

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

Division of Standards, Accreditation, and Workforce Investment August 2026

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **California State University, San Bernardino**. 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
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	Met
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met with Concerns
4) Continuous Improvement	Met with Concerns
5) Program Impact	Met

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Multiple Subject	7	6	1	0
Preliminary Single Subject	7	6	1	0
Bilingual Authorization	5	5	0	0
Preliminary Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Support Needs	7	6	1	0
Preliminary Education Specialist Extensive Support Needs	7	6	1	0
Early Childhood Special Education	7	6	1	0

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Adapted Physical Education Specialist	13	12	1	0
Pupil Personnel I Services School Counseling	5	5	0	0
Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology	5	5	0	0
Preliminary Administrative Services	9	9	0	0
*Designated Subjects Career Technical Education	16	0	2	14
**Designated Subjects Adult Education	13	0	1	12

*CTE Program Standards 8-16 are subsumed under Program Standard 6

**Adult Education Program Standards 5-13 are subsumed under Program Standard 4

Note: Designated Subjects Special Subjects and Supervision and Coordination credential programs were not reviewed as part of the accreditation site visit and were moved to inactive accreditation status at the Committee on Accreditation on April 21, 2026.

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, San Bernardino

Dates of Visit: April 12-15, 2026

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
April 22, 2018	<u>Accreditation</u>

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 candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, supervising practitioners, and community partners. 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 general preconditions and preconditions for all credential programs were **met**.

Program Standards

All program standards for the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs were **met, except for Program Standard 3, which was met with concerns**.

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

All program standards for the Preliminary Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs credential programs were **met, except for Program Standard 3, which was met with concerns**.

All program standards for the Early Childhood Special Education credential program were **met, except for Program Standard 3, which was met with concerns**.

All program standards for the Adapted Physical Education Specialist credential program were **met, except for Program Standard 9, which was met with concerns**.

All program standards for the Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling credential program were **met**.

All program standards for the Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology credential program were **met**.

All program standards for the Preliminary Administrative Services credential program were **met**.

For the Designated Subjects Career Technical Education credential program, program standards 1 and 2 were **met with concerns**, and program standards 3 through 16 were **not met**.

For the Designated Subjects Adult Education credential program, program standard 1 was **met with concerns**, and program standards 2 through 13 were **not met**.

The Designated Subjects Special Subjects and Supervision and Coordination credential programs were not reviewed as part of the accreditation site visit and were moved to Inactive accreditation status at the Committee on Accreditation meeting on April 21, 2026.

Common Standards

Common Standards 1, 2, and 5 were **met**. Common Standards 3 and 4 were **met with concerns**.

Overall Recommendation

Given the above findings on preconditions, program standards and common standards, the review team recommends an accreditation status of **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

The team recommends the following stipulations:

Program Standards

1. For the Designated Subjects programs, that within one year, the institution provide a report that addresses all CTE and Adult Education program standards.

The team further recommends that, due to the nature in which CTE and Adult Education preliminary credentials are issued, the institution shall not be permitted to recommend candidates for a preliminary CTE or Adult Education credential until all standards have been addressed and the 7th year report accepted by the COA.

2. For all other credential programs, that within one year, the institution provide a report to address each program standard which was met with concerns.

Common Standard 3

3. That within one year, the institution provide a report that addresses each element of Common Standard 3 that was inconsistently evidenced. These include the following:

- a. Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.
- b. Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.
- c. All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.

Common Standard 4

4. That within one year, the institution provide a report that addresses each element of Common Standard 4 that was inconsistently evidenced. These include the following:
 - a. 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.
 - b. Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completion data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.

Six-Month Report

5. That within six months, the institution provide a six-month report to the Committee on Accreditation on the progress made to address each of the stipulations above.

In addition, staff recommends that:

- California State University, San Bernardino's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- California State University, San Bernardino be granted full approval 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.
- California State University, San Bernardino be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

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
- Preliminary Single Subject
- Bilingual Authorization
- Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs
- Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs
- Preliminary Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education
- Adapted Physical Education Specialist
- Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling
- Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology
- Preliminary Administrative Services
- Designated Subjects Career Technical Education and Adult Education

The following programs were not reviewed at the site visit and were moved to Inactive status at the COA meeting on April 21, 2026.

- Designated Subjects Special Subjects
- Designated Subjects Supervision and Coordination

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission	Assessment Materials
Program Review Submission	Candidate Handbooks
Common Standards Addendum	Survey Results
Program Review Addendum	Performance Expectation Materials
Course Syllabi and Course of Study	Precondition Responses
Candidate Advisement Materials	Performance Assessment Results and
Accreditation Website	Analysis
Faculty Vitae	Examination Results
Candidate Files	Accreditation Data Dashboard

Interviews Conducted

Constituencies	TOTAL
Candidates	406
Completers	121
Employers	11
Institutional Administration	8
Program Coordinators	9
Faculty	84
TPA/APA Coordinators	5
Field Supervisors – Program	33
Field Supervisors – District	54
Credential Analysts and Staff	30
Advisory Board Members	29
Advocacy Groups	19
TOTAL	809

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.

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Mimi Miller
California State University, Chico

Common Standards:

Terri Pieretti
National University

Mahmoud Suleiman
California State University, Bakersfield

Staff to the Visit:

Jake Shuler
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Kiyomi Meeker
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Program Reviewers:

Jill Anderson
California Polytechnic State University,
Humboldt

Michelle Dean
California State University, Channel Islands

Randy Fall
Azusa Pacific University

Marianna Harris
University of California, Merced

Keri Morgan
San Diego County Office of Education

Charlie Rodrigues
Concordia University Irvine

Rebecca Wardlow
United States University

Mary Yung
San Mateo County Office of Education

Background Information

California State University, San Bernardino (CSU San Bernardino) is a center of intellectual and cultural activity in Inland Southern California. Opened in 1965 and set at the foothills of the San Bernardino Mountains, the university serves more than 20,000 students each year and graduates about 4,000 students annually.

CSU San Bernardino reflects the dynamic diversity of the region and has the most diverse student population of any university in the Inland Empire, and it has the second highest African American and Hispanic enrollments of all public universities in California. Seventy percent of those who graduate are the first in their families to do so.

Education Unit

The Watson College of Education (WCOE) at CSU San Bernardino is home to an extensive educator preparation unit, including sixteen credentials, ten master's degree programs, a doctoral program in educational leadership, and two bachelor's programs. The faculty is committed to providing the best quality training for those seeking a professional career in education.

Candidates have options to pursue credentials in the areas of initial teacher credentials for multiple subjects and single subjects, special education (mild to moderate support needs, extensive support needs and early childhood), bilingual authorizations, adapted physical education specialist credential, administrative services credential, pupil personnel services credentials (school counseling and school psychology), and designated subjects credentials (including career technical education and adult education). The adapted physical education specialist program is offered through the Department of Kinesiology, and the credential requirements are fused with the single subject program. All programs within the WCOE are overseen by a dean who reports to the provost.

Table 1: Enrollment and Completion Data

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2024-25)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2025-26)
Multiple Subject	193	297
Single Subject	196	446
Bilingual Authorization	11	3
MS+ Bilingual Authorization	16	67
SS+ Bilingual Authorization	n/a	67
Adapted Physical Education	12	24
Early Childhood Special Education	17	36
Education Specialist Extensive Support Needs	13	40

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2024-25)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2025-26)
Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Support Needs	28	110
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	53	92
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology	18	64
Preliminary Administrative Services	18	64
Designated Subjects: CTE	9	9
Designated Subjects: Adult Education	1	0

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 Subject and Single Subject with Intern

Program Design

The Preliminary Multiple Subject (MS) and Single Subject (SS) credential programs are housed within the Department of Teacher Education and Foundations (TEF) at CSU San Bernardino, in the Watson College of Education (WCOE). The governance structure operates through a clearly defined structure, with the program coordinator serving as the operational lead and primary liaison between faculty, candidates, and staff, reporting directly to the department chair. The department chair maintains oversight of administrative functions, including faculty recruitment, scheduling, and evaluation. Credential recommendations are managed by the college's Student Service Center. This structure ensures that while leadership turnover occurs, documented processes and consistent mentoring provide institutional stability.

Recently the MS and SS programs moved from separate coordinators to one coordinator overseeing both programs. In interviews, candidates expressed that this change has caused issues with timely communication regarding program requirements.

Program alignment is maintained through monthly faculty and staff meetings where admissions, fieldwork, and CalTPA trends are reviewed. Interviews confirmed that external feedback is provided by the TEF Advisory Committee, which is composed of district leaders, administrators, and resident teachers (district employed supervisors) who meet biannually. Candidate feedback is captured through the dean's open forums and completer surveys. Individual instructor feedback is obtained through end of course evaluations.

The most significant modification was the Fall 2023 establishment of Track D (Teacher of Record). By formalizing this pathway, the institution provides a course of study for candidates already hired by districts, preventing these hires from teaching without university support.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The program's "theory-to-practice" model is intentionally sequenced to scaffold candidate development. Foundational coursework provides the pedagogical lens through which candidates view their early fieldwork, eventually leading to full clinical responsibility. The program uses a hybrid delivery model—alternating between weekly face-to-face sessions and synchronous online instruction. The curriculum progresses from foundational theory to specialized methods.

The program offers five credential pathways that each require 600 hours of clinical practice and are tailored to the varying needs and professional contexts of its participants. Track A is designed for traditional full-time candidates, spanning two semesters. For those who need a

more flexible pace, Track B covers three semesters. The Track C (Intern) pathway also spans three semesters but is specifically designed for candidates hired by districts as the teacher of record. Track D (Teacher of Record) provides a variable duration for established teachers of record (such as Short-Term Staff Permit (STSP) or Provisional Internship Permit (PIP) holders) and is aligned directly with specific district hiring needs. Finally, the residency pathway offers a one-year duration for candidates embedded in year-long district partnerships. In this Residency pathway, candidates remain in the same classroom for their entire fieldwork experience.

The 600-hour clinical requirement is met through early fieldwork (120 hours) where candidates engage in observation and small-group support. Supervised student teaching (480 hours) is the culminating phase that requires a minimum of four weeks of solo or co-teaching.

Placements are centralized through the college's Supervision Office. This ensures that placements meet the criteria including diverse socioeconomic settings and the presence of fully qualified site administrators. In interviews, many current candidates and program completers also indicated that they are allowed to complete early fieldwork hours in placements that they find and initiate outside of the Supervision Office. These placements must be approved by the program coordinator.

In interviews with current candidates, it was reported that there were some delays in receiving early fieldwork placements, leading to a delay in completing coursework. Current candidates also expressed confusion regarding the number of hours that are required for early fieldwork.

The program utilizes experienced, retired educators as university supervisors. Interviews with supervisors confirmed that they receive training from the university and participate in a professional learning community (PLC). In the evidence presented, and in interviews, university supervisors highlighted that over the last year the PLC has gained momentum, and the supervisors feel they have a voice in the university structure.

