

Interviews with candidates and program staff confirmed that candidates are provided comprehensive information regarding the program requirements and the program track options and are also assisted throughout the program to ensure each individual's academic needs are met. The single subject program draws from multiple majors on campus, including one program integrated with Biology. According to the program coordinators and faculty, candidates are provided advisement by one of the full-time faculty in the matched discipline area, for guidance and assistance throughout the program. Both full-time faculty and adjunct faculty serve as candidates' field supervisors during the clinical experience. Through interviews, it became evident that the sequence of courses and field experiences prepare candidates to become quality teachers. Interviews with candidates confirmed that they know about the program requirements, sequence of courses, and who to contact if needed.

Course of Study – Curriculum and Field Experience

The Multiple Subject, Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization, and Single Subject credential programs are offered in three distinct tracks for post-baccalaureate students. Each encompasses a logical sequence of courses and fieldwork. Track A is the most intensive track, with a full-time student teaching program over three quarters beginning in fall quarter. Track B candidates enroll in a part-time program that begins in the winter quarter and allows them to complete the program in four or five quarters. Track C is an Intern option. To be admitted to the Track C Intern option, candidates must have met all program and state requirements, and have a job offer from a public school district that has an intern contract agreement with the university. Supervision of intern teachers adheres to the requirements outlined in the program standards.

All program coursework provides an emphasis on teaching in diverse classrooms. Candidates are expected to develop the skills and expertise to work with all students to provide equity and access to meet all academic content standards.

Multiple Subject credential and Multiple Subject credential with Bilingual Authorization: The multiple subject program coursework and fieldwork occurs over three phases. In Phase I candidates are introduced to the foundations of educational practice in educational psychology and classroom management, which include the educational needs of English learners and non-English learners and students with special needs. Phase I courses are designed with early fieldwork experiences of 76 hours or more to prepare candidates for student teaching and intern teaching. For example, while taking the Classroom Organization, Management and Discipline course, candidates observe teachers, and create a classroom organization and discipline management plan. As candidates explore the social, psychological, emotional and intellectual processes related to how children think and learn in the Educational Psychology for Diverse Society course, they learn about materials, methods, theory, and strategies for reading/language arts instruction in diverse classrooms. Candidate coursework prepares them to examine current practices in local school districts such as second language acquisition, differentiated instruction,

and designing learning experiences for all students. The courses in Phase I provide a theoretical foundation for candidates to teach diverse students.

During Phase II, candidates refine their skills by planning and implementing lesson plans in student teaching or internship. Through a sequence of courses candidates learn how to implement state-adopted mathematics, reading/language arts curriculum standards in elementary classrooms, including designing instruction to meet the academic needs of all learners in a diverse classroom. They also acquire the knowledge to implement different approaches to English Language Development, plan for language and content instruction, and transfer literacy knowledge skills from first language to second language. While taking the coursework, candidates are simultaneously enrolled in full-time or part-time student teaching where they put into practice what they learn in the courses.

In Phase III, candidates learn to design curriculum and instruction for elementary education in the social sciences and visual and performing arts in a culturally diverse society. In an additional course, they learn how teachers can assist students to engage in science and understand science concepts in a culturally relevant way. Candidates also participate in a student teaching seminar while completing their student teaching assignment.

Bilingual Authorization program coursework and fieldwork follow the same pattern and sequence as the Multiple Subject credential program with modifications included in required courses and fieldwork experiences. During Phase I candidates take a Comparative Linguistics class (or take equivalent Spanish CSET) to learn linguistic areas of morphology and syntax of modern Spanish, linguistics, grammar, and language variation. During Phase II, candidates refine their skills by planning and implementing lesson plans in student teaching or internship in bilingual classrooms. For example, candidates in Mathematics Curriculum and Pedagogy class learn how to implement state-adopted mathematics curriculum standards in diverse elementary classrooms, and also take classes to learn about teaching and to implement different approaches to English Language Development (ELD), plan for language and content instruction (SDAIE), and transfer literacy knowledge skills from first language to second language. While taking the coursework, candidates are enrolled in student teaching in a bilingual classroom.

There are two pathways for completing the requirements for the Bilingual Authorization. In the first pathway candidates follow the same program requirements as the other Multiple Subject teacher candidates and also take the Bilingual Reading/Language Arts Curriculum and Pedagogy course and the Social Studies and the Art Curriculum and Pedagogy course in which bilingual methods are used and taught. These two courses require candidates to submit work in Spanish and English. The second pathway for completing a Bilingual Added Authorization is exam-based, for teachers who already hold a Preliminary or Clear Multiple Subject credential. These teachers can add a Spanish Bilingual Authorization to their initial credential by passing three CSET exams: Spanish Subsets III and V and World Language Subset IV.

Single Subject: The Single Subject program includes eight subject specific methods courses. Faculty from the program with content expertise, or related school experience, deliver methods courses for art, English, kinesiology, mathematics, music, social science, science (biology, chemistry, geo-science and physics), and world languages. Candidates enroll in a student teaching seminar that assists them to prepare for student teaching that addresses the school context.

Fieldwork Requirements: Field experiences within the program include two types, early fieldwork experience and supervised student teaching or internship. All instructors include fieldwork within their courses and require at least one assignment in which candidates interact with teachers and/or students at a school site. All courses are considered field-based, and each includes a minimum of six hours of fieldwork with specific expectations for observation and participation for a total of 76 hours.

Track A, B, and C candidates receive their early field experiences through three foundational courses plus the student teaching seminar course. Track A and B candidates then engage in two quarters of student teaching. During the first quarter, student teachers engage in observations, curriculum planning, assessing and teaching at least two classes in their discipline every day. These teacher candidates also observe one period and have one planning period. Second quarter student teachers take on additional responsibilities and teach all periods of the day for four full weeks for a total of 600 hours of fieldwork and student teaching.

The intern track (Track C) parallels the coursework required in the student teaching track. Interns are assigned a university supervisor who assists and observes throughout the complete intern program. Interns must enroll in the Internship Seminar III course which covers adaptations and strategies for English learners to meet the content standards. School districts assign a mentor teacher, an English language specialist, and school site administrator to each intern. During each year, the intern meets with the mentor teacher for one hour per week for 30 weeks, English language specialist for one hour per week for 30 weeks, and school site administrator for 21 hours during their 30 weeks of internship (seven hours per quarter).

Assessment of Candidate Competence

Assessment of candidates begins with the admission process where dispositions, attitudes, and aptitudes are evaluated through multiple measures including essays and interviews. Faculty, university supervisors, and resident teachers use multiple formative and summative assessments throughout the program. Candidate competence is evaluated as they complete their course assignments, projects, lesson plans, field-based projects, mid-term tests, and final examinations. The embedded pedagogical assignments and other course requirements ask candidates to demonstrate and apply their knowledge and skill in planning and delivery of instruction. Throughout course work and fieldwork, all candidates, whether they participate in student teaching or the intern pathway, must demonstrate their skills and competencies in the Teaching Performance Expectations. During student teaching and internship, candidates are evaluated

based on the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). They are also required to submit their Teaching Performance Assessments (TPAs) by the expected due dates.

The program has established clear requirements for qualification of the university supervisors and resident teacher/district employed supervisors. Fieldwork placement staff assign a university supervisor to each candidate. University supervisors make plans for five observations each quarter to observe candidate's teaching and delivery of instruction and assess his/her competence level. Observation results are used to prepare a developmental and summative evaluation which is used for further planning with the candidate. There is a one-to-one follow up conference to discuss the candidate's teaching. It was communicated during interviews that a copy of the evaluation report is shared with each candidate. Resident teachers (District employed supervisors) are observing candidates formally and informally and provide candidates with periodic written feedback. Resident teachers work with university supervisors to complete a mid-quarter and final evaluation of student teachers. Each student teacher and their assigned university supervisor meet to provide feedback and discuss the results of the evaluation which includes candidate competencies.

