

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

Professional Services Division

October 2025

Overview of this Report

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

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

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

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Bilingual Authorization	5	5	0	0
Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject	7	5	2	0
Preliminary Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Support Needs	7	2	5	0

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

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

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

Institution: California State University, Channel Islands

Dates of Visit: October 5-8, 2025

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
Date: June 2018 Accreditation Report	Accreditation with Stipulations
Date: June 2019 Accreditation Report	Accreditation

Rationale:

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

Preconditions

All preconditions have been determined to be aligned.

Program Standards

All program standards for the Bilingual Authorization were **Met**.

Of the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject program standards, Standards 3 and 5 were **Met with Concerns**.

Of the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were **Met with Concerns**.

Common Standards

Of the Common Standards, standard 5 was **met**, standards 1, 2, and 3 were **met with concerns**, and standard 4 was **not met**.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the above findings for all Program Standards and Common Standards, the team recommends **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

The team recommends the following stipulations:

1. Within one year, the unit will provide evidence that:
 - a. A written plan for the continuous improvement cycle at the unit level has been designed and is being implemented. The plan should include such elements as data to be collected, analytical tools, agendas for meetings during which relevant constituencies engage in an analysis and reflection process, and the cadence for this process. **(Common Standard 4)**
2. A written plan for the continuous improvement cycle to be implemented at the program level. This cycle should align with the process adopted at the unit level. **(MS/SS program standard 5a, ES: MMSN Program Standard 3)**
 - a. The unit has created new formal structure(s) and augmented existing formal structures that engage relevant internal and external stakeholders in on-going collaboration about the unit's educator preparation programs, their operation, development, and continued improvement. **(Common Standard 1)**
 - b. The unit has designed and implemented systems to track candidate progress towards competencies for all programs, including program requirements and clinical experience placement sites and their characteristics; qualifications, preparation, and support for all site-based mentors and university-based supervisors in alignment with **Common Standards 2 and 3, MS/SS Program Standard 3d, ESMMSN Program Standards 1 and 3.**
 - c. That new content, activities, assignments, and evaluation criteria have been added to the Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs program curriculum to address limited alignment with program standards and Teaching Performance Expectations as they relate to knowledge and skills for educating students with special needs in grades 7-12, of diverse program delivery models, of case management strategies, and of different disability profiles. **(ES:MMSN Program Standards 1 through 5)**
 - d. That a system is designed and is implemented to track the progress of candidates in the Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs program towards meeting all relevant Teaching Performance Expectations for this specific credential. This system should include steps that will be taken to support candidates and to intervene for those who are not making adequate and timely progress towards meeting the TPEs. **(ES: MMSN Program Standards 2, 4 and 5)**

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to offer the following credential programs and to recommend candidates for the appropriate and related credentials upon satisfactorily completing all requirements:

*Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject
Bilingual Authorization
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling (new program)*

In addition, staff recommends that:

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

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Pia Wong
California State University, Sacramento

Programs Reviewers:

Nichole Walsh
California State University, Fresno

Common Standards:

Joe Frescatore
San Diego County Office of Education

Amy Gimino
California State Polytechnic University,
Pomona

Terri Pieretti
National University

Morgan Appel
University of California, San Diego

Linda Smetana
California State University, East Bay

Staff to the Visit:

Frances Kellar
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission
Program Review Submission
Common Standards Addendum
Program Review Addendum
Course Syllabi and Course Matrices

Candidate Advisement Materials
Accreditation Website
Faculty Vitae
Candidate Files
Assessment Materials

Candidate Handbooks
 Survey Results
 Performance Expectation Materials
 Precondition Responses

Performance Assessment Results and
 Analysis
 Examination Results
 Accreditation Data Dashboard

Interviews Conducted

Constituencies	TOTAL
Program Candidates	54
Program Completers	23
Employers	8
Institutional Administration	4
Campus-wide Partners	4
Department Chair(s)	4
Program Coordinators	5
Faculty/Lecturers	15
Literacy Faculty	5
TPA Coordinator(s)	2
Field Supervisor(s) – Program	10
Field Supervisor(s) – District	19
Field Placement Coordinator(s)	3
School District – Superintendents	3
School District – Principals	8
School District – Administrators	6
Ventura County Office of Education	4
Credential Analysts	3
Teacher Education Grants – PI & Staff	5
Support Staff	3
TOTAL	188

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed more than once due to multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background Information

Founded in 2002, California State University Channel Islands (CSUCI) is one of 23 within the California State University System. CSUCI primarily serves the communities within Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. The campus is in Camarillo, midway between Los Angeles and Santa Barbara on the Southern California coast. CSUCI embeds its mission “pillars” in the four faculty-led and directed Mission Centers: Community Engagement; Center for Integrative Studies; International Affairs; and Multicultural Engagement.

The 2025 Fall cohort has 4,924 students enrolled in across its undergraduate and graduate programs at its main campus and four satellite campuses. CSUCI offers 25 undergraduate majors, 10 graduate degrees, four educator preparation programs, and a joint doctorate in educational leadership. The current undergraduate student body is 62% Hispanic, 53% Pell eligible, and 64% first-generation college students. Over half of the undergraduates transfer from community colleges. Graduate and credential programs are designed to meet the needs of working adults. CSUCI is designated as a Hispanic-Serving Institution.

Education Unit

The School of Education at CSUCI sponsors two undergraduate programs (Early Childhood Studies and Liberal Studies), four active credential programs (Preliminary Multiple Subjects, Preliminary Single Subject, and Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs), one added authorization (Bilingual Authorization-Spanish), and Pupil Personnel Services in School Counseling. Additionally, it offers two graduate programs (Masters of Arts in Education, Masters of Arts in Educational Leadership), and a Doctorate in Educational Leadership for Equity and Justice program.

The School of Education has prepared over 470 Multiple Subject candidates, 148 Education Specialist candidates, and 198 Single Subject candidates in the period 2019-2025. A majority of their credential candidates identify as Hispanic/Latino, with a significant population identifying as White or Asian/Pacific Islander.

Table 1: Enrollment and Completion Data

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2024-25)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2025-26)
Bilingual Authorization	13	12
Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject	61	82
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs	17	14

The Visit

This site visit was conducted virtually. Institutional and program constituencies were interviewed via technology.

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

PRECONDITION FINDINGS

After review of all relevant preconditions for this institution, all have been determined to be met.

PROGRAM REPORTS

Preliminary Multiple Subjects and Single Subject

Program Design

The Preliminary Multiple Subjects and Single Subject programs are led by the chair of Teacher Education Department under the direction of the Dean of the School of Education. The chair oversees and assigns workload for all tenure-track as well as part-time instructors and supervisors who teach the courses and supervise teacher candidates. The chair and program coordinators work closely with the director of clinical experiences and partnerships to secure quality field placements for teacher candidates, identify qualified university supervisors and provide professional development. Aligned with the School of Education's mission, program leadership has developed course and fieldwork experiences to prepare future elementary and secondary teachers to appreciate and capitalize on the diversity of languages and cultures encountered in California's public-school classrooms. The beliefs that all children can learn and that educators make a difference in students' lives provide the founding principles of the programs. Their department aims for program completers to "engage, experience, enact, and envision."

From its beginnings, the School of Education at CSUCI, the only public four-year educator preparation program in Ventura County, has been defined by deep and sustained connections to the community including the Ventura County Office for Education (VCOE) and surrounding districts. During the 2018-19 academic year, the School of Education convened stakeholder groups including county and district leaders, principals, teachers, faculty, supervisors, K-12 parents and special education programs to identify and center the Multiple and Single Subject programs around competencies essential for the first day teacher.

An advisory board was established and met several times per year prior to COVID. Although significant leadership, staffing, and resource changes have contributed to the advisory board not being reinstituted, the programs have strong partnerships with VCOE and surrounding districts. VCOE staff and CSUCI faculty reported regular meetings, collaborative grants, induction orientations and professional development activities to "serve, support and educate" preservice and Inservice teachers so they are welcomed, supported and ultimately remain in the profession and community. The programs also have residency programs with Oxnard Elementary School District, Oxnard Union High School District, Rio School District, and Santa Paula Unified School District aimed at developing mentor teacher leadership and creating immersive co-teaching experiences to prepare "ready day one teachers."

Over the past seven years, CSUCI has enrolled 473 Multiple Subject and 198 Single Subject candidates. At the time of the site visit, the programs had 50 Multiple Subject candidates and

23 Single Subject candidates (seven English, six math, four science, and six Social Science). Additionally, the Multiple Subject programs had nine Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Education (ITEP) Multiple Subject candidates, 11 candidates concurrently seeking the Bilingual Authorization, and 14 candidates dually enrolled in the Multiple Subject and Education Specialist program. The multiple and Single Subject programs admit candidates into Phase 1 coursework in the fall. Candidates are admitted into Phase II-Student Teaching and Methods only in the fall.

The Multiple and Single Subject programs span three semesters and courses are offered in-person on the main campus. Dual credential candidates enroll in a distinct set of coursework: The roadmap for dual credential candidates includes courses that integrate both Education Specialist and Multiple Subject content, as well as two courses that overlap with Multiple Subject credential candidates. Prior to student teaching, candidates complete one semester of Phase I foundational coursework along with 45 hours of supervised early fieldwork (Phase I). Candidates begin Phase II which includes methods of coursework alongside two semesters of student teaching. Those seeking dual credentials or the added authorization complete one semester of clinical practice for each program. During this accreditation cycle, programs focused on developing teacher residencies to build pipelines and serve the needs of partner districts.

The leadership team consists of the faculty director of clinical experiences and partnerships, Teacher Education department chair, Multiple and Single Subject program coordinators and teacher residency coordinator. Together the department chair, program coordinators and faculty director of clinical experiences and partnerships oversee program admissions, advising, curriculum and instruction, scheduling, hiring, program improvement, and other related matters. Residency liaisons support mentor teachers that host resident teachers that are also employed as university supervisors.

The Teacher Education department chair meet weekly with the dean and other department chairs in the unit, along with the faculty director of clinical experiences and partnerships. All unit employees are invited to monthly department and program meetings where they receive important university, school and program updates and provide feedback for policy, process and program decisions. Faculty and staff reported program leadership solicits input and communicates meeting outcomes, so they feel informed and included. University supervisors and residency liaisons attend semester orientations or meet and greet sessions and monthly meetings with the department chair to address updates and issues surrounding placements. They appreciated regular email communications from the Field Placement Office and reported timely faculty and staff responses to issues and inquiries. Cooperating teachers and resident mentors consistently reported feeling supported in their roles and appreciated regular email communications. They said they frequently visited the department's credential program showcase website which houses welcome videos, program overviews, handbooks, information and resources for the new literacy standards and TPA and co-teaching and key assessment materials (i.e., the lesson plan template, fieldwork tracking log and observation and evaluation

forms). Most supervisors, cooperating teachers, and mentors had served in their role for CSUCI for multiple years. They all said they would welcome the opportunity to continue in their role.

