**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo**

**April 2011
Overview of this Report**

**Overview of This Report**

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

**Common (NCATE Unit) Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For All Programs Offered by the Institution**

|  | Met | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions | X | | |
| 2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation | | X | |
| 3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice | X | | |
| 4) Diversity | | X | |
| 5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development | X | | |
| 6) Unit Governance and Resources | | X | |
| CTC Common Standard 1.1 Credential Recommendation Process | X | | |
| CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance | X | | |

| Programs | Total Standards | Program Standards | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | Met | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
| Multiple Subject, w/BCLAD (Spanish) | 19 | 18 | 1 | |
| Single Subject | 19 | 17 | 2 | |
| Agricultural Specialist | 12 | 12 | 0 | |
| Education Specialist: MM Preliminary | 22 | 21 | 1 | |
| Preliminary Administrative Services | 15 | 15 | 0 | |

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

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing**
**Committee on Accreditation**
**Accreditation Team Report**


| | |
|---|---|
| **Institution:** | **California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo** |
| **Dates of Visit:** | **April 17-April 20, 2011** |
| **Accreditation Team Recommendation:** | **Accreditation with Stipulations** |


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

Common Standards
The decision of the team regarding the six NCATE standards is that Standards 1, 3, and 5 are **Met**, and that Standards 2, 4, and 6 are **Met with Concerns**. The decision of the team regarding the sections of CTC Common Standards 1 and 6 not reflected in NCATE Unit Standards are **Met**.

Program Standards
For the five credential programs, all program standards are **Met** with the exception of Standard 19 in the Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs, Standard 1 for the Single Subject Credential Program and Standard 15 for Educational Specialist Credential Program, which were **Met with Concerns**.

Overall Recommendation
Therefore the overall recommendation of the team is **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

Following is the proposed Stipulation:
- That the School of Education develop and implement a unit-wide assessment system and apply that system across unit programs. The system is to include data collection related to unit outcomes, as well as use of that data for unit improvement.

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

|                  **Initial/Teaching Credentials**                  |         **Advanced/Service Credentials**          |
| :----------------------------------------------: | :----------------------------------------------: |

**Initial/Teaching Credentials**

**General Education**
   Multiple Subject with BCLAD (Spanish)

   Single Subject
**Education Specialist**
Preliminary Level I Mild/Moderate
     Disabilities

**Advanced/Service Credentials**

Agricultural Specialist

Administrative Services
    Preliminary including Internship

Staff recommends that:

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

- California Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

- California Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

**Accreditation Team**

**Joint NCATE-CTC Accreditation Team**

| | |
| --- | --- |
| **NCATE Co-Chair** | **Harriett McQueen**<br>Austin Peay State University, Retired |
| **California Co-Chair:** | **Mark Cary**<br>Davis Unified School District, Retired |
| **NCATE/Common Standards Cluster:** | **Robert Perry**<br>Los Angeles Unified School District |
| | **Elliott Lessen**<br>Northeastern Illinois University |
| | **Nina Potter**<br>San Diego State University |
| | **Kermit Buckner**<br>East Carolina University |
| | **Sue Hughes**<br>Albemarle High School, Retired |
| **Programs Cluster:** | **Bob Loux**<br>San Joaquin County Office of Education |
| | **Patricia Wick**<br>University of Phoenix |
| **Staff to the Accreditation Team** | **Teri Clark**, Director<br>**Paula Jacobs**, Consultant<br>**Lynette Roby**, Manager |

# Documents Reviewed

Institutional Self Study

Course Syllabi and Guides

Candidate Files

Program Handbooks

Survey Data

Candidate Performance Data

Biennial Reports and CTC Feedback

Program Assessment Documentation

Program Assessment Preliminary Findings

Program Assessment Summaries

Field Experience Notebooks

Advisement Documents

Faculty Vitae

College Annual Reports

College Budget Plan

Cal Poly Website

Accreditation Website

Program Evaluations

Meeting Agendas and Minutes

University Catalog

## Interviews Conducted

| | Common Standards Cluster | Program Sampling Cluster | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|
| Candidates | 58 | 82 | **140** |
| Completers | 25 | 32 | **57** |
| Employers | 11 | 5 | **16** |
| Institutional Administration | 22 | 1 | **23** |
| Program Coordinators | 7 | 7 | **14** |
| Faculty | 8 | 18 | **26** |
| TPA Coordinator | 0 | 1 | **1** |
| Field Supervisors - Program | 14 | 7 | **21** |
| Field Supervisors - District | 2 | 25 | **27** |
| Credential Analysts and Staff | 22 | 9 | **31** |
| Advisory Board Members | 18 | 6 | **24** |
| Other | 1 | 1 | **2** |
| | | **Totals** | **382** |

*Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles.*

**Table 1**
**Program Review Status**

| Program Name | Number of program completers (2009-10) | Number of Candidates Enrolled (10-11) | Agency Reviewing Programs |
|---|---|---|---|
| Multiple Subject (with BCLAD) | 98  (4) | 123  (13) | CTC |
| Single Subject | 74 | 99 | CTC |
| Agricultural Specialist | 19 | 28 | CTC |
| Education Specialist Credential Preliminary, Mild/Moderate Disabilities | 18 | 20 | CTC |
| Preliminary Administrative Services | 16 | 19 | CTC |

**The Visit**

The California Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo site visit was held on the campus in San Luis Obispo, California from April 17-20, 2011.  This was a joint NCATE/CTC accreditation visit, piloting the Continuing Improvement model for NCATE.  The institution was seeking initial NCATE accreditation and continuing state accreditation. The site visit team consisted of a Team Lead, two California BIR members who served on the NCATE team reviewing the NCATE Unit Standards (Common Standards), and, two Program Sampling members.  Two Commission consultants accompanied the visit as well as one CTC staff member observing the process.  The NCATE team arrived at the hotel on Saturday evening and the California state team arrived at noon on Sunday, April 17, 2011.   The teams met jointly on Sunday, and participated in a poster session and interviews with constituents beginning on Sunday afternoon. Interviews continued Monday and follow up interviews were conducted on Tuesday morning. The teams met jointly throughout the visit.  A mid-visit report was prepared by the team on Monday evening and presented to the institution on Tuesday morning.  The exit report was conducted at 11:00 a.m. on Wednesday, April 20, 2011.

**Introduction**

California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo (hereafter referred to as "Cal Poly") is part of the California State University system of 23 campuses operating under the governance of the Board of Trustees and the administrative control of the Office of the Chancellor. Cal Poly is located in the city of San Luis Obispo, about 230 miles south of San Francisco and 200 miles north of Los Angeles.

Cal Poly is the second largest land-holding university in California, second only to UC Berkeley, and one of the largest land-holding universities in the nation (total 9,678 acres). Cal Poly uses all of its land holdings in active support of the education of its students.  The main campus includes: 1,321 acres, of which 155 are the "campus core." The San Luis Creek Ranches, adjacent to campus include 1,614 acres. The Western Ranches, not contiguous to campus include 3,043 acres. The Swanton Pacific Ranch in Santa Cruz County includes 3,200 acres. The Valencia Property in Santa Cruz County includes 500 acres.

The University began as a vocational high school in 1901, added a junior college in 1927, became a three-year institution in 1936, and evolved into a baccalaureate-granting institution in 1940. Master's

degree programs were added in 1949, and in 1972 Cal Poly became a University. The University's undergraduate orientation was established by the original legislation and has not since been altered in significant ways. Its emphasis on undergraduate education in applied technical and professional fields (engineering, agriculture, architecture, and business) has created a national reputation for excellence in these fields. Nearly 75% of all students graduate in nationally recognized technical and professional programs that are balanced with the arts, humanities, and social sciences.
The University is home to 24 accredited/recognized programs.

Cal Poly has distinguished itself as a student-focused, learning-centered educational institution. This commitment has been particularly evident in the University's emphasis on experiential learning, a learn-by-doing approach that is a source of pride for students, faculty, staff, and administration.

In order for Cal Poly to seek NCATE accreditation, a joint NCATE/CTC accreditation visit was required. The NCATE Accreditation team including two BIR members familiar with CTC Common Standards addressed the NCATE common standards, and a CTC/BIR program cluster team reviewed those programs leading to a credential. The teams worked collaboratively, and the chairs of the two teams jointly conducted the pre-visit and the visit with assistance from the state's CTC personnel. There were no deviations from the state protocol.

There were no unusual circumstances during the visit.

# The Conceptual Framework

The unit, a school within the College of Science and Mathematics (CSM,) consists of five credentialing programs with 18 tenure-track faculty, seven lecturers and 42 part-time faculty. Its mission is the preparation of qualified, competent and caring professionals to serve as administrators, counselors, and teachers. In order to do so, the unit is committed to providing programs characterized by professionalism, ethical practice and shaping change through inquiry, innovation, and social justice. This commitment is congruent with the university's mission, goals and learning objectives. With the belief that learning is the starting point and the end goal of education, the conceptual framework is supported by an informed knowledge base which guides the system in evaluating candidates, the mission and vision of the unit, and its philosophy, purposes and goals. Throughout the organizational changes that have occurred since 2009, the SOE has remained committed to its mission. Thus, the SOE continues to operate as a center of pedagogy that brings university faculty and school partners together to offer professional education programs that are grounded in the commitment to advance the achievement of all students.