The candidates are also supervised by a district-employed supervisor (DES). The DES supports mentors and candidates in planning, management, assessment, working with English learners and students with disabilities. The evidence provided and interviews conducted do not show how the program systematically tracks the mandated 10-hour training for district-employed supervisors.

The Professional Growth Plan process acts as the primary remediation trigger. If a candidate struggles in coursework or clinical practice, a collaborative support plan is developed between faculty and supervisors to ensure the candidate meets TPE benchmarks.

Assessment of Candidates

Courses include signature assignments that are aligned with the TPEs. Full-time and part-time faculty report that faculty developed 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 syllabi to align with revised literacy standards and teaching performance expectations.

During student teaching, candidates undergo six formal observations per semester. The forms were recently revised with input from full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and university supervisors. The district employed supervisors and the university supervisors collaborate to provide candidates with mid-term and final evaluations of their student teaching experience. In interviews, supervisors consistently reported that the revised forms offer more robust, actionable feedback on candidate mastery of the TPEs.

The program utilizes the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA), with oversight provided by the TPA Coordinator in collaboration with program leadership. Candidates enroll in a TPA seminar course, which maintains a maximum student-to-faculty ratio of 12:1. This small-group setting provides targeted support for video-based commentary and evidence-based responses. In interviews, the TPA Coordinator described how TPA data are used to inform program decisions, noting that “TPA shapes our program” and highlighting efforts to use candidate performance data and reflections to guide instructional improvements.

CalTPA pass rate data and rubrics are shared with program faculty and analyzed for program improvement. Rubrics are reviewed to see where candidates performed well and where additional support is needed in the program. Interviews with the CalTPA coordinator and program faculty confirmed that changes have been made based on CalTPA scoring data.

Candidates complete TPAs within their clinical placements and receive support through coursework and faculty guidance. During interviews, candidates indicated feeling supported and prepared to be successful on the TPA. Program data indicate strong TPA pass rates, ranging from 92% to 100% across cycles. Faculty continue to refine their use of TPA data to strengthen program alignment and candidate preparation.

For candidates who do not meet the necessary benchmarks, the program provides a tiered system of remediation and support. This process begins with individualized coaching, providing one-on-one sessions to review study plans and CalTPA rubrics. This is followed by targeted remediation, which offers mentoring focused on specific failed task components. Furthermore, the program facilitates site-based support by collaborating with school sites to provide additional teaching time for resubmissions. First-time CalTPA pass rates (85% for MS, 89% for SS) exceed state averages.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, supervising practitioners, employers, institutional administrators and staff, and educational partners, the team determined that all program

standards are **met** for the Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern and Single Subject Intern Credential programs, except for:

Program Standard 3 – Clinical Practice - Met with Concerns

The team did not find consistent evidence that the program provides all district-employed supervisors with a minimum of 10 hours of initial orientation addressing each component of the standard. In addition, the team did not find consistent evidence that the program ensures that all district-employed supervisors remain current in the knowledge and skills necessary for effective candidate supervision.

Bilingual Authorization

Program Design

The Bilingual Authorization (BIAU) program at California State University, San Bernardino is housed within the Department of Teacher Education and Foundations (TEF) in the College of Education. The program is structurally aligned with the Preliminary Multiple Subject (MS) and Preliminary Single Subject (SS) credential programs and operates within the same administrative unit, allowing for coordination across credential pathways.

The program is offered through multiple pathways designed to meet candidate and workforce needs. These include integration with the MS and SS credential programs, a post-credential pathway for practicing teachers seeking to add a bilingual authorization, and an intern pathway through district partnerships, such as with Rialto USD. In addition, the program has developed responsive pathways for paraprofessionals pursuing a credential with bilingual authorization. Interviews with program leadership confirmed a strong connection with district partners and a demand for CSU San Bernardino BIAU graduates.

Leadership of the program is shared by two BIAU co-coordinators who oversee program implementation, including advising, course scheduling, candidate support, placement coordination, and program review. These coordinators work closely with TEF faculty and are supported by college leadership. In interviews, candidates described program leaders as important role models and credited the program with opening pathways to advanced study and professional growth.

Program leadership demonstrates regular communication and coordination both within the program and across the unit. Faculty and coordinators participate in monthly meetings addressing curriculum, policy, clinical practice, and assessment, and engage with broader college structures. In interviews, faculty and program leadership confirmed the consistency of these meetings and their role in addressing programmatic issues. Some candidates expressed a desire for more “timely” and “consistent” communication across the broader teacher preparation program.

The program engages constituencies and partners through systematic and ongoing structures, including partnerships with 64 school districts and biannual advisory meetings. District partners

provide input on program design, candidate preparation, and workforce alignment. In interviews, district partners described their collaborative relationship with the program and their role in supporting field placements and program improvement. They also noted their participation in regular meetings and their contributions to program initiatives. Additional engagement occurs through dual immersion symposia and ongoing collaboration with educators and community partners.

Over the past two years, the program has implemented several significant modifications, including expansion to a Single Subject pathway, development of a post-credential option, and implementation of BTPE-aligned coursework.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The BIAU program integrates bilingual authorization coursework with credential coursework in a sequenced design that connects theory and practice. Coursework is differentiated for Multiple Subject and Single Subject candidates and is delivered in Spanish to support bilingual pedagogical development. Coursework is intentionally coordinated with fieldwork, requiring candidates to apply bilingual pedagogies in classroom settings aligned with the BTPEs. In interviews, candidates emphasized the value of applying coursework directly in bilingual and dual immersion classrooms, noting that this integration strengthened their instructional practice and understanding of multilingual learners.

Coursework addresses critical areas such as instruction for English learners, literacy, bilingual pedagogy, and culturally responsive teaching. Candidates reported that strategies such as Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) and Universal Design for Learning were emphasized and supported their ability to meet diverse student needs.

For those pursuing the concurrent BIAU and preliminary multiple subject or single subject credential, fieldwork and clinical practice are structured progressively, including early fieldwork, the 20 hours of bilingual-specific fieldwork, and full-time student teaching totaling approximately 645 hours. In interviews, candidates described two pathways for placement: self-placement using an approved list of schools or placement facilitated by the program. They reported that program-supported placements were generally more seamless and easier to navigate.

Candidates also emphasized the importance of being placed in Dual Language Immersion (DLI) classrooms, noting that these experiences deepened their ability to teach in linguistically diverse settings. Field placements are monitored by university supervisors, who conduct observations and evaluations. In interviews, program completers recommended increasing access to bilingual (Spanish-speaking) supervisors, noting that linguistic alignment is important for providing meaningful feedback in bilingual classrooms.

The program provides multiple systems of support for clinical practice, including supervision, Individual Development Plans, and coordinated faculty support. In interviews, candidates and completers described faculty and supervisors as responsive and supportive, highlighting regular

check-ins and mentorship as key strengths. For candidates experiencing challenges, support includes structured intervention plans and access to campus resources.

Data on coursework and clinical practice are collected through multiple measures and reviewed by faculty to inform program improvements. In interviews, faculty described using data such as TPA results and candidate reflections to adjust instruction and better support candidate success.

In interviews, candidates emphasized that the BIAU pathway provided a strong foundation for teaching in both bilingual and English-only classrooms, with specific preparation to support English Learners through differentiation, SDAIE strategies, and targeted accommodations for newcomers.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed at multiple points throughout the program. At admission, candidates must demonstrate Spanish language proficiency through a local language competency examination, written essay, and interview. Throughout the program, candidates are assessed through coursework and clinical practice evaluations aligned to the TPEs and BTPEs. In interviews, candidates confirmed that they receive ongoing feedback through coursework and clinical evaluations, which supports their development as bilingual educators.

Candidates are informed about assessment expectations through coursework and program communication. Support for candidates includes faculty feedback, advising, and targeted interventions such as Individual Development Plans. In interviews, candidates described faculty as supportive in helping them meet expectations, particularly through feedback on assignments and clinical practice.

Candidates provide feedback through CSU Exit Surveys and program interactions. Faculty review assessment data regularly to inform program improvements. In interviews, program leadership identified access to more comprehensive data across MS and SS programs as an area for growth, noting the importance of shared data for continuous improvement.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, supervising practitioners, employers, institutional administrators and staff, and educational partners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Bilingual Authorization program.

**Preliminary Education Specialist Instruction Credential:
Mild to Moderate Support Needs with Intern and
Extensive Support Needs with Intern**

Program Design

The Educational Specialist Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) and Extensive Support Needs (ESN) credential programs are housed in the Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation and Counseling at CSU San Bernardino within the WCOE. Administrative support is provided through the department, while candidate services such as admissions, supervision, and credential processing are supported through the WCOE.

Both programs are offered through two pathways: a traditional student teaching pathway and an intern pathway. The intern pathway requires candidates to complete prerequisite coursework, secure employment with a partner district or county office of education and remain enrolled in supervised intern fieldwork across four academic semesters.

Admission requirements for the intern pathway include a bachelor's degree, subject matter competence, graduate admission eligibility, admission to the special education program, and completion of the U.S. Constitution requirement. Intern candidates must obtain employment in a participating district and complete specified pre-service coursework before admission.

The MMSN and ESN program's leadership structure includes coordinated responsibilities across admissions, supervision, credential processing, and program administration. Admissions personnel oversee the application process, review materials for eligibility, and determine readiness for internship pathways. Supervision staff coordinate placements and provide support during clinical practice in collaboration with program leadership, departmental personnel, and partner districts. Credential analysts review final documentation and recommend candidates for credentialing.

Program leadership has also been central in implementing updated state requirements, including Teaching Performance Assessments (TPA), and revised literacy expectations under TPE 7. The responsibilities of the education specialist program coordinator for the MMSN and ESN programs are extensive. The program coordinator oversees program planning, candidate advising and progress monitoring, university supervisors and clinical training, data collection, alignment to program standards, support for incoming candidates, CalTPA coaching, ongoing course and program oversight. In addition, the program coordinator facilitates community advisory meetings, and regular meetings and training with university supervisors. Interviews with current candidates, completers, and university supervisors describe the program coordinator as highly responsive, caring, and consistently "going above and beyond" to support the program and the candidates.

Over the past two years, the program has made several important revisions to strengthen curriculum, clinical preparation, and state alignment. These changes include the implementation of the TPA with candidate training and a Canvas support resource and

alignment to the revised literacy standards and teaching performance expectations. The team found that these revisions improved the program's alignment with Program Standard 7 by making literacy, inclusive practices, English learner support, and dyslexia-related expectations more explicit across the MMSN pathway. Additional revisions include embedding child development and health education into prerequisite coursework, adding co-requisite practica to methods courses, and strengthening field-based preparation.

