

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at
California State University, Monterey Bay
April 2014**

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at California State University, Monterey Bay. The report of the team presents the findings based upon review of the institutional Site Visit documentation reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** is made for the institution.

NCATE/Common Standards

	NCATE Recommendations		California Team Decisions
1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Initial Advanced	Met Not Met	Not Met (C.S. 9)
2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Initial Advanced	Met Not Met	Met
3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Initial Advanced	Met N/A	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 with Concerns (C.S. 3)
CTC Common Standard 1 Credential Recommendation Process	-		Met
CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	-		Met with Concerns

Educator Preparation Programs Offered by CSU Monterey Bay

<u>Programs</u>	Total # of Program Standards	Number of Program Standards		
		Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
Multiple Subject, including Intern program	19	16	3	0
Single Subject, including Intern program	19	15	4	0
Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, including Intern program	22	10	4	8
Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe, including Intern program	24	11	4	7
Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder	3	2	0	1

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: CSU Monterey Bay

Dates of Visit: March 9-11, 2014

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: Accreditation with Major Stipulations

Rationale:

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

Common Standards—

The entire team reviewed each of the NCATE/Common Standards and the two Common Standards not reflected in the NCATE standards and determined whether each standard was met, not met, or met with concerns. The site visit team found that Common Standard 9 (NCATE Standard 1) is Not Met and Common Standard 3 (NCATE Standard 6) and Common Standard 6 are Met with Concerns.

+

Program Standards –

Individual team members and the total team membership discussed findings and provided appropriate input regarding the programs at California State University, Monterey Bay. Following discussion, the team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns, or not met. The CTC team found the following:

Multiple Subject Program – all standards met with the exception of Standard 2, 14, and 15, which are Met with Concerns.

Single Subject: all program standards are met with the exception of Standards 1, 8, 12, and 15, which are Met with Concerns.

Education Specialist Program Standards - all standards are met with the exception of Standards 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 14 which are Not Met, and Standards 7, 9, 13, which are Met with Concerns.

Education Specialist: Mild Moderate - all standards are met with the exception of Standards 2 and 6, which are Not Met, and Standard 3, which is Met with Concerns

Education Specialist: Moderate Severe - all standards are met with the exception of Standard 5, which is Not Met

Autism Spectrum Disorders: Added Authorization, all standards are met with the exception of Standard 1, which is not met

Overall Recommendation –

The team completed a thorough review of program documents and program data, and interviewed institutional administrators, program leadership, faculty, supervising instructors, master teachers, candidates, completers, and advisory board members. Based on NCATE/Common and program standards findings the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**

Recommended Stipulations

- 1) The institution must provide a clear description and supporting documentation to address all Program Standards for the Education Specialist and Added Authorization in Special Education credential program found to be not met. For each standard, this information must include:
 - A succinct description of how candidates demonstrate competency in standard requirements
 - The scoring rubric(s) and/or other measures used to determine candidate competency as well as evidence showing how the indicators directly relate to each of the required candidate competencies.
- 2) No new programs will be approved by the COA until the stipulation above is fully addressed.

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

Initial/Teaching Credentials

Multiple Subject

Intern (Inactive, pending COA Approval)

Single Subject, with Intern

Education Specialist Credentials

Mild/Moderate

Moderate Severe

Advanced Credential

Level II MM

Reading Certificate (Inactive)

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- CSU Monterey Bay continues in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

**Accreditation Team
Joint NCATE-CTC Accreditation Team**

NCATE Co-Chair:

Yuhang Rong

University of Connecticut

California Co-Chair:

Mark Cary

Davis Jt. Union School District, Retired

**NCATE/Common Standards
Cluster:**

Michelle McClure

Harris-Stowe State University

James Bowen

Southwestern Christian University

Shirley Lefever-Davis

Wichita State University

Amy Robbins (CTC Reviewer)

California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo

Patricia Wick (CTC Reviewer)

University of Phoenix

Basic/Teaching Programs Cluster:

Paul Johnson

Riverside County Office of Education

Lynn Larsen

Brandman University

Rebekah Harris

Azusa Pacific

Staff to the Visit

Cheryl Hickey

Administrator

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog
Institutional Report
Course Syllabi

Candidate Files
Fieldwork Handbooks
Follow-up Survey Results

Candidate Handbook
 Program Assessment Feedback
 Biennial Reports
 Biennial Report Feedback
 Program Assessment Documents
 Field Experience Notebooks

Schedule of Classes
 Advisement Documents
 Faculty Vitae
 Budget Documents
 TPA Data

Interviews Conducted

	Total
Candidates	33
Completers	39
Employers	8
Institutional Administration	4
Program Coordinators	3
Faculty	4
TPA Coordinator	2
Field Supervisors – Program	21
Field Supervisors - District	27
Credential Analysts and Staff	1
Advisory Board Members	8
Others	2
Total	152

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.

Introduction

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Delivery Model	Number of program completers (2012-13)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (12-13)
Multiple Subject	Initial	Traditional Intern (Inactive)	26 0	28 0
Single Subject		Traditional Intern (Inactive)	31 22	14 18
Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities Preliminary	Initial		21	42
Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Disabilities	Initial		14	41
Education Specialist Level II	Advanced			37
Reading Certificate (Inactive)	Advanced		0	0

The Visit

The visit to the California State University, Monterey Bay was a joint NCATE/CTC visit. An offsite visit was conducted among the team several months prior to the site visit. A two-month out previsit was conducted via conference call on January 23, 2014 and was attended by the NCATE and CTC team co-chairs, and the Commission consultant. The visit began at 9:00 a.m. on March 9, 2014, with a team meeting. This was followed by an orientation to the institution's programs, governance structure, and unit assessment system. Interviews with constituent groups commenced that afternoon and continued, along with document review, throughout Monday, March 10, 2014 and into Tuesday morning, March 11, 2014. An exit report was conducted in the afternoon of March 11, 2014.

Extraordinary Events

The site visit was challenged by the fact that the Program Assessment process had not been completed prior to the visit. Although Program Assessment documents were to have been submitted to CTC for review two years prior to the scheduled site visit, the documents were received substantially later, with resubmissions still being submitted in the weeks prior to the site visit, and therefore insufficient time was provided to do a comprehensive review of CSUMB credential programs prior to the site visit. Because of this, the Administrator of Accreditation determined that the Program Sampling protocol normally used at site visits could not be followed. Instead, one reviewer was assigned to Single Subject the single subject credential program, one to the Multiple Subject credential program, and one to the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe credential programs. These reviewers were assigned to

complete a review of program documentation at the site visit and make determinations about program quality and effectiveness as part of this same review.

Transformation Initiative Model

The institution chose to pursue the NCATE Transformation Initiative Process. Because the information on NCATE team findings on this process is not directly relevant to the Commission's findings on Common and Program standards, they are included in Appendix A to this document. While the findings and the conclusions are not part of the Commission's formal accreditation process, some of the information contained in that section may be important context for the COA. Therefore, it has not been eliminated entirely from this document, but it is included in the Appendix for reference only. During the course of the visit, CSUMB requested in writing that they be reviewed against the six NCATE standards only and requested review under the Continuous Improvement Model.

I. INTRODUCTION

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

According to the unit's Institutional Report, California State University-Monterey Bay (CSUMB) was founded in 1994 as the 21st campus of the California State University System, primarily as a Hispanic serving institution. The University's vision statement notes that CSUMB strives to be "a comprehensive state university which values service through high quality education. The campus will be distinctive in serving the diverse people of California, especially the working class and historically undereducated and low- income populations. It will feature an enriched living and learning environment and year-round operation. The identity of the university will be framed by substantive commitment to multilingual, multicultural, gender-equitable learning. The university will be a collaborative, intellectual community distinguished by partnerships with existing institutions both public and private, cooperative agreements which enable students, faculty, and staff to cross institutional boundaries for innovative instruction, broadly defined scholarly and creative activity, and coordinated community service."

The unit envisions "excellence as encompassing content knowledge, skills, and dispositions that enable students to become life-long learners." The unit's programs are aimed at developing "the leadership and stewardship skills necessary to create responsive pedagogy, assessment practices, and curriculum in schools that are healthy, nurturing, and empowering social environments."

The University defines its professional education unit as "all departments that contribute to the preparation of educators," including Departments of Liberal Studies, Mathematics and Statistics, Biology, World Languages and Cultures, Human Communications, and the Social and Behavioral Sciences. These departments are primarily responsible for the delivery of content. The Department of Teacher Education within the unit offers the post-baccalaureate teaching credential programs in professional education for candidates who received their undergraduate training from other institutions.

The constituent departments of the professional education unit meet as the University-Wide Teacher Education Council (UTEC), chaired by the Department of Teacher Education. The UTEC reports to the Dean of the College of Professional Studies who serves as the Chief Academic Officer for Teacher Education. The Dean of the College of Professional Studies reports to the Provost and through the Provost to the President.

According to documents provided by the unit, the UTEC also include P-12 school district partners with voting rights. The UTEC meets twice a year, its primary function is to review the effectiveness of the teacher preparation curriculum in producing capable teachers in all of our programs with the skills, knowledge and dispositions described in our conceptual framework and professional standards. This function is primarily fulfilled through the review of program assessment data, the identification of program areas of strength and weakness, and the approval of strategies and plans to improve program operations with respect to assessment findings.

The unit has included the following programs for review by the NCATE: Multiple Subjects program for the preliminary teaching credential (primarily for elementary education); Single Subject program for the preliminary teaching credential in Science, Mathematics (including

foundational), Modern Languages, Social Studies, and English; Mild/Moderate Educational Specialist credentials, Moderate/Severe Educational Specialist credentials; and the Reading Certificate Program which is currently inactive.

The unit states that it does not prepare counselors or educational administrators. However, it offers a Master of Arts in Education program, with an emphasis in Curriculum and Instruction or an emphasis in Special Education- neither of which serves to prepare candidates for a credential.

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

This is a NCATE and State joint visit, co-chaired by Yuhang Rong, representing NCATE/CAEP and Mark Cary, representing the CTC. Cheryl Hickey participated in the review as the consultant for the California Commission on Teaching Credentialing. The state also conducted its own program review with an additional team on site concurrently.

I.3 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.).

Not applicable.

I.4 Unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit. (Character Limit: 3,000)

According to the state's program review protocol, the unit was supposed to submit its program assessment reports for state review two years prior to the NCATE-State joint visit. However, the unit failed to submit the report on time resulting the state conducting its review and visit in concurrence with the NCATE-State joint visit.

During the on-site visit, the unit officially notified the NCATE and the California Commission on Teaching Credentialing that it decided to discontinue the transformational initiative project. The unit cited the unanticipated challenges of data collection, faculty retirement, and serious budget constraint as reasons for the discontinuation. The unit is also undergoing a significant restructuring. The current College of Professional Studies will be divided into two colleges, one being the new College of Education. The unit is planning a dean search immediately. The new dean along with the new provost will conduct a strategic development process and ensure all programs and activities are well aligned with the strategic priorities. The unit has requested to revert back to the continuous improvement pathway during the next accreditation cycle.

There is also confusion by the unit if its Master of Arts in Education program is an advanced educator preparation program. After reviewing the program handbook and other supporting documents, it is evident that the program targets on the competencies for certified teachers and is aligned with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. It fits in the NCATE description of advanced teacher preparation program.

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 Overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The unit has indicated that the professional standards that support its conceptual framework, including the Model Core Teaching Standards of InTASC and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) were substantially revised since the 2006 site visit by the NCATE Board of Examiners. The new revisions were incorporated into the conceptual framework and approved by the UTEC at its May 2013 meeting.

The unit states that faculty have reviewed and adopted professional dispositions at the unit level, with specific entries for various programs. These are now included as part of the conceptual framework along with the revised professional teaching standards.

The unit states that its mission is to prepare "caring and responsive educators with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to effectively facilitate the learning of all students from diverse ethnic, linguistic, and ability groups, so that they can fully participate in a dynamic society and world."

The unit has indicated the knowledge base for the unit's programs, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and the educational policies that inform the unit's conceptual framework, was "Education for Excellence, Equity and Ethical Action." Further, the unit states that its knowledge base arises from the unit's concern for the educational, economic, and social wellbeing of all the residents of the service area, including the historically-underserved and -undereducated populations that have supported agricultural and other labor-intensive industries of this area.

The unit's credential programs are based on the recently revised Model Core Teaching Standards developed by the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) in 2010 and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) developed in 2009. The unit's expectations for our students are outcome behaviors, knowledge, and skills directly related to the effective teaching practices embodied in the standards.

The unit has adopted a set of professional dispositions characterizing professional educators as persons who: are committed to ethical conduct-fairness, honesty, responsibility, compassion, collaboration, collegiality; believe all students can and will experience academic success; believe that individual differences in learners are assets to be accommodated in the classroom; are inclined towards being advocates who identify and strive to eliminate inequities, social injustice, and prejudice as stewards of public education for a just society; and reflect on their own practices in a process that leads to continual improvement.

The unit's IR Addendum provides a flow chart to describe the relationship of the Conceptual

Framework to program components. In the flowchart, the unit has provided a description of the contents of the Conceptual Framework, including connections of the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) to national teacher preparation standards (InTASC), state teacher performance standards (CSTP) and program standards of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). The chart displays how TPE's are acquired by candidates and assessed by the program in courses, field experiences, and in program assessments at the unit level. Further, the unit's course syllabi identify specific TPEs developed in particular courses. TPEs are also developed and evaluated in field experiences.