Regular residency program partnership meetings are held with the department chair, program coordinators, partner district representatives, selected site administrators, and the VCOE. Residency mentor teachers provide informal feedback during university-sponsored professional learning days, events and training sessions. Cooperating teachers provide informal oral feedback during candidate supervision.

Multiple and Single Subject candidates and program completers commended program leadership for their organization, responsiveness, and genuine care for candidates. They noted information, advice and assistance were clear and easily accessible through orientations, meetings with credential counselors, handbooks, the department website, and coursework. They appreciated being part of a cohort and the ease of course scheduling. They consistently reported that faculty were responsive to their requests and needs and shared examples of clinical practice placement changes, adjusting the class schedule to reduce the number of days they commute to campus, and adjusting assignments/deadlines when they felt overwhelmed.

The programs have used data to make extensive program modifications over the past two years. For example:

- Candidates and program faculty expressed a need for a class dedicated to designing instruction and lesson planning. The faculty developed a new online *Aligning Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment* course for ITEP candidates that is open to other interested students.
- Beginning 2024-2025, the Multiple and Single Subject programs adjusted the Phase II course schedule based on candidate feedback that full-time student teaching during the day and a full course load was not manageable while also completing their CalTPA cycle.
- Instead of meeting one day a week for the entire semester, candidates now meet late afternoon and evenings for eight to ten weeks depending on the courses and reports. During interviews, candidates and completers conveyed the new schedule is much more manageable.
- In 2024-2025, program faculty collaborated with resident mentors, university supervisors and adjunct faculty to revise the program's lesson plan template, formal observation, midterm evaluation and final evaluation forms to align with the literacy standards and TPE 7. The Multiple Subject program also added focused literacy observations to capture evidence of effective literacy instruction in foundational skills (fall semester) and meaning making (spring semester).
- In 2024-2025, leadership updated the letter sent to districts to include information about the new literacy standards, California Dyslexia Guidelines, TPE 7 and Literacy Performance Assessment (LPA) which focuses on foundational literacy skills and additional cross-cutting themes in literacy. The letter includes explicit language on required fieldwork experiences, including opportunities to observe and practice and receive formative feedback on research-based, systematic and explicit literacy instruction focused on foundational skills, oral and written language development,

literature, effective expression, and multimodal meaning making and Dyslexia Guidelines.

- In 2024-2025, based on candidate and resident mentor feedback, programs added a co-planning day to mentor training to support long-term planning for candidates' solo experience and CalTPA submissions.
- In the spring and summer 2025, program coordinators and seminar faculty attended CalTPA workshops. To prepare Multiple Subject candidates for the new Math Cycle, they collaborated with math faculty to ensure math practices are effectively introduced and practiced in fall math seminar course. The new signature assignment has candidates interview students and use what they learn to plan a math lesson. They teach, assess and reflect on their lesson in their initial student teaching seminar course to prepare for their Math Cycle.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Multiple Subject Coursework and Pathways

Multiple Subject coursework consists of one semester, 17 units of Phase I coursework and 36 units of methods courses (Phase II). All classroom management courses include field observations at local school sites, and all but two lecture portions of the course being held on the main campus. During Phase I (one semester, fall, spring or summer) Multiple Subject candidates complete three courses with Single Subject candidates, including: Language in Social Context; Equity, Diversity, and Foundations of Schooling; and Individuals with Disabilities. They complete program-specific Phase I courses in human development and classroom management, including Child Growth and Development During the Elementary Years/Typical or Atypical Development (dual Education Specialist) and a Creating and Managing Effective Elementary Learning Environments held at partner school(s) that host candidates for their 45 hours of early field experience. Candidates can be fully admitted to the program after completing Phase I coursework and demonstrating subject matter competency. Candidates must pass all Phase I courses with a "C" or better and complete 45 hours of early field experience prior to starting Phase II methods coursework.

During Phase II (two semesters, fall and spring), Multiple Subject candidates complete program specific methods coursework alongside initial and advanced student teaching courses and seminars. In the fall, they complete five initial methods courses:

- Literacy I: Multicultural/Multilingual (TK-Grade 3, Co-taught);
- Modern Methods in Mathematics Teaching to Grades K-3;
- History, Social Studies, & Integrated Arts;
- Initial Student Teaching Multiple Subject; and
- Initial Student Teaching Seminar Multiple Subject (Co-taught)

They also submit the CalTPA Math Cycle. In the spring, they complete five methods courses:

- Literacy II: Multicultural/Multilingual (Grades 4-6, Co-taught)
- Modern Methods in Mathematics Teaching Grades 4-6,
- Science, Health & Physical Education
- Advanced Student Teaching Multiple Subject/Mild Moderate Support Needs, and
- Advanced Student Teaching Seminar Multiple Subject (Co-taught)

They also submit the LPA. Courses are taught/co-taught by faculty with appropriate credentials and expertise in the content and credential areas. Candidates must pass all methods courses with a “C+” or better and with a minimum 3.0 grade point average.

Multiple Subject Traditional Student Teaching Pathway

Each semester, traditional student teaching candidates complete three days per week of full-time supervised student teaching experience for eight weeks, and four days a week in the second eight weeks totaling 672 hours across the arc of the program. Candidates return to campus for afternoon/evening fall or full-day spring courses. Multiple Subject candidates are generally assigned a single placement for the entire student teaching experience with the same cooperating teacher both semesters, although a few candidates have both an early grades and upper grades placement within the year. Undergraduate candidates admitted into the ITEP program as seniors, follow the same path as traditional post-baccalaureate candidates.

Multiple Subject Residency Pathway

Multiple Subject candidates selected for the CSUCI residency program through a competitive process, spend at least three and a half days per week in their semester placements totaling 720 hours during CSUCI’s semesters across the arc of the program, plus an additional eight weeks in the classroom of their residency mentor when CSUCI is not in session. They are supported by a selected elementary mentor teacher. The mentor is also trained and compensated by the university to serve as a university supervisor and supported in this role by a faculty residency liaison. Residents start the first day of school in August when students arrive and remain in their placements until the last day of school when students leave. If district approved, residents are allowed to substitute teach for their mentor during the advanced student teaching semester.

Multiple Subject Dually Enrolled Candidates

Multiple Subject candidates dually enrolled in the Educational Specialist (ES) programs spend one semester in a traditional or residency Multiple Subjects’ classroom and the advanced semester in a special education or dual-immersion setting.

During Phase II (two semesters, fall and spring), Multiple Subject candidates complete program specific methods coursework alongside initial and advanced student teaching courses and seminars. In the fall, they complete five initial methods courses: Literacy I: *Multicultural/Multilingual (TK-Grade 3)*; *Modern Methods in Mathematics Teaching to Grades K-3*; *History, Social Studies, & Integrated Arts*; *Initial Student Teaching Multiple Subject*; and *Initial Student Teaching Seminar Multiple Subject*. They also submit the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA) Math Cycle. In the spring, they complete five methods courses: *Literacy II: Multicultural/Multilingual (Grades 4-6)*, *Modern Methods in Mathematics Teaching Grades 4-6*, *Science, Health & Physical Education*, *Advanced Student Teaching Multiple Subject/Mild Moderate Support Needs*, and *Advanced Student Teaching Seminar Multiple Subject*. They also submit the Literacy Performance Assessment (LPA). Courses are taught by

faculty with appropriate credentials and expertise in the content and credential areas. Candidates must pass all methods courses with a C+ or better and with a minimum 3.0 grade point average.

Single Subject Coursework and Pathways

Single Subject candidates can pursue preliminary credentials in English, mathematics, foundational-level mathematics, science (Biology, Chemistry, Geosciences, or Physics) foundational-level general science, or social science. Coursework consists of 17 units of (Phase I) courses and 36 units methods (Phase II) courses. All classroom management courses include field observations at local school sites, and all but two lecture portions of the course being held on the main campus. During Phase I, candidates complete the same coursework as Multiple Subject candidates except the growth and development and creating and managing effective environment courses are focused on the secondary school years. The latter course is usually held at partner school(s) that hosts candidates for 45 hours of early fieldwork. Candidates can be fully admitted to the program after completing Phase I coursework and demonstrating subject matter competency.

Single Subject Traditional Student Teaching Pathway

Traditional student teaching candidates complete three days per week of full-time supervised student teaching experience for eight weeks and five days a week in the second eight weeks each semester totaling 768 hours across the arc of the program. Candidates return to campus for afternoon/evening courses in the fall or full day spring courses, in the second eight weeks they attend classes one night per week. Single Subject teacher candidates are generally assigned a single placement for the entire student teaching experience where they stay at the same school and with the same cooperating teacher for both semesters, although a few candidates may have a middle and high school placement within the year.

Single Subject Residency Pathway

Single Subject candidates selected for the CSUCI residency program spend three and a half days per week for the first eight weeks of the semester, and five days per week for the second eight weeks of the semester in their placements with a mentor teacher who is trained and compensated by university to serve as a university supervisor and supported in this role by a faculty residency liaison. Residents start the first day of school in August when students arrive and remain in their placements until the last day of school when students leave. If the district approves, residents are allowed to substitute teach for their mentor during the advanced student teaching semester.

All Multiple and Single Subject Candidates

During Phase I courses, candidates obtain certificates of clearance and complete 45 hours of early field experience in classrooms arranged by faculty with relationships with partner schools. These hours are tied to assignments in their courses.

Candidates submit fieldwork hours and evidence of subject matter competency with their program application and complete an interview to be admitted into the program. During Phase II, candidates and cooperating teachers/resident mentors log and verify clinical practice hours to ensure the minimum 600 hours across the arc of the program and four weeks of solo teaching experience. Multiple Subject candidates complete 10 days of consecutive solo teaching per semester and Single Subject candidates complete 20 consecutive days of full-time takeover for at least three periods per day each semester.

Coordination of Phase II coursework and fieldwork provides a cohesive set of learning experiences and enables Multiple and Single Subject candidates to a clear understanding of the realities of California public education. During interviews, candidates and completers described the combined experiences as supportive and “seamless” allowing them to purposefully connect theories and strategies they were learning in fieldwork through observations, assignments and discussions. During interviews, candidates and program completers cited course assignments that required them to plan for classroom activities, such as management plans, unit pacing, lesson plans, and assessments as most valuable.

The Multiple and Single Subject programs have Memoranda of Understanding with 20 school districts. Once admitted, candidates work with the Clinical Experience and Partnerships Office (CEPO) to secure placement. CEPO staff work closely with program leadership, districts, and principals to place candidates in schools and classrooms that meet state and program requirements. They track Title I status, percentage of English learners, administrator and cooperating teacher credentials and experience and feedback from candidates, supervisors and cooperating teachers/resident mentors on to determine placements. Traditional student teaching candidates may remain in one placement all year or request a change in placement for the second semester. Admitted candidates are invited to apply for the teacher residency program and are screened through an additional application and district interview. Principals and district administrators recommend highly qualified teachers for selection as a residency mentor in collaboration with CSUCI residency partners. A kick-off meeting provides an opportunity for residents and resident mentors to provide input into the matching process before residents are assigned with residency mentor teachers.

