Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at California State University Fullerton
January 2016

Overview of This Report

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

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

Standards	Initial	Advanced
1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	MET	MET
2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	MET	MET
3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	MET	MET
4. Diversity	MET	MET
5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	MET	MET
6. Unit Governance and Resources	MET	MET

N/A = Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

Team Recommendations on Movement Towards Target:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	N/A	N/A
2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	N/A	N/A
3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	N/A	N/A
4. Diversity	N/A	N/A
5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Target	Target
6. Unit Governance and Resources	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

Program Standards

Programs	Total Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject, with Internship	19	19		
Single Subject, with Internship	19	19		
General Education Clear Credential	6	6		
Education Specialist Clear Induction	7	7		
Early Childhood Education Specialist	26	26		
Education Specialist: MM	22	22		
Education Specialist: MS	24	24		
Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder	3	3		
Early Childhood Education Added Authorization	4	4		
Added Authorization: Resource Specialist	6	6		
Bilingual Authorization	6	6		
Reading Certificate	5	5		
Reading Language Arts Credential	10	10		
Administrative Services: Clear Induction	5	5		
Administrative Services: Preliminary	14	14		
Speech-Language Pathology	16	16		
School Nurse Services	9	9		

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:
- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report

Institution: **California State University, Fullerton**

Dates of Visit: **November 8-10, 2015**

Accreditation Team
Recommendation: **Accreditation**

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

Common Standards
The decision of the entire team regarding the six NCATE standards is that all standards are **Met**. The decision of the team regarding the parts of California's two Common Standards that are required of NCATE accredited institutions is that both standards are **Met**.

Program Standards
Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total team membership was provided for CSUF. Following discussion, the team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns, or not met. The CTC team found that all standards are **Met** in all programs.

Overall Recommendation
The team completed a thorough review of program documents, program data, and interviewed institutional administrators, program leadership, faculty, supervising instructors, master teachers, candidates, completers, and Advisory Board members. Based on the fact that all NCATE/ Common Standards are **Met** and that all program standards are **Met** the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation.**

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

Initial/Teaching Credentials	**Advanced/Service Credentials**
Multiple Subject	General Education Clear (MS/SS)
Multiple Subject	
Multiple Subject Intern (currently inactive)	
Single Subject	
Single Subject	
Single Subject Intern	
Education Specialist Credentials	Education Specialist Clear Induction
Mild/Moderate Disabilities with Intern	
Moderate/Severe Disabilities with Intern	
Early Childhood Education Specialist	
with Intern	Added Authorizations
	Autism Spectrum Disorder
	Resource Specialist
	Early Childhood Education Specialist
	Clinical Rehabilitative Services – Speech Language Pathology
	Administrative Services
	Preliminary
	Clear Induction
	Bilingual Authorization
	Reading Certificate
	Reading Language Arts Credential
	School Nurse Services

Staff recommends that:
- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- CSU Fullerton be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- CSU Fullerton continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

NCATE Co-Chair:	**Ana Maria Schuhmann** William Patterson University (Retired)
California Co-Chair:	**James J. Zarrillo** California State University, East Bay
NCATE/Common Standards Cluster:	**Amanda M. Rudolph** Stephen F. Austin State University **Amy M. Williamson** University of Washington D. C. **Donna M. Brackin** Victory University **Jonathon M. Gillentine** Hawaii State Department of Education **Gary L. Railsback** Azusa Pacific University **Michael E. Kotar** California State University, Chico
Basic/Teaching Programs Cluster:	**Brad Damon** National University **Olga Grimalt** Loyola Marymount University **Andrea Liston** Point Loma Nazarene University
Advanced/Services Programs Cluster:	**Carol Ann Franklin** University of Redlands **Mindy Sloan** Bridgepoint Education **Candace Poindexter** Loyola Marymount University
Staff to the Visit:	**Katie Croy, Consultant** California Commission on Teacher Credentialing **Sarah Solari Colombini, Consultant** California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Institutional Self Study	Candidate Work Samples
University Catalog	Field Experience Notebooks
Common Standards Report	Accreditation Website
Course Syllabi	Faculty Vitae
Candidate Files	University Annual Reports
Program and Fieldwork Handbooks	University Budget Plan
Survey Data	TPA Data
Candidate Performance Data	Intern Logs
Program Assessment Preliminary Findings	Intern MOUs
Program Assessment Summaries	Course Management System
Biennial Reports and CTC Feedback	Credential Recommendation Data Base
Advisement Documents	Candidate Assessment Tools and Rubrics

Interviews Conducted

	TOTAL
Candidates	163
Completers	178
Employers	37
Institutional Administration	30
Program Coordinators	37
Faculty	96
FAST-TPA Coordinator	1
Advisors	9
Field Supervisors – Program	76
Field Supervisors - District	56
Credential Analysts and Staff	54
Advisory Board Members	145
TOTAL	**882**

Note: In some cases, individuals may have been interviewed more than once (e.g., faculty) if they serve in multiple roles.

The Visit

The CSU Fullerton site visit was held on the campus in Fullerton, California from November 8-10, 2015. This was a joint NCATE/CTC accreditation visit, utilizing the Continuous Improvement model for NCATE. The site visit team consisted of a Team Lead, two California BIR members who

served on the NCATE team reviewing the NCATE Unit Standards (Common Standards), and, because of the size and number of programs and pathways, six Program Standards members. Two Commission consultants accompanied the visit. The NCATE team arrived at the hotel on Saturday evening and the California State Team arrived at noon on Sunday, November 8, 2015. The teams met jointly on Sunday, and participated in a poster session and interviews with constituents beginning on Sunday afternoon. Interviews continued Monday. A mid-visit report was completed on Monday morning with a follow up mid visit report at 1:15pm. On Monday evening, the full team met to discuss findings and make decisions on standards. The exit report was conducted at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 10, 2015.

I. Introduction

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

California State University, Fullerton (CSUF), a comprehensive urban university, is located on 236 acres of what once was part of a vast orange grove. Currently serving over 38,000 students, CSUF began in September 1959 with a population of 452. A Hispanic Serving Institution (HIS), CSUF is number one in awarding bachelor's degrees to Hispanics, and fourth in the nation for the number of bachelor's degrees awarded to minority students.

CSUF offers 55 undergraduate and 54 graduate degree programs, including a doctorate in education and doctor of nursing practice.

The institution is composed of eight colleges: Arts, Business and Economics, Communications, Education, Engineering and Computer Science, Health and Human Development, Humanities and Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences and Mathematics.

The professional education unit at CSUF is led by The College of Education (COE). The COE coordinates and manages all university programs that prepare school professionals to work in P-12 settings. The unit offers both initial and advanced preparation programs housed in five departments within the COE and in four other colleges. The COE departments are: Educational Leadership (EDAD); Elementary & Bilingual Education (EDEL); Secondary Education (EDSC): Reading (READ); and Special Education (SPED).

The unit offers four initial programs at the post- baccalaureate level: Multiple Subject (K-8); Multiple Subject Combined Credential (K-8)/Masters; Single Subject (7-12); and Special Education (K-12; early childhood). Both Single Subject and Special Education initial credential programs offer an Intern Option. The Multiple Subject Intern option is currently on inactive status. The following advanced programs for teachers are offered: Elementary Curriculum and Instruction; Bilingual/Bicultural Education; Educational Technology; Secondary Education; and Special Education. The Master of Arts in Teaching Science (MAT-S) is inactive. The unit offers the following advanced programs for other school professionals: Education Administration; Doctorate in Educational Leadership; Reading; Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages; and Communicative Disorders-Speech-Language Pathology.

_____

The COE employs 29 full-time staff and 152 faculty members, 75 of whom are full-time and 77 are part-time. The COE enrolls 1,719 students in its initial and advanced programs. In 2014-15, the unit recommended 688 candidates for P-12 and administrative credentials, and awarded 254 Master's degrees and 34 Doctor of Education degrees.

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

This was a continuous improvement legacy visit under the NCATE standards. It was a joint visit with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). The Board of Examiners (BOE) team had two California team members. In addition, a CTC team worked collaboratively and side-by-side with the BOE team.

At the on-site meeting, the CTC approved all CSUF credential programs.

The visit scheduled for 2014 was deferred to 2015 due to the state's postponement of accreditation activity.

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

No professional education programs are offered off-campus. The unit offers six programs on-line. In addition, over 100 courses are offered through distance learning. The team collected information from those programs through on-campus interviews with faculty, staff, administrators and candidates.

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

Two of the five BOE team members who participated in the off-site review were not able to participate in the on-site visit due to family circumstances. They were replaced by team members who did outstanding work.

II. Conceptual Framework

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

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

Both the CSUF and the COE mission reflect elements that are central to educational excellence: collaboration, integration of research and practice, cultural and global competence, creativity, technological prowess and critical thinking skills. Both mission statements recognize the faculty's role in preparing candidates to succeed in an increasingly diverse world.

The theme of the unit's conceptual framework (CF) is REACH, TEACH, IMPACT. Specifically the unit's purpose is to prepare candidates who have the capacity to REACH their students at all levels; to TEACH their students using a multitude of instructional and technological strategies; and to have an IMPACT on their students' learning and development. The unit provided evidence that the CF theme is graphically represented and appears on every professional education syllabus along with unit program outcomes and indicators.

The unit program outcomes are to ensure that credential recipients and program graduates are: Knowledgeable and Competent Specialists, Responsive and Reflective Practitioners, and Committed and Caring Professionals. Each of these three outcomes has indicators of candidate proficiency. Candidate assessments and unit evaluations reflect the unit's conceptual framework and program goals/outcomes. In addition to the unit program outcomes, candidates are expected to demonstrate dispositions that are articulated in the CF. The dispositions expected of candidates are to: 1) promote diversity (includes a commitment to fairness and the belief that all students can learn); 2) engage in collaborative endeavors; 3) think critically; 4) maintain professional and ethical standards; and 5) value life-long learning.

Candidates are informed of the CF goals and expectations at information sessions and orientations. The CF has been revised since 2007 to include new vision and mission statements, a revised disposition statement to align more closely with the definition of just, equitable and inclusive education, and to reflect new unit program outcomes aligned with university learning outcomes.

NCATE STANDARDS/CTC COMMON STANDARDS

STANDARD 1: CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS
Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The California State University Fullerton (CSUF) is accredited by Western Association of Schools with over 38,000 students. CSUF has both initial and advanced programs in four colleges, the College of Education (COE), College of Communications, College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics and the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. The departments included in the unit are: Educational Leadership (EDAD), Elementary and Bilingual Education (EDEL), Secondary Education (EDSC), Reading (READ), Special Education (SPED), all within the COE, and Communicative Disorders (HCOM), Science Education (SCED), and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESL) outside the COE.

The unit has four initial programs, Multiple Subjects, Multiple Subject- Combined Credential, Single Subject and Special Education and 11 advanced programs. The California Commission on Teaching Credentialing (CTC) has approved all the unit's initial and advanced credential programs.

Title II reports indicated an overall completer pass rate of 95 percent in 2012-2013 for initial traditional programs and an 82 percent pass rate for alternative programs. Content knowledge for initial programs is also measured by GPA which is reported at every transition point (Exhibit 2.4.a.1). During the onsite visit, candidates verified that they had mastery of content knowledge. Examples of high standards and rigorous assignments were shared. Candidates discussed completing four formal student teaching evaluations, along with multiple assignments in their five courses. For advanced programs, the unit uses degrees and GPAs as measures of content knowledge. In Exhibit 1.4.c, the unit includes the knowledge and skills data for advanced programs through the Culminating Assignment. The unit provided additional examples of evidence for the Culminating Assignment for special education and reading. However, it should be noted that the Culminating Assignment using the unit wide rubrics across programs has only two years of data.

In the Institutional Report, the unit indicates a robust assessment system to address pedagogical content knowledge and professional and pedagogical knowledge. For initial programs, the unit includes: Supervised Fieldwork Evaluations, Student Teaching Evaluations, Capstone Assessments, and Exit Surveys. Data are provided for each measure that is disaggregated by program. The data support the evidence of candidate knowledge and skills. The off-site report indicated a concern regarding the disaggregation of data by program. In the Addendum, the unit provided evidence of disaggregated data for the single subject candidates. During onsite interviews, the candidates reported intense coursework including practice TPA assignments. For

advanced programs, assessments include Admission Assessments, Diversity Assignment, Writing Assignment, Midpoint Survey, Capstone Assignment and Exit Survey. The data are disaggregated by program and supports candidate mastery of knowledge and skills. Onsite interviews verified coursework in research, data analysis and field experiences.

The unit incorporates the TPA as an assessment in the initial programs. The candidates report that the process of preparing for the TPA requires professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Additionally in onsite interviews candidates discussed the work they completed that addressed the community, family, and school connections. In onsite interviews, candidates in advanced programs indicated that all classes addressed data analysis and research. Data and onsite interviews confirm that both initial and advanced candidates are reflecting on their personal and professional practice.

Although impact on student learning was not directly addressed in the Institutional Report or the Addendum, the onsite visit verified that candidates are measuring their impact on student learning across programs. The practice TPA assignments in initial programs have specific prompts to report impact on student learning. The advanced candidate completers discussed implementing interventions in reading and special education and measuring the impact on student learning through those projects. Advanced candidates currently enrolled also described assignments that required pre and post assessments that would measure interventions and/or measure student achievement.

Dispositions for the unit include: promoting diversity, engaging in collaborative endeavors, thinking critically, maintaining professional and ethical standards, and valuing life-long learning. In the Institutional Report the unit provides evidence of dispositions assessments at the initial and advanced levels. However, the data indicate that all candidates received the same rating. In the interviews with program coordinators, the faculty members stated that unit dispositions with the common rubric have only been in place for two years. One program coordinator stated that the candidates are reviewed by several faculty members, but are not shown the instrument or the results unless there is a problem. In other onsite interviews, current candidates and completers in advanced programs were not able to speak to the unit's dispositions.

Both an alumni and employer survey were included in the Institutional Report, the Year-Out Graduate Survey and the Year-Out Employer survey for both initial and advanced programs. The data indicate satisfaction of employers and graduates.

Overall, the unit provides sufficient evidence of candidate knowledge, skills and for both initial and advanced programs with the exception of dispositions. Unit dispositions and the dispositions measures are not communicated to all candidates nor are the results of the assessments consistently shared with candidates across programs. Other assessments are created to measure the content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and skills as well as show impact on student learning. Data is collected and aggregated and disaggregated by programs. The data are then shared, discussed and used to make changes and adjustments to the program in order to better serve candidates. Interviews onsite also support the findings from the Institutional Report, the exhibits and the Addendum.

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 1.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

Continuous Improvement. **What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?**

In the Institutional Report, the unit states that there are two areas that are most challenging to their completers upon graduation. These two areas are teaching English Learners (EL) and using technology effectively. Although the unit references CSUF survey data as a source for the change to focus on EL instruction, the narrative also indicates that major changes were initiated from the CTC. The need for technology focus was initiated by instructors and reinforced by a state survey SEPTPP. Therefore, the two major changes were not identified through annual review of the data with the faculty of the programs or unit. However, in the Addendum, answering an off-site concern, evidence was provided in the Unit Data-Based Changes/Improvements (Exhibit 2.4.a.2). These changes include creation of achievement gap plans and integration of the Center for Careers in Teaching into the College of Education based on the retention data. A technology committee was created as a result of the review of Exit Survey Data and Year-Out Survey data. The Just, Equitable and Inclusive Education Task Force was also created based on review of that same data. Other examples of changes based on the interview with the Assessment Committee include adjusting the Disposition Evaluation to be included in all programs and creating the Diversity Assignment from discussion about survey data.

Through onsite interviews, it was verified that the unit's Assessment Committee works to aggregate and disaggregate data for individual programs. Programs then complete a Department Data Analysis Report to report strengths, weaknesses and changes to the programs.

Strengths. **What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level**? N. A.

