**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at
University of La Verne**

April 2011

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

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

	Initial	**Advanced**
1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	**Met**	**Met**
2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	**Met**	**Met**
3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	**Met**	**Met**
4) Diversity	**Met**	**Met**
5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	**Met**	**Met**
6) Unit Governance and Resources	**Met**	**Met**
CTC Common Standard 1.1 Credential Recommendation Process	**Met**	
CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	**Met**	

Program Standards

Programs	Total Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	**Met with Concerns**	**Not Met**
Multiple Subject, with Internship, w/BCLAD, Spanish	19	19		
Single Subject, with Internship	19	19		
Education Specialist: MM Level I	17	17		
Education Specialist: MM Level II	19	19		
Reading Certificate and Reading Language Arts Specialist	20	20		
Preliminary Administrative Services	15	14	1	
Pupil Personnel: School Counseling	32	31	1	
Pupil Personnel: School Psychology	27	27		

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

Institution: **University of La Verne**

Dates of Visit: **April 9-April 13, 2011**

Accreditation Team
Recommendation: **Accreditation**

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

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

Program Standards
For all twenty credential programs, all program standards are met with the exception of Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence in the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program which is **Met with Concern** and Standard 15 in Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling which is **Met with Concern**.

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

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

Initial/Teaching Credentials	**Advanced/Service Credentials**
Multiple Subject	Administrative Services
Multiple Subject	Preliminary including Internship
Multiple Subject BCLAD (Spanish)	
Single Subject	Reading Certificate
Single Subject	Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Initial/Teaching Credentials   **Advanced/Service Credentials**
  Single Subject

Education Specialist Credentials   Education Specialist Credentials
<u>Preliminary Level I</u>   <u>Professional Level II</u>
 Mild/Moderate Disabilities   Mild/Moderate Disabilities

                                   Pupil Personnel Services
                                     School Counseling including Internship
                                   School Psychology including Internship

Staff recommends that:

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

- University of La Verne be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

- University of La Verne 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: **Hal Knight**
                                        East Tennessee State University

California Co-Chair: **Jo Birdsell**
                                        National University

NCATE/Common   **Dan Elliott**
Standards Cluster: Azusa Pacific University

                                        Mike Kotar
                                        Chico State University

                                        Annie Bauer
                                        University of Cincinnati

                                        James O'Donnell
                                        New Mexico State University

                                        Stephanie Burchell
                                        Central Kitsap School District, Washington

                                        Angela Owusu-Ansah
                                        Samford University

Programs Cluster: **Anne Weisenberg**
                                        CSU Stanislaus

                                        Judy Mantle
                                        University of San Diego

                                        Andrea Liston
                                        Point Loma Nazarene

                                        Pauline Mercado
                                        California State University Los Angeles

Staff to the Accreditation Team: **Cheryl Hickey**, Administrator
                                        Geri Mohler, Consultant
                                        Nick Pearce, PSD Staff Services Analyst

Documents Reviewed

Institutional Self Study	Field Experience Notebooks
Course Syllabi and Guides	Advisement Documents
Candidate Files	Faculty Vitae
Program Handbooks	College Annual Reports
Survey Data	College Budget Plan
Candidate Performance Data	ULV Website
Biennial Reports and CTC Feedback	Accreditation Website
Program Assessment Documentation	Program Evaluations
Program Assessment Preliminary Findings	Meeting Agendas and Minutes
Program Assessment Summaries	University Catalog

Interviews Conducted

	NCATE Cluster	Program Sampling Cluster	TOTAL
Candidates	30	139	**169**
Completers	5	79	**84**
Employers	5	8	**13**
Institutional Administration	5	11	**16**
Program Coordinators	8	16	**24**
Faculty/Adjunct	34	39	**73**
TPA Coordinator		5	**5**
Field Supervisors - Program	8	1	**9**
Field Supervisors - District	42	18	**60**
Credential Analysts and Staff		4	**4**
Advisory Board Members		20	**20**
Other		1	**1**
Totals			**478**