University supervisors also work closely with interns. University supervisors are required to observe and have an extensive conversation with their assigned interns at least twice a month and record evaluations of interns' performances in relation to the Teaching Performance Expectations.. University supervisors conduct five classroom observations during the quarter. In addition to these observations, university supervisors prepare developmental and summative evaluations and plan a one on one conference to discuss teaching performance with each intern teacher. At the end of the quarter, supervisors conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the intern.

Candidates in the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Intern program enroll in the Internship Seminar III class. Interns address and work on their skills in meeting the TPEs, TPA, and program competencies. Interns maintain a weekly reflection log reviewed by the university supervisor and the Internship Seminar III faculty.

Program completers are encouraged to respond to the exit survey for the CSU system. Data from the survey is reviewed to help faculty learn about the quality of students' experiences while in the program and also improve program effectiveness. The program also requests program completers to respond to online surveys and provide feedback on their student teaching placement.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for the Preliminary Multiple

Subject and Single Subject Teaching credential programs and Multiple Subject Teaching credential with Bilingual Authorization

Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Moderate/Severe Disabilities, and Early Childhood Special Education Credential Programs

Program Design

The Education Specialist programs in the CSUSB Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling are coordinated by program faculty members who receive reassigned time to fulfill the duties of a fieldwork coordinator, a general program coordinator, a graduate coordinator, and a liaison to the Liberal Studies Program. The chair of the department is responsible for oversight of the Education Specialist Programs in terms of hiring and evaluating faculty and budget. The department chair is a member of the Dean’s Cabinet.

Full-time faculty meet monthly to discuss issues related to the various programs. Adjunct faculty and university supervisors also meet several times a year to learn of any changes from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) and receive professional development on various topics such as assisting candidates in working effectively with para-educators.

The programs receive support and advice from an advisory board that includes superintendents, county officials, and school district personnel including special education coordinators/directors, human resources managers and staff responsible for fieldwork placements and/or intern support. Candidate performance data is shared with the advisory board to obtain feedback leading to program improvement and candidate learning outcomes. The advisory board meets either in person or via Zoom.

Candidates in the program include both intern candidates who are employed as teachers of record and those in pre-service preparation who complete student teaching. Intern candidates and those in the student teaching track take classes together.

The programs are structured to be completed in four phases. Phase 1, which is required for admission, is the pre-requisite phase. There are three classes in this phase that also address the pre-service requirements for internship eligibility. Phase II consists of core courses including early field experiences in courses that address the program standards. Phase III is referred to as the authorization phase in which candidates complete courses that address the authorization’s specific standards. Phase IV provides supervised field experience. Candidates reflect on their career goals and strengths, skills, and weaknesses relative to pedagogy, and universal access in preparation for induction.

Candidates in the intern pathway are required to complete the pre-requisite coursework prior to

approval for internship eligibility. The pre-requisite coursework includes the pre-service requirements relative to Standards 3, 4, 5, and 7-13. The only exception to this requirement is made for holders of preliminary or clear multiple subject or single subject credential. Once candidates have obtained a letter of intern eligibility and have secured a teaching position and an Education Specialist Intern Credential, they receive ongoing academic advisement from the program coordinator through intern seminars held each quarter, as well as in individual meetings. The intern pathways require six (6) quarters or two academic years to complete. Candidates in the intern program complete supervised fieldwork each quarter of their program.

Documentation from program files and interviews indicate that the progress of all candidates is monitored to ensure that all requirements are met as the candidates move through the four phases including supervised field experiences. Candidates who need extra support are advised and provided with additional opportunities to meet requirements.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Three courses are required in the pre-requisite phase: Introductory Special Education Methods, Policies and Procedures; Typical Human Development from Birth through Adolescence; and Human Diversity and Characteristics of Learners with Disabilities. A fourth pre-service course, Curriculum and Methods for Diverse Learners with Disabilities, is required for candidates who wish to become intern eligible. The course includes more than 45 hours of focus on English language learners with specialized assessment and instructional planning and teaching methods for English language acquisition. Consideration is given to cultural characteristics of students, cultural transmission, EL case studies and EL assessments in both L1 and L2 plus an EL focused practicum.

In Phase 1, the pre-requisite phase, candidates have their first exposure to classrooms that serve students with disabilities. In the Human Diversity and Characteristics of Learners with Disabilities course, candidates are required to observe a classroom that serves students with mild-moderate disabilities and a second classroom that serves students with moderate to severe disabilities.

In Phase II, the core phase, candidates take courses in Identification and Characteristics of Autism Spectrum Disorders, Assessment and Evaluation of Learners with Special Needs, Classroom Management and Positive Behavior Support, Methods for Teaching English Learners, Methods for Reading and Writing, Communication, Collaboration, Consultation, and Co-teaching, Evidence-based Practices in the Education of Learners with Autism Spectrum Disorders, and a course in Health and Wellness.

Candidates in the core phase of the program also have several different opportunities for early field experiences. In Assessment and Evaluation of Learners with Special Needs, candidates observe and identify a range of assessment practices in settings that serve students with disabilities. In Classroom Management and Positive Behavior Support, candidates complete a case study implementing a functional behavior assessment and developing a positive behavior

support plan. In Methods for Reading and Writing, candidates are required to complete small and whole group instructional strategies in reading and writing. In Methods for Teaching English Learners, candidates complete a case study with an English learner which includes assessment and the development of an instructional plan. In Evidence-based Practices in the Education of Learners with Autism Spectrum Disorders, candidates are required to observe the implementation of collaborative practices as well as evidence-based practices in two different settings serving students with Autism Spectrum Disorders.

In Phase III, the authorization phase, candidates take two methods courses in Mild to Moderate Disabilities, Moderate to Severe Disabilities, or Early Childhood Special Education. These courses address characteristics, policies and procedures, assessment, transition, and curriculum and instruction for students with disabilities in early childhood, pre-K through 12.

Phase IV of the program is the culminating supervised field experiences or student teaching. Student teaching candidates complete two (2) quarters of student teaching to be eligible for the Preliminary Education Specialist Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, or Early Childhood credential. Candidates who already hold a valid Multiple or Single Subject teaching credential complete one (1) quarter of student teaching. During this final phase of the program, candidates are required to student teach full-time for 10 weeks. Candidates student teach under the guidance of a district employed supervisor. Teaching performance is evaluated by a university supervisor in collaboration with the district employed supervisor according to the teaching competencies for the candidate's credential authorization objective.

Each intern must secure full-time employment as a teacher in a special education setting. An intern must remain as teacher of record and be continuously enrolled in intern fieldwork for six academic quarters (not including summer). Each intern must earn a grade of credit (CR) each quarter of intern fieldwork. In order to earn CR for the final quarter, all competencies must be assessed as "met" or higher in every area. Review of course syllabi and candidate work indicates an alignment of courses with required Commission program standards.

Assessment

In the Education Specialist credential programs, candidates are evaluated on their performance by faculty, resident teachers, and university supervisors. Evaluation of performance includes reflections on the part of the candidate and fieldwork observations. Fieldwork observations include the classroom observation as well as a post-observation conference where the candidate's performance is discussed and suggestions made. Both the university supervisor and the resident teacher provide formative feedback to candidates.

Summative feedback is also provided to candidates. The resident teacher and university supervisor confer to develop a written assessment of the candidate's progress on the competency rating form at mid-quarter.

At the end of the quarter, the university supervisor and resident teacher confer again to develop a written final summative evaluation on the candidate's performance on the competency rating form. This form incorporates elements from the Council for Exceptional Children standards and Commission Teaching Performance Expectations.

In addition to a clear process for assessing candidates, the program also clearly delineates a process for support and, as appropriate, repercussion for candidates not making adequate progress. Based on document review and interviews, candidates are evaluated regarding their eligibility to apply for the relevant Education Specialist credential. To assess the effectiveness of the preparation program, program completers are surveyed one year after completion of the program in order to determine any changes to the existing program sequence and content. This data is shared with the faculty and the Advisory Board for discussion about possible next steps to improve the preparation of Education Specialist candidates.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **met** for the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe Disabilities, and Early Childhood Credential Programs.

Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization

Program Design

The Department of Teacher Education and Foundations is the administrative department for the Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization (APEAA). The coordination of the program is the responsibility of the APEAA program coordinator who is a full-time tenured faculty member in the Department of Kinesiology. The APEAA program coordinator handles all of the administrative issues associated with the APEAA program such as candidate recruitment, application, acceptance, and enrollment procedures along with academic/career advising. The program coordinator also monitors early field experiences (EFE) and oversees assessment of the program.

The program coordinator is supported by credential programs admissions staff, supervision staff who assist with candidate field experience, and credential analysts who, upon evaluation of candidate documentation, accept applications and recommend for California teaching credentials. The APEAA program coordinator reports to the chair of the Department of Kinesiology. The chair handles general scheduling of classes and arranges space and facilities for the APEAA program.

The APEAA program within the Department of Kinesiology receives feedback from the Department External Advisory Committee. Members of the advisory committee include faculty from other universities and school district personnel.

Instructors in the program receive updates on department, university, state, and national policies and procedures that impact the program. The program coordinator attends the National Adapted Physical Education Conference to connect with national colleagues in the field and to stay up to date on the latest research. The program coordinator also meets with the College of Education assessment committee to share and review outcome data. Documentation from meetings and interviews with program leadership, completers, and candidates indicate that the program receives appropriate oversight and coordination.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The following teaching credential holders can apply to the APEAA program: Single Subject in Physical Education, Multiple Subject, and Educational Specialist. Each candidate will have different APEAA course requirements depending on the candidate's academic experiences and teaching credentials.

Those holding a Single Subject credential in PE, take 20 units of APEAA coursework that includes: Introduction to Adapted Physical Education, Movement Skill Assessment for Individuals with Disabilities, Nature of Disabilities, Applied Behavior Analysis, and a Seminar in Adapted Physical Activity.

Multiple Subject credential and Education Specialist credential holders either pass California Subject Examinations for Teachers in PE (all parts) or complete 17 units of coursework. Kinesiology or equivalent courses are subject to transcript and program syllabus verification. A total of 17 units are selected from the following courses with nine units from the core and eight units from pedagogy courses:

Core Kinesiology Courses (9 units)

Qualitative Biomechanics (5 units)

Motor Development (4units)

Pedagogy courses (select 8 units)

Program Design in Physical Education (4 units) or

Instructional Strategies in Physical Education (4 units)

Psychology of Physical Activity (4 units)

Kinesiology APEAA coursework requires 16 hours of Early Field Experience (EFE) that includes visiting and observing various physical education settings. As part of each 4-unit course candidates must observe where students with disabilities are present. The purpose of EFE

experiences is to reinforce academic coursework with practical EFE to illustrate the relationship of APEAA with kinesiology, especially pedagogical kinesiology.

There is a direct connection between APEAA field experiences and specific APEAA academic coursework in the program. This connection provides candidates real-life experiences in integrating and applying theory, knowledge, and instructional technology into practice across the spectrum of individuals with disabilities and age ranges (3-21 years).

The COE organizes the candidates' clinical practice with university supervision provided by pedagogy faculty in the Department of Kinesiology or College of Education. District employed supervisors are selected based on competence in their subject area, effective teaching skills, an appropriate credential in their teaching field, a minimum of three years of teaching experience, and in-service training in peer coaching or clinical supervision. Review of the APEAA course matrix, course syllabi, key assessments, and candidate work indicate that the CSUSB program is aligned with the Commission standards for the Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization which were adopted in January 2013.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates enrolled in the adapted physical education courses observe and assist in teaching students with disabilities. APEAA teachers observe and evaluate the candidate's teaching effectiveness on an EFE form. The district employed supervisors evaluate the candidates' ability to express and apply their understanding of principles of motor behavior (human growth and motor development, motor learning and motor control, exercise physiology, and biomechanics) to individuals with disabilities in teaching adapted physical education in a variety of settings. Candidates are also expected to self-evaluate their competencies while taking Seminar in Adapted Physical Education as part of the formal assessment process.

Knowledge of the APEAA content standards is met by receiving a grade of a "B" or better in the coursework that matches each standard. Candidates are informed of the results of each course when grades are posted or when journals, papers, exams, etc. are returned during the quarter. Those who are struggling are asked to visit individually with the APEAA program coordinator to discuss concerns, remedies for success, or program changes.

Candidates are recommended by the program coordinator for a credential after successful completion of two quarters of student teaching. In addition, the candidate must meet all program requirements. Candidates may repeat a quarter of student teaching if they fail to receive credit in any quarter following a review and approval by a faculty panel.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **met** for the Adaptive Physical Education Added Authorization program.

Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist

The Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential program is in the process of being withdrawn. Interviews were conducted with the program's three remaining candidates. The candidates noted that they are well prepared to teach reading and literacy as a specialist. Interviews indicate that the candidates have received guidance and documentation regarding the timeline and program completion requirements. The final date for completion of program requirements is June 2018. A needs analysis for the program and degree will be completed before determining if the program will be redesigned and proposed for renewed authorization.

Findings on Standards

After review of supporting documentation and the completion of interviews, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for the Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist.

Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling

Program Design

The School Counseling program is housed in the Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation and Counseling (SRC) and led by a department coordinator. The School Counseling program coordinator reports to the SRC department chair. There are also two full-time faculty and a full-time lecturer who is the fieldwork coordinator. The fieldwork coordinator works in tandem with the program coordinator to oversee field experience, placement, and supervision. The program is supported by approximately 15 part-time lecturers, and there is currently a faculty search to fill one full-time tenured-track position and one full-time lecturer faculty position, both scheduled to start in the fall 2018.

The SRC department holds monthly meetings for all faculty. Program coordinators meet every two weeks to discuss COE policy, management, and planning issues. This leadership team works together with the faculty to support the program, ensure alignment of standards, and promote program coherence. The School Counseling Program faculty meet monthly to review program changes, candidate experiences, and quantitative/qualitative program data. The program is designed to work in a collaborative model, and all full-time faculty participate in policy decisions, candidate admissions, and ongoing advising of candidates. Each candidate is assigned a faculty advisor when entering the program, who provides mentoring and support for program planning, and advancement to candidacy, addresses concerns as they arise, and conducts an exit interview upon program completion. The advising capacity was noted as a program strength in both candidate and faculty interviews, with many candidates and completers making comments such as, "I feel completely supported." The program maintains all program documents, resources, and assessments within a secured website available to all candidates and faculty currently in the

program. Additionally, alumni are able to access the program website for two years after graduating or leaving the university.

All syllabi templates include standards and policies and are available to all faculty to ensure program fidelity. Through the syllabi, candidates are informed about the standards, assignments, and requirements for each course, along with the expectations and process for evaluating their skills, knowledge, and dispositions.

The program requires candidates to complete 102 units to meet the PPS requirements with a Master's degree in counseling. Candidates are expected to complete all program requirements through a three year process that includes regular course and supervision meetings. The course sequence is designed to build on each previous course. The option also exists for candidates to take only 76 units to receive the credential without a Master's Degree. Through the courses, candidates also complete 100 hours of practicum as a means to introduce candidates to the schools and prepare them for their fieldwork experience.

The first two years of the program are designed to provide candidates the skills and knowledge needed to start their fieldwork requirements in the last four quarters of the program. Candidates select a field placement site based on their needs (e.g., career goals, logistical preference, and/or level of education). Each site must be approved by the COE Student Services office in coordination with the human resources department of school districts to ensure site supervisors meet the minimum requirements. Every candidate works with a site supervisor and a university supervisor throughout the field experience.

Over the past two years, based on faculty input and assessment of qualitative data presented in program meetings, the program faculty has developed key assessments in each of the fieldwork quarters. The last quarter includes a culminating special project assignment. The program has recently changed to gathering information with an electronic survey. The electronic survey is being used for both fieldwork evaluations and to obtain information from key program stakeholders. The first survey was distributed to all field supervisors, various principals, and community members and included about 150 participants. Some of the data the program obtained from the initial survey feedback suggest a need to help fieldwork supervisors with more specific target goals expected of candidates and easier access to program fieldwork documents. Both of these findings are currently being used to further modify the program for future fieldwork candidates.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The program is designed with courses building on content from previous courses. Candidates in the first year take courses primarily focused on the foundational and introductory school counseling skills and knowledge. In the second year, the courses focus on advanced skill development. In the third year, candidates start their supervised fieldwork experiences. The program is designed to provide candidates with a solid foundation for working in the schools

before they start fieldwork; and candidates, completers, and site supervisors attested to this point during interviews and indicated that course content is relevant to the profession. Program documents were found to thoroughly cover the California standards as well as the American School Counseling Association (ASCA) domains for school counseling.

