES also has a designated representative from the USD Instructional Technology Department to assist faculty with distance learning objectives.

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 continued from last visit:

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
The role of the Teacher Education Council is not clearly defined or communicated.	ITP,ADV	No information was found in the IR or supporting exhibits related to the AFI and what actions, if any, have been taken to address the AFI.

6.4. Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

Areas of Concern related to continuing to meet the standard: None were cited in the offsite BOE report.

Evidence to validate during the onsite visit (*italics*); team findings from the onsite visit (plain text)

(1) *The current role, if any, played by the Teacher Education Council (TEC) in serving as liaison between the SOLES and the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS).*

Although the evidence was not available for the offsite visit, the Liberal Studies Advisory Council has replaced the TEC. This new group meets periodically and the unit provided minutes from the last several meetings to the onsite team. Interviews with faculty supported a sharing of the results of these meetings.

(2) *The means by which the unit facilitates collaboration between unit faculty and faculty in other units of the institution involved in the preparation of professional educators.*

A group called the Teacher Education Network (TEN), which is comprised of faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences and faculty from SOLES, is scheduled to meet twice per year. The spring 2011 meeting focused on discussion of candidate dispositions. The unit provided the onsite team with minutes from the spring meeting.

(3) *Participation of faculty, P-12 practitioners, and other members of the professional community in program design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its programs. What are the ways these groups are involved?*

Members of the professional community are involved in program design, implementation, and evaluation via participation in a PEU advisory board, consisting of principals, district leaders, and other practitioners. Members of the professional community are also asked to serve on applicant interviews and are engaged in a variety of participatory activities according to interviews and information supplied by the unit in their IR Addendum.

(4) *The roles of part-time and/or adjunct faculty in relation to those of full-time faculty. What access to professional development does part-time and/or adjunct faculty have?*

Adjunct faculty in the Learning and Teaching Department receive email newsletters that include information about department and professional development opportunities. Interviews that included adjunct faculty members indicated that they feel a great deal of support from full-time faculty and department chairs. Adjunct faculty interviewed feel comfortable seeking help and asking questions.

(5) *Allocation of resources across programs to prepare candidates to meet standards for their respective fields. What is the process used to ensure that the needs of all programs are met?*

Faculty request resources and make budget requests through the department chairs. Chairs then bring the requests to the Dean, who organizes the requests and submits a request to the Provost. If the request is not at the time of the budget process, the Dean's office will attempt to find resources to address the request until the formal budget process takes place. Based on interviews with key administrators, the Provost's office then reviews the requests from across the institution and determines priorities.

The budget provided to the onsite team indicates that the contribution margin from the unit is among the lowest at the institution. The contribution margin is the percentage of the allocation to the school that is supported by tuition and outside grants.

(6) *Meeting the needs of all programs. What resources are available to support all programs equitably across the unit?*

The institutional budget indicates that resources are available to meet the needs of all programs. The process for programs to request resources is clear and interviews indicate that the process yields results.

6.5. Summary of significant improvements/strengths related to this standard since the previous visit

Since the last NCATE visit SOLES has moved into a newly built building. The building was built at a cost of \$35,000,000 and includes 88,000 square feet. The technology that is available and the facilities provide a state-of-the-art learning environment.

6.6. Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable: Not applicable to this standard

6.7. Areas for Improvement

Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

AFI	AFI Rationale
The role of the Teacher Education Council is not clearly defined or communicated.	The Liberal Studies Advisory Council has replaced the TEC. This new group meets periodically and the unit provided minutes from the last several meetings to the on-site team.

6.8. BOE Team Recommendation for Standard 6

Initial Teacher Preparation	X Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	X Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable

State Team Decision: Standard Met

Common Standard Findings for Standards Not Included in NCATE Standards

CTC Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership

Met

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

Findings:

SOLES implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements. The individual who occupied the role of credential analyst for many years has recently left the university. This vacancy provided an opportunity for the institution to realign the reporting relationship of the credential analyst and to link that office to the broader data and assessment initiatives within SOLES. To that end, a newly hired full time credential analyst reports directly to the Associate Dean of Assessment Support. The credential analyst's office also works closely with the Assistant Dean, the University-wide Graduate Admissions Office and the SOLES admissions office. By realigning the credentials office within the office of the Dean of Assessment and Support, SOLES is able to create a closer connection between the collection of candidate assessment data, federal and state reporting requirements, and candidate completion needs.

Faculty are responsible for providing the majority of the day to day advising of candidates with the credential analyst's office providing more specific credential advising. In the Multiple and Single Subject credential programs, each candidate is assigned a faculty advisor. Formal orientation meetings are conducted at the beginning the program and prior to student teaching. The credential analyst maintains official hard copy candidate records for current candidates and stores archives of candidate records electronically. To ensure that all parties – faculty, credential analyst, and institutional leadership – are apprised of each candidate's progress, electronic Google Docs is routinely used. A variety of advising documents are available to candidates on line and the institution recently completed an update to candidate handbooks. The credential analyst is provided the support and opportunity to attend trainings including those conducted by CTC and the Credential Counselors and Analysts of California.

After review of the site visit documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty and supervising practitioners, the team determined that this standard is **Met**.

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:

Full time faculty in the Department of Learning and Teaching and the Counseling Program serve as advisors for initial and advanced candidates, and university supervisors serve as advisors for Administrative Services credential candidates. Candidates are assigned an advisor at the time they enter their respective programs. Teacher credential candidates are given additional support from the Director of Professional Services, who oversees the teacher credential programs and two part-time pathway managers. Pathway managers facilitate candidate placement in regional schools. One pathway manager works specifically with elementary teacher candidates and one works with secondary teacher candidates.

All programs provide specific information about program requirements at the department websites and in program handbooks. Each handbook includes all program requirements, outlines the pathways or options candidates can select for completing requirements, explains the roles of the candidate, university supervisor, and cooperating teacher or district mentor during the field experience portion of the program, and has copies of all rubrics and evaluation instruments used for assessing candidates throughout the program. A review of SOLES and individual program websites verified that program information is readily available for all candidates.

There are many points at which teacher, counselor, and principal candidates are assessed. For candidates who are struggling, specific intervention plans are developed with the advisor and every effort is made to ensure that candidates have an opportunity to be successful in the program. Program faculty members pay particular attention to candidates prior to field experiences. There are occasional situations in which a candidate is not able to remain in the program and participate in field experiences. Typically, the candidate's advisor and/or Director of Professional Services meet with the candidate and reach a mutual decision about leaving the program. Interview with university supervisors, cooperating teachers, candidates and completers clearly indicated the wide range of support given to candidates throughout programs and of the ways in which program and site supervisors work together to provide any assistance candidates need in order to meet program requirements. Decisions about dropping candidates from programs are only made after consultation among numerous program faculty and advisors.

After review of the site visit documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty and supervising practitioners, the team determined that this standard is **Met**.