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 (2010-2011)	Agency Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject/Single Subject	188	218	CTC
Multiple Subject, BCLAD (Spanish)	0	11	CTC
Education Specialist Credential Level I, Mild/Moderate Disabilities	38	88	CTC
Education Specialist Credential Level II: Mild/Moderate Disabilities	12	1	CTC
Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist	47	46	CTC
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	40	342	CTC
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology	28	41	CTC
Preliminary Administrative Services	22	41	CTC

The Visit

The University of La Verne site visit was held on the campus in La Verne, California from April 9-13, 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 four 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 10, 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 completed on Tuesday morning. The exit report was conducted at 11:00 a.m. on Wednesday, April 13, 2011.

Introduction
The University of La Verne was founded as Lordsburg College in 1891 by members of the Church of the Brethren. In 1917, it was renamed La Verne College reflecting the name of the emerging community. During the college's early years it served primarily as an institution for the preparation of teachers. La Verne's Board of Trustees became independent of church control in the 1950s although a formal relationship remained through the Board. In 1955, La Verne was accredited by the Western College Association (now Western Association of Schools and Colleges). The college began offering graduate degrees in the mid-1960s.

ULV's commitment to off-campus education began in 1969. The College of Law opened in 1970. The college was reorganized in 1977 as the University of La Verne and, in 1979, awarded its first doctorate. In 1981, ULV founded its first branch campus and continued the trend to provide programs throughout the region.

Currently the University of La Verne is a Carnegie Doctoral/Research University located in La Verne, California. ULV enrolls over 8,500 students in four colleges: the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), the College of Business and Public Management (CBPM), the College of Education and Organizational Leadership (CEOL), and the College of Law (COL). The branch campuses are administered through the Regional Campus Administration. The University is a Hispanic and minority serving institution as defined by the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) as colleges, universities, or systems/districts where total Hispanic enrollment constitutes a minimum of 25% of the total enrollment.

The partnership with the State of California requires a joint visit in which the NCATE team, including two members familiar with California common standards, addresses the NCATE standards and a state team reviews program standards for those programs leading to a credential. The teams work collaboratively and the chairs of the two teams conduct the pre-visit and the visit with assistance from the state's personnel. There were no deviations from the state protocol.

University of La Verne offers programs in teaching and other educational professional candidates can complete their credential or degrees at branch campuses throughout the state including locations in Sacramento, Ventura, San Bernardino, Los Angeles, Orange, San Luis Obispo, and Kern counties. The team interviewed candidates, graduates, and faculty at the Bakersfield, Ventura, and San Luis Obispo campuses and reviewed virtual tours of those facilities that included office and classroom space and technology resources.

There were no unusual circumstances during the visit.

Conceptual Framework
The unit began developing its conceptual framework in Fall 2005 when representatives from each of the unit's programs formed a Conceptual Framework Committee (CFC) charged with identifying a set of unit values. Through an iterative process wherein faculty regularly sought feedback from program faculty, the CFC developed a mind map in May 2006 through which the four guiding principles emerged: caring, excellence, leadership and diversity. These principles were endorsed by the faculty at that time and a process for engaging stakeholders including adjunct faculty, program advisory boards, and regional educators was undertaken. In May 2007

the results of these meetings was shared with faculty and some revisions were made. The unit faculty confirmed these guiding principles in March 2009.

As noted in the college catalog, brochures, and banners that adorn the campus center, the University of La Verne's vision and mission is centered around the creation of "caring, diverse learning opportunities that foster intellectual, ethical, and social responsibility in order to imagine, explore, and design the future."   The mission of the College of Education and Organizational Leadership (CEOL) is to "prepare present and future professional educators and change agents who will be capable of improving educational opportunities and organizational outcomes at all levels in California, the Nation, and the World." This commitment was noted in numerous interviews with current candidates and faculty, both full-time and part-time, and in interviews with graduates, advisory board members, supervisors, and employers. According to the IR, "the college seeks to produce graduates who are technically knowledgeable and highly competent, committed to ethical standards, capable of conducting critical inquiry and skillful in building interpersonal and group relationships leading to personal growth and organizational effectiveness."