Further interviews with site supervisors and other community stakeholders confirm that the CSUSB candidates are well prepared with one interviewee stating, “Candidates are very well prepared to work from day one.” Additionally, completers and current candidates confirm the relevance of course work to the realities of school experiences and work needed in the schools. One interviewee stated, “I was not apprehensive at all when I started fieldwork, because the foundation I received was solid, and I felt I could step right in and start assisting.” This viewpoint was shared by many other interviewees in both their verbal and non-verbal responses (shaking their head in agreement) to the statement.

All candidates are required to find their own fieldwork placement site; however, the university makes the final determination if a specific site is acceptable. Candidates reported that selecting a site was advantageous to them because it allowed them to choose a location that was most conducive to where they want to live and where they may wish to work. The university limits the sites to areas within a certain distance from the school which they call their “catchment area.” Candidates are required to have a minimum of 200 hours experience at two different levels (elementary, middle, and/or high school) with most reporting that they complete half of their hours in one school and the other half elsewhere.

The candidates are observed and evaluated four times each quarter, twice by the university supervisor and twice by their onsite supervisor. A standard rubric is used for the evaluation. There are four primary areas that are evaluated: individual counseling, guidance lessons, group counseling, and consultation. The final assessment includes an evaluation of the candidate’s culminating activity or special project.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed throughout the program. Grading rubrics are developed for each course and utilized by all faculty and supervisors. A summative assessment on candidate performance is completed at four points in during fieldwork and assesses candidate competence in their field experience. Site and university supervisors assess for individual counseling skills, guidance lesson plan development and presentation, group counseling, and consultation skills. Candidates also complete a self-assessment on dispositions at three points through the program, and review their results with their advisor, supervisor and program coordinator. At these points, candidates also receive feedback on their progress in the program. Candidates reported through interviews that they felt supported throughout the whole program evaluation process and felt comfortable approaching any faculty with any concerns or difficulties.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for the Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling Program.

Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology

Program Design

The School Psychology program is housed in the Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation and Counseling (SRC) and led by a department chair. The PPS School Psychology credential program includes a program coordinator and a full-time faculty member who serves as the program fieldwork coordinator. Faculty in these two positions jointly oversee field experience, placement, and supervision. The program is also supported by several part-time lecturers. All PPS School Psychology faculty provide candidates with program and course advisement. Currently the School Psychology program is conducting a faculty search for a full-time tenure track faculty scheduled to start in the 2018-19 academic year.

The SRC department holds monthly meetings for all faculty. All program coordinators meet every two weeks to discuss COE policy, management, and planning issues. The PPS program coordinator meets bi-monthly with program faculty and monthly with SRC department faculty. This SRC leadership team works together with the faculty to support the program, ensure alignment of standards, and promote program coherence. The program coordinator also attends quarterly meetings of the University Graduate Council.

The COE has made several changes in the School Psychology program over the past two years, including the appointment of a new program coordinator and a dedicated faculty member as fieldwork coordinator. The program has recently added a master's level degree specifically for School Psychology. The Education Specialist degree, Ed.S. is now available to all PPS School Psychology credential candidates. These candidates are required to take three years of courses rather than the two years required for credential-only candidates. Candidates and completers both indicated through interviews that the changes have helped to make the program "stronger." Additionally, the program purchased several School Psychology assessment tools with monies obtained from a technology grant. The faculty reported that the additional assessments will ensure that the candidates are getting educational assessment tools currently used in the fieldwork settings thus strengthening links between courses and clinical practice. Another change in the program includes the use of computerized data gathering tools. The key assessments of candidate competencies in fieldwork are now completed in an online format thus allowing for aggregated or disaggregated data soon after supervisors complete the assessments.

The School Psychology program collects stakeholder input from faculty meetings and community partnerships. All of the part-time faculty are working in the local school districts and have knowledge of critical School Psychology needs in the field and are also seen as community stakeholders. The program faculty meet on a quarterly basis to continue reviewing program improvements, improve communication flow, discuss policy, gather input from faculty working in the local school districts, and discuss any problems arising in the programs. Additionally, the program works with completers and uses their feedback in making changes to fieldwork placement and program development. For example, program faculty indicated in interviews that certain fieldwork sites were no longer used because feedback from completers indicated

difficulties with them. In one interview a completer commented “the program values my input and opinion.”

The program design also utilizes data collected from current and past candidates as well as members of the professional community to inform program modification and changes.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The School Psychology program is a 90-unit quarter program. There is an information and orientation meeting for all starting candidates. During the meeting, candidates review all program requirements and are provided with program documents. One of the requirements includes the candidates’ adherence to coursework sequence throughout the program, as each course is designed to build on previous coursework. Program documents indicate that if a candidate is unable to follow the sequence of classes provided, the advisor or program coordinator meets with the candidate to provide guidance.

In the first year of the program, candidates are introduced to courses on the foundations of special education, counseling, laws and ethics specific to school psychology, consultation, and assessment. In the second year, candidates connect theory to practice and service, while also completing 450 hours of practicum. In both the courses and practicum, candidates expand on their assessment skills, gain experience with behavioral and academic intervention, and are introduced to the program’s extensive assessment library. During the program’s assessment sequence, candidates learn to administer and interpret restricted assessment tools, achievement assessments, and ecological assessments. In the third year, candidates complete their course of study with 1200 hours of supervised fieldwork experience. If candidates need more time to complete their fieldwork hours, they are able to add an additional year to their education plan. Candidates and completers indicated in interviews that they appreciate the flexibility of the program, especially with additional time for completing fieldwork hours.

Candidates work with their advisor to plan their field experience. Typically, they select a fieldwork site that best meets their needs, but all sites must be approved by the program before a candidate can begin. Candidates are supervised at their fieldwork site for a minimum of two hours per week. The site supervisors are required to have a School Psychology credential with at least three years of experience. Site supervisors are provided with the program fieldwork documents that include the processes for evaluation and supervision. Candidates are also supervised by university faculty two hours per week on the university campus. The university faculty visit the candidate at their fieldwork site once each quarter to provide additional supervision.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are informed about the program assessment procedures during the program orientation meeting. After the first year in the program, the program coordinator along with the advisor evaluate the candidate’s performance in the program prior to advancement to candidacy.

During the fieldwork experience, candidates are assessed on school psychology skills and knowledge by their site supervisor and university supervisor. At the end of the program, candidates are required to pass a nationally standardized school psychology exam and to create a performance portfolio/project that shows how the candidate addresses each of the state standards through their program assignments, activities, and projects.

Candidates are also informed of the fieldwork evaluation procedures at orientation and are reminded quarterly of the evaluation procedures and their process. Their fieldwork evaluations take place quarterly as part of their field experience class where university faculty visit candidates on-site. The supervisors indicated during interviews that the candidate, university supervisor, and site supervisor meet quarterly to review the candidate's progress in the clinical experience. Additionally, the supervisor evaluations are available online; in addition, the intern handbook still has the evaluations in hard copy format.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for the PPS School Psychology Program.

Preliminary Administrative Services

Program Design

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) Program is designed around a 37-quarter unit curriculum aligned with the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs), and the California Administrator Content Expectations (CACEs). This fact is borne out through an examination of the course matrix, syllabi, and interviews with program leadership and faculty. A review of course syllabi affirms a coherent, developmental, integrated, and interrelated set of theoretical and practical learning activities within the course work and field experience. This is further confirmed through interviews with full-time and adjunct faculty. The program offers an Administrative Intern Credential for candidates who are offered administrative positions prior to completing PASC requirements.