Multiple Subject Credential Program Single Subject Credential Program

Program Design

The Multiple Subject and Single Subject Teacher Preparation Programs at USD are based upon the “ACE” theme of Academic excellence, Critical inquiry, reflection; community and service; and, Ethics, values and diversity.

The Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential programs are housed in the Department of Learning and Teaching. This department is part of the School of Leadership and Education Sciences (SOLES). Both Multiple and Single Subject credential candidates can take a traditional credential program, or a combined credential and masters program. Program leadership is provided by the Chair of the Department of Learning and Teaching and three program coordinators: the coordinator of the traditional Multiple and Single Subject programs, the coordinator of the Multiple Subject Master’s Credential Cohort, and the coordinator of the Single Subject Master’s Credential Cohort.

In addition, there is a Director of Field Experiences for the two programs who is assisted by two Coordinators of Field Experience, one for the Multiple Subject Credential Program and one for the Single Subject Credential Program. Examination of program documents and interviews with stakeholders indicate that program leadership is effective. Leadership roles are clear and faculty and staff time allotted to program leadership is generous.

Communication within the credential programs is clear and frequent. For example, there are monthly department meetings, monthly credential faculty meetings, weekly field experience staff meetings, and supervisor meetings twice each semester.

Program improvement is a continuous process in these programs. Electronic surveys are used extensively for input from various stakeholders such as candidates, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers. Both students and cooperating teachers reported that their feedback is sought and listened to. Several key program modifications and improvements have been made in the last three years. These include more extensive preparation of candidates for PACT, creating a SOLES PACT website where sample teaching events can be viewed, and obtaining funding for faculty supervision during practicum. Master’s credential cohorts were also added for both Multiple and Single Subject candidates.

In addition, a number changes have been implemented that have improved the quality of field experiences. Criteria for selection of field placement sites have been more clearly defined. Fewer and higher quality placement sites are now used. Supervision was implemented for the previously unsupervised field experience practicum, with content specialists employed for Single Subject supervision. The pool of field supervisors was diversified through new hiring. Cooperating teachers were added as interviewers of candidates seeking to advance to student teaching. An additional screen was added for advancement to student teaching in the form of a “Faculty Roundtable” that reviews prospective student teachers.

Course of Study

At USD there are three basic options a candidate has to earn a Multiple Subject or Single Subject Credential: (1) an undergraduate traditional program, (2) a graduate traditional program, and (3) a

Master's Credential Cohort program (MCC). MCC candidates take the same courses in the same sequence, as candidates in the other programs at an accelerated pace (one calendar year). The course of study is divided into three blocks: the Foundations Block, the Methods Block, and the Student Teaching Block.

In the Multiple Subject undergraduate program the Foundations Block consists of three courses: one in English language development, one in multicultural and philosophical foundations, and one in psychological foundations. There are two 10-hour field experiences required with the foundation courses. In the Methods Block there is one general methods course, one methods of teaching literacy and language arts course, one methods of teaching English learners, and one methods of teaching learners with special needs. Field experiences required for these courses total 130 hours. This field experience takes place at two levels. The Student Teaching Block is full-day student teaching for a full semester. In addition there is a student teaching seminar. The Multiple Subject Master's Credential Cohort has a similar set of course requirements with some options on the field experience requirements.

The Single Subject undergraduate program has the same three blocks with similar course work. In the Methods Block, there are special courses in general methods and teaching literacy at the secondary level. The field experience requirements are similar, including a full semester of full-time student teaching. The Single Subject Master's Credential Cohort has a similar set of course requirements with some options on the field experience requirements.

In general, coursework covered all critical areas to a commendable level of depth with one exception. Subject specific pedagogy at USD is addressed in both coursework and fieldwork for all single subject candidates. There is ample evidence that during fieldwork all candidates in all Single Subject areas are provided with multiple opportunities for candidates to learn and apply specific teaching strategies to teach the state adopted academic content standards for their specific discipline and are appropriately matched with a content expert. In previous years, the program offered a generalized methods course for all candidates. More recently, the program has divided the course into two when there are sufficient numbers of candidates – one course aimed at mathematics and science and the other at humanities, which includes all other subject areas. For those subject areas for which there are a few candidates, such as music and world languages, SOLES, under the leadership of the Dean, provides resources to faculty members to seek alternative ways to address the subject specific pedagogical needs of candidates. These include hiring of personnel in the disciplines within the university and outside the university to provide tutorials and assistance in these low incidence areas. These efforts are individualized to candidate needs and are coordinated by individual faculty members. Faculty reported in interviews that each individual faculty member is responsible for seeking the additional instruction necessary within, or as a supplement to, the methods coursework for these candidates. This process appears not to be systemized.

Field experience is an area of special effectiveness. Fieldwork is extensive. Sites for field placements are carefully selected. Selection of cooperating teachers is also a thoughtful process. Supervision is frequent and of consistently high quality on the part of both the university supervisors and the field site supervisors. For the Single Subject Credential Program, content area experts are used for both practicum experiences and student teaching. The programs make a concerted and successful effort to connect field experience and courses.

Candidates report that faculty are very accessible and that they are well advised concerning program requirements throughout the program.

Candidate Competence

There are multiple means of candidate assessment throughout the Multiple and Single Subject Programs. Candidates report that they are well informed concerning the various components of the assessment system throughout the program. Important components of the assessment system include

- Course-embedded signature assignments
- Evaluations by practicum supervisors
- An interview prior to advancement to student teaching
- A roundtable discussion by faculty of individual candidates prior to advancement to student teaching
- Midterm and final assessments in student teaching
- The PACT Teaching Event

The final assessment for credential recommendation is done by the credential analyst via review of candidate transcripts and assessment documentation provided by the Program Coordinator including student teaching and student teaching seminar performance, PACT score, and after confirming that all CTC credential requirements have been met.

The assessment system is effectively implemented in both programs. PACT scorers are well trained, they are recalibrated annually, and the programs are careful to maintain blind scoring.

Findings on the Standards:

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

Education Specialist, Level I/Preliminary: Deaf and Hard of Hearing, with Internship

Program Design

The University of San Diego's (USD) School of Leadership and Education Sciences (SOLES) and the John Tracy Clinic (JTC) have partnered to create a program offering a Master of Education in Special Education and a California Education Specialist Credential in Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH). JTC is an organization founded in 1942 and located in Los Angeles to provide families of young deaf or hard-of-hearing children with information, strategies and techniques to support all aspects of their child's development - communication, socio-emotional, and academics. Leadership of the program is provided by the DHH Program Director and Assistant Director, who maintain ongoing dialogue with the SOLES Unit to strengthen the working relationship between the two agencies. SOLES faculty meetings are attended via Skype by JTC faculty, along with regular communication through email and face-to-face meetings. Members of both faculties indicated in interviews that they felt that the two institutions had a

strong collaborative relationship. Orientation for all students takes place at USD, and curriculum and faculty decisions for the DHH program are approved by USD so that consistent policies are maintained.

