Report of the Accreditation Re-Visit to California State University, East Bay
May 1-3, 2011

Overview:
This item is the accreditation team report for the May 1-3, 2011 revisit to California State University, East Bay. The initial visit took place April 18-22, 2009. This item provides the report of the re-visit team as well as the revisit team recommendations regarding the one stipulations and the accreditation status.

Recommendations
1. That the stipulation from the 2009 accreditation visit, as revised in 2010, be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from **Accreditation with Stipulations** to **Accreditation.**

Background
A COA accreditation team conducted a site visit at CSU East Bay on April 18-22, 2009. On the basis of the accreditation team report in 2009, the COA made the following accreditation decision for CSU East Bay and all of its credential programs: **Accreditation with Stipulations.**

The stipulation in 2009 reads as follows:

2009 Stipulation
That the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS) develop and implement a unitwide assessment system and apply that system across unit programs. The system is to include data collection related to unit outcomes, use of that data for unit improvement and provide a means for assessing the effectiveness of the system.

As is typical for all Commission accreditation reviews, the institution was required to respond to the CTC stipulation within one year. However, because the visit was a joint NCATE/CTC review and because NCATE was requiring a focused revisit within two years of the original visit, the institution and the Commission worked together in 2009 to determine logical next steps prior to a focused site visit. As a result, in the fall of 2009, CSU East Bay provided the Commission with a Unit Assessment Plan. Both the team lead and the state consultant reviewed the Unit assessment plan and, based upon the comprehensive nature of the plan, recommended to the Committee on Accreditation revision to the stipulation. At the April 15, 2009 meeting of the COA, the COA adopted the following revised stipulation:

2010 Stipulation
That as a part of the scheduled April 2011 NCATE/CTC focused visit, the institution provide evidence of data that has been collected relative to unit outcomes as described in the Unit Assessment Plan and provide examples of the use of that data for unit improvement.

In preparing for the 2011 revisit, the institution prepared an interview schedule for the constituencies identified by the team. The re-visit was conducted by an experienced team leader and a CTC staff consultant as well as the NCATE Co-Chair and two NCATE team members. After the interviews on campus, this an accreditation report that was presented to the institution. It is now provided to the Committee on Accreditation for consideration and action. Following are the stipulations from the original accreditation visit and the Re-visit team's recommendations:

2010 Stipulation	2011 Revisit Team Recommendation
That as a part of the scheduled April 2011 NCATE/CTC focused visit, the institution provide evidence of data that has been collected relative to unit outcomes as described in the Unit Assessment Plan and provide examples of the use of that data for unit improvement.	Removal of Stipulation

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Re-Visit Team Report

Institution: **California State University, East Bay**

Dates of Re-visit: **May 1-3, 2011**

Accreditation Team Recommendation:

1. That the 2010 stipulation be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from **Accreditation with Stipulations** to **Accreditation.**

Rationale:

The institution has made remarkable progress over the past two years in addressing the stipulation. In preparation for the 2011 visit, the institution prepared a narrative report that outlined steps taken to address the stipulation and all standards deemed less than fully met at the April 2009 visit. The report included comprehensive supporting evidence for each part of the narrative. After examining the written documentation and conducting interviews at the campus, the re-visit team is recommending that the stipulation be removed. In addition, the team has determined that all Common and Program Standards less than fully met at the April 2009 meeting are now **Met**.

2011 Re-Visit Team Finding

NCATE/Common Standards	2009 Team Findings	2011 Tem Findings
2. Unit Assessment System	Met with Concerns	Met
6. Governance (CTC Standard 1: Leadership)	Met with Concerns	Met
Program Standards		
Administrative Services Tier 1		
Standard 7e: (2009 Revised Standard 7) Nature of Field Experiences	Met with Concerns	Met

On the basis of this finding, the team recommends:

- The removal of the Stipulation Related to NCATE/CTC Common Standard 2: Unit Assessment System.

