

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

March 8-10, 2015

Overview of This Report

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

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

NCATE Unit/CTC Common Standards

	NCATE Recommendations		California Team Decisions
1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Initial Advanced	Met Met	Met
2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Initial Advanced	Met Met	Met
3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Initial Advanced	Met Met	Met
4) Diversity	Initial Advanced	Met Met	Met with Concerns (CS4: Faculty)
5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Initial Advanced	Met Met	Met
6) Unit Governance and Resources	Initial Advanced	Met Met	Met
CTC Common Standard 1 Credential Recommendation Process	-		Met
CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	-		Met

Educator Preparation Programs offered at CSU Chico

Programs	Total # of Program Standards	Number of Program Standards		
		Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
Multiple Subject including Intern	19	19		
Single Subject including Intern	19	19		
Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate including Intern	22	22		
Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe including Intern	24	23	1	
Added Authorization: Bilingual (Spanish)	6	6		
Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder*	3	--	--	--
Added Authorization: Adapted Physical Education	4	4		
Agriculture Specialist	12	12		
Preliminary Administrative Services including Intern	15	15		
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology	27	25	2	
Speech Language Pathology	8	8		

**Since there have been no candidates for the Added Authorization in the past two years, the institution is withdrawing the program. The autism standards were reviewed at the site visit as integrated into the 2014 Education Specialist credential program standards.*

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

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

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

Institution: California State University, Chico

Dates of Visit: March 8 – 10, 2015

**Accreditation Team
Recommendation:**

Rationale:

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

Common Standards

The decision of the entire team regarding the six NCATE standards is that all standards are Met, except for CTC Common Standard 4: Faculty, 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 CSU Chico. Following discussion, the team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns, or not met. The CTC team found that all standards are Met in all programs, except for one Education Specialist Moderate/Severe standard and two PPS School Psychology generic standards, each of which is Met with Concerns.

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of program documents, program data, and interviewed institutional administrators, program leadership, faculty, supervising instructors, master teachers, candidates, completers, and Advisory Board members. Based on the findings for all Common and Program standards, and the fact that no standards were found Not Met, the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation**.

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

Initial/Teaching Credentials

Multiple Subject

Multiple Subject including Intern

Single Subject

Single Subject including Intern

Education Specialist

Mild/Moderate including Intern

Moderate/Severe including Intern

Advanced/Service Credentials

Added Authorization: Bilingual (Spanish)

Added Authorization: Adapted

Physical Education

Agricultural Specialist

Administrative Services

Preliminary including Intern

Pupil Personnel Services

School Psychology

Speech Language Pathology

Staff recommends that:

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

Accreditation Team
Joint NCATE-CTC Accreditation Team

NCATE Co-Chair:	Jean Morrow Emporia State University
CTC Co-Chair:	James Zarrillo California State University, East Bay
NCATE/Common Standards Cluster:	Darlene Castelli School District of Clayton, retired
	Dustin Hebert Northwestern State University of Louisiana
	Nina Potter San Diego State University
	Gary Railsback Azusa Pacific University
	Amy Williamson Angelo State University
Programs Cluster:	Randy Fall Azusa Pacific University
	Bill Kellogg California Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo
	Margaret Parker California State University, Dominguez Hills
	Lettie Ramirez California State University, East Bay
	Joanne Van Boxel California Polytechnic University, Pomona
Staff to the Visit	Cheryl Hickey, Consultant* (ill and did not attend) California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
	Mark Cary, Consultant California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

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

Interviews Conducted

	TOTAL
Candidates	55
Completers	37
Employers	12
Institutional Administration	7
Program Coordinators	15
Faculty	34
PACT Coordinator	2
Advisors	12
Field Supervisors – Program	33
Field Supervisors - District	39
Credential Analysts and Staff	3
Advisory Board Members	25
TOTAL	274

Note: In some cases, individuals (e.g., faculty) were interviewed by more than one cluster because of multiple roles within programs or the institution.

The Visit

The CSU Chico site visit was held on the campus in Chico, California from March 8-10, 2015. This was a joint NCATE/CTC “legacy” accreditation visit, utilizing the Continuing Improvement model for NCATE. The joint visit team consisted of two co-chairs, one each for NCATE and CTC,

two California BIR members who served on the NCATE BOE team reviewing the NCATE Unit Standards (CTC Common Standards), three additional BOE team members, and five CTC Program Sampling team members. One Commission consultant accompanied the visit as the primary consultant was ill and could not attend the visit. The combined team held an orientation/planning meeting on Sunday, followed by an institutional orientation and interviews with constituents on Sunday afternoon. Interviews continued throughout the day on Monday, with a mid-visit report provided to the institution early Monday afternoon. Once all interviews were completed, the joint team held deliberations on standards findings and prepared summary reports of both NCATE standards recommendations and CTC standards decisions. These reports were shared with institutional leadership and invited guests at exit meetings mid-day on Tuesday.

I. Introduction

I.1 Brief Overview of the Institution and the Unit.

John Bidwell donated his eight-acre cherry orchard to secure the northern branch of the State Normal School for Chico in 1887. Construction began on Chico State Normal School, and the campus opened in 1889 with 90 students and five faculty members. The first class of teachers graduated in June 1891. Chico State Normal School became Chico State Teachers College in 1921. The college added a junior college curriculum and awarded a certificate after two years. In 1924 it began granting baccalaureate degrees. Two years after a fire destroyed the Normal Building in 1927, a new administration building was constructed on the site, which was later renamed Kendall Hall. The California legislature converted its teachers colleges to state colleges in 1935, and Chico State Teachers College became Chico State College. During this period the first biological laboratory was established at Eagle Lake, and the University Farm was dedicated to the memory of Paul L. Byrne. Chico State also granted its first bachelor of science and master's degrees at this time. In 1972, the college became California State University, Chico. Academic departments and programs, previously grouped by schools, were reorganized into colleges. The main campus is situated on 119 acres in downtown Chico, but Chico State also owns a 1,050 acre farm and five acres of off-campus dorms about one mile from the main campus. The University also manages 3,950 acre Big Chico Creek Ecological Reserve and the 300 acre Butte Creek Ecological Reserve. The mission of the university is to assist students in their search for knowledge and understanding and to prepare them with the attitudes, skills, and habits of lifelong learning in order to assume responsibility in a democratic community and to be useful members of a global society.

As a result of the 2007 initial NCATE accreditation visit, two departments that had housed all education programs merged into a single unit, the School of Education (SOE). The director of SOE is 0.6 FTE as the director and is also 0.4 FTE associate dean of the College of Communication and Education. The mission of the CSU, Chico School of Education, in collaboration with its community partners, is to develop effective, reflective and engaged educators.

Teacher preparation at both the initial and advanced levels is an all-university responsibility, inviting and requiring the participation of faculty and staff from across the university. Curriculum oversight at the university level is provided by the All University Responsibility for Teacher Education Committee (AURTEC), which is composed of the Dean of the College of Communication and Education, the Dean of the College of Humanities and Fine Arts, the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Director of the School of Education, the Coordinator of the Liberal Studies Program, the Chair of the Educational Policies and Procedures Committee (EPPC) of Academic Senate, and faculty representing Arts and Sciences Subject Matter Programs. AURTEC provides program and policy oversight for all programs of teacher preparation, including both undergraduate subject matter preparation programs and teacher credentialing programs. Significant changes to credential and subject matter programs are communicated to the Provost by AURTEC (IR, pp. 1-2). The unit includes programs from four departments and three colleges.

The School of Education, operating as a single department, offers multiple pathways leading to initial credentials in Multiple Subjects, Single Subjects and Special Education. Multiple Subjects credentials are available through four pathways: Multiple Subject, Concurrent, Rural Teacher Residency, and Bilingual. Single subject credentials are earned through two pathways: Single Subject or Single Subject Bilingual. In addition, Single Subject candidates can earn an added authorization in Adapted Physical Education (with the Department of Kinesiology) or an Agriculture Specialist Credential (with the School of Agriculture). The School of Education offers a master's degree in education with three pathways: Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Administration, and General Education master's in the Educational Administration option, candidates may also earn a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. The Masters in Education general pathways include the Rural Teacher Residency, the Education Specialist emphasis, and the English Learner focus.

Three additional master's degrees in education and related fields are offered outside the School of Education. The Department of Psychology offers a credential in Pupil Personnel Services with a master's degree in School Psychology; the department of Communication Arts and Sciences offers a credential in Speech-Language Pathology while obtaining a master's degree in Communication Sciences and Disorders. A new program in the College of Agriculture (the first cohort finished in spring 2014) allows individuals to earn a master's degree in Agricultural Education.

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 and there were no deviations from the state protocol.

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

There are no programs are offered at a branch campus or at an off-campus site. There are a number of online classes offered and the MS in Agriculture Education is entirely online and offered through a national consortium. The team interviewed faculty, including the program director, and candidates for that program on campus and with phone calls.

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

There were no unusual circumstances that affected the visit.

II. Conceptual Framework

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

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

The conceptual framework subscribes to seven proficiencies contained within three concepts. Those concepts are effective practice, reflective practice, and engaged practice. The seven proficiencies are subject matter knowledge, pedagogical/professional practice, diversity, assessment (effective practice); reflection (reflective practice); and collaboration and civic engagement (engaged practice). Interviews with P-12 administrators, graduates, cooperating teachers, and candidates demonstrated an awareness and an understanding of the conceptual framework. The integration of the conceptual framework in the curriculum is evident through a review of the syllabi and assessments.

NCATE STANDARDS/CCTC COMMON STANDARDS

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

1.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The offsite visit report highlighted strengths of the unit related to Standard 1 and presented a number of questions to be investigated on-site as well as a number of requests for clarification or additional information. These items, primarily related to clarifying the alignments between rubrics and data sets, guided on the on-site investigation of Standard 1. All items were investigated, and the unit addressed each. Concerns that remain are addressed in this report.

Overview:

Candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions are assessed through multiple measures throughout initial and advanced programs. Assessments of candidate performance are aligned with NCATE standards, program standards as appropriate, and California standards; the breadth of these assessments is wide with very few exceptions.

In total, 12 teacher preparation programs are offered at initial and advanced levels. Seven initial programs comprise different California licensure areas and academic pathways candidates may elect to pursue. The array of pathways provides candidates with multiple opportunities to earn either a single credential or multiple credentials integrated within a single program of study. Five advanced programs, some leading to advanced licensure and others providing specialized training only, are offered. Of those five, the school psychology program is recognized with a condition related to rubric specificity by the NASP SPA, and the communication sciences and disorders' program is accredited by ASHA's Council on Academic Accreditation. All programs are approved by the State of California.

Initial Programs:

With few exceptions, initial program candidates' performance scores on key assessments were high. On assessments with evaluation scales of three, candidate performance means were routinely above 2.0. Means on assessments with scales of four or five items demonstrated that the vast majority of candidates scored at or above 3.0 or 4.0, respectively.

Standardized exam score passage rates (CBEST, CSET, and RICA) were 100% as required for California licensure. Other state-mandated assessments or evaluation frameworks (CATs, TPEs,

and PACT) are completed by candidates, depending upon the program/licensure area(s). While candidate performance on these assessments varies, only a marginal percentage of candidates earned low scores. When questioned, candidates indicated that the unit has support mechanisms in place to assist candidates in preparing for these assessments, and candidates had positive comments about program and unit support systems.

Assessments of candidates' pedagogical content knowledge, both planning assessments like unit plans and skill assessments like the TPE field evaluation, reveal that candidates possess the skill to plan for instruction and assessment of student learning and also execute that instruction and assessment proficiently. Furthermore, elements of the TPE and PACT assessments require candidates to assess student learning then reflect on the results to inform instruction, and ratings on those elements show candidate proficiency as well.

Examples of candidate artifacts and interview comments from candidates confirm that key assessments are comprehensive and aligned to institutional, state, and national frameworks, demonstrating a strong relationship between the unit's assessment of candidate performance and the expected knowledge, skills, and dispositions outlined in those frameworks.

Candidate dispositions are assessed both on TPE evaluations and on exit surveys, which provide faculty/mentor teacher evaluations and self-evaluations of candidate dispositions. Routinely, faculty/mentor teacher evaluation mean ratings were above 3.0 on a 4.0 scale, and these revealed strong correlations with the self-evaluations.

Advanced Programs:

Advanced programs feature key assessments, some unique to the programs and others common to all programs, that assess candidate content knowledge appropriate for advanced study in general and also for the unique focus of each program. Writing, capstone, and completer survey assessments include common criteria that can be used for cross-program comparison, and additional assessments are embedded in each program that require candidates to demonstrate specialized knowledge and skills appropriate for each program. Data reveal that, overall, candidates demonstrate content mastery relevant to the unique programs of study.

Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills in advanced programs are often integrated through assessments that demonstrate candidates' content knowledge and impact on student learning and learning environments. For example, M.A. in Education candidates in the Preliminary Administrative Services credential and other advanced degree/credential programs complete action research and assessment projects focused on identifying needs relevant to student learning and learning environments. They are required to understand their fields, know their students and communities, and help create positive, diverse learning environments for students. To that end, candidates develop, implement, analyze, and reflect upon interventions based on the assessment of needs through action research (EDMA 601) and assessment (EDMA 602) projects. Data for these assessments provided limited detail on candidate performance,

though, because data were neither reported by criterion per rubric nor disaggregated by pathway within the program.