Key elements of the program design include a One-Year Onsite program and a Two-Year Distance Learning Program with two summer residencies and extended field experiences at JTC for candidates currently serving as interns. The onsite program is designed to interface with the day-to-day programs of JTC. The candidates have opportunity to work with families in JTC's audiological and psychological consultations, the Demonstration Parent-Infant and Preschool programs, the International Summer Programs, the Spanish International Summer Program, and the International Distance Learning program. All services are provided free of charge to families of DHH children.

The Distance Learning Program is designed to provide a rigorous, cutting-edge curriculum delivered by world-renowned instructors in the field with carefully planned and supervised fieldwork to parallel each part of the curriculum. The JTC leadership staff is committed to having the students see and experience auditory-verbal practices in their classrooms, which is why they require candidates to work as teacher/interns in a program that focuses on the auditory verbal philosophy and have the availability of a mentor in their locale. Distance learning candidates report that they feel very much a part of JTC due to the efforts of program staff to supervise and participate in their mentorship at their location. Employers report that they can see a clear carryover in the daily practice of the candidates from the two summers of face-to-face instruction and coaching that are required. Both graduates of the program and present candidates expressed deep gratitude for the program's offering this model and shared that they would not have been able to participate otherwise.

Interviews with members of the Advisory Council Committee confirm that they meet yearly to provide input on program design. Members include community leaders, employers and supervisors of USD/JTC graduate students, parents, faculty, and former graduate students. Both present candidates and previous program completers shared that they provide ongoing evaluation of the program during their tenure, and interviews with completers confirm that they provide program feedback upon graduation and in surveys after graduation. Current employers of graduates and distance learners shared that they are often asked to comment upon the program's effectiveness by the JTC staff. Stakeholders shared that they felt that program staff heard their voices, and that they were able to see their ideas materialize in changes to the program.

Based on data from candidate performance, as well as input from Distance Learning mentors, candidates, faculty, employers, and the Advisory Committee, changes were made to the program this year (2011-2012) to allow the candidates an immersion fieldwork experience in all aspects of the JTC International Summer Session. Additional hours of observation and participation in audiology testing were also implemented to prepare candidates for their two courses in audiology taught in the fall and spring terms. Another change is planned for this year (2011-2012), due to input from an employer regarding knowledge of IEP goal setting. The employer was invited to present to the candidates during their spring methods classes on IEP goals. A *JTC Dispositions Evaluation* was also created to assist faculty in helping candidates address professional behaviors and attitudes for this year. A pilot program to evaluate the *JTC Dispositions Evaluation* was completed last year, with some changes to the current protocol.

Course of Study

Course content and practicum experiences are built upon a body of research-based practices that train the candidates to provide direct, highly effective instruction to students P-12 who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing, as well as to empower their families to make informed choices and to participate fully in their children's education. The Onsite candidates take 44 units/16 courses over one year, while the Distance Learning candidates work full-time as interns, and take their 44 units/16 courses over two years.

The application process begins with an initial phone interview with the program director and moves through stages of paperwork application, in-person interview, written essay, and budgeting discussions. Besides the academic requirements usually included in an application (prerequisite coursework and tests, degree, etc.), the admissions requirements for the Distance Learning Program include an extensive written evaluation of the school program and administration where they intend to work during the two years of the program to verify its ability and commitment to support the candidate. Also included is an evaluation of the required mentor's background, credentials, experience, ability and commitment to support the candidate, as well as the mentor's commitment to attend the one-week JTC Mentorship Training Program during their candidate's first Summer Residency at JTC with travel and housing expenses assumed by JTC. Mentors and sponsoring district personnel are given the specific components and the attached time commitments up front so that they can commit to allowing the candidate the necessary accommodations to fulfill these requirements. Current candidates, employers and graduates corroborated the intensive screening, application, and acceptance process that the program engages in to bring the highest quality students into the program and into the field of teaching students who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing.

Candidates are trained as teachers, as support providers of parents, and as sensitive facilitators of parent-child interaction. As an integral part of their training, candidates learn to work with families from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, including English Language Learners, and those of Hispanic, Asian-Pacific, African-American, and multicultural heritage. Parents collaborate with faculty by providing lectures and panels, mentoring candidates, and opening their homes for candidate field experiences.

Candidates engage in a carefully sequenced plan of theory and methods courses coupled with fieldwork at the following levels: parent-infant, preschool, elementary, secondary, and family support. Candidates in the Onsite Program are involved in fieldwork for approximately 762 hours over the one-year program. Since candidates in the Distance Learning Program are full-time intern teachers, they are involved in many more hours of fieldwork. Present candidates, graduates, and faculty alike spoke about what they consider to be a very unique part of the JTC onsite program, "The theory and pedagogy we study upstairs in class; we come downstairs and practice in the clinic under the mentorship of a highly trained and supportive staff." Current candidates expressed a detailed knowledge of the program requirements and expectations.

Since most of the families at JTC and in the local public schools are English learners, candidates' fieldwork experiences always involve either direct Spanish, or the use of interpreters. All coursework embeds EL strategies and cultural sensitivity. Graduates shared that they felt well prepared through their fieldwork at JTC to teach students who are English learners.

Qualified personnel who must meet specified requirements accomplish supervision of Onsite Candidates throughout their fieldwork experiences. Mentors for the Distance Learning candidates must meet stringent criteria, including special training, to be accepted as a supervisor for their interns. Employers and candidates spoke glowingly in interviews about the quality and amount of support that is given during the fulfillment of their fieldwork requirements. For the Distance Learning candidate, the JTC trained and vetted mentor oversees the fieldwork for two years, communicating with the JTC Graduate Program Director by e-mail, phone, and weekly *Distance Learning Mentor Conference Forms* on the candidate's progress.

Candidate Competence

Assessment of candidates begins with the initial screening processes for admission. Admission criteria for applicants allow for selection of well-qualified candidates for acceptance into the program. Because all coursework is at the master's level, applicants are required to have completed the GRE, and a bachelor's degree with at least a 3.0 grade point average (GPA). The average GPA for current candidates in the program is 3.5. Experience working with children with hearing loss is required of all candidates prior to being accepted into the program. This allows candidates to choose the program based on personal experience and commitment, one factor that enhances retention. The program actively recruits members of underrepresented groups based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. During the past five years, the USD/JTC DHH Graduate Program has enrolled 40% of its candidates from underrepresented groups. Faculty, too, include members from various underrepresented groups.