Further, staff recommends the following:

- That CSU East Bay be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

- That CSU East Bay continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

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

Multiple Subject Preliminary	Reading Certificate
Multiple Subject with Intern	Reading Language Arts Specialist
Multiple Subject w/BCLAD (Spanish)	Administrative Services
Single Subject Preliminary	Preliminary Administrative Services
Single Subject with Intern	Preliminary Administrative Services w/intern
Education Specialist, Preliminary Level 1	Professional Administrative Services
Mild/Moderate	Pupil Personnel Services
Mild/Moderate with Intern	School Counseling
Moderate/Severe	School Psychology
Moderate /Severe with Intern	School Psychology within intern
Education Specialist, Level II	Clinical Rehabilitative Services
Mild/Moderate	Speech Language Pathology
Moderate/Severe	

Accreditation Team

NCATE Re-Visit Team Leader

Beverly Mitchell
Kennesaw State University, Georgia

CTC Re-Visit Team Leader:

Mark Cary
Davis Jt. Unified School District

Don Platz
University of Wisconsin-Stout

Cheryl Shintani
Department of Education, Hawaii
Resource Teacher, Retired

Staff to the Visit:

Cheryl Hickey
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed
See Appendix A

Interviews Conducted	TOTAL
Unit Accreditation and Assessment Task Force	**19**
Program Coordinators	**12**
Program Faculty and University Based Supervisors	**28**
Institutional Administration	**9**
Credential Analyst	**1**
Candidates	**39**
Advisory Board Members	**13**
District Employed Supervisors	**20**
TOTAL	**141**

Background information
California State University East Bay (CSUEB) is one of 23 public universities comprising the California State University System governed by a chancellor and board of trustees. CSUEB maintains accreditation by Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and holds Carnegie classification as Master's II. Founded in 1957 as the State College for Alameda County, the main campus was established in 1963 in Hayward. The name was changed to California State University Hayward (CSU Hayward) when the college was granted university status in 1972. The Concord campus was established in 1992, and in 2005 CSU Hayward was renamed CSU East Bay.

CSUEB is an urban, coeducational institution with approximately eight percent of almost 13,000 students residing in campus housing. Seventy-eight percent of students are enrolled as undergraduates, and twenty two percent are enrolled in post-baccalaureate programs. The

university's academic calendar operates on the quarter system to support 52 baccalaureate degrees and 67 minors at the undergraduate level, 39 master's degrees and 1 doctoral degree at the post-graduate level.

The College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS) is one of four academic colleges. As the university's Professional Education Unit, CEAS has administrative responsibility for all education programs but two, speech/language pathology services credential and the masters in speech/language pathology, which are housed in the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS). The recent appointment of the dean of CEAS followed a tenuous four year period of three failed searches and three interim deans. Likewise, the position of associate dean in CEAS who also has responsibility as the NCATE coordinator followed a similar pattern of interim posts until the most recent individual to hold the temporary position was chosen to fill the vacancy.

Five academic departments comprise CEAS which oversees programs in hospitality, recreation, tourism, leisure, and kinesiology in addition to education programs representing an array of bachelors, master's and doctoral degrees and certificate, credential, and license preparation/programs. Organizational charts show a common administrative structure with faculty reporting to department chairs and chairs reporting to the CEAS dean. For purposes of implementing the assessment system, the unit's twenty-nine programs including the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership for Social Justice cluster into eight groups defined by common elements such as course work and shared faculty. The faculty's decision to organize under a different structure was an effort to test potential for more effective processes related to program and unit level data collection, compilation and analysis.

The NCATE team interviewed candidates and faculty who were in programs offered at off-campus sites through face-to-face meetings and by telephone. Additional interviews conducted by phone were arranged for candidates in the online program and K-12 supervisors who supervise CSUEB candidates during their field/clinical experiences located in remote school districts.

There were no unusual circumstances affecting this visit.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The education unit affirms through its conceptual framework their core mission to prepare collaborative leaders who are committed to professional excellence, social justice and democracy. Since the 2002 combined state and NCATE accreditation site visit, CSUEB professional education faculty and members of the professional community have undertaken periodic and deliberate reviews of the framework exploring in particular how it continues to meet changing needs across programs, California's teacher and leader credentialing policies and initiatives, and external professional standards. A recent effort initiated by the college's Strategic Planning Committee was a commitment to re-think its strategic plan with expectations that the plan will serve as the basis for a revised conceptual framework for 2011-12.

The outcome of the 2009 CTC/NCATE visit prompted three principal changes in the unit's framework currently evident in materials provided by the institution and confirmed through dialogue with faculty members: 1) shift from a college framework to a unit –wide framework for the expressed purpose of including programs housed in other colleges, 2) revision and re-configuration from the four original candidate learning outcomes to three to be more realistic and measureable, and 3) re-structuring the unit's assessment system which by design and function broadens the scope of essential elements assessed regularly and systematically.