The unit has developed and measured candidate growth in dispositions for more than five years, but the process has been uneven until recently. Previously, each program developed its own dispositions, but the unit realized after 2006 that it needed a unit level approach to this process. The unit has adopted a core set of dispositions evaluated in all programs, while leaving each program to identify additional dispositions pertinent to specific authorizations, such as Special Education. Currently, candidates perform a baseline, mid-point, and final self-evaluation of their dispositional growth. Additionally, clinical faculty also assess dispositions of candidates at mid-point and prior to program exit.

NCATE/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 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

After a review of evidence during the onsite visit, it was determined that standards for initial programs were met with an area for improvement. The unit needs to disaggregate data for internship and traditional delivery models across programs. Nearly half of the Single Subject candidates and most of the Special Education candidates complete the internship pathway. However, no Multiple Subject candidates have completed that option for the last several years. It was indicated during the onsite visit the program option for Multiple Subject internship will be discontinued. The State of California program assessment review has indicated that the Educational Specialist (Special Education) program has not aligned its assessments with state standards, and the state is recommending that the program is placed on probation with a stipulation that no new programs will be approved for the unit until the program is approved. Regarding advanced programs, a review of the evidence resulted in concluding the standards for advanced programs were not met.

An area of concern noted in the Offsite Report was not all candidates in initial programs for multiple subjects and single subjects have the knowledge, skills and dispositions articulated in the Conceptual Framework or have met the California Commission on Teaching Credentialing standards, because only limited data from the PACT was provided and no evidence of meeting

the California Commission on Teaching Credentialing standards. There appears to be some inconsistency in the assessment of candidate preparation in initial programs. While the assessments in field experiences are aligned with program standards and are regularly collected, the assessments used to document performance collected during course work appear to consist of course grades which may also include performance on tasks that are not solely aligned with program standards.

In the Response to the Offsite Report, it was reported the State of California requires all candidates for a multiple or single subject teaching credential pass the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). The PACT is administered by a trained PACT coordinator and scored by trained scorers. A score of 2 or greater is considered passing. Candidates must pass all five rubric categories and have no more than 2 failing scores (score of 1) across all tasks. To pass a category, candidates must have a majority of passing scores within a category. Exhibit "CF3 Five Years of PACT data", includes overall mean scores on all assessment items for candidates from the PACT for elementary and the four single subject programs. Aggregated data from 2008 to 2013 indicate candidate performance exceeds the passing score of 2 in almost all areas. Exceptions appear in the data from 2011-2012 on PACT items related to development of academic language, which showed lower performance levels (1.97 mean score) for all program areas. The scores on those same items improved to 2.28 for 2012-2013.

The Response to the Offsite Report stated that candidate knowledge and support of state-adopted academic standards are assessed in Task 2 and 4 of the PACT which requires students to plan lessons aligned to state standards and to assess student achievement of academic content standards. Mean scores for each program area shown in exhibit "CF3 Five Years of PACT data", indicate a range of scores that exceed a 2.0 on items related to Tasks 2 and 4. The exhibit document also states that students who do not pass the exam do not proceed for a teaching credential.

The Response to the Offsite Report states that all standards were met for the 2010-2012 Biennial Report for Single Subject and Multiple Subject programs. The Biennial Report document summarizes findings from the commission for all programs. Among the findings reported in the Biennial report for Multiple and Single Subject programs are the need to disaggregate data for the two delivery models (traditional, intern) and that PACT data for those who do not pass the assessment also be included. In interviews with program coordinators during the onsite visit, it was indicated a remediation process is in place for candidates who do not pass the PACT assessment and thus, there is a 100% pass rate on the PACT. The program coordinator for Multiple Subject reported that no remediation has been needed for Multiple Subject for several years since all Multiple Subject candidates have earned passing scores on the PACT.

Initial programs are also offered in Educational Specialist program areas Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe. Findings by the State in the Biennial report for preliminary Level 1 Education Specialist programs for Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe also include the recommendation to disaggregate data for both programs and to include assessments unique to each program. Data summaries were provided for self-assessments completed by candidates at three phases of the program in exhibit, "CF3.3 Three years Disp. Results Cand. Self Eval for Gen. Ed". However, the total number of respondents for the survey was not provided and the data were not disaggregated by program making it difficult to draw conclusions. The Response to the Offsite

Report described four required assessments for the Special Education program including the 1) Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form, 2) Professional Dispositions Assessment, 3) CSU, System-wide Evaluation of Graduates and Employers (One Year Out) conducted by the Center for Teacher Quality, and the 4) Program Graduate Survey. In the interview with the SPED coordinators, it was reported that the Center for Teacher Quality survey was replaced with the Progress log in the biennial report due to low response rate on the Center for Teacher Quality survey. It was also indicated that candidate GPA are being used as a measure of candidate content knowledge. Candidates must earn a 3.0 GPA each semester to continue in the program.

The Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form includes supervisors' evaluations of candidate performance on California Standards for the Teaching Profession and the Teacher Performance Evaluation. The scores from the Professional Dispositions Assessment are included in the same spreadsheet as the Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form. Three years of data from these assessments were reported in exhibit, "CF3-MS SS SPED Professional Dispositions". It appears from this exhibit that the assessment tool used to assess candidate dispositions changed in Fall, 2012. Data from the assessment tool used in Spring, 2011 and Spring 2012 with 10 and 12 responses respectively show mean scores ranging from 2.56 to 3.0 (3 point scale) on all measures. Data from Fall, 2012 and Spring, 2013 show a range of scores from 3.65 to 4.93 (5 point scale) for 23 and 19 respondents respectively.

Additionally, data reported in the Response to the Offsite Review from exhibit "CFE3-Three years (2010-2013) Candidate Field Evaluation results by supervisors for SPED candidate evals" show candidate mean scores on the California Standards for Teaching Profession (CSTP) during their final practicum (SPED567) that range from 2.0 to 3.65 on a 4 point scale. However, the number of respondents to this survey does not match the number of candidates in the programs and the data are not disaggregated by distinct program Mild/Moderate vs. Moderate/Severe, nor is it disaggregated by intern vs. traditional programs. Therefore, it is difficult to determine if all special education candidates have met content standards.

Data from the third assessment for Special Education candidates, the Center for Teacher Quality survey is summarized in exhibit "CF3_PP_SPED_CTQ_Data20122013". No data tables are included in the summary report, which describes student satisfaction from 2009 to 2011. Findings are based on 5-6 candidates per year and comparisons are made to average CSU scores. Data from surveys completed by 5 or 6 supervisors each year for years 2008 to 2011 are summarized in the same exhibit.

As stated in the biennial report, the Progress Log is used to determine candidate competency on California Commission Teacher Credential and Credential Specific standards. Program coordinators reported in the onsite visit the university supervisor assesses each candidate on the Progress Log at least four times during the final semester practicum. Data from the Progress Log for Spring, 2012 and Spring, 2013 included in the biennial report show scores from 3 site visits for both semesters. Data summaries provided in the biennial reports show high overall mean scores, exceeding 4.0 on a 5-point scale, on all items in the Progress Log. However, the number of responses was not provided so it is not clear how many candidates were evaluated using this assessment. Additionally, the rubric for the Progress Log does not clearly delineate different performance levels on each item.

The Biennial Report also shows data regarding the percent of candidates in "Good Academic Standing" defined as achieving a GPA of 3.0 each semester. This percentage was determined by comparing the number of candidates placed on Academic Probation to the number of candidates enrolled in the program to determine a percentage of candidates in good academic standing. Thus, the percentage of candidates in good academic standing reflects the proportion of candidates maintaining a 3.0 GPA or better. It is not clear how the unit aligns content standards to GPA and thus it is difficult to determine how this assessment is a valid measure of candidate knowledge and skills.

An Area for Improvement continued from the last visit was candidates in Special Education at the advanced level are not completely familiar with or assessed on dispositions. There were no data provided during the onsite visit regarding advanced level Special Education candidate (in the Master of Arts in Education) dispositions.

A second area of concern noted in the Offsite Report was candidates in advanced programs do not have the knowledge, skills and dispositions articulated in the conceptual framework since no data were provided for candidates in Master of Arts in Education (MAE) advanced programs. The MAE handbook provided during the onsite visit describe purpose of the program being to serve practicing educators, particularly classroom teachers, to work towards becoming outstanding, effective teachers and teacher leaders. However, during interviews with the program coordinator and program candidates, there appears to be some confusion regarding the program goals and outcomes. The Response to the Offsite Report describe a matrix provided in exhibit 1.4.2 showing the relationship between the conceptual framework, learning objectives and Teacher Performance Evaluations and an additional table (exhibit 1.6 Matrix for TPE X Course) showing the connection between Teacher Performance Evaluations and courses. It is also stated in the Response to the Offsite Report, that candidates demonstrate their knowledge, skills and dispositions via course assignments and the culminating assessment, the Master's thesis. However, no data were provided on course grades or pass rates on the Master's thesis.

Evidence to be validated during the onsite visit include the total number of respondents and the response rate for the graduate survey. The Response to the Offsite Report indicate that teacher candidates are required to complete a graduate survey and indicate that typically more than 50 surveys are completed each year with a 90% response rate. Data tables provided in exhibit CF3 Program Graduate Surveys, for years 2010-11 and 2011-12 report scores from 21 and 23 candidates respectively and show mean scores ranging from 3.7 to 4.2 (5 point scale) over both years. It was reported in interviews with program coordinators the survey was sent out by central administration, it was not returned by any candidates from the special education programs.

The exhibits did not include data for the new Autism Spectrum Disorder program or the Reading Certificate program. It was verified during the onsite visit the Reading certificate program is inactive.

1.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.3.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

1.3.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued

AFI:

Candidates in advanced programs do not have the knowledge, skills and dispositions articulated in the conceptual framework. (Revised)

Rationale:

There are no data on knowledge, skills and dispositions for candidates in Master of Arts in Education advanced programs.

1.3.3 New Areas for Improvement

AFI:

Candidates in the multiple subject, single subject, educational specialist mild/moderate and moderate/severe intern and traditional programs do not have the knowledge, skills and dispositions articulated in the conceptual framework. (Initial)

Rationale:

Data are not disaggregated by delivery option, intern and traditional across single subject, multiple subject and educational specialist mild/moderate and moderate/severe programs.

AFI:

Candidates in the Educational Specialist mild/moderate and moderate/severe and Autism Spectrum Disorder programs do not appear to have the knowledge, skills and dispositions articulated in the conceptual framework. (Initial)

Rationale:

No assessments were included that were unique to each program. Response rates on Progress log and Candidate Evaluation form assessments are not reported or are very low.

1.4 Recommendation for Standard 1

Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

Advanced Preparation: Not Met

STATE TEAM DECISION (CTC COMMON STANDARD 9: Assessment of Candidate Competencies)

NOT MET

Rationale:

Assessment of candidate competencies in the Education Specialist credential program relies significantly on tasks completed during program coursework. Based on the documentation provided, and on interviews during the site visit, reviewers were unable to determine that candidate competency was assessed in all areas required by program standards.

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 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

The unit states that its major goal "is to train teachers who will demonstrate effective teaching practices in multicultural, pluralistic settings as they seek to contribute to a socially just society". All programs offered by the unit include learning and/or performance outcomes in three areas: (a) Educators as knowledgeable professionals; (b) Educators as stewards of schools and public education for a just society; and (c) educators as researchers and evaluators. The six California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) have been adopted plus the unit developed and adopted a seventh standard to reflect the philosophy, vision, mission, and purposes of their program. According to the Master of Arts (MAE) Program Candidate Handbook the purpose of the MAE is to serve practicing educators, particularly classroom teachers, to work towards becoming outstanding, effective teachers and teacher leaders. This purpose is reiterated on the university website. The handbook also states that learning outcomes established for the program reflect the five propositions of the National Board Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). However, interviews with candidates, faculty, and the program coordinator indicated a general confusion as to the goals and purpose of the program.

In May 2013 the University-Wide Teacher Education Council (UTEC) approved revisions to the conceptual framework (CF) to reflect the substantial changes made to the Model Core Teaching Standards of INTASC and the CSTP. Student Assessment Timeline provided by the unit (Exhibit 2.6.1) illustrates the flow of assessments from the point of the candidate's admission to the point of analyzing credentials for licensure.

The unit has identified the UTEC as the advisory body for teacher education. As such it evaluates program effectiveness and the development of policies and resources for the improvement of the unit. A description of the UTEC provided by the unit indicates that it consists of students, faculty, and administrative representatives from the university; K-12 public school faculty and administrators; and community college representatives. Interviews and documents viewed during the on-site visit confirmed the makeup of the committee and that the group meets least once a semester. However, subcommittees of the UTEC typically meet bimonthly. Interviews with the UTEC and faculty did not indicate any subcommittee activities. The unit provided an example of review, discussion, and subsequent decisions made by the Council (Exhibit 2.6.4).

The unit assesses candidates through base-line and continuing measures. These include candidate self-reports and analyses of scenarios in public school settings. Examples of Interview questions, protocols and rubrics were provided that illustrate this assessment. Alumni and employer satisfaction with candidate preparation for teaching are measured biannually through a university-wide survey and reported to the UTEC. Candidates' planning, instructional and assessment skills, and their ability to reflect on assessments to improve instruction are assessed with the Performance Assessment of California Teachers (PACT). The unit has developed field-experience assessments tied to co-teaching for the purpose of evaluating candidate performance

in classrooms and schools. An intervention process is implemented involving clinical faculty, program coordinators, the co-teaching coordinator and the field placement coordinator in the event that problems surface during field experiences/student teaching. The unit provided samples of the statement of concern that is generated if warranted by an intervention. If the problem identified is not resolved the candidate is counseled to pursue other career paths other than teaching. The success or failure of interventions is used to guide the further development of the field experience program. The 2009 Annual Report states that a formal candidate complaint procedure was developed, along with a complaint and resolution tracking form which is kept on file with the dean's assistant. The procedure is said to have been in place since spring 2008. Filed complaints are analyzed and evaluated by the Dean and Department Chair and subsequently reviewed with the faculty by the end of each academic year, in order to evaluate the student complaint procedures and determine areas for improvement. An interview with the Dean of Professional Studies confirmed that the procedure is still in place.