Cooperating teachers and residency mentors reported they are informed of program requirements through various means including clear, timely communications from CEPO, semesterly orientations, handbooks and regular emails and/or email communications with university supervisors/resident liaisons. They understood expectations and consistently mentioned feeling appreciated and supported in their roles. During interviews, they referenced the credential program showcase website which houses welcome videos; program overviews and handbooks; information and support for new literacy standards, TPAs and co-teaching; the program lesson plan template, forms and instructions related to clinical practice. Cooperating teachers reported they meet with the university supervisor, complete an orientation module on the website, and are invited to further professional development opportunities (e.g., the California Council on Teacher Education’s Intersegmental Project, VCOE Professional

Development for Mentor Teacher (PD4MT) modules and Teacher Toolkit training). Program leadership was unable to produce documentation that all cooperating teachers complete the required 10-hours of training. Documents and interviews demonstrated residency mentors attended five full-day training sessions on various topics and found last year's co-planning day with residents most valuable.

CSUCI employs 10 university supervisors with experience ranging from 1 to 18 years. Interviews, supporting curriculum vitae and placement spreadsheets convey supervisors are qualified to supervise their assigned multiple and Single Subject candidates. Like cooperating teachers or resident mentors, they attend program orientations at the beginning of the year and appreciate being invited to professional development. During interviews, they expressed they enjoy and feel supported in their roles, so the programs have little turnover. Teacher candidates complete a student rating of teaching (SRT) at the end of every semester which is placed in their personnel action files. Supervisors are evaluated each review period per the faculty collective bargaining agreement.

Supervisors complete at least six formal observations along with informal visits and a mid-term and final evaluation each semester. The university supervisor collaborates with the cooperating teacher to complete a mid-term and final evaluation of student teaching using rubrics aligned with the TPEs. Resident mentors are supported in this role by a faculty residency liaison during the resident student teaching course. The residency liaison visits the pair's classroom several times each semester, conducts at least one formal observation, and collaborates on the mid-term and final evaluation of each resident. At the end of the program, supervisors and cooperating teachers/resident mentors collaboratively complete the Individual Development Plan (IDP).

Teacher candidates contact the CEPO or department chair regarding any concerns about their cooperating teacher/residency mentor or university supervisor. If serious concerns arise, candidates are re-assigned to a new student teaching placement, or assigned to a new supervisor, either immediately or for the following semester. University supervisors and residency liaisons evaluate the effectiveness of each placement within the first two weeks of the semester and inform the CEPO if a new placement is warranted. They assist candidates with issues that arise such as gaining access to classrooms, curriculum, technology and student information. Teacher candidates evaluate supervisors and cooperating teachers/resident mentors at the end of each semester.

Candidates, faculty, and district partners all reported CSUCI programs genuinely care for students and the community. When asked about program strengths, candidates and completers praised the credential counselors and leadership for providing clear information about program and state licensure requirements through orientations, counseling sessions, handbooks and ongoing communications. They enjoyed being part of their CSUCI cohort and felt the coursework, fieldwork and assignments "made sense." Candidates and completers praised faculty and staff for their responsiveness and flexibility citing examples of adjusting teaching placements, course schedules and assignment deadlines. They commended faculty

expertise and connection to schools, and several completers mentioned student teaching seminars were instrumental to their passing their TPAs. During interviews, faculty shared their Statement of Concern (SoC) process and detailed student support action plan to address issues outlined in the SoC. Supervisors shared they request a second observer complete a formal observation of candidates at risk of not passing student teaching. These due process supports are communicated in the program handbook.

Faculty expressed feeling supported in their roles. Likewise, university supervisors and cooperating teachers/resident mentors felt appreciated and mentioned they would continue if given the opportunity to do so. District partners and faculty shared deep community connections including residency programs and collaborations with the VCOE providing grants, ongoing professional development, and campus events such as human resource panels and workshops to prepare candidates for jobs and induction.

The Multiple and Single Subject programs gather feedback from multiple sources to inform unit and program improvement. Leadership reported they previously had a data analyst that prepared CSU Systemwide surveys reports and detailed credential exam reports (e.g., CalTPA rubric averages) to support these efforts. Over the past two years, they have had to rely on information garnered through more informal means (e.g., individual and group communications) and through aggregate level data (e.g., overall CalTPA pass rates). They have used these data to adjust class schedules, inform clinical placements and enhance TPA seminars. Program leadership and staff reported needing access, professional development (e.g., EdReport training) and time to run reports and to store and use data in a more systematic and efficient manner. They use multiple systems, and spreadsheets lack access to the systems undergraduate programs use to track students from admissions to credential recommendation. Despite these challenges, the programs have made significant program improvements over the past two years as previously discussed.

Assessment of Candidates

Courses include signature assignments, aligned with the TPEs, housed in a Student Learning and Licensure (SL&L) system. Program leadership reported that faculty are developing TPE-based rubrics for these assignments so the system can be better leveraged to monitor candidate progress and identify areas for program improvement. The department recently updated their lesson plan template to align Standard 7, TPE 7 and the revised CalTPA. The new plan includes:

- California content, practice (as applicable) and English Language Development (ELD) standards;
- Associated content, practice and Academic Language Development (ALD) objectives;
- Assessment to monitor student progress;
- Universal Design for Learning (UDL);
- Strategies for leveraging students' assets;
- Grouping strategies; instructional sequencing; and
- Lesson reflection and next steps.

Course activities and assignments are designed so candidates receive scaffolded, developmental TPE support and timely formative feedback while connecting theory to practice. For instance, in the literacy series, candidates are introduced to the English Language Arts (ELA)/English Language Development (ELD) Framework and California Dyslexia Guidelines in the *Language in a Social Context Course*. They complete modules, such as the University of California (UC)/CSU Collaborative for Neurodiversity and Learning's module on supporting Multilingual Learners, and a signature assignment analyzing a representative vignette related to the age/grade of their field placement for strategies to support language learners. In the Multiple Subject Literacy I course, candidates are introduced to foundational skills through course discussions and activities (e.g., Reading Rockets modules, sample case studies) and connect what they learn to their initial student teaching placement by analyzing classroom artifacts and a completing a signature case study of a student in their field placement. Candidates continue their study of developing comprehensive literacy programs in their literacy II course focusing on grades 4-6 with a deeper emphasis on vocabulary, morphology, fluency and comprehension of narrative and expository texts and best practices for literacy assessment. They continue to analyze classroom artifacts and complete a demonstration lesson along with a multidisciplinary lesson plan. These experiences also prepare them for the Literacy Performance Assessment (LPA).

In the Single Subject initial literacy course, candidates are introduced to the expectations and evidence-based practices to support academic language development in the content areas, with special emphasis on adolescents who struggle as readers and writers. They connect what they learn to their initial student teaching analyzing text and text-dependent questions, creating a performance task to assess writing proficiency. As a signature assignment they plan, teach and assess and reflect on a content area reading lesson in preparation for their CalTPA. In the advanced literacy course, Single Subject candidates learn how to make curriculum and instruction accessible to English learners. They observe and interview an English learner and plan designated and integrated ELD lessons they can implement in their student teaching. Likewise in the math methods series, Multiple Subject candidates are introduced to the California Common Core Math Standards and Frameworks and effective modern math methods for supporting diverse learners through readings, videos, student work analyses and math inquiry assignments focusing on K-3 and 4-6 grades alongside their student teaching placements.

Similarly, in their content-specific methods course series, Single Subject candidates are introduced to the relevant California Common Core Standards and Frameworks and engage in short and long-term planning for middle and high school students alongside their student teaching placements. Leadership and faculty reported they are revising assignments in the methods and seminar courses to align with the new CalTPA cycles. For instance, Multiple Subject candidates select a TK-6 grade level strand/standard and write developmentally appropriate math content and practice learning goals, whereas, Single Subject candidates write developmentally appropriate content and academic language goals. Both programs now require one video-based student teaching observation to support candidates with video-based commentary and reflection.

Student Teaching Assessments

Documents and interviews confirmed university supervisors complete six formal observations with TPE feedback and post-lesson conferences and informal visits each semester. Candidates reported submitting lesson plans to supervisors at least 24 hours in advance of their observations. Supervisors and cooperating teachers/resident mentors collaborate on mid-term evaluations and complete separate end-of-semester evaluations. Supervisors complete a portable Individual Development Plans (IDP) in consultation with cooperating teachers/resident mentors and teacher candidates to support their continued growth and development.

Over the past year, the programs updated the formal mid-term and final evaluation rubric to include both content and practice learning objectives (when appropriate) and TPE 7 so candidates are formally evaluated on use of evidence-based practices, foundational reading skills, meaning making, language development and effective expression. In the fall, elements of foundation skills are observed within a separate observation, or across multiple observations. In the spring, the meaning making elements are observed.

Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA)

Candidates enroll in TPA seminars that support their completion of CalTPA Cycle 1/Math TPA and CalTPA Cycle 2/LPA alongside their student teaching. Candidates that do not pass can meet with their seminar instructor during office hours or receive remediation support over the summer. When needed, support plans are used to document concerns, corrective actions, and timelines for completion. Candidates consistently reported they are provided clear explanations, extensive support and understood appropriate use of materials including classroom videos. One program completer shared they had received remediation support and felt they would not have been able to complete the program without the support and dedication of their seminar instructor.

The TPA coordinator oversees TPA implementation and regularly attends state meetings and deep dive workshops to remain informed and communicate changes in models, materials, and best practices. The coordinator works closely with program coordinators and seminar faculty who join state meetings and workshops as schedules permit. Together they monitor candidate pass rates, ensure candidates receive appropriate remediation support and adjust seminar coursework based on what they see during remediation sessions. Review of the evidence showed that program leadership lacked sufficient information to make necessary improvements. Interviews revealed that additional training such as EdReport training and data analysis support to run rubric-level reports would allow them to better support continuous improvement efforts across the programs in implementing TPA outside of TPA related courses.

Credential counselors, who are also credential analysts and program coordinators, use various forms and spreadsheets to monitor candidate progress. They collaborate and take corrective actions to ensure student success. These actions include SoCs with improvement plans, course repeat requests, additional student teaching observation(s) by a second trained supervisor, extended student teaching hours, and CalTPA remediation. As appropriate, candidates who do not satisfy requirements despite appropriate support are “stopped or counseled out” or

disqualified from the program. Credential analysts continue to track candidate progress and collaborate with program coordinators until each candidate successfully completes all requirements and is recommended for their preliminary credential.