Since 2009, when the SOE became a part of the CSM, the unit has become increasingly STEM oriented and values inquiry, conceptual and contextual learning—constructs that are embedded in the university's "learn by doing" ethos. The SOE, as part of a polytechnic university, embraces both academic and Career and Technical Education (CTE) and encompasses social, economic, and political goals for both the public and private good. This philosophy provides the impetus for a balanced and comprehensive approach to curriculum. Candidate proficiencies, as defined by the SOE, integrate the standards, objectives, and expectations required by the university, the CSM, and the SOE. The learning goals, learning outcomes, and dispositions expected of all candidates are identified in the conceptual framework.

The five credentialing programs that make up the SOE have designed assessment systems that provide regular and comprehensive information on candidate performance and program effectiveness. Assessments reflect the conceptual framework and are aligned with state and professional standards. Assessment systems enable the unit to monitor and reflect on the degree to which goals are being accomplished and to make improvements when needed. Candidate assessments are reviewed quarterly; program assessments are reviewed annually.

The electronic platform Tk20 is used to store data pertaining to the MSCP and the SSCP programs; data pertaining to the ELAP and SPED programs are stored in Excel files and managed by the program coordinators. Title II data is coordinated by the CSM instructional technology director.

The unit engaged faculty, staff, content educators, and k-12 teachers to develop the conceptual framework as a part of the unit's strategic plan in 2006-07. In 2007-08, program coordinators and their respective faculty groups aligned the learning outcomes and dispositions with their respective state and professional standards. Each faculty member then formulated curriculum maps with transition points, and developed key assignments and assessments.

In 2008-09, faculty, staff, administrators, content educators, and k-12 school partners revised the dispositions expected of candidates to consolidate overlapping statements. During summer 2009, an assessment work group composed of faculty, staff, and administrators revised the conceptual framework to present to the entire faculty and staff for review and input. The updated conceptual framework was widely shared with adjuncts, candidates, graduates, and k-12 educators through print/electronic material and at program and advisory board meetings during 2009-2010.

# Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

*Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.*

## 1.1 Statement about the evidence

The initial teacher preparation programs include Multiple Subject (MS), Single Subject (SS) and Educational Specialist Credential Programs. The state program review visit was done in conjunction with the NCATE unit accreditation visit. The state program review team found that all programs met state standards.

In California, before candidates can complete final student teaching, they must pass the California Subject Matter Exam (CSET) for teachers. This is the state's method of establishing "Highly Qualified" status; therefore, all program completers have passed the content examination for licensure prior to being recommended for a preliminary teaching credential. Multiple Subject and Education Specialist candidates are also required to pass the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) prior to being recommended for a credential. In addition, education specialist candidates must pass an assessment of writing skills before they are advanced to a "candidacy" level in the program.

Candidates in both SS and MS programs are also required to pass the Performance Assessment of California Teachers (PACT). The PACT includes a teaching event in which candidates must plan a unit of instruction and related assessments, teach the unit and videotape themselves as they teach, assess student learning and plan for next steps based on the assessment results, and reflect on their instruction each day. In completing the PACT, candidates are scored on establishing a balanced instructional focus, making content accessible, designing assessments, engaging students in learning, monitoring student learning during instruction, analyzing student work from an assessment, using assessment to inform teaching, using feedback to promote student learning, monitoring student progress, reflecting on learning, understanding language demands and resources, and developing students' academic language repertoire. MS candidates use a mathematics unit for the teaching event. In addition, the MS candidates are required to complete a Content Area Task (CAT) in reading language arts, science and social studies focused on planning and assessment.

Education specialist candidates are required to complete an embedded signature assignment (ESA) to demonstrate competence. This ESA is in the form of a case study during field placement requiring that candidates design and implement several weeks of lessons for students with mild/moderate disabilities. During this assignment, candidates develop and demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge and skills, and pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills. In addition to content objectives for the lessons, candidates are required to identify the IEP objectives for the student(s) that were also addressed in the lessons. The goal is to help the target student(s) meet IEP objectives by the end of instruction by employing research-based practices. Each candidate is assigned a partner, who observes the candidate's lessons and provides feedback using the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). The case study includes artifacts that address the following: (1) characteristics of the target student(s), (2) learning

objectives for instruction, (3) SIOP aspects addressed, (4) lesson plans/activities that address learning objectives and identify SIOP aspects, (5) assessment plan to measure accomplishment of student objectives, (6) assessment data indicating the degree to which student objectives are met, (7) SIOP feedback sheets to measure the accomplishment of SIOP teaching strategies, (8) summary statement that interprets student assessment data and provides a plan for future instruction based on that data, and (9) summary statement that interprets SIOP feedback data and provides a plan for the candidate's continued development of effective teaching strategies.

An example of an (ESA) that provides evidence that candidates in the education specialist program can work with diverse students is an in-depth exploration regarding culturally and linguistically diverse exceptional (CLDE) students. This exploration includes the following: (1) an abstract of the key principles regarding CLDE students that the candidate gleaned from each of his/her sources; (2) a discussion of how each of the key principles identified above relate to course outcomes; (3) what the candidate learned from the exploration; (4) what surprised the candidate; (5) how the candidate felt; (6) what the candidate was still wondering about and (7) what the candidate will do in his/her teaching practice as a result of completing this signature assessment.

The institution's "learn by doing" philosophy is evident in the initial teaching credential programs. Candidates are placed in K-12 classrooms during their first quarter in the program. Methods courses in the MS and SS programs include field experience components that require candidates to go to three different sites in order to work with a variety of student populations. During interviews, candidates consistently reported feeling well prepared to teach students during student teaching due to the amount of time that they had spent in classrooms prior to student teaching. Cooperating teachers and principals reported that they were always willing to take student teachers from the institution because they "knew they would be prepared" for the student teaching experience.

The dispositions required for all candidates include responsibility and accountability, creating a positive climate, cross-cultural competence, collaboration, inquiry and innovation, and social justice. Dispositions are assessed at each transition point in each program. At entry into each program, candidates are required to have letters of recommendation, to submit an essay or statement about why they want to be in the program, and to go through an interview. Throughout the program dispositions are evaluated through embedded signature assignments (ESAs) in courses and by university supervisors and cooperating teachers during their field placements. Dispositions of each candidate in the MS and SS candidates are reviewed at each transition point prior to the candidate moving forward in the program. Candidates in the education specialist program also complete a disposition self-evaluation. Candidates who do not meet the disposition standards are counseled out of the program. Interviews with cooperating teachers and principals at school sites validated that they played a role in assessing candidates' progress.

### Advanced Preparation Programs
Several credential programs at Cal Poly are either integrated credential and Masters Degree programs or integrated basic and advanced credential programs. Candidates in the Education Specialist credential program and the Educational Leadership (ELAP) programs complete the

requirements for both a credential and a Masters Degree in each program area. Virtually all candidates in the Single Subject Agriculture Education program also complete the requirements for the Agriculture Specialist Credential.

The Agriculture Specialist credential program includes candidates who already have a SS teaching credential in Agriculture Education as well as candidates who are completing the SS credential in Agriculture Education requirements concurrently with the requirements for the Agriculture Specialist credential..  In addition to the requirements of the Agriculture SS requirements, candidates must meet standards related to promoting student leadership opportunities, such as facilitating leadership training; implementing and recognizing student placement and entrepreneurial experiences; and facilitating student learning success.

Candidates are assessed throughout their student teaching experience both formatively and summatively by the cooperating teacher and university supervisor.  The summative assessment includes the following candidate dispositions: Leadership, Diplomacy and Tact, Enthusiasm, Initiative, Personal Appearance, Dependability, Promptness, Poise and Self-Control, and Use of Good Judgment.

The ELAP program uses a combination of coursework assignments and comprehensive formal assessments to ensure candidates are meeting state standards.  Each quarter candidates are assessed using a fieldwork log which is completed by the candidate, site supervisor and ELAP coordinator.  The log is clearly aligned to the state standards which include a focus on student learning.  Candidates must meet all standards before they are allowed to move forward in the program.

During the program students must complete an action research assignment where they formulate an empirically-researchable action research problem, review of the literature, design and carry out a study.  All ELAP faculty members use a common rubric for evaluating writing and presentations for any course assignment.

At the end of the program students are required to pass a written exam, an oral exam and submit an e-portfolio.  The written exam is a set of multiple choice questions from courses throughout the program.  For the oral exam, students are given a hypothetical situation in a school and asked to answer a set of questions.   Criteria on the oral exam include knowledge of current practices, research and theories and demonstrating multiple perspectives.  For the e-portfolio, candidates are required to submit a collection of work that documents experiences and skills in each of the state standards for advanced programs in educational leadership.

Candidates in advanced programs are expected to have the same dispositions as candidates in the initial programs.  Dispositions are assessed at entry to the program and at each transition point by university faculty and fieldwork supervisors.

