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

June 2015

Overview of This Report

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

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

NCATE Unit/CTC Common Standards

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

Educator Preparation Programs offered at CSU Long Beach

Programs	Total # of Program Standards	Number of Program Standards		
		Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
Multiple Subject including Intern	19	19		
Single Subject including Intern	19	19		
Bilingual Authorization – Spanish	6	6		
Bilingual Authorization – Asian	6	6		
Adapted Physical Education (incl. undergraduates)	14	14		
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate including Intern	22	22		
Education Specialist Moderate/Severe including Intern	24	24		
Clear Education Specialist	7	7		
Added Authorization in Special Education – Autism Spectrum Disorder	3	3		
Clinical Rehabilitation Services Speech Language Pathology	8	8		
Administrative Services, Preliminary	15	15		
Administrative Services, Clear	9	9		
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	32	32		
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology	27	27		
Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work	25	25		
Teacher Librarian	9	9		
Reading Certificate	10	10		

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 Long Beach

Dates of Visit: April 26-28, 2015

Accreditation Team
Recommendation: Accreditation

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

NCATE/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 California State University, Long Beach. 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, and program completers. Based on the fact that all 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	Administrative Services
Multiple Subject	Preliminary
Multiple Subject Intern	Clear
Single Subject	Pupil Personnel Services
Single Subject	School Counseling
Single Subject Intern	School Psychologist
	School Social Work
Education Specialist	Clear Education Specialist Induction
Mild/Moderate Disabilities	
Mild/Moderate Disabilities Intern	Added Authorization in Special Education
Moderate/Severe Disabilities	Autism Spectrum Disorder
Moderate/Severe Disabilities Intern	
	Clinical Rehabilitative Services
Adapted Physical Education	Speech-Language Pathology
	Bilingual Authorization – Spanish or Asian
	Teacher Librarian
	Reading Certificate

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.

- California State University Long Beach be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

- California State University Long Beach 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
Joint NCATE-CTC Accreditation Team

NCATE Team Leader/Co-Chair: **Linda Barley**
York College/CUNY, New York

California Co-Chair: **Mark Goor**
University of La Verne

NCATE/Common Standards Cluster: **Chinaka DomNwachukwu**
Azusa Pacific University

Janet Gooch
Truman State College, MO

Johnathan Gillentine
Reverence Benjamin Parker School, HI

Kathleen Knutzen
California State University, Bakersfield

Basic/Teaching Programs Cluster: **Claudia Lockwood**
San Joaquin County Office of Education

Bob Loux
Stanislaus County Office of Education

Advanced/Services Programs Cluster: **Margaret Arthofer**
Association of California School Administrators

Stephen Hydon
University of Southern California

Staff to the Visit: **Larry Birch**, Consultant
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Erin Sullivan, Consultant
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog
Common Standards Report
Course Syllabi
Candidate Files
Fieldwork Handbooks
Follow-up Survey Results
Needs Analysis Results
Program Assessment Feedback
Biennial Report Feedback
Field Experience Notebooks
Schedule of Classes
Advisement Documents

Faculty Vitae
College Annual Report
College Budget Plan
TPA Data
Graduate Surveys
Employer Surveys
Faculty scoring calibration documents
Assessment Committee meeting minutes
Unit Assessment documents
Scoring Rubrics
Curriculum Mapping

Interviews Conducted

	TOTAL
Candidates	165
Completers	64
Employers	7
Institutional Administration	30
Program Coordinators	48
Faculty	68
TPA Coordinators	9
Advisors	18
Field Supervisors – Program	27
Field Supervisors – District	21
Credential Analysts and Staff	12
Advisory Board Members	32
Assessment Committee	19
Curriculum Committee	6
Total	526

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

The Visit

The California State University Long Beach site visit was held on the campus in Long Beach, California from April 26-28, 2015. This was a joint NCATE/CTC accreditation visit, utilizing the Continuous Improvement model for NCATE. The site visit team consisted of two co-chairs, one appointed by NCATE and one appointed by CTC, 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, four Program Standards members. Two Commission consultants accompanied the visit. The NCATE and CTC teams met jointly on Sunday, April 26, 2015 and participated in interviews with constituents beginning on Sunday afternoon. Interviews continued throughout Monday, April 27, 2015. A mid-visit report was completed on Monday afternoon. On Monday evening, the full team met to discuss findings and make decisions on standards. The exit report was conducted at 11:30 a.m. on Tuesday, April 28, 2015.

CSULB Candidate and Completer Totals

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (2013-14)	Number of Program Completers (2012-13)
Multiple Subject with Intern	Initial	152	147
Single Subject with Intern	Initial	303	234
Bilingual Authorization – Asian	Advanced	18	1
Bilingual Authorization – Spanish	Advanced	41	20
Adapted Physical Education (incl. undergraduates)	Initial	40	16
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate with Intern	Initial	45	40
Education Specialist Moderate/Severe with Intern	Initial	10	9
Education Specialist Level II	Advanced	16	22
Added Authorization in Special Education – Autism Spectrum Disorder	Advanced	0	12
Clinical Rehabilitation Services Speech Language Pathology	Advanced	18	14
Administrative Services, Preliminary	Advanced	60	29
Administrative Services, Clear	Advanced	4	1
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	Advanced	54	25

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (2013-14)	Number of Program Completers (2012-13)
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology	Advanced	56	9
Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work	Advanced	16	23
Teacher Librarian	Advanced	47	18
Reading Certificate	Advanced	1	4

I. Introduction

I.1 Brief overview of the institution and the unit

California State University, Long Beach began as Los Angeles-Orange County State College in 1949. The campus was renamed Long Beach State College when it moved to its current location in 1952. In 1972, it became Long Beach State University and was renamed California State University, Long Beach in 1982. The campus sits on 323 acres about three miles from the Pacific Ocean. The university houses 7 academic colleges and the College of Continuing and Professional Education, 63 academic departments and programs, 24 centers, four institutes, and four clinics. The campus's primary service area is the greater Los Angeles Basin, a population base of more than 5 million.

CSU Long Beach is a public, urban, comprehensive university (Carnegie Classification Master's I) that provides undergraduate and graduate education to a highly diverse population, with an emphasis on teacher preparation and professional programs. At 35,586 students (Fall 2013), CSULB is one of the largest campuses in the CSU system and in the state. The institution is recognized nationally for its commitment to excellence and student success. In the most recent listing of the "Top 100 Degree Producers" by *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, CSULB is ranked ninth in the nation in conferring baccalaureate degrees to minority students. Its largest ethnic/racial group – Hispanic – comprises about 33% of the student body. CSULB is an Hispanic-Serving Institution with the award of a five-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education that provides catalytic funding for a variety of programs supporting student success. Confirming its status as one of the most diverse campuses in the nation, CSULB is among the top 10 universities nationally in both the number of master's degrees and the number of bachelor's degrees awarded to Hispanics. Additionally, its Asian/Asian-American student population (about 22%) has helped CSULB earn eligibility for the federal AANAPISI program (Asian American Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution). All of this sets a rigorous context in which educator preparation takes place, and in which faculty and staff collaborate for continuous improvement.

The Unit consists of the College of Education (CED) and Affiliated Programs for a total of 25 programs. The three affiliated programs are housed in the College of Health and Human Services. All programs in the Unit participate in the Unit Assessment System. No programs are offered off-campus entirely, although some programs have off-campus cohorts. The UTEACH program offers most courses off-campus but is operated as a delivery model of the Multiple Subject program. No programs are delivered entirely online. Currently, 14 courses are offered online in various semesters in six different programs.

While enrollment trends show a significant decrease in the number of candidates over the last 5 years, the trend is slowly beginning to reverse as local districts begin hiring larger numbers of teachers and other specialists. Similarly, although the number of faculty and staff decreased over the last several years when retirements and departures were not replaced, colleges are now beginning to hire more faculty as funding becomes more robust system-wide. The CED has 57 tenure-track faculty, 40 staff, and 70 part-time faculty members.

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided visit (i.e., join visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?
The state partnership provides for a joint visit. A team from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) worked alongside the NCATE Board of Examiners (BOE) team to complete program-level reviews. Two of the five BOE team members were state team members; these two state team members are from California and have completed BOE training. The CTC (state) team chair coordinated all activities with the chair of the BOE team, both before and during the onsite visit. There were no deviations from CTC's state protocol.

I.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning. Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).
While no programs are offered off-campus entirely, some programs have off-campus cohorts. The UTEACH program offers most courses off-campus but is operated as a delivery model of the Multiple Subject program.

I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.
There were no unusual circumstances during the visit.

II.   Conceptual Framework

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

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

California State University, Long Beach, is a metropolitan comprehensive institution serving a rich and diverse community. The Conceptual Framework identifies the philosophy, knowledge base, purposes, professional commitments, and dispositions that drive program development, teaching, and scholarship in the unit. Seven key ideas, enumerated in their Mission Statement, undergird the vision and define the essentials of the knowledge base upon which CSULB builds its programs and practice: effective pedagogy, evidence-based practices, collaboration, leadership, innovation, scholarship, and advocacy. Each of these ideas encapsulates a solid research base, and is broad enough to include a range of theories and activities across programs in the CED.

All programs have a thoughtfully sequenced set of courses and field experiences that prepare candidates to demonstrate effective practices in their respective areas. Performance expectations are aligned with state standards for credential programs, national and professional standards, CSU system and campus expectations, and the values and principles articulated in the Conceptual Framework. Course syllabi contain the unit theme and mission statements, and faculty routinely review these statements at the beginning of each semester and conduct in-class activities to ensure candidate understanding. Class activities, course assignments, and field experiences reflect the key ideas of the Conceptual Framework in order to provide overall coherence to programs and ensure that candidates are well prepared when they complete their professional preparation and development. Faculty, staff, and administrators work together to ensure that candidates and the professional community understand the unit's Conceptual Framework. The Conceptual Framework was reaffirmed by the Faculty Council in Spring 2014.

Building on this, the CED Strategic Plan articulates clear operational and programmatic priorities for the college. Developed by the Administrative Leadership Group in collaboration with Faculty Council and the Staff Advisory Council and reviewed annually, the Strategic Plan has five goals: 1) Assess Operations and Infrastructure, 2) Support Faculty Research and Scholarship, 3) Collaborate for Program Improvement, 4) Promote Access and Student Success, and 5) Support Staff Professional Development. Each goal has an identified Steward, and contains several concrete Objectives.

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 Unit Assessment System (UAS) is designed to measure candidate performance in each of the elements of NCATE Standard 1 using Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) linked to signature assignments scored with rubrics (4-point scale, with 4 being highest). Aggregate scores in every area are above 3.60 with the strongest being in Professional Knowledge and Skills. Data are disaggregated within programs by delivery mode or off-campus offering. At the program level, nearly all scores are 3.5 or higher (highest scores in advanced programs for teachers and other school professionals).

All final scores for signature assignments collected at the program level are converted to a 0-4 score (rubrics were provided). All program learning outcomes are mapped to college, university, state and national standards. Program-level summary data are reviewed and interpreted by the College of Education Assessment Committee. Data by degree type indicate strong performance (average of 3.0 on 4.0 scale) for candidates.

All licensing programs in the unit are approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) through a seven-year accreditation cycle. All programs participated in the Program Assessment process. Biennial reports to the CTC were submitted in 2009 and 2011, and 2014 and were available for review.

Content knowledge for initial program candidates is ensured, given that all candidates have completed either a major in the subject area of their credential, or passed an examination demonstrating their subject matter competence. Upper division content courses must be passed with a grade of C or better.

Candidates in advanced credential and graduate programs hold an initial teaching credential, a requirement in advanced services credential programs and some M.A. programs. Content knowledge for applicants to M.A. and M.S. programs is confirmed at admission. Successful candidates have a Bachelor's degree and typically some experience in education or allied fields. School-related experiences and content background are demonstrated through their Personal Statements, resumes, writing sample, letters of recommendation and responses during admission interviews.

Pass results for Subject Matter Exams for Teachers were reported in the unit's 2014 Title II report. Pass rates in 2013-2014 were lower on some subtests (Mathematics Subtests, Science, RICA) than for the 3 years previous (e.g., Mathematics Subtest I pass rate was 71 percent for 2013-2014 and 100 percent for the previous three years but remain satisfactory.

On admissions, a majority of programs require candidates to take the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST). Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist Programs require that applicants attempt the CBEST or otherwise show that they have met the basic skills requirement, as a requirement for admission to the program. Candidates must meet the basic skills requirement to advance to student teaching. On exiting the program, documentation is reviewed to ensure each candidate passed this requirement, which can be met in several ways (pass CBEST, pass CSET + Writing, achievement of a certain score on California High School Exit Exam, achievement of certain scores on college entrance placement exams in Math and English).

Pedagogical content knowledge is assessed through coursework and at multiple points in the program: initially in undergraduate content coursework, and later in program coursework in initial and advanced programs. Three years of aggregate scores for assessments aligned with pedagogical content knowledge across the unit were available and ranged from 3.49-4.0 (program biennial reports – Yellow Tables).

Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are assessed during fieldwork and clinical experiences using both formative and summative evaluations. Multiple and single subject programs align clinical assessments with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Collective scores on these assessments ranged from 3.58-3.67 for the educational specialist and multiple and single subject programs and from 3.64-3.81 for the advanced programs. Formative assessments occur throughout each program. Graduates of the program were able to talk about formative assessments, the rubrics used for grading and the system of feedback. Curricular maps for each program were available and indicated where major concepts are taught and assessed. Each program has assignments and activities that require candidates to demonstrate understanding of student development and learning, strategies to engage all students, ways of making the curriculum accessible, and assessments to monitor progress.

First-try pass rates on the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA) were available for a 3 year time frame and ranged from 89-93 percent. This test is required of candidates in multiple and single subject programs prior to being recommended for a license.

Professional dispositions are examined by initial and advanced programs by different means at varying points. Some programs, for example, Psychology, reported the use of individual or group interviews as part of the admission process, where faculty consider applicants' perspectives on teaching and learning, students and families, and their goals and values. Multiple subject programs use a disposition self-assessment as part of the admissions process.

All initial and advanced certification programs have signature assignments that assess dispositions. The assignments are mapped to Student Learning Outcomes and when appropriate one or more of the SLOs are mapped to professional dispositions. Programs provide data from signature assignments that assess dispositions in different ways within the biennial reports. The IR and the IR-Addendum provided templates for collecting disposition data. A1.17, A1.12, A1.14, A1.5, A2.3, and A2.6 contain the templates that are used. Data are collected and aggregated by academic year, and in some cases are aggregated for a three year period. The www.cedcsulb.edu/assessment/program-assessment-documents link contains dispositional data by academic year for single subjects, multiple subjects, advanced program and other school personnel. For example, the single subject programs reported aggregated data for student learning outcome SLO6 that maps to professional dispositions over 3 years. Multiple subject programs reported data for one year only. Early Childhood Education reported aggregated data for SLO7 that maps to professional dispositions for 3 years but provided trend data for only 2 years. Data is available in the biennial reports but not all programs are providing data over a 3 year time frame, trend data, or analysis and/or interpretation of the data.