The unit uses multiple assessments from internal and external sources to evaluate its candidates. The Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), mentioned earlier and designed for multiple and single subject candidates, consists of the Literacy Teaching Event and Embedded Signature Assessments (ESAs). The Teaching Event measures the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), which are teaching standards for California student teachers. The PACT evaluates five categories of a specific Teaching Event: Context for Learning, Planning (3-5 lessons), Instruction, Assessment, Reflection, and Academic Language. A video recorded teaching episode is submitted with evidence of student learning. Candidates are provided with information and assistance to complete the PACT in the Literacy Methods course (ED 617), Seminar and Classroom Technology course (ED 538). A 12 item standardized rubric is used for scoring PACT. The Teacher Candidate Evaluation (TCE) Form is administered each semester in which the candidate is enrolled in a field placement course. It is completed by the candidate's University Supervisor who bases his/her ratings on direct observations of the candidate in the field, along with discussions with the candidate's Cooperating Teacher. The TCE allows the University Supervisor to make a number of evaluations on the candidate's performance relative to each of the California Standards for Teacher Performance (CSTP) and TPEs. The CSU System-wide Evaluation of Graduates and Employers (One Year Out) conducted by the state's Center for Teacher Quality, is an annual survey of credential graduates and their employers addressing the level of preparation in five major areas. The objective is to assist the unit in addressing areas of need in order to improve the preparation of future teachers. For both program completers and their employing supervisors, the survey asks for a rating on a number of items related to teaching activities regarding the extent to which the employee was "well prepared", "adequately prepared", "somewhat prepared", or "not prepared" by the unit. The responses are collapsed for reporting/analysis purposes to the two categories of "well or adequately prepared" and "somewhat or not prepared". The survey further provides an opportunity for program completers to rate the value/helpfulness of various components of the credential program as being "very valuable", "somewhat valuable", "a little valuable", and "not valuable". These ratings are also collapsed for reporting/analysis into the two categories of "very or somewhat valuable" and "a little or not valuable". Candidates complete the program graduate exit survey at the end of their credential program. The survey asks graduates to rank how well the program prepared them on various items related to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) Program Standards. Graduates rate these items using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Low (score of 1), Moderate (score of 3), and High (score of 5).

The unit states that advanced candidates in the MAE program demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions by (1) how completely they meet the learning outcomes (LOs) around which the program is constructed and (2) the completion of a final thesis based on action research applied to a question of local practice or policy. The meeting of LO's requirement is based solely on completing of course projects and there is a general rubric for determining candidates' mastery but no data were reported for this assessment. The thesis requirement is assessed with a rubric but is focused on a candidate's ability to conduct research and report the results. The unit did not provide other measures for assessing advanced candidates' knowledge, skill, and dispositions thus there was no data reported for this program. The team found that data from the various assessments was limited indicating that the data are not regularly and systematically collected and compiled.

The unit's 2012 Annual Report indicates that efforts to eliminate and control for bias and unfairness in its assessment system have resulted in the use of measurement tools with high levels of reliability and validity with respect to surveys of program alumni, surveys of employers, and the use of the PACT to evaluate candidate mastery of Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE). The surveys are administered by an office of the CSU system that has conducted extensive reliability and validity studies on its instruments. The PACT is reported to demonstrate reliability and validity through its preparation by a consortium of universities including Stanford University, the UC system, and the CSU system. PACT users undertake annual calibration in the application of scoring rubrics developed by the PACT consortium. Clinical faculty undertook inter-rater reliability assessment and training in the use of scoring field evaluation instruments. Through this exercise the unit identified norms of use with instruments developed at the campus level. Documents such as PACT Double Scoring (a comprehensive report on portfolio assessments) and DWright Confidence Intervals (a summary of confidence intervals of first-year teachers assessment of the overall effectiveness of their CSU credential program) were provided as evidence of procedures for ensuring fairness, accuracy, consistency, and freedom of bias for key assessments of candidate performance.

The TK20 data management system is used to maintain the unit's assessments. Field assessment reports in TK20 assess the extent to which effective instructional practices were visible in the classroom, whether proper dispositions for teaching are evident in the company of students, and the extent to which co-teaching is practiced in field sites. TK20 recording forms monitor the effectiveness of co-teaching practice. When teacher candidates report for their field placement assignments, they report on the availability of educational technology and describe it in some detail in the field experience binder of the TK20 system. Each candidate is expected to report on the characteristics of learners in classrooms where they are assigned as co-teachers. These reports are made in the units Tk20 curriculum management system within the field experiences binder.

2.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.3.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

2.3.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued

2.3.3 New Areas for Improvement

AFI:

Advanced - the unit does not maintain an assessment system that includes comprehensive and integrated assessment and evaluation measures.

Rationale:

The only assessment for the Master of Arts in Education degree provided by the unit did not evaluate candidates mastery of knowledge, skills, and dispositions for education.

2.4 Recommendation for Standard 2

Initial Teacher Preparation Met

Advanced Preparation Not Met

STATE DECISION: 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 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

After review of documents and interviews with candidates, cooperative teachers, unit and partnering schools, the unit has met Standard Three with some areas of improvements. The unit has provided a summary of the previous unit operations from 1995-2005, which led to the year-long clinical experiences for teacher candidates. In the previous structure, the unit operated with a conventional fifth year post-baccalaureate teacher preparation program aligned with the policy framework of the state legislature and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) standards. The previous model of student teaching appeared not to be effective for the unit. Based on interviews with cooperating teachers, teacher candidates needed to be in field placements prior to start of school. Under the old model, teacher candidates were placed in schools within the academic year which provided substantially shorter periods of time in their placements. Furthermore, student teachers spent time observing students and the cooperating teacher. Responsibilities for teaching occurred quite some time after placement.

According to the unit, as a result of the Blue Ribbon Panel Report of NCATE and funding from the U.S. Department of Education Teacher Quality Enhancement Program grants, the unit implemented a initiative centered on creating a year-long clinical experiences for candidates with three school districts. Based on information from interviews with the field coordinator, the unit actually does not focus on three districts as cited in the IR. The field coordinator identifies partnering schools from various school districts that she has developed strong relationships and are willing to participate in the co-teaching model.

The design of the co-teaching model sets the foundation for candidates to take summer courses in

preparation for the year-long clinical experiences. From interviews with cooperating teachers, candidates, faculty and candidates, candidates take courses in on classroom management and lesson planning. Many of the people interviewed stated that this provided adequate preparation for the candidates so that they could be effective and have a successful field experience based on the co-teaching model. Prior to the change, candidates had limited experience in planning lessons and the ability to manage classroom. The new model allowed for candidates to be identified as co-teachers from the beginning. Cooperating teachers reported that this allowed for the candidates to have ownership of the classroom and invested in the learning of the children in that classroom. Other exhibits that supported this were workshops on the co-teaching model and the pairs training workshop. In addition, candidates have the opportunity to meet their cooperative teachers, help in the set-up and design of their classrooms and participate in the planning week prior to the arrival of P-12 students and conclude at the end of the P-12 school year. Workshops and training sessions were designed for cooperating teachers and teacher candidates on the co-teaching model.

Based on interviews with the field coordinator, she works with schools, not necessarily districts, to identify school partners who will provide candidates with experiences that align with the vision of the unit which is, "To build a multicultural learning community founded on academic excellence from which all partners in the educational process emerge prepared to contribute productively, responsibly and ethnically to California and the global community." While the schools identified as partner schools support the vision of the unit, it contradicts what the Unit stated in the IR. From the IR, the unit wrote that it streamlined the number of districts and arranged to have three districts host teacher education candidates. For placements, it was reported in interviews that teacher education candidates are asked which districts they would like to be placed. She works with various school districts depending on single subject or multiple subjects. Moreover, she stated she works with schools in which she has strong relationships with and will provide teacher education candidates with the experiences that they will need and are supportive of the co-teaching model. When asked how cooperative teachers are identified in partnering schools to serve as cooperative teachers, the field placement coordinator reported that she relies on principals for selection. There is no data available that identifies the criteria necessary to serve as a cooperative teacher. Therefore, it is not clear how cooperative teachers are selected. It appears that they are selected primarily from the principal. This was substantiated by interviews with cooperating teachers. When asked how they were informed about the process to becoming a cooperative teacher, they were asked by the principal to serve. In some instances, the unit held presentations on how teachers in partnering schools could serve as cooperative teachers. However, it was up to the principals' discretion if the teachers were allowed to serve as cooperative teachers.

There are clear entry and exit requirements of the field experience for the candidates. The entry and exit requirement are provided in the unit's handbook. As stated earlier, there are clear roles and responsibilities for the candidates, cooperating teachers, university supervisors and lead supervisors. According to the IR, the unit's assessments of field experiences include end of program surveys that are administered to candidates, selected items from the survey of program graduates and employers which is conducted by the Center for Teacher Quality of the California State University System, and field observation forms completed by university supervisors. These assessments evaluate the effectiveness of the clinical experience. Based on the 2011-2012 results from the surveys of program graduates and employers, 70-80 percent of respondents indicated

that the program adequately prepared or well prepared them for various skills. However, in review of general program satisfaction, the unit reports that scores fail to surpass 60 percent agree that they would recommend this program to another candidate. Furthermore, the data indicated that many respondents did not feel completely prepared for successful independent teaching following completion of the program. Such findings led the unit to reform their programs placing emphasis on the clinical experience of the teacher preparation curriculum. These forms of assessments were substantiated by the exhibits that were displayed. Furthermore, it was reported from interviews with cooperating teachers and candidates that they have the opportunity to complete assessments of the clinical experience through TK20 which serves as an assessment platform for the unit. TK20 also provides P-12 partners the opportunity to provide assessments on the effectiveness of the candidates in the clinical experience. The field coordinator reported that she generates reports from TK20 and provides such reports to the unit for interpretation. She does not interpret any of the data.

There is data available in the exhibits that discuss candidates' views of the clinical experience and curriculum in regards to preparation to teach in the classroom. Candidates reported that courses provided in their curriculum adequately prepared them for their clinical experiences. However, they did report that the unit needs to improve the level of communication with candidates on when such classes are offered prior to the clinical experience. Candidates reported that there is a high level of confusion about what courses to take and when to take such courses. One candidate stated that the master class schedule changed three times. Therefore, there was some confusion on the start date of classes. He further added because he is a graduate of CSUMB undergraduate program, he build up a strong level of tolerance of the miscommunication that takes place in the unit. A candidate, who transferred to the program, reported that she did not have a clear understanding on the start date of classes and the unit needs to do a better job of informing students on the start date of classes.

The candidates did state that the unit placed strong emphasis in placing them in sites that would provide them with diverse experiences. Many cited the completing the summer courses prior to the clinical experience gave them the confidence they needed to be prepared to enter the classroom. In addition, candidates stated that the strong focus on literacy were beneficial for them and allowed for them to use skills learned in their courses to work with English language learners.

In regards to support from the unit, some candidates stated that they received strong support from their site supervisors. However, some candidates in other interviews cited that their support from the site supervisors were in adequate. Therefore, it appears that candidates are not having consistent experiences with the level of support from site supervisors. In addition, the field coordinator provided them with the technical support needed so that they could navigate the necessary assessment tools such as TK20 and PACT and other major assessments that the unit needed related to the clinical experience.

The IR did provide evidence on the opportunities that candidates do have to develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions for helping all students learn. As stated in the IR, candidates are strategically placed in field experiences in which they will have diverse learners. Furthermore, efforts are made to identify classrooms with students with exceptionalities in case candidates are placed in classrooms with cooperative teachers who do not

have students with exceptionalities. From interviews, teacher candidates are very pleased with the strong emphasis on diversity. They appreciate the emphasis on understanding where the "positionality" of their students and the impact that has on learning and the "positionality" of teacher candidates and the impact that has on their teaching.

Cooperative teachers and university supervisors have the opportunity to observe candidates and provide constructive feedback on the delivery of instruction. Exhibits from the IR illustrate that candidates, cooperative teachers and university supervisors work in a triad to support the co-teaching model so that the experience is effective with student learning. From interviews with the cooperative teachers, this triad experience is taking place. Some had the opportunity to work with the university supervisor in observing candidates and providing feedback together with the candidates. Others reported that they did not have such opportunities to provide feedback with the university supervisor. This was not due to the unwillingness of the supervisor, it was often due to schedule conflicts. The university supervisor would come at times that were either planning times for the cooperative teacher or at times the cooperative teacher was unavailable. The cooperative teachers did report that when there were strong areas of concerns regarding the candidates' ability to demonstrate knowledge, skills or dispositions to help students learn, the cooperative teachers could complete a "Statement of concern" to the university supervisors. In many instances, it was reported that the university supervisors were able to address those concerns so that students can continue in their clinical experience.

3.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.3.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

AFI

Unit does not systematically ensure candidates have opportunities to use technology as an instructional tool during field experiences.

Rationale:

Based on the IR, Field placement requests which require for students to have appropriate technology resources in their classrooms are sent to principals and school districts officials. After placements are arranged, clinical faculty are asked to assess the presence of technology in the classroom and record the findings. Data from assessments are not included to measure how effective candidates are with the use of technology to develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students to learn.