Each advanced program includes at least one dispositional assessment; two programs include more than one. Evidence, including interview data, reveal that dispositional assessments are conducted only at the conclusion of programs, especially in the M.A. in Education (Preliminary Administrative Services and other options) and the M.S. in Agricultural Education programs (which is distinct from the Agriculture Specialist Credential program). Furthermore, the dispositional assessment (an exit survey) is a candidate self-evaluation only, and opportunities for faculty evaluation of candidate dispositions could not be identified.

The M.S. in Agricultural Education, a unique program in terms of content and delivery as it is an online, consortium program, includes seven key assessments, and roughly 50% of these assessments are common with other advanced programs. Data on these assessments were limited in that 1) data for only five of the seven assessments were provided (philosophy paper from AGED 601, instructional accommodation activity from AGED 608, program plan project from AGED 601, unit assessment from AGED 610, and culminating activity) and 2) only candidates' final scores on the assessments were provided. Because the data sets are incomplete and because data are not reported by descriptive statistics by criterion by rubric, a sound argument about candidate mastery cannot be provided. More detailed, disaggregated data would be necessary to determine trends in candidate performance.

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

1.2.b Continuous Improvement

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Candidate writing in advanced programs. The unit has implemented standard writing assessments or assessments with writing criteria across advanced programs to strengthen the scholarship element of these specialized programs.

Alignment between rubrics and standards. Interviews reveal several examples, especially in the communication sciences and disorders' assessments, where rubrics that were broad in nature were revised to provide specificity in candidate performance expectations and yield more reliable data in making judgments about candidate mastery of standards' expectations.

Disaggregation of data. The unit offers a number of pathways for several programs of study, and those pathways require prescribed common courses in which candidates complete key assessments. Some data sets for those key assessments, though, were not disaggregated by path, and team members suggested that such disaggregation was important to determine whether all elements of Standards 1 and 2 were met. Interviews with assessment staff and leadership yielded constructive dialog on the format of data sets, and disaggregated iterations

of some data sets were provided upon request. The interviewees acknowledged that data disaggregation is a focus, and revised data sets provided upon request validate that.

Clinical experience based on stakeholder feedback. Interviews revealed that stakeholders—those on advisory boards and those serving as field-based supervisors or mentors—believed their suggestions to have stronger clinical components that reinforced the classroom concepts were embraced by the unit and that curricular adjustments followed. They believed these adjustments provide a more substantive and “theory to practice” experience for candidates.

1.2.b.i Strengths

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

Preparation for PACT assessment. An overwhelming consensus among candidates from several initial programs revealed that the unit’s efforts through coursework, faculty mentoring, and peer-to-peer support to prepare candidates for the state-mandated PACT assessment were superior.

Intervention activities. Candidates offered that the action research assessments in the M.A. in Education (preliminary administrative services and other) provided them with unique experiences. These activities not only demonstrated their professional knowledge and skills but were also focused exclusively on unique needs of specific students or learning environments, showing a direct connection between the candidate and his/her impact on student learning.

1.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

Not applicable

1.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

Not applicable

1.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
Candidate dispositions in advanced programs are not assessed by observable or systematic means.	ADV	Candidate dispositions in advanced programs are assessed only at the conclusion of programs and by candidate self-assessments. Thus, dispositions are not assessed at multiple points in a program to determine trends nor are the assessments based on observable behaviors in educational settings by faculty or mentors.

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 1 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 1 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 1: Met

STANDARD 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

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

2.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit has developed an assessment system that is identified as the “Continuous Improvement System.” This system has four components (plan, implement, assess and reflect/report) to assist the unit in gathering assessment data from key assessments and to evaluate program and unit operations.

The first component of the unit assessment system is planning and this assists unit programs in reviewing a research base, vision, standards and findings from previous assessment cycles. Unit programs at CSU Chico participated in several assessment activities related to different audiences. Annual Assessment Reports required by the regional accreditor (WASC) (see exhibit 2.4.g.2 through 2.4.g.5) are submitted to the director for review, and then to the College Dean and ultimately to an on-campus assessment office. Secondly, credential programs submit a biennial report to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), and thirdly, prior to the site visit unit programs submitted Program Assessment Reports to CTC that are reviewed by subject matter specialists to determine whether the programs have met state or national standards in the program area. Two of the unit programs submitted their program assessment documents to professional accreditation organizations – the Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) credential in School Psychology to the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and secondly, the Speech Language Pathology program is accredited by the American Speech-Language Hearing Association (ASHA). The credential programs submitted biennial reports to CTC and subsequent requests for program assessment data to be reviewed by the site visit were submitted and reviewed.

The second component is focused on the Implementation component. Activities included in this phase are implementing ways to prepare candidates to teach students with special needs, co-teaching with Single Subject candidates, and preparation for teaching with the Common Core State Standards and the State approved Smarter Balance assessment. Interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and advisory board members confirmed that the unit implemented a comprehensive assessment system that

monitors candidate performance and used the data to improve the unit's operations and programs.

The third component of the assessment system is focused on assessment. During this phase, the data and goals derived from previous assessment activities are implemented, reviewed and revised if necessary. Examples of this phase are efforts to ensure that key assessments are fair, accurate, consistent and free of bias (see Exhibit 2.4.c), including revisions to the Supervisor Survey, Classroom Environment survey and the TPE Field Placement Rubric. Interviews with the Director of the School of Education, Director of Assessment and Accreditation and the assessment data analyst confirmed that the unit has gathered three years of assessment data on most programs through the web-based STEPS (Student Tracking, Evaluation and Portfolio System) software developed by CSU Chico's College of Business. The system allows students to upload artifacts that are scored online by faculty and scores are available for students to review. The system allows for the PACT assessment during clinical practice to be blind scored and double scored for a minimum of 15 percent of the population as required by CTC. The unit went beyond this minimum due to a large number of students that had borderline scores according to PACT guidelines. This resulted in the unit double scoring 30% of their candidates in each of the content areas. Interviews with the assessment leadership confirmed these data were available to faculty and were reviewed in program and advisory board meetings.

The fourth and final component of the system is to Reflect/Report. This phase is guided by the Data and Reporting Calendar (see exhibit 2.4.d) that ensures that data are collected, analyzed, and reported to appropriate groups. Program assessment data are reviewed by multiple groups such as program coordinators, faculty, and advisory boards.

Interviews with faculty and assessment leadership confirmed that the new online MS in Agriculture Education did not have key assessment findings from all candidates for the two years that the program has operated. The rationale provided by the unit for this omission is that some of the courses in the program are offered in a National Consortium and that faculty teaching at other institutions did not provide the assessment data to the unit.

The offsite report asked the onsite team to validate two areas at the site visit:

1. How is assessment data reported to candidates? Interviews conducted during the onsite visit with candidates found that candidates have access to the STEPS data management system and can review their scores on key assessments. A demonstration of the data system by the assessment leaders confirmed that candidates can review their scores for key assessments after being scored by faculty members.
2. What documentation can the unit provide concerning candidate complaints and resolution of those complaints? The site visit team confirmed that the unit has processes for both formal and informal grievance situations. The documentation is kept in the candidate's file and in the Office of Student Judicial Affairs. The Director of the School of Education maintains a record of informal candidate complains and their resolution.

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

2.2.b Continuous Improvement

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Since the 2007 NCATE visit, the unit has been involved in a number of activities to improve the assessment system that reflects the conceptual framework and is regularly evaluated by the professional community. In most programs, candidate assessment data are regularly and systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized and analyzed to both improve candidate performance and unit operations. The unit has several advisory boards to support the entire unit and specific program areas and these community partners reported being involved in revising the assessment system and analyzing data that was used for program improvement as well as candidate assessment and unit operations. The unit developed and closely follows a Data and Reporting Calendar to ensure that data are collected by all candidates and assessed by faculty. The All University Responsibility for Teacher Education Committee (AURTEC), which previously provided feedback and approval for programs before they were submitted to CTC, now provides assessment and program quality feedback to the unit. Since the initial NCATE accreditation visit in 2007, the unit has added two new positions – assessment coordinator and director of assessment and accreditation. New assessments, including the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) for initial candidates and the writing proficiency of advanced candidates, have been implemented. Technology is being used to collect and analyze data such as the data dashboard developed by Communication Sciences and Disorders, expanding the use of STEPS to include disposition data, and using Blackboard Learn to distribute candidate videos for scoring.

2.2.b.i Strengths

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

Not applicable.

2.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
The unit does not systematically collect, analyze, and use data on key assessments for program improvement.	INIT, ADV	The unit is gathering performance assessment data from candidates and reporting results in the annual program reports submitted each fall focusing on learning outcomes are now being analyzed to determine necessary program improvements.

2.3.b What AFIs are continued from the last visit?

None

2.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
The MS in Agricultural Education does not have some key assessment findings from all candidates for the two years that the program has operated.	ADV	The MS in Agricultural Education is conducted in cooperation with a National Consortium and some universities in the program did not provide assessment data to the program.

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 2 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 2 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 2: Met

STANDARD 3: FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

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

3.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Clinical practice is at the core of the unit's programs. A range of placements are determined and selected to provide opportunities for candidates to work with students with exceptionalities and those from diverse racial, ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups. Placements currently exist in 183 schools, spanning 82 districts and 20 counties, with a pool of 1023 cooperating teachers (CTs). Initial candidates have at least one placement in a school with over 10% English Learners and at least one placement in a school where over 50% of students are socioeconomically disadvantaged. Extensive field-based opportunities ensure a transfer of theory to practice for candidates.

The collaborative partnerships continue to be strengthened between the area districts and the institution to align the needs of the districts and their students with the teaching preparation provided in the unit. Advisory boards are structured to provide an effective forum for practitioner feedback, which in return is clearly used to adjust curriculum and clinical experiences for candidates. Cooperating teachers and supervisors are given support through consistent training, orientation, monthly meetings, and large-scale workshops, with virtual attendance options in some cases. Interns and student teachers are supported by proactive supervisors, more detailed MOUs with districts, and daily feedback from cooperating teachers.

Candidates regularly have chances to meet with both the supervisor and cooperating teacher to share experiences and determine necessary tools for growth. Assessments for candidates are conducted jointly. The collaborative process between the unit and P-12 schools was previously cited in the offsite report as an area where more information was needed. Additional resources provided by the unit, including advisory board agendas, clarified the multiple areas of collaboration between faculty and P-12 personnel.

Within clinical and field experiences, appropriate learning experiences are designed, implemented, and evaluated in a manner to support the development of candidate dispositions and professional skills. The unit and its partners share expertise and resources to support candidate learning, and the placements of student teachers and interns are jointly determined to ensure quality learning experiences and preparation. Handbooks clearly state expectations before, during, and after field experiences.

Hiring requirements for clinical faculty was previously cited in the offsite report as an area where more information was needed. The unit was able to clearly outline the criteria that cooperating teachers must meet to be considered. The criteria for the selection of clinical faculty include a minimum of five years of teaching experience, a master's degree or equivalent in the field of education, and appropriate licensure for the CT position. To be considered for an interview, clinical faculty must meet minimum requirements and have a complete application on file that includes transcripts, a resume, and letters of recommendation. School faculty are accomplished professionals who are understand their roles in preparing candidates for their professional roles.

Candidates are able to provide feedback on their experiences with clinical faculty through the Classroom Learning Environment survey at the end of their field experiences. The instrument was developed with school partners, including School of Education advisory board members and local teacher union representatives. Data from this survey are analyzed and used to ensure candidates receive maximum learning opportunities and support in the field.

Candidates in advanced programs are able to apply classroom theory to real world settings. Their field experiences require them to apply their knowledge, analyze student learning, and engage in activities that include data analysis, the use of technology, current research, and reflections on their experiences and growth as practitioners. Candidates cite opportunities for working with a range of students from varied grade levels, linguistic proficiency levels, socioeconomic backgrounds and districts, as well as with students from varied cultural and ethnic backgrounds, and students with disabilities. Multiple assessment strategies are used to evaluate candidates' performance and impact on student learning.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

3.2.b Continuous Improvement

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

P-12 clinical partners who serve as mentors or cooperating teachers are highly qualified individuals. Partnerships are maintained and improved through ongoing communication, regular advisory meetings and evaluative surveys. Candidates are observed and supported daily by cooperating teachers. Teams (university supervisor, candidate, and cooperating teacher/mentor) review the effectiveness of teaching strategies and content. Data are used to assess candidates' progress and performance.

Clinical and P-12 faculty utilize multiple measures to evaluate dispositions and skills that are clearly aligned with professional, state, and institutional standards. Regular support is provided, and candidates engage in a variety of reflective practices, including individual conferencing and group discussion. Candidates are also given opportunities to self-assess their performance and demonstrate plans for growth.