Courses are taught primarily through a traditional classroom format, but online assignments and experiences are also employed utilizing Blackboard and Zoom. The program uses a cohort model with cohorts located at the main campus in San Bernardino, the Palm Desert campus, and a district site in Riverside County. Candidates within each cohort are taught by program faculty or adjunct faculty who follow the same syllabus for each given course, including use of the same textbooks, materials, and assessments (including rubrics). Candidates follow a sequential curriculum. All begin with several foundational (also referred to as prerequisite) classes. These include Educational Leadership & Ethics; Culture, Politics, & Communication in a Diverse Society; and Supervision, and Evaluation of Teachers. Additional courses, outside of the fieldwork component, are School Personnel; Policy, Governance and Legal Aspects in Education;

Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment; Fiscal Management; and Issues in Trends in School Administration. An examination of the syllabi finds that the activities within the courses include signature assignments, research, reflections, course projects, interviews of various district and school personnel, course exams, self-assessment, fieldwork (when applicable), a disposition survey, and an ongoing electronic portfolio review of growth in knowledge and applications of the CAPEs and the CACEs. These activities were confirmed through interviews with faculty, program leadership, candidates, and completers, along with samples of candidate work.

The program is administered by the Department of Educational Leadership and Technology (ELT). A program coordinator is responsible for ensuring that the courses focus on candidates achieving mastery of the CAPEs. The program coordinator has monthly meetings with the instructional faculty to ensure they are apprised of recent Commission Administrative Services credential requirements. The program coordinator ensures that all candidates have a program plan, meet the Administrative Services credential requirements, are successful in completion of their coursework and fieldwork, and apply for the certificate of eligibility at the end of the program. Quarterly, the coordinator attends coordinator meetings in which the Dean of Graduate Studies keeps everyone informed of university requirements, research opportunities, grant opportunities, and other pertinent information. Also, the program coordinator attends College of Education quarterly program leaders' meetings that relay changes in the college, university, and Commission credentialing requirements. Interviews with program leadership and faculty confirmed that these activities take place.

Collaboration is a hallmark of the PASC program. It is connected to the communities and schools in which the candidates are serving primarily as classroom teachers. School district partnerships exist in San Bernardino County including the high desert districts, Palm Desert, and Riverside County. There are two advisory councils, one in San Bernardino County and the other in Riverside County. Attendees at advisory council meetings include district office administrators and principals. Such meetings keep members informed of program changes and Commission updates relative to the Preliminary Administrative Services credential. Feedback is attained from the members as to their expectations for future administrators. Local administrators are invited to participate in mock interviews and at other candidate demonstrations of knowledge and skills. In return, program faculty participate in research in local school districts, participate in local school activities, serve on district committees, and keep apprised of current trends in schools and districts.

Course of Study and Fieldwork

A review of the course syllabi, interviews with faculty, and examination of candidate work presents a clear picture of a program that facilitates each candidate's development of a professional leadership perspective through learning activities that promote leadership and interpersonal skills. Additionally, the program provides multiple opportunities for candidates to apply skills of reasoned and objective inquiry to analyze complex problems and propose effective solutions considering political and organizational context and their implications. For example,

Educational Leadership & Ethics requires candidates to write five “argumentative papers” summarizing studies with respect to their research design, methodology, and findings. The topics pertain to leadership theories that are applicable to school administration. Emphasis is placed on learning about ethical leadership.

Supervision and Evaluation of Teachers is conducted as a seminar in which candidates examine the theoretical and practical models of clinical supervision. Through the cooperation of a classroom teacher, candidates conduct a pre-observation conference, a classroom observation, and a videoed post-observation conference. Reflections follow these activities as candidates begin to realize that classroom teaching and educational leadership require different perspectives, and can be in conflict. School Personnel Administration is focused on Human Resource Management. This course includes instruction and practice in the FRISK employee discipline method, and an interview with an assistant superintendent or director of personnel services. This course in particular focuses in on issues of organizational culture. Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment stresses the personal values, ethics, and attributes of effective leaders, as well as professional knowledge and skills. The course requires candidates to develop a School Site Action Research Case Study Proposal, one which inspires candidates to consider organizational culture, intra-organizational systems (often unofficial), and the influence of administrative decisions on human behavior and student outcomes.

Through coursework, candidates are encouraged to examine their attitudes related to issues of privilege and power in different domains including race, gender, language, sexual orientation, religion, ability, and socio-economic status. They learn ways to analyze, monitor, and address these issues, and they come to understand the role of the leader in creating equitable outcomes in schools. Two courses, in particular, assist in these endeavors. Culture, Politics, & Communication in a Diverse Society includes a Diversity Experience assignment wherein candidates write a reflective paper about their reactions to being an outsider, an “only one”. It could be based on a student’s ethnicity, culture, gender, sexual orientation, religion, or something else. The candidate is asked to explain how the experience made him/her feel, and how the situation was handled. Subsequent assignments involve developing a culturally proficient leadership vision. Policy, Governance and Legal Aspects in Education highlights current laws and pertinent court decisions affecting public education and legal processes in schools. Candidates may attend a district or county expulsion hearing, thereby experiencing due process as it affects the individual P/K-12 student. Alternatively, candidates may perform a school equity review wherein they respond to a series of critical questions. Completers report these assignments are particularly effective.

Courses prepare candidates to critically examine the principles of democratic education and the responsibilities of citizenship. Four one unit courses focus on Issues and trends in school administration, school reform, the change process crisis intervention, working with the media, and serving the needs of families of all ethnicities and social economic status. Through participation and an interview with a Director of Special Education, candidates learn of the

complexities of disciplining special education students and the management of Individualized Education Plan (IEP) meetings, along with other issues related to educating special needs students. School Finance and Business Management provides an overview of how schools are financed and fiscally managed within the state. In what is clearly an exercise in democratization of schools, candidates participate in a Local Control and Accountability project as they describe the site, the appropriations, encumbrances, and balances within each of the object codes. They also identify the academic programs in the district that drive the budget. They also interview a site principal to include such questions as “Who is involved in the site budget process?” and “What are the challenges you face regarding school business management?” Candidates also examine site and district budgets. Confirmation of these findings came through faculty, candidate, and graduate interviews, the syllabus, and evidence of work.

In the third and fourth quarter of the program candidates participate in administrative fieldwork while continuing completion of coursework. Through this ongoing process, they maintain an electronic portfolio documenting their progress. For administrative fieldwork, candidates have both a university supervisor and a site supervisor who ensure that candidates have experiences in each of the CAPEs within the school setting. Each candidate performs fieldwork in both an elementary and a secondary setting. The university supervisor meets with the candidate and the site supervisor to ensure that the experiences align with the CAPEs and present a variety of opportunities to learn and grow in administrative skills. Candidates keep a log of their experiences and note the CAPEs they are focusing upon with each experience. They write a reflection on their fieldwork experiences. The site supervisors evaluate candidate progress in the various CAPE-related areas while identifying areas for growth. At the end of the fieldwork, the candidates meet with their university supervisor and share how they have grown in mastering the CAPEs and how they want to continue to grow.

Practicum in Educational Administration is taken concurrently with Supervision and Evaluation of Teachers. The candidate is assigned a program-approved site mentor, and is required to perform 20 hours of field experience. It is expected that the candidate will practice several of the CAPEs during this course. Candidates conduct an interview with the site mentor to learn about the mission and vision of the school (or district), and current observation and coaching policies and practices. This is followed by shadowing the site mentor as the candidate conducts a pre-observation meeting with a teacher, the observation itself, and a post-observation conference. Candidates create a career ladder which includes a description of future goals. These outcomes were confirmed by interviews with completers, university and site supervisors, faculty, and evidence of candidate work, i.e., career ladders.

Two courses provide the Fieldwork in Educational Administration component of the program. To assure that candidates achieve a full range of leadership experience one component of fieldwork is conducted either at the elementary or secondary level, totaling 30 hours, and the second will be conducted at the other level, also requiring 30 hours. There is no established list of required experiences, rather, a university supervisor is assigned who coordinates activities with the

candidate and the site mentor. Collaboratively, a detailed plan is established which stresses skill development in each of the standards. Candidates complete a fieldwork activity log to demonstrate breath of experience. Confirmation was achieved through interviews with candidates, completers, university and site supervisors, and samples of candidate work, i.e., activity logs.