AFI

The unit does not consistently apply policies on qualifications, training, and professional development to clinical faculty who supervise field and clinical experiences.

Rationale:

According to the IR, applicants for clinical faculty positions are expected to have teaching and supervisory experience, or experience as an academic coach. Once, clinical faculty are hired, they participate in orientation training and strategies training in the co-teaching model. Furthermore, the execution of the Common Core Standards, clinical faculty and full-time faculty participate in professional development strategies that focus on the co-teaching relationships and co-teaching strategies for formative assessments and reading comprehension development that will allow for students to meet new standards.

3.3.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued**3.3.3 New Areas for Improvement****3.4 Recommendation for Standard 3**

Initial Teacher Preparation Met

Advanced Preparation Not Applicable

STATE TEAM DECISION: 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 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

Based on review of the data submitted in the IR and interviews with faculty, candidates, and school partners, the unit has met Standard Four.

The unit states that the "opportunity to learn for all students regardless of race, gender, and socioeconomic status is a central disposition of our teacher preparation programs." The Conceptual Framework for the unit is "Education for Excellence, Equity, and Ethical Action." The Conceptual Framework and vision of the unit is clearly articulated throughout the School of Education and with students, candidates and partners associated with the School of Education. The Conceptual Framework was also displayed in the various classrooms in the School of Education.

Prior to admission into the Teacher Initial preparation programs, students are required to complete 50 hours of service learning. The purpose of the service learning component is to provide students with the opportunity to observe the types of experiences that they may have in working in diverse settings or with diverse groups. These experiences provided students with the

opportunity to understand the context of various communities and the challenges that such communities may have as it relates to teaching and student learning. While the service learning component is beyond the scope of the Department of Teacher Education, because it is associated with the liberal studies degree program, the unit, through interviews discuss this service learning component as pre-field experiences to give potential candidates insights to the types of experiences that they may have in the initial teacher preparation. One of the university supervisors stated that the service learning component provides students with the opportunity to see if students have they have the dispositions associated with diversity. However, there was no evidence or provided in the exhibits that supports what was shared in the interview. There are no clear documents that discuss the service learning component and how it aligns with the teacher education preparation programs, particularly the Conceptual Framework and vision statement of the unit. The website for the unit does not provide any information on the service learning component.

Interviews with candidates, cooperative teachers and school partners confirm that the unit places strong emphasis on meeting the needs of diverse learners. This was often a reoccurring theme with many of the people, particularly the candidates, alumni and cooperative teachers interviewed. The teacher education candidates shared that diversity is "what CSUMB does best." The curriculum of the program forces candidates to think about how they approach teaching and how their views and "ways of knowing" impact how they teach. Furthermore, they learn that how students approach learning is often impacted by how they approach "their own ways of knowing.' Another alumnus reported that at first she did not see the benefit in taking literacy courses associated with English literacy since she was teaching mathematics. However, the English language learner courses that she took in the program has changed and enhance how she approach teaching mathematics to her students.

In review of diversity of the teacher education candidates in initial teacher preparation programs, the exhibit illustrates that Whites make up 49% of the teacher education candidates, followed by Hispanic/Latinos at 25%, 10% of students identify with two or more races, and 10% of students race is unknown. Therefore, it appears that teacher education candidates are quite diverse in terms of ethnicity. In terms of gender, 29% of the teacher education candidates are male and 71% are female.

To determine the number of diverse faculty in the program, data from the exhibit reveal that there are 24 full-time faculty teaching in the unit. However, based on interviews with full-time faculty and data collected from the onsite visit, there are only seven full-time faculty members in the teacher education department, and the diversity of the faculty members cannot be validated.

The curriculum and experiences within the program are inclusive of opportunities for candidates to acquire dispositions that all students have the ability to learn. The unit has identified specific courses that provide candidates with skills and knowledge for reaching all students in a diverse classroom. Assessments have revealed the need for development of literacy skills among English language learners. Some examples of courses that address this need are:

ED612 Pedagogy for linguistically and culturally diverse students
ED616 Language and Literacy development across the curriculum
ED617 Language and Literacy development across the curriculum II

SPED560 Inclusionary practices for students with special needs
ED627 Language and literacy development for student teachers
ED628 Pedagogy for linguistically and culturally diverse students (secondary)

For the MAE program, the Master of Arts in Education Program Candidate Handbook reports that candidates are prepared to become knowledgeable of the skills and dispositions associated with inclusion practices that will facilitate learning of all students. The coursework offered at the MAE level include:

MAE630 Emergent Literacy
MAE631 Applied Linguistic and Language Acquisition
MAE632 Arts as Culturally Responsive Curriculum
MAE633 Multicultural Literature for a Partnership World
MAE634 Literacy for Linguistically-Diverse Learners
MAE635 Biliteracy for Spanish/English Learner
MAE637 Multicultural Curriculum Design
MAE640 Pluralism, Politics
MAE642 Multicultural Community partners.

Information on the curriculum for both the initial teacher preparation program and the MAE program was provided by documents presented in the exhibits. There are rubrics and assessments in place that provide measures as to if candidates can demonstrate application and proficiencies associated with diversity. Besides, coursework for the initial credential programs, the unit does work to make sure that candidates are placed in diverse settings that support and align with the mission and vision of the unit. For example in review of demographic information from one of the partnering schools that candidates are placed, the principal reported that of the 2500 students who make up her school, 75% of her students are Mexican, 20% are White, 5% are Black and 5% are Asian. In review of EL learners, 20-25% would be considered English language learners. In terms of socioeconomics, 53% are on free and reduced lunch and in terms of special needs, 8-9% of are students are identified as special needs. So candidates appear to be placed in diverse settings. However, one of the exhibits stated that one of the strengths of the program is that candidates are placed in diverse settings, particularly urban settings because the "urban residency model" is the best approach to preparing students. Based on interviews with the field coordinator, university supervisors, candidates and cooperative teachers, candidates do not appear to be placed in urban settings. They are placed in surrounding counties that appear to be rural and not so much urban. The MAE does not offer field placements because many of the candidates do have certifications and are completing to enhance their skills and dispositions to become better educators.

In regards to the types of experiences that candidates are having as it relates to diversity, the IR reports that there are assessments in place to evaluate candidate acquisition of skills, knowledge and dispositions associated with diversity. More specifically, the unit assesses candidate dispositions associated with diversity through PACT. According to the IR, PACT "measures the extent to which candidates can make instructional plans, teach lessons, and evaluate student knowledge and skills for diverse classrooms." Based on alumni survey data and data from PACT, the unit has found the need to further enhance knowledge and skills in secondary English language learners.

One area of concern identified from the previous visit is, "The Unit does not ensure candidates have one field experience with students with exceptionalities." The unit has addressed this concern by incorporating measures to ensure that candidates will have experiences with students with exceptionalities. Teacher candidates are required to complete reports during the early part of placement of students identified with exceptionalities. These reports include characteristics of the learners in the classrooms that they are placed as co-teachers. This information is used as they perform the PACT. In interviews with candidates, this information was validated because candidates did report that they must submit reports in TK20. Such assessments allow for candidates are able to make adjustments to plans, modify teaching, and reflect on student learning experiences as they relate to meeting the needs of diverse students and students with exceptionalities.

4.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.3.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

AFI:

Unit does not ensure candidates have one field experience with students with exceptionalities.

Rationale:

The unit reports that since the implementation of their TI, the unit has incorporated measures to ensure that candidates will have experiences with students who have exceptionalities. Early in the field placement experience, schools will identify p-12 students with exceptionalities enrolled in clinical placement classrooms. Candidates are required to report on the characteristics of learners in classrooms where they are assigned as co-teachers. As they completed the PACT, candidates can make adjustments to teaching, assessments, plans and reflect on student learning experiences that evaluate their knowledge, skills associated with meeting the needs of diverse students and students with exceptionalities.

4.3.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued

4.3.3 New Areas for Improvement

No areas for improvement.

4.4 Recommendation for Standard 4

Initial Teacher Preparation Met
Advanced Preparation Met

STATE TEAM DECISION: 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 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

During the off site review, assessors met with full time faculty, part time faculty, university supervisors, and clinical faculty. The Professional Education Faculty Qualifications and Experiences (Exhibit 5.4.c) shows that the unit consists of total of 31 faculty members, including seven tenure track faculty members (one professor, two assistant faculty, and 4 associate faculty and 23 part time faculty. There is one full time multiple subject faculty member, two single subject full time faculty, and four full time special education faculty. Faculty shared concerns about the lack of staffing due to retirements and staffing changes, the use of part-time faculty for instruction and the demands of clinical supervision.

Faculty members appear to be engaged in scholarship including publications, conference presentations, grant scholarship funding, and professional service activities. During the onsite review, interviews were conducted with three full time tenure track faculty and one part time faculty. The full time faculty demonstrated exceptional experience and expertise within the four Cal State Monterey Bay Scholarship areas: Discovery Creation and Integration; Teaching and Learning; Professional Application; Presentation. In the last two years, 100% of the full time and part time tenure track faculty have published, presented at conferences, or participated in service with projects focused on classroom management, English learners, and special education. However, due to recent budget constraints and faculty retirement, there have been much limited opportunities for faculty to be engaged in such activities.

Full time faculty have presented at conferences or have been active in leadership roles in organizations such as California State Council for Exceptional Children and have led conferences and symposiums on co-teaching. Two full time faculty are active in Academic Senate which provides an opportunity for service.

Of the 23 part time faculty 5 have terminal degrees, 7 have masters degrees, one has a bachelor's degree and 10 part time faculty were listed without their license area or degree (Exhibit 5.4.c). As listed in the Professional Education Faculty Qualifications and Experiences (Exhibit 5.4.c), part time faculty have limited experience in traditional academic scholarship. Part time faculty validated they are a part of the Cal State Monterey Bay community and note their contributions are valued and important.

Additional information included in the Institutional Report Addendum, the 2012-2013 University Supervisor exhibit verifies university supervisors have extensive experience, expertise, and education. Eighteen faculty (full time and part time) were identified as university supervisors with 12 having terminal degrees; five with masters degrees, and one bachelor's degree. All university supervisors have recent and relevant experience with the appropriate certifications.

Part time faculty act in a variety of roles including teaching, supervision and as one faculty member said; a utility person. Part time faculty supervise, monitor student teachers, and coordinate student teaching. Ten adjunct faculty had their primary role identified as lecturers; six were identified as university supervisors, one is listed as the co-teaching coordinator, one is the coordinator of the Master of Arts program. Most part time faculty serves in at least two roles (instructor and supervisor and lead supervisor). Part time faculty assists with critical needs including supervising student teachers, coordinating student teaching, and teaching critical methods courses.

Through a review of syllabi, interviews with faculty, and PACT assessment data, faculty have a deep understanding of course content and help students meet standards. Program coordinators meet with faculty regularly to share syllabi, signature assignments, instructional strategies, and ensure fidelity of assignments. Google Docs and Google Drive are used as the hub to share materials. Faculty collaboration ensures that students receive similar instruction from like content area faculty.

Faculty discussed how they used the end of course surveys to evaluate teaching and curriculum effectiveness to improve the program. For example, feedback on an end of course survey questioned the timing of specific class assignments. Faculty restructured the class to provide support on key assessments.

A review of syllabi (ED607, ED611, ED538, SPED560) verified that faculty use a variety of instructional strategies, require students to apply new learning, complete research projects, and exceed state standards. Faculties assess candidate performance using signature assignments, PACT, and ensure that a variety of learning styles are utilized. Interviews with clinical supervisors validated that co-teachers demonstrated advanced technological skills and "experienced" co-teachers learned from their candidate co-teacher.

The placement coordinator works closely with partner schools for appropriate placements with licensed clinical supervisors. The field placement coordinator meets with site principals to select and identify appropriately licensed faculty. Of the 9 clinical supervisors interviewed, all were experienced having had between 3 and 9 Cal State Monterey Bay candidates.

The Memorandum of Understanding with partner districts (IR Addendum) delineates the relationship between the school and University but no assurance are provided about verifying appropriate licenses. The University does not have a process to ensure appropriate licensing. The 2012-2013 Cooperating Teachers in the Multiple Subjects Program (Exhibit 5.4.d) identifies cooperating teachers expertise area but license information is not included.

Part time faculty discussed their contributions as faculty and how experience enriches the classroom. Faculty shared background in specific areas such as technology, current teaching, Common Core State Standards, and special education provides candidates with curriculum aligned to state and national standards. Instruction provides links to the current applications. Several discussed how involvement with co teaching model positively impacted teaching. Cooperating teachers discussed the benefits of co-teaching including increased proficiency in technology and lesson design.

During the onsite review, part time faculty discussed how the monthly School of Education Calendar is used to identify professional development opportunities. Faculty members are invited and encouraged to attend the monthly department meetings hosted by the Department Chair. At these meetings, which include program coordinators, all departments, full-time, and part-time faculty including university supervisors, and lecturers, a variety of issues are discussed including curriculum and policy. However, the recent increase of part-time faculty has placed a constraint on the unit's ability to ensure such participation.

During the onsite review, the team conducted a comprehensive review of documents, and interviews with all constituents, and stakeholders. An area of concern noted in the Offsite report was the unit does not use faculty evaluation data to provide opportunities for faculty to develop new knowledge and skills. The onsite review team found several instances where evaluation data is used to engage faculty. Faculty are invited to the monthly department meetings, program coordinator meetings (multiple subject, single subject, special education, and seminar) and are invited to attend professional development via Ilearn.

Faculty said regular professional development is offered around key areas such as co-teaching, Common Core State Standards, and PACT assessments. The Department Chair stated that professional development is linked to evaluation but limited evidence was found to verify this information.