1.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

N.A.	AFI Rationale

1.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

N.A.	AFI Rationale

1.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI 1: The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates develop and demonstrate the professional dispositions identified by the unit. (Initial and Advanced)	**Rationale:** The unit is working toward measuring dispositions and has two years or less of data. However, the data show the same means for all candidates in all programs. Additionally, candidates cannot name or discuss the unit dispositions.

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

State Team Decision for Standard 1: Met

STANDARD 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION
The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1   Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

As noted in the College Assessment Handbook (Exhibit 2.4.a), the Dean of the College of Education (COE) works with the Associate Dean and the Director of Accreditation and Assessment to ensure the Professional Education Unit is meeting its ongoing accreditation and assessment requirements. The Director of Accreditation and Assessment (faculty), the Administrative Analyst/Specialist (Exempt II staff), and a part-time Administrative Support Assistant II compose the COE assessment team. The Director of Accreditation and Assessment leads the assessment team, chairs the Assessment Committee, keeps the Council of Chairs (including the Dean and Associate Dean) current on all accreditation matters, and serves as the College liaison for all University assessment and accreditation needs.

The assessment team reports to the Associate Dean who reviews and responds to assessment reports and submissions. The COE assessment team oversees program assessment for unit departments/programs and is responsible for meeting multiple reporting requirements. All reports require the presentation of assessment data and evidence of program improvement based on assessment results.

The design of the unit's assessment system facilitates an iterative process for collecting, analyzing and reporting data on candidate performance, program effectiveness, and unit operations. Data from both internal and external sources are collected and analyzed at either the program or unit level. Some data are used immediately by programs for decisions regarding candidate admission, retention, and program completion. Other data are aggregated and analyzed by the research analyst, or other responsible personnel, prior to being reported to department chairs and program coordinators. Data seems to be shared at the program level, for the most part. Exhibit

2.4.d includes a table that reflects the flow of data collection, analysis and planned use for initial, advanced, program and unit.

The unit program outcomes (goals) are to ensure that credential recipients and program graduates are Knowledgeable and Competent Specialists, Responsive and Reflective Practitioners, and Committed and Caring Professionals. In addition to the unit program outcomes, candidates are expected to demonstrate dispositions that are articulated in the CF and encompass behavioral indicators within the three program outcomes. Additional key assessments include Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) data, field work verification and scores, exit surveys, and year-out surveys.

Unit program outcomes have been aligned with state and national standards appropriate to each program, as well as the new university standards for student learning (Exhibit I.5.c). Candidate assessments and unit evaluations are purposeful, evolving from the unit's conceptual framework and program goals. The unit's COE Assessment Handbook clearly outlines the assessments used to measure candidate, program, and unit effectiveness.

Selected items from multiple assessments (e.g., fieldwork and student teaching evaluations, Teacher Performance Assessment, surveys) measure candidate dispositions throughout the initial programs. A dispositions assessment and selected items from other assessments (e.g., diversity assignment, surveys) measure candidate dispositions in the advanced programs. Assessments are included in Exhibit 1.4.e and two years of data are presented in Exhibit 1.4.f. Program-specific assessments (for example, admissions interviews in secondary and special education programs, reflected in Exhibit 2.4.c) may exist to supplement unit wide dispositions assessments.

Candidate assessment data are regularly shared with faculty at the program level to help them reflect on and improve their performance and programs. Faculty members cite ease of data access with a new online system.

Questions were raised in the offsite report regarding the involvement of stakeholders in unit data review. In addition, there were some initial concerns about who is involved in assessment decisions within the unit. Meeting minutes and interviews confirmed the composition of advisory boards and the assessment committee, as well as the involvement of various professional community members such superintendents and community college staff in the evaluation of some aspects of the unit's assessment system (graduation and retention rates, for example). Although quite a few advisory boards are in place, the unit provided little or no evidence to demonstrate that data is shared on a regular and systematic basis with principals, teachers, candidates and mentors as members of the professional community. There was no evidence of the existence of a regular mechanism for involving this constituency in the implementation and evaluation of the assessment system.

2.2   Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement
N.A.

2.2.b Continuous Improvement. **What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?**

Revisions since the last accreditation review in 2007 were made to ensure the unit remained aligned with the most current state, institution, and professional standards, unit objectives and educational research. These revisions are referenced in Exhibit 2.4.g. and include a new vision statement (approved in 2011) as part of the development of a five-year strategic plan for the COE, a new mission statement (approved in 2012) that more accurately reflects advances in the unit (since 2007) and its commitment to its newly defined vision, revisions to the dispositions statement (in 2012) to align more closely with the definition of just, equitable and inclusive education (JEIE) as proposed by the COE's JEIE Strategic Taskforce, revisions to the program outcome indicators (in 2012) to align them more tightly with the language of the mission statement, new CF theme and graphic (approved in 2013) to better represent the unit's vision and mission, and unit program outcomes aligned with university learning outcomes (approved in 2013). It is unclear, however, what unit data, if any, led to these changes.

In response to a need for EL instruction, EL Transition Plans were created. As part of these Transition Plans, faculty reviewed syllabi and assignments across the Multiple Subject Program to identify alignment and gaps with the revised standards. Readings that support the teaching of English learners have been identified and included in all content area courses. EDSC's course, EDSC 340: Diversity in Secondary Schools was modified to: emphasize recognizing and understanding the uses of non-dominant varieties of English by students; place more importance on effective engagement with families and communities; and direct attention to the need for candidates to differentiate between language learning and language disability. Faculty added learning goals to all their courses that specifically focus on the new EL standards. The scores from this report cycle (2010-2012) reflected program changes in the courses and field experiences are having a positive impact on how prepared candidates feel to meet the needs of EL. These changes were initiated as a result of a CTC emphasis on EL and corroborated with (survey) data to candidates and employers, as well as faculty perceptions.

Increased technology support and an emphasis on the incorporation of technology in classroom instruction is an example of one data-based change that was made within the unit. Faculty perceptions of technology usage as a weakness for candidates were corroborated in data collected from surveys of graduates and their employers after their first year of teaching, by the System-wide Evaluation of Professional Teacher Preparation Programs (SEPTPP) and the California State University Chancellor's Office. Technological competency was subsequently tackled across the unit in a variety of ways at all levels of instruction, professional development, and even outreach. The college has devoted entire retreats to improving faculty's understanding and use of technology and continues to assure faculty and candidates have access to and training with up-to-date tools for teaching with technology.

Most recently, the yearly assessment of policies, programs, and practices led to the creation of the Just, Equitable and Inclusive Education (JEIE) Task Force and the Technology Task Force. Both of these groups meet at least once each semester and are charged with ensuring that assessment, diversity, and technology remain a focus for the unit

The unit has developed an assessment system that reflects the conceptual framework as well as the professional, state, and national standards and includes multiple assessment tools. The assessment system is regularly evaluated by faculty and staff. It ensures the elimination of bias in assessments and continues to make changes in its practices. Data are regularly compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance and their programs. Changes have been initiated, particularly in program operations, as a result of data evaluations. The unit has developed a system of exchange where faculty can share, reflect, and use assessment information to continually improve candidates' performance and program quality. However, there is limited evidence to support unit-wide dissemination of data or evaluations beyond the program level.

***2.2.b.i Strengths.* What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level**? N.A.

2.3   Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.3. a   What AFIs have been removed?

AFI 1: The unit and its programs have not identified common and key transition-point and post-graduation assessments.	**Rationale:** Since the 2007 accreditation visit, the unit has changed and improved some of its key assessments at both the initial and advanced levels. The Doctorate in Educational Leadership Program did not exist in 2007; however, it currently has the same transition points as the other advanced programs. In 2006, there was no post-graduate assessment for all advanced programs. The unit developed a one year out graduate and employer survey in 2010, for use by all advanced programs. The surveys are administered annually by the COE research data analyst. The surveys were piloted in 2011-2012 in all advanced programs.

2.3.a What AFIs are continued from last visit?

N.A.	AFI Rationale

2.3.b What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI 1: The unit does not collaborate with necessary members of the professional community to implement and evaluate the assessment system. (Initial and Advanced)	**Rationale:** Though there is a marked presence of superintendents, college faculty, program coordinators, and assessment staff on the advisory boards that exist throughout the unit, there is no systematic opportunity for teachers, candidates, and principals to contribute to the evaluation of the assessment system on a unit or program level.
AFI 2: Data are not shared, disseminated, or used regularly and systematically to improve performance of candidates at the unit level. (Initial and Advanced)	**Rationale:** The assessment committee, leadership team, and some advisory boards (i.e. AURTEC) share relevant data in meetings throughout the year, as noted in interviews and meeting minutes. Also, a faculty retreat occurs each fall for the college. However, little to no evidence exists that there is a consistent dissemination and evaluation of data at the unit level. Specifically, data is not regularly shared and evaluated beyond the program level.

STANDARD 3: FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

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

3.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The IR indicates school partners and members of the professional community serve on the Dean's Advisory Board, which includes superintendents and assistant superintendents from partnership districts; the TESOL Advisory Board, whose members include ESL coordinators or designees from four community college campuses; and the Educational Leadership Doctorate Program Executive Board whose membership is appointed by the dean of the unit and includes Ed.D faculty, alumni, and community partners. Minutes provided show data was shared with school superintendents. Interviews with public school partners demonstrated that, based on the relationship developed between master teachers (cooperating teachers) and the university supervisor/coordinator of programs, public school partners feel very comfortable expressing feedback on assessments or programs directly (verbally) to the university supervisor/coordinator of programs. Evidence was not provided to show that principals and public school teachers are involved in design or formal evaluation of the conceptual framework or program. Based on interviews and evidence presented on site, principals and public school teachers do not serve on boards; two master teachers (TESL) indicated that they had previously served on the Graduate Dispositions Committee, which reviewed projects, but were not currently doing so.

The unit has several grants (3.4.a.4) that provide professional development and support for unit faculty, public school partners and candidates, including technology for classrooms and for candidate and master teacher conference attendance. Interviews at an iSTEM school indicated that teachers had gathered demographic and student success information to assist in grant writing and that the grant provided their students with technology in the classrooms. A Professional Learning Community is in place where university faculty members teach candidates one day per week during the semester. Teachers were very comfortable with impromptu observations in their classes. Interviews indicated that direct lines of communication exist between master teachers and university supervisors/program directors to such an extent that master teachers or candidates can easily reach out and give feedback on any given problem/situation. Interviews at this school also indicated that master teachers had given individual feedback to the unit regarding evaluations and assessments and felt that the unit had taken their concerns under consideration. Evidence did not show a formal process in place regarding feedback on the conceptual framework, assessments, or programs from principals or teachers.

A Special Education Co-Teaching Grant, which began in 2010, allowed a partnership with a local school that entailed collaborative selection and on-site demonstration lessons. By fall 2014 a total of 1054 master/cooperating teachers, supervisors and teacher candidates had participated. This began with secondary education (single subject programs) and plans are to pilot one cohort in each of the other initial programs beginning 2015 and expanding to different districts (3.4.a.4). Interviews with public school partners, candidates, and unit faculty demonstrated great enthusiasm for this model. A result of this partnership was regular meetings between the school and unit, including unit faculty, administrators and principals, which led to co-planned professional development for university faculty, candidates and school-site teachers, such as a Common Core/Technology conference, Marzano training, technology boot camp, co-teaching trainings and partnership workshops offered at a COE retreat, instructional rounds and, on-site seminars during student teaching.

The unit has partnerships with over 90 districts and 300 schools for placements in field experience and clinical practice (3.4.a.4) and two samples of signed partnership agreements were provided (3.4.a.2 and 3). Aggregate data were provided which showed initial candidate placement for 2013-2014 in 45 school districts (3.4.b.1) instead of specific school sites. Only one year of data were provided showing placements.

Within the unit, all programs appear to operate independently of one another. There is no central or unit level placement office; placement coordinators for each initial program work with districts and principals to place candidates in supportive settings. From interviews, coordinators in programs are very hands-on with placement, selecting master teachers based on best-fit with teacher candidates and coordinating placement with principals. Candidates in some programs are allowed to indicate three choices of schools for placement. Advanced candidates are typically employed fulltime and complete field experiences in their schools; those without jobs are required to complete a diversity assignment, which differs from program to program. Diversity work samples and data provided on site did not show that all advanced candidates are placed in

diverse field experiences. It is unclear how those who are not employed meet requirements for the field experience.

Data provided show that candidates meet both entry and exit requirements for clinical practice. Exhibits (1.4.d) show how field experiences allow initial candidates to apply and reflect on content, professional and pedagogical knowledge, and skills in a variety of settings. Interviews with both initial and advanced candidates demonstrated a consistent reflection process, along with multiple measures and assessments used by master teachers and university supervisors to evaluate skills and knowledge. Lesson plan formats used by initial candidates included standards, rationales, reflections, modifications and assessments. Interviews with initial and advanced candidates indicated feedback immediately following both master teacher and university supervisor observations. Some programs require a follow-up email summary within 24 or 72 hours. Initial and advanced candidates expressed over and over their appreciation for formative and focused feedback on their performance from both master teachers and university supervisors. Extensive feedback and close personal relationships with university supervisors were consistent across all programs.

Documents state that initial candidate dispositions are measured at multiple transition points in the program and after completion of program (one year after graduation) via self-assessment and through observation assessments by supervisors, cooperating/master/mentor teachers, and future employers (1.4.e.2). Assessment of graduate candidates varies by program. Advanced candidates could be assessed by a graduate committee over the course of the program (EDAD), by individual instructors at the end of each class (EDEL), graduate faculty (EDSC), faculty committee (READ), or the Graduate Programs Disposition Committee (SPED/TESL). Data from assessments were provided in Exhibits 1.4.e.9, 1.4.f.1 Updated, and 1.4.f.2. Initial and advanced candidates in several different groups could not name or discuss the unit's dispositions.

Interviews with current, past, and graduate candidates indicate a focus on technology in lesson plans during both semesters of student teaching. Master teachers and university supervisors indicated that candidates were well-versed in applications for teaching, remediation, and enrichment, often training their master teacher and teachers on site to use various applications. Per interviews, technology is a required component for some programs' lesson plans and a recommendation in others.

Interviews with candidates, principals, master teachers, and university supervisors indicate that candidates take part in professional development training, beginning of school meetings, IEP meetings, back to school night activities, and communication with families, most often in the form of letters home or email. Co-teaching training with master teachers is a required component of all initial programs.

The unit has written specific qualifications for and criteria for selection of school/district-based master teachers and university-based supervisors (3.4.c). Training for master teachers and co-teaching partners takes place several times during the semester, per interviews with university coordinators and master teachers. University supervisors work closely with master teachers throughout placement. Interviews with master teachers, supervising teachers, and both initial

and advanced candidates indicate the close personal relationship between the parties and the value of such a relationship.

Interviews with multiple candidates, unit faculty, and master teachers in initial programs indicated that for some programs, university supervisors visited once per week the entire semester, while others came less frequently. Most programs require formal evaluations twice per semester from both the university supervisor and the master teacher. Feedback is immediate and students in Single Subject areas (secondary) and Multiple Subject programs indicated summary feedback was sent via email for formal observations. Consistently, initial and advanced candidates noted the daily feedback from master teachers. Interviews with master teachers also indicated midday or afternoon one-on-one meetings with candidates for feedback and reflection. Reflections are built into each lesson plan, along with rationales and modifications for diverse learners.

Consistently, interviewees indicated support and excellent communication from university supervisors. Candidates also discussed requirements to complete peer reviews of other candidates during their initial student teaching semester, while still in coursework.

An interview with advanced candidates, including online candidates, showed that these candidates felt well-supported by their advisors and university contact person, who often gave them their personal cell and home phone numbers. Praise for personalized and consistent feedback, along with rapid response time, was given to all instructors in all programs. Several students in the group were grant recipients and several support groups for individual programs met on different time schedules. This varied from grant to grant and program to program. However, all candidates expressed that they felt supported by the unit and knew that if they needed assistance, all they had to do was reach out.