The college has adopted four guiding principles that inform its work in program design, curriculum development, and with its constituencies, e.g., the students and communities in which it works.   The principles are: leadership, excellence, caring, diversity and social justice. "Leadership" is anchored in classical thought as well as contemporary concepts of transformational leadership developed by Burns and others. The CEOL subscribes to the belief that "A leader must be a person who takes care of people and emphasizes in his professional activity the social psychology of an organization" (Takala, 1998). "Excellence" for the unit is grounded in the work of Dewey and expanded by Darling-Hammond. It emerges from a constructivist approach that focuses on framing curriculum in such a way as to connect background knowledge and experience. "Caring" is closely aligned with Noddings' writing and is manifested in the concept that one cannot justify oneself in a career by claiming to care. Rather, caring must be demonstrated in the work that one does. "Diversity and social justice" is a major component that shapes the unit's curriculum and is based on the work of Giroux and Friere with a particular focus on the Praxis (Praxis = Reflection + Action).

Initial Teacher Preparation
The University of LaVerne offers three programs at the initial level. These include Teacher Education through which graduates earn California credentials for Multiple (elementary) or Single (secondary) Subject teaching, Education Specialist Level I Mild/Moderate (special education credential), and the Bachelor of Science degree in Child Development. Each program leading to a credential is approved by the state through California Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness.

The unit assessment system employs a series of state required tests and assessments, key assessments included within program courses, and follow-up studies. The California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET) is used to assess content knowledge of initial level teacher candidates. For 2008 – 2009, pass rates for Multiple Subject and Education Specialist candidates were 100 percent for Exam I, 96 percent for Exam II, and 100 percent for Exam III. Pass rates

for Single Subject candidates across subject areas were 92 - 100 percent (data from 2006 – 2009).

Conditions for meeting California subject matter competence requirements should be noted. (1) All candidates for the Multiple Subject credential must pass the CSET. (2) Single Subject and Education Specialist candidates can meet subject matter competence requirements by passing the CSET in the subject they will teach or by completing a state approved subject matter preparation program offered as part of a bachelor's degree program.

Content knowledge for Teacher Education candidates is also assessed through responses to the California Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) Task 1. The aggregated average score is 3.12 out of 4 points for 2007-2009. The TPA is a four-task assessment used at specified points throughout the program. Tasks include subject specific knowledge (Task 1), designing instruction and adapting it to learners with different needs (Task 2), assessment of student learning (Task 3), and a culminating teaching event planned for the range of learners within a classroom with video recording of the teaching event and analysis (Task 4). The TPA is designed to assess candidates on the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), which are 13 standards for Multiple and Single Subject candidates similar to INTASC standards. Trained scorers not employed by the unit conduct rubric scoring.

Content knowledge of candidates for the Education Specialist Level I program is assessed through a course embedded case study, Understanding Academic and Behavior Needs of Learners. The 2009 average score was 3.9 out of four for this assessment added in 2009. Most key assessments for all programs are scored using four-point rubrics. The Bachelor of Science in Child Development assesses content knowledge of candidates through the Developmental Knowledge Exam and Fieldwork Evaluation. For 2007-2009 the average percent correct was 80%.

Admission requirements are also used to assess candidates' content knowledge. The unit analyzes candidates' last 60-unit undergraduate grade point average (GPA) for admission. GPA is expected to be 2.75 or above. The average GPA of Teacher Education candidates was 3.18. Candidates also respond to a writing assessment. The average admission writing score was 2.94. Candidates admitted to the Education Specialist I program had an average GPA of 3.29 and average writing score of 2.85. For candidates entering the BS Child Development program the minimum GPA is 2.5. Average GPA was 3.09; average writing score was 2.85. Data are for 2007-2009.