District partners consistently reported candidates and completers are well-prepared to serve in their schools. Many highlighted the strength of the residency programs, and a few were disappointed their district's late-hiring practices precluded them from keeping residents in their district. During interviews, candidates and program completers consistently praised the program for equipping them to work with diverse students and appreciated faculty expertise and responsiveness. The program completer data supplied on the Commission's Accreditation Data Dashboard revealed the percentage of Multiple Subject candidates that rated their overall preparedness as "effective" or "very effective" fell below or slightly above 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 state exit survey percentages (75.8% CSUCI versus 85.3% state and 79.2% CSUCI versus 79% state). During the same period, the percentage of Single Subject candidates that rated their overall preparedness as "effective" or "very effective" fell below and close to state exit survey percentages (80.9% CSUCI vs 85.8% State and 84.2% CSUCI versus 86.4% State). Multiple Subject candidates overall average first attempt CalTPA pass rates for 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 fell below state averages (47.5% CSUCI versus 52.4% State and 37.3% CSUCI versus 53.8 State) respectively. Consistent with state trends, Single Subject candidate overall average first attempt CalTPA rates were much higher. For the same period, Single Subject candidates consistently performed above state averages (82.6% CSUCI versus 66.3% State, and 72% CSUCI versus 71% State).

During interviews, program leadership expressed they are highly committed to continuous improvement efforts. They acknowledged significant leadership and staffing changes, amidst COVID and changes in state requirements (e.g., flexibilities, new literacy standards and TPAs, and accreditation) resulted in constrained efforts to achieve their goals. Leadership and faculty shared that they are excited to develop rubrics and better leverage systems such as their Student Learning and Licensure (SL&L) platform for more systematic candidate and program monitoring.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Preliminary Multiple Subjects and Single Subject programs except for the following:

Standard 3D: Clinical Practice: Criteria for Selection of District-Employed Supervisors – Met with Concerns

Although the Multiple and Single Subject programs provide supervisors with an orientation, an extensive showcase website orienting them to the program, and invites them to professional development on supervision approaches, evidence did not show how the programs systematically track these hours to ensure all supervisors complete 10 hours of training and remain current in the knowledge and skills for supervision and program expectations.

Standard 5 A (4): Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) - Met with Concerns

Program documentation demonstrated that the ways program faculty use these data for program improvement purposes beyond TPA seminar courses was inconsistent. Program leadership indicated they need additional training and support, such as EdReport training and/or data analyst support to run rubric-level reports, to allow them to better support continuous improvement efforts across the programs with TPA implementation outside of TPA related courses.

Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs

Program Design

The Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) credential program is housed within the CSUCI School of Education's Teacher Education Department. The program is led by the chair of the Teacher Education Department under the direction of the School of Education dean. The chair works closely with the associate dean/director of clinical experiences and partnerships (CEPO) to secure quality field placements for teacher candidates. The chair and program coordinators work closely with the faculty director of clinical experiences and partnerships to secure quality student teaching and residency placements for teacher candidates, assign qualified university supervisors and provide professional development. The chair oversees tenure-track and part-time instructors and supervisors who teach the courses and supervise teacher candidates.

Professional development for faculty, supervisors, liaisons and field-based personnel take place over the course of the year. The chair, program coordinator and the director of clinical experiences and partnerships meet with those providing instruction and supervision to the candidates several times over the course of the year. In addition, ad hoc conversations regarding the program, course content or candidate performance take place frequently. Often the conversations are the catalyst for consideration of additions, changes or modifications of courses or are the basis of future actions. Faculty shared their appreciation for the accessibility of unit leadership and the opportunity to engage in meaningful communications.

Over the past two years, faculty and staff have created a clear and concise School of Education mission statement, which is featured on the new School of Education website and on promotional materials. This writing of the mission statement also informed the redrafting of the conceptual/theoretical framework that reflects the scholarly and research-based articulation of the values of faculty and staff. The mission statement is reflected in the course syllabi. During interviews, candidates articulated the program values of equity, diversity, inclusion, and teaching/educating for justice and often shared how these values are operationalized in their coursework and fieldwork experiences.

CSUCI has demonstrated a commitment to the community including the Ventura County Office of Education (VCOE) and the school districts within the region. The residency program has brought resources and opportunities for collaboration to support those earning the Education Specialist: MMSN credential. Residents currently are completing the fieldwork requirements in the Oxnard Elementary School District, Oxnard Union High School District, Rio School District, and Santa Paula Unified School District. The VCOE supports the Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs programs through mentoring professional development and opportunities for collaboration. Most candidates who earn their Education Specialist MMSN Credential at CSUCI enter Teacher Induction programs offered through the VCOE. Communication between professionals at the VCOE and the faculty at CSUCI supports a smooth transition into the workforce.

Demonstrating a community centered vision during the 2018-19 academic year, the School of Education convened stakeholder groups including county and district leaders, principals, teachers, faculty, supervisors, k-12 parents and special education programs to identify their vision of the competencies essential for the first day teacher. An advisory board was established and met several times per year prior to COVID. Although significant leadership, staffing, and resource changes have led to the advisory board not being reinstituted, the programs continue to have strong partnerships with the VCOE and surrounding districts. VCOE staff and CSU Channel Island faculty reported regular meetings, collaborative grants, induction orientations and professional development activities to “serve, support and educate” preservice and in-service teachers so they are welcomed, supported and ultimately remain in the profession and community.

The Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs credential program has a dedicated faculty of three professors. One faculty member who joined CSUCI in 2023 serves as the program coordinator. Tenure and tenure track faculty from other programs, as well as full and part-time lecturers participate in the program as course instructors, university fieldwork supervisors and residency liaisons.

The residency program is one of the pathways for the completion of the Education Specialist: Mild Moderate Support Needs and the Dual Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs and the Multiple Subject credential. The faculty of the Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs program recruit for the residency program and have more applicants than they can accommodate. Care is taken in the pairing of the resident with the mentor teacher. Current candidates said that they are at CSUCI because of the residency program.

The residency program serves as an anchor for the program and student teaching experiences of most of the education specialist candidates. Of the 13 enrolled candidates for the 2025-2026 year, nine are residents. This model provides candidates financial support and includes extended yearlong fieldwork experience with a single teacher. It enables districts to develop a pipeline to “grow their own” teacher workforce and provides some financial support to the residents. The residency stipends and other grants enable residents to have financial support

that is close to that of an intern teacher and has become an attractive option for program completion. District administration shared that there are not enough residents to fill the needs of the school district.

A residency coordinator manages the residency programs across the partner districts including Rio School District, Santa Paula, Oxnard Elementary and Oxnard Union High School Districts. District and county administrators shared that the strong relationship with CSUCI leads to teachers who are knowledgeable of the assets and the needs of the students within their service area. Interviews with current residents indicated that the residency program enabled them to return to their community and work with the next generation of students. As residents they could focus on learning to be the best they can give back to their communities. Program completers shared that the residency model provided time for in-depth learning and time to develop their skills within the context of their classroom. Not only did the candidates learn to carry out the responsibilities of a teacher of record, but they also felt that they became a member of the classroom and school community. Completers shared that they consider their residency teacher a colleague and mentor that they can call for assistance, support or just to talk. Those in the residency for the dual program indicated that the program enabled them to complete two credentials in a year.

Two additional pathways are available for the completion of the Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs credential. The difference in the pathway is in the fieldwork part of the program and in the case of the dual program, additional coursework. Candidates across the preliminary preparation programs share a common set of courses from Phase I to the culminating fieldwork seminar for most of the program. Dual program candidates take an additional two courses of methods courses that are content area based.

The major changes in the program took place to meet the requirements of SB 488. Submissions to the SB 488 committee were due October 2023. Faculty indicated that changes were made to better align the Multicultural and Multilingual K-12 literacy courses with additional attention to Standard 7 and the literacy TPEs. Discussion with the literacy faculty who teach the literacy courses indicates that significant attention was given to the elements of TPE 7 with a focus on foundational skills as well as the additional themes of meaning making, language development, effective expression and content knowledge.

Literacy and math courses incorporate strategies for teaching English Learners including SDAIE and translanguaging. A commitment to preparing teachers who are culturally aware, creating relationships with students, using funds of knowledge and the students' assets as a part of instruction is evident.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Prospective candidates must apply to the program through Cal State Apply and may be conditionally admitted to the program. This conditional admittance allows for the prospective candidates to complete Phase I of the program consisting of 17 units of courses prior to

application for the student teaching portion of the program, Phase II. Individuals begin a 45-hour early fieldwork experience during enrollment in the classroom management course which is a part of the Phase I course of study. This course is held at a school site where 45 hours of early fieldwork participation takes place. The two-semester Phase II includes content courses, a student teaching course, and a student teaching seminar course each semester. Candidates must complete additional requirements including Subject Matter Competency, U.S. Constitution, Certificate of Clearance and negative TB test in order to be fully admitted into Phase II.

There are three operational program pathways for Education Specialist MMSN teacher candidates: traditional student teaching, residency, residency (Dual and Education Specialist MMSN only). Regardless of pathway, candidates begin the fieldwork part of the program with observation and limited participation. During the first half of the first semester, the teacher candidate works with the district-employed supervisor or cooperating teacher where they become acquainted with the class and school, begin to work with individual students, and teach small groups of students. In the second part of the semester, candidates are immersed in the placement on a full-time basis in preparation for a 10-day solo teaching experience in planning, implementing, and assessing student learning. For all candidates, the CalTPA Math cycle is completed in the fall semester, and the CalTPA Literacy cycle is completed in the spring semester. During the last week of the semester, the teacher candidate phases out of the teaching role.

Traditional student teaching candidates complete 34 units of study and have two special education placements of 15 weeks each. In each student teaching placement, the traditional pathway candidates have a cooperating teacher (CT) and a university supervisor (US) to support them. These candidates begin with three days of site-based participation for the first eight weeks of the semester. Each semester, the last eight weeks require full time student teaching where the candidate completes a cycle of the CalTPA and a 10-day solo teaching experience. Traditional candidates complete over 300 hours of student teaching each semester.

Education Specialist MMSN residency candidates complete 34 units of study. These candidates have a yearlong single residency student teaching placement with a district employed supervisor (DES). Residency candidates have been placed with a district employed supervisor (DES) at the time of admission to the residency program. During the semester, the residency liaison visits the resident and DES and offers guidance and support. Since residents are in placement for the entire year, they complete over 400 hours of student teaching each semester. Residency candidates complete a 10-day solo experience and a cycle of the CalTPA each semester.

Dual program candidates complete 42 units over the course of two semesters. Candidates completing the Dual Education Specialist MMSN and Multiple Subject program have two semester long placements with one in special education and one in general education. These candidates may complete the program as residents (full time) with a DES or as traditional student teachers who will be in their placement three hours each week for eight weeks and full

time for the remainder of the semester. All program candidates can add a Bilingual Authorization to their credential by completing additional coursework, fieldwork, and a passing CSET III Spanish score to meet the language proficiency requirement.