To ensure that candidates are able to provide all students with hearing loss access to the general education curriculum, candidates receiving the California credential are required to have experience/coursework in general education, and to pass state-approved tests of basic skills (CBEST-California Basic Educational Skills Test), subject matter competence (CSET-California Subject Examination for Teachers), and reading instruction (RICA-Reading Instruction Competence Assessment). Candidates learn how to use the state-of-the-art knowledge and skills necessary to teach the increasing number of children with advanced, digital hearing aids and cochlear implants, and develop skills for using educational and assistive technology to enhance student learning.

The primary candidate assessments that occur during the program involve theory, pedagogy and methodology in two major areas: auditory-verbal education and general education from an auditory-verbal perspective. There are four assessments that evaluate candidates on their competencies in knowledge and skills using validated criteria from the *A. G. Bell Academy for Listening and Spoken Language* during their early childhood education practicum, their auditory-verbal therapy practicum, and their elementary practicum. There are two assessments, an extensive thematic unit and a personal pedagogy of practice narrative that assess candidates on their ability to plan, implement and monitor effective academic instruction. Candidates are also evaluated formally at least three times on their dispositions. Stakeholder interviews indicate that the dispositions of effective teaching are valued and regularly surfaced in classes, advisement, and informal conversation. Credential candidates produce a final reflection, including a centerpiece artifact on all the California standards in their Preliminary Level I portfolio.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the site visit documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards

in the Level I/Preliminary Deaf and Hard of Hearing, with Internship Program are **Met**. This is the end of the first full year of program transition for the Education Specialist programs and a program assessment document is due in December, 2011. At that time, a panel of BIR reviewers will conduct a full standards assessment.

**Education Specialist, Level I/Preliminary:
Mild to Moderate Disabilities, with Internship**

Program Design

The School of Leadership and Education Sciences prepares both undergraduate and graduate candidates to receive the Preliminary Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate credential within the Department of Learning and Teaching. Undergraduate students may enroll in the program as early as the sophomore year and culminating in the senior year or may take the program as a fifth year. Graduate students have the option of completing a concurrent Masters Degree in Education. Candidates are admitted to the program based on the same criteria as other credential programs offered by the institution. An Intern Program is offered in partnership with four school districts. At the present time there are no enrollees in the Intern Program as none of the community partners are offering intern positions. The School of Leadership and Education Sciences is prepared to offer the program at any time the community partners need the program to be made available.

The Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Credential program is aligned to the overarching goals, values and dispositions of the School of Leadership and Education Sciences referred to as “ACE”. ACE outcomes include academic excellence, critical inquiry, reflection, community and service, ethics, values and diversity. These goals, values and dispositions are embedded in coursework, fieldwork and practicum experiences as evidenced by reviews of handbooks, guides and syllabi. These concepts were often referred to by candidates and graduates during interviews.

The Education Specialist Mild/Moderate program is committed to alignment of coursework and fieldwork focusing on providing inclusive educational experiences in the diverse settings and communities of California. The program includes the following: a foundations block, a general methods block which is a shared block of courses with the multiple subject preparation program, a special education methods block and student teaching.

The focus of the course and fieldwork in each block is twofold: first, to ensure candidates understand and develop skills in general education including subject matter, instructional practices and collaborative co-teaching; and second, to ensure candidates develop the skills to instruct students with mild moderate disabilities in a manner which ensures these candidates may access age and grade level appropriate content aligned to California Content Standards.

Course of Study

Both undergraduates and graduates complete the same sequence of course and fieldwork. The Preliminary Education Specialist credential is 42 units/12 courses with 144 hours of practicum and fieldwork. The following outlines the content of the program.

The Foundations Block consists of 11 units of coursework and 12 hours of fieldwork. This block focuses on learning to observe in diverse classrooms and builds an understanding of the elements

of community and family which impact students as learners. Candidates also take a course in legal and ethical issues related to special education this block. Candidates complete a comprehensive case report working with a family of a student with disabilities. The General Methods block includes three courses taken by both multiple subject and education specialist candidates. The block has a requirement for candidates to complete 95 hours of fieldwork. The block focuses on developing the skills to provide age appropriate instruction in content standards in shared inclusive learning environments. Candidates complete a shadowing project with a developing reader as part of this block. Universal Design for Instruction is addressed in this block as confirmed by faculty and candidates. The Special Education Methods Block consists of 12 units of coursework and 37 hours of fieldwork. This block develops the following skills: management of classroom and student behavior, assessment for the dual purposes of instructional planning and determination of eligibility, planning for the dual transitions identified in the education code, understanding typical patterns of language development and atypical patterns associated with disabilities, developing Individual Education Programs and finally, students develop the skills to effectively support students in inclusive settings.

The final component in the course of study is the Student Teaching Block (6 units). It consists of 18 weeks of full-time work in a special education classroom(s) under the supervision of a cooperating teacher and university supervisor. During this time, candidates begin by observing in the classroom and gradually take on increasing numbers of classroom responsibilities, culminating in a period of full responsibility for all aspects of the instructional program. Depending upon individual candidate needs, some candidates will spend additional time working up to full-day teaching within the semester. During student teaching, candidates are supervised by a university supervisor who completes three formal observations. Cooperating teachers also observe and provide feedback on a regular basis. Interviews with cooperating teachers indicated that university supervisors often visit as frequently as weekly.

Candidate Competence

Handbooks, guides, artifacts and interviews with faculty, candidates, graduates and cooperative teachers confirm candidates are evaluated in multiple ways at multiple points in the program to determine if the candidate is successfully meeting all program and professional standard requirements. All assessments are described for candidates in handbooks, course syllabi and program guides. Each of the assessments for coursework has an align rubric. The critical assessment points for all candidates are midpoint and endpoint; prior to beginning student teaching and prior to being recommended for the credential.

Interviews with faculty, candidates, graduates and a review of artifacts confirm candidates complete an Induction Plan, seven signature assignments, self-reflective journaling assignments, video tapes of student teaching activities and an essay exploring the dispositions of character development aligned to ACE. These materials are uploaded into TaskStream for review. The culminating activity for each exiting candidate is a poster presentation integrating all elements of the program of preparation.

Findings on the Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising teachers and staff, the team has determined that all standards for the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Credential

Program are **Met**, except for Program Design Standard 2, Professional, Legal and Ethical Practices, which is **Met with Concerns**.

Rationale: In interviews, some employers reported that candidates and graduates enter student teaching and teaching assignments demonstrating a limited ability to assume the responsibility of full partnership in an IEP Team Meeting and limited understanding of language and concepts of law related to providing services to students with disabilities at the school site level. This concern was also corroborated in interviews with candidates and program completers.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling

Program Design

The School of Education at the University of San Diego (USD) offers a Master of Arts degree with an emphasis in School Counseling and the Pupil Personnel Services Credential in Counseling. Housed in a brand new, technology-enhanced building and a newly named School of Leadership and Education Sciences (SOLES), the program uses a theme that undergirds all aspects of the PPS (School Counseling) Program. This theme encoded in the acronym “ACE” includes Academic excellence, Critical inquiry, Ethics, values and diversity.