Increased collaboration with school partners is evident as a result of a newly hired field placement coordinator, who acts as the point of contact for the university and all school partners and agencies. A gap in the shared decision-making process was identified and addressed to ensure more consistency and quality communication between the district and university. School partners are given the opportunity to regularly provide input on clinical experiences and evaluations. A new web-based data management system is now used to record clinical hours and for the submission of student evaluations by clinical instructors, site supervisors, and faculty.

The Rural Teacher Residency program has increased the partnership between high need rural schools and the unit; a secondary co-teaching program has also been piloted. Additional Teacher Quality Partnership Grant funding is underway to promote a collaborative in secondary math and science with rural school districts, county offices of education and a community college district. Subject matter entry requirements have been adjusted to ensure candidates meet requirements before field placement. A refined use of data to inform instruction exists, and a new classroom environment survey has been implemented so that candidates can provide feedback on school placements. A new disposition survey and exit survey have also been implemented.

Increased support in the forms of mentoring and professional development have been provided. The quality and quantity of field work required in the advanced program has been increased. In addition, field experiences with diversity have been increased. Increased focus on student learning has resulted in additional methods courses and the analysis of student work, as well as experiences with professional learning communities.

3.2.b.i Strengths

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

Not applicable.

3.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1. The unit and its school partners do not jointly determine the specific placement of interns for other school professional roles.	ADV	Three areas cited by reviewers as problematic (Library Media, Reading Language Arts and Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Learners) were suspended in 2010-2011 for reasons of budgets and enrollments. The Library Media and Reading Language Arts programs were formally discontinued in September 2012).

3.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

None

3.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

None

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 3 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 3 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 3: Met

STANDARD 4: DIVERSITY

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

4.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

As noted in the off-site visit report, the unit has devoted considerable effort toward ensuring that its conceptual framework and course offerings help candidates, in both initial and advanced programs, develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to facilitate learning of diverse students. Within their conceptual framework, CSU Chico states, “It is the

responsibility of educators to prepare learners to meet both current and future life challenges, requiring learning that is socially interactive, transformative, and respectful of diverse perspectives. Such learning includes critical intellectual inquiry, reflection, collaboration and active engagement with the larger community.” It was clear from interviews with current candidates and recent graduates across programs that they are reflective practitioners who not only welcome, but regularly seek feedback on their performance in order to improve their practices.

Curriculum components have been designed to ensure candidates learn to make a variety of adjustments to their instruction and professional practice based on student characteristics. Candidates are required to demonstrate the ability to contextualize the application of assignments to reflect student experiences and cultures. Examples of specific coursework addressing these proficiencies in programs at the initial level includes the pre-requisite course “Access and Equity in Education” where candidates explore issues of diversity from a variety of angles including ethnicity, socio-economic status, religion and sexual orientation. In “Reading and Literacy Development” candidates learn about teaching strategies for English Language Learners. Single Subject candidates also take an educational psychology course where they discuss the importance of understand students’ backgrounds and lives outside of school and use knowledge of students’ backgrounds and interest in planning instruction. At the advanced level, candidates enroll in Critical Perspectives in Education where they explore similar topics, but delve into them at a deeper level. During interviews, current candidates and recent graduates verified that these courses had significant effects on their teaching practices.

Candidate proficiencies and dispositions related to diversity are measured throughout the initial programs. Evidence from assessment data shows that candidates effectively demonstrate and apply proficiencies and dispositions related to diversity. Recent program graduates and employers verified that they are well prepared to work with students and families from diverse cultures and backgrounds.

As stated in the off-site report, the university has a non-discrimination policy for all of its employees and solicits diverse candidates for all faculty positions as part of the normal hiring practice. Of the 87 Professional Education Faculty, one percent is Asian, 2.3 percent are Hispanic/Latino, 3.5 percent are American Indian or Alaskan Native, 86.2 percent are White, 3.5 percent are listed as Race/Ethnicity Unknown, and 3.5 percent are listed as Two or more Races/ethnicities. Twenty-eight point seven percent are male, and 71.3 percent are female. In the off-site addendum, the unit provided the ethnic breakdown for clinical faculty. Of the 335 clinical faculty, 2.4 percent are American Indian or Alaska Natives, 9 percent are Asian, 6.3 percent are Hispanic, 0.3 percent are Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, 88.7 percent are White and 5.1 percent are “other” or unknown. Although the majority of professional educational faculty (86%) are White, many have professional expertise and experience working with diverse populations including students who have special needs, students who are English Learners, and students who are socioeconomically disadvantaged. Over 40 percent of faculty speak a language other than English, 32 percent have lived outside of the US, and 21 percent

have taught abroad. In interviews with current candidates and recent graduates they report feeling that the faculty had the expertise and experience to prepare candidates to work with students across different ethnicities, languages and ability levels.

Faculty and administrators in the unit continually seek ways to increase candidates' experiences with diverse faculty and professional educators. According to the IR, for the past 24 years faculty have collaborated with the Office of International Studies to bring international educators to CSU Chico. In spring of 2014, 20 educators from 19 countries visited classes for interaction and exchange with candidates and faculty. In interviews with the Director of the Office of Diversity and the Director of International Studies, they shared that the Office of Diversity holds four or five brown bag lunches each semester to discuss issues of diversity. Topics for these lunches are based on national and international news. These lunches are open to faculty, staff and candidates.

Candidates represent diverse populations with similar demographics as the geographical area. Of the candidates in initial programs, 12.9 percent are Hispanic/Latino, 1.3 percent are American Indian or Alaskan Native, 3.8 percent are Asian, 74.4 percent are White, 4.4 percent are two or more races, and 3.25 percent are listed as Race/Ethnicity Unknown. 27.1 percent are male and 72.9 percent are female. Of candidates in advanced programs, 9.8 percent are Hispanic/Latino, 3.9 percent are Asian, .4 percent is Black or African American, two percent are American Indian or Alaskan Native, 70.5 percent are White, 5.1 percent are listed as two or more Races/Ethnicities, and 7.9 percent are listed as Race/Ethnicity Unknown. 22.4 percent are male and 77.6 percent are female. The unit is committed to increasing the pool of candidates from diverse socioeconomic and ethnic/racial groups. Grant-funded programs, such as the Northeastern California Preparation of Indian Education (NorCAL PRIE), are focused on purposeful recruiting from diverse populations.

Candidates in all programs confirmed that they are placed in settings with diverse P-12 students for their field experience. Data show the diversity of P-12 students in clinical practice sites for initial and advanced programs. In these schools, nonwhite students range from 9 percent (Williams Jr/Sr High) to 85 percent (Quincy Jr/Sr High). Students receiving free or reduced lunch range from 100 percent (Bridgestreet ES, Susan B Anthony ES, Wyandotte) to 9.3 percent (Children's Community Charter School). English Learners range from 72 (Bridgestreet ES) percent to zero percent (Achieve Charter, Children's Community Charter School, Ipakanni Charter Early College HS, Junction ES, Loma Vista ES, Mt. Burney Center, Ponderosa ES, Quincy Jr/Sr High, Scott River High, Trinity HS, University Prep HS). Students with disabilities range from 100 percent (Yolo County Special Ed) to zero percent (McKinley ES). In programs where fieldwork is mostly done in the schools where candidates work, such as the educational administration program, experiences are provided for candidates to visit other schools with diverse student populations. Candidates and graduates all reported that they had experience working with diverse students in the program that represent the population of the local geographic area and that they are well prepared to teach students from diverse backgrounds.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

4.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

As reported in the IR, initial programs have chosen to focus on teaching diverse learners as an explicit part of program improvement efforts, while in advanced programs, a significant Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) grant enabled the creation of the Rural Teacher Residency program, in which candidates earn a combined MA in Education and a teaching credential (Multiple Subject or Education Specialist). This program focuses on preparing teachers to work in high-need, rural schools. Candidates in these programs report feeling well prepared and committed to teach in these high-need schools.

Interviews with faculty and administrators validated that the Office of Diversity is working closely with the unit to hire diverse faculty by strengthening its diversity and by looking into their recruitment practices. The University President’s Diversity Plan has eight priorities, one of which is to “increase diversity in faculty, staff and administration at all levels of the University.” The IR also states the unit is emphasizing the recruitment of more diverse candidates. One grant, NorCAL PRIE (The Northeastern California Preparation and Retention of Indian Educators), has led to an uptick in the number of candidates representing the Native American population. In interviews, faculty reported that these efforts have been successful.

Unit administrators shared activities that have been done across the unit to increase candidates’ knowledge and skills working with students with disabilities. An assistive technology workshop, for example, was attended by 300 candidates across programs. After reviewing feedback on the workshops, they have decided to continue the workshops with some improvements to ensure that candidates across program see how these skills affect their professional practices.

4.2.b.i Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Not applicable.

4.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

4.3.a What AFIs are recommended for removal?

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1. The unit does not ensure that candidates in all advanced programs have an opportunity to complete field or clinical experiences in diverse settings.	ADV	The unit has established guidelines that now ensure that candidates in advanced programs have an opportunity to complete field or clinical experiences in diverse settings.

4.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
2. Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with faculty from diverse groups.	ITP, ADV	All candidates in all programs do not have the opportunity to interact with professional education faculty, faculty from other units, and/or school faculty, who are from at least two ethnic/racial groups.

4.3.c What new AFEs are recommended?

None.

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 4 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 4 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 4: Met with Concerns

Rationale:

Unit faculty are not reflective of a diverse society. Documents and interviews indicate that recruitment and hiring efforts are not effectively addressing this ongoing issue. (CTC Common Standard 4: Faculty)

STANDARD 5: FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

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

5.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Unit faculty are qualified and model best practices in scholarship, service and teaching. The unit is currently comprised of 36 Tenure -Tenure Track (T-TT) and 53 part time faculty members. As stated in the unit addendum and verified in onsite interviews, unit plans for recruiting and hiring talented faculty include hiring a minimum total of ten new tenure track faculty beginning in 2014. In addition, 30 part-time instructors/supervisors have been added since 2011. To ensure the competency of these instructors, the application process includes submission of transcripts, resumes and letters of recommendation. Resumes include years of teaching experience, credentials held, and highest degree awarded of which an MA is the minimum. Onsite interviews with faculty and the Director of the School of Education, as well as addendum

exhibits, verified this process. Interviews with part time faculty are then conducted by a team of at least three faculty resulting in a recommendation to the Director of the School of Education. When hired, part time faculty and unit supervisors receive feedback at least twice per semester and complete a yearly evaluation.

The offsite report noted that ratios for full/part time faculty were not listed. The unit addendum provided evidence via the Chico website that there are 49 percent full-time faculty to 51 percent part-time faculty with 83 percent of full-time faculty holding doctorates/terminal degrees.

Unit faculty know the content they teach and use a variety of methods to ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in state, professional and unit standards. Multiple examples of the integration of technology and diversity into faculty teaching were provided via exhibits, including course syllabi and integration charts, and validated via onsite interviews with faculty, candidates and graduates. Examples of technologies referenced include: embedded video, Camtasia, Prezi, Google Apps for Education, Blackboard Learn, Google Drive, Cloud Computing and TurnItIn. Diversity is also integrated into coursework as evidenced in interviews with faculty, current candidates and graduates and verified in exhibits such as Curriculum Components and Experiences that Address Diversity Proficiencies. For example, in SPED 343, Introduction to Special Education, candidates conduct research on two disability areas and specify educational services that would be appropriate in a general education setting.

Specific examples of how faculty support candidate reflection, critical thinking and problem solving were found in onsite exhibits such as Supporting Reflection, Critical Thinking, Problem Solving and Dispositions. For example, at the initial level candidates "...reflect on teaching competencies and dispositions at various points in program, using self-evaluation forms, and engage in discussion with mentors and supervisors." This example was also verified in interviews with faculty and candidates. Current candidates, as well as graduates, noted their appreciation for the openness of faculty to give feedback and assistance with any issue. As one candidate stated, "The detailed feedback was not frightening, but my chance to gain knowledge and to grow." They report that they feel ready and eager to enter classrooms and that the preparation in coursework and field and clinical experiences allow them to meet the needs of today's students. P-12 cooperating teachers also voiced this sentiment. Program completers, cooperating teachers and current candidates referenced specific examples such as the ability to attend professional development workshops with instructors, the RTR program and the ability to work for an entire year in one classroom as keys to their success.

As stated in the unit addendum and validated in interviews with faculty, initial and advanced coursework are aligned to professional, state and institutional standards. Examples of this alignment were noted in the addendum and include the creation of a TPE Rubric highlighting the Common Core. Standards are referenced in course syllabi and evidenced via the exhibit, Syllabus Highlighted Common Core and ELD, as well as validated in faculty interviews.

Scholarly work of unit faculty is varied and includes publications, research, grants and membership in professional organizations. The Scholarly Achievement Chart for T-TT faculty lists this work from 2011-2014. With an n of 38, results show 12 books published, 27 peer reviewed articles and 213 presentations, peer-reviewed and/or invited, to name a few.