During the onsite review, faculty verified they receive end of course surveys and reflect on the information. Evaluations are conducted by the Department Chair. The Department Chair stated faculty evaluations are completed annually. Part time faculty receive an evaluation at the end of the contract teaching period and positive evaluations result in contracts being extended. This information does not align with information shared during part time faculty interviews.

During the On Site Review it was confirmed that full time tenure track faculty are evaluated using the approved Cal State Monterey Bay Retention, Tenure and Promotion policy. Tenure-track faculty are evaluated using the tenure process and post tenure review process every fifth year along with an evaluation of scholarship, service, and teaching.

Annually, the placement coordinator meets with faculty (both full time and part time university supervisors) to discuss TK 20 Candidate Survey of University Supervisor feedback on clinical supervision. The feedback specifically addresses strengths and opportunities for the university supervisor. Faculty use this feedback for professional development opportunities, however, there is no systematic plan linked to professional development. A monthly calendar verifies that regular faculty development is offered. Results from the Candidate Survey of University Supervisors are shared with the Department Chair.

The placement coordinator reviews candidate evaluation of the Learning Environment (Candidate Evaluation of Clinical Supervisor) and shares that information with the university supervisor. The university supervisor uses that information to coach and develop the clinical supervisor. The placement coordinator uses qualitative data from the Candidate Survey of Clinical Supervisor to determine clinical supervisor efficacy and shares that information with the principal.

Each fall clinical faculty and students are trained in TK 20 and the co-teaching each model. The field placement supervisor and lead supervisor provide an overview of the co-teaching model (clinical faculty only), an orientation to co-teaching, and Pairs Training. A review of the agenda and handouts verified that the Pairs Training includes best practices in co-teaching instructional strategies. Clinical faculty remarked that the activities embedded in the training provided the foundation for communication, conflict resolution, and successful co-teaching. University supervisors are encouraged to attend this training. The TK 20 coordinator is available to meet with clinical or faculty supervisors and provide professional development. Regular communication and training materials are delivered via email.

Part-time faculty members are included in professional development activities including the co-teaching, PACT training, calibration, and Common Core Standards. During the onsite review, faculty stated that inter rater reliability training improved their professional practice by ensuring classroom activities support completion of the PACT assignments and were consistent across program.

University supervisors are invited by program coordinators to two meetings each semester to discuss and reflect on clinical supervision and the co-teaching model. The placement coordinator is invited to this meeting and shares evaluation and principal feedback. These meetings provide time to reflect on instructional strategies, professional dispositions, and the effectiveness of the co-teaching model.

Lead supervisors provide additional candidate support. The weekly "quick visit" guides candidate growth and development. Candidates stated lead supervisor support assisted in assignment clarification and dispositional growth. The lead supervisor and faculty supervisor are the liaisons between the course faculty and clinical supervisor.

The Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant used funding to staff temporary positions for technology and support and enhance curriculum and impact student learning in clinical settings.

5.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.3.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

AFI AFI Rationale

5.3.2 Previous Areas for Improvement Continued

AFI AFI Rationale

5.3.3 New Areas for Improvement

AFI AFI Rationale

5.4 Recommendation for Standard 5

Initial Teacher Preparation Met

Advanced Preparation Met

STATE TEAM DECISION: MET

NCATE Unit 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 Findings related to the areas of concern and evidence to be validated that were cited in the offsite BOE report

After reviewing the IR, IR addendum and conducting onsite interviews, the team has found standard 6 to met with two AFI's.

Currently, the educator preparation unit is coordinated by the College of Professional Studies. As the chief administrator of the college, the dean has authority over the programs within the college including the Department of Teacher Education. The Department of Teacher Education houses all programs for the preparation of professional educators and onsite interviews with faculty and the University Teacher Education Council (UTEC) confirm that the Department coordinates with other campus departments that include those of the subject areas taught in secondary schools as well as the Department of Liberal Studies. With the exception of budgetary autonomy, the dean delegates authority and related functions for the operation of professional education to appropriately qualified professionals including faculty and professional staff.

Interviews with the President, Provost, Dean, Department Chair and faculty indicate there is an imminent structural change and the College of Professional Studies will be split resulting in the creation of a separate College of Education. A dean will be hired to lead the College of Education and, once hired, the dean will be involved with strategic planning to determine priorities including new faculty lines and future resource allocations. Rationale given for this change by the dean and Provost includes having strong individuals but a lack of unified department leadership that can prioritize and manage coherent growth with an evidence-based approach to resource allocation, including determination of specific faculty needs.

Under the current structure, faculty and staff of the Department of Teacher Education elect their own chair and all credential program faculty report through the chair. The Integrated Multiple Subject Program resides within the Liberal Studies program, which also has its own chair. A Program Coordinator who is a full-time faculty member manages each program within the Department of Teacher Education. Interviews confirm the department chair and program coordinators meet regularly. Admission requirements are guided by the California State University system and are described in program handbooks in addition to being accessible on the unit's website. New additions to the admission requirements include an assessment of personal and professional dispositions for teaching and an audition of public speaking and presentation skills.

Onsite interviews of various constituents indicate faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs through program meetings, coordinator meetings, department meetings and the University Teacher Education Council (UTEC). Interviews with UTEC members confirm their role as an advisory body as well as a mechanism for accountability to the field. UTEC membership is representative of all educator preparation programs as well as a variety of other constituents including a County Office of Education Induction representative, cooperating teachers,

adjunct faculty, principals, alumni and representatives from single subject departments on campus, to name a few.

A broad budget was provided for the Department of Teacher Education and comparative numbers were provided for other departments on campus both inside and outside the College of Professional Studies. Additional funding has been secured through a Teacher Quality Enhancement grant. Interviews and materials provided during the onsite visit confirm that grant resources have been used to develop educational technology resources for faculty and professional development for faculty, cooperating teachers and teacher candidates specifically in the area of co-teaching. Though the initial budget provided did not appear to include sufficient funding for professional development, onsite interviews with faculty, staff and the dean provided evidence that professional development is occurring for faculty, staff, cooperating teachers and university supervisors. Additionally, the dean provided an updated budget comparison including more detail on allocations for teacher education. While the dean has clear knowledge of budget allocations within the department of teacher education, interviews indicate the budget process is not transparent to the chair or faculty within the department and budget related decisions reside with the dean.

Faculty workload policies follow the guidelines of the California State University system as well as the bargaining agreement of the California Faculty Association. Faculty within the Department of Teacher Education fill out a Faculty Workload Plan Form, which is reviewed by the department chair. The Workload Plan includes courses to be taught, number of credits to be taught, projected full-time-equivalent for each course as well as direct and indirect teaching units for assigned time. Currently the Department of Teacher Education is in a period of transition as a result of retirements and interviews with faculty indicate a need for additional resources. Interviews with faculty indicate that across programs, faculty are filling multiple roles and no new tenure lines are advertised at this time. While new part-time faculty have been hired, interviews with one program coordinator indicate this has created the additional need of training for the new faculty and the part-time status of the new faculty within the program raises questions of program consistency since all faculty are not able to attend program meetings and there is no evidence of consistent training for these new faculty.

Interviews with faculty across programs indicate there is sufficient support personnel within the department, but there is not evidence that sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum development, instruction, field and clinical supervision, and assessment management. As resource needs arise, interviews indicate program coordinators take these needs to the Chair who discusses them at department meetings and then determines priorities for making requests to the dean. The dean takes the department requests and determines allocations for all departments within the College. Interviews of the Provost, dean, chair and faculty indicate faculty resource requests have been denied at the dean and provost level, however; interviews with the dean, provost and budget analyst also indicate that once a dean has been hired for the soon-to-be College of Education, strategic planning will occur and additional resources including new faculty lines will be allocated based upon that strategic planning and budget resources are available to make this happen.

6.3.1 Previous Areas for Improvement Corrected

N/A

6.3.3 New Areas for Improvement

The unit's faculty workloads do not allow faculty members to be effectively engaged in teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, collaborative work in P-12 schools, and service.

Rationale:

The IR, IR addendum and faculty interviews indicate faculty retirement and reassignment have resulted in faculty members serving in multiple roles preventing them from pursuing self-selected research agendas, grants, and professional development. This has also caused an increased reliance on part-time faculty, which does not assure program coherence and integrity due no evidence of consistent training of new faculty, lack of participation at program meetings for some programs and inconsistent implementation of course syllabi.

The budget does not adequately support on-campus and clinical work essential for preparation of professional educators.

Rationale:

The IR, IR addendum and interviews with faculty and the chair indicate the department does not have sufficient budgetary resources to replace retired tenure track faculty, resulting in remaining faculty filling multiple roles and increased hiring of part-time faculty.

STATE TEAM DECISION: (COMMON STANDARD 3: Resources) MET WITH CONCERNS**Rationale:**

The IR, IR addendum and interviews with faculty and the chair indicate the department does not have sufficient budgetary resources to replace retired tenure track faculty, resulting in remaining faculty filling multiple roles, and increased hiring of part-time faculty.

California Common Standards Not Covered by NCATE Unit Standards**Standard 1: Educational Leadership****Met**

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

Coursework requirements in all CSUMB credential programs are verified using a candidate Evaluation of Competencies form. As a candidate progresses through the program, the candidate's faculty advisor verifies the completion of each required course. The completed Evaluation of Competencies form is then reviewed and verified by the Program Coordinator. When a candidate has completed all program requirements, he/she completes a credential application. The application includes verifications for all other program and CTC requirements, including passage of CBEST, CSET, and RICA and PACT (if applicable).

At this point, the Evaluation of Competencies form, the credential application, and all other required documents are assembled into a credential application packet for submission to the credential analyst's office. The credential analyst reviews each packet, first to check that all required materials have been submitted, and then to ensure that each document and verification conforms to CTC and CSUMB credential program requirements. Candidates are notified by

email any time a requirement is missing, and the credential processing stops until the missing material is provided.

An interview with the credential analyst provided clear evidence that the process used for credential recommendation is thorough and that the role of the credential analyst is limited specifically to reviewing and processing credential materials. All verification of candidate competencies is done by program faculty.

The work of the credential analyst is overseen by the chair of the Department of Education, who is responsible for monitoring the overall credential recommendation process.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Met with Concerns

6.1 Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. 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.

On admission to a CSUMB credential program, each candidate is assigned to a faculty advisor. The advisor is responsible for meeting with the candidate to explain program and coursework requirements, to assist the candidate with any program-related questions or issues, and to verify candidate completion of program course- and fieldwork requirements. In addition to faculty advisors, the credential analyst provides assistance and advice about credential-specific matters. To ensure that faculty advisors have current information about any changes in credential program requirements from CTC, the credential analyst meets with Program Coordinators to provide updates when needed. Interviews with candidates, completers, program faculty, and the credential analyst provided clear evidence that candidate advice is readily available from multiple sources, and that the quality of advisement is generally high.

The credential analyst provides orientation sessions for prospective program applicants and meets regularly with seminar classes to provide comprehensive information about credential requirements for all programs. In addition, the analyst meets with final seminar classes each semester to go over the credential application process with candidates.

Each program—along with the credential analyst office—maintains a web site with current information about program options and requirements and email contact and other links for obtaining further information. In addition, each program provides candidates with a Program Handbook containing detailed information about what is required to successfully complete each phase of the program. A review of online and print materials offered by each program and the credential analyst office indicated that most were current and provided consistent information about programs. One exception to this were some handouts for the Multiple and Single Subjects programs that gave a clear impression that coursework was limited to fall and spring semesters, whereas both programs have required coursework that must be completed in the summer prior to the initial fall semester. In interview with candidates, several Single Subject candidates reported only finding about the required summer coursework after being admitted to the program. In addition, some Single Subject candidates reported that they had easy access to program advisors,

the information they information they received was not always consistent from one advisor to another.

Candidates, completers, and cooperating teachers who were interviewed provided uniformly positive feedback about the quality and effectiveness of support provided by program faculty and fieldwork supervisors. Faculty and supervisors were described as being accessible at all times, pro-active in addressing potential concerns, and providing a wide range of assistance. In the event that a candidate is experiencing difficulty meeting program requirements—and that informal means of support have not been successful—a Statement of Concern and Action Plan is drafted. The plan identifies the specific steps to be taken to address the concern and includes a template for recording candidate progress in resolving the concern. A review of some completed plans indicated that faculty and/or cooperating teacher support during intervention is significant and appropriate. In the event that a candidate is unable to successfully complete an action plan, that candidate is dropped from the program.

Rationale

While most advising materials reviewed were consistent and accurate, various materials describing the coursework requirements for the Multiple and Single Subjects credential year-long residency program gave inconsistent information about what was required of candidates during the summer “prerequisite” phase. In addition, some Single Subject candidates reported receiving inconsistent information from advisors, both with regard to the summer prerequisites and other program requirements.

Program Standards

Multiple Subjects Credential Program

Program Design

The design of the CSU Monterey Bay Multiple Subjects credential program is based upon the foundational components of teacher education and adult learning theory. Candidates working toward a Multiple Subjects credential complete required coursework and fieldwork through a graduate program housed in the Teacher Education Department or through an integrated undergraduate program offered in conjunction with the Liberal Studies Department. Both programs are year-long co-teaching models which identify potential candidates through informational sessions, interviews, and an application process. Program documents and interviews with candidates and university faculty indicate that professional preparation is provided through an organized, comprehensive program that connects candidates to university coursework, cooperating teacher formative assessment, and supervision through university-trained educators. Through these experiences, the Multiple Subjects program provides extensive opportunities for candidates to analyze, implement, and reflect on the issues, theories, and professional practice related to teaching and learning.