The program is headed by a Department Chair and a Director who takes a more active leadership role in the school counseling program. There are three core faculty members providing instruction and a Director of Field Experiences who assists in the selection and coordination of appropriate field placement sites and site supervisors in order to optimize the candidates’ field experience. In addition to three core faculty and Director of Field Placement, there are two adjunct faculty supervisors who work very closely with program faculty and provide direct candidate supervision during fieldwork and facilitate group supervision. The program at USD is accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and has been re-designed to endorse the SOLES leadership initiative and Action Research (AR), in lieu of a Comprehensive Examination.

The school counseling credential program is a cohort-based, sequential program consisting of 48 semester units (16 courses) and a pre-practicum introductory course over a two (2) to two and a half (2 ½) year period, depending on candidate need. The program includes a prerequisite consisting of Psychological Foundations of Education, plus a Core curriculum consisting of thirty units (30), and a School Counseling Specialization sequence consisting of eighteen (18) units. Previously, the Master of Arts degree culminated in a written Comprehensive Examination. Currently, the MA degree culminates in an action research project paralleling the candidates’ two semester field experience. The program includes a pre-practicum course where students learn basic counseling in videotaped simulations, learning basic counseling skills, and later candidates take school-based practica consisting of one hundred hours (100) of on-site experience with children. Finally, candidates complete six hundred hours (600) of supervised field experiences. The initial pre-practicum is embedded into the curriculum, whereas fieldwork is completed at the culmination of all coursework.

Course of Study

The program is based upon the national model of counseling established by the American School Counseling Association (ASCA) and the standards established by the Council for Accreditation

of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Candidates are introduced to the ASCA model in the first course and are required to begin applying the concepts immediately to their course work. The model is used as the core concept throughout the curriculum. Within the program, research-based instruction, reading assignments, cooperative learning experiences, self-reflection, and field-based activities are used as instructional methods. The program enjoys a state of the art, technology-enriched campus building offering faculty and candidates the benefits of enhanced video conferencing, telecommunications facilities, private meeting rooms and other technology supported resources to maximize faculty-candidate communication and access to the community. This facilitates direct communication with candidates in the field, site supervisors and the community. Candidates are provided with multiple opportunities to learn how to work with students from diverse populations. These include cultural diversity, as well as ethnic, language, economic, sexual orientation, education, and exceptionalities. Curricular emphasis is placed upon the understanding and practice of conflict resolution for students with behavior problems. The practica are conducted at school sites, which gives candidates the advantage of immediate application of the skills learned. It also provides opportunities for the candidate to better understand the relevance of and relationship between the class work and the activity.

Supervised field experience is efficiently coordinated by the Director of Field Experiences and faculty supervisors who provide direct supervision and assist candidates with their action research projects. Faculty supervisors conduct site visits two or three times per semester, thus providing candidates with guidance and support.

School counseling candidates participate in 600 hours of field experience within a K-12 setting at the culmination of their coursework. The program includes a clearly defined selection of activities that are to be experienced within a Pre-K to 12 school or district. The activities give candidates opportunities to connect practice with theory and to demonstrate their skills while actively providing services to students. Candidates must complete supervision in at least two (2) grade levels (elementary, junior high, and high school) over a two (2) semester period. Candidates are supervised and evaluated by both university and site supervisors. Fieldwork hours are logged and certified by the Chair of the department.

Candidate Competence

Candidates in the school counseling program are evaluated throughout the program through signature assignments, individual course activities, projects, and examinations. A cornerstone of the school counseling program at the University of San Diego is the SOLES leadership initiative and Action Research (AR), in lieu of a Comprehensive Examination. The change came about as result of data collected from faculty and site supervisors. There was general consensus among faculty, based on data from the comprehensive exam, that the exam was not a valid summative assessment. Faculty increased the scope and influence of the program by extending the Action Research over a two semester, rather than one semester period through critical reflection and meaningful research projects that enhanced their experience while providing valid student services at their schools. The program is in the first year of this change and is collecting data for future analysis. Preliminary data from field supervisors and candidates interviewed indicates that this is a more effective and meaningful determination of candidate competency.

At the culmination of the program, candidates are required to present their action research report to the faculty for evaluation. The student presents a project “defense” before program faculty for a pass/no pass evaluation. Faculty rubrics were developed for assessment of project evaluation

criteria. An evaluation of the action research project, as well as required credentialing materials, coursework completion, and fieldwork is made by the chair of the department and a recommendation for the credential and/or degree is made at that time.

Findings on the Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation, including biennial reports, program summaries, and after conducting direct interviews with current candidates, recent and former graduates, core and adjunct faculty, employers, and supervising fieldwork practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met**.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program, with Internship

Program Design

The University of San Diego's Education Leadership Development Academy (ELDA), under the umbrella of the Department of Leadership Studies, is housed within the School of Leadership and Education Sciences and offers a 2-year (24 units) Preliminary Administrative Services credential program with an option of completing another 12 units for a Master's Degree. In the ELDA's program, aspiring administrators acquire the skills and competencies they need to be highly successful in leading and sustaining instructional improvement through a continuum of university coursework, experiential learning, and reflective practice. The program has been designed to meet or exceed the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) requirements. Although the program is designed around a cohort model, candidates may enter the program beginning in fall, spring, or summer semesters. The program was cited as an exemplary leadership development program in a 2007 Stanford University research study, in 2009 by the Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning, and in 2010 by U.S. Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan at a conference of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE).

To be considered for acceptance to the program, applicants must: be recognized as an excellent teacher; have leadership potential; have participated in recent professional development activities; possess excellent oral and written communication skills; possess excellent human relations skills; and demonstrate a strong desire to serve as a site leader at a district school. In order to attract such candidates, the program has implemented a rigorous process of admission including four distinct stages: Initial screening of candidate and paperwork criteria check, written essay reflecting desired candidate dispositions, formal interview with program staff, and teaching observation by university faculty. According to comments by faculty in interviews, this last stage of the admission process is very important to the program since its desire is to grow highly effective school leaders from highly effective master teachers. A specific emphasis has been on recruiting candidates from diverse backgrounds, and one of the unique ways USD has gone about this is through quarterly collaborative meetings with Superintendents. ELDA brings in renowned speakers in the field of leadership and invites all local districts to participate. During a breakfast or lunch meeting organized for Superintendents to meet with the speaker, program staff seeks to obtain referrals of potential high quality candidates whom they can then contact about participating in the preliminary administrative credentialing program. Phone interviews with superintendents and other local district staff confirmed that this professional activity is a great benefit to their communities.