Interviews with advanced program completers indicated the Ed.D. program is conducted within cohorts that range from 13 to 26. Groups are further divided into smaller groups to address common issues or problems. Projects are collaborative; including examinations of educational theory and the finished product is presented to entire cohort. Emphasis is on real world applications (e.g. use of real data from school settings or ethics case studies based on actual situations faced by candidates).   Completers emphasized all work linked back to student learning and examined a broad range of perspectives. When addressing student achievement, candidates examined a variety of issues, including attendance, social-emotional well-being of students, scheduling/structuring the school day, and time on task. Research seminar focused on writing the conceptual framework for their study and the first chapter of the dissertation study. Diversity within the program provided multiple perspectives on real discrimination issues and the cohorts felt safe looking at sensitive issues together. It was noted that some required readings did not sufficiently address diversity, but felt the unit listened to their feedback regarding change of required reading materials on discrimination.

Information on initial programs indicated an initial student teaching semester and a final student teaching semester. Coursework continues through the initial teacher semester and candidates are required to complete a TPA instrument for Task 1 SSP and Task 2 Designing Instruction during

this time. SPED candidates are not required to complete TPA, as this is not a state requirement. Multiple assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards identified in the unit's conceptual framework. Advanced candidates must successfully complete program specific project requirements (2.4.a exhibits).

Various candidate work samples (Exhibits in 1.4.g) showed candidates' summary reflections on how their lessons affected student learning; samples of both high scoring and low scoring submissions were presented. Initial and advanced candidates in interviews talked at length about pre and post- testing, the need for assessment, and the unit requirements for assessment and reflection on those assessments. Interviews with candidates, supervising teachers, and master teachers indicated requirements for candidate collection of data on student learning, analysis of data, reflection on lessons, and developing next-step strategies for improving student learning. When interviewed, all candidates spoke consistently of establishing relationships with their students and explained how this relationship impacted their students' learning. Work samples showing P-12 students' work were not presented.

Initial candidates participate in clinical practice that includes work with students with exceptionalities and/or ELL students. Placements may vary based on program (3.4.a.5), but specific activities directly related to diversity are required and master teachers indicated candidates came into classrooms prepared to work with diverse students and aware of unit expectations with regard to diversity (Exhibits 4.4.i). It was not clear from data presented whether all advanced candidates were in field experiences or student teaching placements that included students with exceptionalities, from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic gender and socioeconomic groups.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement
 3.2.a *Movement Toward Target*. Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.
N.A.

 3.2.b Continuous Improvement. **What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?**

The unit cites several grants received by unit faculty that will allow collaboration with community and school based partners (3.4.a.4). Language is from the exhibit: The Titan PRIDE – New Generation of Educators grant will strengthen a residency-based, co-teaching model at a current professional development high-need site and will review and strengthen existing courses, create new courses and help develop course schedules that will align with the new residency-based model.

The CSU-ISI Collaboration and Creating an ISI Internship Model will address the need to build capacity of new K-8 teachers in inquiry-based, hands-on STEM teaching and learning. This approach is the centerpiece of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) that California began implementing in 2014-15. The STEM experiences provided by Informal Science Institutions

(ISIs) are highly consistent with the scientific and engineering practices that are central within the NGSS.

The iSTEM K-6 Partnership will develop pre-service teachers' skills and enhance the expertise of veteran teachers, while improving student learning outcomes. Teachers and pre-service teachers work together to integrate technology into math and science lessons in daily classroom learning. The program provides professional development to help teachers and teacher candidates improve their use of technology in teaching and gives candidates experience teaching and observing technology-based instruction and planning lesson goals in tandem with their host teachers.

The Transforming Academic and Cultural Identidad through Biliteracy (TACIB) prototype project targets bilingual students, transitioning from elementary school to junior high school, who will be taught mathematics and science in both English and Spanish during the seventh and eighth grade. The project will draw upon students' linguistic, familial and cultural resources to foster a strong sense of "identidad," which is Spanish for identity, toward learning and excelling in these disciplines. The study aims to improve learning outcomes for Latino students in math and science and increase their interest in pursuing STEM careers.

Mathematics Teacher and Master Teacher Fellows (MT2) will develop a group of mathematics teacher leaders and mathematics teachers who will work together as master/student teachers, mentor/mentee teachers, current and future district and community leaders, and current and future college/university liaisons in high-need districts in the greater Orange County, CA region. Faculty from CSU Fullerton and Santa Ana College will provide leadership for these efforts.

3.2.b.i Strengths. **What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level**? N.A.

3.3   Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.3.a   What AFIs have been removed?

N.A.	AFI Rationale

3.3.b   What AFIs are continued from last visit?

N. A.	AFI Rationale

3.3.c   What new AFIs are recommended?

N.A.	AFI Rationale

STANDARD 4: DIVERSITY

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

4.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The College of Education (COE) at California State University Fullerton demonstrates their commitment to diversity in a number of ways. Core beliefs about diversity are communicated in the unit's Strategic Plan advocating for just, equitable and inclusive education, and the Conceptual Framework promotes a focus and commitment to diversity as a core disposition for their candidates, faculty and partners. Prerequisite coursework for initial program candidates prepare them to specifically work with diverse learners.

Initial and advanced candidates are assessed in multiple ways, with both direct and indirect assessments, on program outcomes and dispositions centered on the demonstration of just, equitable and inclusive education (JEIE) that meets the needs of all students in a caring, respectful, and non-discriminatory manner. Data from these assessments of diversity reveal that both initial and advanced candidates regularly demonstrate proficiency and possess the knowledge, skills and dispositions to work with diverse students.

The offsite report noted an area of concern related to lack of evidence for disaggregated data to indicate that all candidates in each credential area can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. At the onsite visit the team confirmed by reviewing the IR Addendum and through interviews that assessment data was disaggregated for all credential areas for candidates at the initial level (See exhibit 4.4.a).

Initial programs provided disaggregated data in the IR Addendum for the Multiple Subjects, Educational Specialist programs in Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe, Early Childhood Special Education, and for each of the content areas in Single Subject programs. One piece of evidence for Multiple and Single subjects came from Master Teacher and University Supervisor evaluations during both the 5 and 8 week placements including 2012 – 2015. The three constructs chosen by the unit for proficiencies in diversity for Initial programs in Multiple and Single Subject are taken from the California Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) (5) Student engagement, (7) teaching English Learners, and 11 (Social Environment).

An additional assessment for diversity for these two credential areas was the CalTPA Task 2 Designing instruction. This state required assessment has candidates focus on how their instructional plan connects to the student characteristics of their whole class and two focus students, an English learner and a student who presents a different instructional challenge. Data from the last 3 academic years was presented in this same document illustrating that more than

90 percent of Multiple Subject candidates passed this blind scored assessment during the 2012-15 academic year on the first attempt, and more than 97 percent of Single Subject candidates on the first attempt.

The Educational Specialist Programs in Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe utilized student teaching evaluations linked to the California Program Standards. The Appropriation standards for diversity chosen by CSUF are (PS3) Educating Diverse Learners, (PS10) Preparation to teach English Language Learners, (PS12) Behavioral Social and Environmental supports for Learning, and (PS13) Curriculum and Instruction of students with disabilities. These student teaching evaluations were scored by both the Master Teacher and University Supervisor and data were reported for three academic years (2012-15).

CSUF also presented data from the Initial Year-Out Survey distributed by the CSU System to employers of program completers from all 23 CSU campuses. Eight questions were selected by CSUF to focus on diversity and data and were reported for the last three academic years (2012-15). The data were disaggregated for all the preliminary teaching credential programs using a three point scale, with 3 signifying well prepared and 2 adequately prepared by employers. Seven of the statements were rated at adequately prepared by employers for the entire sample, and for each of the individual programs. The employers consistently rated item 24 "know about resources in the school and community for at risk students/families" lower than the other seven.

Proficiencies for advanced candidates were assessed by two direct measures, the unit wide diversity assignment in each of the advanced programs, and the employer survey. The unit presented the key assessment findings for all six programs for the last three academic years (2012-15). Using a four point rubric, each of the programs had an average score well above 3.0 during these three years. The second direct measure was an employer survey sent to advanced candidates also using a 4 point rating scale. Two questions that focused specifically on diversity were "my employee is well prepared to promote equity and diversity," and is "well prepared to design and implement instruction for diverse learners." For the last three academic years (2012-15), employers rated above 3.0 mean with the majority being over 3.5 for the last three years.

The university and the COE both have a goal in their strategic plans specific to the effort to recruit and retain diverse faculty (Goal 3: Recruit and retain high quality diverse faculty and staff, who are advocates for just, equitable and inclusive education (JEIE), in the College of Education). The university's commitment to fostering a community of diverse faculty is further evidenced by policies, programs and procedures enacted to both recruit and support diverse faculty, and candidates are afforded multiple opportunities to interact with higher education faculty of diverse backgrounds.

The unit has higher education faculty from a variety of ethnic/racial groups ensuring that candidates in initial and advanced programs interact with both male and female faculty, and from more than one racial group. Of the 158 faculty members in the COE, 17 percent are faculty of color. In both initial and advanced programs there are both male and female faculty, and representative faculty of Hispanic/Latino, Asian, and Black/African American. In addition, faculty

have professional expertise and experience in issues of diversity, evidenced by their active scholarly agendas, publications, presentations, grants and teaching interests that address aspects of diversity.

The unit was not able to provide demographic data of the Master Teachers that work with candidates at the P-12 school sites but presented this information for the district level.

With regards to candidate diversity, CSUF is ranked fourth in the nation among colleges and universities for the number of bachelor's degrees awarded to minority students, evidence of the attention to inclusivity and diversity on the campus and in the unit. The COE's Student Success Team forges partnerships to recruit and retain more under-represented students into teaching, an effort in support of the university's Student Success Team Initiative (SSTI). The unit provided demographic data on candidates with a comparison to the entire CSUF student population and the geographical area served by the institution. Twenty seven percent of candidates in both the initial and advanced programs were identified as Hispanic/Latino, and 35 percent of CSUF students were Hispanic/Latino and 34 percent of the geographical area. Conversely, 74 percent of residents in the geographical area are identified as white, and only 46 percent of initial candidates and 41percent of advanced candidates are white.

The surrounding area of CSU Fullerton where fieldwork placements occur for candidates is one of the most diverse in the nation, making exposure to and learning of diversity accessible, relevant and meaningful. For initial teacher candidates evidence reveals the demographics of 91 districts with which the COE holds partnership agreements for field placements of their candidates. Data shows that 82 of the 91 districts have a non-white population over 50 percent, and over half of the partnership schools have a majority of students on free and reduced lunch. The unit provided preliminary teacher candidate placement data for the six most frequently used school districts with accompanying data for the individual schools. Another source of demographic data is provided by master teachers that log into an online database system and respond to questions about their agreement that they have the required years of teaching, that more than 25 percent of the P-12 students in their classroom are ethnic, cultural, and/or socioeconomically different from the student teacher, and that they will be able to complete TPA tasks 2, 3 and 4 that require student teachers to work with at least three different students identified as English Language learners. The data submitted was not aggregated.

The unit was able to provide P-12 student demographic data for the six most frequently used school districts. These districts were Fullerton Joint Union High School District; Placentia Yorba Linda; Anaheim Union High District, Capistrano, Santa Ana and Walnut Valley. Demographic data on P-12 students was not submitted for the placements in districts beyond these six.

The unit has an intern program for Single Subject and Educational Specialist candidates to work collaboratively with a district and be employed as a teacher of record when the district can verify that they cannot employ a fully credentialed teacher. In the two-year time period of the intern credential, candidates work with CSU Fullerton to complete course requirements for their preliminary credential. Program coordinators and placement coordinators confirmed that

candidates are required to have a diverse placement either prior to obtaining the intern credential, or that the internship employment is in a high needs school.

Candidates in advanced programs have a required diversity assignment in one of their required courses. The candidates participate in a COE Diversity survey that asks candidates to quantify the diverse backgrounds of P-12 students they work with. For the three years prior to the visit approximately 20 percent of advanced candidates are not simultaneously employed in P-12 schools. The unit was not able to articulate how these 20 percent have opportunities to work with diverse P-12 learners.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 4.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.
N.A.

4.2.b Continuous Improvement. **What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?**

The College of Education at California State Fullerton has continually assessed, reflected upon and developed their efforts to improve components of diversity on behalf of current and future candidates in their programs. These efforts reflect current initiatives as well as future plans to support continuous improvement in meeting their strategic goals related to diversity.

To ensure continuous improvement, three of four goals in the COE Strategic Plan, in place until 2018, specifically address diversity. In order to meet those goals, the unit collects data, actively creates new programs, collaborates with groups who support diversity, pursues and receives external grants, and implements practices aligned with the strategic goals. For example, the unit implemented several strategies to improve candidate focus and practice with diverse learners:
- Created the Just, Equitable and Inclusive Education (JEIE) Task Force, fall 2012
- Included at least one JEIE focused article or activity into every required course
- Revised the diversity disposition statement to align more closely with JEIE
- Refocused professional development opportunities to reflect JEIE issues and instructional strategies
- Created an annual Diversity Forum called Researchers and Critical Educators (RACE)
- Co-sponsored the California Chapter of the National Association for Multicultural Education and the Leadership Institute for Tomorrow to provide mentoring for educational leaders from diverse backgrounds.

The COE has pursued and received several grants to enhance its efforts regarding diversity. Examples are Project STAR (Supporting Teacher Advancement and Retention), a $1.25 million grant from the U.S. Department of Education for teacher candidates from diverse backgrounds to complete the special education teaching credential; $1.5 million from the National Science Foundation to fund TACIB (Transforming Academic and Cultural Identity through Bi-literacy) to support the mathematics and science achievement of Latino middle school students; $700,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Education for the development of a

National Resource Center for Asian Languages. Funds are used to design instructional resources and professional development activities.

The COE also has future plans to support their effort toward continuous improvement in meeting their strategic goals related to diversity. One new effort is implementation of the Achievement Gap Plan (AGP). This is an annual report prepared by each department based on data and analytics provided by the Institutional Research team in order to outline progress made and new efforts needed. Another plan for continual progress is to create a Social Justice Education minor in collaboration with several departments outside of the COE. In addition, the Elementary and Bilingual Education department will offer an "Education for Social Justice" masters level course and are in the process of designing a Social Justice Master's degree. Future plans also include an online master's degree program with concentrations in various areas of special education, and the department of Secondary Education plans to establish learning communities on the use of high-impact practices to enhance achievement and success of diverse students and teachers in California classrooms. These efforts are evidence of a collaborative commitment across departments at the university.

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

4.3   Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.3.a   What AFIs have been removed?

N.A.	AFI Rationale

4.3.b   What AFIs are continued from last visit?

N.A.	AFI Rationale

4.3.c   What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI 1: The unit does not ensure that all advanced candidates participate in diverse field experiences. (Advanced)	**Rationale:** The majority of advanced candidates are employed in schools that are diverse, but 20 percent of advanced candidates are not employed in P-12 schools during their program. There is no evidence how the unit ensures that these advanced candidates have opportunities to work with diverse P-12 learners.

STANDARD 5: FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

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

5.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Unit faculty expressed a commitment to their work in terms of currency of their research, relevance of their scholarship, and collaboration within the unit and with community partners. They hold the view that the most important aspect of their work with teacher candidates is to have significant and lasting impact on the learning of children.

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) requires faculty to participate directly in P-12 settings. This requirement states that all faculty and instructional personnel who regularly teach one or more courses that lead to a credential shall actively participate in the public school system at least once every three academic years. Participation should be appropriate to the individual faculty member's credential area.