Signature assignments, aligned with SLOs reveal that dispositional data vary from program to program. For example, the number of dispositional items vary from eleven for the single subjects to eight for multiple subjects, which suggests a lack of continuity in the presentation, assessment and reporting of dispositional data. The disposition scores are not accompanied by analyses or descriptions of how the data are used to drive program and/or unit improvement.

In on-site interviews, graduates from various programs had difficulty providing examples of signature assignments that assessed professional dispositions. Most graduates had difficulty articulating what was meant by "professional dispositions". Examples of professional dispositions ranged from "professional dress, being respectful of others, working collaboratively in groups". When interviewed, graduates, faculty and chairs lacked a common definition of "professional dispositions". Constituencies were unable to articulate that dispositions are the values, commitments, and professional ethics that influence behaviors toward students, families, colleagues, and communities and that affect student learning and achievement, motivation and development, as well as the educator's own professional growth. The lack of common language to discuss professional dispositions may be a barrier to a clear and comprehensive process for informing students about professional dispositions, assessing professional dispositions, and using data for continuous improvement.

It is unclear how the data collected from instruments to assess professional dispositions are used. For example, it is not clear if the use of the admissions interview rubric score in Psychology is used to make program admission decisions or to identify students who are "at risk" in this area, and if so, how. It is not clear how the "Self-Assessment of Dispositions for Teaching in the Multiple Subject program is used. Interviews with faculty and leadership did not clarify a process for how professional dispositions are monitored and assessed throughout the program and what systems are in place for remediation if candidates are not meeting expectations.

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

Trends in biennial reports reflect some programs' strengths in signature assignment alignment with state and national standards and the use of data to make informed decisions regarding candidates' performance. The 2014 Program Improvement Update describes the continued challenge of data management. The assessment system collects data on the performance of each candidate on signature assignments, including not just a final grade, but also scores on rubric-level criteria. Three of the programs use Taskstream for this purpose, while other programs use custom-designed Excel spreadsheets. The college continues to work on developing a custom database for assessment. The unit has been engaged in continuous improvement since its last visit. Examples of improvement included efforts to increase candidate preparation to teach English learners and students with special needs and to improve critical writing. Faculty, chairs and graduates confirmed the increased support for students in the area of writing. The unit has been engaged in a focused revision of courses, assessments and programs based on various program data, the Common Core State Standards, and with changes made to the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). This was reinforced by Chairs in on-site interviews and by district partners. Other areas of focus include responding to the needs of candidates through the development and offering of online or hybrid courses, improvements to clinical experiences, and identifying and improving obstacles identified by candidates as obstacles to student success. These initiatives were confirmed by the Dean, the Provost and the President during on-site interviews.

1.2.b. Areas of strength.

Areas of strength include the preparation of candidates to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals in content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge and skills. Data presented demonstrates that candidates are well prepared in these areas. Graduates reported satisfaction with their level of preparedness in these areas. Advisory board members and district partners expressed satisfaction with candidates and reported a high percentage of alumni currently teaching in their schools/districts.

1.3.a. Areas for Improvement

AFI:
The unit does not ensure that all candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions to help all students learn.

Rationale:
Candidates, faculty and leadership did not articulate a common definition of professional dispositions that informs the teaching, assessment and evaluation of education candidates.

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?

CSU Long Beach's unit assessment system (UAS) is comprised of student learning outcomes, curriculum maps, assessment plans, assessment flow charts, signature assignments with rubrics, and a data collection process that addresses candidates' performances and perceptions of program quality. The data collection process spans the following: data interpretation, data reporting, and data-driven program improvement decisions (see Exhibit 2.4.a, Unit Assessment System Visual). The UAS assessment infrastructure is comprised of the Assessment Committee, Assessment Office, website, professional development process, and an electronic system comprised of Task Stream, Excel files, and other technology tools. The unit analyses individual candidate performances on learning outcomes, candidate retention and attrition rates, and candidate performance at program transition points. The process moves from candidate-level analysis to program-level analysis, where aggregated data on candidate performance and satisfaction, program quality, and resources are collected and analyzed. At the unit level, aggregated data on candidate performance, satisfaction, retention and progress, as well as unit budget and operations, are analyzed. The unit's standing Assessment Committee which oversees the assessment processes included members of the Assessment Committee and representatives from P-12 partnerships. The current P-12 partner represents the Long Beach Unified School District and manages assessment for the district. This person was involved with the development of the assessment system from its inception in 2007. P-12 Advisory members in specific credential programs are actively involved in shaping signature assignments and clinical practice assessments.

The UAS is integrated across programs and reflect professional standards and university expected outcomes. Programs that are outside of NCATE and CTC scope of examination include the following: PPS School Work + CWA, B.A. in Liberal Studies, M.A. in Education Psychology, M.S. in Marriage and Family Therapy, M.A. in Social Cultural Analysis of Education, M. S. in Student Development in Higher Education and Educational Leadership. The UAS is developmental in nature, and a periodic evaluation of the assessment system itself is conducted by the unit and data from such evaluations have resulted in changes and improvement that led to the creation and enhancement of the Assessment Office.

Student learning outcomes (SLOs) are mapped onto the programs' assessment plans and to the elements of the conceptual framework and university, state, national, and NCATE standards. At the on-site visit, Program Directors and Department Chairs provided detailed history of the development of the assessment system, which began with aligning the unit conceptual framework, program professional standards, and university outcomes, and then mapping them to signature assignments for each program. Data is collected every semester on signature assignments. Programs review the data and make program improvement decisions based on these data. The unit regularly and systematically uses data, including candidate and graduate performance information, to evaluate the efficacy of its courses, programs, and clinical experiences.

The unit has implemented a 4-point rubric for scoring signature assignments. To accommodate for academic freedom, the unit operates a conversion system which allows faculty members to apply their own point scales or rubrics. It is further stated that data are reported for rubric criteria based on these scales and converted to a 0-4 scale for aggregation across the college. The faculty members are required to calibrate around given signature assignments and rubrics. Evidence verifying the calibration process in light of their individual grading scales and the reliability of this process has been provided in the form of training agendas. The unit has recently implemented a workshop they call, "Beyond Compliance Workshop" where faculty members get together yearly for recalibration on scoring rubrics, looking at assessment data and using them to make program improvement decisions. Programs and faculty from other California State Universities have been invited to attend these workshops.

The Electronic Exhibit Room section titled, "Assessment Documents and Data by Programs," provides clear and consistent information on individual program assessment plans, curriculum maps, scoring rubrics for all signature assignments, as well as three years of assessment data for signature assignments and other assessment reports. While three years of aggregated data for Signature Assignments are provided by all programs, the unit did not provide three years of candidate dispositions data.

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

The unit is moving towards target in regularly and comprehensively gathering, aggregating, summarizing, and analyzing assessment and evaluation information on the unit's operations across all programs in most areas. The unit has plans for moving forward in many areas, including the following: (a) Faculty calibration and norming of scoring - Using the Beyond Compliance workshop, the unit will intensify trainings on scoring calibration and norming of all assessment practices; (b) Measurement of Candidate Impact on P-12 students – The unit has fully implemented survey of graduates and their employers using both internal surveys and the CSU California Teacher Quality (CTQ) evaluations. Plans are being developed for measuring candidate and graduate impact on the P-12 population; and (c) Strategic Plan from the office of

Assessment, the unit has put in place a plan for moving the assessment process in the unit to the next level through enhanced involvement of P-12 partners, additional assessment resources to chairs and Program Directors.

The plan includes the goal to "promote variability in data to make data more useful to programs" (Strategic Goals 2015-20). Next steps include working towards a unified understanding of the unit Conceptual framework across all programs, and ensuring that all assessed elements in the program assessments align with the unit conceptual framework and the specific program standards. The unit continues to explore (new) platforms outside of Task Stream, Excel files and File Maker Pro in an effort to move towards a more unified technology platform for data collection, analysis, and dissemination.

The unit provided clear and convincing evidence of target level performance as follows: the unit its plans to sustain its data collection, analyses and reporting of program and unit level to its stakeholders; continuance of calibration training for full-time and part-time faculty and continued efforts to norm rubrics for signature assignments; and continued refinement of assessment planning to effectively use multiple assessments from internal and external sources consistently.

2.2.b. Strengths

The unit regularly involves its professional community partners in evaluating the capacity and effectiveness of the unit assessment system. Following its calendar of assessment reporting, the UAS provides regularly data on program quality, unit operations, and candidates' performance at each stage of its programs, extending into the first year following program completion.

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 2 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 2 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 2: Met

STANDARD 3: FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE
The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

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

The unit effectively collaborates with partners in evaluating field and clinical placements. A variety of district partners and school personnel indicated that communication with the unit is

effective and consistent regarding field and clinical placements, general recommendations for candidate support, and specific needs for individual candidates. They indicated three avenues for this communication: surveys; joint partnership meetings, and constant, two-way feedback between the unit and its partners.

The Service Experiences for ReVitalizing Education (SERVE) office is staffed by two individuals: the Director and the Support Specialist for Clinical Partnerships. They both report to the associate dean. SERVE works primarily with the undergraduate Liberal Studies students to ensure appropriate placements for those students enrolled in SERVE-related courses. The Teacher Preparation Advising Center (TPAC) has a director who reports to the associate dean. Within the TPAC, the staff advisors for the undergraduate Liberal Studies program, the Integrated Teacher Ed Program (ITEP), and the basic credential programs are housed. TPAC serves candidates in the basic credential programs from intake through completion. SERVE and TPAC interact when they support common candidates in the Liberal Studies program. Representatives from each office attend the monthly ITEP Coordination meeting, held by the Department Chair of Liberal Studies. This allows the two offices to ensure that their shared undergraduates are receiving the same information and advising and that any new initiatives are vetted appropriately.

In advanced programs, field experiences are program specific and are described in program handbooks. For example, in the Early Childhood program, candidates all work in a preschool setting. They must complete 10-12 hours of fieldwork per course. For Dual Language Learning, candidates are required to have access to students who are dual language learners to complete fieldwork.

Candidates in preparation programs for other professional disciplines conduct fieldwork in clinical, teaching, or administrative settings under the supervision of the site administrator or his/her administrative designee. Field supervisors must possess credentials in the area in which they are supervising. When field experiences are conducted at a site/level other than the candidate's own site, the university coordinator collaborates with the candidate and district administrative representative to assign appropriate placements with experienced administrative site supervisors. Candidates for other school professionals programs confirmed fieldwork requirements. Pupil Personnel School Psychology candidates complete two field experiences: practicum (450 hours) and fieldwork/internship (1200 hours). Speech-Language Pathology candidates complete 400 hours of direct contact to achieve clinical certification. Pupil Personnel School Social Work candidates complete 600 hours of supervised field education in a school setting. Pupil Personnel School Counseling candidates complete 600 hours in two semesters of fieldwork.

Candidates in all advanced programs are assessed at all transition points, including signature assignments, fieldwork, and culminating activities. All students in a MA/MS program must successfully complete a thesis, project, or comprehensive examination as their culminating activity. Candidates from various Master of Arts programs confirmed similar requirements, including signature assignments, an action research study, and a comprehensive exam or

thesis. Ed. D. candidates confirmed that key assessments included signature assignments, a qualitative research project, a policy paper, and a dissertation. Speech-Language Pathology candidates complete signature assignments and submit SMAKS forms (Self-Managed Assessment of Knowledge and Skills), which track clinical requirements. On the advanced programs exit survey, 98 percent of candidates either strongly agree or agree that their program "facilitated my reflection on my personal values and dispositions."

Only candidates in Speech-Language Pathology were able to articulate how they were assessed on their dispositions, including interacting with clients and other clinical personnel. The primary method of assessment is through the SMAKS, but peer assessments and clinical assignments are also used to assess dispositions. Following up on the Off-Site Report and the IR-Addendum, interviewees were asked to describe their training to serve as a site supervisor. Interview results suggest there is not a unit /program level approach to this process.

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

Curriculum and fieldwork have been enhanced in the last two years to strengthen instruction for English learners, students from various cultures and backgrounds, and students with disabilities. In initial credential programs, several of these changes have been made in response to 2013 requirements from the CTC to improve interns' readiness to teach English learners or to increase candidates' opportunities to teach English learners during clinical practice. Revisions have also centered on incorporating the Common Core State Standards, with a focus on learning how to provide access for all students to the core curriculum. Master of Arts programs for advanced candidates in the Teacher Education Department have made revisions to their courses to incorporate CCSS, and to ensure that candidates working with diverse students have opportunities to apply CCSS concepts in these settings. For example, the revisions to the syllabus in Curriculum and Instruction addressed CCSS (see exhibit A4.1). The Math Education program also held a Math at the Beach workshop in Spring 2014 that focused entirely on CCSS concepts and strategies (see exhibit A4.4). The presenters were graduate students in the program. Candidates confirmed that this event addressed access to the core curriculum for diverse learners.

The unit has partnered with Long Beach USD to establish UTEACH, an urban teaching academy, which is based in three elementary schools. The goal of this residential clinical model is to provide initial teacher preparation within the context of a practical experience in an urban school setting and establish effective teams of candidates working in collaboration with master teachers in low-income, diverse schools. Within the UTEACH model, student teachers participate in a clinical experience for the entire year, including sixteen weeks each in both upper grade and primary grade placements, providing them the opportunity to learn about different levels of development. In this setting, many student teachers are paired with another student teacher in the same classroom along with a master teacher. Student teachers reported that the experience helps them build confidence by checking in daily with their paired

colleague. Furthermore, this collaboration allows them to plan together, share ideas, observe each other and then incorporate new ideas, and debrief in a comfortable setting. Some student teachers indicated that they were paired with someone of a different teaching style, which provided them the opportunity to reflect on their approach to teaching, consider what their strengths and weaknesses are, and how they might learn from their peer to improve their teaching practice. Paired student teachers also engage with other pairs for various purposes. For example, four student teachers have opportunities to conduct unit planning together specific to the grade level in which they are all placed.

Partnerships with local school districts have also advanced other initiatives. For example, unit and district faculty collaborate on the design of STEM teacher preparation to ensure high quality in both program design and student achievement. Unit personnel meet each semester with district and school partners, including personnel from human resources and those responsible for placing student teachers for the purpose of sharing best practices and challenges in their work.

The Pupil Personnel School Counseling Program has made improvements to its cohort model in order to better track candidates and support their clinical experience. The unit now encourages applicants to be full-time students and finish in two years, although some take two and a half years. Candidates now take the majority of their classes together at school sites, forming a stronger, more supportive cohort. For fieldwork, the program assigns candidates in teams to specific school sites, and they work together with the school's faculty, staff and students on a Participatory Action Research (PAR) Project examining a persistent social justice issue at the school. The fieldwork candidates advise the school community on the PAR project throughout the semester. Candidates confirmed that their engagement in social justice issues has been an informative experience.

The hiring criteria for Professional Education Instructors and Field Supervisors in the initial credential programs have recently been established. These criteria now align with university requirements and with NCATE and CTC standards. They also allow program coordinators and department chairs to select and hire well-qualified instructors and supervisors (see exhibit A3.1). Qualifications for Master Teachers and general expectations for their role were placed in a separate document since they do not serve as hiring criteria, according to university policy. These qualifications will be added to, or aligned with, existing program handbooks, effective fall 2015 (see exhibit A3.2).