A separate fieldwork course is designed for interns. To gain intern status, the candidate must secure a school position requiring the preliminary administrative credential. Interns learn the theory and application of each area of the CAPEs. In addition to performing the duties of a school administrator, interns write about issues which confront them, or that are of interest to them as administrators. They meet with their immediate supervisor and the university supervisor to discuss their progress in mastering the CAPEs. The information contained in this section has been confirmed through interviews with faculty, site supervisors, university supervisors, interns and completers.

Assessment of Candidate Performance

Candidates are assessed on their knowledge and skill development in each course through assessments contained in the course syllabus. These include a signature assignment. In each credential course, the candidates also complete a portion of their administrative credential portfolio. In the portfolio they address the CAPEs with a reflection as to how they have grown in mastering the CAPEs and add an artifact that provides a sample as to how they worked toward that mastery. At the end of the program, the candidates provide a final assessment of where they are with mastering the CAPEs in the six areas with an action plan for further growth as a future administrator. The candidates are informed through their course assignments, portfolio assessment, and fieldwork supervisor evaluations as to how they are progressing in the program. The instructors meet with candidates during office hours for questions and advising. Additionally, the program coordinator provides appropriate advising and monitors all program candidates ensuring that they are progressing. Fieldwork is assessed through the combined efforts of the site supervisor, and the university-appointed supervisor. The preceding has been verified through interviews with program leadership, faculty, and review of candidate portfolio content and additional candidate work.

Findings

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential.

Designated Subjects Career Technical Education, Special Subjects, and Supervision and Coordination

Program Design

The California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) Designated Subjects Credential Program is designed to include a purposeful sequence of coursework that prepares Career and Technical Education (CTE) and Special Subjects teachers to meet the Commission Standards. Strategies and methodologies relevant to students with special needs and English learners are integrated through all the courses in the program. The program is built on the belief that “prior knowledge, skills, and abilities, and competency-based learning are foundational when developing teachers.” The CTE program maintains an advisory board that is comprised of local school district administrators and other stakeholders of the program.

The CSUSB Designated Subjects program also has a sequence of courses and experiences that prepares credentialed teachers to serve as a supervisor and coordinator of Designated Subjects programs. The program is housed in the Department of Educational Leadership and Technology. The program coordinator ensures that all candidates in the all departments have program plans, are engaged and successful in their coursework, and complete necessary Commission applications at the appropriate time.

Course of Study

The Designated Subjects Teaching Credential at CSUSB for both the Career and Technical Education and Special Subjects programs consists of six online, 4-quarter unit courses for a total of 24 quarter units, or 10.5 quarter units above the 13.5 quarter units required by the standards. The program is designed to prepare candidates to meet all Commission standards.

Coursework for the teacher preparation programs begins with Early Orientation offered through the university’s College of Extended Learning (CEL). The CEL has an open-entrance registration to ensure immediate access to candidates upon their obtaining a teaching position. The remaining courses are offered through the regular admission process to CSUSB and are designed to continue developing basic teaching skills and advanced instructional support.

The first course in the program, Early Orientation (2 quarter units), consists of five weeks of 20 to 30 hours of self-paced instruction. Initial program coursework consists of four 4-unit courses totaling 16 quarter units, offered in a ten-week quarter format. In addition to the 160 hours of coursework, another course requires an additional 24 hours of documented field experience to be completed at a Local Education Agency (LEA) and evaluated in conjunction with LEA administrators and faculty, and program faculty. Advanced preparation consists of two additional 4-unit courses offered in a ten-week quarter format.

Course materials are provided online using either the Blackboard Learning Management System or on the program’s website. Candidates purchase textbooks, usually online. Course materials

and assignments are designed to model and reflect effective teaching practices. Teacher candidates present lessons in the courses using various technologies, and they are encouraged by faculty and site supervisors to explore emerging teaching practices and technologies that are not included in the course content.

Assignments in each course are designed to facilitate acquisition of the skills and knowledge stated in the course objectives. Candidates present their assignments via e-mail or by electronic portfolio within the course management platform. Upon submission of assignments, instructors provide feedback. The majority of assignments are evaluated using rubrics which have been provided on the course management platform. Candidates are given the opportunity to remediate based on instructor feedback without penalty.

In lesson plan assignments candidates develop instructional objectives, write questions and procedures used for student assessment, plan the facilitation of learning associated with specific content, and plan the assessment of student learning. After thoroughly planning the lesson and assessment, candidates are asked to record themselves teaching the lessons. Recorded lessons are shared with other candidates for their feedback.

In the second course, candidates complete several assignments attending and reflecting on a local Career and Technical Education advisory committee meeting. Based on this experience, the candidates then establish an advisory committee for the program they are teaching. The intention is for every candidate to possess the knowledge and skills required to establish and maintain a CTE advisory committee for the course or program in which they teach.

The classroom management assignments result in candidates developing an understanding of effectively managed classrooms. The candidates learn about differences between adult and adolescent learners and how to manage the physical aspects of the classroom, the learning, and the classroom environment, including safety issues.

Candidates develop a portfolio drawing from assignments completed in each course. The portfolios are designed by the candidates to meet several requirements including those associated with employment and usefulness as an employed teacher. The candidates document several completed assignments in the portfolio, resources for current or future students in their own classes, examples of work, and other items related to successful teaching.

Course of Study Designated Subjects Supervision and Coordination

The CSUSB program to prepare credentialed teachers to serve as a supervisor and coordinator of Designated Subjects (DS) programs requires applicants to possess a Clear Designated Subjects teaching credential and three years of full-time teaching experience under a Designated Subjects teaching credential. The program consists of three 4-quarter unit courses: Organization of DS Programs, Personnel Management in DS Programs, and Field Work in DS Programs. Candidates must also successfully complete the California Basic Education Skills Test (CBEST). Coursework

includes administrative task assignments collected in a portfolio, working with a qualified local on-site administrator in either an ROP, adult education, community college or correctional facility, completion of a 40 hour administrative project, and participation in grant proposal writing.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

Assessment in the CSUSB CTE program is tied to candidate competencies. The program is designed for faculty to provide candidates with formative and summative feedback throughout coursework. Completed assignments are evaluated using rubrics and are returned with suggestions and comments. Candidates are given the opportunity to remediate assignments to ensure that they obtain the knowledge and skills necessary for effective teaching. Program faculty members evaluate and provide formative assessment throughout each course, and summative assessments are provided at the end of each course. Candidates are taught in the program how to create assessment procedures for their own students, including paper and pencil and performance assessments. Program faculty model those procedures in each course. Candidates also receive an evaluation from the site supervisor at conclusion of each course.

The faculty and the site supervisor provide feedback throughout the program via face-to-face and digital meetings (telephone conferencing and e-mail). On-site visitations and candidate teaching videos are used to view candidates in the classroom to provide support and assistance in coordination with on-site (LEA-based) faculty and administrators as needed.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **met** for the Designated Subjects Career Technical Education, Special Subjects, and Supervision and Coordination programs.

Common Standards

Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation Findings: Met with Concerns

The past several years have been times of tremendous change for the College of Education and California State University, San Bernardino. These changes have been in areas such as administrative personnel, faculty changes, community efforts for improvement, and the beginning steps of conversion to a semester system. Throughout this time, the unit has continued to offer credential programs that the community has noted are responsive to their areas of need. In order to strengthen the unit, there has been a restructuring of departments, from four to three. Credential programs now function within a department in order to better provide leadership, communication and assessment of programs and the faculty who work in each program. Coordinators of credential programs were identified in fall 2017. These coordinators meet in different configurations with administration and staff and share information back with program faculty for consideration.

Interviews with regional employers and others involved in improvement efforts for the Inland Empire reported that they were actively involved with the institution regarding educator preparation programs. These activities include work on Linked Learning, AVID initiatives, and stretch programs that will be available in high schools to ensure that students are prepared with appropriate math and science knowledge and skills.