Interviews with the Program Director, site administrators, and candidates confirm that the program consists of established IHE partnerships and collaboration with, P-12 institutions, members of the induction community, and the Monterey County Office of Education, and that opportunities to contribute to the design and implementation of the program are available. The overall program design and implementation result from demonstrated collaboration based on decision-making among those responsible for subject matter preparation and teacher education.

The CSUMB Multiple Subject Credential courses and field experiences have been planned and organized to reflect the developmental nature of the learning-to-teach continuum. The program provides both foundational and current research-based instruction that prepares candidates to teach reading/language arts to all learners in a K-6 setting, and also provides coursework and classroom application of additional content areas of math, science, and social science. Evidence from interviews confirms that the field work component provides experiences in two different grade levels with two different cooperating teachers and includes application of coursework and explicit connections to the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). Information from reports, interviews with program completers, and university staff demonstrate that the CSU Monterey Bay Multiple Subjects credential program implements a plan for data gathering and analysis, and uses that process to evaluate program effectiveness and implement a plan for program improvement.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience)

The CSUMB Multiple Subjects program consists of two options, both utilizing a co-teaching model. The traditional option begins in the summer and incorporates coursework and two stages of fieldwork lasting throughout the K-6 school year. The Integrated model allows Liberal Studies majors to begin their teacher preparation program in the second semester of their senior year and

complete stage one in the last half of the school year and stage two at the beginning of the following year. Each option provides candidates with fieldwork in two different grade levels.

Immediately upon entrance into the program, candidates begin their fieldwork experience by meeting their cooperating teacher and learning about the culture of their respective schools and classes. An initial meeting is scheduled at the site for candidates, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors in order to establish a collaborative relationship and to clarify the roles that each partner is expected to fill during the course of the program. Through integration of coursework and fieldwork experiences, candidates develop pedagogical skills and reflect on classroom practice with both cooperating teachers and university supervisors. Coursework includes content related to creating and maintaining well-managed classrooms, learning about and evaluating instructional alternatives, and of learning how to use and interpret assessment data. Additional coursework connects to pedagogy in content areas, effective teaching of English Learners and students with special needs, and technology. During interviews, candidates confirmed the importance of fieldwork in their development as teachers. At the same time, some candidates reported that coursework scheduling sometimes conflicted with their full participation as co-teachers. Interviews with program faculty confirmed that the combination of small candidate numbers and limited resources sometimes made it difficult to schedule key classes at times that were ideal for all candidates at particular stages of the program.

Student teaching experiences include supervision by a University Supervisor who conducts eight formal observations over the course of the two semesters and who is typically on-site providing additional weekly support. The program provides opportunities for each candidate to promote student academic progress equitably and conscientiously through the use of various assessments, analysis of data, and reflection on data implications. Course syllabi and interviews confirm that the program provides opportunities for candidates to increase their knowledge and understanding of diverse students both through coursework and through classroom experiences. Significant formative feedback is accomplished through regular observations and reflections with university supervisors. Interviews with candidates and completers indicate that during the first phase of, candidates are exposed to tasks on which they will be assessed during the second phase of student teaching and that coursework and fieldwork are clearly integrated in order to support them in demonstrating PACT competencies. While nearly all candidates who were interviewed indicated that they had positive experiences working with their cooperating teachers, a few candidates reported unevenness in the level of support they received from cooperating teachers and in cooperating teachers' overall understanding of program expectations.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are formatively and summatively assessed throughout the Multiple Subjects program. Formative assessment includes formal and informal observations during fieldwork provided by university supervisors who are experienced educators. Student teaching observations are conducted using an evaluation instrument that is closely linked to the Teaching Performance Expectations and PACT competencies. Candidates are given opportunities to reflect on the results of formative assessment both through reflective conversations with their university supervisor and through written reflection. Summative assessment is done through the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). Throughout the second stage of fieldwork, candidates are working toward completion of their PACT. Midway through the second semester, a conference is scheduled between the cooperating teacher, the candidate, and the

university supervisor to discuss the candidates' progress and to address any areas of need. During their second phase of student teaching, candidates complete the PACT; and it is scored with feedback provided to each candidate. Ongoing assessment also includes use of Tk20, a portfolio management system that documents each candidate's application of coursework, fieldwork, and reflection on professional practice that provides formative feedback to help prepare them to successfully pass the PACT. The University routinely appoints and trains educators to analyze and score PACT assessments, and the results are shared with candidates.

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 with the exception of the following:

Standard 2 – Communication and Collaboration

Met with Concerns

While sponsors of the preliminary teacher preparation program establish collaborative partnerships that contribute substantially to the quality and effectiveness of the implementation of candidate preparation, some candidates indicated that there may be inconsistent understanding of program expectations on the part of the cooperating teacher

Standard 14- Learning to Teach through Supervised Fieldwork

Met with Concerns

Although the program includes a developmental sequence of carefully planned, substantive supervised field experiences, some candidates indicated that coursework scheduling had interfered with their participation in particular fieldwork experiences

Standard 15- Qualifications of Individuals

Who Provide School Site Support

Met with Concerns

While most candidates indicated that their cooperating teachers were well-informed about the performance expectations for the candidate's teaching and pertaining to his/her supervision of the candidate, some candidates reported uneven support by cooperating teachers and inconsistent access to teaching experiences that allowed them to practice and refine their instructional skills. Although these inconsistencies resulted in some differences among candidates' overall fieldwork experiences, there was no evidence to indicate that candidate preparation was negatively impacted.

Single Subject Credential Program

Program Design:

The California State University, Monterey Bay, Single Subject Credential Program is a cohort based, one year teacher education program. The program enables candidates to fulfill the requirements for a California Preliminary Single Subject Credential in English, World Languages (French, Japanese, or Spanish), Mathematics (including Foundational Mathematics), Science (Biology, Chemistry, Geosciences and Physics, or Foundational General Science), and History-Social Science. Candidates begin the Single Subject Credential Program in Summer Session and then progress through Fall and Spring semesters. The Single Subject Credential Program is completed via a co-teaching delivery model or via an Intern teaching delivery model. Candidates enter their co-teaching or Intern teaching classroom at the start of the K-12 school year in early August and continue supervised teaching through the last day of school for teachers in June. Program courses are offered in the evenings and/or on Saturdays to allow candidates to participate in the field experience portion of the program during the middle or high school day. Program candidates, completers, and area principals frequently described the program requirement for a full year of experience in a middle or high school as a strength of the program and an important aspect to ensuring that completers are prepared to effectively educate all children.

Each of the delivery models is carefully designed to ensure candidates are provided with support while they are in the field. Interviews with candidates and cooperating teachers verified that lead supervisors and field supervisors are frequently at school sites and that field supervisors complete four observations and evaluations of the candidates during each semester of fieldwork. Should observations by field supervisors or feedback from cooperating teachers indicate a candidate is not showing adequate progress in the field, a Statement of Concern form is completed which initiates the process of developing a Plan of Action for helping the candidate improve. Cooperating teachers, principals, and university supervisors all reported instances in which a Statement of Concern form was utilized and a Plan of Action was developed to assist a candidate in understanding the areas where improvement or development were necessary. Additionally, cooperating teachers and principals indicated in interviews when issues arose with a candidate, they were able to contact the Field Placement Coordinator who provided a quick and appropriate response.

The partnerships between California State University, Monterey Bay and surrounding districts are clearly a strength of the Single Subject Credential Program. Site principals, cooperating teachers, and Intern support providers all stated in interviews that they felt their input and opinions were valued and respected. The partners eagerly accept Single Subject candidates from CSUMB into their classrooms for co-teaching. During interviews, several cooperating teachers expressed disappointment that there were so many Single Subject Credential candidates who ended up in the Intern delivery model that cooperating teachers who wished to work with the program were unable to host a candidate co-teacher this academic year. When asked about the kinds of input the institution has solicited about the effectiveness of program operations, most respondents stated that the institution's primary interest was related specifically to the co-teaching model.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):

The Single Subject Credential Program coursework is structured in a manner to provide integrated instruction along with the field experience. A summer session prior to the public school year (previously two required courses, but scheduled to include three required courses starting Summer 2014) focuses on classroom management, lesson planning, teaching English language learners. It also includes a summer school observational placement to prepare candidates for their co-teaching or Intern teaching assignment. Fall semester coursework focuses on planning, instruction, assessment, and the teaching of reading and writing in middle and high school classrooms. The spring semester coursework provides opportunity for candidates to deepen their abilities to plan lessons and units, instruct, and assess students. In both fall and spring semesters Single Subject Credential candidates take a Curriculum and Instruction course that is specific to the content area they are preparing to teach. Due to the year long co-teaching model or Intern model that candidates are a part of, a Beginning Student Teaching and Seminar course is required in the fall semester and Supervised Teaching and Seminar courses are required in the spring semester. Candidate, completer, and cooperating teacher interviews indicated that the assignments and work in fall and spring coursework assisted them in effectively fulfilling their roles as co-teachers or Intern teachers.

Assessment of Candidates:

The Single Subject Credential Program utilizes the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) as its fair, valid, and reliable assessment of the candidate's status with respect to the *Teaching Performance Expectations* (TPEs). In addition, the Single Subject Credential utilizes the Teacher Candidate Evaluation Tool to assess candidate performance in their co-teaching or Intern teaching. The Teacher Candidate Evaluation Tool is aligned to the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* (CSTPs).

The Single Subject Program appears to rely upon candidate completion of coursework at a grade of C or higher and maintenance of a 3.0 grade point average as candidates adequately demonstrating standards to progress through the program and be recommended for the Single Subject Credential. Program documents and interviews with candidates and recent completers corroborated that End of Stage 1 and End of Stage 2 meetings occur to determine if candidates are ready to progress in the program. Based on program documents and information provided by candidates and completers in interviews, these assessment meetings appear to be focused on course grades, GPA, incompletes, missing items in Tk20 rather than on determining if the candidate demonstrated the required competencies at an acceptable to progress to the next stage of the program.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, completers, faculty, employers, cooperating teachers, and support providers, the team determined that all program standards are met with the exception of the following:

Standard 1: Program Design

Met with Concerns

The Single Subject Credential Program describes a comprehensive assessment system but reviewers were unable to see evidence that all parts of the system are effectively implemented. Specifically, it was not possible to confirm that signature assignments were accurately measuring the required competencies.

Standard 8: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction

Met with Concerns

Interviews with candidates indicated that although they felt adequately prepared to teach in their content area, different sections of the Curriculum & Instruction in the Secondary School Content Area course appeared to vary somewhat in scope and depth according to subject area.

Standard 12: Preparation to Teach English Learners

Met with Concerns

Unevenness of program implementation was found in the area of preparation to teach English learners. Some candidates and completers in interviews indicated they felt adequately prepared to provide instruction to English learners in their co-teaching or intern teaching classroom. Other candidates and completers indicated that they were not adequately prepared to effectively instruct English learners. Some comments were made that the English learner course was a crunch course and not well structured, that candidates were unaware of terminology important to English language instruction in California, or that candidates were not provided an opportunity to demonstrate or implement English language instruction in their co-teaching or intern teaching experience because they did not have English learners (or only had higher level/3 and above) in their classroom.

Standard 15: Qualifications of Individuals who Provide School Site Support

Met with Concerns

Interviews with principals indicated that not all of those interviewed may be aware of the minimum state requirements for participating as a cooperating teacher. At the same time, there was no evidence to indicate that cooperating teachers are being assigned who do not meet these requirements.

**Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Credential Programs
Preliminary and Level II
Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization**

Program Design

CSUMB's credential programs are designed around three concepts: professional knowledge, educators as stewards of schools and public education, and reflective and reflexive instruction and assessment. For the Education Specialist programs, two program chairs, one in Mild/Moderate and one in Moderate/Severe, oversee many administrative responsibilities. The Education Specialist Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe programs contain a prescribed set of courses with certain sequencing requirements within some of the coursework. The program has sequencing requirements for field experiences. There are two suggested plans of study, depending on whether the candidate is an intern or a student teacher.

Interviews were conducted with program faculty and current candidates. Program faculty were able to articulate program alignment with standards. In addition, candidates indicated that the overall program design was sound. However, candidates felt that since most courses required candidates to work with students with disabilities, the university should provide more assistance in securing those opportunities outside of the two required field placement courses. Candidates felt it was difficult to find appropriate students to conduct assignments related to assessment, assistive technology, and transition.

Evidence reviewed during the site visit also indicated that there are inconsistencies in content within particular courses depending on instructor. Conflicting information regarding the amount of academic freedom allowed adjunct faculty regarding the implementation of course materials and assignments was presented during interviews with faculty and program chairs. As a result, it was not clear to reviewers that all candidates were receiving consistent program delivery that met standards. In addition, candidates interviewed expressed some dissatisfaction with some courses that are common to Education Specialist and General Education teacher candidates. For example, Education Specialist candidates reported that ED 617 (Language/Literacy Curriculum I) is a course taken by both General Education and Education Specialist candidates, and is sometimes taught differently for candidates in the special education program. However, when the course is taught for both General Education and Education Specialist candidates, Education Specialist candidates are expected to remain for class time addressing PACT elements in the course even though special education candidates do not complete this assessment.

Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience):

Candidates in both the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe credential programs are required to take courses in special education methodology, language and literacy, mathematics, health, teaching students with autism, classroom and assistive technology, and two fieldwork courses. Special education methods courses focus on assessment, positive behavior supports, methods for mild/moderate or moderate/severe, transition, assistive technology, students with autism, and field placements in special education settings. Courses also taken by Multiple Subjects candidates in health, mathematics and reading methods, and technology in the classroom are required. Candidates in the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe credential programs take all of

the same courses except for a methods course specific to each credential area. Candidates in the Mild/Moderate program take SPED 561, Reading Diagnosis & Preferred Practices for Students with Learning Challenges. Candidates in the Moderate/Severe program take SPED 574, Teaching Functional Communication to Students with Moderate-Severe Disabilities.