The unit collects evidence on active participation in P-12 settings from all unit full-time and part-time faculty through an annual survey administered through the COE Data Research Analyst's Office. Evidence of active participation (IR Exhibit 5.4.a) included:

- Serving as a student teacher supervisor, which includes collaboration with P-12 teachers and principals
- Modeling, co-teaching, or teaching in P-12 classrooms
- Volunteering in P-12 classrooms
- Mentoring new P-12 teachers and/or administrators
- Consulting in a professional capacity with teachers, staff, and/or administrators on P-12 programs
- Supervising service learning projects that directly impact P-12 schools or programs

In addition to the CTC requirement, service is a requirement of all tenure-track faculty as part of the university faculty evaluation process defined within University Policy 210.000. In this document, service is defined as contributions to the university or the community that: develop mutually beneficial partnerships, serve the needs of the profession and/or community, enhance the campus' role as a regional center, and/or strengthen institutional effectiveness and collegial governance. Within the post-tenure review process, faculty service activities are described in narrative summaries.

Holmes Fellows participate in engaged scholarship in close association with a community partner as part of their award. Since the fellowship was initially offered in 2011, four unit faculty have been awarded this fellowship:

- The 2012 fellow collaborated with a local high school teacher in his Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) classes to support efforts to help his students be better prepared for college by raising their pass rate on the CSU English placement tests and preparing them for rigorous college-level writing.

- The 2013 fellow extended his participation with a local school district to train early childhood educators in early bilingual/biliteracy development. He facilitated professional development activities that were balanced, research-based, and culturally/linguistically responsive.

- The 2014 fellow collaborated with a school district on data collection then developed a new unit for her course in order to better prepare teacher candidates to conduct assessments with students with disabilities.

- The 2015 fellow is planning on consulting with a local school district in its implementation of a 1:1 mobile device policy. He will also provide professional development to teachers in that district on effective integration of educational technology across the curriculum.

Clinical faculty qualifications are included in the exhibit describing qualifications for professional education faculty. Qualifications include degree(s), teaching credentials, teaching experience in P-12 and higher education settings, mentoring experience, honors and awards, and other relevant experience.

Part-time faculty and adjuncts are evaluated in a process outlined in UPS 210.070. There is an annual review of syllabi, Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs), narrative summaries, samples of teacher candidate work, classroom observations, and curriculum vitae. In this process feedback is provided by the department chair, which informs the strengthening of instruction.

Data from SOQs for clinical supervisors indicated consistently high ratings. For example, in the fall 2013 administration of the SOQ, ratings for clinical supervisors in special education ranged from 3.73 to 4.0 (on a four-point scale).

The university requires (as stated in Personnel Policy for full-time temporary faculty – UPS 210.050) that full-time temporary faculty complete a self-assessment of their work in the area of service in the form of a narrative summary of their accomplishments in professional, university, and community service. Additionally, personnel standards for each program fully detail expectations for faculty in terms of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Documentation of service work must be submitted within the period of evaluation. Evidence indicates unit faculty are engaged in service activities that are relevant, significant and of a high quality. For example, post-tenure review documents and lecturer evaluation documents indicate that faculty are engaged in national text or journal review panels at the national level, professional organizations, state and regional projects, in addition to department, college, and campus service activities, and activities that support teaching and learning in the community.

If evaluation reviewers identify weaknesses in the evidence presented in a portfolio, it is documented in the review. It is expected that such weaknesses are to be addressed and improved in subsequent evaluation reviews. For faculty demonstrating weaknesses, specific feedback to the individual faculty member is provided by the department chair. The chair may also require the faculty member to create a plan of improvement or assign that individual to a mentor. A university-wide Faculty Development Center provides workshops, professional development sessions, cohorts for special projects, mentoring, coaching, and one-on-one support.

While evaluation of individual faculty members is confidential, evidence from faculty who volunteered to share their evaluation portfolios as exhibits was made available. Data in these portfolios included curriculum vitae, course syllabi, lists of teaching assignments, distribution of grades, student opinion questionnaire summaries, and narrative summaries and documentation of scholarly, creative, and service work.

University policy on faculty evaluation (UPS 210.000) establishes an expectation that faculty must show evidence of ongoing professional development in teaching. Faculty must demonstrate the impact of professional development on their growth as an instructor. Evidence showed that the unit regularly evaluates faculty professional development opportunities.

For tenure-track faculty, ongoing professional development must be detailed in both in narrative form as well as documented in appendices as part of the evaluation process. New faculty must create a prospectus during the second year of employment outlining plans for professional development needs.

Unit-wide professional development has motivated faculty to infuse readings and instructional activities that promote Just, Equitable, and Inclusive Education (JEIE) in every program, and in some programs, in every course. Additionally, all departments have added items related to JEIE to their SOQs. The unit has also focused on the use of professional development as a tool to improve teaching performance. Faculty review documents demonstrated specific examples of how professional development helped individual faculty to increase SOQ ratings and include multiple indicators of teaching effectiveness in their review portfolios.

The part-time and adjunct faculty indicated that they have a variety of professional development opportunities. Some examples include staff retreats, IRIS modules, Marzano institutes, national conferences and activities provided by the Faculty Development Center. These faculty members also indicated that they appreciate the level of collegiality that is extended to them by full-time faculty. They feel valued and included in the life of the unit; they are often asked what they need in terms of professional development as well as what they can offer to the unit to support their colleagues.

No formal process exists to allow community partners to evaluate faculty instruction. In the field, master/cooperating teachers are instructed to contact their respective Program Coordinator if there is a concern about the university supervisor assigned to their classroom.

The unit and partner school districts have a Memorandum of Understanding that master/cooperating teachers are certified in their field and have at least three years of experience. These requirements are provided to districts and no exceptions are allowed. The signature of district personnel serves as verification that master/cooperating teachers meet the requirements.

The unit has established a continuous improvement timeline for sustaining a target level performance on the standard. For the current semester, the unit has reviewed the current assessment system at a faculty retreat and within department meetings. In future semesters:
- The unit will make recommendations on professional development relating to engaged scholarship for JEIE, plan and implement guidelines for faculty who desire to participate in this area of growth. Following this, the unit will implement their professional development plans for promoting engaged scholarship in JEIE.
- The unit will embed partnership development for faculty in leadership roles.
- The unit will feature a professional development session for engaged scholarship at its annual retreat.

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 5.2a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 5.2b.

***5.2a Movement Toward Target.* Based on the criteria for Movement toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance**.
The unit is at target for this standard. There is clear, convincing, and sufficient evidence that demonstrates the unit's performance as described in all elements of the target level for this standard and there is a timeline and plan for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

5.a Qualified Faculty - Target
The evidence demonstrated that professional education faculty at the unit have earned doctorates, have contemporary professional experiences in school settings at the levels that they supervise, and are meaningfully engaged in related scholarship. Clinical faculty are licensed in the fields that they teach or supervise and are master teachers.

5.b Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Target
The evidence demonstrated that all professional education faculty members have an in-depth understanding of their fields and are teacher scholars who integrate what is known about their content fields, teaching, and learning in their own instructional practice. They exhibit intellectual vitality in their sensitivity to critical issues. Many of the professional education faculty are recognized as outstanding teachers by candidates and peers across campus and in schools.

5.c Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Target
The evidence demonstrated that all professional education faculty demonstrate scholarly work related to teaching, learning, and their fields of specialization. Their scholarly work is driven by

the unit's mission to prepare and develop innovative and transformative educators. They are actively engaged in inquiry that ranges from knowledge generation to exploration and questioning of the field to evaluating the effectiveness of a teaching approach.

5.d Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Target
The evidence demonstrated that most professional education faculty are actively engaged in dialogues concerning the design and delivery of instructional programs in both professional education and P–12 schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with P–12 practitioners and with faculty in other college or university units. They are actively engaged within a community of practice. They provide leadership in the profession, schools, and professional associations at all levels.

5.e Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Target
The evidence demonstrated that the unit's systematic and comprehensive evaluation system includes regular and comprehensive reviews of the professional education faculty's teaching, scholarship, service, collaboration with the professional community, and leadership in the institution and profession.

5.f Unit Facilitation of Professional Development - Target
The evidence shows that the unit has policies and practices that encourage all professional education faculty to be continuous learners. Experienced professional education faculty mentor new faculty and provide encouragement and support for developing scholarly work around teaching, inquiry, and service.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target.

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		ATTAINED
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	TARGET
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. *AND* There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. *OR* There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.[BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. *AND* There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. *AND* There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

5.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

N.A.	AFI Rationale

5.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

N.A.	AFI Rationale

5.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

N.A.	AFI Rationale

STANDARD 6: UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES
The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

6.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Educator preparation at CSU, Fullerton is centered in a College of Education led by a Dean who provides leadership and vision for the College, and is responsible for oversight of programs that prepare professionals to work in P-12 settings, and for matters related to the College such as, curriculum, personnel, fiscal management, and adherence to university, system, state and federal policies. The unit includes programs managed outside the College of Education such as, Speech-Language Pathology and School Nursing.

The unit has a governance structure that is collaborative, reflective, and responsive. A document titled, Governance and Organizational Overview in the exhibits described administrative roles and responsibilities at each level, as well as the six College of Education standing committees that assist with decision-making. These are the: Curriculum, Technology, Appeals, Credential Program, Secondary Education Cooperative Teacher Education Program (SECTEP), and Assessment Committees. Interviews with committee members confirmed their roles in shared governance and their ability to recommend improvements for programs and unit operations. Other CSU, Fullerton colleges that offer components of educator or school professional preparation have representatives on some of these committees to ensure collaboration across the university and consistent operation of all programs. For example, the SECTEP Advisory Council has faculty from Arts and Sciences disciplines.

Advisory boards such as, the All University Responsibility for Teacher Education Committee (Arts and Sciences deans and unit representatives), the Dean's Advisory Board (K-12 superintendents), and the College of Education Leadership Council (college supporters) provide advice, assistance, and opportunities for collaboration with the university, P-12 schools, and community. Interviews

confirmed the effective work, active participation of members, and the consistent regular scheduling of meetings of committees and advisory boards.

The unit updated its strategic plan for the 2013 – 2018 period. The unit strategic plan aligns unit goals with university goals and identifies actions to reach unit goals. Evidence in exhibits and collected on-site provided examples of improvements that have been made to achieve goals so far such as, the addition of staff student service professionals for program advising and department faculty admissions/advisors. Another example is the Just, Equitable, and Inclusive Education (JEIE) initiative, a component of the unit conceptual framework. A task force has worked to develop a robust definition of just, equitable, and inclusive education and concrete steps to help faculty infuse JEIE concepts and activities in each course the unit offers. The dean and faculty reported that this part of the process has been nearly completed and future JEIE steps are being addressed. The strategic plan also has goals for faculty professional development, for example in the area of technology education. Many faculty reported on the high level of support and assistance they receive for learning about and using technology in their teaching and other work.

Recruiting, admission, and candidate advising policies and practices were explained in the IR, exhibits, and in interviews on-site. Potential candidates can learn about educator preparation programs through the Admission to Teacher Education Office, the Center for Careers in Teaching, by attending one of the frequently scheduled information meetings, or online through unit maintained websites and podcasts. The Center for Careers in Teaching was relocated from Academic Affairs to the unit in 2013 and is the first center in the California State University system to provide comprehensive undergraduate advising for students interested in teaching. Recruitment and advising are also supported through the Regional Teacher Educational Council, a consortium of CSU, Fullerton and community colleges. Advanced programs have a faculty coordinator to assist candidates with the application process. Information about programs is provided through different types of media including, college and university publications, websites, and social media. Each program offers comprehensive online information and/or a program handbook. The unit maintains the university's college readiness website for high school students and teachers and provides resources and information to help high school students reach college readiness. Additional resources to support candidates are available through the Academic and Student Affairs divisions of the university.

The unit has an assistant dean of students who provides counseling, guidance, and support for candidates who experience personal and/or academic problems, and the unit recently formed a Student Success Team as part of a university initiative to improve advising, student retention and graduation rates specifically for underrepresented students. Interviews with faculty and candidates showed that a significant amount of professional and personal support for candidates of all programs was based on relationships with faculty that were widely reported, caring, and long-term.

The unit receives budgetary support that, on a full-time equivalent student basis, exceeds allocations provided to other colleges at CSU, Fullerton. That level of per student funding for the three academic years from 2011 – 2014 has been consistent. Looking within the unit budget,

allocations for assessment, technology, and distance learning have increased while support for professional development has remained consistent on a percentage basis for the 2011-2014 period. The unit budget included fees collected and distributed by the university such as, a student fee for online courses that supports improvements in technology use, and Miscellaneous Course Fees used to fund enhancements to educational experiences for students.

Workload of unit faculty follows the California State University system policy of 15 weighted teaching units (WTU) per semester. Tenured and tenure-track faculty are allocated three WTUs for research and service to their department so that a full teaching load is 12 WTUs (the equivalent of four 3-semester unit courses). Full-time lecturers are assigned 15 teaching units. Part-time clinical faculty are assigned WTUs based on the number of candidates they supervise. The supervision ratio is either two or three candidates per WTU. Across the College of Education various levels of release time support have been allocated for program coordination and leadership, work implementing the co-teaching model, providing professional development to P-12 partners, service on time-intensive committees, etc. The dean reported that the unit is intentionally attempting to support the complex work of the faculty through release time assignments.

In the IR and exhibits the unit reports that it has sufficient resources for teaching and learning, including library and technology resources. Faculty reported on the high quality resources available for teaching in classrooms and online, including hardware, software, instructional design, technology support, and professional development. A tour of classrooms and the library confirmed these resources. Library holdings and resources described in the exhibits are sufficient for supporting candidates, graduate students, and faculty. The library has collections specific to educators such as the Curriculum Materials Center and the Learning Resource Display Center, and appropriate scholarly journals and research databases. The library employs a liaison (education librarian) to the College of Education who teaches most library instruction classes and provides research consultation. Also housed in the library are the Donoghue Children's Literature Center and the Schools First Federal Credit Union Center for Creativity and Critical Thinking that provides a classroom for candidates to acquire knowledge of a variety of technology learning tools. The library has extensive technology resources available for candidates.

Faculty resources for instruction are as divergent as one-to-one support for uses of technology and course development, to low cost or free software, the provision of appropriate desktop, laptop, and tablet hardware, campus and COE computer labs, and classrooms with appropriate recent technology for instruction. This was confirmed through interviews and on-site tours of facilities. Of note, and highly regarded by faculty, were the Faculty Development Center for a variety of teaching and research support services, the Technology Cadre, faculty experts who help ensure that faculty are competent in using technology to teach, and Course Custodians/Coordinators in each department who help to ensure that each program course meets quality and consistency expectations.

6. Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement
Please respond to 6.2a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 6.2b.

6.2b *Continuous Improvement.* **What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?**

The unit strategic plan goals are aligned with the elements of Standard 6. The unit is making progress toward their strategic plan goals and reports accomplishments such as, infusion of Just, Equitable, and Inclusive Education components into each course, the high quality student recruitment, advising, and support services that have been developed, increases in external funding through advancement and development as well as grants, and the Engaged Scholarship enhancements to the unit faculty evaluation processes that will increase support for collaboration with P-12 schools and educators.

6.2b.i *Strengths.* **What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?**
Two strengths are noted.
Technology
Faculty consistently identified the resources that have been made available to them to support technology integration for teaching as exceptional. These resources include hardware, software, and instructional design and support services as well as professional development and other learning opportunities. Resources are provided for tenured, tenure-track, and adjunct faculty. A tour of unit and university facilities showed extensive availability of recent technology for faculty to model instruction and for candidates to conduct research and practice use of technology in education.

Support Services
Interviews with candidates, faculty, and unit leaders revealed an array of high quality support services for candidates across all programs. Support services are provided through counseling and advising offices, caring faculty who develop relationships with candidates, and processes such as the Student Study Teams. Faculty expressed genuine interest in helping candidates achieve success and in maintaining long-term professional relationships with alumni. Candidates and alumni shared about the valued support they received from faculty that helped them meet professional and personal goals, and continued growth in their careers.