Course of Study

The course of study throughout the program is rigorous since candidates for admission must possess a master's degree or be willing to earn one (M.A. in Leadership Studies), have taught a minimum of three years in a full time teaching position, have 3.0 GPA on all undergraduate and graduate coursework, possess basic technology skills, have passed the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST), and possess a valid Clear California Teaching or Services Credential. Preliminary administrative credential candidates move through a four semester and two inter-session programs of coursework and coordinated fieldwork under the supervision of program staff and a trained, site-based mentor. From their first course in leadership and diversity to their capstone course in leadership and politics, program faculty have designed a course of study based on continual data analysis of program completer feedback, stakeholder feedback, and state-of-the-art research in the field. The program coursework addresses diversity, social justice, school law, instructional leadership, technology, and politics of education. Each fall there is a special topics course, which operates in tandem with the Superintendent's collaborative. For this course, the program brings in speakers from the field on various current topics. Both candidates and local district administrators have access to this resource, and during interviews they remarked on how valuable this part of the program is. Candidates and completers report that the courses provide current, useful information with strong support and assistance from university faculty for all candidates throughout the duration of the program.

Candidates in the ELDA program begin their fieldwork very shortly into their first semester. The Program Director assigns the University Supervisor to them. This supervisor will remain with the candidate throughout the program. A mentor principal is chosen in an effort to match the candidate with an experience that would contrast with what is familiar to them at the jobsite. For example, if the candidate works at a school that is an elementary non-urban setting, their mentor principal might be from an urban traditional or charter public high school. Fieldwork candidates experience a comprehensive and authentic field experience, which is carefully integrated with the coursework in the program. Candidates work closely with the university fieldwork supervisors and mentor principals to integrate theory and course content with on-site experiences. Candidates assume educational leadership roles agreed upon by the Credential Candidate, the University Program Supervisor and the mentor principal. The university supervisor initially assists the candidate in organizing the field experience and is always available by phone or email for consultation. Not only do the candidates work in an apprenticeship situation with their mentor principal, but the university supervisor works with the jobsite administrator to arrange leadership experiences at the jobsite as well. Face-to-face meetings with the university supervisor are scheduled at least monthly during the entire two years of the program. Candidates and completers indicate that the fieldwork experience provides opportunities to work with diverse student populations, meet with the public, supervise personnel, and plan day to day school operations under the strong support and assistance of university supervisors and on-site supervisors throughout the duration of the program. Interviews with candidates, program completers, and mentor principals confirm that fieldwork plays an essential role in helping candidates become competent in all standards areas.

Candidate Competence

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program candidates are assessed throughout their program, from the admission assessments, through coursework assessments, and culminating with the final portfolio assessment and presentation. During the admissions process the program staff does a formal observation of the candidate's teaching followed by a debriefing session. A

short time later, each candidate for admission completes a written assessment performed at the SOLES computer lab. During the entire two years of the program, candidates engage in activities and assignments in their coursework and fieldwork that are devised to assess particular behaviors and skills within each of the CPSEL standards. Candidates write a reflection on each of these artifacts. The reflection is scored according to a rubric and filed. The candidate will choose the best sample from among these artifacts to include in their culmination portfolio. Throughout the 40 days of required mentorship during the two-year program, candidates meet regularly with their university supervisor, their mentor principal, and sometimes their jobsite principal for feedback and reflection on each of the standards. These meetings are referred to as “triads” and are documented and collated by the program.

The program has recently retooled some of its assessments based on observation and program completer feedback. Rubrics were changed to reflect a more realistic continuum of growth. There is a much stronger emphasis on candidate dispositions, which are assessed three times during the course of the program - beginning, middle, and end. The educational platform/portfolio presentation is a cumulative assessment, which is summative as well. Candidates select artifacts from their CPSEL files and present them to a group of critical friends including the Program Director, mentor principal, university supervisor, and a member of their choosing from their cohort. Candidates select one artifact to share and the critical friends group chooses another one for the candidate to speak on extemporaneously.

Findings on the Standards

After review of the site visit documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program, with Internship, are **Met**.

APPENDIX: UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO VISIT REPORT

I. THE TRANSFORMATION INITIATIVE

TI.1 Summary of the Transformation Initiative

The Transformation Initiative undertaken by the University of San Diego is related to NCATE Standard 3 specifically and addresses major issues and challenges in the field experiences and clinical practice for educator preparation and quality. The implications of the Transformation Initiative, *Connecting Aspiring Leaders and Teachers*, are also potentially significant to Standard 1. Three research questions were identified by the institution for the Transformation Initiative (TI).

Research Question #1 is: *What are the effects of systematic, highly articulated early field experiences on teacher candidates' preparation for, and performance in student teaching?*

Research Question #2 is: *What does the mentoring relationship between aspiring leaders (master teachers) and teacher candidates look like, how are each of the participants affected, and how does it improve ELDA classroom practice? (How do they interact? What strategies are taught? What modeling occurs? What questions do teacher candidates ask, what do they learn, and how is that different or related to what is taught in university classes? What do aspiring leaders learn from the experience of mentoring teacher candidates and how is this different or related to what is taught in university classes? Does ELDA classroom instruction improve over time as a result of class debriefings around coaching events?)*

Question #3 is: *How does the participation of teacher candidates in early field experiences affect the host school, and thereby, student learning?*

Some of the elements the institution seeks to address through the TI process are related to:

- Clinical practice and moving educator preparation into school settings through partnerships with local schools and interaction with P-12 teachers.
- Evidence of the value-added role of accreditation in improving P-12 student learning as an ongoing process, which is partially covered in Action Research Projects in addition to the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) that is being conducted.
- Overcoming barriers in educator preparation to ensure that candidates have the knowledge and skills to help all P-12 students learn.
- Validity studies of assessments or other research on assessments and evidence of candidate ability to facilitate P-12 student learning.
- Partnerships with P-12 schools and school districts to address the transformation of student learning and the conditions that support learning, such as school organization, learning environments, community and family engagement, and other district/school/and student-specific programs as a cornerstone of this work.
- Partnerships with P-12 schools to assess and improve student learning and readiness.
- Candidates' ability to use formative assessment to design instruction and improve student learning.

TI.2 Status of TI Implementation

Question 1 has received the majority of attention at this time. The unit has made the most progress in implementing some aspects of Question 1. Candidates are involved at a partner school, Balboa Elementary. This involvement includes a reading program of Power Hour, which the unit described as a form of RTI.

However, many individuals spoken with during the visit had little or no knowledge of the Transformation Initiative (TI) or its goals. Given the three research questions, knowledge and understanding about the TI varied widely. Constituents at partner schools were unable to identify concepts or goals related to TI overall. Although some partnerships are forming, no data are available to demonstrate or to support significant change in the process as identified by the institution.

TI.3 Statement about TI Findings

The unit created a rubric for analysis of the TI's research questions, methodology, plan, collaboration, timeline, and results/reflections. In examining this TI initiative, the BOE team thought it appropriate to utilize the concepts from the rubric in this narrative. The findings are divided by research question.