Student teaching placements are made by the placement coordinator. Since student teachers have two placements, an effort is made to provide the candidate with two different grade-level experiences. Candidates in the Education Specialist program are provided with an elementary placement one semester and a secondary placement another semester. They are also provided with a Resource Specialist Program and Special Day Class experience.

During the clinical placement period, the US or the DES regularly observes and evaluates the teacher candidate using evaluative criteria aligned to the Universal Teacher Performance Expectations and MMSN standards. These scripted observations (a minimum of 6 per semester) enable the US and DES to provide guidance and feedback and document candidate growth. Candidates are required to submit a lesson plan to the US or the DES at least 24 hours in advance of the observation. The US and DES evaluate their candidates each semester at mid-term and in the final week of student teaching using the Midterm and Final Evaluation Form for Education Specialists and DUAL credential candidates. The six residency candidate observations are carried out by the district employed supervisor. The residency liaison serves as an additional set of eyes in the residency placement.

The fieldwork of candidates is focused on the development of content lessons that enable the candidate to demonstrate progress towards meeting the TPEs for the credentials being sought. Comments from current candidates, completers, supervisors and liaison indicate that the fieldwork is lesson and TPE-based. TPEs are listed next to each element of the lesson evaluation form. Candidates share the lesson at least 24 hours in advance of the observation which provides time for the US and CT or the DES to give feedback to the candidate that may or may not result in some changes in the lesson plan.

Candidates document the activities carried out in their fieldwork experience through daily entries in the Student Learning & Licensure (SL&L) management system. These entries are approved by the university supervisor, cooperating teacher, or the district employed supervisor. The SL&L system also serves as a repository for candidate lesson plans and supervisor observation notes.

The student teaching seminar is focused on the tasks, knowledge and skills needed for candidates to pass the CalTPA. Education Specialist MMSN candidates and Dual program candidates take the same student teaching seminar, though they will be completing different CalTPA assessments.

The fieldwork of candidates is focused on the development of content lessons that enable the candidate to demonstrate progress towards meeting the TPEs for the credentials being sought.

However, the structure of the fieldwork does not provide an opportunity for candidates to have experience across grade levels, models of service delivery and disability categories.

Assessment of Candidates

The first level of assessment begins at Phase I where individuals are completing the Phase I courses. Candidates must complete the Phase I courses with a grade of “C” or better. Upon entering Phase II, the student teaching phase of the program, candidate performance is evaluated through coursework and performance in fieldwork. Candidates are continually assessed for program competencies and meeting the TPEs through course assignments, signature assessments, field experiences, and the CalTPA.

Candidates are made aware of course and fieldwork competencies through the identification of the Universal and Education Specialist MMSN teaching performance expectations (TPEs). Each course syllabus identifies the TPEs covered in the course. In many cases, the specific assignment or activity has identified TPEs. Though performance in courses on activities and signature assignments and fieldwork provides the largest source of candidate assessment data, additional data is gathered through candidate entries and supervisor notes in the Student Learning and Licensure System. Candidate performance on the CalTPA serves as another assessment.

Each course contains instructor evaluated activities including reflections, role plays, case studies and scenarios. Course readings, lectures, videos and other sources of content provide the content for the course. Course instructors evaluate candidate’s performance on the course activities and signature assignments. Since these assignments are evaluated using a rubric, all candidates are evaluated with the same criteria regardless of the course instructor. Candidates must maintain a “B” average in the program.

Candidates' performance in fieldwork is assessed using the lesson observation form as well as the mid-term and end-of-term evaluation forms. These forms are completed by the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor, the district employed supervisor who also serves as the cooperating teacher, and the university supervisor. There are specific mid-term and end-of-term evaluation forms for candidates in the Education Specialist Instruction Program for Mild to Moderate Support Needs and candidates who are completing the DUAL program. Candidates who are student teachers are evaluated by the cooperating teacher in addition to the university supervisor as a part of the three-way conference at the end of the semester. Residency candidates will have mid-semester and end-of-semester evaluation meetings with their district employed mentor.

The final source of candidate evaluation comes from candidate performance on the CalTPA. Education Specialist Instruction Mild to Moderate Support Needs candidates complete the CalTPA for credential authorization. In this TPA, candidates are expected to demonstrate knowledge and skills reflecting the universal and the MMSN specific TPEs. Dual credential candidates complete the CalTPA for Multiple Subjects, which is based on the universal TPEs, but do not demonstrate their knowledge and skill related to being an education specialist.

Prospective candidates are first introduced to the assessment process as a part of the application interview, where faculty share information regarding the CalTPA, fieldwork requirements, and coursework. The program handbooks present this information for candidates' current and future reference. Course instructors share information on coursework in syllabi, and all syllabi contain links or reference to the universal and authorization TPEs. Candidates are informed of assessment results through course grades and fieldwork evaluations linked to the universal and authorization-specific TPEs.

At the midpoint of the semester, the program coordinator requests that faculty identify candidates who are not making adequate progress. The Statement of Concern form is completed by faculty and/or supervisors when an area of concern about a teacher candidate arises. The Statement of Concern is a plan of action detailing the steps that the teacher candidate will take to address the issues of concern. Specifics, such as a timeline to complete assignments or extending student teaching, should be included in addition to descriptions of the candidate's work to be accomplished. The candidate is supported by the program faculty and field-based personnel in completing the actions required on the Statement of Concern form.

At the end of each semester, candidates provide feedback regarding their fieldwork university supervisor, the student teaching cooperating teacher or residency district employed supervisor, and placement. They also share their perspectives on their experiences and level of support provided by their university supervisor and cooperating teacher and district employed supervisor. Additional data is collected through the Student Evaluation of Teaching Assessment completed for each course, and the results are shared with program faculty.

Interview results validate that candidates feel well supported in taking and passing programmatic and state assessments as well as feel supported by program personnel including supervisors, cooperating teachers, district employed supervisors, faculty, and program administration. Candidate confidence is increased in the completion of course assignments and supervised fieldwork experiences.

Candidates are required to pass the CalTPA to be recommended for a preliminary credential. A faculty member serves as the TPA coordinator. The program provides candidates with vouchers for the CalTPA so that candidates do not absorb the cost. Candidates have two opportunities to pass Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 of CalTPA. If the candidate does not pass CalTPA on the second attempt, they will need to coordinate with the program chair for an additional opportunity. Teacher candidates learn about the CalTPA in their student teaching seminar courses. Preparation for and completion of CalTPA is the candidate's responsibility, and any support provided by program personnel is in alignment with the CalTPA Guidelines for Acceptable Support.

The fieldwork seminars in fall and spring semesters provide candidates with the content and opportunities to practice the elements of the CalTPA prior to submission. Candidates felt that they were supported in the CalTPA process. Course instructors shared how prior course content

demonstrates effective strategies for use in the CalTPA assessment. They identified elements in courses and the application to the tasks of the CalTPA. The course instructor provides additional support and appropriate coaching for the candidates who were not successful with their submissions.

Due to the limited number of candidates who take the CalTPA for Education Specialists, the data is limited. Data for Dual program candidates taking the CalTPA for Multiple Subjects is presented as a part of the overall Multiple Subjects data. Therefore, analysis of the Dual candidates' performance is not available.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Preliminary Education Specialist (MMSN) except for the following:

Standard 1: Program Design and Curriculum – Met with Concerns

A review of the evidence demonstrated that the Preliminary Education Specialist (MMSN) does not fully address the elements of this standard, especially in relation to “knowledge of disability characteristics,” “case management practices,” typical and atypical child growth and development from birth through age 22,” “understanding the learning trajectories of young children to young adults,” and “the full range of service delivery options.” The program curriculum focuses primarily on instruction and clinical experiences for grades TK-6. Content related to the characteristics of secondary students with mild to moderate support needs as well as appropriate secondary level curriculum is not sufficient.

Standard 2: Preparing Candidates to Master the Teaching Performance Expectations - Met with Concerns

The evidence reviewed did not demonstrate that a system is in place to ensure that candidates are meeting each of the Education Specialist MMSN Teaching Performance Expectations, especially as they relate to programming, strategies, experiences with students who have special needs in grades 7-12 and to age 22.

Standard 3: Clinical Practice – Met with Concerns

The evidence reviewed did not demonstrate that the program ensures candidates have planned experiences and/or interactions that reflect general education and the full diversity of grades/ages, federal disability categories and the continuum of special education services outlined in the specific credential authorization. Completters shared that they learned about the IEP content and process; however, limited content related to case management strategies and practices was included in coursework or in their field placements. The evidence reviewed did not show a system is in place for determining that candidates had met all of the standard indicated on the lesson observation, mid and final evaluation forms.

Standard 4: Monitoring, Supporting, and Assessing Candidate Progress towards Meeting the Education Specialist Credential Requirements - Met with Concerns

The evidence provided inconsistently demonstrated the ways candidates in the Education Specialist MMSN program were assessed on their progress towards meeting and mastering the Education Specific MMSN credential specific performance expectations and requirements, particularly for the dual credential candidates.

Standard 5: Assessment of Candidate Competency - Met with Concerns

A review of the evidence revealed candidates in the DUAL Multiple Subject and Education Specialist Instruction Credential pathway complete the CalTPA for Multiple Subjects. As a result, candidates earning the MMSN credential via the DUAL credential pathway are not completing a summative assessment that evaluates candidates' attainment of the knowledge and skills identified for this specific credential.

Bilingual Authorization

Program Design

The Bilingual Authorization program is situated within the School of Education at California State University Channel Islands (CSUCI), as part of the Teacher Education Department. The program is integrally connected to the institution's Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist credential programs. Candidates add the Bilingual Authorization program to one of those credential tracks. The Bilingual Authorization program is designed for those who are bilingual and biliterate in English and Spanish, and who want to work with English Learner/Emergent Bilingual students in a variety of settings (dual language immersion classrooms, structured English immersion, among others).

The Bilingual Authorization program operates under the broader leadership of the Dean of the School of Education, who provides strategic oversight and ensures alignment with institutional and state standards. Within the School of Education, the program resides in the Teacher Education Department, led by the department chair, who oversees all credential programs, including the Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, and Bilingual Authorization programs. The day-to-day leadership and coordination of the Bilingual Authorization program are managed by the Bilingual Authorization program coordinator, who oversees curriculum design, course delivery, faculty assignments, and alignment with credential requirements. The department chair is responsible for faculty hiring and workload assignments.

The Bilingual Authorization credential counselor provides administrative support to the program. They also provide advising and administrative support to candidates, as well as assist with admissions, course sequencing, and credentialing processes. Faculty members, including both full-time and part-time instructors, deliver coursework and supervise field experiences in bilingual settings. The director of field placement collaborates closely with the program coordinator and department chair to ensure that candidates are placed in high-quality bilingual and dual-language classrooms for their clinical practice. Administrative and credential support staff within the School of Education further assist in the processing of applications, program

documentation, and candidate communication, contributing to the program's overall coordination and effectiveness.