For the ESN pathway, the curriculum also addresses candidate autonomy, self-determination, and transition planning. In other ESN coursework candidates develop knowledge related to transition-focused instruction, independence, self-determination, and development of IEP objectives aligned to student needs. Program materials also indicate that candidates are introduced to tools for assessing candidate autonomy.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The course of study moves candidates through prerequisite preparation, core pedagogy, authorization coursework, and supervised clinical practice. Early preparation includes foundational study in special education, human diversity, and learner development, together with early field observations in two classrooms serving students of different ages and support needs. Interviews with the program coordinator, part-time faculty, and current candidates confirmed that two courses provide early field experiences: Methods to Support Inclusive Learning and Practicum, and Seminar/Practicum in Literacy Learning for K-12 Students with Special Needs. Each course offers 45 to 50 hours of practicum hours in a K-12 classroom and provide candidates with multiple clinical experiences when combined with intern and student teaching placements.

In the Methods to Support Inclusive Learning and Practicum courses candidates observe inclusive settings and collaborative teaching models. In Collaboration and Consultation in Special Education, candidates examine the relationship between Specialized Academic Instruction (SAI) and the general education curriculum and develop an understanding of collaboration with general educators, speech-language pathologists, paraprofessionals, behavior specialists, and families. Multiple completers reported in their interviews that the program prepared them well for collaboration, which they described as highly valuable in their current teaching positions; they noted that they regularly collaborate with other teachers, related service providers, and families. Completers identified that early field experiences, cooperative and collaborative projects, and case study analyses were especially effective in strengthening their professional collaboration skills.

Another early field work experience occurs during the Seminar in Literacy Learning for K-12 Students with Disabilities course and associated practicum. These courses address evidence-based literacy instruction, including foundational reading skills, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, comprehension, academic language, and written expression. While the course appears to provide an excellent opportunity for candidates to receive valuable early field work experiences focused on reading intervention, many interview participants reported that faculty

and program leadership did not provide them with timely access to field placements which interfered with their ability to pass the course.

The program consists of 32 units, with 600 total hours of school-based preparation and includes 200 hours of embedded fieldwork and 400 hours of supervised clinical practice. The student teaching pathway requires at least 400 hours of supervised practice over 15 weeks, including at least eight university supervisor observations. The intern pathway requires supervised fieldwork over four semesters, with eight formal observations each semester.

The program coordinator confirmed during the interview that candidates complete early field experiences in two classrooms serving students of different ages and support needs and complete assignments tied to English learners, literacy, assessment, behavior support, and inclusive practice. Interviews with current candidates noted the difficulty of taking both of the early field experiences during the same semester. Interview participants taking early field experiences in separate semesters reported greater benefit from these experiences.

Candidates in traditional student teaching programs complete one semester of supervised clinical practice totaling at least 400 hours over 15 weeks, including teaching across two grade ranges. Placements are coordinated by supervision staff in consultation with the credential program coordinator, department staff, and cooperating districts. Monitoring includes at least eight supervisor observations, ongoing virtual coaching, and daily or frequent feedback from the resident or mentor teacher. Online virtual coaching is conducted through digiCOACH, which is a web-based classroom observation tool that includes structured feedback and guides coaching conversations.

Intern placements consist of full-time employment as a teacher of record in a mild to moderate support needs setting with a partner district or county office of education. These placements extend across four academic semesters and are monitored by university supervisors, district mentors/support providers, the credential program coordinator, and internship staff. Monitoring includes eight observations each semester, intern seminars, individual advising, and performance review through digiCOACH.

Student teachers are supported by a university supervisor and a site-based mentor teacher. The university supervisor provides at least eight formal classroom visits, documents performance in digiCOACH, and conducts post-observation conferences. The resident and mentor teachers provide day-to-day coaching and collaborate in midterm and final evaluations. Interviews with mentor teachers revealed inconsistent communication between the university and the mentor teachers. These mentor teachers solely relied on their districts and the candidates for communication from the university. While the university reported that all mentor teachers participate in an initial 10-hour orientation, which is offered each semester, some mentor teachers interviewed reported receiving no mentor teacher training through the university. Other than the initial orientation that some mentor teachers received, there was no additional information provided regarding ongoing training for mentor teachers.

The program has established a layered support system for candidates who experience difficulty in coursework or clinical practice. Faculty monitor performance through assignments aligned with course outcomes and TPEs and provide targeted feedback when concerns arise. Early fieldwork that candidates complete with their first term of courses appears to strengthen early intervention by embedding guided practice and formative feedback. During clinical practice, supervisors document performance in digiCOACH and meet with candidates after observations to discuss strengths and areas for growth. Student teachers also receive ongoing guidance from mentor teachers. Current candidates report positive relationships with their university supervisors and mentor teachers, noting their support and mentoring as a strength to the program and to their development as a teacher.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed throughout coursework and clinical practice. During coursework and early field experiences, faculty evaluate performance through assignments aligned with course learning outcomes and the TPEs. These measures provide formative feedback before candidates begin student teaching or intern practice. University course evaluations also provide feedback on instruction.

Clinical practice data are collected through digiCOACH during each university supervisor formal observation. These data are supplemented by post-observation conferences, reflective analysis, and midterm and final evaluations that include input from resident teachers, mentor teachers, and district support providers. During interviews, university supervisors noted the usefulness of using digiCOACH to facilitate collaborative meetings with mentor teachers and candidates. In interviews, current candidates expressed appreciation for receiving digiCOACH feedback from university supervisors within 24 hours of their observations.

Candidates are assessed at midterm and final benchmark points during clinical practice. Student teachers are jointly evaluated by the university supervisor and mentor teacher. Intern candidates are assessed across four semesters of supervised fieldwork. In the final semester, interns must earn at least an “emerging” rating on all required TPEs to receive credit. The MMSN/ESN tracking matrix is also used to support monitoring of program competencies. The California Teaching Performance Assessments Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 are also used to determine candidate readiness to be recommended for the MMSN/ESN credential. Candidate scores are sent to and recorded by the program coordinator.

In interviews, candidates confirmed that they are informed about required assessments through formal program notifications, Canvas notifications, faculty advising, emails and phone calls from the coordinator, coursework, and clinical practice support. Assessment timing is aligned with candidates’ progression through the program. Coursework includes ongoing assessment, while more formal summative assessment occurs during student teaching or intern fieldwork. Candidates receive results through digiCOACH feedback, post-observation conferences, and midterm and final evaluations.

According to interviews with faculty, supervisors, and program leadership, when candidates are not making adequate progress, the coordinator will meet with the candidate and may develop a Professional Growth Action Plan with the candidate (in collaboration with support from university supervisor and/or faculty as relevant to individual candidate needs). Additional support is available through faculty advising, supervisor guidance, a Canvas site for TPAs, semester-based training, district mentors, and coordinator assistance. First-time CalTPA pass rates (92% for MMSN, 95% for ESN) exceed state averages.

The program collects robust data that can be used to track candidate progress and program continuous improvement. The interview with the program coordinator noted the use of PeopleSoft to track candidate progress through the program. Interviews with the Community Supervisor Support Team, university supervisors, current candidates, and program leadership verified that digiCOACH is used to track candidate competencies in their clinical placement setting, including formal mid-term and final evaluations. The program also uses the MMSN Tracking Matrix to enable candidate self-monitoring of development of program competencies, but it is not clear how these data are used to inform candidate outcomes or program improvement.

Separate interviews with the Community Advisory Committee and with program faculty indicated that program reviews of assessment data were not a regular part of committee meetings. Program development and improvement appeared largely centered on TPE alignment. Full time faculty described the complete program renovation that occurred with the switch from quarters to semesters and their efforts to align programs with revised literacy standards and teaching performance expectations.

Program leadership expressed their intention to continue to develop systems to utilize existing data to examine candidate competencies on a program level, to use data to reflect on current candidate outcomes with program personnel and community stakeholders, and to use these data to inform continuous improvement.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, supervising practitioners, employers, institutional administrators and staff, and educational partners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs programs, except for:

Program Standard 3 – Clinical Practice - Met with Concerns

The team did not find consistent evidence that the program provides all district-employed supervisors with a minimum of 10 hours of initial orientation addressing each component of the standard. In addition, the team did not find consistent evidence that the program ensures that all district-employed supervisors remain current in the knowledge and skills necessary for effective candidate supervision. Finally, the team did not find consistent evidence that the

program ensures that all candidates have timely access to planned field experiences that meet the expectations of the literacy practicum course.

Preliminary Early Childhood Special Education with Intern

Program Design

The Preliminary Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) credential program for CSU San Bernardino is housed in the Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation and Counseling (SRC) and is supported by the WCOE Student Service Center. The SRC faculty and WCOE credential administration team provide the necessary support for candidates to complete coursework and fieldwork experiences toward the required components of the ECSE credential. The ECSE credential program includes both a traditional and an intern pathway, with a greater number of candidates completing requirements through the intern pathway.

The ECSE credential program faculty and credential administrative operations work together to provide candidates with the structure to complete requirements. A program coordinator is the primary contact between the full and part-time faculty for the credential coursework and point of contact for fieldwork and clinical experience. The program coordinator also provides some instruction within the SRC for candidates within the credential program. The full-time faculty and program coordinator for the ECSE credential work in collaboration to ensure that coursework and practical experience standards are met. Current candidates and credential completers commented on the accessibility, responsiveness, and assistance that they receive from the program coordinator and full-time faculty member.

The program leadership and credential administrative teams coordinate the necessary requirements of the ECSE credential program within the WCOE. Coordination includes working with the university assigned supervisors that review and provide feedback for clinical experiences, collaboration with district and school partners, and communication with site-based field supervisors.

The ECSE program has an advisory body made up mostly of district, school, or county office partners but also includes part-time faculty who meet twice a year in the fall and spring. Interviews confirmed that the purpose of the group is to provide feedback on “what works and what needs to change,” and to hear about the new requirements for credentialing. Over the last couple of years, the group has focused on the changes to the TPEs, the new literacy requirements, and training/use of the digiCOACH platform.

A major shift of the program over the last two years has been both the expansion of the credential through kindergarten and the implementation of the literacy TPEs. The program’s leadership team has worked to align the new TPEs with the existing curriculum and worked on adding the clinical experience necessary to allow candidates to be able to complete the TPA.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The program reported that there is a requirement of early fieldwork experience which entails observations of children and families of infants/toddlers or children from birth to three and a completion of a key assignment. Candidates are then expected to either complete clinical experience of preschool and/or transitional kindergarten/kindergarten (TK/K) students. For candidates in either the traditional or intern pathways, they are expected to find an infant/toddler or birth to three-year-old to observe and complete required assignments. Once a candidate completes coursework for clinical fieldwork experience, the paths diverge to either the traditional student teaching or intern teaching pathway. All candidates are required to find their own placements for either pathway. A candidate who is completing the traditional student teaching pathway completes a student teaching placement in either preschool or TK/K for one semester, then completes the alternate classroom experience for their second semester of student teaching. A candidate who is completing the intern pathway is required to find a job with a district, school, or county office of education with whom the CSUSB has a "Learning Site Agreement." The intern placement is a two-year (four semester) teaching experience within an ECSE classroom typically within a public school for a district, school, or county office of education.