In order to implement Linked Learning on a sustainable basis in the single subject credential program the unit has taken several steps. Sections of EDSE 436 (Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment, and Classroom Management) are held on high school campuses in partner districts. The original Linked Learning pilot program showed strong results from this format, thus the pilot has been adopted by the unit. Linked Learning content was infused in EDSS 300 (Introduction to Teaching), EDSE 435 (U.S. Secondary Schools: Intercultural Education), EDSE 436, and EDSS 450 (Curriculum and Methods in Teaching). For some of these courses, fieldwork assignments also allow candidates to employ Linked Learning concepts. Finally, ongoing

professional development on Linked Learning was offered to program faculty and students in existing venues (Single Subject Credential Program Summits, Student Teacher Professional Development Days).

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 3 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 3 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 3: Met

STANDARD 4: DIVERSITY

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

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

Each of the unit's programs has developed student learning outcomes (SLOs) that are aligned with university outcomes of Knowledge and Respect for Diversity. Candidates report on exit surveys that they feel well prepared to work with diverse students in urban settings. Data from the 2013 Student Success Survey (N = 616) show that candidates find that diversity plays a key role in their learning: 97 percent strongly agree or agree that "my program emphasizes respect for students from all racial, ethnic, social, and economic backgrounds;" and 78 percent "Very Often" or "Often" included diverse perspectives (race, religion, gender, etc.) in class assignments. Data from this survey were also disaggregated by candidate ethnicity and race (i.e., under-represented minorities and non-under-represented minorities) to look for disparities or gaps in candidates' experiences in the unit. There was little difference in how candidates from these groups reported their experiences. For example, 71 percent of under-represented minorities strongly agree that their program "emphasizes respect for students from all racial, ethnic, social, and economic backgrounds," and 75 percent of non-under-represented minorities strongly agree with the statement (2013 Student Success Survey, Question 2 Item 2; total N= 365).

The unit makes a concerted effort to place advanced candidates in settings that provide experiences with diverse students. The unit reviews these placements over time to insure that a range of placements provide candidates needed experiences with a variety of diverse students. For example, speech language pathology candidates are provided a wide selection of opportunities to work with diverse clients, including hospitals, schools, and campus clinics (for students and other clients needing speech/language pathology services for articulation,

phonology, language disorders, autism, motor-speech disorders, adult language disorders, or for culturally or linguistically diverse clients). Placements are also made in clinics in various communities and cities near the unit. In the Education Specialist II program, candidates work with children from a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds in addition to children with Autism Spectrum Disorders. All program assignments relate to the diverse characteristics of children in her classroom and how support their success in learning. Dual Language candidates are required to complete an ethnographic assignment, a case study on dual language learning, and a research paper on diversity. Candidates also adapt lessons based on the knowledge acquired through these assignments. All of the advanced candidates interviewed indicated that some aspects of diversity (race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, linguistic diversity, or students with disabilities) were reflected in placement settings.

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

Curriculum and fieldwork have been enhanced in the last two years to strengthen instruction for English learners, students from many cultures and backgrounds, and students with disabilities. Programs for advanced candidates in the Teacher Education Department have made course revisions to incorporate CCSS, and to ensure that candidates working with diverse students have opportunities to apply CCSS concepts in these settings. For example, the revisions to the syllabus in Curriculum and Instruction addressed CCSS (see exhibit A4.1). The Math Education program also held a Math at the Beach workshop in Spring 2014 that focused entirely on CCSS concepts and strategies (see exhibit A4.4). The presenters were graduate students in the program. Advanced candidates confirmed that this event addressed access to the core curriculum for diverse learners.

As part of the Long Beach College Promise, the university has developed transfer agreements with community colleges in its attendance area that articulate clear pathways for their students to enter the undergraduate programs leading to credentials. Currently, the unit has a transfer agreement that is active with Cerritos College (see exhibit A4.5). Seven other nearby colleges are covered under a more recent set of transfer agreements established across the CSU system through state law (SB 1440). All of these transfer agreements help ensure that a diverse group of local community college students enter the undergraduate program. For example, in Fall 2014, 117 students transferred to the College of Education. Of those, 64 were Latino/a, 13 were Asian/Pacific Islander, and 27 were Caucasian.

The unit's continued support for bilingual credential programs, both the Bilingual Spanish and Asian Languages Added Authorization (BILA) provides evidence of the unit's dedication to supporting diversity in programs and to increasing candidate diversity. Several examples of continued support include: continued participation in the CSU's Asian Languages system-wide consortium; cross-program collaboration between the BILA program and the Multiple Subjects Credential Program and the Dual Language Development MA program; advising and

recruitment support for BILA candidates through the Teacher Preparation Advising Center (TPAC); and assessment support for BILA candidates through the unit's Assessment Office.

The TED tool kit was created to inform faculty and supervisor practice, in terms of how they deepen practice over the course of the program. The tool kit includes a list of knowledge and skills for teaching English Learners and students with disabilities, organized by course. For example, the tool kit includes the skill "monitor teacher speech" slower, clearer, reduced idioms/slang" for supporting candidates working with students who are learning English (see exhibit A4.6 TED Toolkit). The tool kit was created by faculty in order for them to imbed these competences into their syllabi and to ensure that these strategies are addressed systematically throughout the program. The tool kit reflects the unit's core belief system in meeting the needs of all learners. Supervisors interviewed indicated that the tool kit helped them provide more effective support to their candidates in terms of their development of in-depth thinking and connections for their English language learners. They also stated that the tool kit helps unit faculty support candidates as they prepare for TPA assessments.

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 4 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 4 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 4: Met

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?

The professional education unit is comprised of 54 full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty, all with either a Ph.D. or Ed.D. The unit also employs five full-time lecturers, 47 part-time lecturers, and 119 clinical faculty members. The clinical faculty providing the fieldwork supervision is comprised of primarily adjunct faculty (93 of 119 supervisors). The selection criteria and qualifications for part-time lecturers are provided, as well as the expectations for these clinical faculty. The department chair and program coordinators hire part-time faculty from an applicant pool maintained by the campus. The unit has required qualifications for all lecturers and clinical faculty which include a master's degrees or higher education experience, content expertise, and relevant practical experience. Fieldwork supervisors are expected to hold a credential in their area of supervision. Interviews provide support that procedures are in place to assure that adjunct faculty are aware of expected professional standards, including required signature assignments. Evidence provided in the IR indicates that all faculty hold appropriate professional qualifications and experiences relevant to their assignments in either

the initial or advanced programs. As outlined in the CSULB Faculty & Staff Diversity Plan, the University's four action areas seek to recruit, appoint, and retain a qualified, diverse faculty.

The IR states that the faculty engage candidates in a wide range of pedagogical strategies and learning experiences via face-to-face, hybrid, and online modalities. Interviews at the site visit confirm that a variety of cutting-edge technologies and active-learning pedagogies are used to enhance student learning. For example, faculty are implementing "flipped classrooms" and teaching in two new "active classrooms". Interviews provide evidence that faculty are engaged in collaborative partnerships with school partners. Both faculty and partners confirmed at the site visit that there are numerous examples of partnerships, including offering programs at school sites and working as partners with school districts on a number of grants.

Candidates indicate that faculty regularly model the use of technology in their courses and classroom assignments usually have a technology component. Candidates indicated they feel well prepared use instructional technology in P-12 classrooms. As indicated by the IR, professional education faculty publish and/or present on topics related to their areas of expertise, as well as engage in service to the P-12 community and various academic and professional organizations. Faculty serve on multiple committees at the program, Department, College, and University level. Faculty can apply for assigned time or small grants for research activities. Full-time faculty also receive travel funding to present at professional meetings. The Associate Dean of Research and Grants is available to assist faculty with writing and research methods and with editing of the final manuscript for submission. Faculty can present their research in CED hosted Brown Bag events.

University and college procedures for tenured and tenure-track faculty evaluation are presented along with faculty performance expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service. Those involved in evaluating faculty for performance, tenure, and promotion include faculty peers, the appropriate chair, dean, the College Review Committee, the provost, and the president. There is a university process for evaluation of lecturers. This applies to lecturers who hold appointments for two or more semesters.   In the IR, it is indicated that this process is handled by the department office.   The Department Chair conducts classroom observations and discusses the course evaluation with the lecturers. The use of a classroom observation was not confirmed at the visit. A department committee also reviews lecture evaluations and offers suggestions for improvement. As a part of the evaluation process, faculty are asked to "describe how they have used the feedback received at prior evaluation reviews to enhance their teaching, scholarship, and service". College based clinical faculty are evaluated by candidates and by the University fieldwork supervisor. Coordinators in the advanced programs visit sites to evaluate the placement compatibility. Interviews with the program coordinators and members of the Faculty Council provide evidence that the unit systematically evaluates faculty performance for all faculty. Part-time faculty evaluations could benefit from the development of clearer evaluation processes and timelines.

The exhibits provide evidence that many of the tenure-track and tenured faculty have published in the last three years. Sample publications demonstrate quality and currency in the

field. Both tenured faculty and lecturers are also engaged in a number of collaborative and community-based activities, demonstrating an engaged faculty. Faculty indicate there is a high level of collaboration between faculty across different programs that allow for continuous improvement in teaching, program revisions, and scholarship. Faculty is qualified and they collaborate with colleagues in other content areas on campus and in the local schools.

The college and the university provide significant support and mentorship for new faculty. Support is provided by the Faculty Center for Professional Development, faculty mentorship, and dean mentorship. Professional development opportunities are also available for all faculty in the college through sponsorship of monthly college meetings, program retreats, workshops and brown bag sessions. Full time faculty participate in monthly meetings at the department or college level where professional development activities are presented. Webinars, annual lecture series, and workshops are available to both full and part-time faculty. Interviews provide evidence that a wide range of topics have been presented. Part-time faculty are also invited to participate in program discussion meetings. Part-time fieldwork instructors in Social Work are required to obtain continuing education units, Education Specialists fieldwork supervisors meet twice a semester, lecturers who teach methods courses evaluated by the CAL TPA attend regular professional development sessions, and all part-time faculty are invited to an annual meeting. The unit also works collaboratively with some local school districts to provide professional development to university and school district personnel on co-teaching. The initiation of an online professional development network for master teachers and university supervisors is in progress. The unit facilitates professional development for all faculties.

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

The unit and university have implemented a number of strategies to support diversification of the faculty. Since 2011, 63 percent of the new hires in the college have been faculty from Asian, Latino, and African-American ethnic groups. The university has also put in place a strategic hiring plan and protocol which is based on a full-time equivalent student (FTES) model. The unit is anticipating an increase in FTES with the predicted teacher shortage and is planning for the possibility of new hires.
Examples of changes reflecting continuous improvement include providing additional professional development specifically in the areas of English learners, students with disabilities, and those at risk for school failure. This has been done by bringing in guest speakers and through regular discussion of these topics, as well as others, in the monthly CED meetings. Part-time and clinical faculty are also invited to all professional development events. The college has recently developed a dual inclusive teacher preparation pathway. This has required that additional professional development on effective practices for learners in urban classrooms be provided to both faculty and site supervisors.

The Department chairs in the unit developed a CED Mentoring document in Fall 2014 to guide them in their mentorship roles with faculty at multiple levels. Interviews with faculty confirm they receive mentoring from both program coordinators and chairs. Many courses are being modified for an online or hybrid format with the assistance and support of Instructional Technology Services. The College has also recently hired a Technology Integration Specialist to provide individual support for faculty. Faculty workload is also a focus of continuing improvement as teaching load and program coordinator responsibilities are regularly evaluated. The College has been the recipient of a number of grants (Linked Learning, S.D. Bechtel, OSEP Personnel) that have provided support for innovative curricular revisions which are sustainable and responding to changes in the field.

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

State Team Decision for Standard 5: Met

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

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

The Dean of the College of Education (CED) is the head of the education unit, which includes four academic departments: Liberal Studies, Teacher Education, Advanced Studies in Education and Counseling, and Educational Leadership. CED also has department chairs, two associate deans, a program coordinator, and various other staff members who contribute to unit administration. Additionally, CED is the administrative unit for nine single subject area programs.

The CED conducts business through the Faculty Council comprised of eight elected members from each department and the single subject program, as well as six additional ex-officio members. The council meets monthly to review and develop policy for various aspects of the unit. The Faculty Council members report they work closely with the Dean to work on strategic planning and provide input for CED discussion and review. In addition to the Faculty Council, there are eight standing committees of the council and two sub-committees (Budget and Financial Resources; Planning and Policy). The membership and responsibilities of these committees are clearly outlined in the CED constitution. CED faculty and administrators participate in the Educator Preparation Committee, which is an all-university Senate committee. The dean interacts with the community through the CED Advisory Committee, whose 18 members represent primarily local school districts and community college districts. The Advisory Committee meets quarterly to review assessment data and initiatives in the

College. Members report a very positive, collaborative relationship with CED and describe multiple joint projects with the College. The dean also meets monthly with the Superintendent of the largest local school district. There is also evidence that the unit head meets with staff members through a recently formed Staff Advisory Council. There is considerable opportunity for faculty involvement in governance through various university-wide committees. No part-time lecturers or clinical faculty serve on the committees, but minutes are available for all faculty (full and part-time) via a college web site. The Dean also sends out a Monday message to all faculty, staff, and community members highlighting activities in the Unit. All indicators suggest that the unit has the leadership and authority to plan and implement effective educator preparation programs.

A review of catalog, calendars, and other documents suggests that the unit keeps its program information accurate and current. There is a comprehensive application packet for each program which is accessible from the website. The college also provides information and advising through two offices. The Teacher Preparation and Advising Center works with initial candidates to assist them with applications, policies, and procedures. The Graduate Studies Office, housed in CED, provides advising for advanced candidates. Faculty also provide significant advising in the advanced programs.

The unit is allocated resources from the Provost's office based on the number of full-time equivalent students (FTES) and enrollment. A campus-based task force makes a budget recommendation to the President for distribution if additional funding is available. Divisions make budget presentations and provide enrollment growth projections and hiring plans. There is gap funding provided by the Provost to supplement the base budget and other funding is available for special designations (lottery, Student Excellence Fund, SURF). Information was provided on faculty and administrator salary allocations, which are about half of the allocation to the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics. The College maintains a centralized budget after distributing operation dollars to each department. The unit indicates they are provided sufficient funds based on historical enrollment trends and discipline specific student-faculty ratios.   There is a differentiation between undergraduate and graduate funding to account for the clinical nature of the graduate programs.   Tenure-track faculty teach eight courses a year and lecturers teach ten courses a year. Clinical workload assignments vary across the programs for supervision.

The unit provides support for technology, professional development, and candidate services through multiple avenues. Technology is supported in the unit through the use of annual lottery funds and a student technology fee, both of which have been applied to expand and upgrade computer labs, expand the multimedia equipment, and replace classroom furniture. A new staff person is also available to provide instructional technology support to faculty. Faculty confirmed they receive significant support from the university technical staff both for professional development and for individual technical problem solving. Professional development is available to all faculty via participation in monthly college meetings, Brown Bag sessions, sponsored lectures, course support for transformation to a hybrid format, and financial support for attendance at professional conferences (approx. $1000/faculty).