Interviews with candidates, recent graduates, cooperating teachers and employers validate the findings that all candidates are well prepared in regards to content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.  Program completer exit surveys

and one-year follow-up surveys of graduates and their employers corroborate these finding as well.

**1.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?** This is an initial NCATE visit.

**1.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?**
   Not appropriate to this standard

**1.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?**
   None cited

**1.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales:** None

 **1.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?** This is an initial NCATE visit.

 **1.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?** This is an initial NCATE visit.

 **1.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement?** None

**1.6 Recommendation for Standard 1**

 **Initial Teacher Preparation:** Met
 **Advanced Preparation:** Met

**State Decision: Met**

# Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

*The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.*

## 2.1 Statement about the evidence

Unit programs have assessment systems in place that reflect the conceptual framework as well as professional and state standards. Program staff members collect program-specific data on their candidates from multiple assessment instruments during each quarter and from program completers as well as employers annually. Those data are shared within the programs and with advisory boards whose memberships include P-12 partners. Discussions with P-12 partners and advisory board members verify their involvement in those discussions.

Each program makes use of comprehensive and integrated assessment and evaluation measures to monitor candidate performance. Evidence during the visit demonstrated several ways assessment data had been used to improve programs and increase candidate proficiencies. For example, candidates reported changes in emphasis on classroom management skills that had resulted from program completer survey data. In addition, field experiences have been increased as a result of assessment data and feedback. Program decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments that occur at admission, at appropriate transition points during the programs and at program completion. Programs take steps to eliminate bias in their assessments and work to establish the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of their assessment procedures.

The BOE team found that thorough and comprehensive data collection and analysis within programs has enhanced candidate preparation and program effectiveness. However, there is an absence of aggregation and disaggregation of data at the unit level. During meetings with program directors, comments were made about unit level data collection and analysis prior to the reorganization of the School of Education and its placement within the College of Science and Mathematics, but unit data collection and analysis is now an inconsistent, informal process. This was affirmed during a conversation with the unit director.

Individual programs maintain assessment systems that provide regular and comprehensive information on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, competence of graduates, and program quality. For example, assessments include Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), Embedded Signature Assignments (ESAs) (including assessment of dispositions), Teaching Events and a variety of other assessments, some of which are embedded in courses. The programs collect data from applicants, candidates, recent graduates, faculty and other members of the professional community. Candidate assessment data at the program level are regularly and systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance and program quality.

The unit has no alternate route, off campus or distance learning programs. The unit maintains records of formal candidate complaints and documentation of their resolution. Several systems are used to maintain program area data. They include T*K*20, Excel and paper records. The differences in the manner in which date is stored revolve around several factors--the number of candidates in a program, the standards being assessed and other factors. For example, the special

education program admits cohorts of twenty candidates yearly. Faculty in this small, intimate program maintain paper records on candidates while the larger initial and advanced teacher licensure programs use the computer based T*K*20 program to manage the larger volume of data they collect.

Programs within the unit regularly and systematically use data, including candidate and graduate performance information, to evaluate the efficacy of their courses, programs, and clinical experiences. Programs analyze program evaluation and performance assessment data to initiate changes in programs and program procedures. Faculty members have access to candidate assessment data and/or data systems. Candidate assessment data are shared with candidates and faculty.

The state requires specific candidate competencies which have resulted in the development of aligned program area assessments which are comprehensive and integrated throughout initial and advanced programs. Conversations with external partners and graduates affirmed the quality of preparation programs within the unit as do their performance those rigorous state assessments.

With the exception of some educational specialist program assessments and evaluation criteria, assessments and evaluation criteria are aligned with state, professional and national standards. Some education specialist program rubrics are vague and not well aligned with standards. The BOE examined numerous examples of student work which revealed high levels of performance and candidates' ability to document proficiency in field and clinical experiences. In addition, numerous examples of program adjustments based on data analysis and feedback were provided.

Evaluations of unit operations have also occurred. They were conducted by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, various advisory committees, state accreditation teams and internal measures such as program assessment data, employer surveys, program completer surveys, faculty evaluations, staff assessments (performance and productivity), review of resources (budget, facilities, and technology support), and review of services (advising and other processes). The university also requires the unit to provide an annual assessment report. The BOE noted that several of the outside unit accreditations included concerns about the governance structure following the realignment of the unit within the College of Science and Mathematics.

Data gathered on candidates includes information on new applicants, candidate outcomes, and competence of graduates. Program staff members collect data from multiple assessment instruments each quarter on all candidates, and annually from program completers and employers. Data are shared within the program areas and with advisory boards, whose membership includes P-12 partners and unit faculty. Evidence provided indicates that candidates are welcome to attend. Candidates reported they had attended and were welcomed.

**2.2 Continuous Improvement**. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?  This is an initial NCATE visit.

**2.3 Movement to the Target Level.** What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not appropriate for this standard.

**2.4 Strengths.** What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
None

**2.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

    **2.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?** This is an initial NCATE visit.

    **2.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?** This is an initial NCATE visit.

    **2.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement?**

(1) The unit does not collect and analyzes program evaluation and performance assessment data needed to initiate improvements in the unit and its operations.

    *Rationale:* While the BOE found evidence within programs that a wide variety of data are being collected and used for program improvement, there is limited evidence that such data—as well as data on program effectiveness—are being collected or used for unit improvement.

**2.6 Recommendation for Standard 2**

    **Initial Teacher Preparation: Not Met**
    **Advanced Preparation: Not Met**

**State Decision: Met with Concerns**

    *Rationale:* While the team found evidence within programs that a wide variety of data are being collected and used for program improvement, there is limited evidence that such data—as well as data on program effectiveness—are being collected or used for unit improvement. (CTC Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation)

# Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

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

## 3.1 Statement about the evidence

The unit's mission statement declares that it values free inquiry, cultural and intellectual diversity, mutual respect, civic engagement, and social and environmental responsibility. The thrust of this mission is evident in the conceptual framework that guides the five credentialing programs: Multiple Subject (MS), Single Subject (SS), Education Specialist, Administrative Services (ELAP), and Agricultural Specialist. With learning and the learner as the focus of all programs, faculty members have crafted a framework that supports both the University's and the College of Science and Mathematics' mission and vision of learning for various purposes of social justice and participation in a democratic society, learning through engagement and reflection, and learning about context and praxis. Mission, vision, goals, and proficiencies are interwoven to create a strong conceptual and practical basis for training educators of all students.

The various programs have developed collaborative relationships with multiple partners, including the San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara County Offices of Education, school site cooperating teachers and administrators, their candidates, and the program advisory groups when considering the design, implementation, and evaluation of field and clinical experiences. Each program has an advisory group that includes educational leaders, program faculty members, employers, candidates, graduates, supervisors, and cooperating teachers. The advisory groups meet at least annually to review issues that affect field and clinical experiences such as placement demand and availability, mentoring by site supervisors, and ways to improve partnerships between the programs and schools in the community.

With regard to knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, the faculty members craft their courses (readings, assignments, and assessments) to coordinate with the conceptual framework, state standards from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and/or professional standards which are clearly referenced on the syllabi. The field work and clinical practice flow directly from the course work, while the criteria and parameters for the field and clinical experiences are referenced to the standards. Candidates are further engaged with the conceptual framework standards as they are required to be evaluated by their cooperating teacher and supervisor at the end of the field and clinical experiences using rubrics that are specific to the standards.

Candidates systematically use technology throughout their programs. They use Blackboard to access course materials and to submit assignments electronically. They also learn to use technology as a tool for instruction through podcasting, blogs, electronic journals, email, wikis, electronic presentations, research, and digital video. Candidates demonstrate proficiency in this area by either passing the CSET Preliminary Educational Technology Test or completing an educational technology course.

All candidates, including those in the advanced credentialing programs, complete some type of preadmission field experiences (e.g. EDU 300) prior to acceptance into the credential program.

Multiple Subject, Single Subject-including Ag Specialist, and Education Specialist candidates must fulfill 45 pre-admission hours, and ELAP candidates must have had at least two years of teaching experience prior to admission.

Candidates across all programs have field experiences woven into their coursework in alignment with the conceptual –framework's notion of "learn by doing." These experiences are focused primarily on the observation of instruction across a variety of settings, the demonstration of successful mastery of dispositions, and the engagement in reflection on knowledge, skills and professional dispositions. For the field experience, site partners must commit to allowing a candidate to shadow them through the day as they do their job in order for the candidate to obtain valuable on-the-job knowledge and training. Administrators who were interviewed shared that they were pleased when candidates came to their schools for fieldwork finding them eager to learn and to be a part of the learning community while on campus.