The framework draws upon knowledge bases derived from related literature in educational history, philosophy, sociology, psychology and anthropology in which core concepts of social justice and democracy have relevance. The framework is cogently described in the 2011 Institutional Report. A more extensive description along with cited references from the literature is in the 2009 Institutional Report and details the rationale and foundation upon which the framework rests. Following extensive discussions that occurred after the previous state and NCATE visit two years ago, faculty generated 11 Unit Assessment Outcomes (UAOs) assessed by the system through multiple measures and processes implemented at unit and program levels. The first three UAOs pertain to candidates who upon program completion will:

1. Demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions aligned with professional standards that implement universal design and research-based programs to achieve equitable learning outcomes (Equitable Learning Outcomes),
2. Demonstrate the ability to create environments, systems, and practices in which all individuals are treated with respect, dignity, trust, and fairness (Equitable Environments),
3. Work collaboratively with students, parents, and professional colleagues to achieve equitable learning outcomes and equitable environments (Working Collaboratively).

Of the remaining 8 UAOs, 6 are focused on the 6 NCATE unit standards, and the final 2 are common CTC standards not addressed by the NCATE standards. While these outcomes serve as common unit expectations of candidates, additional program specific outcomes defined by relevant CTC standards and in some cases national standards are evident in curriculum, field experiences and assessment instruments used to validate candidate acquisition of proficiencies related to their specific subjects. For example, credential programs (e.g. multiple subject, single subject) require that candidates acquire California's Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE) and assessed through the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA). This assessment, consisting

of four parts each embedded at a different phase of the educator preparation program and implemented with K-12 students in all but one, is evaluated by trained university assessors. Programs for other school personnel such as school psychology, administrative leadership and speech-language pathology utilize assessments developed around subject specific standards from National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL) and American Speech-Language Hearing Association (ASHA) respectively. Careful attention to the nature of each program and specific standards which guide curriculum and delivery help to assure that candidates know the unit and program expectations as ones to be acquired, demonstrated and evaluated through various assessment tools applied during their course work and field/clinical experiences.

The framework was revised to give stronger attention to the assessment system in response to the 2009 combined state and NCATE visit which resulted in seven areas for improvement for standard 2. The unit is confident now that its assessment system represents a comprehensive and integrated structure comprised of measureable outcomes and data sources related to candidate performance and a wide array of unit operations. How the system is carried out is explained in the Unit Assessment Plan, a document which describes the system's components, methodology of data collection and analysis, and a timeline employed to gather, analyze, evaluate and use results from multiple assessments to improve its programs and operations. The evaluation of the system as well as the results generated by the measures is conducted in a formalized process with multiple groups – program faculty, K-12 partners, university partners, provost and president – over a year's time and concludes with specific recommendations for remediating areas cited for improvement.

Stipulations

Stipulation 1 Related to NCATE/CTC Common Standard 2 (2010):

> *That as a part of the scheduled April 2011 NCATE/CTC focused visit, the institution provide evidence of data that has been collected relative to unit outcomes as described in the Unit Assessment Plan and provide examples of the use of that data for unit improvement.*

2011 Revisit Team Findings:

Under the collective leadership of the Dean, Associate Dean and the Unit Accreditation and Assessment Task Force (UAATF), the CSUEB Professional Education Unit has fully implemented the Unit Assessment Plan first presented to the Committee on Accreditation on April 15, 2010. During the 2009-10 academic year, the unit collected data at transition points common to all programs relative to eleven Unit Assessment Outcomes (UAOs) based on the unit's conceptual framework, NCATE Unit Standards, and CTC Common Standards. These data were compiled and aggregated, analyzed by the UAATF, and reviewed by unit faculty and staff, the Campus Committee on Professional Education (CCPE), K-12 Cluster Advisory Councils, the Deans of the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS) and the College of Education and Allied Sciences (CEAS), as well as the Provost and President of CSUEB. Included in materials reviewed by all groups were improvement plans drafted by each program. Implementation of these plans has begun and will continue through the summer.

Data collection for the 2010-11 academic year will be completed at the end of spring quarter, and these data will be compiled and aggregated for review by the UAATF in the fall—initiating a second cycle of analysis and action planning. While it is inevitable that adjustments will be made to improve how the analysis, review, and action planning process works, the robust infrastructure that has been put into place will ensure that the unit assessment system continues to support effective integration of data on program and unit effectiveness—and the use of these data to improve program and unit operations. [Additional supporting information is included in the report of the NCATE revisit team later in this report.]