Professional development funds are available for faculty in the Ed. D. program for dissertations and Ed. D. faculty can also compete for funds in support of research and scholarship. Interviews with faculty provide evidence that faculty are receiving adequate financial support for professional travel and conference attendance.

CED and its faculty have multiple opportunities for funding at the university level. Faculty can apply for sabbaticals or other research funds. The Office of Research and Sponsored Projects provides funding for mini-grants, summer stipends, reassigned time for scholarly activity, and support for writing grant proposals. CED maintains a website on grants and contracts, but with no noted internal financial support component. The College has an Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Research to support faculty grant writing and research efforts. Fiscal support for faculty grant efforts has also been reorganized to better serve faculty. Additionally, internal and sabbatical opportunities for faculty have increased.

Candidate services are seen as adequate and are basically provided by the Teacher Preparation and Advising Center for the initial programs and a physical office restructure has brought multiple candidate services together (advising, field experiences, department offices, graduate studies, and credentials). The availability and effectiveness of these student support structures was corroborated during interviews with candidates. The University also provides significant student support across a wide spectrum of specialized areas.

The average faculty workload for fall semester 2013 was 13.08 weighted teaching units (WTU). Assistant professors and instructors teach more candidates in the programs, with student-to-faculty ratios (SFR) of 19.94 and 29.19, respectively, compared to 14.51 and 11.66 for professors and associate professors, respectively. Professors and associate professors both receive an average of 3 to 3.5 WTUs of indirect reassigned time. The unit employs several part-time lecturers and fieldwork supervisors. Faculty workloads appear to be consistent with California State University practices as well as accreditation expectations for educator preparation programs.

CED programs have access to adequate facilities and services through a campus-wide system for space allocation. The college has a facilities coordinator who manages this process for the faculty and programs. There are 185 classrooms on campus which are smart rooms and available for CED use. Also, the college is currently designing two active learning classrooms. The college has a systems specialist to provide lab and computer support, and the university library supports the education programs in many different ways.

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

CED has implemented a number of new initiatives to support continuous improvement in multiple areas. The assessment system has been strengthened to collect more data in a more systematic manner. The addition of an assessment analyst has provided staff support to assist

programs with the collection, organization, and presentation of the data. Two new assessments have been added in the areas of student success and alumni surveys. The dean is supporting and organizing an annual workshop on assessment and program improvement where faculty can share information on "closing the loop" and suggest pathways for continuous improvement and transformation. The college is also looking at developing a web-based system for advising and tracking candidates from admission to completion.

New staff positions have been created and hired in the areas of technology manager, graduate studies advising, and administrative support for the TPAC. The dean also formed a new Staff Advisory Council to provide for more professional development opportunities and to facilitate collaboration among staff. Starting in spring 2013, additional support for faculty research has been provided through endowment funds. Two new active learning classrooms have also been funded.

Since the last accreditation, there has been a reorganization of both programs and space. A new department was formed to house the doctoral and educational leadership programs (Department of Educational Leadership). The TPAC was created to combine services into one office to support initial credential candidates. The liberal studies program offices were moved to be closer to the TPAC, credential offices, and department offices. This was complemented by moving the fiscal staff to the vacated liberal studies area.

One of the key indicators of the improvement in governance and authority to run an effective educator preparation unit, was the consistency of answers across all stakeholder groups and programs, within this large and diverse professional education unit. All of these changes suggest that there has been continuous improvement in unit governance and resources since the last visit.

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 6 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 6 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 6: Met

The CTC Common Standards requirements not reflected in NCATE Unit Standards

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

CSU Long Beach implements and monitors a credential recommendation process through a Credential Center. There are three credential analysts and a Director who work with advisors and coordinators to communicate process, information, and timelines. Interviews with the credential analyst confirmed that the process was thorough and accurate. Accurate and complete files are maintained in a secured area and the analysts carefully monitor the progress of each individual candidate. Once a candidate opens a file in the credential office, they are entered into a database and all subsequent documentation of exam results, transcripts, fingerprint clearance, and admission letters become a part of their file. Credential evaluations are completed by the analysts to provide candidates with their current standing and/or credential recommendation outcome. Clear evidence was provided at the visit to confirm that admissions and credentialing procedures are highly integrated and carefully monitored.

State Team Decision for Standard 1.5: Met

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

Interviews with program completers, candidates and faculty confirmed that qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants. Candidates receive advice and assistance in the areas noted above from professional staff advisors, program coordinators, and faculty.   Walk-in advising is available as well as appointments with any of the nine professional staff advisors.   Multiple Subject candidates are mostly advised by program coordinators or staff, Single Subject candidates primarily by program coordinators, Education Specialist candidates primarily by faculty, and advanced programs primarily by faculty. Students also receive information on credential and graduate degree program information from the Credential Center and the Graduate Studies Office.

State Team Decision for Standard 6.1: Met

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

Information on all programs is available through the university catalog, program and university web sites, and print materials. In addition, candidates receive additional information at advising and orientation sessions.   Most candidates also receive program fieldwork handbooks early in the program which provides information on program requirements. When a candidate file is started in the credential office, candidates receive an evaluation of their current standing in program coursework.   This is repeated at the end of the program.

State Team Decision for Standard 6.2: Met

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

The unit has clearly-defined support and assistance systems in place for all credential programs. Candidates in the initial programs complete a self-assessment and they continue to be assessed throughout the program. Program faculty, field supervisors, and master teachers provide direct support and counseling to candidates who may be experiencing difficulty. In the advanced programs, program faculty monitor candidates in the courses and provide mentorship to aid candidates in their development. A remediation process is in place to assist struggling candidates. Upon completion of the remediation plan, candidates can re-apply to enter the program. Candidates who are unable to successfully complete program requirements after remediation are counseled out of the program. Additionally, candidates are expected to maintain a 3.0 GPA and are put on probation when it drops below. This is checked each semester. Candidates' rights and appeal processes are protected and governed by University policy. Interviews with candidates and program completers indicated a high level of support and assistance from program faculty, university supervisors, and fieldwork supervisors in all programs.

State Team Decision for Standard 6.3: Met

CREDENTIAL PROGRAMS

Preliminary Multiple Subjects Credential, with Intern

Program Design:

The Multiple Subjects Credential Program (MSCP) at CSU Long Beach operates as part of the College of Education. The Dean of the College of Education oversees the credential program with responsibilities delegated to associate deans, department chairs and program coordinators. The Multiple Subject Program coordinator reports to the chair of the Teacher Education Department, who reports to the dean of the college.

Collaboration is a hallmark of the teacher preparation program at CSU Long Beach with decision-making informed by multiple entities within the university. The Chair of Teacher Education meets monthly with Teacher Education Faculty to gather input on needed program changes, candidate outcome measures, and best practices. The Chair of Teacher Education and the Coordinator of the MSCP program meet regularly to discuss curriculum, instruction, and policy issues related to the program. Both the Program Coordinator and the Chair are members of the College Leadership Team which meets on a bi-weekly basis to discuss policies, resource planning, and collaborative activities among the various departments in the college. The Associate Dean, Chair of Teacher Education, and Program Coordinator serve on the University-wide Educator Preparation Committee which collaborates on university level policy issues as well as communication with the President's Office and the Academic Senate.

The MSCP has a long-term, well-established ongoing dialogue with the Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD) and 25 other schools districts within the CSULB service area. The university collaborates with these districts concerning field placements, student teaching placements, coursework in the MSCP Program, Teacher Education Department, and College of Education offerings. Interviews with principals provided information regarding the quality of the program and of the student teachers placed at their sites. Employers consider the student teachers valuable co-teachers at their school sites, providing additional talent to the teaching staff.

The MSCP has a Community Advisory Council consisting of students, district administrators, teachers, community members, as well as CSULB faculty and administrators. The mission of the advisory council is to provide advice to the Department of Teacher Education on the broad range of issues related to the credential program.

The MSCP features a structured, sequential spiraling curriculum organized in four phases. *Phase 1 (Pre-Requisite): Historical and Philosophical Foundations and Preparing to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom* lays the groundwork for candidates' understanding "big picture" ideas about what school is globally, in the United States, and in California. In *Phase 2 (Co-requisite): Child Development, Motivation and Learning, and Language and Cultural Foundations* candidates are required to attend a sequence of courses in which they develop a knowledge base in the following areas: child development and learning, family dynamics, health and physical education, healthy environments, child abuse and

reporting requirements, effective drug and alcohol prevention, school violence and conflict resolution, theories of motivation and learning, and the effect of schools and classrooms on student behavior. They also are provided the opportunity to develop sensitivity and appreciation for linguistic and cultural diversity. In *Phase Three: Subject-Specific Pedagogy in the Major Content* Areas candidates are provided opportunities to connect theory and practice with regard to pedagogical strategies related specifically to subject disciplines. Included are strategies to provide appropriate instruction to English Learners, specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE), strategies to integrate literacy and technology, and to differentiate instruction based on students' diverse needs. Finally, in *Phase Four: Student Teaching* candidates participate in increasingly more complex field experiences in clinical settings in public K-8 classrooms with the guidance, support and mentoring of TPA-trained student teaching supervisors. Candidates complete two student teaching assignments: one at the K-3 level and one at the 4-6 level. They plan daily lessons based on the Common Core State Standards and they organize and implement unit plans. It is in this phase that they apply the strategies learned in phase three.

In addition to the traditional MSCP program, the university offers a specialized clinical model of teacher preparation known as UTEACH (Urban Teaching Academy). Candidates combine pedagogy and practice in a personalized credential program designed to fully prepare future teachers in a hands-on supportive school setting. In this integrated clinically based program candidates learn and apply best practices immediately during their residential student teaching experience. In this year-long school-university residency program teaching methods courses are conducted at the school sites where candidates are performing their student teaching. The curriculum is consistent with that of the traditional program. Interviews with student teachers and graduate students confirm the positive aspects of this cohort-based program.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):
Candidates may choose one of three tracks to complete the Preliminary Multiple Subject Credential: post-baccalaureate, internship, or the Integrated Teacher Education Program (ITEP), a blended program in which candidates earn both a baccalaureate degree and teaching credential.

MSCP Candidates receive extensive advisement throughout the program. Beginning with an information meeting, candidates receive information on the MSCP, California credential requirements, and application procedures. Once admitted into the program, candidates participate in a "Journey" meeting which provides extensive information on program requirements, scheduling recommendations, professional examination requirements, and student teaching. Approximately six months prior to student teaching, candidates are required to attend a Student Teacher application meeting where the requirements for the culminating field experience and credential application process are covered in detail. The Teacher Preparation Advising Center is open year-round on an appointment, walk-in, email or phone basis to advise candidates on individual concerns.

The MSCP design includes a series of experiences designed to develop candidates' understanding of public school settings especially with diverse student populations. Instruction

in critical content areas for student populations with unique learning needs is evident throughout the program. A priority of the program is addressing the needs of English Learners and those students with unique learning needs, including those with disabilities. Each of a required series of five courses requires student observation of elementary classrooms for 10 hours each. Selected classrooms must include at least 25% of the students be classified as English Learners. Interviews with student teachers and graduates indicate that candidates feel particularly well-prepared to address the needs of this group of students. Candidates are also required to spend 45 hours tutoring an individual student in reading and math which includes the gathering and use of pre- and post-assessment data.

Field work at CSULB takes place in several configurations. During the early field experiences in the pre-requisite courses, candidates complete between 45 and 120 hours of field work, depending on their program. Candidates enrolled in pedagogy courses are required to complete a minimum of 10 hours of fieldwork per course.

Field supervision is a collaborative effort among program faculty, university supervisors, and site-based cooperating/master teachers. During the student teaching experience, the university supervisor observes each candidate once a week (or biweekly for ITEP Student Teachers) and holds a student teaching seminar once a week with the group of student teachers he or she is supervising. University supervisors conduct formative evaluations every four weeks and summative evaluations at the end of each student teaching assignment.

The UTEACH program involves a co-teaching model with two student teachers sharing classroom responsibilities for a full year under the supervision of a single classroom teacher and university supervising teacher. The student teachers attend classes as a cohort on the school site classroom during part of the day/week and teach the remainder of the time for a full year.

Cooperating teachers supervise all of the required hours and complete an evaluation of each student after each rotation. Cooperating teachers also complete an evaluation and certification that the candidate has completed the required fieldwork and faculty verify the completion of the required field assignments. University Faculty in off-campus methods courses also supervise and evaluate candidates on a weekly basis. Candidates who are having difficulties in their assignment will be placed on an Action Plan and Remediation Contract (if necessary) that is monitored on a weekly basis, by the Master Teacher, University Supervisor and the Program Coordinator. Master Teachers supervise the candidate on a daily basis and provide formative feedback during post lesson conferences.

Interviews of master teachers, student teachers, program graduates, and employers uniformly provided positive information regarding the quality of the MSCP. Master teachers consider the field work experience to be a collaborative effort with the student teachers being fully integrated into the life of the school. They attend all site meetings and professional learning events. Veteran staff value new information and instructional strategies that are brought in by student teachers. Employers enthusiastically share that they readily hire student teachers that have been assigned to their school sites when positions are available.

Assessment:
The MSCP uses the CalTPA system as the summative evaluation of candidate competencies. MSCP fieldwork is assessed by candidates' completion of course-specific TPEs and course-specific TPA tasks. Professional preparation coursework and field experiences are formatively assessed and summatively evaluated by multiple assessment strategies, such as exams, papers, journals, course projects, and participation in class discussion and activities. Authentic performance is assessed by instructional units, case studies, lesson plans, and other work drawn from fieldwork experiences. Fieldwork verification forms, required by each subject-specific pedagogy course and filled out by the cooperating teacher at the conclusion of the candidate's fieldwork experience, are submitted to the course instructor for evaluation. Each pedagogy course utilizes a signature assignment to assess student learning in individual courses while providing the program with feedback about student progress across the program.

Program candidates are introduced to the 4-task CalTPA system, including its structure, scoring rubrics, the pass/no pass cut, the high-stakes nature of the assessment, when and how to complete the tasks, and how to remediate and retake a task at the MSCP Orientation meeting and in the introductory program course. Candidates receive more specific instruction for each task in the task-aligned course. Candidates are notified of their scores via TaskStream approximately 6-7 weeks after the submission deadline. Candidates who do not pass one or more tasks are notified sufficiently in time to enroll in the Resubmission Course, during which they receive whole group and individual remediation and an opportunity to re-write and re-submit their task(s). Currently, candidates can re-submit a task an indefinite number of times.

Findings on Standards:
After a review of the institutional report and documentation, conducting interviews with faculty, university supervisors, employers, graduates and candidates, the team determined that all standards for the Preliminary Multiple Subjects Credential are **Met.**

Preliminary Single Subject Credential, with Intern

Program Design:
The overarching purpose of the Single Subject Credential Program (SSCP) is to prepare high quality beginning teachers who possess the knowledge, aptitudes and dispositions that will enable them to create and support the conditions necessary for meaningful, instrumental learning for all students so that they can become active citizens in a democratic, increasingly global, technology-driven society. The SSCP course and field experiences are based upon a theoretical and scholarly foundation that is relevant to contemporary conditions of school.