For Teacher Education candidates TPA Tasks 2, 3, and 4 are key assessments for pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and student learning. These tasks are associated with three program courses. For 2007-2010 initial pass rates and averages scores were: Task 2 – 87%, average score 3.23; Task 3 – 86%, average score 3.38; and Task 4 – 89%, average score 3.44. Candidates are allowed to repeat TPA tasks and the unit's eventual overall pass rate for the period was 89%. Education Specialist I candidates also complete three key assessments. For 2009 – 2010, average scores ranged from 3.40 to 3.85 out of four points. Average scores for Bachelor of Science Child Development candidates ranged from 3.22 to 3.61 on the four key assessments to which they respond.

Follow-up data is collected for Teacher Education and Education Specialist I programs through the Comprehensive Evaluation of Teacher Preparation surveys of initial credential program graduates and employers about graduates' preparation conducted by the California Center for Teacher Quality. Data are from surveys administered near the end of the first year of teaching. The most recent data from 2007-2009 show that high percentages, generally over 80%, of graduates and employers indicate that ULV graduates were either well or adequately prepared in content knowledge, issues of diversity, assessment of student learning, and other aspects of teaching. ULV compares very favorably with similar institutions.

During interviews candidates indicated that they felt comfortable and confident in their ability to plan, assess and adjust instruction to meet the needs of all students. Follow up surveys and discussions with master teachers and P-12 administration indicate a high level of satisfaction with ULV candidates and graduates. Graduates confirmed that they feel prepared and confident in teaching and assessing their students to determine student learning and making adjustments to instruction.

Advanced Teacher Preparation
Advanced programs for teachers include the Professional Education Specialist Level II program in Mild/Moderate (the Master of Science degree can be earned with this credential) and the Master of Education (M.Ed.) Special Emphasis for Multiple and Single Subject credentialed teachers. Candidates in advanced programs for teachers must hold basic (initial) teaching credentials. For the Education Specialist program, content knowledge is assessed through the Current Issues, Policies and Practices research project embedded in SPED 504. The average score, based on course grades for 2008-2010, was 3.99. For the M.Ed. Special Emphasis, content knowledge is assessed through the combined TPA scores. The average for 2007-2009 was 3.39. Admission requirements also indicate candidates' content knowledge. Candidates must have and maintain GPAs of 3.0 during these programs. For the M.Ed. Special Emphasis, admission GPAs averaged 3.25. For Education Specialist II candidates, GPAs averaged 3.29. Writing assessment scores were 3.19 for M.Ed. Special Emphasis and 2.87 for Education Specialist candidates for 2007-2009.

The unit prepares a Biennial Report for each program that contains assessment results. For each program a series of course embedded key assessments has been designed. Education Specialist Level II candidates are assessed on key assessment projects such as the Theory and Practice Behavior Change project, a case study, inclusive instruction project, assessment report on case study, and a technology support project. Average scores ranged from 3.43 to 3.80 for 2009-2010. Teachers in the M.Ed. Special Emphasis program are also assessed through projects in courses including a literature review, a reflection on classroom behaviors, and the graduate seminar project. Average scores for these projects ranged from 3.22 to 3.63. Scores are for 2008-2010. Advanced teacher candidates in the M.Ed. Special Emphasis demonstrate a thorough understanding of assessment of student learning and ability to make data based decisions through a test review project. Average score was 3.65 for 2008-2010.

Interviews with candidates at advanced level indicated that they felt comfortable and confident in their ability to assess students and design and adjust instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Other School Professionals

The unit offers six programs for other school professionals that include the Preliminary Administrative Services Program, M.Ed. in Reading and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Program, Master of Science in Educational Counseling, Master of Science in School Psychology, and the Master of Science in Child Development. Each has assessments for unit themes that have been cross-referenced to NCATE Standard 1 elements. Program key assessments are course embedded and generally scored on four-point rubrics. These programs also look at measures at admission that include prior GPA, writing assessment scores, interview scores, and ratings of applicant references, also on four-point scales. Many of the assessment measures data was reported on have been phased in over the last three years, however the unit has had an assessment system in place much longer. Assessment data for programs for other school professionals is captured in Biennial Reports.