2011 Re-Visit Team Recommendation on Stipulation:
On the basis of review of the written and interview evidence related to the stipulation and the standards appropriate to the stipulation, the team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

NCATE Unit Standard 6 (CTC Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership)
During the 2009 visit, the NCATE team noted an Area for Improvement (AFI) related to NCATE Unit Standard 6: Governance, however, it was not part of the 2011 NCATE team's charge for the 2011 revisit. The CTC accreditation team; however, was not so restricted and therefore is able to make a determination about the standard.

2009 Findings on NCATE Standard 6 (CTC Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership
The CTC review team for the 2009 found NCATE Standard 6 (CTC Common Standard 1) to be "Met with Concerns." The rationale for this finding was as follows: "The institution has not maintained a leadership structure for evaluating programs and operations at the unit level. Evidence from documents and interviews indicates that the continued dependence upon interim leadership at the unit level has interfered with efforts to develop an integrated unit assessment system and to build unit identity."

2011 Team Findings
During the 2011 revisit, the CTC team found clear evidence, both in its review of NCATE/CTC Common Standard 2 and throughout interviews and document examination, that this concern related to CTC Common Standard 1: Leadership has been fully addressed. The Dean and Associate Dean (both of whom are permanent appointments to their relative positions) have not only provided the leadership needed to design and implement a comprehensive unit assessment system, but they have also created frameworks for bringing together faculty across programs within the unit and with other institutional and community partners for constructive collaboration.

Based on a thorough review of all evidence provided, the CTC team has determined that Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership is **Met.**

NCATE Unit/Common Standards

2011 Re-Visit Team Finding

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.

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation

Three interrelated components define the unit's assessment system: the unit assessment plan, program assessment plans, and the unit assessment system evaluation process to improve performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs. Eleven Unit Assessment Outcomes (UAOs), as explained in the conceptual framework section of this report, are assessed with rubrics utilizing the NCATE taxonomy of "target," "acceptable," and "unacceptable." Academic year 2010-2011 represents the timeframe for completion of the first full cycle of the redesigned system implemented and evaluated by multiple working groups in accordance with the unit's official plan.

All credential programs adhere to CTC and selected national standards. The unit submits biennial reports to CTC to confirm candidate achievement of required standards which it assesses regularly through signature assessments. In addition, all Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential candidates take the California Basic Educational Skill Test (CBEST), while all initial Multiple Subject candidates and Single Subject candidates who do not complete a CTC-approved undergraduate subject matter preparation program take the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET).

The system is regularly evaluated by the professional community. The Unit Accreditation and Assessment Task Force (UAATF) comprised of the CEAS associate dean, faculty representatives from each program, four department chairs, unit staff, and the CEAS dean, along with the Campus Committee on Professional Education (CCPE) comprised of faculty and university administrators from areas outside the unit are the two university-based groups with responsibility for development, implementation and evaluation of the unit's assessment system. Feedback is regularly obtained from K-12 representatives who affiliate formally through program advisory councils. Once each year, eight unit cluster groups develop improvement plans based on unit assessment system findings. A unit evaluation report generated by the UAATF and CCPE groups along with *Cluster Improvement Plans* provide the basis for decision-making as the unit works toward achieving "target level" in each UAO. Interviews with faculty and members of these constituent groups verified in-depth understanding and effective implementation of the unit assessment system.

The comprehensiveness of the unit assessment system enables the unit to collect and manage data on candidate performance, diversity characteristics of candidates, faculty and P-12 students, faculty grants and publications, and budgets. Multiple measures employed in signature assessments are used to evaluate candidate performance at five transition points throughout all

programs, from admission to program completion. Additionally, Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs use California Teaching Performance Assessments (TPAs) at four points in the programs to provide summative evaluation of candidates. Evaluations completed by candidates are used to evaluate faculty instruction in all program coursework. The scope of operations assessed regularly by the unit is reported annually in the Unit Evaluation Report.

Interviews with faculty working with initial candidates identified the unit's conceptual framework as the overarching focus for their programs. The UAOs guide assessments to improve candidate performance program effectiveness, leading to program improvement plans, *Cluster Improvement Plans*, and unit improvement efforts.

The unit recognizes the importance of eliminating bias in all assessments; interviews with faculty and candidates confirmed efforts to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency through its use of common UAOs, common rubrics, and common data input technologies. In addition, the TPA required in credential programs utilizes procedures to remove all personal identifying information for scoring purposes.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals

Like the unit's initial teacher preparation programs, the unit's advanced teacher preparation programs follow the same unit assessment system procedures utilizing the same components: the UAOs and their rubrics of "target," "acceptable," and "unacceptable," program assessment plans, transition point assessments, and *Cluster Improvement Plans* . In addition, advanced programs in speech-language pathology and school psychology submitted reports to professional organizations, American Speech-Language Hearing Association (ASHA) and National Association of School Psychologists (NASP).