Candidates interviewed in Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Education Specialist programs expressed that these field experiences brought theory into practice for them. When asked about how the field experiences prior to clinical practice were beneficial to them, program completers who were interviewed stated that these experiences greatly reduced the anxiety of actually going into a classroom as a student teacher. Course syllabi provide evidence that candidate fieldwork is evaluated by reflections or a course-specific assignment. The program coordinators shared in interviews that they make a conscious effort to plan field experiences throughout the courses that give candidates an opportunity to observe across a variety of settings with widely diverse student populations. Interviews with current candidates in the MS and SS credential programs confirm that they are afforded opportunities to tutor diverse learners in their fieldwork experiences. Education Specialist credential candidates have a component built into the design of their program in which they spend time supporting students with autism and their families in the students' homes. Advanced credential candidates in ELAP and Agriculture also are expected during fieldwork to demonstrate the ability to work with the families of the students that they serve.

Across all programs offering an initial teaching credential, the student teaching experience is well-designed by all stakeholders, rigorously implemented by candidates over two or three quarters, and thoroughly evaluated with multiple measures. Site partners must meet criteria established by each program in consultation with all stakeholders. The cooperating teacher must have a credential in the appropriately corresponding field and be tenured in the district; they should also be willing to invest the time into mentoring the candidate. The process for placing candidates typically involves a conversation between the placement coordinators for the various programs and school district's central office staff. The program coordinators in interviews reported that the criteria for placement of candidates vary across school districts, and that often they "are required to work through district channels before approaching the school site administrators." Once the district has given the green light, the program coordinators make the final determination of placement in consultation with the school site partners, and the candidates themselves.

Candidates for the MS and SS credentials have two quarters of clinical practice experience (student teaching) with a gradual release of classroom responsibility by the cooperating teacher

---

so that during their second quarter candidates have full classroom responsibility. Candidates for the Education Specialist credential have three quarters in clinical practice assuming full classroom responsibility during their third quarter. Advanced credential candidates in ELAP and Agriculture are required to do extensive fieldwork projects throughout their programs.

University supervisors in the various programs prepare the school site-based faculty in supporting these candidates at the beginning of each term during general orientation sessions either face-to-face or electronically. Expectations and responsibilities of both the program faculty members and the school partners are clearly delineated for the clinical experience. The unit and some of the programs have student teaching handbooks. The unit program coordinators work with school partners to make sure that time is allocated by all participants for orientation, consultation, reflection, and evaluation. Some of the programs provide staff development opportunities throughout the school year which school partners may attend.

Evaluation of program clinical experiences is carried out on a variety of levels. University Supervisors and cooperating teachers use multiple measures to assess candidate competence. University supervisors schedule frequent observations and provide in-depth feedback in collaboration with the cooperating teacher and the candidate. Formal evaluations are completed at the midpoint and at the end of the quarter. Reflection on content, pedagogy, management, and professional dispositions is an integral part of the evaluation process. MS and SS candidates are required to complete the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) assessment which is a rigorous lesson planning, observation by videotaping, and reflection tool. Candidates and completers in interviews stated that they work very closely with their program faculty member to support them through the PACT process.

**3.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?** This is an initial NCATE visit.

**3.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?**
The unit has forged substantial relationships with its partners in the community by involving them in designing, implementing, and evaluating their programs and candidates. The unit also offers various professional development activities that they share with their partners. There is a strategic plan to move toward target on this standard. Discussions are being held with local districts regarding the implementation of a co-teaching model based on work from St. Cloud, MN as a foundation. A podcast is currently being developed for supervisors and cooperating teachers aimed at informing them about the responsibilities of supervisors and cooperating teachers. The podcast will also provide coaching tips to better support candidates as they progress through their student teaching experience.

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

**3.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationale**
      **3.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?** This is an initial NCATE visit.

**3.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?** This is an initial NCATE visit.

**3.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement?**
None

## 3.6 Recommendation for Standard 3

**Initial Teacher Preparation:** Met
**Advanced Preparation:** Met


**State Decision: Met**

# Standard 4: Diversity

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

## 4.1 Statement about the evidence

Learning outcomes related to diversity were added to the university's learning outcomes in 2009. These proficiencies were further articulated in those adopted in the conceptual framework. Attention to diversity is implied in the SOE Dispositions expected of all candidates. Disposition 2.1 addresses cross-cultural competency and disposition 3.2 addresses shaping change: social justice. All SOE Learning Outcomes, including Learning Outcome 5, *effecting sustainable communities in multicultural environments,* have been aligned with state-adopted Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and INTASC principles for all initial programs,

Multiple Subject and Single Subject candidates complete the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). There are five PACT teaching events and all five require that candidates demonstrate competence related to working with students from diverse backgrounds: planning, instruction, assessment, reflection, and academic language. In addition, candidates seeking initial credentialing in Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs complete coursework specifically designed to address diversity. As indicated in some course syllabi and in PACT Teaching Events for Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs, candidates are required to collect substantive information about students who are English Language Learners (ELLs) and students with special needs and to make adaptations in their lesson plans to meet the needs of these students. In addition, they must demonstrate that they are able to implement these adaptations in classroom teaching situations. During interviews candidates expressed confidence in working with diverse learners, which is verified for Multiple and Single Subject candidates by PACT results.

Multiple Subject candidates complete EDUC 440 (Educating Individuals with Exceptional Needs) and Single Subject candidates complete EDUC 418 (Culturally Responsive Teaching in Diverse Classrooms). Other initial candidates and candidates in advanced programs complete specific assignments (ESAs) throughout their programs that are related to the needs of special education students and English Learners. Candidates in the Educational Leadership and Administration Program (ELAP) complete EDUC 588 (Education, Culture, and Learning) and EDUC 542 (Administration of Special Programs). Course syllabi for EDUC 440, EDUC 418, and EDUC 588 and embedded signature assessments for other programs do not consistently show alignment with diversity learning objectives, but most are aligned with the SOE Dispositions.

Curriculum, field experiences, and assessments to address diversity proficiencies were indicated as being evident in course syllabi. Some syllabi to which the team had access did not directly link these experiences, activities, and assessments to the articulated diversity objectives. Additionally, other syllabi (e.g., EDUC 300, EDUC 424) did not show evidence of activities or

assessments that were related to diversity. At the advanced level, the ELAP program has one course, EDUC 588, that is focused on multicultural issues and another course EDUC 542, that specifically addresses how school administrators work effectively with a variety of diverse populations. Although faculty and candidates across programs discussed such activities and assessments during interviews, syllabi for all program courses did not reflect activities or assessments related to diversity.

Interviews with initial program faculty, program coordinators, candidates, and program completers indicate that all methods courses have embedded field experiences that require candidates to work in classrooms with diverse P-12 students. Their assignments are scaffolded throughout the series of methods courses. Therefore, while syllabi in many instances do not indicate assignments or activities related to diversity, interviews with various constituencies indicated that there are diversity-related assignments and assessments throughout each program.

Data available at the visit validated that candidates in the special education credential program are assessed on diversity dispositions and their ability to work effectively with diverse candidates through a formative/summative process. Interviews confirm that course assignments embed issues related to diversity. Candidates self-assess, are assessed collaboratively with their cooperating teacher, and then are assessed collaboratively with their cooperating teacher and university supervisor. This final step allows for a triangulation of diversity data for special education candidates in their final student teaching experience.

According to interviews with ELAP program faculty, the program coordinator, candidates, and program completers, diversity-related activities and assignments (embedded signature assessments) are required in all courses. Program faculty members indicate that they collect information related to diversity throughout the program (i.e., candidates' dispositions related to diversity during the admission process; embedded signature assessments during coursework; and evaluations of candidate performance during fieldwork). However, data were not available at the time of the visit.

While the IR states that the *Tk20* system is used to house portfolios and other assessment data, not all programs use the system. Multiple Subject and Single Subject candidates are required to show progress by maintaining an electronic portfolio, although there were no portfolios found in *Tk20*. The system holds individual teaching elements of the PACT for Multiple and Single Subject candidates, however, data are displayed only by candidate or course. Neither aggregated data across all initial programs nor disaggregated program data are available. For this reason, it is only possible to determine whether diversity proficiencies is being addressed or met on an individual candidate basis.

The racial/ethnic profile of program faculty, including both tenure-tenure track and part-time faculty indicates that 91% are White and 9% are of non-White races/ethnicities. The overall University percentages are 84% White and 16% non-White races/ethnicities. Thus candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse faculty in the University and an even more limited access in their credential programs. Data for tenure-track faculty and full-time lecturers indicate that these individuals have experiences with diverse learners. Data were not provided prior to or during the visit about the diversity of school-based faculty.

The IR states that programs invite "guest speakers" to make presentations on topics related to diversity. Interviews confirm that some speakers are sought for diversity-related topics not typically included in coursework (e.g., Child Protective Services; parents of a student with autism for MS and SS). While such diversity-related speakers can complement opportunities to work with diverse faculty, these opportunities are neither consistent within or across programs to support that candidates have experiences working with diverse faculty.

Through the IR, the unit's response to the Offsite Visit Report, and interviews, no evidence was provided of specific efforts to recruit and retain a diverse faculty. It was stated in interviews conducted at the site visit that University processes are followed during faculty searches.