Interviews revealed that the program coordinator and faculty are responsive to candidate needs as they arise. Some candidates expressed concerns about lack of communication and information for completion of credential requirements. Candidates are provided with an individualized plan that includes a timeline for completion of ECSE program requirements upon enrollment in the ECSE credential program, and information is shared with students via their university email accounts. However, several candidates expressed frustration with the need to find their own fieldwork placements that may sometimes lead to being dropped from a class or failing the class if they do not have the requisite fieldwork placement. Other candidates indicated that there are gaps in communication from the program, that they "are not getting information about anything... missed important deadlines... still catching up because [I] did not receive any communication."

Clinical fieldwork requirements for the ECSE credential include a minimum of 600 hours of supervised clinical practice across the arc of the program, ranging from birth to kindergarten. Based on the evidence gathered from candidates, faculty, and supervisors, ECSE candidates complete preschool or TK/K clinical fieldwork, but they do not complete infant/toddler or birth-to-three supervised clinical fieldwork. Additionally, some student teaching candidates indicated that finding a clinical fieldwork placement proved difficult, and others mentioned difficulties in switching from an intern to a traditional pathway when they learned that their placement did not meet program requirements.

The ECSE program assigns a university supervisor and a site- or field-based supervisor to each candidate completing clinical fieldwork requirements. University supervisors utilize an electronic platform (digiCOACH) to track candidate application of the TPEs during the clinical fieldwork experience. Observations of candidate instruction is captured in digiCOACH, and supervisors are able to provide feedback and select suggested strategies for student teachers or

interns within 24 hours. The strategies provided are research based and identified through digiCOACH's research and development department. Observations are required of each candidate at least eight times a semester. Candidates indicated that mentors and field supervisors are often available for support.

Training of the supervisors for clinical practice was not verified and some candidates expressed concern with the feedback received from university supervisors, citing "observation notes did not match what I was doing." When candidates indicated that they reached out to request a change, no changes were made and it seemed as if they had no choice but to move forward with their assigned supervisor. While candidates expressed appreciation and acknowledged the hard work of the full-time faculty and coordinator, there was varying feedback about the rest of the faculty and university supervisors. Some candidates also expressed confusion with the requirement to secure employment before being able to move into the intern program pathway.

While individual data of candidate progress is collected through digiCOACH, candidate level completion data from the clinical fieldwork experience is the only component shared during advisory board meetings. Reviewers found no evidence of how this information is presented in an aggregated format to determine programmatic changes for the ECSE credential program, or indication of use for continuous improvement.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed using various ongoing reflections, key assignments, and assessments to determine competency in their coursework. DigiCOACH is utilized to support the observation and progress monitoring of candidate clinical fieldwork. Candidates also indicated that upon entering the ECSE credential program, they receive a "plan, or list" that outlines all the courses they are required to take, along with a timeline for clinical fieldwork, and TPAs from the program coordinator. Despite some confusion over the new TPA requirement, candidates indicated that both the full-time faculty and program coordinator were responsive and "accessible if they needed help." They spoke very highly of both. For struggling candidates, both the faculty member and program coordinator held special sessions to help them with the requirements of the assessments.

The ECSE program is guiding its first cohort of candidates through the TPA process in literacy which was not required in the past. Staff indicated that significant changes had been made to courses to align with the TPEs in literacy for the program. The program coordinator has worked closely with faculty to ensure that the TPEs are embedded in the coursework over the course of the last two years. Since the literacy performance assessment is a newer requirement, the program is reliant on the candidates who share their results with the college.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, supervising practitioners, employers, institutional administrators and staff, and educational partners, the team determined that all program

standards are **met** for the Preliminary Early Childhood Special Education credential program with Intern, except for:

Program Standard 3 – Clinical Experience - Met with Concerns

The team did not find consistent evidence that all candidates have planned clinical experiences that reflect the full diversity of grades/ages outlined in the specific credential authorization, specifically in the Birth-3 (infant-toddler) age range. In addition, the team did not find consistent evidence that the program provides all district-employed supervisors with an initial orientation and ensures they remain current in the knowledge and skills necessary for effective candidate supervision.

Adapted Physical Education Specialist

Program Design

CSU San Bernardino offers candidates a comprehensive and sequenced program of study toward completion of the Adapted Physical Education Specialist Credential (APESC). Candidates can complete the CSUSB APESC program coursework as an undergraduate emphasis in kinesiology or as a postbaccalaureate candidate. Postbaccalaureate candidates include those completing the APESC concurrently with their base teaching credential program and credentialed teachers returning to add on the APESC.

The program is committed to the development of Adapted Physical Education (APE) teachers who are prepared to teach the diverse student populations attending California public schools. Additionally, the program prides itself on continued engagement of alumni, who help foster a strong network of early fieldwork experience and student teaching sites. CSUSB's APESC is housed in the College of Natural Sciences, Department of Kinesiology.

Coursework and field placement requirements are completed in association with the WCOE. A tenure track faculty serves as the program coordinator. Their responsibilities, in addition to teaching coursework, include: a) monitoring fieldwork processes, b) collecting and analyzing data for program improvement, c) providing input on staffing for courses, d) advising, and e) assisting with accreditation tasks. Additionally, the program has an advising coordinator who completes initial advising about the APESC program for all credential candidates that may be interested in pursuing it. All candidates receive multiple level advising that includes WCOE advisors, APE program faculty, and university advisors.

The APE program coordinator communicates regularly with the WCOE to complete a variety of tasks. These tasks include admission decisions, advising, program plans, and recommendations for completion. Interviews confirmed that leadership in the program feels supported and included by the Kinesiology Department as well as within Natural Sciences and the WCOE. Program faculty report that communication with the WCOE has historically been a challenge but that it has improved in recent years. The program coordinator meets regularly with the WCOE leadership group and participates in unit level meetings. Additionally, program faculty and the program coordinator report feeling supported by the administration and that they have

adequate resources to run the program. Part-time faculty expressed a desire to have more support for professional development, as many of them represent CSU San Bernardino at regional and national APE conferences.

Candidates completing the APESC program (1) hold or are completing a valid teaching credential authorizing the teaching of physical education in any grade K-12; or (2) hold or are completing a credential authorizing instruction or services in special education or multiple subjects and a passing score on the CSET or 15 semester units of foundational physical education coursework in both kinesiology and motor development; or (3) successful completion the Undergraduate in Kinesiology: Physical Education and Adapted Physical Education Concentration requirements. Candidates may complete the APESC as part of an intern program following the guidelines and requirements set forth by their primary credential intern program.

The program coordinator and faculty meet regularly with campus and community constituents to gather feedback about the program and candidate preparation. The advisory board and program faculty interviews confirmed that there are ongoing open lines of communication between the groups and feedback from all program constituents is welcomed and integrated into program changes. Current candidates are provided systematic opportunities to provide feedback about APE coursework on a semesterly basis. University supervisors in the WCOE reported systematic utilization of semesterly candidate feedback via lecturer evaluations as the primary mechanism for candidate feedback on their placements and supervisors; however, candidates and program completers reported not being aware of opportunities to provide student teaching specific feedback.

There have been notable program changes in the last two years. CSU San Bernardino shifted from a quarter to a semester structure in fall 2020, which has had long-lasting impacts on program curricular updates as content shifted to meet the new campus structure and continues to be refined to meet content needs. For example, their introductory adapted course was added to the core of the Kinesiology Program in an effort to provide all majors with an understanding of how to adapt exercises and activities for individuals with disabilities. Additionally, the Physical Education concentration was renamed to Physical Education and Adapted Physical Education (PEAPE) Concentration to reflect updated coursework that covers content standards in both Physical Education (PE) and Adapted Physical Education, preparing candidates to meet all Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) content standards in both PE and APE. The sequencing of concentration coursework was also rearranged to improve candidate learning experiences. Finally, to replace a retiring faculty, a tenure track APE faculty was hired in 2024.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Candidates in all pathways are required to complete the five courses (15 units) that make up the essential coursework of the APESC program. These courses include a scaffolded curriculum that covers all content-based Commission competencies for APE and teaching English language learners. APESC program faculty implements evidence-based practices within the service programs, classroom instruction, and other settings, and they model professional standards in

all aspects of the program. This was confirmed through interviews with program coordinators, program completers, current candidates, and full and part time faculty. Additionally, four of the five courses require 14 hours of early fieldwork experience (EFE) each (56 hours total). EFEs consist of observations and opportunities to support instruction and conduct assessments under certified APE teachers. Content focuses for the EFEs are in alignment with the course content (e.g. behavior management, assessment, modifications, individualized instruction) making direct connections between courses and fieldwork. Candidates complete their EFEs at different locations each semester to ensure a variety of facilities, equipment, disabilities, ages, and teaching styles. During each EFE, candidates complete guided reflections and receive feedback from both the credentialed teacher and course faculty.

In addition to the essential APE coursework, candidates on the Multiple Subject or Education Specialist pathways must either pass the CSET-PE or complete foundational Kinesiology coursework. This foundational kinesiology coursework includes 15 units in motor development, kinesiology, and principles and practices in teaching physical education.

Candidates in all pathways complete student teaching fieldwork experiences that consist of scaffolded responsibilities culminating in solo instruction in APE placements. Supervision and assessment in these placements are coordinated by and follows all procedures and expectations set forth by the WCOE. Candidates who already hold credentials or are completing APE program coursework concurrently with a credential program, complete student teaching fieldwork simultaneously. Candidates who completed the Physical Education and Adapted Physical Education Concentration as undergraduates, complete their student teaching hours once they are in their primary credential programs. Candidates also have opportunities to voluntarily engage in community programming including inclusive and Special Olympic sporting events.

Candidates reported that they are required to develop lesson plans during courses and as part of fieldwork experiences for students with varying disabilities, and at various settings. Additionally, candidates present parents with updates on their children's progress in Individualized Education Plan (IEP) meetings. As evidenced by provided documents and interviews with candidates, completers, university supervisor, district employed supervisors, and program faculty, all candidates receive comprehensive field experiences across settings that are designed to allow them to observe, apply, and demonstrate theoretical pedagogical content knowledge learned in coursework. Current candidates and program completers reported feeling very supported during their time in the program and exceptionally prepared for their student teaching, and future careers respectively. District employed supervisors reported that candidates are well prepared for their roles in fieldwork and appreciated that in recent years, candidates come not only with strong pedagogy backgrounds but also with a comprehensive understanding of and appreciation for the scope of the profession.