During interviews, faculty identified the conceptual framework as the overarching focus for their programs and the UAOs for assessing candidate performance, operations and programs. Interviews with faculty from within and outside the unit indicated that the unit assessment system, the UAOs, and rubrics have been effective in building collegiality across campus, providing focus for improvement efforts, allowing faculty to reflect on their practice, and making effective use of input from the professional community. The transition to the newly-created unit assessment system was undertaken in a systematic and strategic manner with direction and support from unit leadership and full involvement of unit faculty.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation

The current unit assessment system was created in 2009-2010 and implemented in 2010-2011. The newly developed unit assessment system is being maintained and a defined timeline has been established by the unit to gather, analyze, and summarize candidate assessment data. While the new assessment system has only been implemented during the current year and changed the process by which data is collected and analyzed, key assessment data on candidate performance has been available for three years. Program areas use data to develop cluster improvement plans. The Unit Accreditation and Assessment Task Force (UAATF) has primary responsibility for the

unit assessment system. Unit faculty, program coordinators, and department chairs provide input into the unit assessment system process and have primary responsibility for monitoring individual program assessment plans. Eight cluster groups with common attributes have been formed to provide another level of analysis on program and candidate performance and subsequent improvement.

Data for the new unit assessment system are collected, aggregated, disaggregated and analyzed. Data on candidates in initial programs are collected at five transition points: admission, entry into clinical practice, exit from clinical practice, program completion and after program completion. Candidates evaluate course and clinical faculty and contribute date to the unit and unit programs through completion of the *CSU Exit Survey* and the *CSU Survey of Program Graduates.* Unit faculty also indicated they informally request candidate feedback at mid points in their courses. Faculty use rubrics to evaluate candidates' performances through course signature assignments and other course projects and clinical activities.

Candidates enter signature assignments into TaskStream and these are evaluated by faculty, with feedback provided to candidates. Taskstream data is uploaded into Sharepoint for analysis as well. Candidates at the initial level indicated that faculty provided frequent, constructive feedback on their signature assignments as well as other course projects. Many program coordinators and faculty meet weekly to assess candidate course assignments and to discuss any low performances on assignments by candidates. Through the use of Blackboard, TaskStream and Sharepoint, candidate assessment data at the initial level are disaggregated for programs in the unit's assessment system. Data are also disaggregated for candidates participating at the two major campuses and in the online program. The UAATF uses data on candidates at the initial level to evaluate the eleven unit accreditation outcomes (UAOs) that relate to the conceptual framework, NCATE and CTC standards and candidate performance.

The unit has established policies and procedures to address candidates' complaints. Within the unit a candidate first meets informally with a faculty member in an attempt to resolve the conflict. If not satisfied the candidate may continue the grievance with the department chair, and then to the Associate Dean. The Associate Dean reviews all documentation and makes a determination as to the outcome of the grievance and notifies the candidate in writing of the decision. Faculty indicate that, while few in number, most candidate complaints relate to grading issues and that a large majority of complaints are resolved between candidate and faculty. Faculty also stated that constructive efforts are made by candidates and faculty to prevent formal complaints from being initiated.

The unit assessment system includes established guidelines by which the unit compiles, summarizes and analyzes data. The system incorporates an improvement plan process based on data analysis. Program faculty and coordinators were able to outline procedures they use on a frequent basis to implement the unit assessment system as well as the program assessment plans. Blackboard, TaskStream, and Sharepoint are technologies used by faculty in initial programs to maintain data on an ongoing basis to support unit and program assessment.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or Other School Professionals
The current unit assessment system also applies to advanced level programs in the unit. Advanced level program faculty, program coordinators, and department chairs have primary responsibility for their program assessment system and contribute to the review of the UAOs.

Data are collected on candidates at the advance level at five transition points parallel to candidates in initial programs: admission, entry into clinical practice, exit from clinical practice, program completion and after program completion. Candidates also complete exit surveys and informal course evaluations. Faculty evaluate candidates through signature assignments, portfolios and other course assignments.