Field experience takes place through two practicum courses. Early in the program candidates take SPED 567A, Initial Practicum. In this supervised field experience, candidates gain early experiences in the classroom under the supervision of a master teacher (student teaching track) or a district support provider (intern track). Other course assignments throughout the program require candidates to gain experience working with students related to assessment, literacy, transition, and assistive technology. For student teachers, the culminating field experience, SPED 567B, is a full-time, supervised placement with a master teacher, while for Interns; it is a supervised placement in their own classrooms. During observations in field placements, supervisors fill out a Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form in both field experience courses. Data from these forms is uploaded directly into an online data management system. Another tool used by the supervisors during the field experiences is the Progress Log. This tool is a checklist of teaching behaviors (e.g., completed lesson plan present, large group instruction, small group instruction). Although the program's Biennial Report states that items on the Progress Log are rated using a Likert scale, examples of Progress Logs provided in the program assessment binder and shown during interviews only have space for the supervisor to indicate whether the candidate completed a particular item or not (i.e., no Likert scale). The data provided in the Biennial Report were generated by averaging the number of visits that the item was observed, not by using a Likert Scale indicating the level of mastery for each task.

Candidates interviewed stated that the program coursework was directly related to their work as special education teachers, and that assignments and class activities were effective learning tools. Although not clear in their documentation, program faculty were able to discuss how various course assignments and activities provided opportunities for candidates to demonstrate competency in the program standards discussed.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed throughout the program with various course assignments, the Teacher Candidate Evaluation Tool, Progress Log, and Professional Dispositions Assessment. Assignments throughout the program include group projects, completing online modules with reflections, lesson plans, case studies, assessing students and interpreting results, and writing sample IEPs.

It was difficult to determine program alignment with standards and effectiveness of candidate assessment because details about course assignment alignment to standards were not provided, and program assessment had not been completed prior to the site visit. Because the program data provided (e.g., Progress Log, Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form, GPA, Academic Standing) were not useful indicators of whether and the degree to which candidates mastered the competencies outlined in the standards, reviewers had to rely on course assignments and rubrics to determine if competencies were being met.

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 with the exception of the following:

Program Standards 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, and 14, which are Not Met.

Program Standards 7, 9, and 13, which are Met with Concerns

Mild/Moderate Standards, 2 and 6, which are Not Met.

Mild/Moderate Standard 3, which is Met with Concerns

Moderate/Severe Standard 5, which is Not Met.

Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder Standard 1, which is Not Met.

Program Standards

Program Standard 3: Educating Diverse Learners

Not met

Rationale: It is unclear from the program documentation and interviews how the program provides instruction in understanding and acceptance of differences in religion, gender identity/expression, and sexual orientation.

Program Standard 4: Effective Communication and Collaborative Partnerships

Not met

Rationale: It is unclear from the program documentation and interviews how the program provides the opportunity for candidates to demonstrate knowledge of building social networks for students with disabilities such as parents, primary caregivers, general education teachers, co-teachers, related services personnel, administrators and trans-disciplinary teams.

Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students

Not met

Rationale: It is unclear how the program provides opportunities for candidates to demonstrate knowledge of required statewide assessments and local, state, and federal accountability systems.

Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning

Met with concerns

Rationale: The program has an entire course addressing transition, SPED 585, Transition and Career Development for the Education Specialist. Interviews with faculty and review of course syllabi confirmed that assignments were in place, but the program did not clearly articulate how these assignments provide candidates with opportunities to demonstrate competency for this standard.

Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEP

and Post-Secondary Transition Planning

Not met

Rationale: It is unclear how candidates demonstrate the ability to participate effectively as a team member and/or case manager for the IFSP/IEP/transition planning process, from pre-referral interventions, assessment, and implementation of instruction.

Program Standard 9: Preparation to Teach Reading/Language Arts

Met with Concerns

Rationale: It is unclear how the listening and speaking portion of the standard is addressed in the program.

Program Standard 10: Preparation to Teach English Language Learners

Not met

Rationale: Through interviews with faculty and review of course syllabi, assignments were in place, but the program did not clearly articulate how these assignments provide candidates with opportunities to demonstrate competency for all aspects of this standard.

Program Standard 13: Curriculum and Instruction of Students with Disabilities - Met with Concerns. Rationale: It is not clear how candidates demonstrate competency for collaboration or co-teaching.

Program Standard 14: Creating Healthy Learning Environments - Not met.

Rationale: It is unclear how candidates demonstrate competency in the areas of diverse family structures, community cultures, and child rearing practices in order to develop respectful and productive relationships with families and communities. It is unclear how candidates demonstrate competency in understanding and utilizing universal precautions designed to protect the health and safety of the candidates themselves such as demonstrating safe lifting and positioning practices of students with motor impairments and demonstrating an ability to use and instruct other personnel in the appropriate use, maintenance, and care of rehabilitative and medically necessary equipment such as wheelchairs, walkers, orthotics, prosthetics, etc. It is unclear how candidates demonstrate competency in working collaboratively with other professionals to ensure healthy learning environments.

Mild/Moderate Disabilities Standards

**M/M Standard 2: Assessment and Evaluation of Students
with Mild/Moderate Disabilities**

Not met

Rationale: It is unclear how candidates demonstrate competency for assessing communication, career, and community life skill needs of students and monitor students' progress. It is unclear how the candidates demonstrate competency for students participating in state-mandated accountability measures.

M/M Standard 3: Planning and Implementing

Mild/Moderate Curriculum and Instruction

Met with Concerns

Rationale: It is unclear how candidates demonstrate their ability to use a variety of grouping structures in the program coursework other than fieldwork. There is no indication of this in the SPED 568 syllabus as indicated on the resubmission.

M/M Standard 6: Case Management

Not met

Rationale: It is unclear how candidates demonstrate their understanding of case management practices and strategies for students with mild/moderate disabilities and for those referred for special education services—such as the ability to provide consultation, resource information, and materials regarding individuals with exceptional needs to their parents and to staff members; monitoring of pupil progress on a regular basis; participation in the review and revision of IEP's as appropriate; and referral of pupils who do not demonstrate appropriate progress to the IEP team.

Moderate/Severe Disabilities Standards

M/S Standard 5: Movement, Mobility, Sensory and Specialized Health Care **Not met**

Rationale: It is unclear how one set of “end of module responses” can address all of competencies required in this standard, including skills to facilitate individual student initiation of and generalized use of mobility and other functional motor movements to promote maximum

participation and involvement in activities; an understanding of the impact of sensory impairment on movement and motor development and the corresponding ability to effectively facilitate both motor and sensory functioning; current assistive and adaptive devices as well as knowledge of and a facility with the state adopted modifications and accommodations; the ability to share information regarding sensory, movement, mobility, and specialized health care needs and procedures with general educators, students, parents and others to increase the level of understanding and sensitivity; the ability to arrange classroom environments to accommodate sensory movement, mobility, specialized health care needs, while promoting positive, proactive and respectful behaviors, students' independence, and the dignity of students with disabilities.

Autism Spectrum Disorders Added Authorization Standards (ASDAA)

Credential holders seeking to add the Added Authorization in Autism Spectrum Disorders at CSUMB must successfully complete SPED 560: Inclusionary Practices, SPED 564: Formal Assessment Diverse Populations and SPED 571: Teaching Students with Autism. These three courses are also required for those completing the Preliminary Mild/Moderate credential program.

Program Standards for the Added Authorization in Autism Spectrum Disorders are met with the exception of ASDAA Standard 1.

ASDAA Standard 1: Characteristics of ASD

Not Met

Rationale: It is unclear how candidates demonstrate their unique knowledge of cognition and neurology and the core challenges associated with language and communication, social skills, behavior, and processing and their implications for program planning and service delivery. It is unclear how candidates demonstrate that they can identify the unique characteristics of students with ASD. Through review of course syllabi, assignments were in place, but the program did not clearly articulate how these assignments provide candidates with opportunities to demonstrate competency for this standard.

Appendix A

III. The Transformation Initiative

III.1 Summary of the Transformation Initiative

According to the unit's original proposal for transformational initiative, the primary goal of the project "is to improve the clinical teaching component of teacher education while simultaneously improving P-12 student learning in schools that serve as clinical placement sites." The unit states that its secondary goal is "to redefine the roles and responsibilities of university faculty as teacher educators." The unit has proposed research questions on the basis of the following program redesign:

- Year long placements of student teachers in high need partnership schools with experiences in different grade levels or classrooms as indicated by standards;
- Concentrated placements of student teachers in one school setting;
- Adoption of the co-teaching apprenticeship models of student teaching;
- New roles for full-time faculty at partner school sites in support of school reform.

The unit proposed four research questions:

- What is the effect of year-long student teaching placements in selected partnership schools on student teacher satisfaction with their experiences in preparation for teaching and on the performance of the teacher candidate on the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), a CTC recognized Teaching Performance Assessment?
- What are the effects of the co-teaching model of practical training for pre-service teachers when compared to the unit's conventional model of student teaching in terms of teacher candidate performance, teacher candidate satisfaction with professional preparation, and student achievement on district common assessments taken by P-12 students during the practical training exercise?
- What is the effect of concentrated placements of year-long student teachers using the co-teaching model on teacher candidate performance on the PACT tasks, teacher candidate satisfaction with teacher preparation as measured with the Center for Teacher Quality alumni satisfaction survey, P-12 student performance on district CST scores by grade level or in subject areas, and where appropriate, P-12 student performance on district administered standards-based benchmark assessments?
- How can unit faculty influence student teachers in the partnering schools to contribute to local school improvements?

The unit states that its redesigned field experience delivery model has been implemented for three years. In addition to changes in the field experience, it has modified the delivery of the campus-based curriculum to support candidate success during the academic year. Courses have been revised and re-scheduled to prepare teacher candidates for successful teaching on the first day of school and to support candidates as they face challenges that typically appear during the school year.

The unit reports that it is in the process of obtaining evidence about p-12 student achievement gains in co-taught classrooms to compare them with p-12 learning experiences in classrooms that

are not co-taught.

III.2 Status of TI Implementation

The unit has reported the following progress:

- All multiple subjects and single subjects teacher candidates are placed in full year experiences for student teaching placements or internships.
- Candidates placed as student teachers experience a full year of the co-teaching model. They are trained in co-planning and co-teaching in late July or early August and they plan for the opening of the school year with their cooperating teacher. In the co-teaching relationship, both the cooperating teacher and the teacher candidate are expected to make meaningful contributions to student learning beginning with the first day of school. This does not occur for candidates who begin in January.
- The unit has streamlined its partner schools to ensure its candidates' ability of conducting field experiences in well-defined schools. The number of school districts and school placement sites has steadily declined.
- From 2011-2013, a member of the teacher education faculty organized multiple subject candidates for the administration of reading diagnostic assessments to identify struggling readers and to provide an intervention for students at-risk. Through this project teacher candidates learned the relationship between diagnostic assessment, provision of a related intervention, and summative assessment to measure project effectiveness. Unfortunately, a reduction of staffing within the Department of Teacher Education has called the faculty member away to administrative duties. The unit expects to resume the school improvement activities when new staffing allows the unit to do so.
- All cooperating teachers, supervisors, and teacher candidates are trained by the Co-Teaching Coordinator in the co-teaching model. Course content has been revised and re-scheduled to support the clinical experience. Modifications to coursework that support student success during the clinical experience are still underway. During the first two years of implementing the new model, teacher candidates expressed their displeasure with the burden of additional hours in the field accompanied by little relief in their schedule of campus-based courses. Since that time, efforts to relieve student burden include the scheduling of courses across three terms (summer through spring), providing more practical field projects as course assignments to be completed while teaching in assigned classrooms, providing more on-line and hybrid format course delivery, and scheduling courses in a manner that reduces the need for frequent visits to campus during the academic year.

The unit has reported challenges in the assessment of P-12 student academic performance in co-taught classrooms where student teachers are placed include school district resistance to releasing student achievement data at the classroom level. Some information has been forthcoming, but not all of partner school districts are equally disposed to releasing information about teacher and student performance on standardized tests.

The unit reports that its research evaluation methods have changed as a result of the unit's commitment to place all teacher candidates in year-long residencies and a co-teaching relationship with a cooperating teacher. It is now adopting a time series methodology rather than a comparison between control and experimental groups. The unit hopes that such data reports will provide information on employer satisfaction with teacher candidate performance, alumni satisfaction with the program preparation for teaching, outcomes of field experiences, the Performance Assessment for California Teachers, the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA), and other measures taken prior to the beginning of the reform efforts in 2010-2011 and their current state of implementation at the start of the 2013-2014 academic year.

The unit has also reported that some of its partners have changed. This is an outcome of the unit's intention to reduce the total number of placement sites as it increases the number of teacher candidates at each site.

Goal four of the unit's TI pertains to the implementation of school improvement efforts by cohorts of teacher candidates placed in public schools. The unit originally planned to have each cohort of student teachers at each field placement site conduct a school improvement initiative under the leadership of a full-time faculty member. The initiatives would be data driven efforts to enhance p-12 student success. The unit's full-time faculty in the multiple and single subjects programs are placing students in nine placement sites with substantial numbers of student teachers. Due to the need for full-time faculty to perform program leadership and other administrative duties, the unit has insufficient resources at this time to pursue this goal.