The Preliminary Administrative Services Program reported admission ratings that ranged from 3.17 to 3.95. The program assesses candidates using five key assessments including the foundations of leadership examination, a school program plan and budget project, the student performance improvement plan, the Windows on Diversity research paper, and technology based assignments. Average scores ranged from 3.51 to 3.90 for 2008-2010. The program has set a passing score of 3 out of 4 points.

Admission data for the M.Ed. in Reading and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program ratings varied from 3.25 to 3.71. Course-based key assessments include the reading specialist competency exam, a lesson plan and an assessment lesson, the diversity in reading reflection paper, and a persuasive proposal presentation. Average scores ranged from 3.44 to 3.86 for 2008-2010.

Candidates in the Master of Science in Educational Counseling are assessed through three key assessments that include Evidence of Meeting Learning Outcomes (EMLO) and fieldwork evaluations, an audit project, a diversity project, and a technology-based presentation. Scores averaged from 3.70 to 4.00. Evidence of Meeting Learning Outcomes (EMLOs) are program-defined sources of data for each theme assessed. Program admission data included an average GPA of 3.06 and average writing score of 3.32.

The Master of Science in School Psychology candidates are assessed through four course-based key assessments. They are the national PRAXIS exam, the student portfolio, the multicultural learning outcomes document, and the technological data presentations. Average scores were from 3.18 to 3.72. The School Psychology Program also collects candidate data at admission. Admission data averages ranged from 3.23 to 3.90.

Candidates for the Master of Science in Child Development degree are assessed through course-based key assessments that include a research review, a final exam in EDUC 550, a lesson plan assignment, an assignment to create an assessment, a curriculum presentation, and a neurological based behavior reflection paper. For 2008-2010 average scores on these assessments ranged from 3.07 to 3.72. The final exam in EDUC 550 had an average during the period of 92.5%. Admission data averages 3.39 to 3.56.

Interviews of candidates, graduates and employers indicated that graduates are well prepared with the knowledge and skills needed to be successful in the roles of other school professionals. Employers indicated that they have choices in this region and feel that ULV graduates are able to be effective, caring and responsible on the job. Data from assessments and interviews with candidates confirm that graduates positively impact student learning. Employers verified that program graduates are very well prepared for their positions as other school professionals.

Professional Dispositions
The unit has adopted unit-wide professional dispositions. A review of the data and interviews with faculty and candidates confirmed that the dispositions are aligned with the conceptual framework and assessed. Professional dispositions defined by the unit are clearly addressed in instruction in all programs. Faculty and students reported on attending to developing dispositions. Further evidence was found in student portfolios, student reflections, clinical evaluations, and course assignments. The unit monitors candidates' professional dispositions through all courses and transition points, primarily through a course-end survey completed on every candidate by faculty and supervisors called the Candidate Disposition Form. A system of review and assistance with dispositional problems through program coordinator, department chair and dean is in place. Candidates who do not develop needed professional dispositions are asked to leave the program.

Follow-up information on candidate and graduate dispositions is gathered through relationships faculty have with area educators and practitioners. Master teachers and P-12 administrators indicated that they believe candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions required to be effective teachers. They are impressed with candidates' professionalism and content knowledge.

Recommendation for Standard 1
    Initial Teacher Preparation   **MET**
    Advanced Preparation   **MET**

State Team Decision: MET

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
The College of Education and Organizational Leadership has an assessment system for collecting, analyzing, and disseminating unit data. The unit ensures that the information generated by the system on initial and advanced candidate proficiencies is aligned with state and professional standards as well as its conceptual framework's outcomes and thematic principles. The five core key assessments required of each initial and advanced program measures candidate proficiencies derived from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), the national standards, and reflect the unit conceptual framework outcomes. In addition, multiple key assessments are used by the unit at the initial and advanced program levels to monitor and make decisions about candidate performance at transition points. Three years of aggregated data clearly demonstrated candidate proficiencies with respect to rubric scores which were aligned with state standards, dispositions performance criteria, and conceptual framework outcomes. The unit uses multiple assessments both internal and external, e.g., assessments of recent graduates, end-of-program self-assessment surveys, and annual "Quality of Pedagogical Preparation Programs" state standardized surveys.