The Bilingual Authorization program at CSUCI exhibits a strong commitment to cooperative program development and ongoing stakeholder engagement. Program leadership gathers input from a diverse network of partners, including the Ventura County Office of Education (VCOE), neighboring county offices of education, and local school districts and sites, through a range of structured meetings—weekly, monthly, quarterly, and ad hoc. This engagement ensures that the program's vision for and delivery of bilingual education is both place-based and contextually grounded, and responsive to the linguistic and cultural needs of the region.

To support candidates, faculty, and partner institutions holistically, the Bilingual Authorization program convenes regularly and on an as-needed basis within the Teacher Education Department and the School of Education and coordinates regularly with relevant academic departments across campus, including Ethnic Studies, Chicano Studies, and Spanish. These consistent, cross-departmental and community-focused interactions foster alignment between coursework, field experiences, and regional educational priorities, enhancing the overall preparation of teacher candidates to serve emergent bilingual students effectively.

The program engages in sustained dialogue with internal and external partners, including candidates, creating structured opportunities to gather feedback that informs ongoing, formative adjustments to curriculum and instructional offerings. These iterative discussions further guide strategic, long-term refinements to the program's structure, safeguarding the integrity of the Bilingual Authorization program while ensuring its continued relevance and responsiveness to the linguistic, cultural, and educational needs of the region.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Integrated Undergraduate Pathway

Undergraduate Teacher Education (ITEP) credential candidates pursuing a Liberal Studies Teaching and Learning degree may elect the Bilingual Authorization Emphasis, integrating the nine-unit Bilingual Authorization Phase I coursework into their major. This pathway is designed to enable candidates for concurrent enrollment in credential programs while completing the necessary coursework for the Bilingual Authorization. Admission to the credential program requires successful completion of the Phase I courses and other applicable credential admission requirements, including passing the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET) Spanish III to meet the language proficiency requirement.

Post Baccalaureate Concurrent Credential Pathway

Candidates enrolled in post baccalaureate Multiple Subject, Single Subject, or Education Specialist credential programs at CSUCI may pursue the Bilingual Authorization concurrently. After completing the nine-unit coursework, candidates engage in bilingual methods coursework and a semester of supervised student teaching in a bilingual or dual-language classroom. This pathway enables candidates to earn the Bilingual Authorization alongside their primary credential, ensuring alignment between initial teacher preparation and bilingual instructional practices.

Add-On / Post-Credential Pathway

Credentialed teachers seeking to add the Bilingual Authorization may enroll in the Add-On pathway. This program is offered during the summer and fall sessions, allowing candidates to complete the nine units of required coursework. Candidates must provide a passing CSET Spanish III score report to be eligible for the added authorization. The program is designed for credentialed teachers interested in adding a Bilingual Authorization to their teaching credential. At CSUCI, Bilingual Authorization program coursework is intentionally aligned with field experiences to ensure that theoretical knowledge is immediately reinforced through practical application. Foundational courses in bilingual education, sociocultural context, and language development are sequenced to precede methods and instructional courses, allowing candidates to integrate pedagogical frameworks with classroom practice. Supervised field placements and student teaching experiences are carefully aligned with course content, enabling candidates to implement strategies learned in the classroom under the guidance of experienced mentor teachers. Regular collaboration between faculty, the program coordinator, and the director of field placement ensures that field experiences reflect local bilingual and dual-language contexts, supporting the professional growth of candidates while maintaining program coherence and adherence to state standards.

The program uses formative feedback from field experiences to inform ongoing coursework and program refinement. Mentor teachers, university supervisors, and candidates provide structured observations and reflections that are reviewed by faculty and the program coordinator, creating multiple opportunities to adjust instructional approaches and course content in real time. This feedback loop ensures that coursework remains responsive to candidates' evolving needs and the realities of bilingual classrooms, while also guiding longer-term program enhancements. By integrating insights from field placements into curricular decisions, the program maintains alignment between academic preparation and practical teaching, strengthening both candidate development and the overall effectiveness of the Bilingual Authorization program.

Within the Bilingual Authorization program at CSUCI, coursework is designed to provide candidates with comprehensive preparation in key areas essential for effective bilingual instruction. Foundational courses address the needs of English learners across all initial teaching programs, including the sociocultural, linguistic, and cognitive dimensions of second-language acquisition. Literacy instruction is emphasized, equipping candidates with strategies for supporting emergent bilingual students in reading and writing development across grade

levels. For candidates in Single Subject credential program, coursework includes subject-specific pedagogy that integrates bilingual instructional strategies within the content area, enabling teachers to adapt academic instruction to meet the language and learning needs of diverse students.

Additional coursework addresses culturally responsive teaching, bilingual assessment, and instructional planning, ensuring that candidates are prepared to create equitable, rigorous, and linguistically responsive learning environments. Collectively, these courses provide a coherent foundation for candidates to apply research-based practices in bilingual classrooms and support the academic and linguistic development of emergent bilingual learners.

Critical coursework is intentionally sequenced and integrated with field experiences in the Bilingual Authorization program to maximize the application of theoretical knowledge in authentic classroom settings. Foundational courses addressing English learners, literacy instruction, and subject-specific pedagogy are completed prior to or concurrently with methods courses and supervised teaching placements, enabling candidates to apply research-based instructional strategies in bilingual and dual-language classrooms. Field experiences are designed to correspond directly with course content, allowing candidates to implement literacy strategies, differentiated instruction, and culturally responsive practices under the guidance of mentor teachers and university supervisors.

Regular reflection, feedback, and consultation between faculty, the program coordinator, and field placement mentors ensure that coursework remains relevant and responsive to classroom realities, fostering the development of candidates who are both pedagogically proficient and culturally competent. This integrated approach ensures coherence across the curriculum and fieldwork, preparing candidates to meet the academic and linguistic needs of emergent bilingual learners effectively.

Candidates in the Bilingual Authorization program at CSUCI participate in multiple field placements designed to provide progressively responsible classroom experiences. Multiple Subject candidates complete at least one semester of supervised student teaching in a bilingual or dual-language classroom, in addition to earlier observational and practicum experiences integrated with coursework. Education Specialist and Single Subject candidates are provided with a short-term field experience in a dual language setting. Field placements are coordinated by the program coordinator in collaboration with the director of field placement and partner school districts, including VCOE and neighboring district offices.

Placement decisions consider classroom language environment, grade level, and the candidate's credential pathway to ensure alignment with program goals. Field experiences are closely monitored by university supervisors and mentor teachers, who provide formative feedback on instructional planning, classroom management, and culturally and linguistically responsive teaching practices. Regular communication between supervisors, program faculty, and candidates supports ongoing reflection and ensures that placements are coherent with

coursework, meet state standards, and provide meaningful opportunities for candidates to develop the competencies required for bilingual instruction.

The CSUCI Bilingual Authorization program maintains partnerships with local school districts to provide candidates with both full-semester and short-term field experiences in bilingual and dual-language settings. During the 2023–2024 academic year, a total of 23 student teachers were placed in full-semester experiences across eight schools in the Oxnard, Hueneme, Ventura, Rio, and Pleasant Valley districts, all of which are designated Title I schools, Spanish bilingual classrooms, and staffed with bilingual-authorized teachers. In addition, four candidates completed 20-hour short-term placements in the spring semester at Channel Islands High School (Oxnard Union High School District) and University Preparation Charter School (Pleasant Valley School District in Camarillo).

In 2024–2025, eight student teachers were placed in full-semester assignments across five schools in the Oxnard, Hueneme, Rio, and Ventura districts, again all in Title I schools, Spanish bilingual classrooms, and with bilingual-authorized teachers. Short-term 20-hour placements in Spring 2025 included five candidates across five schools, providing additional exposure to bilingual instruction in varied contexts.

The Bilingual Authorization program at CSUCI provides a comprehensive and multi-layered system of support for candidates during field experiences and clinical practice. Each candidate is guided by both a university supervisor and a district-employed cooperating teacher, ensuring consistent feedback from academic and practitioner perspectives. University supervisors—experienced bilingual educators—conduct regular classroom observations, typically bi-weekly, to provide formative feedback on lesson design, language use, and culturally responsive pedagogy. They also facilitate reflective conferences that link candidates’ fieldwork to coursework and professional standards. Cooperating teachers, selected in collaboration with district partners, provide ongoing daily mentorship, model effective bilingual instructional practices, and engage candidates in co-planning, co-teaching, and assessment. Program faculty and supervisors meet regularly with cooperating teachers to calibrate expectations, monitor candidate progress, and address emerging needs.

Formal evaluations are completed at designated points during the placement, incorporating input from both supervisors and mentor teachers. This dual system of support—anchored in collaboration between program personnel and district partners—ensures that candidates receive consistent, contextually grounded guidance that promotes professional growth, pedagogical proficiency, and alignment with the program’s bilingual education vision.

To maintain coherence and quality across all field placements, the Bilingual Authorization program sustains frequent and structured communication among university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and program faculty. Joint meetings are held at the outset of each semester to align expectations and review supervision protocols, with follow-up calibration sessions convened monthly or as needed. Supervisors and cooperating teachers communicate weekly—through in-person conferences, digital observation notes, and collaborative online

platforms such as Canvas or email—to monitor candidate progress and address emergent instructional concerns. Program coordinators and field placement directors maintain continuous contact with district liaisons and site administrators to ensure placements remain contextually appropriate and mutually beneficial. This sustained communication network reinforces shared accountability, ensures consistency in candidate evaluation, and strengthens the reciprocal partnership between CSUCI and its school district collaborators.

The Bilingual Authorization program at CSUCI is deeply committed to fostering the academic and professional success of all candidates through a responsive system of support. Faculty members and university supervisors maintain close, ongoing communication with candidates to identify early signs of difficulty and provide timely, targeted interventions. Academic support includes individualized faculty advising, structured office hours, and access to the University's Learning Resource Center for tutoring and academic skill development. Within the clinical setting, mentor teachers and university supervisors collaborate to provide formative feedback, guided reflection, and co-planning opportunities that promote professional growth. When additional support is warranted, the program coordinator and department chair collaborate with faculty and site supervisors to develop individualized improvement or support plans, ensuring that interventions are both constructive and aligned with program standards. The program's emphasis on reflective practice, culturally responsive pedagogy, and relational mentoring allows candidates to develop resilience and competence as bilingual educators while maintaining high expectations for academic and professional excellence.