Research Question 1

- Goals - emerging
 - The goals are specified but need refinement.
- Research Questions
 - Research questions are somewhat developed; connection to the goals needs refinement
- Methodology - emerging
 - The plan for studying research question 1 is clear, but lacks a systematic process
 - Methods seem appropriate for the research question 1
- Research Evaluation Plan - initial
 - Process of data collection is not systematic or thorough.
 - Inadequate data collected.
- Collaboration – developed
 - Participants are actively engaged and working toward the goals.
- Timeline – emerging
 - Timeline is reasonable but not met
- Results and Reflection – initial
 - The plan was not yet executed

Research Question 2

- Goals – emerging/developed
 - The goals are specified and address the TI, with some refinement still needed.
- Research Questions - emerging
 - Research questions are somewhat developed; connection to the goals needs refinement
- Methodology – initial/emerging
 - Emerging – plan for studying this research question is clear but not systematic.
 - Initial – the methods chose are not reasonable given the question.

- Research Evaluation Plan - initial
 - Process of data collection is not systematic or thorough.
 - Inadequate data collected.
 - At this stage, an n=1 is a concern
- Collaboration – emerging
 - The unit has formalized a partnership and a plan for collaboration is in development.
- Timeline – initial
 - Timeline not met
 - How many of the items cited in the timeline would have occurred without TI and would have had to occur as a natural course of meeting NCATE or CCTC requirements?
 - How many items on the timeline would have occurred due to university changes that are ongoing?
 - It appears that the majority of items cited in the timeline would have occurred without the TI.
- Results and Reflection – initial
 - The plan was not yet executed

Research Question 3

- Goals – initial
 - The goals of research question 3 are vague
- Research Questions – initial
 - The question is not well developed and it does not clearly connect to the goals of the TI;

TI.4 Recommendations on Further Implementation of the TI

The institution should re-evaluate the TI and its projected timeline and reconsider whether or not it is committed to this process. The following are the BOE team’s recommendations that may assist the unit as it moves forward with this initiative:

- Question 3 needs considerable attention; it is not clear why question 3 is included or how it connects to a transformative initiative related to field placement.
 - Question 3 could become a more quantitative assessment of some of the outcomes related to the implementation of Question 2. For example, “How are the professional dispositions of educational administration candidates affected by a semester or year-long one-on-one mentoring internship with a candidate in student teaching?”
- Better align the overall goals of the TI with the individual goals of each research question.
- Redevelop a timeline for each research question that clearly outlines the aspects of the initiative in relationship to the methodology, research evaluation, plan, and collaboration.
 - For Question 2, the current implementation of involving one educational administration candidate and one candidate in teacher education is not transformative and does not provide the level of results to determine the effectiveness of the process.

TI.5 Next Steps for Reporting to NCATE

Based on the timeline developed by the institution, NCATE will expect annual updates. These updates should include supporting evidence to document the changes the institution is making, as well as answers to the research questions as they continue to develop. Examples of this should

include, but not be limited to, revised timelines, responses to recommendation cited by the BOE team, revisions to the research questions, and progress made in each of the areas.

IV. Evidence Viewed via Unit Online Exhibits during the Offsite Review and/or Onsite Visit

- Institution, unit, and program websites
- Learning and Teaching Handbook
- 2009-2011 USD Graduate Course Catalog
- 2010-2012 USD Undergraduate Course Catalog
- 2011-2013 USD Graduate Course Catalog
- USD Academic Calendar
- Undergraduate Academic Calendar (2010-2011)
- Graduate Student Academic Calendar (2010-2011)
- SOLES Newsletter
- SOLES Dean's Report (Fall 2010)
- Educational Leadership Development Academy (ELDA) Newsletter (Fall 2010)
- SOLES Faculty Handbook
- Graduate Student Policies
- School Counseling Program Student Handbook
- Administrative Services (Educational Leadership Development Academy)
- Administrative Services (ELDA) Handbook
- Elementary Practicum Guidelines
- Secondary Practicum Guidelines
- Montessori Program Handbook
- Research Handbook
- Special Education Handbook
- Student Teaching Handbook
- Special Education Field Experience Student Teaching Guide
- DHH Student Teaching Handbook 2011 -Onsite Program
- DHH Student Teaching Handbook 2011 - Distance Learning Program
- Counseling Program Syllabi
- Educational Leadership Development Academy Syllabi
- Department of Learning and Teaching Syllabi
- CACREP: School Counseling Accreditation
- Council for Exceptional Children (Report available at the AIMS Website)
- Montessori Institute of San Diego Accreditation
- 2008 USD CTC Biennial Report
- 2008 USD CTC Biennial Report Response Letter
- USD CTC MS, SS, SPED Program Assessment Report 2009
- USD CTC MS, SS, SPED – Preliminary Report of Findings
- USD CTC Preliminary and Professional Services Program Assessment Report 2009
- USD CTC Preliminary Administrative Services – Response
- USD CTC Preliminary Administrative Services – Preliminary Findings
- USD CTC Professional Administrative Services – Response
- USD CTC Professional Administrative Services – Preliminary Findings
- USD CTC School Counseling Program Assessment Report 2009
- USD School Counseling Preliminary Findings
- USD Counseling APR Self Study
- USD Administrative Services CTC Biennial Report 2011
- USD Education Specialist DHH Credential CTC Biennial Report 2011
- USD Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Credential CTC Biennial Report 2011