Apart from outcomes and performance criteria specified for candidates, the unit identified five domains that define effective unit operations to ensure continuous improvement. The domains include teaching quality, student satisfaction (program quality), candidate preparedness for diverse environments, candidate enrollment, and faculty research/scholarship. The unit operations' benchmarks, reviewers, frequency of review and expected outcomes are outlined. Interviews with the University Assessment Vice President and faculty confirmed that unit operations data were collected and analyzed regularly. Assessments and evaluation measures used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit include university-wide climate surveys and accreditation evaluations, faculty and course evaluations for tenure and instructional purposes, and a unit level compliance and integrity assessment.

The unit assessment system is evaluated on several levels by independent groups. Clarification on the role of each of the independent groups was requested by the offsite team. The onsite team determined four major evaluative levels through interviews with members of the office of Assessment and Accreditation, members of the program advisory councils, and meeting minutes of the Assessment Committee. At one level the assessment system is evaluated through an ongoing collaboration on data type choice and analysis between the Director of Assessment and Accreditation, the Vice President of University Assessment and other members of the office of University Assessment. The system also undergoes a second level of evaluation through the collaboration of assessment directors, (i.e., on a regular basis assessment directors of the various schools of the university meet as peers to share and modify assessment tools and processes). Thirdly, members of the professional community, (e.g., teachers, principals, and program advisory councils) meet to assess the appropriateness of assessment instruments. In addition, the Assessment Committee consisting of program chairs, faculty and coordinators evaluate the effectiveness and integrity matters of the assessment system at the unit-wide level.

The methods used to ensure accuracy, consistency, and freedom from bias in the unit's assessment procedures include inter-rater reliability, data triangulation, and collaborative evaluations. Interviews with faculty and alumni confirmed that the unit takes effective steps to ensure that assessments are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias. For example, new faculty and adjuncts are thoroughly indoctrinated on expected norms. Other steps consist of: the inclusion of external evaluators, a well aligned system of five key assessments and standards per program; rubrics and scoring guides, clear communication of expectations, alignment with state and professional standards, the thematic principles of their conceptual framework, and a common scale for scoring key assessments. Though a four point scale is consistently used, behavioral expectations for each indicator are not consistently present. In addition, these field experiences are not aligned with the four tenets of the conceptual framework.

The unit maintains a well developed yet "evolving" assessment system. Data from the key assessments are accessible for all stakeholders who need to collect, summarize, analyze, and use data for decision-making. Data entry is accomplished via the university-wide data system Banner by Sunguard for course assignments, course grades, program selection and all demographic data. Task Stream is used for management of key assessment data and distribution of appropriate candidate surveys. Candidate data are gathered at the end of each term for analysis, summarization and presentation. According to faculty, the output reports are then shared and

discussed at each of the assessment committee, program focus group, program advisory groups, and program meetings.

The summary reports are typically posted to shared drives for access by all authorized faculty and staff. At orientation and for recruiting purposes, relevant summaries are shared with candidates. Candidate assessment data are regularly and systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed in state biennial reports focused on improving candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. State Biennial Reports for all program areas are now available on the college website.

The unit disaggregates candidate assessment data for candidates by campus location, demographics, courses, and instructors, among other variables. Sample summaries of such data by location and year are provided. According to part-time and full-time faculty, comparative analysis of such data has led to program decisions. One such decision has been the requisite for adjuncts of the various campuses to observe full time instructors teaching for at least a semester. In the catalog, complaint and grievance policies are stated. Records of formal initial and advanced candidate complaints and resolutions are maintained and archived electronically in the dean's office.