The institution's student population is diverse: 65% of the student population is white and 12% of the student population is Hispanic/Latino. The remaining 23% represent other racial/ethnic origins. Candidates within across programs represent an equally diverse population: 63% of candidates are white, 17% Hispanic/Latino, and 20% of other ethnic origins. The candidate profile across all programs does not separate data for initial candidates from data for advanced candidates. The team found no evidence of policies and practices for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates across the unit. Instead, individual program efforts were indicated such as those of the Center for Excellence in Science and Math Education (CESaME) for Single Subject mathematics and science. The major effort that was cited to attract new candidates from diverse backgrounds is to hold regular orientation sessions. Recently, a newly funded Teacher Quality Program grant was secured to serve the central valley of California and should increase opportunities to serve rural and remote candidates.
Candidates in all credential programs are required to complete significant amounts of fieldwork. Although a data table was not included as evidence before or during the visit, it was stated in interviews that candidate field placements are completed in schools with a minimum of 25% diversity (ELL and special needs) and 10% free and reduced lunch. The data on the diversity of school placements resides in individual candidate folders that are housed with each program coordinator and were not provided across programs or for individual programs.

A Bilingual Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) program* exists which initial candidates may complete simultaneously with the initial credential requirements. Candidates who are enrolled in this program work only in bilingual or immersion classrooms. While three nearby language immersion schools were mentioned in interviews, the team was not able to access demographic information on these schools or the faculty with whom credential candidates are placed.

*Institution stopped accepting candidates into BCLAD program in Fall 2010.

**4.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?** This is an initial NCATE visit.

**4.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?** Not applicable

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


**4.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales**
    **4.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?**   This is an initial NCATE visit.

    **4.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?**  This is an initial NCATE visit.

    **4.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement?**

(1):  Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse faculty in the unit.

> *Rationale:*  Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with faculty who represent multiple racial/ethnic groups in the unit.  No other diverse data about faculty were provided.  Faculty demographics indicate that SOE and affiliated faculty are predominately white, non-Hispanic (91%) with three Hispanic faculty members and one multiracial faculty member.

(2):  There are no policies evident to suggest that there are processes in place for the systematic recruitment and retention of diverse faculty and candidates.

> *Rationale:*  Faculty hiring at the institution is decentralized and resides in the office of the dean of the college (CSM).  Procedures and processes for hiring were unable to be documented.  There is no systematic plan for the unit or the college to recruit or retain diverse faculty.

> While the majority of candidates enter the credential programs from the institution's undergraduate programs, there are no systematic, across-program initiatives to recruit diverse candidates.

**4.6 Recommendation for Standard 4**

    **Initial Teacher Preparation:** Met
    **Advanced Preparation:** Met


**State Decision: Met with Concerns**
    *Rationale:* The faculty is not reflective of a diverse society. Interviews indicate that recruitment and hiring efforts are not addressing this issue. (CTC Common Standard 4: Faculty)

# Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

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

## 5.1 Statement about the evidence

The SOE consists of 25 faculty members, 13 full-time in the unit and 12 part-time in the unit. A review of vitae for all faculty indicates that all are qualified for the positions they hold and to teach the courses they teach. There are an additional 42 faculty members, 13 part-time in the institution and 42 in supervisory positions.

Criteria for hiring and evaluating all faculty and expectations for research, professional development, evaluation, and grant opportunities are in the Faculty Personnel Actions, university guidelines and procedures; College of Education Teacher Education Decision Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Policy, which also includes lecturers; and Personnel Evaluation Division of Graduate Studies in Education College of Education documents.

California requires that all school-based faculty be licensed in the areas that they teach and supervise. Thus, 100 % of the school-based faculty are appropriately certified. Lists of school-based faculty who are interested in being cooperating teachers are sent from school districts to the program placement coordinators. Those chosen to be cooperating teachers serve for a trial period. Positive assessments by the candidates and the university supervisors must be received for them to continue to serve as cooperating teachers.

The SOE faculty members provide service that is consistent with the mission of the institution. In addition to supervision of candidates in field and clinical assignments, interviews with faculty and school-based faculty verified faculty participation in P-12 schools. These activities include staff development for P-12 teachers, grant writing, serving on advisory boards, applied research, modeling best practices in instruction, and consultation. One hundred percent of the unit faculty are engaged in some way with P-12 school districts. Unit faculty provide professional development for faculty across the university through the Center for Teaching and Learning.

Course syllabi align with the university's mission and vision statements, the university learning objectives, the Conceptual Framework, California standards, and California Teaching Performance Expectations. Interviews with faculty verified integration of technology into the learning outcomes. All faculty use Blackboard to post grades and materials and for communication. Other technology resources used by the faculty include the use of web-based instruction for classroom management, Podcasts, wiki spaces, and model classrooms with modern technology. Instructional strategies that include hands-on experiences using technology and field experiences support the institution's "learn-by-doing" ethos.

A review of course syllabi for all credentialing areas verifies the integration of diversity learning outcomes in courses for each certification area. All SS candidates enroll in EDUC 300 Introduction to Teaching). Other courses for SS that address diversity are EDUC 412 (Access to Learning in a Pluralistic Society); EDUC 416 (Literacy, Language, and Culture in Content Area

Classrooms); EDUC 418 (Culturally Responsive Teaching in Diverse Classrooms); ENGL 424 (Teaching English in Secondary Schools); HIS 424 (Organizing and Teaching History); MATH 424 (Teaching Mathematics); and PSC 424 (Organizing Teaching Science). In addition to EDUC 300, MS candidates take EDUC 430 (Teaching Reading and Language Arts with a Multicultural Perspective). AGED candidates take AGED 438 (Instructional Processes in Agricultural Education) in which one of the objectives is, "Develop daily lesson plans which address diversity in student populations." ELAP candidates take EDUC 518 (Fieldwork/Internship) during which they "Promote the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to students learning and staff professional development" and model "a personal code of ethics and" develop "professional leadership capacity." SPED candidates take EDUC 440 (Educating Individuals with Exceptional Needs).

Systematic and comprehensive evaluation of faculty teaching performance is conducted and opportunities for professional development are offered. Faculty instruction is evaluated by regular end-of-course student evaluations and peer reviews. In addition, the CSU system provides additional professional development for all faculty in the 23 CSU institutions. Budget shortfalls have curtailed travel for participation in professional development outside the state, but the university has compensated by using technology for on-campus attendance. State-wide staff development relates primarily to regulatory changes and accreditation, and travel within the state is supported for all faculty who are interested. As a member of the PACT consortium, faculty engage in staff development regarding candidate assessment for the Multiple and Single Subject programs. The calendar for the Center for Teaching and Learning includes workshops on assessment, course design, curriculum development, and other topics related to teaching and learning. Faculty interviews verified that the Center for Teaching and Learning offers workshops for improving instruction and provides media to enable faculty to record their own teaching for review and reflections. The Center also offers grants to fund professional development. Interviews verified that faculty regularly discuss dispositions that are determined by CTC and NCATE standards. Exit surveys and employer surveys are used for improvement of instruction and to determine professional development activities for faculty.

As part of their evaluation, faculty members create two portfolios in which they demonstrate teaching, scholarship, and service. Institutional portfolios that demonstrate teaching, scholarship, and service are maintained in the office of the dean of the CSM. These include a statement of teaching philosophy, reflections on teaching and learning, results of student and peer evaluations, course syllabi, and professional development plans developed from evaluation results. Personal action portfolios are maintained by the individual faculty member.

The collective bargaining agreement for the institution describes the evaluation process leading to tenure and post-tenure review process which occurs every five years after tenure is earned. The institutional portfolio is a part of this process. During the past five years, 93% of full-time faculty members who have been reviewed for tenure or promotion have completed the process successfully.

SOE faculty are engaged in scholarly work based on the mission of the institution: learning by doing. Faculty scholarship includes presentations in local school districts and professional

---

organizations. All publications and presentations appear to be related to the faculty member's area of expertise.

An Annual Distinguished Teaching Award and a Staff Award recognize good teaching and scholarship are presented at both the university and the school/department levels.

**5.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?** This is an initial NCATE visit.

**5.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?** Not appropriate to this standard

**5.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?**
None for this standard

**5.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales:**

    **5.5.1 What AFIs have been removed:** This is an initial NCATE visit.

    **5.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?** This is an initial NCATE visit.

    **5.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement?**
    None

**5.6 Recommendation for Standard 5**

    **Initial Teacher Preparation: Met**
    **Advanced Program: Met**

**State Decision: Met**

## Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

*The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.*

### 6.1 Statement about the evidence

The unit is currently in transition. Since 2009, the unit has resided as a school in the College of Science and Mathematics (CSM) which is one of the six California Polytechnic State University (Cal Poly) colleges. The governance structure for the unit changed in 2009. The College of Education, with a dean and an associate dean, was merged with the College of Science and Mathematics and became the School of Education (SOE) under the leadership of a director. The SOE retained the designation as the unit with the authority and responsibility to prepare teachers for Cal Poly. The SOE Director reports to the CSM dean as do the chairs of the seven departments in the college. The reorganization was initiated by the provost partially as a result of a declining budget, and the provost led the planning for this change in mid-December 2008. Faculty who were affected by the change were notified by e-mail of the change in January 2009. The SOE director was elected to the position in March 2009 and assumed leadership of the unit when the new governance structure went into effect in September 2009.