6.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

N.A.	AFI Rationale

6.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

N.A.	AFI Rationale

6.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

N.A.	AFI Rationale

Common Standards requirements not reflected in NCATE Unit Standards

Standard 1: Educational Leadership

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

All credential applications are processed through the Credential Preparation Center in the College of Education. Candidate files are first reviewed by program coordinators and then forwarded to the Credential Preparation Center for final recommendation to the CTC. Credential analysts evaluate each candidate's file using program-specific checklists to verify all program requirements. Upon verification, the analyst makes the final decision on the recommendation. Program coordinators are notified if the file is incomplete. The coordinator notifies the candidate of the deficiencies and assists the candidate in meeting the remaining requirements.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

6.1 Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist each candidate's professional placement.
The unit has several integrated structures to advise and assist candidates from the time they first express interest in a K-12 career until they have earned their credentials. The Unit's Center for Careers in Teaching (CCT) provides advice and assistance to students who express an interest in entering the Unit's professional preparation programs. The CCT's counselors help students determine their best pathway toward earning a credential. Each of the Unit's departments has an Admissions Coordinator who works closely with the College of Education Admission to Teacher Education Department (ATED). ATED's full-time staff support applicants throughout the application process. Once admitted, program coordinators conduct advisement sessions for candidates and assume responsibility for advising candidates as they progress through the professional preparation program. Campus services include the University Career Center, which provides one-to-one assistance. The Center also hosts a job fair.

6.2 Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements.
Each program has requirements that are checked at multiple transition points throughout the program. Information about these requirements and other information about program completion were reviewed on the university, college, and program websites; and in program handbooks. Program coordinators, instructors, and field supervisors all respond to candidate inquiries.

6.3 The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retain candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.
Support for applicants and candidates has been described in the previous sections. Interviews with the credential analysts and program coordinators confirmed that candidates must meet the requirements of each transition point to progress through their program. Program coordinators

track candidates' progress at each transition point. Each program has processes in place to provide remediation to candidates who show promise, but are having difficulty meeting program requirements. Candidates who cannot meet the requirements at any transition point, and have not responded to remediation, are either counseled out of the program or are dismissed. Candidates have the right to appeal.

Findings:
Standard 1.5: **Met**
Standard 6.1 – 6.3: **Met**

Program Standards Findings

Multiple Subject Credential and
Multiple Subject Internship Credential

Program Design

The Multiple Subject Credential Program (MSCP) is guided by three program outcomes: Knowledgeable and Competent; Reflective and Responsive; and Committed and Caring. Each of the outcomes is evidenced across courses. The program developmentally and sequentially integrates coursework with fieldwork in diverse settings across the southern California region.

MSCP candidates complete an undergraduate bachelor's degree program with a major other than education and three prerequisite courses before entering the credential program. Once admitted to the credential program, candidates are placed in cohorts ("blocks") and engage in twenty-two units of credential level methods coursework. Candidates have the option of enrolling in a two semester, three semester or credential/Master's program. Each cohort "block" is led by a faculty member (block leader).

Course of Study

The first part of each semester consists of a combination of coursework and field experience. Candidates engage in student teaching during the second part of each semester. Two-semester and combined credential/Master's candidates spend one day per week, for ten weeks in a classroom, and five weeks student teaching with a cooperating/master teacher. In the second semester, candidates spend one day a week, for seven weeks, in a classroom and eight weeks student teaching with a cooperating/master teacher. Three-semester candidates typically engage in three fieldwork experiences, and three student teaching assignments, in each semester. Candidates, completers, cooperating teachers and university supervisors all reported the implementation of a co-teaching model during field experience and student teaching as positively impacting the clinical practice experience of candidates.

Candidates and completers reported that they were well prepared to teach in diverse settings through coursework, field experiences and student teaching. Candidates, completers, cooperating/master teachers and employers reported that the program prepares candidates to create lesson plans that differentiate instruction for diverse students including English learners, and students with special needs. Candidates and completers stated that beginning with the program orientation, technology was integrated throughout coursework. Employers also stated that candidates are well prepared in 21st century skills.

Assessment of Candidates

The Multiple Subject Credential Program is assessed through the College of Education Unit Assessment System. The Assessment System is designed for the continuous collection and analysis of multiple data sources to monitor candidate performance and to manage and improve program effectiveness. Data is collected at four transition points: Admission to Program,

Admission of Initial Student Teaching, Admission to Final Student Teaching, and Exit from Program.

Candidates are required to pass all four Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) tasks prior to completing the program. All two- and three-semester candidates must pass the TPAs—Subject Specific Pedagogy (SSP) and Designing Instruction (DI) before beginning their final semester, and Assessing Learning (AL) and Culminating Teaching Experience (CTE) before completing the program. Candidates in the combined credential/master's program must pass the TPA-- SSP and DI before beginning their second semester, and AL and CTE before completing their second semester. Candidates receive feedback on the TPA through a student feedback form as well as their TPA grade. TPA data is shared across the unit with block leaders, TPA module faculty, Department chairs and faculty meetings. TPA assessors engage in recalibration yearly.

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

**Single Subject Credential and
Single Subject Internship Credential**

Program Design
The Single Subject (SS) preliminary teacher preparation program is based on a theoretical framework of developmental theories and reflective pedagogical framework. Program design is sequenced and includes appropriate transition points. Interviews with the Program Director, completers, and master teachers confirm that upon completion of the program coursework and fieldwork, candidates have the knowledge, skills, and ability to work with diverse populations, including English learners and students with special needs. A Partner Districts Cohort (PDC) model brings teacher candidates into the world of the secondary school very early in the first semester of the program. Instructors in the program are drawn from university faculty, school district personnel, and public school administrators and master teachers.

California State University Fullerton's mission and goals also inform the vision and focus of teacher preparation as noted below:
- Candidates apply theoretical and evidence-based foundational knowledge in their professional practice.
- Candidates apply appropriate theories, principles, and strategies in teaching English learners (ELs) through English Language Development (ELD) and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE).
- Candidates, as reflective practitioners, use assessment and knowledge of appropriate strategies to facilitate high achievement for all students.

Single Subject credential preparation is offered in Art, English, Foundational Level Mathematics (FLM), Mathematics, Music, Physical Education, Foundational Level General Science (FLS), Science, Social Studies, World Languages, and English/Theatre Arts.

Course of Study
Single Subject candidates (traditional and intern) are required to complete 12 semester units of coursework and 45 hours of fieldwork prior to beginning their program. In addition, candidates must meet subject matter competency, basic skills, and demonstrate English language writing proficiency. Candidates reported that the program requirements were clearly outlined and program staff were supportive throughout and beyond the candidate's enrollment in the program.

Program coursework and field experiences are sequenced to offer introductory, development, and mastery of Teaching Performance Expectations, use of technology in instruction, assessment of student learning, preparation to teach English Learners and students with special needs, and reflective practice. The handbook provided by CSU Fullerton to candidates and program participants stresses a logical sequence among the critical components of teacher education, including subject matter preparation, pedagogical instruction, fieldwork observation and participation, and student teaching.

Candidates learn to use state-adopted instructional materials, assess student progress, and apply these understandings in teaching students as related to the content of the pedagogy coursework and to practice this knowledge in their field placements. In their initial fieldwork and in their Final Student Teaching, candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate pedagogical competence as defined by the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). In addition, candidates are given constructive feedback through lesson observations, mid-semester and final goal setting/assessment meetings. Candidates and university supervisors reported that individualized instruction was provided in pedagogy specific to the candidate's subject area.

Assessment of Candidates
Formative and summative assessment data are gathered for each candidate in each of the following ways: (1) course assignments, lesson plans, unit plans, and their lesson plan notebook. (2) Fieldwork observations, proficiency ratings on TPEs, and the CAL TPA.

Program completers and master teachers reported that candidates are skilled at utilizing a highly developed lesson plan template which incorporates lesson differentiation, EL, Resource Specialist Program Students, and advanced instructional strategies. Lesson plans are regularly evaluated based on organization, lesson plan, and supporting material. Master teachers and university supervisors reported that CSUF candidates had consistently exceptional lesson plans. Employers interviewed indicated that the CSUF candidates were well prepared and were selected for interviews and employment ahead of candidates from other institutions.

During the Preliminary Single Subject Credential Program candidates gain knowledge and skills relative to all TPEs, with formative evaluation in coursework and field experience, and summative evaluation through the TPA. Minimum scores on each of these assessments have been

established, and candidates who fail to meet these levels of performance are advised of their status and provided remediation according to their areas of weaknesses. As appropriate, a candidate may be asked to resubmit an assignment, extend their fieldwork, be placed on a Teacher Candidate Improvement Plan (TCIP) or be required to complete a 1-unit TPA Remediation course.

Faculty, master teachers, university support providers and candidates reported that the level of cooperation and communication between the master teacher, university, and candidate was excellent. Master teachers interviewed knew who their student teacher was prior to the start of the school year. Furthermore, master teachers reported that their student teachers were well prepared, highly engaged, and fully supported by the university.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all standards were **Met**

General Education Clear Credential (MS/SS)

Program Design
The Clear General Education Credential Program (CCP) is an online program with local face-to-face support. Participating teachers enroll in the program through University Extended Education for two semesters. The program is based on individual needs and progress and candidates may continue to enroll in the program and receive support for additional semesters (no more than five years total) until all program outcomes are met.

Prior to enrollment in the program candidates must meet the eligibility requirements for the Clear Credential Program. Program documents, interviews with the program coordinator, completers, and candidates confirm all eligibility requirements are enforced and must be met prior to enrollment.

Candidates and the program coordinator confirmed a three course series focusing on preparation and professional development for participating teachers in accordance with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and utilize the Formative Assessment for California Teachers (FACT) system. Participating teachers also complete a course on Current Issues and Problems, which is relevant to contemporary and complex conditions of teaching and learning in California schools, and is connected to their local contexts.

Course of Study
Sites for participation in the CSUF Clear Credential Program are based on candidates' employment. Field experiences are aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and by the Clear Credential Program Standards of the Commission for Teacher Credentialing, as demonstrated in course syllabi and via interviews.

Candidates access a variety of sources electronically that are related to California's student needs such as English acquisition, special educational needs, equity, and health considerations. In such cases that a candidate's site represents a limited slice of California's diverse student population, the candidate is required to conduct further research and plan application in a context that represents the full range of students and contexts found in California schools. Arrays of resources are available electronically (video, audio, and multimedia sources).

Interviews with the program coordinator, candidates, and completers confirm that participating teachers receive at least three layers of support in the Clear Credential Program: (1) They are provided an onsite, experienced teacher support provider in the employing district or local site, (2) they are assigned a university supervisor for their content area, and (3) they participate in a cohort of participating teachers who can serve as support for each other over the course of the program.

Program completers and candidates reported that expectations were clear: online course portal had all the info needed for the modules and information about the program. Instructors were available to assist in a timely manner and observations were tailored to the needs of the teacher with a minimum of three formal documented observations.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidate assessment is based on the education program's three outcome indicators, as follows:

Program Outcome 1: Knowledgeable and Competent Specialists
      a) Demonstrate a strong foundation of knowledge
      b) Implement effective practice
      c) Use current technologies for teaching and learning

Program Outcome 2: Reflective and Responsive Practitioners
      a) Advance just, equitable, and inclusive education
      b) Make informed decisions
      c) Participate in collaborative endeavors
      d) Think critically and creatively

Program Outcome 3: Committed and Caring Professionals
      a) Demonstrate leadership potential
      b) Maintain professional and ethical standards
      c) Engage in continuous improvement

Program coordinators, Candidates, and Faculty interviews confirmed that clear credential candidate assessments are conducted at four transition points: (1) admission to the program, (2) program continuation, (3) exit from program, and (4) post program.

Findings on Standards

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

Education Specialist Credential Programs
Education Specialist Clear Induction Credential Program

Program Design

The Mission Statement of the College of Education at California State University, Fullerton is aligned with both the University's Mission Statement and the Educator Preparation Program's (EPP) Conceptual Framework. Their mission embraces a "commitment to the preparation and professional development of innovative and transformative educators who advance just, equitable, and inclusive education…promoting creativity, collaboration, and critical thinking as fundamental to student achievement and success in a diverse and interconnected world." In response to their mission, the Department of Special Education prepares education specialists for the Education Specialist Clear Credential. This authorization is designed for candidates who have earned their Education Specialist Preliminary Credential. It has been designed to allow credentialed Education Specialists to clear their preliminary credential, enhance their current skill base, stay informed of current evidence-based curriculum and instruction in special education and prepare for leadership roles in educational settings.

The Special Education Department Chair provides organizational and administrative support for this specific credential. The quality of coursework is maintained through the annual assessment of data by faculty and changes made based on analysis for program improvement. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards and candidate competency ratings data guide program development, key assignments and program modifications. Findings were confirmed through review of syllabi and interviews with the chair and faculty. Interviews with program completers and candidates confirmed that the College of Education (COE) is responsive to the needs of the community and in partnering districts. Candidates and completers also stated they experienced a most effective coordination of the varied administrative components including admissions, ongoing candidate assessment and ongoing support in the field.

All programs in the Special Education Department are designed to train education specialists in inclusive approaches for children with special needs. To ensure best practice, programs engage in active collaboration within their educational community. Faculty is often recruited from local education institutions, bringing their expertise and infusing their scholarly work into each of the special education areas. In addition, coordinators work with district advisory boards to identify and employ university supervisors, as well as to coordinate training and provide ongoing professional development for the local education institutions. For the Education Specialist Clear Program, the main advisory board is the College of Education's advisory board which has representatives from the districts (administrators and teachers), community members, and education partners. This advisory board meets once each semester and each program gives

updates. Review of the agendas and minutes show evidence of stakeholder input for program improvement in the areas of coursework and field experiences grounded in research and evidence-based practices relevant to the contemporary trends in the field of education.

Course of Study

The Education Specialist Clear Program provides a mechanism for the successful induction of a new professional. It serves preliminary Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe and Early Childhood Education Specialists. The program includes 12-15 units with the emphasis of advanced knowledge and reflective thinking in providing effective instruction and environment for student success. Interviews with the department chair, faculty and university supervisors revealed that a few of the smaller local districts offer the induction program. In this case, candidates use the preliminary BRIDGE document to establish the initial direction for the Professional Clear Individual Induction Plan (AKA action research plan). The development is a collaborative venture between the new professional, the employer and the university. If the employing district does not offer the induction program, the COE is prepared to serve candidates by offering a university-based induction program in which the required support provider is a faculty member of the Department of Special Education. Candidates interviewed stated that overall support provided by university faculty serving in this capacity was abundant and timely.

A candidate's typical program ensures that CTC program standards are met and includes a selection of 4 advanced courses, and an advanced seminar. Candidates also engage in the FACT Induction Program and complete Modules A, B, C, & D. Per interviews with the department chair, program coordinators, and candidates, advanced coursework study includes action research, bilingual/multicultural special education, collaboration and communication with a fieldwork component, pedagogy, universal access, selection of an elective and focused professional development. A review of advanced coursework syllabi identified appropriate learning outcomes and assignments, program assessment outcomes, and assignments linked to the program standards. Special education faculty or exemplary practitioners in the field employed by partnering districts, serve as coaches in the induction process.

Assessment of Candidates

Review of course syllabi confirms how specific standard and unit outcomes are addressed by course objectives and met in course assignments. Course instructors use rubrics aligned with course objectives and specific assignment descriptions to score Signature Assessments. Course grades reflect candidate understanding, demonstration, and implementation of course and standard outcomes across all courses. Candidates must receive a grade of B or better on signature assessments, maintain a C- or better in every course, and successfully complete the FACT portfolio to earn the Education Specialist Clear Credential.   Interviews with faculty confirmed that several key assignments are tied to direct instruction and the candidate is expected to carry out the assignment in the fieldwork experience component.

Key Assessments for the Education Specialist Clear Credential are as follows:
- SPED 531/32/33 Action Research Project
- SPED 551 Key Assignment – Diversity Project, Action Research
- Capstone Assessment – Culminating FACT Portfolio

_____

- Program Survey – Candidates' perceptions with regards to their performance and proficiencies

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and university supervisors, the team determined that all program standards for the Educational Specialist Clear Credential are **Met**.