Multiple data sources are evaluated for the efficacy of courses, programs, and clinical experiences. Data collected are both qualitative and quantitative and used for making changes at the unit level. A printout of "Course Evaluation Analysis" provides evidence that the University Assessment Office conducts an annual content analysis on candidate course evaluations for the College of Education and Organizational Leadership. Faculty meet collaboratively to assess qualitative assessments, including candidate field experiences, to make unit decisions. Structures are in place to ensure that data are used to initiate changes. Through interviews, the Assessment Committee and the various program Advisory Committee members each confirmed their role in data-driven decisions or changes in the unit. Two major unit changes in 2010 include an increase in the integration and purchase of novel technology and the establishment of an extended required writing course for candidates who need remediation. The committees made the decisions based on survey data on candidates' concerns about technology content and candidates' low scores on writing admission tasks, respectively.

Recommendation for Standard 2

Initial Teacher Preparation	**MET**
Advanced Preparation	**MET**

State Team Decision: MET

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
Initial Programs:
Review of documents and interviews with faculty and unit leaders verified that over 150 school districts have signed contractual agreements through which the districts and school sites agree to the unit's placement requirements. School districts agree to assist in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the supervised teaching experience and intern program. Candidates request a

partner district or school from an approved list. The unit sends a written request to the district which determines if the request can be met and notifies the unit fieldwork coordinator for assignment approval. Assignments and requirements are then confirmed in writing with the district, school principal, and on-site supervisor.

Review of documents and interviews with faculty and unit leaders verified that school-based faculty engage in ongoing communication with programs on the design of field experiences has resulted in changes in the order of courses, increased emphasis on Individualized Education Plans, and closer alignment with school curricula. Schools and the unit share expertise whenever fieldwork supervisors make weekly observations of candidates. The candidate and the school-site supervisor debrief daily. The university supervisor, on-site supervisor, and candidate meet at the end of each field experience to explore the candidate's professional development and allow the candidate the opportunity to reflect. Candidates also engage in ongoing journaling with faculty members and supervisors to reflect on their development.

Review of documents and interviews with faculty and unit leaders verified that initial candidates are provided extensive developmental and sequential opportunities in the schools. Evaluations of field and clinical experiences are grounded in the California Teaching Standards, Teacher Performance Expectations, and the unit dispositions, but are not clearly aligned to the conceptual framework. Documents provided as "rubrics" do not consistently include behavioral descriptions of the anticipated behaviors at each level of performance. Rather, descriptions are provided for the four levels across indicators.

The institutional report, documents reviewed, and faculty interviewed revealed that the use of technology is assumed to be addressed in the lesson plans. Interviews revealed that an assessment for the infusion of technology throughout practice has not yet been developed. In addition, though dispositions are assessed in the field, field evaluations are not aligned with the conceptual framework.

Review of documents and interviews with faculty and unit leaders and candidates verified that field experiences allow candidates to act both as teachers and learners. Criteria for school faculty are clear, and qualifications are verified by school administrators. Quality of school-based faculty is assured through direct observation of suggested teachers, training, and district screening for effectiveness. Clinical faculty provide ongoing support grounded in state standards and unit dispositions. These clinical faculty are trained through instruction on requirements and the handbook, and shadow more experienced supervisors.

Admission to student teaching is clear and requires mastery of content and pedagogical knowledge. Through the Teaching Performance Assessment, candidates perform an analysis of student work and differentiate instruction. In interviews, candidates were able to describe formal and informal assessment strategies and tools, and the differentiation of instruction developed through these assessments.

Advanced programs:
Review of documents and interviews with faculty and unit leaders verified that candidates in advanced programs have structured field experiences supported by handbooks, school-based

supervisors, and university supervisors. Candidates specifically engage in activities related to the roles for which they are preparing; one evidence of school and district input into field experience design included revision of school counseling and educational administration tasks to better align with requirements in the schools. All field experiences for advanced programs are conducted in settings with at least 25% of students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups as well as students with exceptionalities.