The single subject program is a university-wide program. Dr. Jared Stallones is the Coordinator for Single Subject programs. The program coordinator chairs meetings of the area coordinators and provides oversight to the program in conjunction with the Dean of the School of Education. There are also eight single subject area coordinators representing each of the content areas in

the university. All coordinators work closely with other College of Education faculty to ensure cohesion among the programs.

The program collaborates with 30 local school districts to provide opportunities for teaching candidates and student teachers to develop understanding of programs through observation and experience. The program also has developed relationships with foundations including Bechtel and the Irvine Foundation in pursuit of strengthening and augmenting programs to provide expanded opportunities for teaching and learning at the university level. Stakeholder input is provided through the SSCP Advisory Council, the Long Beach Education Partnership, the Linked Learning Alliance, and other means.

Interviews with graduates, student teachers, master teachers, and employers indicate that the candidates are very well prepared to work with diverse learners. Strategies to support the instruction of English Learners and special needs students are emphasized in all of the content areas.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):
The SSCP has three components: subject matter preparation, professional pedagogical preparation, and clinical practice. The program has eight Commission-approved subject matter programs that lead to credential programs: Art, English, Health Science, Languages Other Than English, Mathematics, Music, Physical Education, Social Science and Science. Subject matter programs vary in length from 35 to 75 units and are essentially undergraduate majors. Professional preparation is accomplished through a 45-unit set of courses with 27 units dedicated to foundational and pedagogical preparation and 18 units associated with the culminating clinical experience. The program also offers an Internship track with the same structure and unit load.

Prior to admission to the student teaching program, candidates must demonstrate subject matter competence, complete all program coursework, and be assessed for readiness for the final field experience. Included in the subject matter coursework is 75 hours of field work in which candidates observe students in a variety of settings including at least one in a linguistically diverse classroom. Required SSCP courses include a prerequisite 3-unit class (Introduction to Teaching), 12 units of co-requisite courses, twelve units of core/methods (Professional Preparation) classes, and 18 units of capstone classes which include student teaching and student teaching seminars.

In the culminating fieldwork, candidates teach a minimum of three class periods per day in at least two different grade levels or subject areas. The fieldwork requires completion of specific assignments designed to supplement and build on the associated coursework. Fieldwork builds competencies related to the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) in a sequential manner throughout the program.   Critical areas such as addressing the needs of English learners and exceptional learners are reinforced throughout the program. Interviews of student teachers, graduate students, master teachers, and employers indicate that candidates are well-prepared to provide instruction to students from all backgrounds.

Interviews of candidates, graduate students, and completers, showed a high regard for the quality of instruction in credential coursework. Candidates and completers expressed that they had acquired critical skills in the coursework phase that they were able to apply in the student teaching phase. The professional education coursework closely coordinates with the requirements for successful classroom practical experience. In interviews, employers communicated a high regard for graduates of the CSULB program. Principals state that they would hire any student teachers that have been placed at their sites should requisite vacancies exist. Student teachers are considered by employers to be part of the teaching staff and are included in all staff activities (e. g. professional learning activities, faculty meetings). Employers also expressed the additional benefit of having student teachers who frequently share new ideas and strategies with veteran staff at the site level.

Evidence of collaboration and support for candidates in the student teaching program is apparent through interviews of all involved. Interviews with candidates and supervising teachers indicate that candidates are well-supervised and supported. Supervising teachers are required to visit each candidate at least seven times during the semester. In fact, reports are that they observe the student teachers at least biweekly and frequently weekly. Triangulated meetings among the supervising teacher, master teacher and student teacher are included in these observational visits.

Assessment of Candidates:
Candidates are assessed in multiple ways at different stages of the program: for program entry, during program course work, for advancement to student teaching, and during student teaching.

Program applicants must submit the following evidence prior to admission to the program: evidence of a minimum grade point average of 2.67 overall (or 2.75 in the last 60 units), written evaluation of the candidate's fieldwork in the prerequisite *Introduction to Teaching* (EDSS 300) by a classroom teacher, written assessment of the candidate's aptitude and potential for teaching by the EDSS 300 instructor, an oral assessment interview by program faculty, two letters of recommendation attesting to character and potential for teaching, student self-assessment of professional dispositions, and achieving "B" level work in EDSS 300.

Candidates are assessed in program courses with several assessments that may take the form of reflection papers, academic papers, case studies, unit and lesson plans, fieldwork write-ups, class participation (including discussion and presentations), mid-term and final exams. Candidates must maintain a "B" average in program courses, with no grade lower than "C," and must earn a "B" or better in EDSS 450: *Curriculum and Methods in Teaching/CalTPA 1* to advance to student teaching. In addition, as part of the CSULB Unit Assessment Program each professional sequence course includes a signature assignment designed to assess key elements of TPE domains. The program uses data from these assessments to inform candidates of their progress toward mastery of the TPEs and for continuous program improvement.

Candidates are assessed on several factors in order to advance to student teaching. They must have completed all course work with a "B" average and no grade lower than "C"; they must

earn a "B" or better in EDSS 450; they must have passed the CBEST; they must be subject matter competent; and they must have demonstrated to their subject matter program that they are ready for student teaching responsibilities. Formative assessment in student teaching is ongoing. University supervisors and master teachers provide candidates with continuous feedback through formal and informal conferences, and through written feedback on unit and lesson plans. Midway through the semester, both the university supervisor and master teacher complete a Student Teaching Evaluation as a means of providing formal feedback on a variety of teaching behaviors. At the conclusion of the student teaching semester, the university supervisor and the master teacher, on the Student Teaching Evaluation form, again evaluate candidates. Candidates must receive a "satisfactory" evaluation or higher to successfully complete the assignment and be recommended for the credential.

The program ensures that candidates understand the *California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)* and that the TPE domains and performance indicators form the basis for the formative and summative assessments throughout their program courses. Candidates recognize early on the importance of the TPEs to their development as a teacher, and are aware that they form the basis of the high stakes final evaluation in student teaching. Course activities and assignments in this and subsequent courses connect candidates to the TPE domains and performance indicators.

The Student Teaching Evaluation form is based on the TPEs. The program utilizes the *CA-TPA Tasks* and scoring rubrics as course-embedded assignments. The program has numerous faculty members calibrated using state benchmarks and trained as trainers for each of the four *CA-TPA* assessments. Assessors are initially calibrated and then recalibrated annually.

Interviews of candidates and completers indicate that candidates are well-supported in the assessment process with support for completion of the TPE tasks built into coursework and field work activities.

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

Bilingual Authorization Program (BILA)

The College of Education Bilingual Authorization (BILA) Program in Korean, Mandarin, Vietnamese and Spanish has been offered at CSU Long Beach to Multiple Subjects Credential candidates and post-credential teachers since the fall of 2011. Candidates in the four language authorizations share a unifying view of additive bilingualism. Candidates learn to prepare, implement, and assess sound instruction in a target language and English language development.

Program Design:

The BILA program is housed in the Teacher Education Department (TED) in the College of Education, and is supported by the department chair as well as the Associate Dean and the Dean of the college. Two full-time faculty comprise a joint leadership team with course release time provided each semester to administer the program. One faculty member is responsible for oversight of the Spanish language program, the other faculty member oversees the Korean, Mandarin and Vietnamese programs. The program coordinators participate regularly in TED meetings and share in the outreach, recruitment, and advising of candidates interested in pursuing a Bilingual Authorization. Additionally, they participate with the TED in course scheduling and serve on department committees. The Asian languages coordinator collaborates with a consortium of program coordinators of other Asian language Bilingual Authorization programs at California institutions of higher education.

The BILA is coordinated with and builds on the requirements of the integrated and traditional post-baccalaureate teacher preparation pathways. Bilingual Authorization applicants are assessed for program entry using the same criteria as applicants for the Multiple Subject Credential Program. Additionally, applicants must demonstrate proficiency in the target language. Candidates take the same professional preparation courses, engage in the same program experiences, and are evaluated on the same set of assessments as are Multiple Subject program candidates, with the added expectation of performing, when required, in the target language. In addition, BILA candidates take courses in the culture of the target language and in bilingual teaching methodology. Prior to beginning student teaching, candidates are required to pass the CSET Languages Other Than English Subtest III (Assessment of Language and Communication Skills in the Target Language) to demonstrate proficiency in the target language.

The program design prepares BILA candidates to gain the requisite knowledge and skills in the areas of biliteracy, bilingualism, and biculturalism. A strong clinical component characterizes the BILA program. Candidates do one of their two student teaching assignments in a bilingual setting in the target language under the supervision of a bilingual classroom teacher and a bilingual university supervisor. For example, student teaching in the Spanish program takes place at a bilingual school in Long Beach Unified School District and the bilingual methodology courses are conducted at the same site, providing student teachers with the opportunity to apply their new pedagogical learnings directly and in a timely manner. Courses linked with field experiences provide a forum for collectively discussing and reflecting upon the effectiveness of strategies learned. In developing the new program, stakeholder input was obtained through an advisory meeting with representatives of local school districts and with Teacher Education Department faculty.

Completers, student teachers, and employers all praise the program and the competency of student teachers from the program. Employers consistently state that their first choices for new hires would be the student teachers on their sites.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):
The Bilingual Authorization program requirements are simultaneously taken with those of the traditional Multiple Subject Program (post-baccalaureate) and the Integrated Teacher Education Program (undergraduate) pathways. The Spanish, Mandarin, Korean or Vietnamese authorizations candidates gain the knowledge and skills in the area of biliteracy and bilingualism through the target language methodology course. The course addresses bilingual instructional models, teaching strategies, materials and assessment in bilingual programs. Due to the limited amount of primary language materials available in Mandarin, Korean and Vietnamese, candidates must adapt and expand their knowledge of the core processes involved in using and adapting State board-adopted and State board-approved materials. Candidates also must take a course in the target culture of their authorization (Mandarin, Korean, Vietnamese, or Latino) focusing on issues of culture including traditions, roles and status. Candidates are required to examine critically the socio-economic and educational and cultural conditions surrounding the status of Latino/Chinese/Korean or Vietnamese as they relate to education in California and the United States.

Bilingual Authorization candidates demonstrate their mastery of planning and implementing pedagogically sound lessons in the target languages in their student teaching assignments in a bilingual setting. The methodology courses as well as the fieldwork/student teaching experiences require candidates to develop lessons and implement assessments using the four domains of language. Candidates are required to develop lessons that are differentiated according to language proficiency levels using a variety of instructional strategies. Student teachers and master teachers all express that candidates are very well prepared and equipped with appropriate levels of language proficiency to provide bilingual classroom instruction.

Assessment of Candidates:
Bilingual Authorization candidates are assessed during each eight week assignment (Regular and Bilingual) with a formative and a summative evaluation by both the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher, mid-way and at the end of the eight week setting for Track I candidates and of the 16-week assignment for ITEP candidates.

The BILA program has three main benchmarks: (1) Admission to the program; (2) A mid-year review in which candidates are required to meet with their advisor before their student teaching application may be submitted (during the second semester of the program); and, (3) A comprehensive assessment/student teaching portfolio and exit interview. CalTPA Tasks 3 and 4, completed during candidates' student teaching seminar and practicum (EDEL 482B), are submitted online through Taskstream. These assessment tools and a professional development portfolio serve as the comprehensive assessment system for all BILA candidates. Interviews indicate that student teachers feel that they are well-prepared to successfully complete the TPEs.

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

Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization

Program Design:
The mission of the Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization (APEAA) program is to promote school improvement and advocate for individuals with disabilities by providing a highly effective physical education teacher training program that promotes lifelong learners reflective of best teaching practices. The College of Education, College of Health and Human Services and the Kinesiology Department collaborates to offer candidates a cohesive, sequenced, diversified and comprehensive program of study toward the completion of the authorization including sequenced coursework and a variety of supervised field experiences (i.e., on-campus, agencies, and various public school sites). The program is strongly committed to the development of Adapted Physical Education (APE) teachers prepared to teach the diverse student populations and disabilities attending the California public schools, especially students who are precluded from participating in a general education physical education program.

The program coordinator advises all APEAA candidates enrolled in the program; moreover, the coordinator oversees all administrative responsibilities, teaches the majority of the coursework, and oversees all field and student teaching experiences. The APEAA Coordinator and one additional lecturer work together to deliver instruction. The coordinator also works closely with the Single Subject Physical Education Program Coordinator and Physical Education Teacher Education faculty to assure coordination of the APEAA and Single Subject Physical Education programs.

An active working relationship exists between the APEAA program faculty and effective APE teachers who teach in the public schools, many who are alumni of the program. Expert certified APE teachers are invited back to the campus as guest lecturers in various APEAA courses. All fieldwork site coordinators and student teaching cooperating teachers are Commission-certificated APEAA teachers with many years of experience assisting in the program. In addition, an APE Council exists and these professionals actively provide input to help assure the quality of the APEAA program. Interviews of student teachers, graduates and master teachers demonstrate a high degree of commitment to quality APE instruction and to the unit's program.

The APEAA program has multiple points of entry in order to accommodate the needs of the candidates. During any given period there are approximately 40 candidates enrolled in the program. Approximately 60% of the candidates enrolled in the program are concurrently completing the more traditional pathway of obtaining both the Single Subject Physical Education and APEAA. The remaining candidates hold a Single Subject Physical Education, Multiple Subject or Education Specialist credential and are completing the APE Added Authorization.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):
In the APEAA program, general pedagogical knowledge is sequenced and spiraled throughout the curriculum and provides candidates with a broad-based perspective of physical education

programming for individuals with disabilities related to the total school curriculum. Pedagogical content knowledge provides candidates with the tools and resources necessary to develop program goals and objectives, identify program content, and choose appropriate instructional strategies and evaluations specific to teaching APE. Also included is an analysis of teaching physical fitness, fundamental skills, innovative games, individual/dual sports, and team sports specific to individuals with disabilities. Candidates seeking an APEAA complete 27 units of required coursework including six units of fieldwork in a public school setting. Candidates are placed in one of over 25 public school sites in the Los Angeles and Orange County areas.

The APEAA program provides candidates with a broad range of supervised field experiences. These comprehensive field experiences follow a planned sequence from the beginning of the program to include experiences in a broad range of service delivery options. In the culminating student teaching placement the candidate works toward assuming full responsibility for the provision of services with teaching in both adapted physical education and general physical education. Proper feedback by qualified personnel is provided during all field experiences. The APEAA coordinator reviews the suitability and quality of each APEAA field experience placement sites and APE supervising teacher, who must be APE certified.

During interviews graduates, student teachers and master teachers all provided enthusiastically positive information about the quality of the educational and field work experiences that the program provides. Interviews also confirmed that candidates all feel well-prepared to work with students from diverse backgrounds along with their families/caretakers.