According to the IR, as a result of this merger, authority over programs, operations, and budget was transferred to the CSM dean. Two credential analysts, who also assist in advising Multiple Subject, Education Specialist, and Single Subject candidates, and the technology coordinator, who reported to the COE dean, now report to one of two CSM associate deans instead of reporting to the SOE Director. Advisory groups ensure representation of stakeholders and important constituents in program direction. Coordination of the Liberal Studies major is achieved through periodic meetings with the partner programs. School committees (Curriculum, Graduate, Assessment, Accreditation, Accountability) ensure coordination and feedback needed for governance, and that all programs within the unit have an advisory council composed of faculty and educational partners from the area. Furthermore the unit itself also has a newly formed advisory group that consists of education partners, including k-12 personnel, as well as selected institution faculty and students and community leaders. This advisory group meets annually to provide perspectives on design, implementation and feedback regarding programs and policies in the unit. The onsite team held a phone conversation with two members of this committee who live in another state. No evidence was provided that there are unit-level assessments to be shared with the unit advisory group in the same way that program assessment is shared with program advisory committees.

The IR states that "the leadership structure was still in transition at the time of this report." This was confirmed in an interview with the CSM dean who stated that leadership is not yet established as it should be. The onsite team requested interviews with all governance committees but these interviews were not scheduled. Thus, the onsite team was unable through interviews to confirm that the unit has the authority to ensure coordination and feedback needed for governance through the structure of policy-making committees. Furthermore, in interviews with representatives from all program advisory committees and in interviews with one group of candidates, concern was raised about the organizational structure and the level of university support for teacher education.

Admissions and degree requirements for each program appear to be clearly and consistently described in university catalogs and in online resources. Additional materials regarding applications and admissions are provided in unit materials. Although budgetary constraints exist university-wide, the unit has adequate resources to provide quality programs. The availability of resources was in fact enhanced when the SOE was placed in the CSM. Enthusiasm for the preparation and quality of candidates and completers was evident throughout interviews and school visits.

Facilities are adequate with sufficient technology available for instruction and candidate learning. SOE candidates are well supported with technology to expedite course assignments and field experiences. A very attractive School of Education Resource Center is maintained by the college librarian and provides access to candidates and faculty to state approved textbooks, rapid access to resources that support faculty and student research, and books and materials for k-12 students. The unit uses *Tk20* as its electronic platform for PACT data collection and analysis for the Single Subject and Multiple Subject programs.

During the offsite visit, the team had questions about the impact on leadership, authority, and resources of the change in the governance structure from a "college," under the direction of a dean, to a "school," with a director reporting to the CSM dean. These questions were not fully answered during the onsite visit, and the impact of the change in governance structure on the identity and integrity of the unit remains unclear. The unit retains its institutional mission to prepare high quality professional educators who teach so that all students learn. The SOE mission statement is aligned to university objectives, as are CSM objectives, and the conceptual framework informs the requirements of all programs in the unit. However, it was not clear to all persons interviewed nor in all institutional practices and requirements whether the School of Education is the unit or whether the CSM is the unit.

As a result of system-wide funding shortfall, the College of Education budget was reduced from the 2007/2008 to the 2009/2010 academic year; at that time the College of Education became the School of Education. Since 2006, Operations and Expenditures (O&E) funds from the university have not increased. Vacant faculty positions were not replaced. Recently, the university confirmed its commitment to filling vacant faculty positions by hiring two new faculty members for the SOE to begin employment in fall 2011.

Statewide resource restrictions have affected program delivery. A reduction in the number of faculty led to reduction in enrollments, the assignment of tenure track faculty to perform tasks previously assigned to field/clinical supervisors, a reduction in planning time. Time spent engaged in assessment and in scholarly activities have also been reduced. These changes have been associated with increased workload stress. Professional development support for faculty members university-wide has been reduced as a result of budget restrictions.

Comparison budget data made available by the CSM dean's office confirmed that the SOE is an equal participant in the CSM "family style" budgeting process. Additional resources were provided to the unit in order to complete the additional work required to submit programs to the CTC for approval as well as for the NCATE accreditation visit.

**6.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?**
This is an initial NCATE visit.

**6.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?** Not applicable

**6.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?**
Not applicable

**6.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

    **6.5.1 What AFI's have been removed?**
        This is an initial NCATE visit.

    **6.5.2 What AFIs Remain and Why?** None

    **6.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement?**

(1)   Evidence is insufficient to assure that SOE leadership is empowered with the authority to ensure consistent unit-wide high quality candidate preparation programs aligned with professional, state, and institutional standards.

    *Rationale:* Final authority over programs, operations, budget, unit resource personnel was moved to the moved into the CSM, effective 2009. There is general confusion about the definition of the unit and what the lines of authority are. Uncertainty about the structure, organization and lines of authority of the unit exists.

**6.6 Recommendation for Standard 6**

    **Initial Teacher Preparation: Not Met**
    **Advanced Program: Not Met**

**State Decision: Met with Concerns**
    *Rationale:* There is a lack of evidence that unit leadership represents the interests of each program within the institution. (CTC Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership)

# CTC COMMON STANDARDS NOT ADDRESSED BY NCATE UNIT STANDARDS

**CTC Common Standard 1.1**                                                                  **Met**

*The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.*

### Findings:

The Credential Analyst's office is responsible for compiling and reviewing all materials necessary for credential recommendation. Each program has a checklist of required assessments coursework, field experiences, and PACT results for the Multiple and Single Subject Credential programs. Appropriate documentation is included for all required items. The process is monitored by randomly sampling candidate folders and having a second credential analyst review the contents for accuracy prior to credential recommendation.

**CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance**                                 **Met**

*Qualified members of the Unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist in their professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The Unit provides support to candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.*

### Findings:

Candidates and cooperating teachers have written documents that explain each step of the credential process. Faculty and credential counselors present information in classes and through emails. Candidates can also make appointments to meet with counselors or faculty one-on-one if they have specific questions. In order to ensure that only candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession are allowed to continue, each program has identified transition points at which time candidates are required to submit documents to ensure that they have met the requirements for that stage. Candidates who do not meet the requirements are counseled out of the program. Interviews with candidates, cooperating teachers and employers validated that some candidates had been counseled out of the program.

## TEACHING CREDENTIALS

### Multiple and Single Subject Credential Program
### Multiple Subject BCLAD Option (Spanish)

*Program Design*
The Cal Poly Multiple Subject/Single Subject program coursework emphasizes learning through doing as expressed in the Conceptual Framework. Coursework and fieldwork are carefully coordinated though regular communication with faculty, administration and at school sites. Interviews with stakeholders verified that coursework and fieldwork are linked and provide opportunities for candidates to practice what they are learning. This was confirmed by candidates and completers who discussed the impact of learning theory accompanied by regular opportunities to practice by doing.

Coursework is structured in three blocks: foundational, methods, and student teaching. This sequence provides a scaffold approach to learning. Program completers and current candidates discussed how beginning field experience offered them enough practical experience to approach student teaching with confidence. Field experience is directly connected to coursework and provides regular opportunities to practice course content.

Interviews with candidates and completers verified that the program uses faculty advisors, university supervisors, the PACT coordinator, and credential analysts to provide consistent and regular feedback to students on program progression and completion.

Stakeholders are involved in curriculum development and planning. The advisory councils meet annually and provide specific feedback to the program. Recent advisory council feedback focused on how using a co-teaching model could positively impact program and how improvements can be made to the English Learner curriculum. Faculty, advisory council members and employers verified they are actively involved in program planning.

**Course of Study**
Candidates and completers reported that the methods courses were the best part of the program. Interviews with employers, cooperating teachers, and site principals verified that Cal Poly candidates and completers have an extremely high level of content knowledge. During fieldwork, candidates make use of content standards, state-adopted textbooks, and assessment plans geared to state content standards as they carry out their teaching responsibilities. Completers shared that they were well prepared for the job and used curriculum materials from their credential programs in their current teaching assignments.

Candidates first begin learning about the principles of instruction when they are in schools observing instructional practices and interacting with students. They observe research-based practices, identify the theories behind the practices, and assess the effectiveness of a wide range of instruction. The practicum provides the opportunity to practice application of theory first by observing and later through interactions with students. Candidates and completers identified the practicum as a program strength.

Field experiences are designed to follow a developmental sequence which moves from observation to teaching, from working individually to small group to a whole class of children, and moves from teaching that is taken on by a pair or team to individual responsibility for teaching. Candidates discussed the impact of the foundational courses and how actually being in a classroom made the curriculum make sense.

Candidates complete two quarters of student teaching, one part-time and one full-time. Agriculture education single subject candidates complete one 20-week block of student teaching. Candidates are assessed by their university supervisor and receive three TPE assessments. Candidates particularly appreciated the evaluation meeting with the cooperating teacher and university supervisor. In conversations with candidates and completers, they remarked that the TPE feedback was invaluable in their development as teachers.