Ten grants have been awarded to the unit as stated in the Unit Grant Descriptions (2013-2014). One example is that of an Autism Clinic, begun in the fall of 2003. This is an interdisciplinary clinic for candidates to work in cross-disciplinary teams with families and children with autism. As discussed onsite in the unit overview presentation, the unit has just been awarded a five-year multimillion-dollar Teacher Quality Partnership Grant for the Promoting Rural Improvement in Secondary Mathematics and Science (PRISMS) project. Two focus areas of this project are increasing the pool of teachers in math, science, English and special education in rural schools and supporting teachers in implementing the Common Core and science standards.

The offsite report requested evidence of professional sharing of faculty as it pertains to the current two overarching goals of the unit: supporting students with special needs, and supporting English learners. Examples of how these goals fostered professional development and sharing were outlined in a chart found in the unit addendum describing initial workshops in the area of assistive technology and follow up meetings from the fall of 2013 through the spring of 2014. As verified in interviews, faculty noted that this experience resulted in changes in coursework, such as a focus on IEP development.

As stated in the offsite report, service is a primary responsibility of faculty. This area is evidenced via multiple partnerships. The Office of Outreach, Research and Grants (ORG) currently manages ten projects serving P-12 students and provides professional development. Additional examples of collaboration with P-12 partners were detailed in the addendum exhibit, Examples of Partnerships, and were validated in interviews with faculty and P-12 personnel as well as highlighted in the overall unit presentation. One such collaboration involves faculty, supervisors, staff and family members feeding the homeless at the Torres Shelter once every month.

As noted in the offsite report, assessments of faculty performance are outlined in the unit's Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (FPPP) documents. These documents are based on Title V regulations as well as a Collective Bargaining Agreement. Each department develops individual retention-promotion-tenure (RTP) policies aligned with the FPPP, which are then approved by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs. An RTP calendar for all departments is developed yearly and includes unit faculty to be reviewed, the type of review, and timelines for evidence/reports. As noted in the summary of results in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service, 15 faculty members have undergone performance evaluations during the past three years. Faculty are rated using four performance levels: Inadequate, Adequate, Effective and Superior. Of the 15 faculty evaluated, 80% earned a rating of superior in teaching, 93% earned a rating of effective or superior in research, and 87% were rated superior in service.

Faculty are committed to improvements in teaching, scholarship and service. One example of this commitment is through faculty reflection based on multiple areas of evidence from candidates. At the initial level, these include Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs), syllabi and feedback on candidate work. These assessments are utilized to set new goals and actions. Examples of changes occurring based on the data analysis include preparing candidates to participate in PLCs and utilizing resource teachers (7-12) as guest speakers in courses. Another example cited in faculty interviews involved the addition of online courses in special education, with a focus on writing behavior plans and understanding the IEP process.

As outlined in the Professional Development Funding Guidelines, the unit supports opportunities for faculty to develop new knowledge and skills. In addition to a beginning professional development amount of \$2000, new faculty are provided \$1800 per year and a 3-unit course release for the first two years with eight hundred dollars per year for professional development for T-TT faculty. Grants are also available through external and internal organizations such as the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT). In interviews, faculty stated that the professional development support results in improved learning for them as well as for their candidates and the P-12 students. They also noted that they are many more opportunities than they currently have the time to pursue.

Informal mentoring and collaboration of faculty occurs in myriad ways. As noted in interviews with unit faculty, meetings throughout the year of faculty in different programs offer opportunities to collaborate and share ideas and resources. Faculty in advanced programs meet monthly to discuss ways to better support students. For example, currently faculty are exploring ideas for the improvement of writing, with a specific focus on working with writing proficiency for international students. Fall and spring retreats offer more formal ways for all faculty to analyze data and goal progress and to set the focus for upcoming changes in order to improve learning.

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

The unit identified two elements of Standard 5 for moving toward target. These include qualified faculty and unit facilitation of professional development.

As noted above unit faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in multiple ways. Faculty have been recognized as outstanding by various entities. Specific examples include awards such as the Chico Exemplary Online Instruction Awards and the State Farm Award for Service-Learning: Excellence in Teacher Education (2009). Unit faculty provide presentations for the Center of Learning and Teaching. One focus of these presentations is workshops on ideas and skills to support English Language Learners. As noted in Start-up Professional Development Workshop Feedback: Three Modes of Communication to Support

English Learners (2014), P-12 partners and other colleagues attending noted that they gained new knowledge regarding strategies to support English learners.

Adjusting assessments and instructional practices to meet the needs of candidate learning occurs in multiple ways. For example, initial programs have developed policies to support struggling students such as tutoring sessions. At the advanced levels, a course to support candidates' writing was developed to meet the needs of candidates struggling with research writing and APA style. Additional plans include that of introducing co-teaching pilots across all initial programs starting in fall 2014. Plans for interdisciplinary collaborations called VECTORS and built around unit-wide themes are slated for 2014-15. Regarding faculty changes based on data, the addition of a mentor and mentoring checklist for new faculty has resulted in providing additional support.

Collaborative and cross-discipline work occurs through the unit. These include grade-level teams, lesson study and video-based reflections. Unit faculty secured over \$4 million in external funds for the 2013-14 school year and \$15 million in funds overall since 2008. Faculty report that they feel "... honored and privileged to be a part" of the unit because of its focus on excellence in teaching; not only at the local level but also at the state, national and international levels. This focus on future needs of tomorrow's educators as well as civic engagement in social issues such as the service projects cited above were noted as strengths for the unit.

The unit has policies and practices that encourage all professional education faculty to be continuous learners. For example, unit faculty attended professional development on the Common Core State Standards and implementation timelines of P-12 partners. As a result of this learning, unit faculty created assignments using these standards and invited P-12 partners (specifically science teachers) to view lessons based on Next Generation Science Standards. A presentation to a P-12 school board was another connection made following this lesson debriefing in order to build community understanding.

A timeline with specific actions for future goals in the areas of qualified faculty and facilitation of professional development was provided in the unit addendum and verified in interviews with faculty. Examples of these plans include:

Fall 2014-Spring 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Professional Development for faculty increases. Ongoing support continues from the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT) in the form of workshops and other supports.- Department Chairs Leadership Institute begins. Chairs, chair-elects, and associate chairs are encouraged to consider applying. Institute focuses on developing leadership skills that should directly benefit individuals in current and future leadership roles. Participants, each of whom will receive \$750 for professional development or stipend for participation in the program.- Internal research grants announced
-----------------------	--

Spring 2015	<p>5a. Qualified faculty. New Academic plan is drafted based upon results of APC report. The draft will include university-wide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - philosophy on faculty expectations that emphasizes the teacher-scholar model - articulation and clarification of faculty expectations - a focus on faculty renewal and support
Spring 2015	<p>5a. Qualified faculty. RTP alignment and cross-departmental mentoring. Conversation across departments in the college (Dean and Chairs meetings) and in the unit (EP Unit) meetings. Draft template of RTP document to be completed in spring.</p>

5.2.b.i Strengths

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

Unit faculty model the conceptual framework of preparing educators who are effective, reflective and engaged. Continuous learning is valued at all levels of the unit. Faculty report that they are encouraged and supported in trying new things such as online options using technology and coursework partnerships in which special education and general education courses are blended into one so that faculty can teach in collaboration. Another example of the commitment by the unit and by the university with regard to continuous learning is in the area of diversity. As referenced in interviews with unit faculty, the Director of the Office of Diversity, and the Director of International Training; all faculty (both tenured track and part time as well as P-12 partners) have access to multiple learning opportunities. Two opportunities include the two week summer Diversity Academy and a year-long Diversity Certification, which meets four hours each month. This learning has resulted in increasing faculty knowledge of diverse populations as well as in the integration of this knowledge into their coursework and field and clinical experiences.

5.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

Not applicable

5.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

Not applicable

5.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

Not applicable

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 5 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 5 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 5: Met

STANDARD 6: UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

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

6.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The School of Education, located in the College of Communication and Education (CME), is responsible for the unit. Exhibit 6.4.b.2 provides the organizational chart for all programs in the unit. The dean of CME is responsible for academic policy, administration of instructional and research resources, and fiscal and personnel management. The director of the School of Education (SOE) is a 0.6 FTE assignment and also has a 0.4 FTE assignment as associate dean of CME. The director of SOE reports to the dean of SOE and is responsible for the administration of policies of the university, college, and school; assigning of faculty workload; evaluating faculty and staff; preparing and administering the SOE's budget; and providing leadership in program and curriculum development. The role of the director as head of the unit was clarified in interviews with university administrators and in evidence provided in the IR Addendum. Program coordinators meet monthly. There is an SOE Governance Council whose members include elected members from all program levels, faculty at large, staff, lecturers, and the Credential Analyst. This group meets twice monthly with pathway coordinators to make policy recommendations for the SOE. The governance organizational chart is found in Exhibit 6.4.b.1. The university and the unit provide a range of services for candidates including advising, a wellness center, a counseling center, an accessibility resource center, and a career center. There is a preprogram advisor for all candidates seeking admission to the SOE. Once admitted to the SOE, each candidate is assigned an academic advisor. Graduate candidates and those seeking an advanced credential are advised by their program coordinators and program faculty.

The unit's recruiting and admission practices can be found in publications and catalogs. Academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading policies, and advertising appear to be accurate and current. Many of these are available on their website (<http://www.csuchico.edu/index.shtml>).

Evidence provided in Exhibits 6.4.f.1, 6.4.g.1, and 6.4.g.2 and onsite interviews with the chief financial officer, provost, and SOE administrators indicate that the budget is adequate to support the preparation of professional educators and is comparable to similar units on campus that have a clinical component in their programs. Funding is tied to FTES with consideration given to lecture, lab, lower division, upper division and graduate FTES; administrative support, technology, majors, and special needs.

Faculty workload is a collectively bargained agreement (CBA) between the faculty union and the CSU system. That workload is 24 WTUs (weighted teaching units) per year equivalent to four

three-credit classes per semester or three three-credit classes and supervision. Course release can also be "bought" through grant funding.

Unit facilities include an autism clinic, a speech and hearing clinic, and a kinesiology pedagogy lab. "Smart" classrooms are outfitted with laptop carts, Smartboards, Swvl cameras, and modular furniture. All candidates have access to physical and virtual classrooms, computer labs, library resources, including curriculum resources found in Meriam Library, and distance learning. The unit allocates about \$45,000 a year for technology investments. Interviews with SOE personnel and candidates described one of those investments as the purchase of video cameras for candidates to check out and use for videotaping the lesson required for PACT.

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

6.2.b Continuous Improvement

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The two departments that housed the majority of programs in the unit at the time of the initial accreditation visit have been merged into a single unit called the School of Education. There is a new organizational structure, governing policies and practices – including shared governance, a new constitution, and the SOE: Personnel Policies and Procedures which includes the Ratings for Tenure and Promotion (RTP). Other policies that have been adopted include professional travel guidelines and a new Student Evaluation of Teaching instrument. Documentation was available and interviews with university administrators, SOE faculty, and administrators provided evidence of the collaborative efforts that led to these changes.

The unit has added additional leadership positions including an associate dean of teacher education (0.4 FTE), an elected director of the SOE (0.6 FTE), an elected assistant director (0.2 FTE), and a director of assessment and accreditation with variable release. Additional staff positions have also been added: assessment coordinator, credential analyst trainee, field placement coordinator, pre-program advisor, grants office coordinator, five project assistants, two recruiters, and two full-time technology support staff.

Every department in the unit has an advisory board. The advisory board typically meets once or twice a year. There is also an SOE Advisory Board that meets twice yearly. All department web pages are updated regularly. The education programs have become more involved in university-wide recruitment efforts with a focus on diversity. A specially designed degree audit program to allow credential candidates to monitor their progress is being piloted this year.

B6.2.b.i Strengths

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

Not Applicable.

6.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

Not applicable

6.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

Not applicable

6.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

Not applicable

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 6 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 6 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 6: Met

CTC Common Standards requirements not reflected in NCATE Unit Standards

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

The credential analysts ensure that all candidates have met requirements prior to being recommended for a credential. For the Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Education Specialists programs, a candidate file is kept by the School of Education beginning at the time of entry to the program. A copy of the file is sent to the credential analyst once the candidate enters Phase Two of the program. Candidate progress is tracked on a spreadsheet to ensure that candidates have completed all program requirements. For the Pupil Personnel Services Credential in School Psychology, candidate files are kept in the psychology department and for the Speech and Language Pathology credential candidate files are kept in the Department of Communication Arts and Sciences until the candidate has completed required coursework and clinical practice requirements, at which time the files are sent to the credential analysts for a final review and recommendation for a credential.

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

CSU Chico has a single Academic Advisor for Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Education Specialist who provides general information about program requirements for all prospective and new candidates. Program requirements are in student handbooks which are available online. Candidates receive one-on-one advising as needed. Candidates and program completers indicated in interviews that they were well advised of all the program requirements. Faculty advisors are also available to assist candidates with academic, professional and personal

development. Candidates reported that they felt well supported and were able to ask questions and get accurate answers in a timely manner.