<div align="center">

Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE)
Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization

</div>

Program Design

The results of a review of documents and interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, advisors, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and program leadership indicate that program design reflects a focus on multiculturalism, curriculum, instruction, assessment, working with families, behavior management, collaboration with multidisciplinary service providers, and other critical content areas. ECSE candidates experience student teaching placements in environments for 0-3 year olds in the first semester and pre-school (up to age 5 years) during the second semester. Candidates who have a baccalaureate degree, or who seek an internship, may enter the program. Both the traditional and Intern program can be completed in 12 months if prerequisites are met. When persons in the credential programs receive a job offer from a school district, they may choose to become an intern. Others enroll as interns when they have been placed in an environment where they already work with children in a special education setting. Candidates who currently hold an Education Specialist in Mild/Moderate or Moderate/Severe are eligible to obtain the Early Childhood Added Authorization. Currently, there are no candidates in the added authorization program. Interviews with credential candidates indicate that prerequisite coursework is often required for those candidates who do not have prior course work in child development and other key content areas. Information collected from interviews confirms that candidates who have an undergraduate degree or prior coursework in key areas such a child development, may be required to complete less coursework to earn the credential.

Course of Study

The results of a review of documents and interviews with candidates, program completers, faculty, advisors, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and program leadership verify that the program provides a logical, scaffolded sequence of the critical components required of teacher education, including content preparation, pedagogical instruction, classroom observation and participation, and fieldwork experiences. The sequence of components is responsive to contemporary educational concerns, and connects theory and practice. The program consists of three phases. A prerequisites phase introduces candidates to positive behavior support, language and culture for special populations, an overview of exceptionalities, and 60 hours of fieldwork. A core-components phase focuses on all aspects of the profession. An advanced specialization phase addresses characteristics and teaching methods related to the specialty area. Field-based performance assignments that tie into Fieldwork Dispositions and Competencies are required in all methods courses. The importance of key concepts, such as

working with families/caregivers, collaborating with members of an interdisciplinary team, autism, behavior management, typical and atypical development, reflection, and multicultural factors are embedded throughout the courses and field experiences, as indicated through interviews with program leadership, faculty, advisors, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, candidates, and program completers.

A review of documents and interviews with college leadership indicate that the Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Program is assessed through the College of Education Unit Assessment System. Coursework is aligned with the unit's program outcomes, which also guide the development of course content and assignments. Each course syllabus details how specific standard and unit outcomes are addressed by course objectives and met in course assignments. Course instructors use rubrics aligned with course objectives and specific assignment descriptions to score Signature Assessments. Course grades reflect candidate understanding, demonstration, and implementation of course and standard outcomes across all courses.   The results of interviews with candidates, program completers, faculty, advisors, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and program leadership indicate a consensus that the coursework and field experiences are viewed as both high quality and effective.

Evidence from interviews with candidates, program completers, faculty, advisors, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and program leadership confirms that observations and fieldwork experiences are embedded throughout the coursework.   There are multiple opportunities for candidates to understand the importance of working with families, collaborating with multidisciplinary professionals, and integrating best practices relative to multiculturalism, assessment, autism, assistive technology, behavior management, typical and atypical development, personal reflection, and other key knowledge and skills.   Program leadership, faculty, cooperating teachers, and candidates confirm that candidates have multiple opportunities to interview families and caregivers, in particular to actively participate in the assessment and diagnostic process.

Interviews confirm that cooperating teachers are supportive, and candidates feel comfortable contacting program leadership, faculty, and university supervisors if potential challenges arise. When asked why they choose to act as cooperating teachers, the cooperating teachers stated that it is an opportunity to give back to the profession and to stay current in the field. Interviews reveal that seminars on a variety of topics are offered on an ongoing basis. Candidates shared that cooperating teachers helped them to work more effectively with families, and to collaborate with other professionals such as school psychologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, administrators, and paraprofessionals.   Cooperating teachers and candidates confirmed that they have multiple opportunities to participate in individualized educational planning and program delivery.

Multicultural learning opportunities are integrated throughout the program, according to interviews with program leadership, faculty, advisors, candidates, and program completers. This includes an eco-mapping project in which candidates are required to describe a local community. Case studies are used to reinforce skills necessary in effectively collaborating with families and caregivers, paraprofessionals, and other service providers. According to the results of interviews

with program leadership, faculty, advisors, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, candidates, and program completers, the need for a positive disposition is embedded throughout the coursework and field experiences. Candidates who demonstrate a need for improvement in this area are provided with 1:1 counseling by faculty, advisors, university supervisors, and/or cooperating teachers, according to the results of interviews with these key stakeholders.

Assessment of Candidates
A review of documents and the results of interviews with candidates, program completers, faculty, advisors, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and program leadership indicate that after admission to the program, candidates are guided and coached on their performance throughout the preliminary program. There are several key assessment points where faculty note candidate progress and decide whether or not they will continue in the program or need additional support. Throughout these multiple points of assessment and transition, candidates must demonstrate competency in both coursework and directed teaching. Interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, advisors, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and program leadership affirm that multiple points and measures of assessment are critical elements of the candidate experience. Key transition points include admission to the program, admission to initial student teaching, admission to final student teaching, exit from the program, and post program. Tools include a Fieldwork Evaluation of Dispositions Assessment and Early Childhood Education Exit Survey.

Interviews with candidates, program completers, faculty, advisors, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and program leadership confirm that candidates in the education specialist credential are recommended for the preliminary credential only after multiple experiences and opportunities to demonstrate successful competency and development of a plan for induction that includes both summative and formative assessment. Information collected through interviews with cooperating teachers, candidates, and program completers indicate that candidates are well prepared to enter the fieldwork experiences. They stated that they felt supported by program leadership. Program leadership, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, candidates, and program completers confirmed that there are multiple opportunities to interact with families, including sharing diagnostic results and education plans.

When asked why they choose to act as cooperating teachers, cooperating teachers shared that they do it to "give back" to the profession, bring "energy" to the classroom, debunk rumors that preschool is babysitting, improve one's own practice and to stay current in the field. They specifically described learning from candidates about current best practices relative to autism and assistive technology. Information gathered through interviews with program leadership, faculty, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, candidates, and program completers confirms that candidates are effectively assessed.

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

_____

Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate
Traditional and Intern

Program Design
The Mission Statement of the College of Education (COE) at California State University, Fullerton embraces a "commitment to the preparation and professional development of innovative and transformative educators who advance just, equitable, and inclusive education…promoting creativity, collaboration, and critical thinking as fundamental to student achievement and success in a diverse and interconnected world." In response to their mission, the Department of Special Education prepares mild/moderate credential candidates for careers as special education teachers through two pathways. One pathway is designed for traditional candidates and the alternative pathway is designed for intern teachers working in the field.

The Mild/Moderate Program Coordinator provides organizational and administrative support for this specific credential. The Coordinator supports the development and revision of courses, assignment of instructors. The quality of coursework is maintained through the annual assessment of data by faculty and changes made based on analysis for program improvement. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards and candidate competency ratings data guide program development, key assignments and program modifications. Findings were confirmed through review of syllabi and interviews with the coordinator and faculty. Interviews with program completers and candidates confirmed that the COE is responsive to the needs of the community and in partnering districts. Candidates and completers also stated they experienced a most effective coordination of the varied administrative components including admissions, ongoing candidate assessment and ongoing support for program completers.

The Mild/Moderate Program engages in active collaboration within their educational community. Interviews with cooperating teachers, university supervisors and program completers confirmed that through grants, (such as the AIMS grant), the COE offers ongoing professional development for all within the local educational communities. Through collaboration with district partners, faculty are often recruited from these local education institutions, bringing their expertise and infusing their scholarly work into each of the special education areas. This was confirmed through the review of documents and cooperating teacher interviews. In addition, coordinators work with district advisory boards to identify and employ university supervisors, as well as to coordinate training and provide ongoing professional development for the local education institutions. Two advisory boards for the Special Education Department meet once each semester to give program updates and seek input from the community. Review of the agendas and minutes show evidence of stakeholder input for program improvement in the areas of coursework and field experiences grounded in research and evidence-based practices relevant to the contemporary trends in the field of education.

Course of Study
The major goal of the Mild/Moderate Program is the preparation of effective entry-level special education professionals for teaching positions with students identified as having learning disabilities, developmental delays, autism, emotional disturbance and/or behavior disorders.

Review of the course requirements and syllabi verifies that the instructional curriculum provides candidates with a broad background in the physiological, environmental and social aspects of exceptionality.

The Mild/Moderate courses are offered in a combination of on-line and face-to-face settings for both the traditional and intern credential candidates. Coordinators and interns verified that intern candidates must demonstrate the eligibility for placement by meeting the specific intern readiness requirements (i.e., prerequisite phase and first phase). Interviews with candidates and completers confirmed that all candidates are required to move through four phases also known as transition points. The phases include a prerequisite phase; first phase; advanced phase; and completion phase.

The program-specific field experiences begin in the prerequisite phase and continue through the candidates' enrollment in the program. The experiences are intentionally designed to provide candidates opportunities to observe and participate in educational settings that model effective practice and serve diverse students. All fieldwork occurs in school sites where at least 25% of the students are from ethno-linguistically diverse backgrounds. Once hired in the field, interns work with their university advisors to ensure that the diversity component is met. Various instructional delivery models are also explored throughout the field experiences. It was confirmed through interviews with cooperating teachers and university supervisors, that partnering districts and schools must embrace best practice and engage in co-teaching, common core, and universal access. The culminating practicum extends this opportunity, intensifies the involvement and responsibility of the candidate, and requires demonstration of the competencies required for recommendation for the Education Specialist Credential.

Intern specific support is provided by university supervisors, district support providers and administrators. With an MOU in place, the support team works with interns to develop a professional development plan to guide interns in their area of expertise. Mandated support logs, mainly coordinated by the Special Education Department, track the hourly support in regards to activities, content and EL specific training. This was confirmed through document review and interviews with candidates, coordinators, and university supervisors.

All candidates and program completers interviewed remarked on feeling adequately prepared, supported and mentored throughout the program and beyond completion. Exit surveys confirmed this level of preparation and support. University supervisors and district support providers are required to hold the same credential the candidate is working toward, meet the EL competence requirement, and attend ongoing professional development seminars. All cooperating teachers and field supervisors interviewed indicated a strong sense of community and an ongoing partnership between the Special Education Department.

Assessment of Candidate Competence
The Curricular Map for the Mild/Moderate credential identifies the required courses with alignment to the CTC program standards. It further identifies the courses in which standards are introduced, developed and mastered. In the review of syllabi, course learning outcomes are aligned with these standards, as well CSTP's, TPE's, and the CEC Standards. Opportunities to

practice reflection, refer to scholarship within the content areas, and demonstrate well-respected educational practice were evident in course syllabi as well as in in the Practicum Supervision Logs.

Each candidate is monitored through the four transition points in the program and must pass specific assessments to determine if the candidate is successfully meeting or has met the required CSTP and TPE standards. Per interviews with program coordinators, all candidates must demonstrate successful completion of coursework and demonstrate competencies through observations conducted by university support providers and master teachers.

Candidates struggling to meet competencies are given multiple chances to succeed. They are provided with an Improvement/Corrective Action Plan, advisement and coaching by faculty, field supervisors and mentor teachers, or district support providers. Coordinators, master teachers, candidates, and program completers corroborated this safeguard.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and university supervisors, the team determined that all program standards for the Mild/Moderate credential are **Met**.

Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe
Traditional and Intern

Program Design
The Mission Statement of the College of Education (COE) at California State University, Fullerton embraces a "commitment to the preparation and professional development of innovative and transformative educators who advance just, equitable, and inclusive education…promoting creativity, collaboration, and critical thinking as fundamental to student achievement and success in a diverse and interconnected world." In response to their mission, the Department of Special Education prepares moderate/severe credential candidates for careers as special education teachers through two pathways. One pathway is designed for traditional candidates and the alternative pathway is designed for intern teachers working in the field.

The Moderate/Severe Program Coordinator provides organizational and administrative support to candidates seeking this specific credential. The quality of coursework is maintained through the annual assessment of data by faculty and changes made based on analysis for program improvement. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards and candidate competency ratings data guide program development, key assignments and program modifications. Findings were confirmed through review of syllabi and interviews with the coordinator and faculty. Interviews with program completers and candidates confirmed that the COE is responsive to the needs of the community and in partnering districts. Candidates and completers also stated they experienced a most effective coordination of the varied administrative components including admissions, ongoing candidate assessment and ongoing support (1-3 years) for program completers.

Active collaboration within CSU Fullerton's educational community through grants (such as the AIMS grant) was confirmed in interviews with cooperating teachers, university supervisors and program completers. The COE offers ongoing professional development for all within the local educational communities. Through collaboration with district partners, faculty are often recruited from these local education institutions, bringing their expertise and infusing their scholarly work into each of the special education areas. This was confirmed through the review of documents and university faculty interviews. In addition, coordinators work with district advisory board members to identify and employ university supervisors, as well as to coordinate training and provide ongoing professional development for the local education institutions. Two advisory boards for the Special Education Department meet once each semester. The focus group relevant to the Moderate/Severe Program is known as "Process Project." This board is supported by a federal grant and has regular attendance and consistent membership to include teachers, candidates, program completers and administrative district representatives. The other board is the College of Education's advisory board which has representatives from the districts (administrators and teachers), community members, program completers, cooperating teachers and education partners. This advisory board meets to give program updates and seek input from the community. Review of the agendas and minutes show evidence of stakeholder input for program improvement in the areas of coursework and field experiences grounded in research and evidence-based practices relevant to the contemporary trends in the field of education.

Course of Study
The major goal of the Moderate/Severe Program is the preparation of effective entry-level special education professionals for teaching positions with students identified as having moderate to severe development delays, autism, emotional disturbance and/or behavior disorders. Review of the course requirements and syllabi cites that the instructional curriculum provides candidates with a broad background in the physiological, environmental and social aspects of exceptionality. Faculty, candidate, and program completer interview data supported the finding that candidates learn the common characteristics, assessment strategies, and research-based teaching strategies, as well as interdisciplinary/collaboration skills. In addition, the curriculum provides the knowledge and skills in transition and positive behavior support.

The Moderate/Severe courses are offered in a combination of on-line and face-to-face settings for both the traditional and intern credentialing candidates. Coordinators and interns verified that intern candidates must demonstrate the eligibility for placement by meeting the specific intern readiness requirements (i.e., prerequisite phase and first phase). Interviews with candidates and completers confirmed that all candidates are required to move through four phases also known as transition points which include the prerequisite phase; the first phase; the Advanced Phase and the Completion Phase.

The program-specific field experiences begin in the prerequisite phase and continue through the candidates' enrollment in the program. The experiences are intentionally designed to provide candidates opportunities to observe and participate in educational settings that model effective practice and serve diverse students. All fieldwork occurs in school sites where at least 25% of the students are from ethno-linguistically diverse backgrounds. Once hired in the field, interns work with their university advisors to ensure that the diversity component is met.

Various instructional delivery models are also explored throughout the field experiences. It was confirmed through interviews with cooperating teachers and university supervisors, that partnering districts and schools must embrace best practice and engage in co-teaching, common core, and universal access. The culminating practicum extends this opportunity, intensifies the involvement and responsibility of the candidate, and requires demonstration of the competencies required for recommendation for the Education Specialist Credential.

Technology is integrated into courses as candidates access a computer-based learning interface to varying degrees and participate in hybrid courses that blend distance/online and face-to-face learning. Through various grants, candidates and employers verified that the SOE often brought technology into the classroom thus adding value. Several course assignments and projects also require immediate application of research and best practices as candidates observe and reflect about classroom experiences, model strategies with students, and collaborate with families and agencies.