### *Candidate Competence*
Candidates are formatively assessed using embedded signature assignments in their coursework. During the practicum, candidates meet with their university supervisor and cooperating teacher and review elements of the TPE assessment. In field experience, they are evaluated a minimum of 5 times and meet with their university and supervisor for a mid term and final evaluation conference. Summative assessment of candidate competence is confirmed by candidates' completion of PACT.

Candidates complete the PACT during their student teaching course. Results of these assessments are available to the candidates through an electronic tracking system. The PACT coordinator expressed concern that candidates can see faculty feedback during the assessment process, are notified of any rescore, and can see the assessor's work in progress. Cal Poly rescores 10% of the PACT assessments, however, Program Standard 19 requires 15% of tasks be rescored. Assessors are recalibrated annually; however, there is no system in place to monitor assessor validity during the year.

### *Findings on Standards:*
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with program leadership, completers, candidates, advisory board members, employers, faculty, and university supervisors, the team determined that program standards are **Met** for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs with the exception of Standard 19 for both programs and Standard 1 for the Single Subject credential program, which are **Met with Concerns**.

### *Rationale:*
          **Multiple and Single Subject Programs**

          **Standard 19: Implementation of the Teaching Performance:   Met with Concerns Assessor Qualifications, Training, and Scoring Reliability**
          The multiple and single subject programs rescore 10% of the PACT assessments, however, the standard requires 15% of assessments to be rescored.

The standard requires that the program establish and maintain policies and procedures to assure the privacy of the assessors. Currently, assessments are scored in "real time" and because of the technological platform candidates can view this information during scoring.

The standard requires that: "The program periodically reviews the performance of assessors to assure consistency, accuracy, and fairness to candidates within the TPA process, and provides recalibration opportunities for assessors whose performance indicates they are not providing accurate, consistent, and/or fair scores for candidate responses." The program requires assessors recalibrate annually, but there is no system in place to monitor the accuracy of assessors between recalibration.

*Single Subject Program*

**Standard 1: Program Design**                                       **Met with Concerns**
The standard requires that candidates have early field experiences which include purposeful, interrelated, developmentally-designed sequence of coursework and field experiences. Interviews with Single Subject: Agriculture candidates indicated that they were not provided the same opportunities for field experiences in EDUC 410, 412, 414, 416 and 418 as other candidates enrolled in those same courses.

**Agriculture Specialist Credential Program**

*Program Design*

The Agriculture Specialist Instruction Credential Program is coordinated through the Agricultural Education and Communication Department in the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences (CAFES). The department head, a full-time tenured full professor, has the responsibility and authority to recommend credential candidates for the Agriculture Specialist Instruction Credential. All members of the department advise undergraduates preparing for the credential as well as new and continuing post-baccalaureate candidates. Candidates and completers shared that they were assigned a faculty advisor and felt confident that they could talk to anyone, at anytime, and be supported.

The Agriculture Specialist credential and Single Subject-Agriculture credential are offered concurrently. With the exception of one candidate, all candidates interviewed were completing both the credential and agriculture specialist credential. During interviews, cooperating teachers and employers remarked that Cal Poly candidates have a sophisticated understanding of subject matter.

The department head and members of the department meet formally and informally with department heads/chairs and faculty in other CAFES departments to maintain subject matter preparation instruction that meets CTC standards. As referenced in the preceding Multiple and Single Subject Credential Program report, the Agriculture Education Coordinator, Single Subject Coordinator, and Advisory Council are aware of concerns of Single Subject candidates and are working to strengthen coursework and early fieldwork opportunities to support this group of candidates.

The department head serves on the SOE Single Subject Committee and meets formally and informally with the Single Subject Coordinator to organize administrative components of the Single Subject and Agriculture Specialist programs. Interviews with faculty, university supervisors, and the credential analyst verified that these meetings occur and are valuable for program coordination.

*Course of Study*

Each course in the Agriculture Specialist Instruction Credential Program sequence has supervised field experiences. These experiences connect course content with appropriate contexts observed in classrooms and/or practiced in clinical experiences. Single Subject professional education courses also employ field experience as a critical element of the candidates' professional development. Candidates, cooperating teachers, completers, and employers said that Cal Poly students are actively involved in the community in such events as FFA State events, conferences, and classrooms.

Candidates and completers interviewed reported positive things about the field-based and hands-on learning components of their program. Candidates said classroom experiences linked theory to practice. During interviews, faculty and cooperating teachers discussed how field experience connected all aspects of the program and "combined the art and science of teaching." Candidates,

employers, and completers reported that their specific agriculture content field experiences were particularly valuable.

Candidates appreciated the opportunity to complete field experience in non-traditional settings and felt their field experience and clinical practice provided robust opportunities to practice the theoretical elements of the program.

Candidate interviews and document reviews confirm that the program is delivered in 3 segments: foundations, methods, and student teaching. Candidates complete a 6 month (20 week) field placement in agriculture education. Candidates are placed throughout California (primarily in the central valley) and teach a variety of subjects. Candidates verified that student teaching placements offer a variety of agriculture education opportunities including welding, floriculture, wood and metal shop experiences, and also offered them an opportunity to work with a cooperating teacher and university supervisor. Candidates complete foundational educational coursework in the School of Education. All content-specific classes are taught in the AG ED department. Cooperating teachers, candidates, completers, and Advisory Council members all commented on the importance of candidates working in the community and the impact student teaching had on candidates' experience.

Employers explicitly stated that candidates have sophisticated content knowledge and stated that candidates completing the Cal Poly program were well prepared. Employers said that hiring a Cal Poly teacher was an easy choice because the program completers had the skills and knowledge to be successful. Completers stated they were well prepared for their first job and the program could not have done a better job of preparing them.

### *Candidate Competence*
During student teaching candidates are assessed monthly by their university supervisor. Candidates provide lesson reflections and receive three Teacher Performance Expectation evaluations during their student teaching experience. Candidates verified that the TPE conferences provide substantive feedback and were extremely important in their personal and professional development. Candidates are placed for student teaching in geographically dispersed settings and are evaluated by their University Supervisor three times. All candidates and completers provided evidence that they were supported in their placements and that the University Supervisor feedback was invaluable.

Candidates confirmed they received feedback on their TPE assessments, reflective journals, and student teaching. Candidates provide weekly feedback to their university supervisor.

### *Findings on Standards:*
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with program leadership, completers, candidates, advisory board members, employers, faculty, and university supervisors, the team determined that program standards are **Met** for the Agriculture Specialist Credential Program.

**Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate**

*Program Design*
The purpose and main goal of the Education Specialist Preliminary Program SPED in Mild/Moderate Disabilities at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo is to provide an integrated Masters degree and credential program. Candidates admitted to the program have the option of completing all program and degree requirements within three quarters, or they may complete the program in two strands (Autism Family Intervention Strand and School-Based Strand) over a longer period of time. Courses for the Masters degree (which also support candidates' preparation for the Education Specialist Preliminary Credential) are focused on the needs of students with autism and support for the families of those students.

A unique aspect of this program is the Autism Family Intervention Strand, a series of six classes which includes the candidate working with a family that has a child with autism. The candidate spends several hours every week at the family's home, working with the student and supporting the family. During this interaction, the family helps the candidate to learn about their autistic child, to understand their family characteristics, to experience how the child functions and interacts within the family unit. Every candidate and program completer interviewed at the site visit commented on how much this experience helped them to better understand how autism affects the child and his or her family.

*Course of Study*
Candidates in the program must complete three prerequisite courses and twelve program courses (one of which is Special Education Student Teaching). In addition to student teaching, each of the program courses has a field-based component. Courses in the program build upon one another. Content is introduced in the fall quarter, developed in the winter quarter, and mastered by the end of the spring quarter upon completion of fieldwork.

Prerequisite courses for the program include instructional planning and management strategies for both general education and special education classrooms. Candidates may be admitted conditionally and complete prerequisites prior to the beginning of fall quarter.

Program coursework addresses characteristics of special education students, learning interventions, positive behavior support, assessment strategies, collaboration and consultation, and support and transition strategies. In addition, candidates take three courses focusing on inquiry, research methodology, and research application to complete the Masters degree. These courses are completed in conjunction with fieldwork.

Candidates in the Integrated Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Disabilities and M.A. Program in Special Education are placed with a mentor teacher for three quarters. This arrangement gives mentors a chance to work with the special education teacher candidates from September through June. The mentor not only serves as a field supervisor but helps the candidate learn about being a special educator. In addition, each candidate learns about the school district, the school, the mentor's program, and the students in the mentor's program. Candidates are full-time graduate students, spending time with their mentors during the day and attending classes at

Cal Poly in the late afternoon/evening. The program coordinators also serve as university supervisors for candidates.