The APE Coordinator and the WCOE collaborate with local school district personnel regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, and site-based supervising personnel. The desired qualities of district employed supervisors include, but are not limited to, competence in their

subject area, effective teaching skills, a California teaching credential in their teaching field, a minimum of three years of teaching experience, and in-service training in peer coaching or clinical supervision. District employed supervisors reported feeling heard by program faculty and the program coordinator and that their contributions to the program were valued.

The candidate's final coursework includes a take-home written exit exam and in-person interview. The take-home exam includes both knowledge and theory-based questions for candidates to demonstrate their readiness to carry out the roles and responsibilities of APE teachers. This was confirmed through interviews with the program coordinator, program faculty, candidates, and completers.

The program coordinator along with program faculty collect program data including candidate success in early field work experiences, formative and summative course assessments, pass rates, and rates of candidates in the undergraduate program that go on to pursue their APESC. These data are disseminated and discussed with multiple groups on an ongoing basis, including a bi-weekly meeting of the tenure track APE faculty, monthly meetings where the APE faculty meet with the PE faculty and Kinesiology department, and semesterly meetings with the advisory board (which includes both part time faculty and district employed supervisors). All meetings are used to discuss program successes, needs, and future improvement plans.

As evidenced by interviews with district employed supervisors, part time faculty, and program faculty, all parties feel respected by each other, that their voices matter in program improvement decisions, and that they see tangible program changes based on this work. For example, multiple data sources indicated candidates would be better served in early field work experiences if there was a more systematic process for identifying the location of each placement. In response, the program changed a policy that allowed candidates to choose any location to a using a guiding framework that steers candidates to a variety of placements across the delivery spectrum.

Assessment of Candidates

APESC candidates are required to attain a grade of "B" or better on all essential APE coursework to be recommended for the credential. The APESC program coordinator, with faculty input, is responsible for coordinating the evaluation of all candidates during APE coursework, early fieldwork experiences, and the final exam and exit interview. Formative assessment via coursework and early fieldwork experiences are completed on an ongoing basis. Candidates complete multiple reflections per semester which include feedback from the coordinating teacher as well as program faculty. Results of these assessments are available to candidates at the posting of course grades and in real time during the semester. The APE coordinator evaluates candidate competencies in alignment with the Commission APESC program standards. Candidates who are not meeting the expected competencies in these areas are required to meet individually with the program coordinator to discuss concerns, remedies for success, or alternative program changes. Candidate and completer interviews confirmed that program faculty provide support to candidates in APE coursework by providing one-on-one instructional support and fostering open lines of communication.

Formative and summative evaluation of candidates' student teaching placements is conducted by the WCOE. District employed supervisors provide informal feedback to candidates daily and complete mid- and end-of-semester evaluation reports. University supervisors are intended to provide formal assessment through evaluation reports multiple times a semester and meet with candidates and district employed supervisors. All candidates reported ongoing and valuable feedback from their district employed supervisors. While some candidates reported they did not have direct observations or feedback from university supervisors specifically during student teaching in their APE placements, other candidates did have multiple direct observations and detailed feedback from university supervisors. District employed supervisors also reported that engagement from and communication with university supervisors at APE student teaching placements varies.

Candidates identified as needing additional support and growth in student teaching are put on a, non-punitive, Personal Development Plan that outlines what items need attention and a process to remedy. This process was confirmed through interviews with the district employed supervisors and university supervisors.

Candidates are informed of all program requirements and policies before and during the program through advising sessions APE program faculty. In interviews, both candidates and completers reported clear communication about program requirements, some reported inconsistencies with receiving communication in the transition from the undergraduate program to the credential phase. Candidates, completers and program faculty confirmed that candidates are able to seek assistance with requirements for the APESC from the program coordinator, program faculty and staff in the WCOE.

Current candidates and program completers indicated they were provided consistent and ongoing opportunities to provide feedback to faculty in APE courses and that this feedback was well-received and integrated into the program. Further, they confirmed they feel heard and supported throughout their program and that the faculty are available for concerns and support. However, both groups reported they were not aware of opportunities available to them to provide feedback about placements and supervisors for student teaching.

Candidates concurrently pursuing a base credential also complete performance assessment requirements in accordance with the standards and expectations set forth for the base teaching credential program they are enrolled in. Support for completion for TPAs is provided by the School of Education and includes TPA preparation courses, remedial TPA courses, and one on one assistance from the TPA coordinator.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, supervising practitioners, employers, institutional administrators and staff, and educational partners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Adapted Physical Education Specialist Credential program, except for:

Program Standard 9 – Assessment of Candidate Performance - Met with Concerns

The team did not find consistent evidence that all candidates in all APE credential pathways work with APE university supervisors during APE field work, and therefore that the determination of professional competence related to field work may not be consistently documented and verified for all candidates by an institutional supervisor.

Pupil Personnel Services (PPS): School Counseling

Program Design

The Master of Science (MS) in Counseling with a concentration in School Counseling at CSU San Bernardino is housed within the Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling, within the WCOE. The Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling includes several programs: Preliminary Educational Specialist Credential (Mild to Moderate Support Needs, Extensive Support Needs, Early Childhood Special Education); MS Counseling; MS Counseling and Social Change Minor; PPS: School Counseling; PPS: School Psychology; and Ed.S. Rehabilitation Counseling, MA.

The Master of Science in Counseling program offers three concentrations: (1) School Counseling, (2) Professional Counseling or (3) Dual Concentration. The School Counseling concentration prepares candidates for the California Pupil Personnel Services Credential (PPS-SC), issued by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission). The Professional Counseling concentration prepares candidates to become Licensed Professional Clinical Counselors (LPCC), regulated by the California Board of Behavioral Science (BBS). Candidates may choose to complete one concentration or combine both.

The program reports 53 program completers in 2024-2025, and 93 candidates enrolled in the program for 2025-26.

The program is administratively supported by the chair of the Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling, the program coordinator, the field/placement coordinator, and a licensure/credentialing staff member. The faculty distribution table lists seven full-time faculty with one currently on sabbatical and one on emeritus status. Fourteen adjunct faculty members are included in the department.

Communication with the larger department and school follows the organizational structure, with the program coordinator responsible for concerns within the program, and the department chair available for concerns above the program level.

In 2023, the program created an advisory committee which meets twice per year to provide program feedback. The committee is composed of core faculty, adjunct faculty, field and placement leadership, candidates and alumni. In addition, feedback to the program is provided during field supervision meetings, faculty advising sessions, candidate advising sessions, exit

interviews and program review discussions. Interviews with current candidates, recent completers, fieldwork supervisors and site supervisors consistently support the role of constituents in providing feedback and input to the program. Part-time faculty particularly describe openness and interest from the full-time faculty for their input into the program. One example of a change based on stakeholder input is the development of the culminating experience master's degree project.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The combined school counseling and professional counseling program is 72-75 units, while the school counseling program is 60 units. Each program is three years in length. Candidates typically complete coursework in the first year, coursework and practicum in the second year, and fieldwork in the third year. Field placements are coordinated and monitored by the program. Candidates typically identify their own fieldwork sites. Current candidates and completers consistently express appreciation for program staff and their willingness to help with fieldwork placements.

Program documentation indicates that the institutions implemented a Depth and Breadth Model, which ensures, throughout the three-year program, that candidates engage with equity, access, advocacy, and the academic, college, career, and social-emotional domains. During the first year in the program, candidates develop foundations in counseling theory, human development, learning theory, ethics, research, crisis response, and beginning counseling skills. In Year 2 of the program, candidates have an opportunity to start early field work and receive assessments in socio-cultural counseling, family and group counseling, and conflict resolution. In the final year of the program, candidates demonstrate mastery in career counseling, systems consultation, appraisal, professional school counseling, advanced fieldwork, and a culminating experience. The program assesses candidates on all School Counselor Performance Expectations (SCPE domains) prior to credential recommendation, ensuring comprehensive preparation for each candidate.

The program develops clinical practice partnerships with institutions and requires them to sign Learning Service Agreements. Part of the agreement is to collaboratively develop the field experience for candidates. Additional support for clinical practice includes supervisor training modules housed in the Supervision Hub, SCPE-aligned evaluation tools, and placement monitoring systems. The institution ensures candidates complete experiences across at least two school levels and across academic, college, career, and social-emotional domains. Site supervisors are verified to hold PPS credentials and to have completed program training on supervision models, SCPEs, and program expectations. Candidate clinical progress is evaluated upon entry, midpoint, and exit using standardized rubrics and assessment tools.

The program recently developed a practicum log that includes both the hours and experiences expected in practicum. Current candidates and recent completers consistently reported that they completed the required 100 hours or more for practicum, and that their experiences were consistent with the Commission standards.

Dispositions are assessed at admission, at the end of year 1, before practicum, during each fieldwork semester, and at program completion. For candidates who encounter challenges, the program has a process to develop a Student Improvement Plan or an Individual Growth and Development Plan, depending on the type and severity of the challenges. As a program that serves many first-generation candidates, the program has well-developed structures for candidate support. Candidates also report extensive efforts by faculty, including the program coordinators, to support them to overcome difficulties they face.

Each candidate is assigned a faculty advisor. Data collection includes a candidate monitoring dashboard, advising logs, progress reports, dispositional records, and MyCOE and PeopleSoft verification systems. Program data is reviewed by the program coordinators and the full-time faculty. Examples of program improvements based on data include revisions to courses to match practicum and placement needs, revisions to grading standards, and the addition of a master's degree project at program completion.

The program also benefits from the presence of a Student Council, composed of members elected by candidates. The Student Council communicates candidate concerns to the program faculty.

Assessment of Candidates

The program includes multiple assessments and feedback to candidates. The major assessments of candidates include coursework-based formative feedback, candidate reflection and self-assessment, clinical practice feedback, faculty advising review and monitoring, Student Improvement Plan or Individual Growth and Developmental Plan if needed, and summative competency determination based on the SCPEs.

Current candidates and recent completers describe many informal opportunities for feedback from full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and site supervisors. Information about required assessments is included in the School Counseling Student Handbook, and appeal options are described in the CSU San Bernardino catalog. In the most recent completer survey, 98% of respondents for the program indicated strongly agree (70%) or agree (28%) that the CSUSB PPS professors/instructors were approachable if students sought help or had questions about the course or material.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, supervising practitioners, employers, institutional administrators and staff, and educational partners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling program.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology

Program Design

The school psychology credential program is within the Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling within the WCOE. The program offers two pathways, one a combined Education Specialist with the Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) School Psychology credential, and one a PPS School Psychology credential only. The program coordinator reports to the department chair, who reports directly to the Dean of the WCOE. Field placements in the program are coordinated by the program coordinator. Communication with the larger department and school follows the organizational structure, with the program coordinator responsible for concerns within the program, and the department chair available for concerns above the program level. The program reports 18 program completers in 2024-25, and 64 current candidates in the program.