Intern specific support is provided by university supervisors, district support providers and administrators. With an MOU in place, the support team works with interns to develop a professional development plan to guide interns in their area of expertise. Mandated support logs, mainly coordinated by the Department, track the support in regards to activities, content and EL specific training. This was confirmed through document review and interviews with candidates, coordinators, and university supervisors.

All candidates and program completers that were interviewed remarked on feeling adequately prepared, supported and mentored throughout the program and beyond completion. Exit surveys confirmed this level of preparation and support. University supervisors and district support providers are required to hold the same credential the candidate is working toward, meet the EL competence requirement, and attend ongoing professional development seminars. All cooperating teachers and field supervisors that were interviewed indicated a strong sense of community and an ongoing partnership between the Special Education Department.

Assessment of Candidate Competence
The Curricular Map for the Moderate/Severe Program credential identifies the required courses with alignment to the CTC program standards. It further identifies the courses in which standards are introduced, developed and mastered. In the review of syllabi, course learning outcomes are aligned with these standards, as well CSTP's, TPE's, and the CEC Standards. Opportunities to practice reflection, refer to scholarship within the content areas, and demonstrate well-respected educational practice were evident in course syllabi as well as in in the Practicum Supervision Logs.

Each candidate is monitored through the four transition points in the program and must pass specific assessments to determine if the candidate is successfully meeting or has met the required CSTP and TPE standards. Ongoing observations and performance evaluations are performed by the university supervisors. The ratings give the supervisor and candidate a forum for discussing areas of strength and target next steps in the individualized professional development plan through the completion of the program.

All credential program candidates must be formally recommended by the Department of Special Education and their respective coordinators. Prior to recommendation, candidates must have passed the designed phases of the program to assure competencies and performance criteria have been met. If the student has satisfactorily met all Department of Special Education requirements, the Credentials Office forwards a formal recommendation for the appropriate credential.

Candidates struggling to meet competencies are given multiple chances to succeed. They are provided with an Improvement/Corrective Action Plan, advisement and coaching by faculty, field supervisors and mentor teachers or district support providers. Coordinators, master teachers, candidates and program completers corroborated this safeguard.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and university supervisors, the team determined that all program standards for the Moderate/Severe credential are **Met**.

<div align="center">

Education Specialist: Added Authorizations
Autism Spectrum Disorders

</div>

Program Design
The Mission Statement of the College of Education at California State University, Fullerton is aligned with both the University's Mission Statement and the EPP's Conceptual Framework. Their mission embraces a "commitment to the preparation and professional development of innovative and transformative educators who advance just, equitable, and inclusive education…promoting creativity, collaboration, and critical thinking as fundamental to student achievement and success in a diverse and interconnected world." In response to their mission, the Department of Special Education prepares education specialists for the Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization in Special Education (ASDAA). This authorization is typically designed for education specialist teachers working in the field.

In 2010, faculty with expertise in research and practice associated in working with students diagnosed with autism along with input from local district and SELPA persons with expertise in autism developed the courses required for the ASDAA. This development was timely and responsive, as holders of the Ryan Specialist Credential in Learning Handicapped and the Education Specialists Credential in Mild/Moderate Disabilities were also required by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) to obtain a separate ASDAA if the holders were teaching students diagnosed with autism. The 2014-15 Biennial Report cited 13 ASDAA candidates as actively enrolled. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) standards and candidate competency ratings data guide program development, key assignments and program modifications. A review of syllabi confirms the integration of the ASDAA CTC standards. The Special Education Department works with district advisory board members to coordinate training and provide ongoing professional development for the local education institutions as the ASDAA program enrollment continues to rapidly decline.

Course of Study

The authorization is aligned with the CTC standards inclusive of characteristics of students with the Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), teaching, learning, and behavior strategies for students with ASD, collaborating with other service providers and fieldwork experience. Interviews with program completers and instructors confirmed that three of the four required courses (9 out of 12 units) involve a fieldwork component providing an opportunity for candidates to apply their skills an environment supported by a district and/ university coach.

Assessment of Candidates

Each course syllabus also details how specific standard and unit outcomes are addressed by course objectives and met in course assignments. Course instructors confirmed the use of rubrics aligned with course objectives and specific assignment descriptions to score Signature Assessments. Course Grades reflect candidate understanding, demonstration, and implementation of course and standard outcomes across all courses. Candidates must receive a grade of B or better on key assessments, as well as a C- or better in every course to earn the ASDAA. Several key assignments are tied to direct instruction and the candidate is expected to carry out the assignment in the integrated fieldwork experience component.

Key Assessments for the ASDAA are as follows:
- SPED 502 Key Assignment – Case Study Intervention
- SPED 522 Key Assignment – Behavior Intervention Plan
- Capstone Assessment – Portfolio
- Fieldwork Experience – Demonstration that the candidate has the instructional skills and professional dispositions necessary to serve students on Autism Spectrum. Candidate proficiency is measured by the course instructors according to guidelines for response journals and observation logs

Findings on Standards

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

<div align="center">

Education Specialist: Added Authorizations
Resource Specialist

</div>

Program Design

The Mission Statement of the College of Education at California State University, Fullerton is aligned with both the University's Mission Statement and the Education Preparation Program's (EPP) Conceptual Framework. Their mission embraces a "commitment to the preparation and professional development of innovative and transformative educators who advance just, equitable, and inclusive education…promoting creativity, collaboration, and critical thinking as fundamental to student achievement and success in a diverse and interconnected world." In response to their mission, the Department of Special Education prepares education specialists for

the Resource Specialist Added Authorization in Special Education (RSAA). This authorization is typically designed for education specialist teachers working in the field.

Course of Study

The RSAA accommodates those experienced teachers (Ryan Credential) who already have a Learning Handicapped, Severely Handicapped, Physically Handicapped or Communicatively Handicapped Credential and want to improve their skills by adding the RSAA. A review of documents and syllabi cites that this program consists of the following four courses, and takes two semesters to complete. Candidate completers stated that classes are presented in an on-line format with frequent instructor-candidate interaction.

Opportunities for candidates to meet the RSAA standards are determined most often by their place of employment as virtually all candidates working toward this authorization are employed. As required by CTC, the program participants do not have to be employed. The faculty shared that if a participant is not employed, the campus will place the person in one of the Professional Development Schools (PDS) having a collaborative relationship with the Department of Special Education. They will be assigned a fully credentialed Education Specialist to work with them as a support provider and to give them the access to students needed to complete program assignments.

Assessment of Candidates

Review of course syllabi details how specific standard and unit outcomes are addressed by course objectives and met in course assignments. Course instructors use rubrics aligned with course objectives and specific assignment descriptions to score Signature Assessments. Course grades reflect candidate understanding, demonstration, and implementation of course and standard outcomes across all courses. Candidates confirmed that several key assignments are tied to direct instruction and carried out in the fieldwork experience component.

Key Assessments for the RSAA are as follows:
- SPED 551 Key Assignment – Diversity Project, Action Research
- Capstone Assessment – Portfolio
- Program Survey – Candidates' perceptions with regards to their performance and proficiencies
- Fieldwork Experience – Demonstration that the candidate has the instructional skills and professional dispositions necessary to serve students. Candidate proficiency is measured by the course instructors according to guidelines for response journals and observation logs

Findings on Standards

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

Specialist Credentials and Certificates
Bilingual Authorization Program

Program Design

The Bilingual Authorization (BiAu) program is available to candidates enrolled in the Multiple Subject, Single Subjects and Education Specialist Credential Programs. It is also offered as a post-credential program to teachers who hold a Multiple Subject, Single Subject or Education Specialist credential that includes SB2042, CLAD equivalent. The BiAu is offered in Spanish, as well as the following Asian languages: Mandarin, Korean and Vietnamese. California State University, Fullerton is also part of the Asian language consortium.

Course of Study

The program coordinator, faculty, completers and candidates confirmed that BiAu candidates complete two 3-unit BiAu courses: a bilingual methodology course and a culture of emphasis course. These units are required in addition to the credential program requirements. BiAu Spanish coursework is offered at CSUF. BiAu Asian coursework are offered through the Asian BTEP consortium. Completers and employers confirmed that the coursework for the bilingual authorization prepares candidates for teaching in a bilingual setting. Spanish BiAu completers and candidates reported that the bilingual authorization courses prepared them to teach in a dual language classroom.

The program coordinator and bilingual faculty report that the Asian BTEP consortium meets once a month to coordinate the course offerings in Mandarin, Korean and Vietnamese. Completers also stated that the two courses for the bilingual authorization were valuable and applicable to both bilingual and non-bilingual classrooms.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are initially assessed for fluency in the target language. For Asian BiAu programs, Mandarin and Korean applicants must pass CSET LOTE Subtest III, and Hmong applicants must pass CSET LOTE Test II for admission into the Asian BiAu program. For Spanish candidates, score of Advanced Low or better in all four areas of the ACTFL-based language proficiency assessment is required. During the admission interview, potential candidates are required to receive a minimum score of 8 out of 12 possible points on the interview questions and must demonstrate a commitment to bilingual teaching and potential for success in the BiAu program.

The BiAu program has two midpoint checks for candidate progress. The first midpoint, consists of candidates receiving a B or better in the bilingual methods course. This course can also be waived with verification of passing the CSET LOTE Subtest IV. Candidates are also required to complete a fieldwork requirement consisting of 20 hours in a dual language classroom. The second midpoint consists of candidates earning a B or better in the culture course. Candidates may waive this course by passing the CSET LOTE Subtest V.

The BiAu program coordinator also acts as the program advisor for the bilingual candidates in both the Spanish and Asian Language BiAu program.

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

Reading Certificate (Added Authorization)
Reading Language Arts Credential (Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential)

Program Design
The Graduate Literacy and Reading Program at CSU Fullerton emphasizes collaborative learning, reflecting upon one's actions, and empowering learners to read to their full potential. The program encourages candidates to be active in the profession of education and expects them to make positive differences in the settings where they are employed.

A review of syllabi and program documents confirm that the Literacy and Reading Program is designed so that five courses (15 units) constitute the Reading Certificate (Added Authorization) and an additional four courses (14 units) are needed to complete the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential (Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential) for a total of nine courses (29 units). The program is offered as both a hybrid program and 100% online. By completing 30 semester units, candidates earn their Reading Certificate, Master's Degree, and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential.

Documents, syllabi and the website indicate that the organization of coursework and experiences in the Literacy and Reading Program reflect principles consistent with the Unit's Conceptual Framework and are aligned with the Unit and Program Outcomes and the CTC and International Literacy Association Standards.

Course of Study
A review of the syllabi and program documents verify that coursework and fieldwork are designed to provide candidates with a range of experiences with students, pre-K to adult, from diverse ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Course syllabi indicate that the program fieldwork and practicum experiences are woven into each semester of the program at both the Certificate and Credential level, moving from tutoring and classroom observation to more in-depth case studies and one-on-one intervention case reports. Using formative assessments, candidates plan literacy interactions that are designed to meet the needs and motivate the individual reader. Interviews with faculty and candidates confirmed that candidates tutor an intermediate level reader where the emphasis is on adolescent and adult literacy learning and further fieldwork includes a student assessment, structured interview, briefing and de-briefing. As they progress through the program, candidates learn and use various assessments to determine the strengths and needs of readers. These assignments, verified by course syllabi, provide an opportunity for candidates to become proficient in formative and summative assessments.

The program also highlights the need to prepare teachers to become advocates for students and their families. The emphasis of the program is to look at each reader as an individual with specific needs, and to use this information in instructional planning. Coursework prepares candidates to become informed decision-makers, with knowledge and skill in the use of a variety of techniques, methods and materials for all learners. Completers cited the Community Mapping assignment where they engaged in a "teacher as researcher" fieldwork project with an English Language Learner as being instrumental in understanding how to make informed decisions for diverse learners

Throughout the program, candidates learn about the wealth of assessments that exist to evaluate learners from early reader to adult and to plan for intervention, both one-on-one and small group A review of program documents and syllabi confirms that the program maintains an effective sequence of coursework. Completers and candidates stated that the sequence of courses allowed them to learn strategies intended for early and emergent literacy, to adolescent and adult literacy, and finally to create and evaluate literacy curriculum.

The Literacy and Reading Program provides multiple opportunities for candidates to apply what they are learning in a "real world" setting. For example, candidates spend five weeks each with two students, one early reader and one adolescent, and complete a case report summary for each which includes assessment results, data analysis, and recommendations for further intervention. In addition, candidates use all of the assessment data gathered from the first five - week experience to make grouping decisions. The second experience requires one-on-one intervention with a struggling reader ninety minutes a week for twelve weeks. Intervention classes are supervised by Literacy and Reading Department faculty (when hosted online this is done via video using TaskStream® or the campus online platform). The focus of this supervised fieldwork is to determine and complete appropriate assessments, design and implement a plan for intervention, post assess and report on progress in a formal report to all stakeholders. Recent completers confirmed that their clinical practice experiences were instrumental in the effectiveness of their preparation to begin work as a Reading Specialist. All candidates and program completers that were interviewed commented on being adequately prepared, supported, and mentored throughout the program.

Assessment of Candidates
The Reading Certificate and the Reading Specialist Credential programs are assessed through the College of Education Unit Assessment System designed for the continuous collection of multiple data sources, both internal and external, to monitor candidate performance and to manage and improve program effectiveness. Data are collected and analyzed to determine if candidates have met the requirements necessary to matriculate through the program at four transition points (TP).

Candidates complete an integrated curriculum leading to a Reading Certificate and/or a Reading Specialist Credential. The department chair, program coordinators, and faculty support the deliberate alignment of courses and assignments with professional standards and program outcomes that promote viable measurement of candidate proficiency.

Interviews with the department chair, program coordinators, and faculty indicate that each course has an assigned custodian who regularly meets, communicates, and shares resources with all course-alike instructors to ensure that assignment expectations are consistent across all course sections, rubrics for key assignment are provided, and assessment practices and grading are aligned. Grades are submitted electronically to the university database system by course instructors. Each year the College Data Analyst collects, charts, and reports grade data back to programs for analysis.

In addition to final course grades, the program also collects grades for Signature and Key Assignments. Five assessments are identified for the Reading Certificate, and four are identified for the Reading Specialist Credential.

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

Preliminary Administrative Services

Program Design
The Educational Leadership Preliminary Administrative Services program at CSU, Fullerton, has a longstanding, purposefully developed program of professional leadership preparation based on department goals and revised over time in order to ensure continuous improvement. The goals of the department are to prepare educational leaders who demonstrate a wide array of knowledge, skills, attributes and commitment. Concern for diversity and the preparation of leaders committed to just, equitable, and inclusive education are hallmarks of the program as confirmed by faculty, program coordinators and the department chair.

Interviews and review of faculty vitae confirmed that all faculty, program directors, and faculty support persons in the Department of Educational Leadership have terminal degrees and significant leadership experience in PK-12 public education at both the site and district levels. Interviews with faculty, program coordinators and the department chair confirm that the faculty are extremely collaborative and share responsibility for course integrity and program coordination. Both candidates and mentors reported that they have confidence in the program and have recommended it to others because of the quality of candidates it generates.

Course of Study
The program of study is a five-semester program designed as a combined credential and master's degree program. The department requires that all candidates recommended for the credential have a master's degree. Applicants who have an earned master's degree in education or a related field may enroll for the credential only.

Program components reviewed for admission, advisement, courses, and evaluation confirmed the use of a continuous sequence as indicated by the candidates. Candidates, program directors,

and faculty support persons, and faculty confirmed that a portfolio is required for admission and then utilized throughout candidate advisement. According to interviews with candidate cohort groups, the cohorts function successfully as communities of learners facilitating collaboration and teamwork. Candidates, faculty, and advisors noted that candidates were informed of all requirements upon entering the program. There is a standard sequence of courses regardless of whether cohorts start in the fall or spring.

Review of handbooks, syllabi, and discussion with the program coordinator indicated that the sequence of courses is purposeful and appropriate, including both classroom and field experiences. Learning objectives for each course are aligned with and drawn from the California Professional Standards for School Leaders (CPSELs).