Assessment of Candidates:
Multiple measures with feedback in the assessment of all candidates are conducted on an ongoing systematic basis from admission through advancement and exit in both the Single Subject Physical Education credential program and the APEAA program. The APEAA Program Coordinator is responsible, with faculty input, for coordinating the evaluation of all candidates during APEAA coursework, fieldwork and student teaching experiences and the final summative exit interview. Candidate assessment includes documentation and written verification of all assignments conducted by various faculty and supervisors. Assessment includes Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) or signature APE assignments during identified coursework, fieldwork and student teaching experiences and summative candidate portfolio evaluation.

More specific major APEAA candidate assessments include an SLO assessment of the APEAA candidate's performance that is annually collected, analyzed, and reported to the College of Education. Formative and summative "Student Teaching Evaluation Reports" are written and reported by the university supervisor, the cooperating master teacher and general physical education master teacher at midterm and during the final week of the candidate's student teaching experience. All candidates conduct an exit interview with the APEAA Coordinator to evaluate each candidate's competence. This candidate culminating experience, which is clearly articulated throughout the program, includes (a) an electronic exit survey of the APEAA program effectiveness, (b) evaluation of candidate competence by presentation of a portfolio

notebook with artifacts of their work, (c) an interview, and (d) a certification verification document of course work completed is sent to the College of Education Credential Center.

Findings on Standards:
After a review of the institutional report and documentation, conducting interviews with faculty, university supervisors, employers, graduates and candidates, the team determined that all standards for the Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization are **Met.**

Education Specialist Credential
Preliminary Mild/ Moderate, Moderate/Severe Programs, with Intern

Education Specialist Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Level I/Preliminary Credential Program Design:
The Dean of the College of Education provides leadership for all faculty and staff in creating and articulating a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. The Department Chair of Advanced Studies in Education & Counseling also provides leadership to individual program faculty and program coordinators in order for them to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the department.

California State University Long Beach accepts approximately 60 candidates into the Preliminary Education Specialist credential program annually. Candidates in the Preliminary Program complete 13 semester units of prerequisites or the equivalent, 21 semester units in program core courses, and 12 semester units in supported fieldwork at sites that educate and provide related supports and services to children and youth identified with mild/moderate or moderate/severe disabilities. Each year approximately 50-60 candidates enroll in fieldwork and subsequently apply for the credential.

Faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. The current coordinator of the Education Specialist credential program provides ongoing opportunities for program faculty and stakeholders to participate in program development and organization.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):
These credential programs consist of 33 semester units plus 13 semester units of prerequisites, typically taking candidates four semesters to complete. Interns complete the same coursework as other Education Specialist program candidates.

During student teaching, candidates are required to be in their assigned setting for the full classroom day, four days a week. The fifth day of each week is used for completion of the Field Experience requirements that cover areas outside of their assigned student teaching setting such as transition, assistive technology, and M/M or M/S secondary or elementary settings. The extra day is also reserved for observations in settings recommended by a candidate's

university supervisor as needed for specific areas of need such as behavior management. Depending on the number of units for which the candidate is enrolled, the university supervisor will visit the candidate at his or her assigned site a minimum of six times per semester. Ongoing communication is maintained as needed through phone and email.

Interviews conducted with program completers, master teachers and current candidates confirmed that the program was clearly laid out and that the program design enables candidates to effectively complete all program requirements.

Candidates and program completers (including Interns) reported that the faculty was very accessible and approachable, and that they effectively provided consistent support and advisement. If candidates had any challenges with course work or field experience, they felt that they had a number of different people who could assist them including site supervisors, faculty and the program coordinator. Supervisors and master teachers reported they were aware of the type of feedback to give in the field placements and how often to give the feedback. The supervisors reported that they received a handbook that reviewed all of the requirements in the field placement, and that they then gave this information to the master teachers. The master teachers felt that while training provided by the university could at times be inconsistent, they were able to get the information they needed. This may be the result of district efforts to distribute the student teacher assignments more equitably which seems to leave the program unaware of who the master teacher will be until the candidate arrives on site. Candidates reported that they found the program handbook very helpful and referred to it each semester throughout the program. Candidates reported that course work was relevant to their field placements and that the assignments aligned with the type of placements they were in. Faculty reported that they designed assignments to fit with candidate field placements in order to help make the coursework relevant to what the candidates were experiencing.

Assessment of Candidates:
During the first required core course in the program candidates begin the required program portfolio. The portfolio is used by candidates to collect and reflect upon course assignments that are used as artifacts to support their demonstration of competencies when they reach their Advance Field Studies (student teaching) courses. The expectations for the portfolio and fieldwork competencies are clearly addressed in this foundation course. The portfolio is reviewed in EDSP 480: *Foundations of Inclusive Education in a Diverse Society: Philosophical and Historical Perspectives and Legal Mandates*, in fieldwork seminars (peer review) and finally during student teaching, by both the university supervisor and master teacher. Candidates use the content of the portfolio, combined with practices during the student teaching experience, to demonstrate completion of all fieldwork competencies as are laid out in the Advanced Field study Competency Checklist.

During the formative (mid-term) assessment in student teaching, candidates are advised of their progress at that point and are informed by their university supervisor and program coordinator if there are any concerns at the time or if they are at risk for not receiving credit in the student teaching course. Interventions are discussed and implemented, as needed, with the

support of the university supervisor, master teacher, and program coordinator in order to increase the candidate's opportunities for success.

Standard Findings:
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 Level II/Clear Credential

Program Design:
The Professional Level II Education Specialist Credential Program at CSULB prepares candidates to be authorized to teach in the areas of Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe disabilities, and received initial approval in November 1999. It is currently phasing out, with no new candidates being admitted after December 31, 2014. The university's new Education Specialist Clear Induction Program was approved in February 2015.

For each of the program SLOs, there is a signature assignment in a program course to measure the outcome. Candidates in the Level II program take 4 courses (12 units), which meet program SLOs 1-5 and, if the candidates are earning a Moderate/Severe Clear credential, they also are required meet SLO 6.

In the 2012-2013 school year, 23 candidates earned a Mild/Moderate Level II credential and 11 candidates earned a Moderate/Severe Level II credential. In 2013-2014, 18 candidates earned a Mild/Moderate Level II credential and 4 earned their Moderate/Severe Level II credential.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):
The three stated goals of the Preliminary program are to assist candidates to become effective and caring teachers, partners with parents and others in the development of high quality educational programs, and lifelong learners engaged in program development reflective of practices in special education. The Level II program extends candidate competence in key program areas of individualized education, cultural responsiveness, evidence-based practices, and advocacy and leadership. The Level II program is designed to allow candidates to continue to develop as reflective practitioners in advanced skill areas and knowledge. The program focuses on developing advanced skills and knowledge of current research in special education and demonstration of the ability to engage in reflective inquiry.

Candidate Assessment:
Candidates maintain a program portfolio that documents their demonstration of program competencies through coursework and practical experiences. At the end of their program, candidates are required to participate in an Exit Interview with program faculty, where they orally demonstrate how they met program competencies. Candidates then apply for their credential through the Credential Center on campus.

Standard Finding:
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**.

Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization

Program Design:
Interviews with faculty and candidates and document review showed that the Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization (ASDAA) prepares candidates to demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and skill in providing competent, humanistic and meaningful support to learners on the autism spectrum representing diverse ages, abilities, languages, cultures, economic backgrounds and socio-cultural experiences.

Document review showed that the ASDAA consists of four 3-unit courses totaling 12 semester units. The psychology department is responsible for one of the courses for the autism authorization. With the pool of candidates becoming smaller and smaller, there have only been one or two earning the authorization the last two years. The university can only offer the psychology course once each semester, which is during the school day, which has compounded the small number of candidates earning the authorization.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):
Document review and interviews with candidates, graduates and faculty confirmed that the ASD AA offers a cross-disciplinary perspective that provides candidates with theory, research and evidence-based practices for understanding the complex nature and addressing the multi-faceted needs of those affected by autism. Courses focus on a foundational content about ASD and specific content regarding characteristics of students with ASD, and strategies to support these students in the areas of academic instruction, behavior, communication, socialization, and sensory needs. Activities and assignments reinforce the knowledge and skill needed to effectively interact and collaborate as a member of a multidisciplinary team while engaging with families of children across the spectrum in humanistic, responsive and culturally sensitive ways.

Assessment of Candidates:
Document review and interviews with candidates and faculty showed that assessment of candidates in the ASD AA program is both formative and summative. In each course, candidates complete key assignments that correspond to professional competency areas. Candidates in the ASD AA document their professional competencies based on the evolution of their knowledge and skill through participation in courses and field experiences. Assignments integrate classroom work and field experiences. Assignments may include both individual and small group collaborative experiences. All are written and may also include a class presentation or activity. Scores are based on content knowledge, integration, competency demonstration, and writing proficiency.

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 were **Met**.

Speech Language Pathologist Credential Program

Program Design:

The Speech-Language Pathology Services Credential (SLPSC) Program resides in the former Department of Communicative Disorders now entitled the Department of Speech Language Pathology (DSLP), a department within the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS). The SLPSC program is designed to meet the standards of program quality and effectiveness adopted by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) as well as NCATE standards appropriate to the Teacher Credentialing Program headed by the College of Education. Accordingly, the DSLP has primary administrative responsibility to the CHHS but also articulates closely with the College of Education (CED) via the SLPSC Program. This close tie between the DSLP and both colleges is reflected in the conceptual framework for the SLPSC Program.

Candidates graduating from the Master's Program meet all of the academic and clinical practicum requirements for Clinical Certification from the American Speech-Language and Hearing Association (ASHA), licensing by the State of California, and importantly, are eligible for the Speech-Language Pathology Services Credential issued by the Commission.

Candidates have two options for completing the SLPSC:
1. The Traditional Master of Arts Program: Courses are offered Monday through Saturday during the day and some evenings in the Fall and Spring semester. More than 90% of program candidates are graduates of CSULB undergraduate programs.
2. The Special Cohort Master of Arts Program: This self-supported program is offered in conjunction with the College of Continuing Education and Professional Education. Candidates complete the program as a cohort in two years and two summers. As a requirement, all candidates must be graduates of CSULB undergraduate programs.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):

The SLPSC program is organized in a theory-to-practice sequence providing a) coursework, b) professional training (clinical practicum), and c) fieldwork experience in Speech-Language Pathology. To complete the SLPSC program candidates must meet all the prerequisites required for the Bachelor's degree, an additional undergraduate 3-unit course *Teaching Learners with Exceptionalities* (EDSP 350), as well as 41 units of graduate coursework that includes an additional 2-unit graduate course *Educational Topics in Speech-Language Pathology* (CD 575). Coursework is accomplished primarily within the Department of Speech Language Pathology. Graduate units of study are distributed amongst six academic seminars (18 semester units) and a course in research methods (3 units). Each of the six seminars addresses

a specific disorder area (i.e., traumatic brain injury, child language and phonology, voice and the oro-facial mechanism, adult language, speech motor and swallowing, and autism). Seminars are taken either prerequisite or co-requisite to clinical practica (minimum of 12 semester units) that addresses each of the disorder areas plus linguistic diversity. Clinical practice with Language-Disordered Adults addresses neurological disorders and therefore subsumes adult language and traumatic brain injury in adults. Clinical practice with Speech Motor Disorders addresses speech motor disorders but also incorporates voice disorders.

In the SLPSC program each candidate's plan of study culminates in a required part-time (3 days/14 weeks) or full-time (5 days/10 weeks) externship (5 semester units) in the public schools (CD 686A). Candidates in the Traditional MA Program may also elect to complete a full-time externship in a medical setting (CD 670). In CD 686A the candidate is required to complete a minimum of 100 hours of direct contact with students in the public schools. In addition, all candidates must either complete a thesis (CD 698; 4 units) or an elective course (2 units) and the comprehensive examinations (CD 695).

Assessment of Candidates:
The DSLP conducts ongoing and systematic assessment of academic and clinical education and performance of its SLPSC candidates using a comprehensive formative and summative approach to knowledge and skills demonstration and remediation. The Master's program has an integrated assessment system, which serves to verify that coursework (seminars), clinical practica, fieldwork, graduate thesis/comprehensive examination, and national examination competencies are met. Candidate assessment, which is continuous, is guided by and documented on the Self-Management and Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (SMAKS) form which is essentially a running record the candidate's relevant competencies in his or her performance in all coursework (to include undergraduate coursework), clinical practicum, and fieldwork experience(s) as they progress developmentally across each phase of the SLPSC program. This comprehensive evaluation serves as a framework for confirming that all program competencies are met relative to multiple content knowledge and skill areas including the clinical practicum and fieldwork experience in the schools (CD 686A).

Results of candidate assessments are used to plan and implement program improvements that align with the DSLP's goal "to teach and demonstrate to our students how to solve clinical and school-based problems using theoretically sound assessment and intervention practices."

The DSLP makes every effort to provide SLPSC candidates with a clear understanding of the methods used to evaluate his or her individual program competencies. Candidates are fully apprised of the DSLP's methods of assessment at multiple points of entry in the SLPSC program including the graduate orientation meeting, monthly graduate advising meetings (in *CD696: Research Methods*), in each of the six seminars and six clinical practica, and during the fieldwork experience in the school setting. Candidates are encouraged to meet at least once a semester with their Faculty Advisor to review their program and are required to meet each semester with the Assistant Clinical Director to jointly update the SMAKS form. The DSLP also has a formal protocol for identification and remediation of "At-Risk Student Clinicians," the purpose of which is to prevent inadequately prepared candidates from matriculating through

the program and into the field.

Standard Finding:
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 Credential Programs
Clear (Tier II) Administrative Services Program (Standards Based)

Program Design:
The Preliminary and Tier II/Clear (Standards Based) Administrative Services Credential (ASC) programs reside within the College of Education's Educational Leadership Department. The Dean of the College of Education has oversight of all credential programs and delegates responsibilities to the associate deans who have responsibility for various departments within the College of Education. In 2012 the Educational Leadership Department (EDLD) was established; Preliminary and Clear ASC Program Coordinators report to the EDLD Department Chair.

In September 2014, a transition plan was submitted to the Commission for the Preliminary ASC. The transition plan outlines steps that will be taken to embrace the newly revised Leadership Standards and corresponding California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE) and the California Administrator Content Standards (CACE).

Interviews with full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty members confirm collaboration and communication within the credential program and within the College of Education unit provide the foundation for ongoing program and unit assessment as well as improvement initiatives. The Program Coordinators meet regularly as a leadership team to discuss curriculum, instructional materials, relevant content development in the field, student learning, and progress toward meeting established learning outcomes. Full- and part-time EDLD department faculty meet monthly to review candidate progress, current policy, and credential requirements. In addition, Program Coordinators meet with adjunct faculty quarterly to review program effectiveness, scope of learning assessments, relevant research, and progress of candidates. Inclusion of Preliminary and Clear ASC Program Coordinators as part of the core faculty within the College of Education has led to both greater articulation between the programs and an authentic vertical articulation.