Candidate assessments at the advanced level are collected, aggregated and analyzed primarily through the use of signature assignments, Mindscape assignments, portfolios and other program measures associated with transition points in programs. Faculty use rubrics to assess candidate's performance. For most advanced programs, key assessments are completed by candidates in TaskStream, and data from these assessments are uploaded into Sharepoint for analysis by faculty and programs coordinators. The Pupil Personnel Services Cluster uses iGoogle to collect and analyze candidate data which are uploaded into Sharepoint. The Speech/Language Pathology Cluster group uses other means to collect candidate data which are uploaded into Sharepoint. Candidates stated that faculty provided extensive feedback related to their assessed level of performance on rubrics used for course and program assignments. Program coordinators meet on a regular basis with program faculty to summarize and reflect on candidate performance data as well as instructional practice. The UAATF uses data on candidates at the advanced level to assess the unit's performance in each of the UAOs.

Assessment data are disaggregated annually for each program in the unit's assessment system. Data are also disaggregated for candidates participating at the two major campuses. Data are used in advanced programs in developing annual Cluster Improvement Plan documents which outline changes to be made to improve candidate performances.

Advanced programs utilize general policies and procedures of the unit to address candidates' complaints. Faculty indicated that most candidate complaints relate to grades received and that a large majority of complaints are resolved between candidate and faculty.

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation
The unit's assessment system evaluation component outlines the process by which the unit uses data to annually evaluate the 11 unit outcomes and its programs. The procedures and processes are outlined in the document, *Unit Assessment System Process Summary and Calendar.* Specific to the features in the assessment plan are the processes for analyzing data to improve performance of candidates, unit programs and unit operations. Unit and program assessments are developed and shared in the annual *Unit Assessment System Evaluation Report.*

The UAATF takes responsibility to implement improvements in the 11 unit assessment outcomes based on the analysis of unit data shared in evaluation reports. Program coordinators and faculty

make suggestions to the UAATF with regard to potential needed changes. The use of data to initiate changes in the unit are spelled out in annual Cluster Improvement Plans, which define goals and objectives to improve the performance of candidates in each program. For example, in 2009-2010, the program coordinator for the Mild-Moderate Program reviewed the signature assignments on TaskStream and found them weak in some instances. Some assignments were eliminated and some rubrics were revised to better correspond to standards and course content. UAATF members, program coordinators and faculty cited a number of program improvements and new candidate initiatives that were generated based on their review of data.

Faculty have access to a variety of data relative to candidate, program and unit performance. Faculty can access data from Blackboard, TaskStream, and Sharepoint, to review candidate performance on signature assignments, portfolios, and clinical activities. They have access to the annual *Unit Assessment System Evaluation Report* for additional information on unit assessment system data. The unit assessment system process also provides faculty the opportunity to review data as they participate in program and cluster area sessions designed to use data to improve candidate and program performance. Faculty and program coordinators indicated they meet regularly, weekly in many cases, to review data and make recommendations for candidate or program improvements.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or Other School Professionals
The unit's assessment system evaluation component is also utilized by advanced programs in the unit. The assessment system outlines the process by which the unit uses data to annually evaluate courses, programs and clinical experiences of the unit. The procedures and processes are outline in the unit's document, *Unit Assessment System Process Summary and Calendar.*

The UAATF takes responsibility to implement changes to the 11 unit assessment outcomes base on the analysis of unit data shared in the evaluation reports. Examples for the unit's assessment system document annual Cluster Improvement Plans, which define goals and objectives to improve the performance of candidates and programs, outlines specific plans for improvement. Both UAATF members and faculty and program coordinators and cited a number of program and candidate improvement initiatives generated from their annually review of data.

Faculty have access to a variety of data relative to candidate, program and unit performance. Faculty can access data from Blackboard, iGoogle, TaskStream, and Sharepoint, to review candidate performances. Similar to initial programs, program coordinators and faculty at the advanced level have access to the annual *Unit Assessment System Evaluation Report* to receive additional information on the unit assessment system data. The unit assessment system process also provides faculty the opportunity to review data as they participate in program and cluster area sessions to use data to improve candidate and program performance.

Faculty who teach in the advanced programs indicated they use data to improve candidate performance by modifying course assessments, rubric language, and course content. Program coordinators also indicated that they use feedback from candidates to alter the sequence of their courses to better match the content and clinical needs of candidates and to meet with and set goals for candidates who do not complete signature assignments or other evaluated work at an acceptable level.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has implemented a new assessment system that collects and analyzes data on candidate performance, program quality and unit operations. The new assessment system reflects the unit's conceptual framework and addresses professional and state standards. The system is evaluated by the professional community. Five transition points are used to evaluate candidate progress. Signature assignments, clinical performances, portfolio reviews and other course projects are used to evaluate candidate performance.