Over the past two years, program faculty describe an ongoing process of modifying curriculum, increasing opportunities for candidate feedback and revised assessments of competencies. These developments over the past two years strongly support candidate learning. An example of a program change based on feedback was the decision to purchase 60 iPads for candidate use and to update the assessment classes to the newest assessments.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The program seeks to create a diverse cohort of candidates. Completers and current candidates report that a high percentage of the candidates in the program are first generation college students.

The school psychology traditional and intern pathways are both three years. Program documentation details a 66-semester unit program organized into strands: Foundations, Counseling, Assessment, School Psychology Specialty and Practicum and Fieldwork. After reviewing assessment documents and feedback, the program made a few changes to better align with program standards and the National Association of School Psychology standards. Specifically, there are additional units for fieldwork practicum courses and updated course objective for the assessment courses. The program uses research-based intervention and best practices to provide a balanced approach to training and allows for multiple opportunities for candidates to learn, apply and reflect. Program documentation shows that candidates are trained to conduct assessments and analyze data for academic and behavioral interventions.

Candidates take courses and begin practicums in the first year. They continue courses and practicum in the second year. Candidates complete 1200 hours of placement (fieldwork or internship) in their third year. Candidates can begin practicum from day one of the program, though it takes some candidates more time to identify a practicum site. Candidates complete a practicum plan, which affirms that they know the practicum requirements. Candidates typically complete practicum in four terms – at the end of practicum they have a faculty member affirm that they are ready for fieldwork or internship.

Candidates in placement (fieldwork or internship) have both a site supervisor and a university supervisor. The site supervisors are required to meet Commission requirements for credential and experience. Student teaching candidates typically find their own placement sites. Several candidates described situations in which a site fell through or did not work out, and the program coordinator assisted them in successfully finding a site.

In interviews, recent completers and current candidates described extensive opportunities for support when they experience challenges in the program. Some candidates report concerns through the Student Council, some go to individual faculty members, and some go directly to the program coordinator. Candidates consistently described the faculty as available to them and always willing to provide support.

Assessment of Candidates

In year 1, candidates complete a practicum plan, receive feedback from their practicum supervisor, and set up their portfolios. In year two, site supervisors complete a survey evaluating their competencies and continue building their portfolios. In year 3, candidates complete a self-evaluation, receive feedback from their site supervisor using a candidate competency evaluation form on their fieldwork competencies, and complete their portfolios. Candidates are also required to take the Praxis school psychology exam. Candidates complete a portfolio which includes a psychoeducational assessment (case studies), report and presentation. In Year 2 and 3 Practicum Evaluation Forms are designed to assess candidate competencies in the performance expectations (PEs).

Candidates are informed about assessments in the candidate handbook, practicum handbook, orientation meetings and group advising sessions. In interviews, candidates and completers reported some uncertainty about assessments, but they also confirmed that program faculty are responsive to questions or concerns.

Candidates, completers, part-time faculty and site supervisors all consistently reported multiple opportunities to provide feedback and insights to the program. Program faculty were consistently praised for their openness and interest in input from all stakeholders. An example of feedback into the program is the development of new competency ratings. The program sent out a pilot of a new version of the competency ratings to site supervisors, who reported that it was too long and difficult to complete. The program coordinator modified the document to make it more usable for site supervisors, leading to better data for the program.

Candidates and completers were also enthusiastic in their endorsement of the program's efforts to include their feedback and insights into program modifications. The development of the portfolio is an example of a modification that was voted on by candidates and is now a required element of the program. In the most recent completer survey, 96% of respondents for the program indicated strongly agree (62%) or agree (34%) that the CSUSB PPS preparation program allowed them to develop the skills and tools needed to be effective in their professional work.

The program has done commendable work in developing coursework to meet the Commission program and School Psychology Performance Expectations.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, supervising practitioners, employers, institutional administrators and staff, and educational partners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology program.

Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education and Designated Subjects: Adult Education

Program Design

The Designated Subjects Credential programs at CSU San Bernardino are housed in the WCOE, Department of Educational Leadership and Technology and include the following designated subjects credentials: Career Technical Education (CTE) and Adult Education (AE). The Designated Subjects Credential program's course offerings are accepted as academic credit for all Career and Technical Education baccalaureate and master's programs.

Through a review of evidence including matrix submissions, the CSU San Bernardino website, and candidate and personnel interviews it was not possible to determine the program's design and alignment to CTE and AE program standards.

The candidate handbook indicates five courses required for the program. However, in interviews, there was confusion among many current candidates about how many courses they needed to take to complete the required units for the program. One candidate explained, "I was told nine units when I enrolled and then told I have to do 15 units." Some candidates reported have taken coursework that may or may not be necessary given the lack of clarity about required coursework. One candidate said, "I took a course that I am now told is no longer valid for the program, so I wasted my time and money. It is on my transcript, but I am told it counts for nothing." And while this confusion may exist, candidates reported that, "instructors were very knowledgeable" and feedback on coursework was well received.

Because of confusion around the coursework required to complete the program, the institution paused enrollment into both programs prior to the site visit.

Faculty expressed they "control the curriculum" and are able to revise courses along with the syllabus. In interviews, they shared that standards were "objectives in the courses that assignments and discussion are created around" and that they do what they can "to stay compliant and teach to the standards and follow the guidelines."

The leadership structure within the credential program consists of a department chair, coordinator and faculty. Faculty can be full-time or part-time. All faculty are assigned advisees

and complete a program plan that is submitted in the admissions process. Faculty members communicate with pre-admissions staff and credential analysts about program requirements for admission and credential programming purposes. Faculty may share course resources among each other, and they may receive reassigned time for fieldwork coordinator, program coordinator, and graduate coordinator roles.

The programs have had multiple coordinators over the last few years, which may have contributed to inconsistent leadership communication around course pathways and credential requirements.

Interviews confirmed the annual occurrence of meetings of the designated subjects advisory committee. While data sharing was not a part of these advisory meetings, generalized trends were provided and the program did, “ask for lots of input on their curriculum.” Advisory members were aware of the fact that the program had “paused” enrollment and a mention of the model changes was noted in the interview but again there was confusion as to what will be offered. They were told about the 12 or 9 credit programs options but were uncertain about which will satisfy the Commission and other accreditation standards.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Documentation submitted indicates that the Career Technical Education program consists of 15 semester units (5 course model). Interviews with multiple constituencies expressed confusion about what courses are currently being offered or required. All coursework is fully online and asynchronous.

During faculty interviews when asked, “How is the coursework differentiated to meet CTE and ADED standards?” The response was, “We were told to present or give evidence of the five-course model, but we offer the three course or four course model.” For the three-course (9 unit) model, CTE candidates and AE candidates both take the same first two courses, then the third course is CTE or AE specific to the credential being earned. Candidates are encouraged by faculty to earn both the CTE and AE clear credentials.

When asked about the coursework, candidates noted that the rubrics, grading, and assignments were well done. The asynchronous online format was a predominant reason for candidates to choose CSU San Bernardino, along with the option to potentially earn a bachelor’s or master’s degree. If a candidate was struggling with coursework, enrollment or navigating the program, candidate feedback in interviews stated that they had to reach out to initiate any support. The support provided to candidates who were struggling in a course was positively received. In interviews, candidates noted that the faculty provided quick and supportive feedback or answers.

When attempting to get clarity on the Early Orientation (EO) requirement, faculty suggested that it is met through the preliminary credential application process, which includes the CTE or AE program plan and if the candidate is employed, the employer is invited to an advisory meeting to discuss what the candidate needs from the employer and program perspectives.

Since employment in a teaching position is not required for program enrollment, this component of the EO standard cannot be consistently satisfied by all candidates. It was also stated that there is an assignment in the first required course designed around the EO standards however, the course review did not provide sufficient evidence to determine that EO was met.

The two years of teaching experience required for clear credentials, which can be considered fieldwork, is not required to enroll in the program. Since a candidate can potentially complete the coursework with no teaching experience, there is concern that throughout the period of the preliminary credential, CTE and AE teachers' performance is not guided, assisted, and evaluated in relation to each standard in Category II through supervision and support.

Candidates consistently stated they did not have a mentor (supervisor or support teacher) and if they did have one it was a district mentor that had no connection to CSU San Bernardino's program. Interviews were unable to verify a cooperative relationship between the program sponsor and local school administrators and teachers that set up a system of support and supervision for candidates.

Some data is collected via the Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) survey. SOTEs are emailed to the candidates after each course is completed but candidates are not required to complete them so many candidates commented that they did not complete the SOTEs. One candidate mentioned that some instructors created their own survey. It is unclear whether these data are used to inform program improvement, as interviews and evidence reviews did not demonstrate any connection to improvement efforts.

Assessment of Candidates

As coursework is completed, candidate assignments and discussions are reviewed and graded. However, the coursework assessment can vary for each faculty member. When asked in the interviews about how candidates are assessed, a faculty member stated that they had stopped using rubrics and instead used a checklist (Met or Not Met) for standards. This variation in instructor assessment of candidate coursework may have led to inconsistencies in the syllabi linked in the matrix when verifying assessment of candidate competencies within the standards.

The credential analysts review and verify documentation of all requirements met prior to issuing a CTE or AE credential. This may take some back and forth with the candidate for verification of the two-year teaching requirement and the credential analysts are available via face-to-face, zoom, or phone support should it be needed.

Although a process exists for reviewing and verifying program completion to support recommendations for clear credentials, the absence of clearly evidenced Category II standards in CTE and AE prevents a full determination of teacher competence.

Findings on Standards – Career Technical Education

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, supervising practitioners, employers, institutional administrators and staff, and educational partners, the team determined that the Designated Subjects Career Technical Education Credential program standards 1 and 2 are **met with concerns**, and program standards 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 are **not met**.

Program Standard 1 – Program Design and Rationale – Met with Concerns

Because the design of the program, including number of units and coursework requirements, is unclear, the team did not find consistent evidence that the implementation of the program's design and rationale effectively prepares Career Technical Education teachers.

Program Standard 2 – Equity, Diversity and Access to the Curriculum for All Students – Met with Concerns

The team did not find consistent evidence that program coursework covers each component specified within this standard.

Program Standard 3 – Early Orientation – Not Met

The team did not find consistent evidence that the Career Technical Education Credential program is collaborating with the employer in providing each candidate with an early orientation before or during the first month of teaching covering all required components in the standard.

Program Standard 4 – Collaboration with Local Educators - Not Met

The team did not find consistent evidence that the Career Technical Education Credential program is collaborating with the employer in the selection of supervisors and/or support teachers for each candidate.

Program Standard 5 – Beginning Teacher Support and Advisement - Not Met

The team did not find consistent evidence that the Career Technical Education Credential program verifies that each candidate's performance is guided, assisted and evaluated through supervision and support throughout the preliminary credential period.

Program Standard 6 – Determination of CTE Teacher Competence - Not Met

The team did not find consistent evidence that the Career Technical Education Credential program has a clear process in place for determining CTE teacher candidate competence.