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

Program information is available in several forms to guide candidates' attainment of all program requirements for each credential offered at CSU Chico. The University Catalog has the official requirements for entry into, and completion of all programs, and the catalog is available on-line. Student handbooks for credential programs are kept up-to-date with information on courses, fieldwork expectations and roles and responsibilities of candidates, coordinating teachers and university supervisors. These are also available online. A review of print and online information sources confirmed that all sources provided current, accurate, and consistent information about requirements for all credential programs.

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

Candidates are assessed at key transition points throughout the program and only those candidates who meet these criteria are allowed to progress. Candidates who are not making appropriate progress in meeting program requirements are provided additional support and assistance. Initial assistance is provided through interventions by faculty and/or fieldwork supervisors. In cases where candidates continue to struggle, formal support and remediation plans are developed and implemented. In the event that a candidate is not able to make progress following assistance efforts or cannot successfully complete a remediation plan, the candidate is dropped from the program. During interviews, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and program faculty provided examples of candidates who responded to support efforts and were able to successfully complete the program as well as candidates who were not allowed to continue in the program due to lack of progress.

Findings:

Standard 1.5: **Met**

Standard 6.1 – 6.3: **Met**

TEACHING CREDENTIAL PROGRAMS

Preliminary Multiple Subjects Credential

Program Design:

The Multiple Subjects (MS) Credential Program is comprised of four credential pathways and is located in the School of Education (SOE) under the leadership of the SOE director and the pathways coordinators. The four MS Program pathways include: MS (traditional and Intern), MS with Bilingual Authorization, Concurrent MS/Education Specialist, and Rural Teacher Residency (RTR). [The Concurrent MS/Education Specialist program is referenced in the Education Specialist credential report.] The RTR pathway utilized an intensive co-teaching model and designed curricula to focus specifically on the needs of schools in rural settings. The program was supported through grant funding, which ends with this academic year. While the RTR program will not be continuing after June, SOE leaders point to the success of the co-teaching model and plan to incorporate it into the Multiple and Single Subjects credential programs. Program leaders are currently developing partnership agreements for field placement sites that will implement the co-teaching model beginning fall, 2015.

The MS Credential is a three-semester program with a designed sequence of coursework that focuses on the context of schools, learners, and effective pedagogy practices. The field experience includes two student teaching experiences, Practicum I and II, at different grade levels—with at least one of those placements in a linguistically diverse classroom.

Candidates and program completers spoke highly of their experiences in the MS credential program. Candidates shared how the program integrates theory from coursework with implementation in the field experience. Several of the program completers and credential candidates reported starting the first day of school in their first field placement and ending the school year in their second placement. They explained participating in two classrooms was very helpful and made them feel competent and comfortable in their own classrooms. The Rural Teaching Residency (RTR) candidates shared how they liked their program because they stayed in one classroom as co-teachers all year.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):

Candidates in all MS pathways experience their preparation through a course sequence Block Plan that provides for developmental sequencing of learning experiences along with the flexibility to meet some of the personal needs of candidates. The course sequence begins with essential prerequisite or related knowledge and understandings. While awareness of, and strategies for meeting the needs of English learners and special populations is threaded throughout the program, these critical areas are a primary focus during prerequisite coursework for both candidates and Interns.

Candidates must complete a 45-hour Early Field Experience course prior to admission to the program. Once admitted, they complete two semesters of pedagogical coursework and two

supervised practica. All MS pathways value extended, supervised, experiences in schools for credential candidates. Over the course of their second and third semesters, candidates in all MS pathways experience over 800 hours of student teaching.

Student teaching experiences are organized in such a way that candidates experience all phases of a school year on-site, including the opening of the school year, staff development days, and parent conference days. Opportunities to observe, acquire and utilize professional knowledge, skills and dispositions are provided through the field experience, as candidates take increasing responsibility for instructional planning, differentiating instruction, assessing student learning, and reflecting on the results of assessment to inform future planning and teaching.

During field placements, candidates have numerous opportunities to plan and practice multiple strategies for managing and delivering instruction. Candidates complete individual teaching assignments and are observed formally and informally by cooperating teachers and university supervisors. Candidates and program completers reported that field placements enabled them to make connections between pedagogy courses and field-based experiences.

Candidates and Interns are observed regularly by their cooperating teachers/mentors, and reported receiving a high level of support from cooperating teachers/mentors and university supervisors. In addition, they are visited and observed a minimum of eight times by their university supervisor. At specific points in each teaching practicum, formal three-way conferences are held among the candidate, cooperating teacher/mentor and university supervisor to discuss candidate progress, identify challenges and plan for improvement. These conferences also provide opportunities to review candidate effectiveness in applying teaching strategies in relation to California academic content standards, curriculum frameworks, and student needs, interests and accomplishments. Candidates also self-evaluate their progress at the end of each teaching practicum. Additionally, cooperating teachers/mentors and university supervisors evaluate candidates' performance using the *Practicum & Disposition Midterm/Final Evaluation*, which are guided by the *Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) and Dispositions Rubrics*.

During interviews, Multiple Subjects candidates and program completers shared the various ways they receive feedback, such as observations, exit surveys, three way conferences and face-to-face sessions with university supervisors. Candidates and completers shared how valuable the observations were to them and how much they learned about the TPE's and rubrics after each evaluation. The observations served both as feedback and support to the candidates and as a reminder of what cooperating teachers need to model in working with candidates.

Cooperating teachers interviewed at the visit stressed the quality of communication that exists between the district and the University. They believe the faculty and university supervisors are always accessible and supportive. The cooperating teachers feel that they are valued partner

with the SOE because their concerns are heard, and they see the program improving as a result of their feedback to the program. Several cooperating teachers also praised the collaboration opportunities provided by the program during fall and spring gatherings and commented on the high quality of presentations offered during these events.

Assessment of Candidates:

Along with course- and field-based assessments designed to measure candidates' progress on specific TPEs, field-based teaching and dispositions evaluations completed by cooperating teachers/mentors and supervisors at the midpoint and end of each semester measure how well the candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills associated with each of the TPEs, based on classroom observations. The combination of course-embedded assessments and the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) Teaching Event (TE) provides both formative and comprehensive summative assessment data aligned to the TPEs. The multiple measures allow for triangulation of data in the aggregate and by individual candidate.

Candidates and Interns in all pathways are informed of program expectations, including the PACT Teaching Event, and the resources available through an initial program orientation meeting prior to the beginning of their program and prior to their second practicum experience, through the appropriate multiple subject pathway handbook and through clear course syllabi that link objectives and assessments to TPEs. Additional information regarding PACT is also provided throughout their courses and special PACT seminars. Candidates are given many opportunities to ask questions and seek clarification throughout their program

Candidates and graduates of the MS Credential program shared how well they are prepared to pass required examinations and to meet a wide range of student needs. As one candidate commented, "I feel [Chico] prepared me to be successful." The classes and field experience have provided the support and scaffolding candidates need to be successful in their own classrooms. Cooperating teachers affirmed that the candidates they received in field placements were well-prepared for their roles as beginning teachers.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews with candidates, graduates of MS Credential Program as well as faculty, university supervisors, employers and members of advisory boards, the team determined that all program standards for the Multiple Subjects credential are **Met**.

Preliminary Single Subjects Credential

Program Design:

The Single Subject Program is located in the School of Education under the leadership of the SOE director and the Single Subject program coordinator. The program coordinator chairs meetings of the Single Subject Program faculty and supervisors, and also chairs the Subject Matter Preparation

Program Advisors, who meet at least once per semester to share information about the credential program, changes in admission requirements, and updates from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Candidates complete the requirements for the Single Subject Credential in a three-semester program that includes a carefully designed sequence of coursework focusing on the context of schools, the learners, and effective pedagogical practices. Their developing understandings and skills are applied in three field experiences: Early Field Experience and Teaching Practicum I and II, at least one of which is in a linguistically diverse classroom. Learning activities in courses and field-based experiences provide for transfer of theory to practice as candidates apply effective instructional strategies and practices. The infusion model, in which topics are introduced explicitly in specific courses then addressed in greater detail and related to teaching and learning in subsequent courses and practica, ensures that candidates' understanding of teaching and learning processes is continually interrelated and reinforced.

The School of Education Advisory Board provides support, feedback, resources, and guidance to enhance the quality and development of credential programs. Single Subject program cooperating teachers are also encouraged to offer feedback on candidates and the program through focus group events such as Partners in Education (PIE) and by completing surveys on program quality and processes. Feedback is sought from Single Subject candidates by a variety of means including exit surveys, candidate focus groups and in face-to-face sessions with university supervisors. Graduates provide additional feedback through completion of the CSU Exit Survey at the end of their programs and at the end of their first year of teaching through their and their supervisors' responses to the CSU System-wide Evaluation of First Year Teachers.

Interviews with employers, SOE Advisory Board members, candidates and program completers all indicated that the program design was effective in producing high quality graduates. The Single Subject program effectively utilizes an Advisory Board that meets often to provide feedback and direction to the program. Furthermore, several of the subject areas have their own advisory boards (i.e., Adapted PE and Ag Specialist). A review of program handbooks and other advisement materials confirmed that the program is well-planned and that candidates are well-informed of all program requirements. Candidates and completers reported that faculty and support staff were available to provide effective advice and assistance throughout the program. Measures are in place to regularly assess the program's design and make adjustments to the program as needed. Training and other support measures are in place to prepare university supervisors and cooperating teachers for their roles while working with teacher candidates. Members of the Single Subject community (i.e. coordinator, supervisors, and faculty) meet frequently to review, discuss, and suggest improvements to the program.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):

Candidates are expected to complete 14 units (five courses) of prerequisite courses before being admitted to the program (usually completed as an undergraduate). Program coursework is organized in two semester-long phases, each with its own set of student teaching activities (Practicum I and Practicum II). Practicum I involves ten weeks of student

teaching. Candidates also are concurrently enrolled in three courses during Practicum I that support their 10 week student teaching experience. Practicum II follows the secondary school semester program for a full 15 weeks, usually involving 4-5 hours per day minimum on a secondary school campus. During this time, candidates are concurrently involved in EDT 536 (pedagogy specific to subject matter of the disciple) and EDT 537 (seminar course in which the content is driven by data and student survey). To accommodate the full-time schedule of the two teaching practica, coursework in the Single Subject program is offered in both weeknight and weekend formats. Coursework and field experience for candidates in both the Single Subject and Single Subject Internship pathways is organized and scheduled in such a way to provide for developmental sequencing of learning experiences along with the flexibility to meet some of the personal scheduling needs of candidates and Interns.

The Single Subject credential program values extended, supervised, full-time experiences in schools for credential candidates. During the first semester of the credential program, candidates also take a daytime course during the last five weeks of the semester after completion of the ten-week practicum. They are encouraged to continue visiting their placement sites on a part-time basis during this time.

Strategies for meeting the needs of English learners and special populations are threaded throughout the program. In addition to the 45-hour field experience that candidates complete prior to admission to the program, candidates complete supervised placements throughout an entire academic year and experience all phases of a school year on-site, including the opening of the school year, staff development days, and parent conference days.

Throughout the program, candidates are required to complete projects that provide valid and reliable documentation that they are acquiring skills to serve pupils across a range of age and grade levels. Professional education courses in the second semester closely coordinate with experiences in secondary school classrooms. During both teaching practica, candidates have numerous opportunities to plan and implement multiple strategies for managing and delivering instruction.

During interviews, candidates and program completers frequently praised the quality of instruction in credential coursework and the expertise of program faculty. They reported that field experiences that were linked to specific courses were well-designed, and relevant to their instructional needs. Candidates and completers expressed they gained valuable experiences prior to beginning their first semester of credential courses via the prerequisite coursework. Interviews at the site visit provided clear evidence that the Single Subject credential program is effectively organized and that program completers have a good grasp of their roles as teachers, as well their individual subject matter areas. Interviews with candidates, university and district field supervisors, and program completers indicated candidates were well supervised during the field experiences, with at least a minimum of four site visits during each phase of student teaching.

Interviews with program leaders, faculty, and current Interns confirmed that all CTC Intern requirements are being met. A number of current Interns reported waiting to apply for positions until they had completed the first semester of coursework, and they reported being well-prepared for teaching—both in their subject areas and in working with English Learners. Those Interns who began full-time teaching in the first semester of coursework reported being sufficiently well-prepared for taking on teaching responsibilities but acknowledged that the significant workload associated with taking courses while teaching full time. Both groups reported satisfaction with university supervisor and site mentor support.

Assessment of Candidates:

All Single Subject credential candidates are expected to pass all sections of the Performance Assessment of California Teachers (PACT). Candidates are assessed multiple times in the program, during both Practicum I and Practicum II. A final assessment of teacher candidates is done at the completion of the Practicum II activity, along with course and field-based assessments designed to measure candidates' progress on specific TPEs, field-based teaching and dispositions. These are completed by mentors and clinical coordinators at the midpoint, and end of each semester. The combination of course-embedded assessments and the PACT Teaching Event (TE) provides both formative and comprehensive summative assessment data aligned to the TPEs.

Candidates and program completers indicated that there were numerous times when they were assessed during both phases of student teaching. The primary assessment in Practicum I is a two-week teaching event that focus intensively on quality teaching. The PACT is used as the summative assessment for both Practicum II and for the overall program. Faculty reported using the PACT assessment data to better inform changes to the Single Subjects credential program. Candidates and completers reported being uniformly well-supported during their courses and field work activities.