Onsite documentation and candidate feedback indicated that the fieldwork provides on-the-job experience under the immediate direction of a practicing school administrator, called the mentor, and the general supervision of a university instructor, called the fieldwork supervisor. At CSU Fullerton, candidates complete fieldwork throughout the program as verified by interviews with completers, candidates, faculty and the program chair. Fieldwork begins during the first semester with a series of approved activities documented on forms signed by the school site mentor and the faculty fieldwork supervisor and continues throughout the remainder of the program.

Assessment of Candidates
Interviews with candidates, faculty, and the program coordinator indicate that assessment is ongoing and a comprehensive learning activity for candidates. A review of the syllabi demonstrates the full range of assessment activities included in the program. The major assessment activities that inform instructors of student progress and provide data for program assessment include the following: Pre and Post inventory of Candidate Competence, Signature Assignments, Master's Project, and Formative Assessments in Fieldwork. At the end of the fieldwork program candidates are required to demonstrate their performance competencies by submitting a portfolio of artifacts documenting the fieldwork completed and completion of required competencies. This culminating experience is introduced Semester One of the program and monitored via the formative assessments that are designed to monitor student progress and to identify students having difficulties in completion of fieldwork.

Completers and current candidates agree that one of the major strengths of the program is the real-world practical experience of the faculty and the multiple leadership perspectives offered in their classes. They also indicate that the engaging cohort model results in a positive, supportive learning community.

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

Administrative Services: Clear Induction

Program Design

California State University, Fullerton's Administrative Services Clear Induction Program is based on the Professional Administrative Credentials Standards adopted by the California Commission for Teacher Credentialing (CTC). The program, which is embedded within the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership Program, is designed to support the professional and educational development of school administrators and to prepare them to be effective change agents who create just, equitable, and inclusive schools. Due to the adoption of new standards for the Clear Administrative Services Credential by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the program's transition to the standards beginning in the fall of 2015, there is limited data regarding the implementation of this program. The credential program consists of collaboration with a certified coach from the university, professional learning through Ed.D. coursework, professional development completed through a school district, and demonstration of competence in all six of the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs). Interviews with program coordinators, the department chair and the program faculty confirm a very strong culture of collaboration between all constituencies.

Course of Study

Seven courses comprise the ED.D. /Clear Credential Program. In addition to coursework, each candidate prepares an Individualized Induction Plan (IIP) which is based on self-assessments aligned with the CPSELs. Completers, faculty and current candidates reported that their coursework was seamlessly integrated and that assignments for the Clear Credential paralleled that of the Ed.D. Candidates and completers commented on feeling ready to work as an administrator upon program completion and report on enjoying positive program experiences.

Each candidate prepares an Individualized Induction Plan (IIP) which is based on self-assessments aligned with the CPSELs. These professional performance goals are collaboratively developed by the candidate and the coach. The Professional Credential Program at CSU Fullerton consists of three Individual Induction Plan (IIP) components:

1. Collaboration with Coach to establish a strong, supportive relationship;
2. Professional learning including doctoral coursework; and
3. Assessment of competence.

Fieldwork for the Clear credential program is two-fold. Faculty Coaches meet with the candidates at least 40 hours over the 2 year program to help develop their induction plan. This includes 2 formal site visits and 8 informal meetings each year. Additionally, candidates choose a site supervisor/mentor to assist them in reaching their fieldwork goals. Program coordinators, faculty and the chair confirm that mentors must meet specific standards to be eligible and are formally recognized with a Certificate of Appreciation when their mentees graduate.

There is a reciprocal feedback loop between coaches and mentors as verified by interviews with each constituency. Contact information is shared and mentors state they have a very positive

connection with the university. In fact, many mentors are graduates of the CSU Fullerton Education Leadership program.

Completers, candidates and Program Coordinators all confirm that the Clear Administrative Services Credential program provides a robust blend of theory and practice and appreciate the real-world experience of the professors as it enhances the candidates' understanding of the problems and issues which they are dealing with as new administrators.

Many of the employers and support providers interviewed were graduates of the program, indicating a strong sense of community and continued partnership between CSU Fullerton and program completers.

Assessment of Candidates
Formative assessment is on-going throughout the program. As candidates complete the data collection for activities on the IIP, they submit an Activity Feedback Form that includes their reflection on how the activity has impacted their leadership. The coach provides formative feedback on the activity. As candidates move through the two-year program, they are expected to continuously improve their leadership practices and to ensure competence in all areas of the CPSEL standards.

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

Other Related Education Specialist Services Credentials
Speech-Language Pathology: Language, Speech and Hearing

Program Design
The Speech-Language Pathology (SLP) program values both theory and applied experiences and is fully accredited by American Speech and Hearing Association. The program design features integrated courses and field practice. Of particular note is coursework designed to meet the needs of California's diverse population and coursework that places speech language pathology in the context of human development. Required courses include those in developmental psychology, exceptional individuals, autistic spectrum disorders, communicative disorders of the bilingual/multicultural child, and a clinical practicum in communicative disorders and differences in individuals from diverse backgrounds.

The results of interviews with candidates and program completers confirm that the program includes a foundation in both theory and practice. There are multiple opportunities for candidates to participate in research on a variety of specialized topics with faculty. Information from interviews confirms that evidence-based practices, ethical behavior, healthy dispositions, multiculturalism, and specialized areas of expertise and currency in one's field are highly valued

and supported. Faculty expertise and knowledge of complementary specialty areas was particularly described as strengths by candidates and program completers.

A review of the evidence gathered through interviews confirms that the program has a strong academic base, extensive self-assessment, emphasis on diversity, and a high completion rate. The improvement in Praxis scores as evidence in the program data is one indicator that the program is becoming academically stronger. A wide variety of subjective as well as objective measures are used to assess candidates' competence in terms of knowledge and skills. Results validate the program design.

Information gathered through interviews with master clinicians and program completers verifies that the program is well-respected outside the university. Interviews with program leadership confirm that there is a high retention rate and employment rate that is highly valued by peers. This information serves as further evidence that the program design is of high quality and effective.

Course of Study
A typical sequence of undergraduate coursework includes coursework for both semesters of the junior and senior years, and graduate courses and clinical practicum in two additional semesters. Coursework covering the types of speech-language disorders assessed and treated in a clinical practicum is scheduled prior to or concurrently with the corresponding clinical practicum. During practicum experiences, candidates perform assessments and therapy with children who typically have a language and/or phonological/articulation disorder; perform hearing screenings on clients; are involved in aural rehabilitation with clients; perform assessments and therapy with candidates with a variety of speech/language disorders in a public school setting; perform assessments and therapy with adult clients, most frequently with clients who have had strokes; perform assessments and therapy with adults and/or children who are culturally/linguistically diverse; perform assessments and therapy with adults and/or children in a hospital, clinic, or skilled nursing home facility; and perform assessments and therapy with adults and/or children in a hospital, clinic, or skilled nursing home facility.

Evidence from the interviews indicates a high level of academic quality in both the coursework and field experiences. This result is consistent with, and supports, the results of the recent Graduate and Employer Evaluation of Graduates. Completers responded that they had a strong background in communicative disorders, scoring the following areas on average at 3.5 or above, with 4 the maximum score: strong oral communication skills, fundamental bases of speech, language, and hearing, and basic knowledge of communicative disorders. There were no areas in which completers and employers on average scored at below 3.0.

The results of interviews with program leadership, faculty, advisors, the clinic team, university supervisors, master clinicians, candidates, and program completers confirm the program has a strong emphasis on multicultural knowledge and skills. This includes assignments embedded throughout coursework, observations and field experiences. The results of interviews verify that this includes case studies of populations who have diverse cultural and socio-economic backgrounds.   A multicultural clinic experience is required of all candidates, as well as

experiences in both child and adult clinics. Information gathered from interviews with candidates indicates that they are provided opportunities to use the services of translators to improve services to clients/students.

Information collected through interviews with faculty, master clinicians, university supervisors, candidates, and program completers confirms that candidates have multiple opportunities to develop skills needed to effectively work with families and caregivers. The results also confirm that candidates are provided experiences working as part of a multidisciplinary team with school psychologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, general education teachers, special education teachers, and other service providers.

Candidates, program completers, and master clinicians confirm that they receive a high level of support from program leadership so they can fully experience the program as designed. The fieldwork coordinator was specifically described as knowledgeable, skilled, and committed to supporting the success of the services to candidates and master clinicians. When asked why they are involved in the program, master clinicians indicated they do it to "breathe new life" in to their classroom, bring more "energy" into their practices, find new ideas, and support new generations. They confirmed that the program is of high quality and effective, and that they learn from candidates who share best practices in areas such as autism, multiculturalism, and assistive technology.

Assessment of Candidates
Multiple measures administered at multiple points in time are used to assess candidate performance. These include: (1) The Knowledge and Skills Assessment (KASA) Exams, ten 2 ½ hour exams covering 10 essential areas in speech language pathology; (2) the Praxis Exam in Speech-Language Pathology, which is required for both the credential and the Certificate of Clinical Competence from the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association; (3) the Diversity Assignment, used to document a candidate's experience with culturally diverse students; and (4) the Student Practica Evaluations.

Information gathered from program leadership, faculty, master clinicians, and candidates confirms that a robust set of multiple measures are used to effectively assess candidate performance throughout the program. This includes a rather lengthy assessment tool that is aligned with the expectations of the professional organization, and 30 hours of examination over a series of 10 assessments.

A review of the evidence reveals that candidate assessments are of high quality and are effective. Faculty and completers believe that the Student Practica Evaluations are especially valuable. Three practica experiences occur on campus in the University Speech, Language, and Hearing Clinic and are completed by university supervisors. Feedback is written and oral, reviewing 52 clinical skills and provided weekly on the Practicum Evaluation Ratings Summary Form.

The results of reviews with master clinicians, candidates, and program completers indicate that field experiences provide, and candidates respond effectively to, ample opportunities to develop advanced skills relative to working with families and caregivers. Information gathered via

_____

Accreditation Team Report   *Item 13*   *January 2016*
CSU Fullerton   *page 65*

interviews confirms that candidates demonstrate proficiency in their field experiences relative to supporting clients/students of across a broad span of ages, cultural backgrounds, exceptionalities, languages, socio-economic backgrounds, and other factors relevant to providing services. This includes opportunities with clients who are nonverbal, challenged by swallowing and/or fluency issues, experience autism spectrum disorder, and utilization of assistive technology devices. Master clinicians shared that candidates improve the practices of master clinicians by sharing best practices from their courses. This confirms that candidates are assessed and are demonstrating appropriate knowledge and skills.

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

Other Services Credentials
School Nurse Services

Program Design
The California State University, Fullerton school nurse credential program is based on the *California Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Health Services: School Nurse Credential Programs.* The course work consists of 24 units of study with a recommended part-time 4-semester study plan. The School of Nursing (SON) collaborates with other departments on campus (Counseling, Special Education, and Human Communications) to develop courses that provide a diverse experience and prepares candidates to succeed as school nurses. During the past two years the Health Teaching Special Authorization was discontinued due to low enrollment and the instructional strategies course (3 units) was eliminated from the program. In addition a major assignment was removed from the NURS 524: Advanced Pediatric Health, as it was deemed to be more appropriate for the Nurse Practitioner level of study, moving the School Nursing course, NURS 524: Advanced Pediatric Health Assessment, from 4 to 3 units. The total program units changed from 28 units to 24 units, still meeting the CTC program unit requirements. Many candidates and completers indicated that they had completed the Audiology course through another approved program or source of audiometric certification.

Interviews with the candidates, faculty, and the program coordinator indicated that courses are delivered online (asynchronous) with three required on-campus face-to-face experiences. There is an orientation at the beginning of the program and the summer course, COUNS 511 Counseling for School Nurses, requires two on campus Saturday all-day class meetings where candidates may practice counseling skills, video record their own counseling sessions, and engage with the faculty. As the technology for online instruction has improved the School Nursing program has embedded more interactive learning strategies and assessments into courses using tools like Adobe Connect. Candidates stated and enrollment supported that this design provides quality professional education and is accessible to a diverse candidate population who are registered nurses and employed as school nurses in California public schools. Candidates participate in organized fieldwork in NURS 524 and NURS 533L. Candidates and completers indicated that

assignments in credential courses include assessments and research using resources that were available through their districts or available via the CSUF Library.

Course of Study

In general, candidates are employed as school nurses (with a preliminary school nursing credential) when they begin the program. The first courses in the program are foundational courses, NURS 530 Nursing Specialist 1 and SPED 462 Practices and Procedures of Special Education. These courses provide knowledge in the basic practices and competencies of school nursing by examining topics including the profession, roles, legal foundations, children with chronic conditions, health services management, and the school nurses role in special education. Candidates, completers, and preceptors indicated that legal and ethical issues are woven throughout the courses and practicums with special emphasis in special education laws and policies. They reported that this is some of most critical knowledge they learn in the program.

The second and third semester candidates continue to develop important skills and competencies: NURS 526 Health Care of the Young Family focuses on child development, developmental and emotional issues and related assessments, and skills and competences. NURS 524 Advanced Pediatric Heath provides the knowledge and skills to perform and write-up health histories and physical exams in the school setting. COUNS 511 provides content and practice sessions in counseling children of all ages, addressing disasters at school and working with school psychologists. HCOMM 461 (Audiology) prepares the candidate to meet the requirements for their school audiometrist certificate. Completers and candidates in their last term indicated that hands-on techical experience for the audiology skills is imperative in their professional roles.

During the final semester candidates study cultural competence, school nurses' role in research and health education with an emphasis on health promotion (NURS 532 Nursing Specialist II). The program ends with a final practicum course (NURS 533L School Nurse Practicum). The program is designed so that candidates may continue to complete a Master's of Science in Nursing.

As indicated by the program coordinator and in the candidate/preceptor handbook, the field work experiences consist of 135 mentored hours with preceptors (current school nurse credential holders) as well as assignments and assessments done with children and students in the candidate's own or local school districts. The fieldwork expectations include the following:

- ➢ Candidates work 135 hours under the leadership of a credentialed school nurse preceptor.

- ➢ Completers, preceptors, employers, and faculty all cite that the process of completing a faculty-designed and candidate-designed goals and objectives to ensure knowledge, competency, and skills required in the practice of school nursing (NURS 533L School Nurse Practicum, final semester) is an essential capstone assessment of the program. The candidates in collaboration with preceptors and university practicum faculty review the assessment and concur on an individual set of goals to frame the candidate's practicum experience. Faculty and candidates confirmed that at the completion of the semester, the preceptors and candidates review the final assessment of the plan and engage with the university practicum faculty.

_____

- Candidates perform seven growth/development/mental/emotional assessments (NURS 526 Health Care of the Young Family) during the second semester.

- Candidates organize and assume leadership of a Coordinated School Health Committee in their own or a local school district. This committee administers the CDC's School Health Index survey, and the committee uses this information to plan needed health promotion activities (NURS 532 School Nurse Specialist II, final semester). Candidates, completers, and preceptors indicate that this task is often very difficult since it requires the cooperation of several school site personnel during the beginning of the school and if possible, could be introduced earlier in the program.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates, faculty, and course syllabi noted that candidates are evaluated throughout the program by

1) Successful completion ("B" grade or better) of three signature assignments
   - Chronic Conditions of Childhood Packet/Presentation
   - Health History/Physical Exam Write-up Assignment
   - School Health Index/Health Promotion Assignment
2) Candidate evaluations by mentor/preceptor conducted in the practicum course
3) Successful completion ("B" grade or better) of all credential courses

After successfully completing all of the coursework, fieldwork, and assessments Candidates are recommended by the School Nursing Program chair for the School Nurse Services Credential.

Forms reviewed at the site visit and data collected indicated that courses and faculty are evaluated by candidates each term and preceptors are evaluated by candidates at the end of their practicum.

Findings on Standards

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