Program Standard 7 – Advanced Programs of Preparation - Not Met

The team did not find consistent evidence that the Career Technical Education Credential program either: (1) offers an advanced pathway for candidates to earn their clear credential with coursework that covers the advanced Category II standards, or (2) verifies that candidates not completing an advanced pathway to clear their credential have completed the required successful teaching on the basis of the Preliminary CTE Teaching Credential in the industry sector(s) listed on the credential.

Program Standards 8-16 (Category II Standards) – Not Met

These standards describe the competencies covered by the credential program coursework and are subsumed under CTE Program Standard 6.

Findings on Standards – Designated Subjects Adult Education

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, supervising practitioners, employers, institutional administrators and staff, and educational partners, the team determined that Designated Subjects Adult Education Credential program standard 1 is **met with concerns**, and program standards 2, 3, and 4 are **not met**.

Program Standard 1 – Program Design and Rationale – Met with Concerns

Because the design of the program, including number of units and coursework requirements, is unclear, the team did not find consistent evidence that the implementation of the program's design and rationale effectively prepares Adult Education teachers.

Program Standard 2 – Collaboration with Local Educators - Not Met

The team did not find consistent evidence that the Adult Education Credential program is collaborating with the employer in the selection of supervisors and/or support teachers for each candidate.

Program Standard 3 – Early Orientation – Not Met

The team did not find consistent evidence that the Adult Education Credential program is collaborating with the employer in providing each candidate with an early orientation before or during the first month of teaching covering all required components in the standard.

Program Standard 4 – Beginning Teacher Support and Advisement - Not Met

The team did not find consistent evidence that the Adult Education Credential program verifies that each candidate's performance is guided, assisted and evaluated through supervision and support throughout the preliminary credential period.

Program Standards 5-13 (Category II Standards) – Not Met

These standards describe the competencies covered by the credential program coursework and are subsumed under AE Program Standard 4.

Preliminary Administrative Services

Program Design

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) Program is housed within the WCOE at CSU San Bernardino and is administered through the Department of Educational Leadership and Technology. The PASC is offered as a stand-alone credential and as part of the Master of Arts in Educational Administration; both pathways include an intern option. The program is

intentionally designed to be delivered over three semesters, mirroring the three requirements of the CALAPA. Candidates complete a total of 28 semester credits for the PASC and 34 credits to complete the PASC and the MA in Educational Administration. Additionally, candidates may apply up to five credential courses toward the requirements for the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership.

The three program objectives are well articulated and well understood by the community, candidates and faculty. These objectives focus on candidate achievement and well-being; diversity, equity and inclusion; and transformational leadership.

Program leadership is shared by two full-time faculty members (lecturers), each receiving one course release to support administrative responsibilities. Due to the anticipated retirement of one faculty member, program administration will transition to a single coordinator with two course releases. In addition to administrative duties, program coordinators maintain full teaching and supervision loads. The program is supported by five full-time faculty members—several of whom also contribute to the doctoral program—and approximately six adjunct instructors. Full time faculty members represent the diversity of the community and are fully engaged in various leadership roles within the community as well as at the university. Faculty share their expertise and unique experiences with the candidates, further enriching the program and candidate experience. University supervisors are typically drawn from the full-time faculty. Some faculty responsibilities are shared across credential and doctoral programs within the department. The faculty reported that the leadership of the program is very engaged, hands on and supportive. One of the adjunct faculty members noted that the program is like a “family” and if required to only teach at one university CSUSB would be her choice. The word “humanity” was used by both the faculty and the candidates, noting that there is a caring and supportive environment for learning that is reflected by the leadership of the program.

The program demonstrates a clear commitment to meeting the needs of working professionals. Since the COVID-19 pandemic, all coursework has been delivered in a synchronous online format, with classes scheduled during weekday evenings. Additional flexibility is provided through the option to conduct three of fifteen class sessions asynchronously, a practice valued by both faculty and candidates. Candidates are organized into cohorts based on program entry, promoting professional community and collaborative learning. Intern candidates are integrated into cohorts and contribute relevant professional expertise in the classes from their current administrative roles.

The program coursework is offered fully online except for district cohorts, such as Fontana USD, which is a hybrid model that includes in-person and online. Candidates consistently identified program flexibility as a primary factor in their enrollment decisions. Online candidates indicated that geographic distance would have otherwise limited access, while district cohort participants emphasized the benefits of in-person collaboration with colleagues. All candidates interviewed shared that they were pleased with the option they had chosen.

Guided by feedback from local educational partners, the program is grounded in the goal of preparing “principal-ready, equity-minded” leaders. Evidence from candidates and completers feedback indicates that the program effectively fulfills this objective. While theoretical foundations are addressed, the curriculum emphasizes applied practice through coursework, assignments, and field experiences. For example, candidates complete a grant proposal for a \$10,000 funding opportunity in the finance course, attend and analyze school board meetings, and review board policies. These assignments reflect authentic administrative responsibilities. Candidates are also required to engage in structured reflection, completing written analyses following each California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE) aligned activity to assess professional strengths and areas for growth. The program maintains a close connection with the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) and encourages the candidates to take advantage of the many professional development opportunities that are offered.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

CAPEs are systematically embedded across coursework and fieldwork. At the beginning of each term of fieldwork, the university supervisor collaborates with the candidate and site supervisor to develop an individualized plan for meeting CAPE standards. Intern candidates are placed in cohorts with other candidates and follow the same program design. Candidates and completers consistently reported high levels of faculty accessibility and support, noting frequent and responsive communication. University supervisors were recognized for their commitment to candidate development, including conducting site visits and observations as needed. Program responsiveness to candidate needs, including flexibility with workload and assignment timelines, was also noted as a program strength. Candidates further highlighted the adaptability of fieldwork activities, which allow for multiple pathways to demonstrate competency aligned with CAPE standards.

Assessment and Candidate Support

Preparation for the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA) is intentionally integrated throughout the program. Coursework and fieldwork are aligned to the three CalAPA leadership cycles. Within designated courses, candidates engage in the full inquiry cycle—investigate, plan, act, and reflect—aligned to each leadership cycle. Structured peer review processes are embedded within coursework and were identified by candidates as critical support in completing CalAPA requirements. Candidates requiring additional support beyond the semester are enrolled in a targeted support course led by faculty with specialized expertise in CalAPA. The program reports a CalAPA pass rate of 97.2%. Candidates and completers consistently reported feeling well-prepared and supported in meeting this credentialing requirement.

While faculty members are free to add to the course syllabi and personalize the materials, course assignments and assessments are “fixed,” allowing for a planned sequence addressing the standards at each of the levels of introduction, practice and assessment. Additionally, faculty and leadership share materials through a shared google drive to support each other in coursework and supervision. To ensure candidates are meeting the CAPEs, data are collected throughout the field work, with intentional planning to ensure that all areas are met. In the rare

occasion that a candidate is not well suited for a placement or is not progressing, a conference is held with the site supervisor, the university supervisor and the candidate. If necessary, another placement may be found. It was clear that the program coordinators are attentive to the data collected; there was no evidence of systematic sharing and utilization of the data collected through the fieldwork, Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness, and CALAPA results.

Of note for this program is the large number of candidates who have chosen to return to CSU San Bernardino for their administrative credential following earning their teaching credential and other degrees at the university. Interviews confirmed that the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program at CSU San Bernardino clearly has an outstanding reputation in the community and among its alumni, many of whom are serving on the Program Advisory Committee, as site supervisors, part-time faculty, and are prominent leaders in education in the region.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, supervising practitioners, employers, institutional administrators and staff, and educational partners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The site visit team found that the California State University, San Bernardino's (CSU San Bernardino) Watson College of Education (WCOE) demonstrates a strong commitment to preparing educators, administrators, and school counselors who are responsive to the needs of the diverse communities they serve. WCOE maintains deep and sustained partnerships with regional school districts and community organizations, many of which are led by program alumni, who describe WCOE as "always evolving, relevant, and cutting edge". These partnerships contribute to a coherent system of educator preparation that is closely aligned with workforce needs in the Inland Empire. School personnel consistently described candidates as "prepared on day one" to effectively support culturally and linguistically diverse learners. A collaborative and student-centered culture is evident at WCOE, with coordinated systems in place to support candidates from admission through credential recommendation.

While the unit demonstrates many strengths, the team also identified areas for continued growth. These include ensuring that the program coordinator role is supported with sufficient resources, strengthening consistency in clinical practice experiences, and further developing a comprehensive, systematic, unit-wide approach to continuous improvement. In addition, the team noted that the CTE and Adult Education programs require further attention to meet program 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.	Consistently

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.	Consistently
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

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The WCOE has developed a research-based vision and mission centered on compassion, collegiality, and a commitment to inspiring candidates and serving communities. Interviews confirmed that WCOE effectively enacts a unit conceptual framework grounded in social justice theory, culturally responsive pedagogy, and community engagement. The unit's vision, as confirmed through documentation and interviews, reflects a strategic priority to cultivate diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging and prepares candidates to effectively teach all students, particularly in linguistically and culturally diverse settings.

WCOE employs a multi-layered governance structure that supports shared decision-making and program coherence. The Dean's Cabinet and Unit Assessment Committee meet regularly and include representation from administrators, department chairs, program coordinators, faculty, and staff. Program-level concerns are addressed at the level closest to candidates and elevated through department chairs to unit leadership, ensuring that decision-making is informed by

program implementation. The unit further supports engagement through Extended Leadership meetings and weekly drop-in sessions focused on data use and accreditation processes.

WCOE actively engages community partners in program development through advisory boards, semester meetings with district partners, and partnerships with over 100 school districts and agencies. District representatives and community members, many of whom are alumni, contribute to discussions on curriculum, program improvement, and candidate performance. Unit-sponsored initiatives such as Project Impact, the Educational Leadership Summit, and Latino Education and Advocacy Days (LEAD) reflect a strong commitment to regional engagement and responsiveness to community needs. Collaboration with P–12 partners is embedded in faculty roles through supervision, advisory participation, and district partnerships.

Interviews and documentation indicate that the unit allocates and leverages resources to support advising, supervision, and clinical practice. Despite institutional budget constraints, the unit has maintained stable faculty-to-student ratios and prioritized candidate access to services. Advising and fieldwork are coordinated through faculty, program coordinators, the supervision office, and the Office of Student Services. The unit supplements funding through grants and philanthropic initiatives. Overall, evidence indicates that resources are sufficient to support candidates across all phases of preparation. However, the team found inconsistent evidence that resources provided for program coordination were sufficient to support program effectiveness. In some programs, the assigned time for the program coordinator role may be insufficient to support the scope and complexity of responsibilities.