Findings on Standards:

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

Bilingual Added Authorization

Program Design:

The Bilingual Crosscultural Professional Preparation Pathway (B/CPPP) is located in the School of Education (SOE) and leads to a Multiple or Single Subjects Credential with Bilingual Authorization. Program candidates are prepared to teach in bilingual/crosscultural classrooms in a variety of educational settings that provide primary language instruction, English Language Development (ELD) and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) for linguistically diverse students. The program promotes strategies to foster language development, enhance crosscultural understanding, and address the academic needs of English

Learners (ELs). The pathway is organized into a two-semester plan consisting of professional education courses along with field experiences in the classroom. The program is designed so that students learn about language, culture, and development as they implement multicultural curricula through cultural relevant pedagogy.

Credential candidates and program completers praised the program, reporting that they liked starting the first day of school in one placement and ending the school year in a second placement. They also stressed the coordination between the classes and the field experience as a program strength. The classes cover theory and often have assignments in which the candidates need to implement or collect data in their field experience. Candidates explained how they planned lessons as part of their coursework and then had the opportunity to implement them in their own field experience classrooms. Candidates and completers felt all coursework and field experience was very helpful and made them feel competent and comfortable in their own classrooms. Employers reported the candidates are well prepared and are excellent teachers.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):

Before admission to the B/CPPP, candidates must complete a series of Spanish courses leading up to Grammar and Composition; they also choose between Introduction to Latin American Studies or Culture and Civilization (taught in Spanish).

Candidates have two courses on Latino culture, as well as insight into sociocultural issues between the mainstream society and the Latino community, as well as experiences of linguistic and cultural minorities in the context of educational policy, school law, program options, and the social purposes of education. In the program, candidates are provided with a framework to infuse multicultural education throughout the curriculum, develop instructional units, and implement strategies that enable ELs to access academic content and promote academic language development. In the methods and assessment courses for Multiple Subjects candidates are introduced to culturally relevant pedagogy. Courses linked with field experiences provide a forum for collectively discussing and reflecting upon the effectiveness of strategies learned. Candidates in the Bilingual Pathway complete supervised placements throughout an entire academic year, with the first placement being for a ten-week period and the second placement for a 15-week period.

The program model not only addresses student achievement but also helps candidates to support their students in accepting and affirming their own cultural identity while developing critical perspectives that challenge inequities perpetuated by schools. The model's three criteria are: academic success, cultural competence, and critical or sociopolitical consciousness. Evidence gathered at the site visit indicated that program faculty and university supervisors advise and guide candidates throughout the credential process, and candidate and completers confirmed the effectiveness of program support. Candidates, completers, cooperating teachers and employers all confirmed the value of the support they received from university supervisors. Program completers shared they felt they were well prepared to plan, implement and

differentiate instruction. Candidates, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers reported that candidates reflect on the TPE's after each observation, and that these reflections served as scaffolds to support the candidates in feeling confident about their learning experiences.

Assessment of Candidates:

The CSU, Chico Bilingual/Crosscultural Professional Preparation Pathway uses a combination of measures to assess language proficiency. Candidate performance in Spanish language courses, the Applicant Interview Process and the CBMS Spanish Language Exam are all considered in order to meet this standard and identify the students' level of language proficiency prior to admission into the program. Candidates for admission who are bilingual in English and a language other than Spanish must pass the language and culture specific California Subject Examinations for Teachers: Languages Other Than English (CSET: LOTE).

During field experiences, candidates are informally observed and evaluated daily by their cooperating teachers. In addition, they are observed and evaluated a minimum of four times by their university supervisor in each field experience placement. At specific points in teaching practica, formal three-way conferences are held among the candidate, cooperating teacher and university supervisor to discuss candidate progress, identify challenges and develop a plan for improvement. These meetings also serve as a means to review candidate effectiveness in applying teaching strategies in relation to California academic content standards, curriculum frameworks, and as an opportunity to discuss candidate needs, interests, and accomplishments. The combination of course-embedded assessments and the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) Teaching Event (TE) provides both formative and comprehensive summative assessment data aligned to the TPEs. The multiple measures allow for triangulation of data in the aggregate and by individual candidate.

During interviews, candidates shared they feel well prepared to pass their Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Program completers reported the program prepared them well for passing all required assessments including TPEs and the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA). University supervisors and program faculty interviews provided multiple examples of how the candidates are supported throughout the program. Cooperating teachers reported that they participate in workshops where they review the TPE and disposition rubrics to help them support and assess the candidates better. University supervisors and assessment coordinator shared how the candidates are assessed with Content Area Tasks (CATs), PACT and TPEs. Candidates must pass the PACT to complete their second placement.

Findings on Standards:

After a review of the institutional report and documentation, conducting interviews with faculty, university supervisors, employers, graduates and candidates, the team determined that all standards for the Bilingual Added Authorization are **Met**.

Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization

Program Design

The Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization (APEAA) program is designed to prepare physical education teachers to provide effective instruction to individuals with disabilities. The authorization is offered through the Kinesiology Department at CSU Chico. Candidates seeking the added authorization are required to have a bachelor's degree and a teaching credential authorizing the teaching of physical education. The most common pathway for candidates seeking the added authorization at CSU Chico is to complete required coursework in adapted physical education as part of an undergraduate degree program in Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE), which is a CTC-approved waiver program. On graduating, these candidates enroll in the Single Subject credential program in physical education to complete credential coursework and APE added authorization field experience requirements. The Adaptive PE program utilizes an individual Advisory Board that provides feedback and direction to the Adaptive PE credential program.

Candidates wishing to enter the added authorization program from other pathways (e.g., Multiple Subjects or Education Specialist credential holders, or holders of undergraduate degrees in Adapted Physical Education without teaching credentials) must provide evidence of physical education content knowledge through completion of additional coursework and/or passage of the CSET in physical education, in addition to meeting other program requirements. Candidates entering the program already holding Single Subject credentials in physical education meet APEAA requirements through program coursework and APE-specific field experiences.

Interviews with program completers indicated the program design was effective. They felt well prepared to enter the teaching profession. The APE program handbook and other advisement materials provide clear and consistent information about program admission and completion requirements. Completers stated the faculty and support staff were available to assist with their progress through the program. Measures were in place to assess the program's design and make adjustments to the program.

Course of Study (coursework and field experience)

In addition to completing all coursework requirements for obtaining a Single Subject credential in physical education, APEAA candidates must complete 21 units of Kinesiology coursework focused on providing instruction to individuals with disabilities. Topics include children with disabilities, disability sports, collaboration in APE, motor assessment for individuals with disabilities, and an autism clinic. Following successful completion of these courses, candidates complete an additional field experience course in APE. All program courses have fieldwork requirements or key assignments requiring application of course content in a variety of settings.

During the second semester of Single Subjects credential field experience, APE candidates spend one-half of their student teaching assignment working with a cooperating teacher in

general physical education and the other half of their assignment with a cooperating teacher in adapted physical education. During this semester, candidates are supervised by both an education university supervisor and an APE university supervisor. Candidates who already hold a Single Subject credential in physical education are only required to complete field experience requirements in an APE setting.

During interviews, candidates and program completers frequently praised the quality of instruction in credential coursework, and the expertise of program faculty. Candidates and completers reported that they gained valuable experiences prior to beginning Phase I via the prerequisite coursework. They also reported that the field experiences linked to specific courses were well-designed, and relevant to their instructional needs, with several identifying their experiences in the Autism Clinic as being particularly valuable. The two semesters of the graduate program are effectively organized to produce candidates who had a good grasp of their roles as Adapted Physical Education teachers in working with students with disabilities.

Assessment of Candidates

In addition to passing all sections of the PACT teaching event in physical education, which is required of all Single Subject credential program candidates, APEAA candidates demonstrate competency in a number of other ways. Program coursework includes a set of key assignments that provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate competency in knowledge and skills required by CTC standards. Candidates also demonstrate competency through evaluations conducted by university supervisors at four points during the APE field experience. The program-specific key assessment for the APEAA requires that candidates create an eight-week unit plan to prepare students for the Special Olympics Track and Field Competition. Summative assessments for the program include submission of a final portfolio and an exit interview with the APEAA Program Coordinator that focuses on candidates' personal development and their ability to apply program content to a variety of teaching situations.

Candidates and program completers reported numerous times when they were being assessed numerous times throughout the program. Faculty reported using the final assessment to inform changes to the APE program. Candidates and completers felt supported during their courses, and that believe field work activities, and key assessments have strengthened their abilities as teachers. Current candidates praised the support they received from their university supervisors and their cooperating teachers in both regular and adapted physical education placements.

Findings on Standards:

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

Agriculture Specialist Credential

Program Design:

The Agriculture Specialist Credential program is housed in the College of Agriculture. The Agriculture Specialist program has a designated faculty program coordinator who coordinates the program with the School of Education, and handles the administrative responsibilities of the Agriculture Specialist program. At CSU Chico, the Agriculture Specialist credential is generally completed concurrently with a Single Subject credential in agriculture.

The Agriculture Specialist program has its own Advisory Board. The Advisory Board is made up of subject matter faculty (e.g.; Ag Business), practicing agricultural teachers and administrators, and industry representatives. In addition to an advisory role, this group interviews all credential candidates. Faculty in the program also supervise student teachers in Practicum II. The agriculture education faculty meet regularly to discuss issues and revise and improve the program. Furthermore, the faculty are highly engaged in Agricultural Education at the state and national levels, which helps ensure that the Ag Specialist program provides candidates with current information about agricultural policy and practices.

A well-developed series of courses and field base activities meet the program standards required for the Ag Specialist credential program. During Practicum II (15 week student teaching experience) candidates must be placed at schools that are approved by the California Department of Education. This often requires extensive travel for both the candidate, and the university supervisors.

Interviews with employers, Agriculture Specialist Advisory Board members, candidates and program completers all indicated the program design was effective in producing high quality graduates. The program is well-designed to meet the needs for highly-skilled agriculture specialists. Program documents, including program and fieldwork handbooks clearly describe program requirements and the sequence of coursework and field experience required to complete all requirements for the Single Subject and Agriculture Specialist credentials. Candidates and completers reported that faculty and support staff were available at all times to assist with their progress through the program.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):

The Agriculture Specialist credential builds on the Single Subject Agriculture credential, but requires 45 additional semester units of technical agriculture coursework. In addition to required coursework, undergraduate and graduate candidates are actively engaged in many high school FFA and leadership training activities sponsored by the institution. A thorough and systematic set of courses (conducted both on campus and during student teaching) addresses each of the 12 Agriculture Specialist Program Standards. During Practicum I, program candidates are supervised by Single Subject university supervisors; and during Practicum II, they are supervised by agricultural education faculty, who support and assess candidates in meeting Agriculture Specialist standards requirements. As mentioned above, field experience sites for

Practicum II are chosen from a list of California Department of Education (CDE) approved Cooperating Schools. Furthermore, program faculty seek to place student teachers at sites that will help strengthen areas in which they need more experience. For example, if a student teacher needs development in the plant science/floral area, a site would be selected with a strong floral program.

During interviews, candidates and program completers frequently praised the quality and expertise of the agricultural education faculty. Candidates and completers reported that they gained valuable experiences prior to beginning Phase I via the prerequisite coursework, particularly in coursework provided by the agriculture education faculty. Coursework and field experiences in the two semesters of the credential program are carefully organized to ensure that candidates not only acquire basic teacher competency, but they also develop the specific skills needed for agricultural educators who must be able to supervise student projects and conduct leadership activities in their roles as agriculture teachers. Evidence from interviews confirmed that candidates were well supervised during the field experiences, with at least a minimum of four site visits during each phase of student teaching.

Assessment of Candidates:

Candidate assessment begins with an interview process provides evidence of each candidate's overall qualifications prior to the entry into the credential program. During the credential program, all candidates participate in the assessments required by the Single Subject credential program, including field-based assessments designed to measure candidates' progress on specific TPEs, field-based teaching, and dispositions evaluations completed by mentors and clinical coordinators at the midpoint and end of each semester. Candidates must also successfully complete all sections of the PACT. In addition, they are assessed by university and site supervisors during Practicum II on requirements specific to the Agriculture Specialist credential. These assessments serve to document candidate competence in Agriculture Specialist standards requirements.

Interviews with candidates and program completers confirmed that they felt well-supported by program faculty in both Single Subject and Agriculture Specialist coursework and by university and site supervisors in both Practicum I and II. Assessments throughout the program kept candidates apprised of their progress and helped them identify areas in which they needed to focus more attention or effort. Interviews with program completers indicated that their preparation enabled them to assume teaching responsibilities with confidence and to take leadership roles in the schools where they were employed.