Candidate support activities within the Bilingual Authorization program are documented and reviewed as part of the program's continuous improvement processes. Faculty, supervisors, and the program coordinator maintain detailed records of candidate progress, advising notes, and support plans, which are reviewed regularly during program and departmental meetings. These data inform discussions on curricular alignment, fieldwork expectations, and overall candidate preparedness. Trends or recurring areas of need are analyzed to guide adjustments to coursework, supervision structures, and candidate support protocols. Feedback from candidates, mentor teachers, and supervisors is also incorporated into annual program assessments and shared with the School of Education's leadership team to ensure accountability and alignment with institutional goals. Through these intentional feedback loops, the program sustains a responsive, evidence-based approach to candidate support that promotes equity, continuous learning, and overall program integrity.

The Bilingual Authorization program at CSUCI employs a multi-source approach to data collection on both coursework and clinical practice experiences to ensure ongoing program quality and responsiveness. Candidate performance data are gathered through course-embedded assessments, signature assignments, and evaluations from university supervisors and cooperating teachers during field placements. Additional feedback is collected through end-of-course surveys, candidate exit surveys and anecdotal interviews, and partner district input during regular advisory and collaborative meetings. These data are reviewed collaboratively by the Bilingual Authorization program coordinator, department chair, and faculty within the School of Education as part of the continuous improvement cycle.

Findings are also disseminated during departmental and program-level meetings to identify trends, discuss areas of strength, and develop targeted action plans. Recent examples of data-driven improvements include the refinement of bilingual methods coursework to strengthen alignment with the California English Learner Roadmap and the addition of field placements in dual-language immersion classrooms to enhance candidate preparation for emerging district needs. This reflective and evidence-based process ensures that the program remains contextually grounded, responsive to stakeholder input, and aligned with evolving state standards and community priorities.

Assessment of Candidates

The CSUCI Bilingual Authorization program implements a structured and multi-tiered system of candidate assessment to ensure the development of effective bilingual teaching practices. Each candidate participates in six formal instructional assessments (observations) conducted either by a university supervisor in partnership with a mentor teacher for the traditional credential pathway, or by a mentor teacher in conjunction with a residency liaison for candidates in the Residency pathway. Candidates plan lessons using a proprietary lesson plan template, and evaluators utilize the CSUCI Formal Observation for Teacher Candidates During Student Teaching Protocol to assess instructional effectiveness.

In addition to these formal assessments, the program provides ongoing informal instructional evaluations, allowing for continuous feedback and reflective practice. Mid-term and final evaluations are conducted each semester: district-employed supervisors and university supervisors jointly evaluate candidates at mid-term and independently conduct final assessments, while mentor teachers in the Residency pathway complete mid-term and final evaluations with guidance from the residency liaison. This multi-layered evaluation structure ensures that candidates receive timely, formative feedback, supporting their professional growth and the program's commitment to high-quality bilingual teacher preparation.

Candidates in the CSUCI Bilingual Authorization program receive ongoing guidance regarding all required programmatic and state assessments from admission through program completion. Assessment expectations, timelines, and performance benchmarks are introduced during program orientation and revisited in advising sessions, course syllabi, and program handbooks. Faculty advisors and the program coordinator provide detailed information about when assessments must be taken, how results are communicated, and what steps candidates should take to interpret and act upon their results. Candidates are also directed to university resources such as the School of Education's Advising Center, Writing and Multilingual Learning Centers, and test preparation workshops for additional support. To ensure equitable success, the Bilingual Authorization program maintains a comprehensive system of academic and individualized support for candidates who may struggle with assessments.

Faculty and supervisors monitor candidate progress through formative assignments, field evaluations, and performance data. When challenges are identified, tailored intervention plans are developed collaboratively with the candidate, including targeted feedback, tutoring, mentoring, and additional practice opportunities prior to retaking any assessment. The program

also maintains strong communication with site mentors and field supervisors to ensure alignment of academic and practical support.

The program actively seeks candidate feedback regarding assessment preparation and support through course evaluations, end-of-program surveys, and focus groups. Candidates are encouraged to share their experiences related to the clarity of assessment expectations, the quality of instructional preparation, and the effectiveness of the support systems provided. Input from these feedback mechanisms is reviewed collectively by faculty and leadership within the School of Education to inform continuous program improvement. This reflective and responsive approach ensures that the Bilingual Authorization program remains transparent, supportive, and aligned with both state standards and the needs of its diverse candidate population.

Assessment data are collected, analyzed, and reviewed within the CSUCI Bilingual Authorization program to inform continuous improvement and ensure alignment with state and institutional standards. Candidate performance data from signature assignments, field evaluations, course assessments, and state-required examinations are aggregated and analyzed each semester by faculty and program leadership within the School of Education. These data are discussed in program meetings, assessment retreats, and collaborative sessions with faculty from related departments—including Teacher Education, Spanish, and Chicana/o Studies—to identify trends, strengths, and areas in need of refinement. Feedback from candidates, supervisors, and community partners is triangulated with quantitative outcomes to inform evidence-based modifications to coursework, fieldwork expectations, and candidate supports.

When patterns of challenge are identified, targeted interventions—such as curricular adjustments, enhanced field supervision, or the integration of additional pedagogical supports—are implemented. This data-driven and reflective approach ensures that the Bilingual Authorization program remains responsive to evolving educational contexts, continually enhancing its quality, relevance, and impact on the preparation of future bilingual educators.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Bilingual Authorization program.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

California State University, Channel Islands serves the greater region of Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties. The unit is characterized by high levels of collaboration, deep and impactful partnerships with P-12 personnel and programs across the region, responsiveness to candidates and commitment to preparing them in an environment that builds on their assets and supports them to develop into excellent educators for equity and social justice.

The site visit team identified myriad examples of innovation, effectiveness, and impact. In addition to the programs under review, the unit has also been successful in securing external funding to support several state-of-the-art programs including a residency program and a retention program for bilingual and special education educators. Representative constituents characterized their collaborations with unit programs and faculty as meaningful, collegial, and highly valued. Current candidates and program completers praised the programs and associated faculty for a memorable level of responsiveness, care and rigor.

The site visit team recognized that the unit implements many effective practices but also would benefit from implementing more sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program. Ensuring the institution has the appropriate infrastructure in place will lead to practices resulting in consistent, intentional, and efficient operations, aligned with the Commission standards.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:	<i>No response needed</i>
The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among, and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California's adopted standards and curricular frameworks.	Consistently
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituencies in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	Consistently
The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation.	Inconsistently

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development/instruction, field based supervision and clinical experiences.	Inconsistently
The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.	Inconsistently
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	Consistently
The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. Qualifications of faculty and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service.	Consistently
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 1: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Review of this standard included an analysis of relevant documents and interviews with key constituencies including leaders at the campus, the School of Education, and program levels, select faculty and staff, current candidates and program completers, and representative external partners.

The unit has developed a research-based vision whose themes are put into practice in program curriculum, policies and practices, as evidenced by document review and testimony from candidates, completers, and external partners. The programs are staffed by well-qualified faculty who remain current in their respective fields through robust research agendas, success with securing external funding (e.g., grants), and active collaborations with external partners which extend beyond program operation and also occasionally include joint pursuit of research and extra-mural grants and funding. Moreover, interviews with current candidates and completers highlighted a common theme of caring and responsive practice among the program

faculty, further supporting the finding that the faculty “demonstrate effective professional practices.”

Unit operations are supported by a regular internal meeting structure that fosters ongoing communication and information flow among key program staff and unit leadership. Interviews corroborated that faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituencies internal to the unit participate in appropriate decision-making processes.

The unit is viewed by campus leadership and the broader P-12 community as making important contributions, particularly with respect to preparing educators that are well-equipped to serve the local and regional communities. The unit has initiated programs and practices that are respected and valued by internal and external constituencies alike.

A review of program operations documents and interviews with constituencies indicate that the programs operate effectively and responsively. However, due to resource constraints, programs must operate extremely efficiently. These necessary efficiencies can result in a shortchanging of some elements of program operation, particularly related to recruitment, developing and deepening the pipeline of “feeder” programs and institutions, and continuous improvement efforts. Recent instability of unit leadership has also contributed to unevenness in overall operations, impacting some programs more than others. The unit uses an innovative and highly personalized approach to the credential recommendation process, which is executed with precision.

Rationale for the Finding

The unit enjoys sustained and mutually beneficial collaborations with P-12 partners. The unit has initiated many programs and practices that are respected and valued by internal and external constituencies alike. Many of these practices and programs operate in a seemingly ad-hoc manner, with light systematization or standardization. The collaboration relies in large part on a specific person or role, rather than mutually developed systems or formal/official bodies (councils, committees, area groups, etc.) with more formalized processes and practices (e.g., representative group rosters, meeting schedules, co-developed agendas, etc.). Therefore, their presence and impact are not consistently evident across programs or contexts.

This same dynamic was echoed in the review of evidence about collaboration with campus partners, where communication and collaboration are occurring, but in an ad-hoc and situational manner rather than as a result of jointly maintained systems, structures or processes designed to elicit active, reflective or strategic engagement.

Evidence related to more formal collaboration structures was not robust enough to determine the nature of the interactions in reference to this Common Standard (e.g., limited documentation, interviews did not fully corroborate written materials).

The evidence further indicates that there is insufficient support to ensure that all programs are able to engage in core program activities, particularly recruitment, deepening partnerships and

pipelines (both internal and external), engaging in continuous improvement activities, and providing support to program completers as they on-board into the profession. There was limited evidence regarding the existence of infrastructure to facilitate and support these activities, staff capacity, and unit norms and incentives (specifically in relation to deepening pipelines, for recruitment and alumni support, and continuous improvement).

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Team Finding
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	<i>No response needed</i>
The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	Inconsistently
The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.	Consistently
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements.	Inconsistently
Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.	Inconsistently

Finding on Common Standard 2: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The infrastructure to support interested and qualified candidates into the educator preparation programs is articulated and integrated into the overall university admission process as reflected in the written documents, and is further supported by the interviews especially in the area of selecting candidates for the residency program and candidates who are selected to participate in the Special And Bilingual Educator Retention (SABER) grant funded program to support their obtainment of the Bilingual Authorization and the MMSN credential. There is also evidence gathered through the interviews to suggest a robust relationship between constituencies, program staff, site support staff and candidates to support successful entry and success while in the program. However, there was minimal evidence to support that formalized processes are in place to support retention of candidates in the profession. It should be noted however that the SABER grant program is an excellent example of a program resource that focuses on retention in the profession intentionally and is both articulated in clearly developed tools to track

candidate success as well as course learning outcomes designed to support candidate retention in the profession. For example, a key element of the SABER grant program is to help candidates master the art of classroom management and understanding effective ways to manage and address the behaviors of students who may struggle with social emotional learning skills. The reason for this focus, as clarified through the interviews of key personnel, is due to the body of research that suggests that a common reason educators leave the profession is due to the challenges surrounding classroom management. Interviews with faculty and programs further substantiate an intentional focus on classroom management and meeting the social emotional needs of students.