Evidence indicates that unit leadership has the authority and institutional support necessary to address program needs across the unit. The Dean of WCOE participates in university leadership structures, including the CSUSB Provost's leadership team, enabling communication and advocacy for program priorities. Leadership actions, including equitable course release policies and use of multiple funding streams, demonstrate the authority to support program operations. The Dean's Cabinet provides a formal structure for shared governance, ensuring that program-level needs are communicated and addressed.

The institution demonstrates a commitment to recruiting and developing a diverse and qualified faculty aligned with its mission. All full-time faculty hold terminal degrees, and all program supervisors are appropriately credentialed. Faculty development is supported through the Faculty Excellence Center, mentoring programs, and unit-sponsored professional learning opportunities. Evaluation processes include Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTEs) and candidate feedback on field-based educators.

Three credential analysts housed within the WCOE Office of Student Services verify completion of all program and state requirements using multiple data sources, including program plans, transcripts, and documentation maintained in the MyCOE PeopleSoft system. Analysts collaborate with program coordinators to confirm eligibility and resolve discrepancies prior to recommendation, supporting accuracy, consistency, and compliance with Commission requirements.

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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 2: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Across programs, clearly defined admission criteria are disseminated to prospective candidates through Program Admission Files (PAFs), program handbooks, and institutional admissions systems. These criteria include multiple measures such as GPA, subject matter competency, and structured interview performance. Admissions processes are consistently applied by program personnel to evaluate candidate readiness, support selection decisions, and guide candidates through credential pathways. The WCOE Credential Program Admissions webpages and the Cal State Apply system further ensure transparency and equitable access to application requirements. Interviews with admission advisors and recruiters confirm that candidates receive individualized guidance through information sessions and advising appointments, and candidates consistently report that these supports clarify expectations and facilitate successful entry into programs.

Recruitment efforts are substantiated through documentation and stakeholder feedback, demonstrating intentional strategies to diversify the educator pipeline and serve regional workforce needs. Outreach artifacts, including community college presentations, Teacher Pathway events, and partnerships with local school districts, reflect sustained engagement across the Inland Empire. Enrollment data from the WCOE Statistical Factbook indicate that approximately 60% of candidates identify as Hispanic/Latino and 6% as African American,

reflecting alignment with regional demographics. Program personnel emphasize a shared commitment to equity and access, while candidates report being drawn to the program’s focus on representation and community relevance.

“Project Impact”, an initiative dedicated to diversifying the teacher workforce by intentionally recruiting and preparing underrepresented minorities, provides additional evidence of targeted recruitment and sustained support for underrepresented candidates. Program records document the enrollment of 75 Hispanic and African American male candidates since inception, supported through partnerships with districts such as Rialto Unified School District and other regional partners. Participant interviews indicate that mentoring, financial assistance, and cohort-based support are key factors influencing both enrollment and persistence. Program leaders further identify the Grow-Your-Own model as an effective strategy for strengthening local educator pipelines and improving long-term retention.

Candidate support is evidenced through coordinated systems within the Jim & Judy Watson Student Services Center, which provides advising, credential processing, fieldwork supervision, and Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) support. Candidates report that TPA workshops, faculty feedback, and clinical supervision significantly enhance their preparedness and confidence. Faculty confirm that structured monitoring systems enable early identification of candidates needing additional support and timely intervention to promote success.

Additional alignment with state standards is demonstrated through induction and post-program support systems. Collaboration with the Riverside County Office of Education provides a two-year induction program focused on mentoring, coaching, and professional development for new teachers. Completer interviews indicate that induction support strengthens instructional practice and eases the transition into full-time teaching. Project Impact extends mentoring support for up to three years post-completion, directly contributing to teacher retention. The Master’s in Education program further reflects opportunities for ongoing professional growth and continuous development.

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

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
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
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.	Inconsistently
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.	Inconsistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 3: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Based on a comprehensive review of documents and interviews with faculty, stakeholders and candidates, evidence indicates that a high-quality course of study exists in each program, with a robust focus on the necessary skills for beginning educators. The coursework across programs puts forth strong connections to current research and best practices. The two teacher residency programs are examples of exemplary integration of research-based and authentic learning experiences that also reflect seamless communication between program coordinators, school district leadership, the unit leadership team, support staff and faculty. Evidence highlighted the unit's commitment to differentiating planned sequences of coursework and diverse fieldwork experiences in order to meet the needs of its vast service region.

There is strong support and articulation of program goals at the program level that drives the unit's various professional learning communities (PLCs). These PLCs contribute to building more integrated processes to ensure candidates engage in rigorous site-based fieldwork that focuses on issues of diversity and school climate. For example, new site-based supervisors and university supervisors participate in professional development to address problems of practice

with an emphasis on “humanizing pedagogy” which appears to be a mindset embedded throughout most of the programs.

The process for ensuring that university supervisors are experienced is evident across all programs. However, interviews revealed inconsistencies in how the certification of experience for site-based supervisors is verified in the preliminary teacher credentialing programs.

Faculty interviews provided clear evidence that district employed supervisors are knowledgeable and able to deliver high level support to candidates, with an emphasis on guiding candidates to master the implementation of research-based strategies for improving teaching and learning.

Supervisor handbooks, specific to each program, provide detailed information delineating the role and function of personnel responsible for candidate supervision, as evidenced in the artifacts and validated through the interviews. There is a process to ensure that university and site-based supervisors are monitored based upon feedback from candidates. If any supervisor receives an unsatisfactory evaluation from a candidate, the dean and the chair meet with the supervisor to develop an improvement plan.

There was inconsistent evidence that site-based supervisors in all programs are trained in supervision and oriented to the supervisory role. Interviews with district employed supervisors indicated some collaborative articulation with university supervisors to meet fieldwork competencies, but that collaboration is inconsistent. In some cases, it was noted that candidates are receiving inconsistent feedback regarding their fieldwork experience. There is limited evidence to suggest that the evaluation of candidate fieldwork experiences is done systemically across all programs.

The unit and the programs provide rich experiences for candidates in school settings that align with California State Standards and reflect the diversity of California’s student population.

Rationale for the Finding

There was inconsistent evidence that all site-based supervisors are certified and experienced in the specified content areas of the credential areas they are supervising. In addition, there was inconsistent evidence that all site-based supervisors are trained in supervision and oriented to the supervisory role. Lastly, there was inconsistent evidence that all programs effectively implement fieldwork and clinical practice.

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.	Inconsistently

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
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.	Consistently
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completion data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.	Inconsistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 4: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The interviews collected indicate that most programs provide robust experiences for candidates, but there is limited evidence to indicate that assessment data are systematically collected around these experiences and aggregated to promote continuous improvement across programs. It is also not clear that program level data is retrievable by the unit to ensure continuous improvement at the unit and program level. However, during the visit it was acknowledged that expectations placed on individual programs to collect program level data, separate from the unit, has been ambiguous, therefore the unit will revisit the data collection process to ensure more efficient ways for the data to be shared with the unit assessment committee and the dean's cabinet to promote continuous improvement. Discourse with the unit leadership acknowledged that the lack of sharing data has created inconsistencies in the comprehensive analysis of data for continuous improvement.

There is evidence to support that program effectiveness throughout the unit is assessed using tools such as digiCOACH, course assessments, candidate success ratings generated from course competency tools such as CalAPA scores. There is evidence that qualitative data emanating from the professional learning committees is captured through minutes at the program level but it is not clear how those artifacts are accessed by the unit. There is evidence to support that the supervision department and the assessment department at the unit level collaborate with program coordinators across programs to assess and analyze program level outcomes. While the unit assessment committee appears to be engaged well with tracking data collected by the multiple subject and single subject programs, it is unclear how data is tracked for the other programs. The data collected for the multiple subject and single subject programs includes a rigorous amount of observations, including eight observations per semester, which highly informs both the unit and the program about candidate progress and success. The unit collaborates with programs to examine the candidate course evaluations and determine if there are gaps in course curriculum that may be contributing to candidate deficiencies.

Completer data are being collected through the Center for Teacher Quality Survey, but it is not consistently shared across the unit to promote continuous improvement. There is evidence that qualitative data emanating from the professional learning committees are captured through minutes at the program level, but it is not clear how those artifacts are accessed by the unit.

Rationale for the Finding

There was inconsistent evidence that 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. In addition, there was inconsistent evidence that the unit and each of its programs regularly and systematically use data to improve programs and their services.

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 team found consistent evidence that candidates meet Commission-adopted competency requirements as specified in program standards. Data from Teaching Performance Assessments (TPA/CalTPA), CalAPA results, and Education Specialist competency evaluations (including ECSE, MMSN, and ESN assessments) demonstrate that candidates achieve expected levels of proficiency in instructional planning, delivery, assessment, and reflective practice. Fieldwork and intern evaluation data from Multiple Subject and Single Subject placements (2021–Fall 2023) further confirm that candidates demonstrate readiness to assume instructional responsibilities in diverse classroom settings. These findings are corroborated by clinical supervisor and university supervisor interviews, which consistently indicate that candidates are well-prepared in lesson design, differentiation, classroom management, and professional collaboration.

Employers of the Administrative Services credential completers noted the outstanding reputation of the CSU San Bernardino program in the community and among its alumni. Interviews with the advisory committees for the Pupil Personnel Services credential programs highlighted wide reaching engagement and strong partnerships throughout the community.

Interviews confirm that WCOE programs have an overall positive impact on candidate learning and professional competence, as well as on teaching and learning in P–12 schools within the service area. District partners and employer representatives report that WCOE candidates are highly prepared and frequently recruited to fill teaching vacancies. Survey data from completers and employers further support these findings, indicating strong satisfaction with graduate preparedness, including effectiveness in supporting students with disabilities.

Candidate and completer interviews provide additional confirmation of program impact. Candidates consistently report that structured clinical experiences, supervision, and TPA preparation activities contribute significantly to their instructional readiness. Completers and some employers indicate that these experiences translate into increased confidence, instructional effectiveness, and ability to meet diverse student needs upon entering the profession. Field supervisors similarly note that candidates demonstrate increasing levels of independence and instructional competence over the course of their clinical practice.

Additional evidence of program impact is demonstrated through consistently strong licensure pass rates across TPA, CalAPA, and Education Specialist assessments, as well as positive field evaluation outcomes across credential areas. Advisory board feedback, superintendent-level engagement, and district partnership communications further validate program effectiveness and indicate that program completers are viewed as effective contributors to school communities. Alumni engagement data also show that many completers return to serve as university supervisors, adjunct faculty, and mentor teachers, reflecting continued professional commitment and program preparation effectiveness.

“Project Impact”, an initiative dedicated to diversifying the teacher workforce by intentionally recruiting and preparing underrepresented minorities, provides further solid evidence of targeted program impact in strengthening educator diversity pipelines. Program documentation shows the enrollment of 75 Hispanic and African American male candidates to date, supported through structured mentoring, financial assistance, and cohort-based supports. Participant interviews confirm that these supports are critical to persistence and completion and contribute to long-term workforce development in high-need districts.