Program coursework emphasizes learning through doing, reflecting the motto of Cal Poly. Coursework and fieldwork are carefully coordinated though regular communication with the faculty, administration and stakeholders at placement sites providing fieldwork opportunities. Based on feedback from community partners, the program promotes learning opportunities that employ multiple modalities and intelligences. The number and type of field experiences is designed to gradually bring the candidate to the point where he or she is able to demonstrate the ability to teach students with mild/moderate disabilities, conduct assessment activities, and collaborate with general education colleagues in supporting students with mild/moderate disabilities. The candidate is expected to observe and actively participate in assessment activities during the fall quarter of the program. The candidate is expected to actively participate in classroom activities during the winter quarter of the program by planning for and teaching small groups of pupils, by leading the entire class in one or more major activities or instructional experiences, and by managing student behavior. During the spring quarter, the candidate continues the activities of winter quarter as well as developing skills in collaborating with general education colleagues, assessing students, completing IEPs, and conducting IEP meetings.

Candidates and faculty commented on how quickly the program responds to suggestions from candidates' quarterly evaluations. Examples of this include moving the assessments course from later in the program into the first quarter. Candidates felt they needed that information much earlier, so that they could effectively assess their students. Another example is the autism fieldwork segment, which originally was only the last quarter of the program. Candidates suggested the autism fieldwork become longer so that they would have a chance to bond better with the family and the child. The program responded by extending this experience to three quarters.

*Assessment of Candidate Competence*
Candidates are assessed formatively throughout the program by signature assignments completed at several transition points and scored by trained faculty. In addition to coursework grades, candidates are observed and evaluated during field work by district-employed mentor teachers and university supervisors using a comprehensive list of skills and dispositions essential for effective teaching in special education settings. Rubrics are used for all the signature assignments, and all measure thoroughness, completeness, organization and professional citations/references

When past graduates had a chance to share their thoughts about the program, one graduate stated that "this program advocates for the kids, and they want us to see the bigger picture". This sentiment was echoed throughout the group, and similar statements were expressed by interviewees throughout the visit.

*Findings:*
In fall of 2010, Cal Poly Special Education faculty reviewed the entire program curriculum and developed 11 new courses in the process of transitioning to the new education specialist standards that were approved by the Commission. The Education Specialist program was

reviewed in the Program Sampling as did all approved programs. Since the program has recently undergone transition to new standards, a panel of BIR reviewers will conduct a full program assessment within one year of implementation of the newly transitioned programs to determine if the narrative response is aligned with the Preliminary Education Specialist Program Standards.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, supervising practitioners, employers, and members of the Advisory Board, the team determined that program standards in the Education Specialist Program are **Met** with the exception of Standard 15, which is **Met with Concerns.**

*Rationale:*
> While many candidates and program completers reported being confident about their ability to provide special education services to students across the P-12 range, others reported that having field experience at only one level left them feeling inadequately prepared to work with students at all grade levels.

**Preliminary Administrative Services Credential**

*Program Design*
The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program (PASC) at Cal Poly contains essential principles for administrative preparation that are well grounded in scholarship and theory. This theoretical framework provides a systematic process for helping adults learn by 1) making explicit the implicit knowledge and beliefs about education and leadership candidates bring to the program; 2) linking new knowledge to this implicit knowledge; 3) encouraging candidates to reflect on how the new knowledge challenges their implicit knowledge and beliefs; and 4) fostering new "mental models" or theoretical lenses candidates can use to modify and improve their practice. The theory also provides a cogent rationale for the use of technology to effectively facilitate adult learning (e.g., using web-based delivery for course content). The objectives of the program are to ensure every candidate is able to apply theories of educational leadership, mastery of practical skills required for effective school administration, and competence in research methods necessary for understanding and assessing learning organizations.

The program coordinator has made an effort to ensure that every cohort has two or three spots held for those interested in higher education and non-profit organizations. Candidates commented that the inclusion of these individuals brings a diverse perspective to the program.

During their time in the PASC, candidates demonstrate proficiency with the new Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential through successful completion of coursework assignments, fieldwork experiences, and course-related practica. Candidates assemble evidence of proficiency for each standard in an electronic portfolio. These portfolios are assessed during each quarter of the program. Program completers commented that the portfolios were excellent examples of their competencies and could be a great resource to share at employment interviews. Program coordinators stated that having a copy of a candidate's electronic portfolio made it very easy to respond whenever they were asked for an employment recommendation for a candidate or program completer.

Employers feel the program fully prepares the candidates for what can be expected in school administration today. A comment by the program coordinator, and validated by several employers, is that in the past few years more school administrators have been calling the university asking to enroll someone handpicked from their site so that they can develop new leaders for their districts.

*Curriculum*
The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) program, as part of the Education Leadership and Administration Program (ELAP), provides credential candidates with an integrated and cohesive set of learning experiences designed to prepare the competent beginning administrator. The Educational Leadership and Administration Program is divided into four thematically-aligned academic quarters to provide integrated learning experiences for candidates: Organizational Leadership, Instructional Leadership, Managerial Leadership, and Community Leadership.

The curriculum is structured to provide a broad theoretical overview of organizations and decision-making in schools during the first quarter of the program. Coursework then follows a logical sequence that builds upon candidates' knowledge and skills. For example, candidates study supervision and evaluation of curriculum, personnel, and school sites during the second quarter. They study school law, finance, and educational research methods during the third quarter, and they conclude the program by examining cross-cultural education, current topics, and research applications. Candidates' electronic portfolios are assessed at the end of each quarter and at the end of the entire program. They must receive a grade of 'B' or better on their portfolios to be recommended for the Preliminary Administrative Services credential.

Program faculty use both classroom and web-based curriculum delivery. Each week during the quarter, students receive an electronic "Weekly Learning Session" from their instructor(s) via Blackboard. These sessions introduce the concepts discussed that week; course readings, assignments, and a calendar of upcoming events. Classroom sessions (half-day Friday and all day Saturday) provide opportunity for intensive group and individual work on course topics. Candidates are involved in group projects, assessments, lectures, and readings. Guest speakers with expertise in one or more administrative areas are often invited to participate in these weekend learning experiences. Both candidates and program completers commented on the high quality of instructors, most of whom are successful school and district administrators. The ability of these instructors to bring a real-life perspective to their courses helps the candidates fully understand the complexities of school administration.

*Field Experience*
Fieldwork in the Education Leadership and Administration Program provides opportunities for candidates to develop increasing competence as administrators by providing opportunities to apply theoretical concepts in practical settings. In the process they also engage in evaluating their experiences and synthesizing much of the knowledge and understanding of educational administration.

Fieldwork is integrated into the first three quarters of the program, and field experiences are aligned with the content of courses taught each quarter. The first quarter of fieldwork introduces candidates to various school sites with differing grade-level configurations (e.g., K-6, 6-8, 7-8, 9-12). Candidates progress through a logical sequence of field-based learning experiences, each designed to prepare them for more challenging activities as they progress through the PASC program.

The schedule of the Fast Track cohort program, (courses Friday evening and all day Saturday), enables candidates from throughout the state to take advantage of this unique program. The program coordinator has always been able to find qualified administrative fieldwork supervisors, whether in Northern California or the San Diego area.

Field experiences are designed to bring theory to practice and address the major duties and responsibilities authorized by the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential in a variety of authentic settings. After completing each quarter of fieldwork, candidates complete an assessment of their university and site supervisors. Candidates also complete a self-assessment report in which they describe how they linked classroom learning with fieldwork experiences.

The Administrative Services Fieldwork experience:
- Relates candidates' field experience duties with job performance requirements of administrators;
- Links field experiences with coursework that candidates are taking concurrently;
- Requires candidates to work with their site supervisor so they have adequate time to perform their fieldwork duties during the regular school day;
- Selects settings in which candidates are able to perform a wide range of administrative responsibilities;
- Matches candidates with site supervisors who will provide appropriate direction in the quality of their field experience assignments;
- Includes opportunities for candidates to explore long-term educational policy issues in their school or district;
- Organizes authentic and significant field experiences at one or more sites with diverse school populations;
- Incorporates a variety of school levels and school settings in which candidates perform their fieldwork.

### *Assessment of Candidate Competence*
Candidates in the ELAP are assessed continuously throughout the program. Assessment begins during the initial quarter of enrollment and continues until candidates are recommended by the program coordinator for the Preliminary Administrative Services credential. Candidates are challenged to complete a variety of assignments (papers/case studies/financial analyses/examinations) and projects (papers/case studies, data analyses, and presentations) culminating with reflection papers and creation of an electronic portfolio that is submitted quarterly.

In addition to assessments in each course, the ELAP faculty use embedded signature assessments (ESAs) to evaluate candidate progress and needed curricular revisions. These signature assessments, based on CTC and Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC) standards, take place in specific courses each quarter throughout the program, and candidates must achieve a passing score to continue in the program. The four ESAs used to assess candidate progress are: (1) quarterly fieldwork assessments; (2) quarterly E-portfolio assessments; (3) culminating action research paper/project; and (4) culminating exit examination. Instructor-generated rubrics are used to assess students' knowledge and ability to apply, synthesize, and evaluate course assignments in light of problems of authentic practice.

Information about every assessment conducted as part of the PASC is provided to candidates at the beginning of the program (i.e., program and fieldwork handbooks) and at the beginning of each academic quarter (i.e., course syllabi, expectations, and assessment rubrics). Candidates are

well informed of formative and summative assessments, and program faculty explain (in detail) each assessment at the beginning of each quarter.

***Findings on standards:***

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