A word that stakeholders used many times as they shared about their work with the College of Education was “responsive.” There is a trust that the concerns of those in the PK-12 community will be heard and that the College of Education will work in a collaborative and cooperative way with them to address the concerns.

University administration shared the process for resource distribution and that a change has been made to budgeting so that the amount provided is more reflective of student enrollment in the colleges and schools of the university. Additional monies for special projects through lottery funds and university grant proposals are available.

Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs. Unit faculty and administration are involved in leadership activities throughout the university and the broader educational community. This was confirmed through interviews with faculty and administration both within and beyond the College of Education.

There are six searches underway in the College of Education at this time. There is a concerted effort to continue to recruit faculty who reflect the diversity of the region and demonstrate a commitment to the College’s values. There is particular emphasis on ensuring that prospective

faculty have a clear understanding of the area they will be serving and how they would like their work to impact and improve the region as well as education in general. Part of the Retention, Promotion and Tenure process includes a reflection by the faculty on their impact on the region.

There are experienced credential analysts who process the recommendations to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Credential analysts noted that they communicate with program coordinators when information is missing from the credential program plan. An associate dean was hired in fall of 2017 and is responsible for ensuring that the credential process sends forth only those candidates who have met all requirements. Based on team findings Common Standard 1 is **Met with Concern**.

Rationale

The rationale for this finding rests with a lack of a “research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among, and is clearly represented, in all educator preparation programs.” The current College of Education Mission Statement was written in 2008. Since that time, many changes in programs, faculty and the community have occurred. College of Education cabinet affirmed the Mission Statement at a retreat in 2016.

Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support

Findings: Met with Concerns

The team reviewed various print materials available on-line as well as published forms and guidelines and interviewed professional recruitment staff, candidates, program coordinators, district-employed supervisors, and partners. The CSUSB College of Education operates many educator preparation programs. This creates a complex environment in which the needs of multiple actors – from prospective students to prospective employers – must be met with clarity, efficiency, and sensitivity. The team found that advising materials are clear and outreach efforts are regular, signaling a commitment to making the educator preparation programs visible and attractive to a wide range of prospective students.

A selection of recruitment activities sponsored by the COE includes: regular presentations to undergraduates about educator preparation options by full-time staff, occasionally accompanied by program coordinators and faculty; participation in EduCorps; targeted recruitment efforts to paraprofessionals and other district employees via a range of “grow your own” kinds of programs; the Noyce scholars program, and others. However, the purposeful recruitment of specific groups currently under-represented in the COE is hampered by the lack of a comprehensive plan and associated strategy.

Broadening the ownership of recruitment goals by the College “team” as a whole (staff and faculty and administration) is also needed. These factors speak to a lack of purposefulness in the COE’s recruitment efforts, though it is certainly investing staff time and resources in recruitment generally.

The College uses multiple measures to assess prospective students in all of its educator preparation programs. The admissions criteria reflect a strong understanding of the predictive qualities of an applicant's profile as well as recognition that prospective students can demonstrate aptitude for educator preparation programs in a variety of ways. These criteria are easily accessible and students can avail themselves of a variety of supports to prepare a successful application. The programs use a range of strategies to communicate program requirements to the candidates, including guidelines, FAQs, and program handbooks. Interviews with a range of individuals performing various roles and functions associated with each program demonstrated an understanding of program requirements. More importantly, interviews confirmed that these individuals had a clear understanding of their role, how to support candidates, especially those who might be struggling, and how to access any program resources they might need to better support a candidate. Similarly, a system of periodic review and monitoring is in place to ensure that candidate progress is tracked and corrections – with support as needed – can be made as appropriate. Currently, faculty must navigate several information sites to ascertain candidate progress. The COE is in the process of creating a new, wholly integrated candidate management system that will launch in the near future. This integrated management system may actually serve as a model for the CSU system and may bring candidate monitoring to the next level at CSU SB (see Common Standard 4 and 5 for more information).

Rationale

The College implements coordinated processes of admissions, support, and monitoring, across its many educator preparation programs that are well-aligned to Common Standard 2. In order to fully meet the standard, the unit should work with more focus and purpose on the recruitment of diverse and currently under-represented candidates into its programs. Interviews with administration, staff and faculty indicated that their preparation for the visit noted this as an area of need. This is a new area of need as in the past, the undergraduate population and surrounding area provided the diversity of the candidate pool needed without effort. However, since the recession of several years ago as well as the time of teachers receiving “pink slips” in the surrounding areas, the pool of candidates decreased as did the diversity. Based on the findings, Common Standard 2 is **Met with Concerns**.

Standard 3: Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice

Findings: Met

Print materials and other artifacts (syllabi, samples of candidate work) as well as interviews indicated all of the educator preparation programs at CSUSB are grounded in strong foundational knowledge for the discipline and robust integration of theory and practice. Coursework is sequenced appropriately with clear connections to field experiences and clinical practice. Interviews revealed careful attention to the tensions between practical preparation and strong theoretical foundations, with program faculty taking care to integrate both in ways that meet the needs of pre-service candidates. There are numerous examples but including the assignments completed by preliminary administrative services candidates who methodically build a set of

skills through assignments that require them to learn, experiment (do, on a small scale), reflect, and then revise. Similar comments could be made about classroom management plans required of teacher candidates or narrative assessment tools used by school counseling candidates. Across the programs, candidates receive formative and summative assessments to inform their development and also to alert program faculty about needed changes. Interviews validated that most candidates experience their programs as rigorous with high standards for performance accompanied by sufficient support to reach the standards. Interviews also confirmed that partners benefit from mentoring the candidates and acknowledge that they make a contribution to their sites and the profession, even as novices. Not surprisingly, employers hold the program completers in high regard and eagerly recruit candidates from CSUSB programs to join their education staff.

Because many forms of diversity are hallmarks of the Inland Empire communities, the programs offer candidates intentionally structured opportunities to experience this diversity and learn from it. Interviews and documents confirm that clinical placements are made to maximize candidates' exposure to diverse populations. The definition of diversity is also broad and includes familiar constructions of diversity (cultural, racial, and linguistic) and expands the boundaries of those definitions (working with local native communities, working with foster youth, etc.). The team also notes that the programs have been careful to prepare candidates with the skills and tools needed to work effectively with these broadly diverse communities. Interviewees noted that candidates seem comfortable with diverse communities, many are themselves members of these diverse communities, and enter clinical practice well-versed in specific strategies and mindsets (e.g., narratives, assets-focus, dispositions self-assessment) designed to build their confidence and effectiveness in working in these contexts. Moreover, interviews indicated that candidates demonstrated a willingness to learn and expand upon the foundation derived in coursework and actively sought out new experiences and strategies during clinical practice.

The unit works closely with partners in its vast service area to coordinate on important matters related to clinical practice. There are various protocols implemented across partners to ensure high quality placements, which reflect the state's diversity and model quality implementation of the state's adopted standards and policies. There is adequate collaboration and dialogue about these protocols, so that they are up-to-date and reflect current realities experienced by all partners. Partners revealed solid understandings of educator preparation program requirements and program staff and faculty expressed that they felt they had "inside" knowledge of partner operations and parameters. This kind of duality in roles has contributed to working routines that appear to be mutually reinforcing and beneficial. Entities such as the COE Advisory Council (focused on induction issues), the District Partners Committee, and others indicate that these collaborative efforts are institutionalized across the systems. As a result, there is sufficient evidence to confirm that supervisors (site-based and university-based) receive the orientation, support, and guidance needed to perform their roles. In some instances, this occurs through written communication. In other instances, the process is more robust, with face-to-face orientations accompanied by written communication. The Multiple and Single subject programs

have been intentional in aligning program practices to new program standards. They have surveyed each mentor to determine how best to match new requirements in training and support to the pools existing knowledge base and skill set.

The COE provided strong evidence of enduring collaborations with partners in its extensive service area. The most common descriptor for this relationship was “responsive,” uttered in several meetings and by different types of partners. Indeed, there are many examples of synergy among the partners, with each adopting programs or frameworks used by the other, to the benefit of students across the systems (e.g., AVID content in educator preparation programs, teaching credential faculty serving as instructors in induction programs). Based on team findings Common Standard 3 is found to be **Met**.