The Preliminary ASC program is a cohort model that exists on two campuses: one on the main campus, the other housed in the South Bay. Design of coursework and fieldwork is grounded in Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) program standards and the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL). A review of the curriculum map, program syllabi, and candidate assessment system shows an organizational structure that forms a logical sequence among its instructional components. The program is designed around a comprehensive set of practical skills, learning experiences, and foundational knowledge

concepts based on theory, practice, and application that meets the needs of those who aspire to become school leaders. Six major areas of focus include:

1. Shared Vision of Learning
2. Culture of Teaching and Learning
3. Management of the School in the Service of Teaching and Learning
4. Working with Diverse Families and Communities
5. Personal Ethics and Leadership Capacity
6. Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Understanding

The Tier II/Clear ASC program draws on the knowledge base defined in the Preliminary ASC program, is responsive to the individual candidate's needs, and is coordinated effectively. The overall design of the program is consistent with the design features of the Preliminary ASC program. Faculty and Tier II/Clear ASC candidates shared examples of the latitude they are given to construct their Induction Plans based on their own assessment of their immediate and long-term needs and to choose the objectives and learning strategies that will assist them to attain self-selected goals. One interview discussed in detail the support provided by the faculty to work through a pending situation in order to move towards future goals.

As the programs transition to the Preliminary/Clear model, ongoing program modifications include collaborative efforts by faculty to review and revise program course curriculum, reading, and signature assessments in order to reflect current and relevant issues, policy and research. Faculty and the Program Coordinator independently shared examples of incorporating current research and theory, Common Core State Standards and other policy influencing education into course and fieldwork assignments, as well as formative assessments and candidate competencies outcome expectations. Reviewers verified evidence of significant revision to address current and relevant theory in content, assignments, and assessment in EDAD 649: *Urban and Community Leadership*, as well as noting numerous examples of collaboration with district partners, practitioners and other faculty to update and revise course content and assessments. No other major changes have been made to the Preliminary Services Credential Program other than on-going refinement of Signature Assessments and corresponding rubrics.

For the past decade, the Tier II ASC has served a diminishing number of credential candidates and, since 2009, has become entirely embedded within the Doctoral program. The Program Coordinator is in consultation with professional colleagues in the field and with Commission consultants on examining how program redesign will be feasible given the new Clear Induction Standards. Select individuals within the incoming Doctoral Cohort that begins in June 2015 will be the final group under the current structure to earn the Tier II Administrative Services Credential.

The EDLD Department has established the Education Leadership Department Advisory Board and the College District Partnership Board; each meets twice a year. Both entities encompass the Pk-20 spectrum and function to collaboratively shape policies and program practice pertaining to candidate selection and program outcomes, design of field experiences.

Interviews and evidence of coursework, fieldwork, and assessment refinement demonstrates a healthy working relationship among advisory body members that contributes substantively to the quality and effectiveness of the design and implementation of each candidate's preparation, and in examining key issues and collaborating with nearby districts. Attendance on these committees is consistent, indicating a willingness to maintain meaningful partnerships. In addition, many of the adjunct faculty are community members and thus, through their teaching and program involvement, provide the program with ongoing feedback.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):
The Preliminary ASC program candidates complete eight 3-unit courses designed around the six CPSEL focus areas and program standards. Formative assessments, including signature assessments, address specific standards, and are embedded in identified courses as documented in the curriculum map, syllabi, and signature assessment documents. The curriculum map for the program graphically displays each standard and the corresponding course. The curriculum map, course syllabi, and assessment system shows the program addresses the major duties and responsibilities authorized by the ASC as articulated by program and CPSEL standards; this was also repeatedly verified through interviews with candidates and graduates. Interviews also indicated coursework, assessments, and fieldwork are coordinated in a logical sequence and address a variety of school levels, settings, and a wide range of the typical responsibilities of a full-time administrator. Additionally, program candidates and graduates expressed that the urban setting provided rich and varied opportunities for working with diverse populations.

Each course includes approximately 10 hours of fieldwork aligned to specific Commission standards. The fieldwork enables candidates to practice and apply the knowledge and skills acquired from each course of study. Candidates' final course is a 120-hour, 3-week, intensive field experience. During interviews, credential candidates unanimously reported the learning and growth opportunities presented in the signature assessments, reflective journal, fieldwork, and summative e-portfolio were valuable in their "real-life" responsibilities during fieldwork and helped to prepare them in pursuit of a permanent position.

In the Tier II/Clear ASC program, the primary distinction between the competencies outcomes expected of candidates, as compared to the Preliminary ASC candidates, is the application and demonstration of leadership knowledge and skills. Interviews confirmed induction plans are collaboratively developed by the candidate and program advisor is based on the candidate self-assessment and identified needs. The candidate and Program Coordinator target activities which demonstrate the candidate's ability to apply theory to practice and record them in the Induction Plan through the selection of individual goals related to each of the administrative standards. Several program candidates expressed the guidance, advice, feedback, and support provided by the Program Advisor and Mentor Teacher assisted them in the performance of their role and helped to facilitate the development and application of professional learning.

For both the Preliminary and Tier II/Clear ASC, interviews and review of accreditation documentation confirm program candidates are provided multiple and clear sources of information with regard to program orientation, including program completion, course

requirements and performance expectations. Numerous and consistent remarks during interviews with all parties indicate individual advisement is readily available and responsive when candidates are in need of assistance.

Candidate Competence:
At the conclusion of the candidate's experience with the Preliminary ASC sequence of courses, including the Advanced Field experience (EDAD 680), a system of formative and summative assessments is used for evaluation. Throughout the program formative assessments are itemized by standard, including specific indicators. Signature assessments also address specific standards and are embedded in identified courses. The curriculum map for the program clearly displays where each standard is represented in a corresponding course. Evidence of standards' assessment can be found in the signature assessments instructions and grading rubrics. Signature assessments are part of the program assessment component and are articulated throughout the course sequence as well as introduced and discussed during courses, as noted by interviewees.

The College of Education website, interviews with candidates, and accreditation documentation confirm course, assessment, and program requirements are clearly communicated by the Preliminary ASC program. They are well known by candidates and engrained as part of a cohesive and logically organized program, as articulated by candidates and faculty. Candidates are to maintain a GPA of 3.0 or better and complete the Exit Portfolio Assessment. The summative assessment instrument is clearly aligned with the Category III Commission Standards. Candidates are required to prepare an Exit Portfolio of selected program artifacts (at least 3) for each standard drawn from their coursework and field experiences; they submit written reflections about their selections, discussing how each prepared them to become competent in that standard. Additionally, candidates indicated that they prepare and submit for review their own summative vision of leadership, a personal mission statement, and a current resume, and reported this was extremely useful in their preparation for new work.

In the Tier II/Clear ASC program, the primary distinction between the expected competencies of candidates, as compared to the Preliminary ASC, is the demonstration of application of theory to practice in leadership knowledge and skills embedded in the candidates' job assignments. During the induction and planning portion of the program, the candidate meets with the university advisor to complete an induction plan that includes a self-assessment based on the CPSEL, a Professional Development Plan with three goals, and a rationale for the selection of the goals. After one semester, the candidate meets with the university advisor to evaluate the extent to which the leadership goals were achieved. If successful, the candidate is endorsed for the Tier II/Clear Administrative Services Credential.

Program completion and summative assessment expectations are presented verbally and provided in writing at their induction orientation, available throughout the program, and again several weeks before the end of the program. Interviews confirmed summative assessment, exit assessment, and evaluation of goal attainment procedures are well known to credential candidates in both programs. The criteria for assessment are the same as those applied

throughout the program. The exit portfolio is assembled similarly to the preparation of the field experience portfolios. Additionally, multiple faculty members articulated that the Assessment Office provides program-wide faculty training on calibration of assessments and corresponding rubric development as well as scoring in order to ensure validity and reliability of program assessment tools.

Document review, candidate surveys, and interviews confirm a defensible system of candidate assessment for program completion and recommendation of Preliminary and Tier II/Clear Administrative Services Credentials.

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**.

Pupil Personnel Services Credential: School Counseling

Program Design:
The Master of Science in Counseling (School Counseling Option) and the Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling Credential (PPSC) Programs are designed to prepare counselors to work in urban elementary, middle, and high school settings. Both programs support a comprehensive, developmental, and collaborative school counseling model. Based upon the American School Counselor Association's (ASCA) National Standards for K-12 School Counseling Programs, the ASCA National Model and the Education Trust's Transformed School Counselor Programs, the PPSC program support a balanced, holistic approach that considers the academic, college and career development, and personal/social needs of K-12 students. Graduates are expected to become proactive leaders who will advocate for their students and themselves as counseling professionals working toward equity, achievement, and opportunity for all candidates using themes of data driven decision making, collaborative consultation, and advocacy. Candidates are described as "independent social justice advocates."

The Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling Credential (PPSC) Program is led by one full-time tenure-track faculty member who co-coordinates with a full-time faculty member in the Master of Science in Counseling program. The two co-coordinators communicate daily with each other, meet with their colleagues in the MS in Counseling program monthly, and attend monthly college and department meetings. They attend a bi-monthly credential coordinators meeting and a monthly graduate programs meeting. The co-coordinators, two part time lecturers and two district partners make up the School Counseling Advisory Board. In interviews with the advisory board, there is confirmation that participation and input in overall design and governance of the program is welcomed and encouraged. Faculty members, program coordinators and candidates support the current admission structure and the sequencing of coursework and field practica. Candidates are informed of program requirements during an orientation whereupon they meet with credential analysts, faculty and current candidates to receive an introduction to the program and are then connected with

advisors that systematically communicate with candidates throughout their duration in the program.

During the past two years, the program has made modifications such as creating a new partnership practice to explore field placements, ensuring candidates are established in well-grounded and highly effective internships. Course curricula have been modified to reflect new trends in evidenced based practices.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):
Candidates take courses as a cohort and are encouraged to complete the program in two years. Courses are aligned to meet the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and Education Trust Standards to prepare 21st century transformative school counselors to work in the nation's schools. The PPSC program faculty and lecturers started a new partnership practice during the Spring of 2014 of meeting with district partners to explore fieldwork placements. The meeting encourages both sets of stakeholders to discuss needs of K-12 students, schools, as well as needs and program expectations of fieldwork candidates to achieve the set competencies in the Fieldwork Handbook. Coursework is directly aligned with the competencies candidates will be expected to show in their fieldwork. Both alumni and advisory board members expressed how coursework and field practica are "synchronized well" and current candidates feel like the faculty advisors are "very supportive" and they are "immersed as a graduate student".

Fieldwork placements include middle and high school level at both public and charter schools. Candidates are evaluated twice during fieldwork by both the university supervisor and school site supervisor (mid-term and final) using rubrics in the School Counseling Fieldwork Handbook. University supervisors conduct a minimum of 3 site visits for each candidate.

Assessment of Candidates:
During the 2013-2014 school year program faculty changed the program assessment to a Take Home Comprehensive Exam evaluating candidates' program competencies. This change was based on discussions with candidates and evaluation of the existing system that revealed a high level of anxiety for candidates resulting in minimal useful evaluation of total competency areas. Candidates are given a study guide and meet with the program coordinators and lecturers at a formal meeting to discuss the exam and areas for group study. Candidates in the PPSC program feel the program prepares them for the profession "through research, counseling theories and the placement matching process".

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**.

Pupil Personnel Services Credential: School Psychology

Program Design:
The School Psychology program is housed in the Department of Advanced Studies in Education and Counseling (ASEC) in the College of Education. The program is based on 60 units of coursework (plus 6 prerequisite courses), and includes 450 hours of practicum and a 1200-hour internship. In addition to earning the Educational Specialist degree (Ed.S.) in School Psychology, candidates concurrently fulfill requirements for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential in School Psychology (PPSP). The School Psychology program is accredited by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission). Candidates typically complete the program in 3-4 years, with the first two years devoted to full-time coursework, practicum experiences in the third year, and the last year completing a full-time internship experience.

Prior to fall 2012 the PPSP program was a credential-only program in which candidates entered either with an earned Master's degree in a behavioral science or were admitted to the Master of Arts in Education-Educational Psychology program, and took school psychology-specific courses to fulfill the requirements for the PPSP credential. Presently, candidates enter the program and earn an Ed.S. degree in School Psychology, considered the entry-level degree in professional school psychology by NASP, as well as fulfill the requirements for the PPSP credential.

An associate professor serves as coordinator of the PPSP program and oversees all administrative responsibilities including program assessment and accreditation, course scheduling, recruitment and admissions, program policies and procedures, curriculum, and candidate concerns.

To ensure program faculty are abreast of current policies and procedures, and candidate concerns are addressed in a timely manner, monthly program meetings are held with all full- and part-time faculty. Mandatory candidate advising is held each November where candidates complete and submit to their advisor the School Psychology advisement survey, a document that evaluates candidate progress in the program and allows for candidates to share their questions or concerns. Faculty advisors review candidates' program plans and provide feedback regarding course load and sequencing, projected fieldwork plans, and candidate-chosen culminating activity (e.g., thesis or comprehensive exam). Additionally, the School Psychology Community Advisory Committee, comprised of school personnel, faculty, students (current and alum) and supervisors, meets annually to receive input and guidance from the field regarding current and projected needs in the field, and quality of training of practica candidates, interns, and graduates. In interviews with advisory committee members, it is clear they are well informed and provide advice on the direction of the program. Additionally, candidates have opportunities to provide feedback to the unit in the "belongingness survey" and the "satisfaction survey".

Over the past two years, there has been a major shift in emphasis from a focus on assessing clients to intervening on behalf of clients; this was clearly articulated by both faculty and the

advisory board. Additionally, the program has added a "systems change" class to respond to demands of the profession.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):
The School Psychology program is a 60-unit course of study that leads to the Educational Specialist Degree (Ed.S.) and completion of the requirements for the PPSP credential. All candidates, regardless of whether they hold a Master's degree upon entering the program, are required to complete a degree culminating activity (e.g., thesis or comprehensive exam). Candidates must complete both fieldwork experiences under the supervision of a credentialed and experienced school psychologist. Although candidates are required to find their own practicum/internship site(s), program faculty assist with placements by providing candidates with leads and recommended field sites and supervisors. This mutual process allows for self-selection of practicum and is a mutually acceptable method for all involved.

PPSP candidates are required to complete 185 clinical hours in the college's Community Clinic for Counseling and Educational Services. The clinic serves as a "lab setting" for conducting therapeutic interventions grounded in theoretical orientations. It is a learner centered environment that attracts candidates to the unit, one candidate indicating it was "because of the clinic that I came to this school".

Practica candidates are evaluated at the end of each semester by their field supervisor using the *Practica Fieldwork Supervisor Evaluation*. Data from evaluations is analyzed and aggregated for opportunities to make program recommendations to enhance candidate learning and proficiency of competencies in school psychology. University supervisors evaluate practica candidates via course assignments completed at their school site, such as a consultation case study, school analysis report, and writing-up classroom observations.

During fieldwork/internship, candidates are interviewed for appropriateness of fit whereupon potential site supervisors look at the "whole student" when reviewing a potential candidate for field placement. Candidates are expected to work with a variety of diverse students and families, and engage in an array of activities based on the NASP Standards for Training and Practice (e.g., consultation, counseling, academic/behavioral intervention). Additionally, they are required to document 200 hours of experience in at least two levels of schooling in any of the following settings: preschool, elementary, middle or junior high, and senior high/transition age. University supervisors complete site visits each semester of a candidate's internship experience where they observe the intern engaged in a school psychology-related activity (e.g., social skills group, IEP meeting, etc.), as well as interview the fieldwork supervisor regarding intern activities and concerns, if any. Often this interaction allows for transparency of candidate progress and growth. Candidates expressed the importance of this visit because it allows sharing of ideas to improve performance and site supervisors seem to appreciate the exchange as well, indicating it was an "excellent professional development process" and that it places "students (candidates) out of their comfort zone".