Findings on Standards:

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

Education Specialist Credential Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe

Program Design:

The Education Specialist (ES) Credential Program is comprised of three credential pathways and is located in the School of Education (SOE) under the joint leadership of the SOE Director and the ES Program Coordinator. Pathways in the Education Specialist Program are: (a) a traditional pathway leading to a Mild/Moderate (M/M) or Moderate/Severe (M/S) authorization, (b) an Intern pathway leading to M/M or M/S authorization, (c) a concurrent pathway leading to a dual authorization of a Multiple Subject Credential and Education Specialist M/M Credential (in which candidates complete all program requirements for both credentials, including field experience in both general and special education). [The program also offered a Rural Teacher Residency (RTR) pathway leading to the ES M/M Credential and Master's Degree in Education. That program was funded by a grant through the end of the 2014-15 academic year, at which time the program will close.] Goals of the program are informed by the SOE conceptual framework (Effective, Reflective, Engaged) and ES program themes including collaboration, case management, Evidence Based Practices (EBP) and inclusion, which was affirmed by various constituents interviewed. A review of evidence submitted during the site visit and interviews with program faculty indicate a current program goal is to increase candidate knowledge and use of assistive technology and increase inclusive teaching practices. These goals are being accomplished through coursework and an annual Inclusion Conference. This conference is open to and attended by candidates in both ES and Multiple and Single Subjects credential programs.

Effectiveness of program design is monitored through ongoing assessment and input from internal and external advisory committees, which meet on a quarterly basis and are comprised of partners that include local district employers, supervisors and numerous program completers. Interviews with the program coordinator and advisory board members indicate meetings are held both face-to-face and remotely. During interviews, partners highlighted the responsiveness of the unit, the culture of open communication in sharing program data, and the receptivity of the unit in implementing partner recommendations for areas of improvement. Candidates are admitted to the programs in fall and spring semesters, and courses are offered during evening and weekends to provide flexibility to candidates, particularly Interns and those in more remote areas served by the unit. Interviews and review of evidence indicate that recent program modifications include offerings of courses in hybrid and online formats to accommodate distance learners and Interns and to accommodate the accelerated program design. Another recent program modification is the creation of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) specific to Education Specialist candidates to monitor entry-level professional skills specific to the role of the Education Specialist (e.g., Individualized Education Program (IEP) case management and transition planning.).

The ES program is designed with common foundational courses for all pathways, with differentiated curriculum and instruction coursework and field experiences based on the ES authorization (M/M or M/S). Faculty and candidates reported that the accelerated program

design makes it conducive to immediate application of learned skills within their field placements. While candidates and cooperating teachers acknowledged the challenging workload associated with the accelerated design, both reported that candidate preparation is not compromised by the design. Integrated within both the M/M and M/S pathways are three courses designed to prepare candidates to effectively teach students with Autism. Until the 2012-13 academic year, this coursework was also offered in a stand-alone program option for the Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization (ASDAA). [Since the ASDAA program has not admitted candidates in the past two academic years, it was not reviewed as an independent authorization during this site visit, and the unit is withdrawing the program.]

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience)

The courses for all ES pathways are organized in a developmental sequence, progressing from foundational knowledge and skills addressed in pre-requisite courses and field experiences, to more advanced knowledge and skills taught through core program courses and field experiences. The Education Specialist TPEs are addressed and assessed within coursework through assignments and through related field experiences. Key skills emphasized in the courses support the ES program themes of collaboration, case management, Evidence Based Practices and inclusion. Through a review of documented evidence and faculty interviews it was confirmed that anchor assessments in core program courses have a common minimum competency requirements of the evaluation rubrics. Teaching skills and strategies for English Learners are integrated into all courses but primarily delivered through a prerequisite course that emphasizes language acquisition and theory. Numerous ES courses have integrated field experience components, which focus on application of skills learned, particularly in the area of case management and curriculum and instruction. Interviews from candidates affirm the rigorous nature of assignments.

Advisement of program requirements is provided to candidates by the Program Coordinator, Program faculty, the Field Placement Director, university supervisors and the credential analyst. Interviews with program faculty and the Fieldwork Director indicated advisement occurs formally during program orientation and continues informally through communication with faculty and the fieldwork director throughout the program (e.g. emails, phone calls, etc.). Interviews with current candidates and Interns indicated they felt well-informed about current program and CTC requirements.

Interviews with program constituents confirmed that candidates experience a variety of field experiences in all stages of the program. Program completers and current candidates spoke highly of the 45 required hours in pre-requisite courses during interviews, which prepared them with relevant skills for program entry. The application of skills specific to ES responsibilities in the field is developed and supported within field experiences. For example, one field experience described during both faculty and supervisor interviews required candidates to implement and monitor a behavior support plan. During both Practicum I and II, candidates receive advice and assistance from program faculty and university supervisor, along with formal advisement from the program coordinator.

Program faculty and supervisors are able to maintain relationships with partner districts, which helps ensure effective field placement options for student teaching. Effectiveness of field placement sites is monitored by survey data collected by the Fieldwork Director and informal feedback obtained from program faculty and university supervisors. Field supervisors and cooperating teachers for candidates (both traditional and concurrent) and Intern mentors are trained and supported by program faculty on an annual basis with additional opportunities for professional development offered through summer workshops (supported by grant funds) and online modules.

During the Practicum experiences, candidates and Interns are informed of their progress through three-way conferences guided by an evaluative and reflective competency assessment instrument. This tool help guides discussions about developing competencies and facilitates areas of improvement planning between the candidates, the university supervisor and the mentor teacher. Formal conferences are held at three points in the program: during an initial meeting prior to the practicum, at the mid-semester point, and a final meeting after the practicum.

Assessment of Candidates:

Documentary and interview evidence confirmed that numerous summative assessment measures are in place to inform candidate progress. In addition to concurrent candidates, CSU Chico requires Education Specialist candidates and Interns to pass the PACT. Candidate performance data is reviewed and shared with program faculty and candidates. Differentiated key assessments specific to the credential authorization area with rubrics that specify minimum proficiency levels are used to ensure candidates are successful with their practicum experiences. Supervisors and cooperating teachers collaborate to collect and analyze candidate performance data aligned to the TPEs and dispositions.

Assessment results are shared with candidates through mechanisms such as grades, clearly defined anchor assignment rubric scores and feedback from university supervisors and cooperating teachers. Candidate TPE and dispositions rubrics were developed by program faculty in collaboration with administrators and P-12 partners. Candidate disposition and TPE scores from supervisors and cooperating teachers are reviewed during monthly meetings with faculty, at which time common areas of need are addressed and troubleshoot collaboratively. A minimum proficiency score must be met prior to clinical practice. Concurrent pathway candidates take the PACT and three Content Area Tasks (CATs) that are scored and calibrated by trained university faculty.

During the program, candidates are guided and coached on their performance in relation to the TPEs using formative processes. Candidates engage in self-evaluation of their TPE proficiencies during the teaching practicum. Self-evaluations are also reviewed at the initial, midway and final 3-way conferences. Assistance for candidates who are unable to meet one or more program requirements occurs through multiple means. For candidates struggling to demonstrate competencies of the TPEs within their practicum and/or courses, a candidate improvement plan form is created. The candidate improvement plan can be initiated by the

university supervisors and/or program faculty. Steps of the action plan are created through candidate self-reflection, with guidance from program faculty. Interviews with candidates and completers indicated that program faculty are also very responsive, supportive and efficient in helping candidates resolve any issues that may arise in successfully completing all program and CTC requirements informally through email, phone calls and in face to face meetings.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards for the Education Specialist credential are **Met**, with the exception of **Moderate/Severe Standard 4: Assessment Program Planning and Instruction, which is Met with Concerns.**

Rationale:

The standard states, “Each candidate is able to develop and implement systematic, evidence-based instructional strategies to teach skills within school, community, and working settings...” In interviews, candidates and cooperating teachers expressed concerns about the relevance of some assignments within field placements, stating that some seemed more appropriate for use in Mild/Moderate settings than for Moderate/Severe settings. Candidates also expressed an interest in learning more teaching strategies geared specifically toward Moderate/Severe students, an interest expressed by cooperating teachers as well.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

Program Design:

Note: The program did not admit students for the 2014-15 academic year. Program leaders are working with CTC staff in order to ensure full compliance with the requirements to offer the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential in accordance with the revised Commission adopted standards.

The Educational Leadership and Administration Program (ELAP) is located in the School of Education under the leadership of the SOE director and the Educational Leadership and Administration program coordinator. Both the director and the program coordinator serve on the School of Education Governance Council, which is the coordinating and internal advisory committee for the School of Education. The program coordinator chairs meetings of the Educational Leadership and Administration Program faculty and supervisors who meet at least once per month to share information about the credential program, changes in admission requirements, and updates from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Curriculum oversight at the university level is provided by the All-University Responsibility for Teacher Education Committee (AURTEC).

The School of Education Advisory Board provides support, feedback, resources, and guidance to enhance the quality and development of credential programs.

The Educational Leadership and Administration Program is organized around the following five leadership roles: Role 1: Leader as Principal Teacher; Role 2: Leader as Purposeful Manager; Role 3: Leader as Inquirer, Reflector, and Connector; Role 4: Leader as Community Organizer; and Role 5: Leader as Change Agent in a Democracy. The leadership roles and accompanying candidate outcomes align with the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs) and California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) program standards.

Candidates complete the requirements for the Educational Leadership and Administration Credential in a two-year cohort system that tracks candidates through a developmental sequence of learning and structured field experiences that meet the requirements for the Preliminary Administrative Services credential and also enable students to obtain a Master's degree in Education, Educational Administration Option. The cohort structure helps candidates acquire networking contacts and skills essential to their success as leaders at the school, district, or county levels. The program also includes a small number of Intern credential holders, who participate in the program along with candidates.

Learning activities in courses and field-embedded experiences provide for transfer of theory to practice. The infusion model, in which topics are introduced explicitly in specific courses then addressed in greater detail and related to teaching and learning in subsequent courses and field-embedded experiences, ensures that candidates' understanding of teaching and learning processes is continually interrelated and reinforced.

Interviews with candidates, the program director and program completers confirm the overall design and structure of the program as a coherent sequence of coursework and experiences leading to competencies in educational leadership and administration. In order to address the need for some flexibility within the cohort model, faculty occasionally make modifications to the coursework sequence in response to individual candidates' needs. While this created some challenges for candidates taking courses or completing field assignments out of sequence, there was no evidence that these modifications interfered with those candidates' successful completion of program requirements.

Completers affirmed the program's balance of theory and practical skills. Completers also noted the effectiveness of the program faculty in broadening candidates' perspectives toward diverse and underserved populations. Program faculty noted the successes of completers as administrators in local districts, as well as significant accomplishments by program candidates in implementing change projects in their school sites.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):

Candidates begin with foundational courses to learn skills for accessing, comprehending, planning and conducting research studies using basic statistics. Further courses cover curriculum

development, instructional design and assessment, educational equity, supervision, staff development, budgeting, and school law. In their last semester, candidates take an extended field-based capstone course along with a companion course in which they synthesize their learning and prepare for the MA in Education comprehensive exam. Candidates have the option of a thesis or project as a culminating activity. To accommodate the full-time schedule of most candidates, coursework in the Educational Leadership and Administration Program is offered in both hybrid-online and weekend formats.

Each course in the EDAD sequence includes field-embedded experiences that provide candidates with opportunities to apply the leadership knowledge, skills and dispositions that they acquire throughout the program. They participate in an intensive field experiences in their last semester. The participation of site mentors and other school district personnel who have knowledge and experience in school leadership helps extend and enhance candidate learning.

By design, the program provides multiple opportunities for candidates to learn how to maximize academic achievement for all students. Candidates demonstrate their competency on all candidate outcomes through formative and summative assessments in course and field embedded experiences under all five leadership roles. In response to the need for better preparing candidates for addressing the wide range of school populations and student needs in California, a recent modification to the program requires each candidate to engage in two experiences at schools with diverse populations (other than their own schools.) Additionally, the program incorporates multi-media technologies throughout all courses.

Field-embedded assignments are a feature of each EDAD course in the program. These field experiences provide opportunities for candidates to make connections between what they are learning in their courses and apply these understandings at their schools. Each candidate works with a university supervisor and site mentor to develop a field experience plan. This individualized plan must (a) be comprehensive (i.e., multiple sites, programs, levels, organizational entities, and demographics), (b) address both the strengths and learning/experience needs of the candidate, and (c) be tied to the *California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* (CPSELs), as well as address NCATE and CCTC standards. Candidates meet formally with site mentors and university supervisors in two face-to-face meetings at the candidate's site. These meetings take place at the beginning and end of each school year. One additional meeting to check for progress takes place mid-year. This supervised field supervision experience takes place over the two-year term of the program. Field experience progress is documented in the portfolio.

Interviews with candidates, faculty members, a site supervisor and the program director confirmed the central role of field experiences in candidate development. Both faculty members and candidates described instances in which candidates' field experiences led candidates to develop important insights, often related to understanding the perspectives of diverse populations. Candidates were enthusiastic about the effectiveness of course-related field assignments as experiences that bridged their developing theoretical knowledge with practical

application; and the site supervisor similarly validated both the importance of the course-linked field assignments and the overall preparation of the candidates for fieldwork.