The system is maintained and provides comprehensive information on candidate, programs and the unit. While the new unit assessment system has changed the process by which data has been collected, aggregated and analyzed, data on key assessments has been collected on candidates over the last three years. Data is also disaggregated for off campuses programming and for the online programs. A system to tract formal complaints is used by the unit and technology is used to maintain candidate, program and unit data.

Data are frequently collected, analyzed, and utilized by the UAATF, program coordinators, and program faculty. Program coordinators meet with faculty regularly to review data on candidate performance and clinical practice. Faculty have access to data and reported they use data frequently to evaluate candidate performances and program delivery.

Areas for Improvement (AFIs) from last visit: **Corrected**

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. The unit does not have a comprehensive and integrated assessment system to monitor candidate performance and manage and improve unit's operations and programs.	The newly developed unit assessment system is comprehensive which allows for monitoring of candidate performance, unit programs, and unit operations.
2.The unit assessment system is not aligned with the conceptual framework.	Three of the 11 key unit assessment outcomes are aligned with the conceptual framework in the unit's newly developed assessment system.
3.The unit assessment system is not regularly evaluated by the faculty and professional community.	The unit assessment system is evaluated annually by faculty and members of the professional community. A process with a timeline for the annual evaluation has been developed and is being implemented.
4. The unit does not compile, aggregate, summarize candidate assessment data.	The unit's newly developed assessment system enables the unit to compile, aggregate, and summarize candidate assessment data.
5. The unit does not use technology to provide faculty with access to individual and aggregated data on candidate performance.	TaskStream, SharePoint, iGoogle and Blackboard are technologies used by faculty to access and aggregate formal and informal data on candidate performance.

6. The unit does not disaggregate candidate performance data for off-campus programs.	The newly developed TaskStream unit assessment system provides disaggregated candidate performance data for the unit's two campus sites and their online program.
7. Data for key assessments were limited to one year.	The unit has three years of key aggregated assessment data across transition points.

Recommendation for Standard 2:

Initial Teacher Preparation	• Met
Advanced Preparation	• Met

State Team Finding: Met

Administrative Services Credential Program Standards

2009 Team Findings – Standard Met with Concern

Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences

In the program of administrator preparation, candidates participate in significant field experiences that are designed to facilitate the application of theoretical concepts in practical settings. Each candidate addresses the major duties and responsibilities authorized by the administrative services credential as articulated in Standards 10-15. Field experiences include intensive experiences in a variety of diverse and realistic settings both in the day-to-day functions of administrators and in longer-term policy design and implementation. (2009)

2009 Accreditation Team Finding:
The April 2009 accreditation team determined that all program standards were deemed to be "Met" for all programs except for one element of one standard in the Preliminary Administrative Services credential program. Standard 7e for that program was determined to be "Met with Concerns." The standard element states, "Authentic and significant experiences addressing a variety of school levels and a variety of school settings are required for each candidate." Although graduates and field supervisors had positive reports about the field experiences in the program, the team found that candidates usually perform field experience at only one school.

Although these standards have since been replaced by the 2009 Administrative Services Program Standards, this requirement continues in the current standards.

2011 Revisit Findings:
As part of the May, 2011 joint NCATE/CTC revisit, the CTC co-chair and CTC consultant for the 2009 visit reviewed evidence provided by the Preliminary Administrative Services credential program to determine whether this issue has been corrected. Interviews with the program coordinator, program faculty and supervisors, and candidates—as well as examination of supporting documents—the revisit team found clear evidence that all candidates must take part in assignments and activities that provide substantial experiences at multiple levels and that the original visit concern has been fully addressed. The program coordinator and faculty noted, and candidates confirmed, that from the beginning of enrollment in the program that diversity of experiences is an explicit expectation for all candidates in the Tier I administrative services credential program.

As part of program coursework, candidates complete a series of key assignments that are done in "work groups" or "think tanks." These groups include candidates working at two or three different levels in their current school assignments. As a group, candidates are required to develop plans or respond to scenarios that apply to multi-grade-level needs or situations. Each candidate needs to be able to explain the full rationale behind the group product and how the plan or scenario would be implemented across the full range of grades. This includes explaining

any modifications or adaptations required for effective implementation at each particular level. In interviews, candidates were able to describe how these assignments provided significant opportunities to learn about, and reflect on leadership issues across the P-12 span.