On the basis of the discussions with the unit leadership and faculty, the BOE team has found that the transformational initiative has significantly changed from the form originally approved by the NCATE. The original proposal focused on the research component on the reformed teacher candidate clinical and field experiences. The research methodology has been significantly altered.

As a result of budget non-sustainability, shortfalls of faculty resources, lack of data cooperation from the school partners, and institutional restructuring, the unit requested that its transformational initiative is discontinued and the unit is reverted back to the continuous improvement pathway for its next accreditation cycle.

Progress of TI Implementation

This rubric is intended to provide feedback to an EPP on (1) its capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the TI; (b) the level of broad-based involvement of EPP constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the TI; and (c) review of the goals and assessment plans that result in a successful TI.

Overall evaluation of the progress of the TI--Undefined

III.3 Statement about TI Findings

The unit proposed a research method based on comparison of treatment and control groups in schools where the TI is undergoing implementation. The original idea was to compare K-12

student academic performance in classrooms within the same school and grade level (or subject area) where the year-long placement of student teachers with the co-teaching model was in place in relation to the academic performance of K-12 students in classrooms with conventional student teacher placements. As a result of consolidation of placements in fewer schools and a decision by the faculty to abandon the conventional model of student teaching, the unit has decided to use classrooms with no student teachers as control groups. It also plans to use a time series evaluation process, comparing teacher candidate's opinions and performances in years prior to implementation of the intervention with opinions and performance of candidates during the years of full implementation of the new placement model.

The unit argues that the newly adopted research methodologies are appropriate for the four research questions. Each of the four research questions are focused on changes in the clinical experiences in the teacher education programs: consolidation of placements into fewer schools with several teacher candidates in one setting, year-long placements, use of the co-teaching model, and candidate implementation of a local intervention for student success. These changes are expected to improve teacher candidate skills and dispositions during student teaching and to improve K-12 student learning due to the changes in relationships between student teachers, cooperating teachers, and K-12 students in co-taught classrooms. The unit asserts that the research methodology is intended to demonstrate improved candidate satisfaction with their clinical training, improved candidate performance of teaching skills and dispositions, and improvements in K-12 student teaching. The unit believes the methods selected focus on those anticipated outcomes.

The unit has preliminary data pertaining to K-12 student achievement gains, candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions of teaching, and candidate opinions about the efficacy of their teacher training experience. In one elementary school with teachers having the most experience in hosting co-teachers, the unit has found evidence of a difference in student achievement in classrooms where co-teachers are placed. The unit's data show that at Dolphin school highlighted classrooms with co-teaching placements have significantly higher state standards scores than other classrooms. An update for the most recent academic year demonstrates that this pattern of achievement continues at the school.

The unit has also reported data collected from survey data of program graduates about the effectiveness of the co-teaching and year-long model on their teacher preparation. The results indicated that they are satisfied with this approach. For instance, there are relatively low scores when candidates are asked if the experience should be shortened. One finding from the survey is the evident of the need to have college supervisors provide more direct support for the co-teaching process. In response to this concern, the unit has added "lead supervisors" with the express role of helping co-teaching pairs learn and practice co-teaching strategies.

The unit concurs that the transformational initiative requires the coordinated support of staff who will make arrangements, conduct trainings, and work closely with partner schools for year-long residency placements. This aspect of the reform activity requires substantial activity prior to the start of the academic term at the university, which begins well after K-12 students have reported to schools. So far the unit has used its Teacher Quality Partnership grant to support this special effort but the grant will expire in 18 months. In order to continue with this initiative, the unit will need to change its budget cycle from a nine-month academic year to a full calendar year with

summer operations. A proposal for this change in the curriculum is currently undergoing the curriculum approval process.

The unit has reported significant human resource constraints to continue the transformational initiative. In Spring 2013, two faculty members retired and one additional faculty member entered the transitional retirement program, effectively placing that faculty member on half time status. Additionally, two other faculty members have moved from transitional retirement to full retirement in the last eighteen months.

As a result, the unit only has three full-time faculty members for the multiple subjects program, the single subject program, and the Curriculum and Instruction, MAE program. The three full time faculty members in the general education component of the program do not have time to be at our many partner schools to lead school improvement initiatives with student teachers. The unit has not made any commitment to providing the much-needed human capital for this project.

With the support of the Teacher Quality Partnership grant, through September 2015, the unit plans to use grant resources to complete its collection and analysis of data prior to the expiration of the grant. During this Spring 2014 term, the unit suggests that it will work closely with cooperating teachers and principals to obtain data on K-12 student success, including test score data.

Further, the BOE team does not believe the time-series evaluation model, as proposed by the unit, has the rigor in comparison to the original proposal. It is uncertain how the unit plans to sustain long-term research efforts when it only has three full-time faculty members in education. Finally, with the serious lack of resources, the BOE team believes that there is no certainty that the transformational initiative will continue to be implemented with much success while remains focused on the research questions.

Specific Standard Findings with Respect to TI:

1.2 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

As reported in the Response to the Offsite Report, the unit has comparative data (exhibit TI.4.3 CST data) from eleven classrooms in three schools. Scores from one of these schools demonstrate that K-12 students in co-taught classrooms achieve higher test scores in Math and English Language Arts than their peers in conventional classrooms. No further data are currently available to document progress being made in implementing the TI and it's impact on candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions.

2.2 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

It states in the IR that the unit's assessment system has been substantially modified to reflect their TI. Purportedly, specific assessment resources were developed specifically to evaluate the effectiveness of TI elements on the quality of the teacher preparation programs. Modifications to the TK 20 electronic portfolio have been made to evaluate elements of co-teaching that are a part of each field observation.

Goal 2 of the TI is to use the co-teaching model with appropriate pre-service training and academic year support. End of program assessments include exit interviews and surveys of teacher candidates and cooperating teachers to assess the co-teaching experience. As stated earlier, the unit's Human Subjects Research Application (Exhibit 2.5.1) associated with its TI proposal provides the policies and procedures for data use. The policies and procedures demonstrate how data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and used to make improvements.

2.5 Recommendation related to the TI

Not applicable.

3.2 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

The TI focuses primarily on improving the clinical teaching component of student teaching while simultaneously improving P-12 student learning in schools that serve as placement sites. In addition, this initiative also strives to redefine the roles and responsibilities of unit faculty as teacher educators.

Four research questions associated with the clinical experience are examined:

1. What is the effect of year-long student teaching placements in selected partner schools on student satisfaction with their experiences in preparation for teaching and on the performance of teacher candidates on various assessments.
2. What are the effects of the co-teaching model of practical training for pre-service teachers when compared to the conventional model of student teaching in terms of teacher candidate performance, teacher candidate satisfaction with professional preparation and student achievement on district assessments during the clinical experience.
3. What is the effect of concentrated placements of year-long student teachers using the co-teaching model on teacher candidate performance PACT tasks and assessments.
4. How can unit faculty influence student teachers in partnering schools to contribute to local school improvements in an effort to enhance student achievement .

CSUMB has worked to place all teacher education candidates in full year clinical experiences. In addition, it was reported in the IR that the unit has streamlined its partnering districts to three to serve as placements of its candidates. Based on interviews with the field experience coordinator, the unit does not focus on specific school districts. Focus is placed on partnering schools rather than partnering districts. The schools that are used as placement sites are in various districts. Therefore, the emphasis to streamline and focus on particular districts appears to be non-existence.

CSUMB has assessments which include end-of-program surveys that are administered to candidates, selected items from the survey of program graduates and employers which is conducted by the Center for Teacher Quality of the California State University System, and field observation forms completed by university supervisors. These assessments evaluate the effectiveness of the clinical experience. Based on the results from the Center for Teacher Quality surveys of program graduates and employers, 70-80% of respondents indicated that the program

adequately prepared or well prepared them for various skills.

However, in review of general program satisfaction, CSUMB reports that scores fail to surpass 60% agree that they would recommend this program to another candidate. Furthermore, the data indicated that many respondents did not feel completely prepared for successful independent teaching following completion of the program. In close examination of the research questions that the TI originally addressed, the following was found based on interviews and reviews of the exhibits:

For question one that examines, the effect of year-long student teaching placements in selected partner schools on student satisfaction with their experiences in preparation for teaching and on the performance of teacher candidates on various assessments, CSUMB alumni reported that the year-long clinical experience is a strength of the program. It provides candidates with the opportunity to teach from the very beginning, which allowed for candidates to have more experiences teaching in the classroom compared to candidates in the traditional model. Alumni also reported that the classes centered on diversity helped them to adapt to addressing the needs of diverse learners. One of the principals interviewed stated that she was first concerned with working with CSUMB under the traditional model. However, since implementing the co-teaching model, she has had great experiences with the unit. Furthermore, she stated that completers from the unit are more than adequately prepared to teach. She further added that they are "together with literacy." Graduates are more than prepared to address the needs of English Learners.

In review of question two which examines the effects of the co-teaching model of practical training for pre-service teachers when compared to the conventional model of student teaching in terms of teacher candidate performance, teacher candidate satisfaction with professional preparation and student achievement on district assessments during the clinical experience, no data is provided or collected. Through some interviews, it was reported by the cooperating teachers and the principal that things have improved. However, there is no comparative data in the exhibits or the IR on candidates who have completed the co-teaching model compared to those who completed the traditional model.

For question three, What is the effect of concentrated placements of year-long student teachers using the co-teaching model on teacher candidate performance PACT tasks and assessments. There was no data available or presented associated with this question in the exhibits or the IR.

For question four, the unit has reported that it does not have the resources to examine how faculty can work with student teachers in partnering schools to implement new initiatives to improve student achievement.

3.5 Recommendation related to the TI

The initial TI had four research questions that the unit identified that it would examine. At this time, the unit has not adequately addressed the TI nor has it provided sufficient data and evidence as to the progress that has been made to the TI. While there is data on the types of experiences candidates have in their clinical experience and preparation, no data is provided on the impact that the clinical experience has on some dispositions, and student learning in the partnering

schools. Furthermore, question four which examines the impact that full time faculty have on students teachers to improve student teaching has not been explored. Changes in the unit have significantly affected its ability to explore and address these research questions. However, unit must put measures in place to collect data and report on their findings to appropriately address the TI since the clinical experience is the main focal point.

4.2 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

Since the TI focuses primarily on improving the clinical teaching component while improving P-12 student learning in schools that serve as placement sites, the IR reports that CSUMB addresses the issue of diversity by placing candidates in schools and districts that meet "minimum expectations for diversity in classrooms" where candidates are placed. A field placement coordinator identifies field placement where diverse students can be found in all placement sites. Candidates are required to identify the number of students with exceptionalities in their assigned classes during the first few weeks of placement, if there are no students with exceptionalities, then efforts are made to expose students to other classrooms where students with exceptionalities may be found.

There are assessment policies and procedures in place to measure the effectiveness of candidates as it relates to planning instruction, teaching, and assessing student learning in classrooms with diverse students and student with exceptionalities. However, in review of question four which examines how faculty will work with teacher education candidates to improve student achievement, no progress has been made on this question. Based on the IR, there are no resources or faculty available to pursue the part of the TI.

4.5 Recommendation related to the TI

The unit has not demonstrated through its TI research that the redesigned year-long field experience has enhanced its candidates' competencies to ensure that all students can learn. Data on student achievement from the districts that serve as placement sites for candidates would help determine the impact of candidates' competencies to help all students learn.

5.2 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

The unit is in full implementation of the TI Co-Residency Year Long Residency including curriculum reforms. Candidates are engaged in full year residency and matched with a co-teaching partner. The multiple subject candidates work with two co-teachers (semester 1 and 2) and the single subject candidates work with one co-teacher for the year. Professional development and training occurs in fall of each year (overview, orientation, and Pairs Training) with mini training offered in the spring semester.

The Teacher Quality Program has funded two additional research staff positions to address the question of student success in the co-teaching classroom. The assessors did not see evidence of research of co-teaching effectiveness.

5.5 Recommendation related to the TI

n/a

6.2 Progress of the TI related to this standard, if applicable

A reduction of staffing within the Department of Teacher Education required faculty organizing TI Goal Four to be transitioned to program leadership and other administrative duties. Goal Four of the TI pertains to the implementation of school improvement efforts by cohorts of teacher candidates placed in public schools. This goal has been deferred until faculty resource needs have been fulfilled through position vacancy searches. As of the site visit, there were no new tenure-line recruitments to fill vacancies.

6.5 Recommendation related to the TI

The unit does not have sufficient resources and personnel to meet the goals of the TI at this time. A reduction of staffing within the Department of Teacher Education required faculty to be transitioned to program leadership and other administrative duties leaving them unable to complete the research aspects of the TI.

III.4 Recommendations on Further Implementation of the TI

Not applicable. See rationale in III.5.

III.5 Next Steps for Reporting to NCATE

Interviews with the Unit's President, Provost, Dean, faculty, and school partners indicate that it has been challenging to collect student learning data from partner schools. Because of faculty retirement and reassignment, activities and the research component has been significantly delayed. Although there is still limited federal grant fund remained to support another year of data collection and adjunct faculty time, the unit does not believe that it has the resources to sustain the project beyond September 2015.

The unit is also undergoing significant organizational restructure. The current Dean for the College of Professional Studies is stepping down in July 2014. The College of Professional Studies will be divided into two new colleges, one of them will be the brand new College of Education. The unit will immediately begin the search for a dean, and expects the new dean to take the leadership of developing strategic priorities for the unit. Until that is completed, the unit has stated that it will not invest in resources to support the research component of the transformational initiative. The unit has asked to withdraw its transformational initiative project from the NCATE accreditation review, and revert back to the continuous improvement pathway in the next accreditation cycle.