Assessment of Candidates:

Throughout the program, multiple assessment measures are used to monitor and evaluate candidate's development of the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions needed by high quality administrators. These measures include pre-admission application, including recommendations and initial writing sample, formative classroom- and field-based assessments, as well as key summative assessments, including field observations, mid-term review, final portfolio evaluation, exit interview and comprehensive examination (for the MA degree).

Candidates are informed of program expectations, including the portfolio, and the resources available through the initial program orientation meeting held prior to the beginning of their program and each semester thereafter. They learn about program requirements through the through the *Educational Leadership and Administration Program Handbook* and through clear course syllabi that link objectives and assessments to program leadership roles and candidate outcomes and CPSELs. Candidates are provided additional information regarding the program throughout their courses. Candidates are given many opportunities to ask questions and seek clarification throughout their program.

Educational Leadership and Administration Program site mentors are also encouraged to offer feedback on candidates. A training and focus group event with each cohort that includes mentors, candidates and faculty provides a forum for feedback and discussions about program quality and processes. Graduates provide additional feedback through completion of an exit survey at the end of their program.

Interviews with the program director and faculty affirmed the usefulness of the mid-term review and final portfolio as means to document candidate fulfillment of competencies, particularly for accreditation purposes. In addition, candidates who were interviewed at the site visit stressed the value of the anchor assignments within courses, faculty feedback, both in face-to-face and to posts in Blackboard, and ongoing faculty support and scaffolding in projects in enabling them to meet program and standards requirements.

Findings on Standards:

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

Pupil Personnel Services Credential: School Psychology

Program Design:

The PPS School Psychology program is located within the department of psychology in the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences. The administrative structure of the program includes the program co-coordinators, two department-level committees of faculty (most directly the PPS Committee, which is a subcommittee of the Graduate Committee), and an Advisory Board representing the broader educational community being served by the program. Local administrators, counselors and psychologists on the program's advisory board contribute an important voice in the design of the program. Members of the advisory board report regular meetings with opportunities for substantial influence on the design and implementation of the program.

The program is small and intensive, generally recommending 5-10 candidates for school psychologists annually, and it is the only public university program in School Psychology within a large, rural service region. The program has strong ties to a number of P-12 school districts and the county office of education, through internship opportunities, the employment of program completers, and program instructors. Districts that host candidates for practicum and internship experiences collaborate with the program to provide opportunities for candidates to meet specific practicum and internship objectives.

The School Psychology program is based on a philosophy which combines systems theory with a preventive approach to service delivery. The program is based on the belief that school psychological services should be proactive and prevention-oriented in order to reduce the potential for academic, emotional, and social problems of children. The program has a goal to serve all children, to work proactively to prevent problems and provide coping skills to children, and to provide consultation to teachers. Students receive training in skills that represent the breadth of school psychological services, including intervention, assessment, counseling, consultation, and program planning.

Candidates work in schools several days a week during two and one-half years of School Psychology practica and internship. During that time, close on-site and university-based supervision and instruction provide practice in program development, behavioral and instructional consultation, instruction, assessment, counseling, collaboration, and crisis intervention. School sites in the area provide experience with a variety of cultural groups. Multiple sources of evidence affirm the careful sequencing of content and experiences. Program completers describe the program as well-designed and sequenced, with challenging academic content matched to practical experiences.

Faculty members, the program director and program completers all support the current admission structure, in which students are admitted to the MA first, and are admitted to the school psychology program after one year of successful coursework. The use of multiple

practica throughout the first two years of the program—prior to internship—appears to provide candidates with valuable opportunities to practice skills developed in coursework.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):

Admission to the PPS Program at CSU, Chico is a two-step process. Candidates are first admitted to the MA program, are required to receive advising each semester once they enter the graduate program and take their first year of coursework. Following successful completion of the first year of coursework, and based on recommendations from practicum site mentors and program faculty, candidates are then admitted to the PPS credential program.

During the first two years of coursework and practica, candidates are trained in a wide range of pupil personnel functions, including, but not limited to, counseling and crisis intervention, psychoeducational approaches to the development of social and self-management skills in children, behavioral and instructional consultation, assessment, inservice training, program development and program evaluation, and collaboration with other professionals to intervene in children’s problems and optimize their educational and personal development.

In year three of the program, candidates complete an internship in a public school. Candidate internship experiences include a weekly seminar on campus throughout the year, for which they submit weekly logs of experiences and professional development. Candidates also have an individual conference with their university supervisor once a month. The candidates also take additional practica during the first semester of the internship, which provide additional support in small, closely supervised courses as students hone their skills. School psychology interns meet at least two hours per week with their credentialed field site supervisors. University supervisors consult by telephone with field supervisors each month. School psychology site supervisors complete formal evaluations of students at the end of each semester.

Information from interviews with candidates, program completers, practicum site supervisors and internship site supervisors confirmed the close supervision provided for candidates in both practicum and internship experiences. All constituent groups concur that communication between the program and the sites is ongoing and substantive. Candidates and completers describe skillful support and scaffolding by program faculty in assisting them to meet challenges that arise in practicum and internship experiences. Site supervisors consistently rate candidates as well-trained, open and ready to learn. Program completers were enthusiastic about the value of weekly internship meetings. Candidates and site supervisors both noted the conundrum of best practices as taught in the program vs. practical exigencies of the day-to-day work of a school psychologist in a public school.

Assessment of Candidates:

Since the School Psychology program is competency based, candidates are required to demonstrate specific competencies in all classes in order to qualify for the PPS credential.

Competencies are met through written and oral assignments, as well as demonstration of professional skills in the field, depending upon the nature of the course. Upon formal admission into the credential program at the end of their first year, students are assessed at the end of each semester, while they are serving in field placements. Their performance in general and progress on competencies is evaluated by the PPS Committee following feedback from field supervisors and instructors. At that time, any concerns are conveyed to students, and conditions may be imposed for their continuance in the program.

A rigorous comprehensive exam is also required for all program candidates. Completers report that the comprehensive exam was valuable to them, though stressful at the time, in confirming and consolidating their knowledge developed throughout the program.

Interviews with completers and current candidates support the effectiveness of the assessments for both formative and summative purposes. Multiple sources noted with justifiable pride that 100% of program candidates passed the Praxis II exam in school psychology. Field supervisors affirm that their assessments of candidates are given serious weight by the program. Field supervisors report taking significant time and consulting several sources in completing the evaluation of each practicum or internship candidate each semester.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards for the PPS School Psychology credential are **Met**, with the exception of the following: **PPS generic Standard 8, and PPS generic Standard 16, which are Met with Concerns.**

Rationale:

Standard 8: Self-esteem and Personal and Social Responsibility

While evidence from the visit affirms that candidates engage in self-reflection, particularly as related to the role of the school psychologist as a helping professional, reviewers did not find evidence that candidates were provided with opportunities to assess their own self-esteem, as the standard requires.

Standard 16: Supervision and Mentoring

While evidence from multiple sources indicated that candidates learned about models of supervision in informal and implicit ways through their own experiences with supervisors, the team did not find evidence that candidates have explicit opportunities to demonstrate knowledge of models of supervision used to mentor pre-professionals in practica and field experience placements.

Communication Sciences and Disorders Speech Language Pathology Credential

Program Design:

The Communication Sciences and Disorders (CMSD) program is housed within the Department of Communication Arts and Sciences in the College of Communication and Education. Although the program is not directly within the School of Education, CMSD faculty collaborate closely with SOE faculty. This collaboration includes monthly meetings, shared lectures with the Kinesiology Adapted Physical Education program and clinical collaborations with the Kinesiology Autism Clinic and the Center for Communication Disorders. In addition, there are collaborative workshops with Special Education faculty on Augmentative and Alternative Communication. CMSD faculty sit on the Liberal Studies Advisory Board. Leadership within the CMSD program consists of a Program Director, Graduate Coordinator, Clinic Director, Associate Clinic Director, and Internship Coordinator. The program is nationally accredited through the Council on Academic Programs, American Speech Language Hearing Association, by NCATE and by CTC. The program offers the Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts degrees and the Speech and Language Pathology credential. The undergraduate courses in the major are prerequisites for the graduate program. All credential candidates must meet the requirements for both the Masters' degree and the Speech and Language Pathology credential.

First year candidates are advised as they enter the program, and candidates, faculty, supervisors and program completers all reported that all faculty members advise program candidates on an ongoing basis. Advisory Board members and program completers state that they often call faculty members for help with a student – and always get an immediate and positive reply. During the first year, candidates participate in the campus Clinic – the Center for Communication Disorders. During the second year, they have two internships, one at a school site and the other in a medical setting. The program has a very active Advisory Board that meets twice a year. During interviews, Advisory Board members reported that the faculty are very responsive to comments and suggestions from the board and have made program changes reflecting their recommendations.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):

There is only one pathway to completion of the program, which takes two years to complete. Candidates in the program are working simultaneously toward the CTC Speech and Language Pathology credential, the American Speech, Language and Hearing Association Certificate of Clinical Competence and the California license issued by the Speech and Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board. Coursework is sequenced to provide a strong theoretical and practical framework and focus on evidence-based practice, student learning, and student success. Courses have clinically focused assignments involving problem solving and critical thinking skills, and some include community service and/or service learning activities. Candidates participate in a clinical practicum each semester. During the first year, candidates enroll in the on-campus clinic at the Center for Communication Disorders. After two semesters, including work with at least three clients and 50 clock hours of experience, candidates are

eligible to apply for off-campus placements or internships. Candidates, faculty, and site supervisors reported that fieldwork and coursework run parallel throughout the program. This means that faculty teaching a class consult with clinic faculty to assure that what is presented in the classroom is reflected in the candidates' clinical performance. All faculty members track student progress.

Candidates do not begin a school internship until they meet the competencies needed to succeed. The Advisory Board recommended this and the faculty developed a checklist that evaluates 44 competencies related to the credential. Once candidates meet the competencies, they apply for the school internship. The program has over 70 internship sites where candidates can fulfill their clinic requirements. Candidates at all internship sites are supervised by on-site clinical supervisors, who have responsibility for ensuring that candidates have opportunities to complete all clinical requirements. In the event that a particular site is unable to provide a required experience, the program finds an alternative site (or sites) to ensure that candidates have opportunities to demonstrate competence in all program requirements. Site supervisors are trained by program faculty and are provided with a copy of the Handbook for Clinical Internship Instructors, which describes all their responsibilities for candidate supervision and evaluation.

Interviews with program completers, current candidates, and both university and site supervisors provided clear evidence that candidates are well-supported throughout their clinical experiences. Candidates and completers consistently reported that their supervisors provided all assistance they needed, that they were accessible whenever candidates needed advice, and that they were effective role models as practicing clinicians. University and site supervisors reported having close working relationships that enabled them to respond quickly and effectively to candidate needs, and site supervisors reported that candidates were very well-prepared for clinical practice when they entered their internships.

In response to feedback from the readers of the CTC Program Assessment document regarding SLP Standard 2: Professional, Legal and Ethical Practices, program faculty immediately met to address the comments. They designed a new course to be offered this fall to address the issues raised by reviewers. This is only one example of how the faculty continuously responds to recommendations or anticipates the need for changes in coursework and field experiences.

Assessment of Candidates:

Assessment is both formative and summative. The Program Director developed an electronic Data Management System (DMS) that tracks student progress in both coursework and in clinical practice. CMSD students are using the system in the campus clinic, and at their off campus site, to track hours, types of disorders, and diagnostic or therapy sessions. Site supervisors have access to the system as well and input data daily. The candidates have access to their records at all times. This system tracks candidates as they progress in on-campus work and in off-campus internships. All CTC program standard requirements are addressed in this system. University supervisors and site supervisors have access to the system Candidates,

faculty, supervisors and advisory board members, noted this outstanding tool for tracking every aspect of the candidates experience at CSU Chico.

Key formative assessments include coursework assignments and clinic assessments. The Clinic Assessment assesses 28 clinical skills in six domains including prevention, evaluation, intervention, interpersonal skills, reporting and professional behavior and responsibilities. This assessment is conducted at the end of each practicum. A required portfolio is compiled during the two years of graduate study. It includes coursework, projects, written assignments, reflections and evaluations. The portfolio is reviewed periodically throughout the 2 year program. Faculty members conduct mid-semester and end-of-semester evaluations throughout the program, and candidates conduct a self-evaluation of progress each semester. Finally, the candidates complete an Exit Survey that measures their perception of preparedness in areas identified by program learning outcomes. Faculty members review these responses very carefully and make programmatic changes when needed.

Key summative assessments include the Comprehensive exam and the nationally-administered PRAXIS examination. The Comprehensive exam is taken in the spring of the second year of the graduate program. The exam consists of 6 questions written over two days. Each faculty member writes and scores 1 – 2 questions which cover 9 areas of learning.

The faculty continuously engage in reflective practices. Candidates unanimously reported that every faculty member is supportive of their classroom and clinic endeavors. During interviews, site supervisors and employers stated that the students are very well prepared to enter the profession as beginning practitioners. Second year candidates, who are now beginning the process of interviewing for their first job, also stated that they are well prepared to begin their Clinical Fellowship Year.

Findings on Standards:

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