Assessment of Candidates:

The PPSP program is designed to foster candidate outcomes based on the NASP *Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists* (NASP, 2010). As such, assessment activities are designed to measure candidates' performance as they engage in activities related to these outcomes beginning the first semester of their first year in the program through graduation. Similar outcomes are measured at several different points in the program (e.g., first, second, and third year) as the activities are considered developmental and permeate all aspects of the practice of school psychology (e.g., data-based decision making; consultation). First year candidates are routinely informed of program requirements via a mentorship program with second and third year program candidates. The mentorship process allows for routine communication and is an extremely effective way to bridge continuity across all three years of the program.

Outcome data are collected each semester and submitted to the college's Assessment Office. Candidates submit weekly activity logs and are evaluated three times per year in concert with program coordinators and site supervisors. Data are aggregated and returned to the program coordinator and faculty for review at monthly faculty meetings. Based on candidate data, modifications of course activities such as an understanding of cultural competence, readings, assessment activities and rubrics, and/or lecture content may be discussed and recommended. Candidate opportunities to learn and issues of measurement, such as reliability and validity, are continually considered when interpreting candidate data.

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**.

Pupil Personnel Services Credential: School Social Work

Program Design:

The School of Social Work offers the Pupil Personnel Services School Social Work Credential (PPSW), with specializations in School Social Work and Child Welfare and Attendance. This competency-based credential program is fully integrated into the Master of Social Work (MSW) program and prepares candidates to work as partners with school staff, family members, and the community. The opportunity to apply for the program is available to candidates going into their advanced year who have chosen the Children, Youth, and Families concentration. PPSW program personnel collaborate closely with the Credential Center and the Credential Program Assessment Office within the College of Education. The Program Coordinator attends the Credential Coordinators' meetings convened by the Associate Dean of the College of Education. Since the MSW program is completely distinct from the College of Education, it maintains constant communication between colleges and the credential office to ensure standards are being met and program requirements are enforced.

The PPSW program prepares candidates to utilize their assessment, prevention, intervention, evaluation, research, and collaboration skills within the interdisciplinary educational team to provide coordinated and comprehensive services to children and their families. They are trained to provide appropriate prevention and intervention strategies to remove barriers to learning for children.

The advisory board is an excellent source of stakeholder input. Consisting of practitioners, faculty and school personnel, it meets regularly and is often a conduit for information sharing and community collaboration. One board member indicates that from time to time, there is "spirited dialogue" about how to ensure state standards are being met which creates openness and creativity.

A major program modification occurred during the last two years based on a strategic plan, stakeholder input and new education policy accreditation standards established by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) which required an entirely new curriculum beginning in Fall 2015. The credential program is excited about this new direction in course content, pedagogy and delivery of the curriculum.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):
The PPSW program is a special program embedded in the Master of Social Work (MSW) Program. The curriculum of the MSW program requires 60 semester units overall, including 1000 hours of field experience. Candidates who choose the concentration *Children, Youth, and Family* apply for the PPSW program as they complete their foundation year whereupon they become candidates for the PPSW credential.

Candidates must complete a minimum of 600 hours in their school-based internship and are also required to be enrolled in co-requisite practice courses during field internships. Both the foundational and advanced years of field experience include an integrative seminar which uses group process to support practice competencies, professional development, self-awareness, ethics, and problem solving in a multicultural context. The purpose of the seminar is to promote integration of classroom and field experiences. Candidates are required to complete a weekly journal of reflections on their field experience, critical incidents, and personal processes. In addition, they must complete a self-reflection/ critical analysis paper at the end of each semester which covers such concepts as self-awareness and self-esteem.

For their advanced year of field experience, candidates must be placed in a school setting and be supervised by a field instructor (district-employed) who has a PPSW credential. These field instructors are required to provide a minimum of one-hour of individual supervision each week for each candidate intern. They must also complete three written evaluations of the candidate each semester: 1) an Interim Progress Report at mid-semester; 2) a Comprehensive Skills Evaluation at the end of the semester; and 3) a Comprehensive Skills Evaluation specific to PPSW standards at the end of each semester. The first two evaluations are standard for every MSW candidate; however, the third evaluation is specific to the school social work skills required by the Commission.

These evaluations are submitted and reviewed by the faculty instructor of the integrative seminar (university-employed) who is responsible for issuing a grade of credit/no credit for the field experience course. In addition, the seminar instructor serves as a field liaison. She or he is responsible for monitoring the field placement, supporting both the candidate and the field instructor, and visiting the field site at least once during the placement. At the end of the year, seminar instructors/field liaisons also complete an evaluation of field placements to provide feedback on the quality of the internship experience. Several outcomes related to data collection include creating "literacy night" and "cultural fairs." Candidates and faculty indicate there are multiple opportunities to bring social issues into the classroom environment, allowing for a rich dialogue of how school social workers can intervene and advocate on behalf of client systems.

Assessment of Candidates:
In addition to the standard assessments for all MSW candidates, PPSW candidates are assessed for credential-specific competencies through the use of a mid-year and final Comprehensive Skills Evaluations. The candidate's field instructor evaluates the candidate on competencies related to seven standards for the School Social Work specialization and six standards for the Child Welfare and Attendance standards.

The PPSW Program Coordinator is responsible for monitoring each candidate's progress through the program and for reviewing all PPSW-specific evaluations. Once the coordinator verifies that all PPSW program requirements have been met, she or he issues a formal letter approving the candidate for recommendation for the credential. This letter is sent to the Credential Center on campus with a scanned copy emailed to the candidate.

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**.

Teacher Librarian Services Credential and
Special Class Authorization in Information and Digital Literacy

Program Design:
The Teacher Librarian Services Credential with Special Class Authorization for Information and Digital Literacy program resides within the College of Education's Advanced Studies in Education and Counseling (ASEC) Department.

Leadership, communication, and coordination within the program are well documented and were verified at the site visit. The Program Coordinator is responsible for and has oversight of the Teacher Librarian Services Credential (TLSC) program and reports to the College of Education Associate Dean. Interviews, review of the website, and meeting agendas validate a system of communication and coordination within the credential program and across the unit; the TLSC Program Coordinator meets with the ASEC Program Coordinators and Graduate

Committee monthly, other credential coordinators and the Associate Dean each semester, and Educational and Technology and Media Leadership faculty twice monthly.

The TLSC program addresses the processes of admission, advising, and assessment of candidates. The program provides incoming students with multiple opportunities to access information through informational sessions held both on and off site, information housed and accessed on the College of Education's website, and orientation meetings. Interviews with candidates, graduates, and faculty confirmed that during each course candidates are informed about course expectations and assessment criteria, provided exemplars and syllabi and regularly scheduled informational visits from the Program Coordinator to classes. In addition, the program coordinator maintains a presence on the college's own online platform, BeachBoard, providing timely announcements and a semester newsletter about professional development activities, scholarships, and employment opportunities. The program coordinator, who also serves as the advisor for the program's candidates, is available for additional consultation by telephone, email, and in person as needed. The aforementioned sources and supports coordinate to provide complete information about specific program standards, outcomes, deadlines, performance expectations, and progress towards completion of the program.

The program consists of eight required courses and a culminating field experience, which includes an E-portfolio. Interviews, review of the curriculum map, assessment plan, and course syllabi identified a coordinated structure of coursework, signature assessments, and fieldwork to meet program standards, individual candidate needs, and to support growth and attainment in Student Learning Outcomes (SLO).

In 2011, the Commission adopted new standards for TLSC programs. At that time, the college merged the Educational Technology program with the Library Services Credential to form the Educational Technology and Media Leadership master's degree with an embedded credential. Faculty reviewed courses, readings, assignments and fieldwork in order to adjust, expand, and update the program to meet the new standards.

The program addresses the processes of program evaluation and improvement. Documents, data, and interviews confirm the college's Assessment Unit supports the College of Education's extensive system of candidate, program, and unit assessment. Interviews with graduates, district partners and faculty verified program data is collected. Results of the data are aggregated by the Assessment Unit and provided to programs for review and analysis of program effectiveness during regularly scheduled unit and program meetings. Both full time and part time faculty review and analyze data and survey results. The college's program evaluation and analysis efforts include student course evaluations and exit surveys, alumni surveys, and focus groups.

The program also addresses coordination and communication with PreK-12 schools/district partners through their Advisory Board on a regular basis. The program's Advisory Board includes faculty, practitioner teacher librarians, a public library trustee, and teacher librarian employers that meet each semester. During interviews with the Program Coordinator and

district partner representatives it is clear the Advisory Board is a rich source of sharing of information and feedback used to strengthen the program and its relationships with the community.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):
Courses are designed to provide the concepts and techniques for candidates to design, develop and implement standards-based learning experiences. Course syllabi, description of the sequence and progression of coursework with program outcomes, signature assignments, and coordination of coursework with fieldwork are well organized and were easy to access for program reviewers. During interviews, candidates and graduates expressed the value of and the learning which occurs during coursework, real world coordination and application of signature assignments, and clinical practice.

The program coursework, clinical practice, and fieldwork provide opportunities for candidates to
   1) use a variety of instructional strategies and assessment tools and emerging technologies, to design, develop and implement standards-based learning experiences,
   2) collaborate with educational partners to support student learning and develop multiple literacies throughout all disciplines,
   3) model and promote ethical and equitable access to physical, digital and virtual collections by students and staff; instruct students and staff in effective use of these collections,
   4) articulate and advocate for effective school library programs and positive learning environments that focus on student learning and achievement,
   5) examine best practices to plan, develop, budget for, implement, and assess school library programs,
   6) provide a library program with equitable access that is appropriate for all students, including those with diverse needs, interests, capabilities, and socio- cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Program participants, practitioner teacher librarians, field supervisors, and the program coordinator verified this during interviews.

The fieldwork and clinical practice include opportunities for candidates to: observe, collect and analyze data, and make instructional recommendations about information and digital literacies behavior; collaboratively develop a curriculum-based technology acquisition plan; produce a product related to digital citizenship or design and conduct an Internet-based learning prototype; design and teach a web-based information literacy lesson (including curriculum, resources, instruction, interactive student tech activity, assessment).

In interviews, effective placement of fieldwork candidates was demonstrated by the program coordinator, practitioner teachers, Advisory Panel and graduates. Recommendation by district partners, other program faculty, Advisory Committee members, local district library coordinators, and county office library media staff are all considered during the placement process. Prior to approving placement for new sites or practitioners, the program coordinator visits and evaluates any potential field experience site to ensure program standards will be

addressed and will take into account the individual candidate's needs, represent the student diversity of the area, offer experiences with new technologies and offers a sufficient collection of print and non-print resources.

In addition to this evaluation by the Program Coordinator, consideration of appropriate field experience placements are based on an initial visit by the credential candidate to meet the teacher librarian and observe both the program and the facility in order to ensure site is appropriate in the candidate's opinion; approval by the district library media coordinator as required; and approval by the site principal. All field experiences have fully credentialed teacher librarians. TLSC program graduates and district partners provided examples of positive placement experiences as well as the program's quick response to correcting or reassigning students when the occasion called for action.

Assessment of Candidates:
The TLSC program uses multiple measures to determine candidate competence. Course outlines identify the standards of competency and performance expectation to be addressed. In assessing candidate competence the program uses a variety of formative assessments including, but not limited to, discussion, oral presentation, signature assignments, direct observation, and review of the candidate's technology plan, workshop presentations, and journal submissions. Review of program documents and interviews confirm candidates have knowledge of assignments, course and program outcomes, and access to rubrics and exemplars through their program courses and online, and they receive feedback on assessments specific to program outcomes and expectations as outlined and described in rubrics. Formative and summative assessments offer candidates opportunities to practice and improve their competencies. During field experience, candidates have an opportunity to demonstrate in practice their mastery of these competencies.

Signature assignments are faculty-designed assessments, typically embedded in courses that assess candidate learning on program-level outcomes. Assessment scoring is guided by rubrics to ensure consistency and fairness. These data are collected each time the relevant course is offered and are then forwarded to the Assessment Office for analysis. Analysis includes calculating the mean and standard deviation for overall and criteria scores. Signature assignment and rubric development are articulated and outlined by the unit and are consistent throughout the program and unit.

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**.

Reading Certificate (Reading and Literacy Added Authorization)

Program Design:
The previously approved Reading Language Arts Specialist program was declared inactive in June 2014 and has since expired. The Specialist program has not admitted students since the 2012-13 academic year; the last cohort matriculated in spring 2013. In interviews the program coordinator stated the program transition to the new standards for the Certificate (Reading and Literacy Added Authorization) was approved by the Commission in December 2014. The Certificate (Reading and Literacy Added Authorization) will begin with a new cohort in the summer of 2015.

The program is housed in the Teacher Education Department and is supported by the department chair and the program coordinator.

The Reading Certificate (Reading and Literacy Added Authorization) is composed of five courses that develop teachers' specific knowledge and skills in reading and literacy for children K-12. The program is designed to "spiral" the students' content knowledge and pedagogy so that they are able to synthesize and apply their understandings about teaching and learning over time. Using a cohort model, students are scheduled in two courses a semester. The courses are linked to complement each other in content and sequenced to build content knowledge in a highly applied setting.

Each course in the program includes an identified signature assignment that is administered to every candidate. The assignments are evaluated on a common rubric scale and the College of Education Assessment Office tabulates the results for program faculty. Each semester program faculty meet to identify evidence-based strengths and needs of the program using the signature assignment data produced by the Assessment Office. Recommendations are made and action plans are established.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):
Over a period of two semesters and a half semesters, candidates take the following courses:
- EDRG 540 Advanced Studies in Literacy
- EDRG 551 Assessment and Instruction in Reading and Writing
- EDRG 558 Language Study for Reading Teachers
- EDRG 559 Practicum in Teaching Reading/Language Arts
- EDRG 543 Integration of Technology in Reading/Language Arts

Candidate Competence:
Candidates engage in research and assessment in reading and literacy in their own classroom and schools. In EDRG 551, candidates complete an evaluation of the culture of literacy in their own classroom. Candidates share and discuss with their course instructor and peers the strengths of the literate environment in terms of promoting the culture of literacy and identify areas for improvement. These and other assignments are evaluated throughout the program. Additionally, program faculty members discuss candidates' performance in respective courses and provide interventions (if needed) to those who may have not done well in a course.

Signature assignments, selected for their significance for demonstrating candidate learning, are scored using rubrics and those data are sent to the Assessment Office.

The Credential Center Coordinator checks the data from the signature assignment of each course as a way to ensure that each candidate meets all requirements satisfactorily. Candidates who complete all of the courses satisfactorily are eligible for endorsement for the Reading/Language Arts Added Authorization by the Credential Center.

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**.