- USD MS SS CTC Biennial Report 2011
- USD School Counseling CTC Biennial Report 2011
- 2008 USD CTC Biennial Report Response Letter
- USD CTC MS, SS, SPED Program Assessment Report 2009
- Title II Reports
- Master's Research Handbook
- M.Ed. and M.A. Action Research Rubric
- Learning and Teaching Programs Exit Survey
- Counseling M.A. School Counseling Exit Survey
- SOLES PEU Dispositions Assessment
- SOLES Internationalization Survey (Pre-Program)
- SOLES Internationalization Survey (Post-Program)
- 2009-2010 M.Ed. Curriculum and Instruction Learning Outcomes Assessment Results
- 2009-2010 M.Ed. TESOL, Literacy, and Culture Learning Outcomes Assessment Results
- 2009-2010 M.Ed. Mathematics, Science and Technology Education Learning Outcomes Assessment Results
- 2009-2010 M.A. Teaching Learning Outcomes Assessment Results
- 2008-2009 Action Research Summary
- 2009-2010 Action Research Summary
- 2009-2010 M.Ed. TESOL, Literacy, and Culture Learning Outcomes Assessment Results
- SOLES – Graduate Follow Up Studies
- SOLES Employer Feedback Summaries
- 2010-11 UG Applicant Recommendation Data
- 2010-11 UG Admission Interview Data
- 2007-2010 Special Education Assessment Summary
- 2007-2010 John Tracy Clinic Special Education Assessment Summary
- 2008-2011 Preliminary Administrative Services Dispositions Assessment
- Program Specific Rubrics
 - Initial Teacher Educations Program Applicant Interview and Evaluation
 - Initial Teacher Educations Program Applicant Evaluation
 - Advanced Teacher Education Programs Applicant Interview and Evaluation
 - Advanced Teacher Education Programs Applicant Evaluation
 - PAS Application Directions
 - PAS Credential Admissions Writing Rubric
 - PAS Credential Writing Rubric Before 2010
 - School Counseling PPS Admissions Evaluation Part I
 - John Tracy Clinic (JTC) List of Application Materials
- SOLES Faculty and Personnel Handbook
- Initial Program Data
 - Student Teacher Evaluation Midterm Multiple Subject Fall 2010
 - Student Teacher Evaluation Midterm Single Subject Fall 2010
 - Initial Teacher Candidate TPE Scores Summary 2008-2009
 - Initial Teacher Candidate TPE Scores Summary 2009-2010
 - 2009-2010 PACT All Candidates Score Summary
 - Multiple Subject PACT Results 2009-2010
 - Single Subject Traditional PACT results 2009-2010
 - Single Subject Alternative PACT results 2009-2010
 - Special Education Assessment Summary 2007-2010
- Advanced Program Data
 - 2008-2009 Action Research Summary
 - 2009-2010 Action Research Summary
 - M.Ed. Special Education Assessment Summary John Tracy Clinic 2006-2010
 - School Counseling Fieldwork Assessment Midterm 2010
 - School Counseling Fieldwork Assessment Final 2010
 - Preliminary Administrative Services Midpoint Cohort 8 Fall 2008
 - Preliminary Administrative Services End Cohort 8 Spring 2009

- Preliminary Administrative Services Midpoint Cohort 9 Fall 2009
 - Preliminary Administrative Services End Cohort 9 Spring 2010
- SOLES Student Complaint Policy
- SOLES Grade Grievance Procedures
- Graduate Research Handbook
- Active District Contracts
- Sample Contract Template for School Districts
- San Diego Unified Affiliation Agreement
- School Faculty Selection Criteria
- School Personnel Listings
- Cooperating Teacher Data Sheet Form
- Handbooks for Initial Programs
 - Elementary and Secondary Student Teaching Handbook
 - Practicum Guidelines for Elementary
 - Practicum Guidelines for Secondary
 - Special Ed Student Teaching Process and Procedures
 - Special Education-DHH Student Teaching Handbook 2011 -Onsite Program
 - Special Education-DHH Student Teaching Handbook 2011 - Distance Learning Programs
- Handbooks for Advanced Programs
 - School Counseling Program Student Handbook
 - School Counseling Fieldwork Manual
 - Administrative Services Program (ELDA) Handbook
- Field Placement Assessment Rubrics -- Initial
 - Practicum Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form
 - Practicum Cooperating Teacher Evaluation of University Supervisor
 - Practicum University Supervisor Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher
 - Practicum Student Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher
 - Practicum Student Evaluation of University Supervisor
 - Midterm Multiple Subjects Student Teacher Evaluation Form
 - Midterm Single-Subject Student Teacher Evaluation Form
 - Final Multiple Subject Student Teacher Evaluation Form
 - Final Single Subject Student Teacher Evaluation Form
 - Special Education DHH Auditory-Verbal Educator Teaching Behaviors
 - Special Education Evaluation Form
 - Student Teaching Cooperating Teacher Evaluation of University Supervisor
 - Student Teaching University Supervisor Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher
 - Student Teacher Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher
 - Student Teacher Evaluation of University Supervisor
- Field Placement Assessment Rubrics -- Advanced Programs
 - School Counseling Fieldwork Intern Assessment
 - Preliminary and Professional Administration Leadership Skills Rubric
 - Preliminary and Professional Administration Video Score Sheet and Written Analysis/Evidence of Outcomes
- SOLES Curriculum Components
- Fall 2010 Faculty Demographics
- Fall 2009 Faculty Demographics
- SOLES Faculty Recruitment Policy
- Fall 2010 Candidate Demographics
- SOLES Recruitment Policy of Diverse Candidates
- SOLES Fall 2010 Clinical Practice Placements
- SOLES Faculty Qualifications Table
- Faculty Scholarship Report
- University of San Diego Rank and Tenure Policy
- School of Leadership and Education Sciences Appointment, Reappointment, Rank, and Tenure (ARRT) Policy
- SOLES Course Evaluation Form

- Spring 2010 Course Evaluation Summary
- SOLES Faculty Planning Document
- 2010-2011 Faculty Research Grants List
- 2009-2010 Faculty Research Grants List
- Curriculum Committee Policy
- Global Center Committee Policy
- Faculty Status Committee Policy
- Dean's Advisory Cabinet (DAC) Policy
- Internal Dean's Advisory Cabinet (IDAC) Policy
- SOLES Sustainability Committee Policy
- University Professorship Committee Policy
- SOLES Organizational Chart
- SOLES Department/Program Chart
- Department of Learning & Teaching Organizational Chart
- Roles of the Dean and Associate Dean
- Office of the Credential Analyst Overview
- Office of Outreach and Recruitment Overview
- Office of Development and Alumni Relations Overview
- Office of Budget and Operations Overview
- Office of Assessment Support Overview
- Office of Career Services Overview
- SOLES Budget Allocation and Comparison with other units
- SOLES Endowments
- Faculty Load Form and Instruction Page
- 2010 faculty workload summary
- Information Technology Service Websites or Overviews
 - Academic Technology Services
 - Instructional Media Services
 - ITS Helpdesk
 - CE 6 (WebCT/Blackboard)
 - iTeam/WebCT
 - Training Schedule
 - Online Technical Support

Evidence Viewed via Unit Online Exhibits during onsite

- September 2011 CTC Biennial Reports
 - USD Administrative CTC Services Biennial Report 2011
 - USD Education Specialist DHH Credential Biennial Report 2011
 - USD Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Credential Biennial Report 2011
 - USD MS SS CTC Biennial Report 2011
 - USD School Counseling CTC Biennial Report 2011
- Faculty Curriculum Vitae
- Spring 2011 Dean's Report
- Faculty Scholarship Update
- Revised Program Handbooks
 - John Tracy Clinic Distance Learning Program Handbook
 - Learning and Teaching Student Handbook
 - Preliminary Administration Credential (ELDA) Handbook for Cohort 12
 - School Counseling Handbook
 - Special Education Candidate Handbook 2011-12
 - Special Education Enrollment Student Teaching Supplement
 - Special Education Student Teaching Guide 2011-12
- Candidate Work Examples
- Samples of Annual Faculty Planning
- Spring 2011 Course Evaluations

Evidence viewed directly during onsite visit

- Meeting minutes from the Teacher Education Network
- Meeting minutes from the Liberal Studies Advisor Council
- PEU Committee minutes
- Additional budget data
- Minutes from unit advisory group
- Email notes on Educational Leadership assessments