Standard 4 – Continuous Improvement

Findings: Met

Through interviews with college leadership, department chairs, program coordinators, and staff, as well as extensive review of documents and data systems, it is apparent that the College of Education unit and programs have developed a system for continuous improvement that is implemented at the unit and program level.

At the unit level, the dean and associate dean establish the expectation and support for continuous improvement. The full-time Director of the Office of Assessment and Research manages data, makes it available to the unit and programs, designs and implements protocols and reporting templates, aggregates and summarizes findings, and co-chairs the Unit Assessment Committee with the dean. The Unit Assessment Committee meets once a month to review annual reports, discuss findings, consider programs’ recommendations for action or changes based on findings, and prepare for accreditation. In addition, regular meetings with advisory boards and district partners yield feedback on program completers’ success in their classrooms. At the program level, program coordinators work with faculty to gather and examine data, and to write annual reports for each program. Program coordinators, faculty representatives, and department coordinators meet monthly at Program Improvement and Evaluation (PIE), workshop-style meetings where they share information, examine data, review each other’s program documents, and prepare for accreditation activities.

The main mechanism for collecting data at the program and unit level is the annual reporting process. The annual reports serve to hold programs accountable for routine data collection, analysis, and use. They also meet the university’s annual reporting requirement for WASC and program review. The annual reports are drafted by program coordinators in early summer (although the date will change due to quarter-to-semester conversion). Drafts are reviewed by faculty during program meetings. Final drafts are sent to the Director of Assessment and the dean, who review them prior to sharing them with the Unit Assessment Committee. The Unit Assessment Committee reviews all reports and makes recommendations for modifications or improvements that are then shared with programs. In one interview, it was suggested that a next

stage in the process could be to summarize the annual reports into a single unit-wide report that could be a useful way to document this work over time and could be shared more broadly in the aggregate.

Each program, including degree and credential programs, uses the annual report template to guide its data discussions and reporting. Starting this year, each report includes two years of data instead of one, to allow for trend analysis. Program coordinators gather their key assessments that include 3-4 of the following for each program:

- Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA) pass rates
- Fieldwork observation data from field supervisors
- Exit surveys
- Exit interviews
- CSU data from surveys of 1-year completers and their employers
- Signature assignment scores, aggregated by course
- Comprehensive exam pass rates
- RICA pass rates
- Program enrollment trends
- Feedback from advisory boards and employers
- Praxis exam scores

These are summarized in the annual report, which also contains program specific information about enrollments, a program description, and a description of changes made based on findings since the last annual report. For example, based on TPA results and feedback from advisory boards and employers, the Multiple Subject program moved a course from Phase III to Phase I so candidates could have this content earlier in the program and apply it in fieldwork.

According to program coordinators, programs are able to make appropriate modifications based on findings from these assessments because of the usefulness of their data. Early on, TPA scores were broken down in a way that helped faculty see specific areas for improvement in their courses. Although this process was later changed, faculty continue to use TPA scores as an indicator of candidate proficiency and of areas in coursework that may need strengthening. Also, in developing fieldwork observation protocols using the new Teaching Performance Expectations, faculty in initial credential programs have adhered to a level of detail that allows them to understand where candidates succeed and where they struggle. These forms, completed online, are shared electronically with the candidates as timely formative feedback. The aggregated fieldwork observation scores are also examined for areas to strengthen in coursework.

A new system for managing candidate data across the college and in each program, using PeopleSoft modules that are specially programmed for the college, is being implemented. With two customized modules— Admissions and Student Records – the system will allow faculty, staff, and leadership to regularly access data on candidates. The Admissions module was implemented

in fall 2016. The Student Records module has begun implementation winter 2018 with full implementation by the end of spring 2018. Admission decisions are emailed directly to candidates and advising notes can be entered into the system to facilitate communication. Enrollment in programs and courses can be tracked, and completion rates can be obtained. The system also manages fieldwork placements, and staff have entered district and school information into the system for all the districts and schools that the college has worked with over the last few years. Supervisor information is also added to the system, so program coordinators can see who is supervising which candidates at which schools, and in which quarters. And credential analysts can use this system to update completion status for candidates and run queries for Title II reports. In addition to taking all of these processes online in a comprehensive system, the PeopleSoft modules solve a perennial problem of tracking credential candidates from admission to completion. The team that built this system includes staff from the COE as well as Institutional Research and PeopleSoft programmers, and is a highly collaborative and persistent group. Numerous workshops have been held for faculty and staff to introduce this PeopleSoft system, including how to run queries. The committee reports that now that faculty can run their own queries, their most used queries are fieldwork placement reports and enrollment reports. Next steps include the development of public-facing data dashboards for the COE.

Continuous improvement is a goal of the COE and its programs. College leadership recognizes the necessity of fostering a culture of continuous improvement, as well as establishing the routine structures and supports for the systematic collection and use of data. Based on team findings Common Standard 4 is **Met**.

Standard 5 – Program Impact

Findings: Met

Interviews with program coordinators, department coordinators, and faculty as well as a review of program documents and assessment protocols and instruments confirm that the institution ensures that candidates know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students. Each program works collaboratively to implement courses and fieldwork experiences that prepare candidates for successful practice as educators. Candidates' knowledge and skills are assessed through signature assignments, fieldwork observations, exit surveys, and required performance assessments (e.g., the Teaching Performance Assessment). These data are reviewed by program coordinators and faculty to ensure that candidates are meeting program standards and performance outcomes.

According to candidates, completers, and employers, the unit and its programs are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence, and on teaching and learning in schools. Interviews with candidates and completers from initial and advanced programs show that they appreciate the impact that programs have on their personal and professional growth and learning. Candidates that were interviewed were very positive about their programs. For example, one candidate stated that they felt that “the program not only changed my professional

outlook but my own outlook on life.” Other candidates agreed with this statement. Another candidate shared that an assignment in a class led to her discovery of a new business model that she now uses. Others shared that they felt all teachers in their field should have the learning opportunities they had. Candidates in another program noted that their lives were changed after the first few courses, when they realized what their new field was about and their investment in their new direction.

Interviews with employers, including superintendents, human resources directors, school principals, and county office directors indicate that there is strong regional support for the COE and its programs, and enthusiasm for the educators that are prepared by this college. The unit and programs’ positive impact in teaching and learning is clear in these interviews. Employers report that teacher candidates who complete CSUSB programs are knowledgeable in Common Core State Standards and have a high level of engagement in designing lessons and building good rapport with students. They understand the IEP process and know how to work with para-educators. They are connected with the community, and eager to work with students in San Bernardino and the Inland Empire. They exhibit confidence, innovation, and a hands-on approach to teaching and learning. They are interested in growing professionally and they become leaders in their schools.

In addition, the College of Education/Induction Advisory Board meets once a month and includes faculty and Induction leaders from the region. This is a long-standing partnership (formerly called RIMS BTSA) between the College of Education and County Offices of Education and the Center for Teacher Innovation that includes local districts. Members of the group include college faculty and participants from four county offices (San Bernardino, Riverside, Inyo, and Mono Counties). This partnership group exchanges information, data, and updates such as changes to requirements for credentialing. Their work together highlights the unit’s impact on teaching and learning in schools. Lately they have focused on the transition from the COE programs to Induction, and recently developed an effective Transition Document that candidates are now using to shape their Individual Learning Plans with their mentors. This group is also interested in tracking first year teachers through surveys to learn about their challenges and strengths and giving this information back to districts to help them see the impact of how new teachers are placed. Also, CSUSB faculty attend the Induction professional development meetings and bring that information back to their programs. Members of this collaborative group are committed to letting new teachers know that “they are not teaching by themselves,” and that they have support from their preparation program and their induction programs.

As confirmed by interviews with employers in the region, the College of Education is having a positive impact on teaching and learning in schools, as well as principal leadership, counseling, and school psychological services. Based on team findings Common Standard 5 is **Met**.