As part of their fieldwork, candidates develop and maintain "Fieldwork Activity Plans" in which they log their field experiences. These logs, which are regularly reviewed by candidates' university and site supervisors must show evidence of activities undertaken across a range of grade levels. Candidates not only describe these activities but also reflect on what they are learning from them. In reviewing candidate reflections, university supervisors are able to assess the depth and accuracy of a candidate's understanding and the extent to which the candidate is focusing on issues relevant to that particular level. In the event that a candidate's fieldwork activity plan does not include a significant range and number of experiences at varied levels, the site supervisor and/or university supervisor ensures that the candidate schedules additional experiences to meet the standard requirement. A review of sample candidate fieldwork activity plans provided clear evidence that candidates take part in substantive experiences at a variety of levels prior to completing the program.

After careful review of all evidence presented at the revisit, the team determined that Administrative Services Tier 1, Program Standard 7 is now **Met.**

Appendix A

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF ACCREDITATION EXHIBITS

1. *2009 Areas for Improvement: An Update (new)**
2. *2009 Electronic Exhibit Room*
3. *2009 Institutional Report*
4. *2010 Unit Assessment Plan*
5. *2010-2011 Advisory Council Meetings(revised)***
6. *2010-2011 Unit Assessment Outcome Aggregation*
7. *2010-2011 Unit Assessment System Evaluation Record*
8. *2011 Cluster Improvement Plans*
9. *2011 Institutional Report*
10. *2011 Unit Evaluation Report (revised)**
11. *Academic Affairs Organizational Chart (new)**
12. *Aggregated Unit Databases*
13. *Assignment Sample - Initial Program 1 (new)**
14. *Assignment Sample - Initial Program 2 (new)**
15. *Assignment Sample - Advanced Program 1 (new)**
16. *Assignment Sample - Advanced Program 2 (new)**
17. *Campus Committee on Professional Education (CCPE)*
18. *Candidate Assessments*
19. *College Forums*
20. *College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS) Strategic Planning Process: An Update (new)**
21. *CSU Exit Surveys*
22. *CSU Survey of Program Graduates*
23. *CTC Biennial Reports*
24. *CTC/NCATE Focused Visit 2011 Draft Schedule 04-01-11 (revised)***
25. *Exit Surveys: Pupil Personnel Services Cluster*
26. *Exit Surveys: Speech/Language Pathology Cluster*
27. *Fieldwork Activities Plan - Administrative Services Tier I (new)**
28. *Fieldwork Activities Plan: Sample 1 (new)** · Sample 2 (new)**
29. *NCATE Table 1: Professional Education Faculty and Graduate Teaching Assistants*
30. *NCATE Table 2: Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and Their Review Status*
31. *NCATE Table 3: Advanced Preparation Programs and Their Review Status*
32. *Other Surveys of Program Graduates*
33. *Overview of Professional Education Unit Programs: IR Table OV-1*
34. *Program Assessment Plans: 2011 IR Tables 6-1 to 6-23*
35. *Program cohorts in the University's Division of Continuing and International Education (DCIE); Program cohort with All Online Courses (new chart)**
36. *Summary Description of the Unit Assessment System: 2011 IR Conceptual Framework*
37. *TPA Reports*
38. *Unit Aggregated Data*
39. *Unit Assessment System Process Summary and Calendar (revised chart)**
40. *Unit Assessment System Roles of Participants and 2010-2011 Roster (new chart)**
41. *Unit Conceptual Framework Diagram*

42. *Unit Conceptual Framework: 2011 IR Text*
43. *Unit Database on Diversity*
44. *Unit Database on Faculty Grants*
45. *Unit Database on Faculty Presentations*
46. *Unit Database on Faculty Publications*
47. *Unit Database on Unit and Program Budgets*
48. *Unit Operations: Summary of the Improvement Process (new)**
49. *Unit Quantitative Data Aggregation 2008-2009 · 2009-2010 (new)**
50. *University Accreditation Assessment Task Force (UAATF)*
51. *May 1st Requests (new)***

    a. Minutes of the meetings of the Unit Accreditation and Assessment Task Force (UAATF)
    b. Minutes of the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS) Council of Chairs
    c. Minutes of the CEAS Strategic Planning Committee
    d. Minutes of the Faculty Forums
    e. Minutes of meetings of the Campus Committee on Professional Education (CCPE)
    f. University websites on University application and University admissions processes

52. Educational Leadership Website (new)**
53. Summary of Candidate Complaints (new)**
54. Applied, Admitted, Denied (new)**
55. Final Alphabetical List of Exhibits – Word Document (new)**
56. Final Interview Roster – Word Document (new)**