In addition, the level of coordination and collaboration with the Ventura County Office of Education and individual school districts is impressive and evidence gathered from interviews clearly indicated that there is a specific focus on seeking qualified candidates to diversify the pool of qualified applicants to fill vacancies, particularly in the geographic areas near the university and multiple measures are considered when seeking applicants. The School of Education advisory board and additional efforts to leverage other university-wide advisory groups, as indicated by the dean of the School of Education play a key role in supporting the recruitment efforts but the interviews with School of Education leadership and program leads indicated that more support at the university level was needed to broaden the recruitment efforts across all programs.

Faculty participation, both in the program and in the community, substantiates robust efforts to support, advise, and assist candidates to succeed and thrive in the various programs. This was evidenced by the exemplary support provided by the credential analysts. For all credential programs being reviewed, it was very evident that the credential analysts track the journey of every candidate in a highly personalized way. It was also evident that the credential analysts play an important role as the conduit for candidates to successfully meet the requirements to attain their desired credential. The credential analysts meet personally with every applicant to ensure that the applicant is admitted into the credential program and pathway that best meets their needs. While the process is clearly explained by key personnel, the unit would benefit from formalizing these processes in such a way as to capture the individual notes that are shared in the individual candidate files and calendars that are maintained individually by the analysts.

Key personnel are well qualified as evidenced by the qualifications and experiences embedded into the program description and were clearly supported during the site visit. Standards set forth for academic staff are impressive as depicted in the Program Personnel Standards document which was also well supported through the interviews during the site visit. There is also much evidence to support myriad opportunities for staff and faculty to connect with interested applicants and it is impressive that there are multiple meeting opportunities for interested candidates to learn about program options. The website is organized with clearly identified touch points to facilitate interaction between candidates and staff to problem solve and advance in the program. However, during the site visit it became evident that the support at the university level is not nearly as robust as it is at the School of Education level. The

changes in leadership both at the school level and university level have impacted the school's capacity to refine processes into a more cohesive and systematic framework according to the staff and leadership who were interviewed. However, it should be noted that the dedication and commitment of the school staff and leadership team is impressive, and a common thread across all programs was passion and commitment on the part of staff to support candidates and a strong desire to create more capacity within programs to focus on effective ways to retain candidates in the profession.

While there was sufficient evidence to support that candidate competency and performance expectations were met, there were some discrepancies in course syllabi that supported key competencies, particularly in cases where candidates were seeking dual credentials. It was also not consistent across programs the degree to which course outcomes were measured in relationship to candidate competencies in a formalized manner to facilitate timely tracking of student mastery of core competencies.

Rationale for the Finding

There was evidence to support a specific and intentional focus on retention across some programs but was not consistent across all programs. Retention of candidates was evident in the SABER grant program which requires that the candidate must be in a special education placement for two years and the coursework is visibly aligned to ensure that students receive adequate support to remain in the profession. However, a review of the evidence showed this was not articulated across the other programs. The evidence reviewed did not reveal a formalized process is in place to align course outcomes, as depicted in the syllabi across programs, to align with candidate performance. This was especially evident in programs that promoted the obtainment of dual credentials.

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards.	Consistently
The unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.	Consistently
The unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites, as appropriate to the program.	Consistently

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
Through site-based work and clinical experiences, programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	Consistently
The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	Inconsistently
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	Consistently
For each <i>program</i> the <i>unit</i> offers, candidates have significant experience in <i>California public schools</i> with diverse <i>student</i> populations and the opportunity to work with the range of <i>students</i> identified in the <i>program</i> standards.	Inconsistently

Finding on Common Standard 3: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The coursework provided throughout the credential programs is robust and reflective of current research and best practices in the field. The courses in each program are aligned to the common standards throughout the program and there are many examples of robust assignments and reflections to substantiate the intricate nature of each program, in terms of instruction, candidate support and robust fieldwork placements and experiences. There is also evidence to support that coursework and site/staff supervision of candidates in the field is carefully planned to reflect a focus on the school climate. Courses around school climate and classroom management are built into the program requirements, but most impressive was the focus on the part of faculty, mentors, and liaisons to support candidates through a robust debriefing process of the execution of lesson plans from the perspective of examining the impact of the lesson and lesson considerations to support the well-being of the students.

Faculty interviews provided clear evidence that faculty are extremely knowledgeable and well trained to deliver high level instruction. Interviews with faculty also indicated that faculty members are involved in myriad activities to support their own professional knowledge and development, as well as impressive experiences in the field. Most faculty members, mentors, and supervisors are either currently working in the K-12 system or have prior experience in K-12 systems and in most cases, leadership and/or curriculum experiences in K-12. The Roadmaps

depicted in the program materials provide a clear understanding of the program components and a clear timeframe for completing the program course offerings. Evidence embedded into the program documents also indicated that candidates have a voice in the delivery of program elements, but there was not a sufficient number of candidates to interview to indicate from a candidate perspective that the alignment between coursework and field experiences is aligned in real time. However, the candidate voice has impacted course delivery and organization. For example, in the teacher credential programs, the delivery of courses changed to an eight to ten week delivery of courses in the afternoon and evening as opposed to a one day a week for 15 weeks as a means to make the program more manageable for candidates, taking into consideration their field experiences and other demands on their time.

There was much evidence to support a high-level of collaboration relative to the selection of key personnel to support clinical and field work experiences. Two examples which highlight the passion and intentionality of this collaboration amongst staff can be found in the Bilingual Authorization program and the other in the placement of candidates in fieldwork placements. In the Bilingual Authorization program, the team expressed unanimously that the courses explicitly prepare candidates in biliteracy and academic language proficiency and that the fieldwork experiences are authentic. Candidate interviews confirm they receive a lot of support to pass the Spanish CSET, which they believe contributes greatly to helping them demonstrate academic language proficiency in their field and clinical experiences. The interviews substantiated the high quality of the site supervisors who demonstrate exemplary proficiency in biliteracy and academic language. Another attribute of this program is the focus on selection of qualified mentors to support candidates in that mentors are handpicked and are usually completers of the CSUCI program. In fact, one team member indicated that this past year there were actually more qualified mentors available to support new candidates than candidates themselves. The reason cited for this is the intentional focus on instilling in program participants, the importance of giving back to their schools and their profession to intentionally build a robust support system for candidates. It should be noted that the role of the mentor is particularly critical in the residency program because the mentor is the evaluator for the candidate's work and fieldwork in the program.

A second example to support fieldwork is the collaborative process to place candidates at school sites which is done with the help of school district personnel attached to the human resources department of the school districts. This involvement of human resource staff and district leadership also supports the labor-intensive process of securing MOUs to support the placement of candidates at the school sites, but more importantly, oversight from district leadership helps to ensure that site supervisors are highly qualified and experienced to provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.

In the area of providing candidates with significant experiences, there is concern that not all programs provide direct evidence that candidates do not receive a range of experiences across grade levels. This concern was most pervasive in programs where there is a dual credential component as it relates to the education specialist credential.

Rationale for the Finding

The evidence indicates that the unit practices are generally aligned with Common Standard 3. However, there is an inconsistency in some programs, especially the Education Specialist: MMSN program, in the extent to which their candidates “work with the range of *students* identified in the *program* standards,” resulting in an inequitable prioritization of some competencies over others in the program’s implementation of the Teacher Performance Expectations. Further, there is inconsistency in terms of how the programs systematically document the training, orientation, and support of their site-based supervisors. This is especially noted for the Multiple and Single Subject programs.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.	Not Evidenced
The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.	Inconsistently
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.	Not Evidenced
The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from key constituencies such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.	Inconsistently

Finding on Common Standard 4: Not Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Although the unit and programs conduct periodic assessments of course content, fieldwork, and candidate support services, these activities appear to occur inconsistently and without a formalized structure across all programs. Some program personnel shared examples of localized evaluation and data use, while others lacked evidence of regular assessment or systematic analysis. The variation in assessment practices prevents the unit from ensuring consistent program effectiveness and alignment with standards.

While some programs have gathered feedback from candidates, completers, and community partners, a consistent, unit-wide system for collecting and analyzing multiple measures of data is not evident. Processes for integrating feedback from employers and educational partners, as well as data on candidate readiness for professional practice, were not consistently observed.

The inconsistent implementation of these feedback mechanisms limits the unit’s ability to demonstrate a comprehensive, data-informed approach to continuous improvement.

Rationale for the Finding

Evidence reviewed did not demonstrate a clearly defined or systematically implemented continuous improvement process at either the unit or program level. While individual programs have engaged in some assessment or reflective practices, there is insufficient evidence showing how data are collected, analyzed, and used collectively to evaluate unit effectiveness or to inform coordinated program modifications.

The review did not yield sufficient evidence that candidate and completer data, or data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations, are regularly and systematically collected, analyzed, and used to guide program and operational improvements. While limited examples of data collection and analysis were shared, these examples did not indicate a coherent process connecting data analysis to decision-making or program modifications.

Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Team Finding
The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.	Consistently
The unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California’s students.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 5: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard.

The CSUCI School of Education ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to educate and support all students effectively in meeting state-adopted academic standards.

Candidates and program completers across all School of Education programs consistently highlighted the responsiveness and individualized support provided by faculty and program leadership. One candidate shared, “From the start of the program, teachers were there for us. They took the time to go in depth and provided feedback that helped me adjust my lessons so students could better understand the content.”

Several candidates also spoke highly of the support received from their seminar instructors: “My seminar teacher was there for me throughout the entire year. She was always available to help during the program and even called me today just to check in—and I’m no longer a CSUCI student.” Another candidate added, “The seminar course was a huge strength. It really prepared me and my peers for the CalTPA and for practical, real-world teaching—it meant so much to me.”

The CSUCI School of Education continues to demonstrate a positive impact on teaching and learning in schools serving California’s students through its educator preparation programs across Ventura County. In collaboration with the Ventura County Office of Education (VCOE), grants such as *Educators Thriving*, *Effecting Behavior Change*, and the *Literacy Bridge Pathway* are strengthening teaching practices among pre-service, induction, and full-time teachers. As a result of these partnerships, 89 new teachers entered the workforce with credentials across multiple content areas.

The Math and Science Teacher Initiative (MSTI) grant, administered systemwide across the CSU, continues to provide critical support to candidates pursuing credentials in mathematics and science through direct financial assistance. While modest in scale, the grant’s impact within the CSUCI community is significant. MSTI funding supports candidates from Phase I coursework through graduation and into their early careers. Additionally, collaboration with the VCOE Next Generation Science Standards Network fosters professional connections that help retain qualified science educators in the field. One CSUCI faculty member observed, “Without the support of MSTI funding, the dream of becoming a teacher would not be possible—it’s life-changing for our community.”

Further extending its outreach, the MSTI grant also funded a STEM Day event that engaged 250 sixth-grade students in hands-on learning activities. The event provided participants with opportunities to explore science, technology, engineering, and mathematics concepts while gaining insight into potential STEM-related career pathways.