Interviews with faculty described the degree to which patterns in data about advanced candidate performance in field experiences, some of which are qualitative, are reviewed by each program faculty for program improvement decisions. School and campus faculty share information through evaluation forms, log documents, and personal interaction. A review of program documents suggests that evaluations of project assessments appear to be based on the successful completion of specific tasks and activities rather than the evidence generated from these tasks and activities as described in the standards or conceptual framework. Entry and exit criteria are clearly monitored and grounded in the candidates' abilities to demonstrate the desired outcomes. Though the use of technology appears to occur throughout the program and involves efforts such as virtual meetings, direct evaluation of the use of technology is not apparent. Evaluations of field sites and supervisors are qualitative in nature and are reviewed by rereading rather than generating aggregated data.

Recommendation for Standard 3

Initial Teacher Preparation	**MET**
Advanced Preparation	**MET**

State Team Decision: MET

Area for Improvement: Candidates' performance on the infusion of technology throughout teaching and practice is not systematically assessed. The level of specificity in assessments rubrics and scoring used in field and clinical experiences is inconsistent and not clearly aligned with the conceptual framework.

Rationale: Evaluations of candidates' infusion of technology throughout teaching and practice occurs through informal observation and lesson plans. Members of the Assessment Committee indicated that assessment of candidate implementation and infusion of technology is not formally assessed. The conceptual framework was designed at the beginning of the NCATE accreditation process and linkages with current field and clinical evaluations are not apparent. Rubrics did not consistently include behavioral descriptions of performance at each level and were not aligned with the conceptual framework.

Standard 4: Diversity
Interviews with faculty, candidates and leaders verified how deeply the unit is committed to diversity. Diversity is reflected in the mission and vision statements. The unit has clearly identified candidate proficiencies related to diversity, listed on page 17 of the Student Teaching Handbook. The unit's College of Education and Organizational Leadership (CEOL) has adopted various policies demonstrating their commitment to diversity including a Strategic Plan for

Diversity that put this commitment into practice. Policies are based on the belief that diversity should be taught as a set of conscious practices that are outlined on page 65 of the IR. Faculty members are instrumental in influencing and bringing forth the process for the creation of the strategic plan.

The faculty has developed diversity-related projects that have included training for faculty, staff, and students. The College Diversity Committee (CDC) collaborates with other groups on campus and continues to support efforts to design, implement, and promote the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. The resulting program has both action and reflective components. Interviews with the CDC reflect the active role that the unit takes in creating a diverse experience for candidates.

Diversity issues are a curricular strand that run through all programs and courses. Candidates are introduced to the dispositions and philosophical foundations at the admissions interview and in initial courses. Course syllabi and supporting program documents demonstrated how candidates are expected to develop interactive skills that will enable them to work with all students and to implement skills in meaningful and intentional ways. Candidates engage in fieldwork and clinical experiences in diverse settings as they learn to contextualize teaching by drawing upon actual experience with diverse students.

A review of syllabi support that coursework focuses on understanding adaptations, learning differences, and diversity begins with the initial courses in the Liberal Studies Program and the Teacher Education Program. All initial and advanced programs have diversity themes woven into required coursework. Details of coursework requirements may be viewed on pages 68-71 of the IR. Review of syllabi and interviews confirm that candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to develop and teach lessons that incorporate diversity, connect instruction and services to students' experiences and cultures, demonstrate sensitivity to differences, allow for multiple perspectives and create environments that value diversity throughout their coursework.

Program faculty explained how each program has developed key assignments and assessments that allow for program review at different levels to examine the effectiveness of diversity-related experiences for candidates, and through which candidates demonstrate awareness and skill in working with a wide array of children, families, and communities. A listing of key assignments and assessment may be viewed on pages 72-75 of the IR. Review of syllabi and conversations with candidates during interviews confirm the variety and commitment to diversity throughout coursework.

Candidates interviewed reported that candidates have multiple opportunities to interact with higher education faculty and school-based faculty from diverse groups in formal and informal ways. Faculties in all programs have a variety of backgrounds and areas of expertise which provide for attention to diversity issues in all programs in meaningful ways. Interviews with candidates, faculty (both unit and school based), and unit leaders confirm that candidates have interactions with school, unit and other faculty. Classes provide opportunities for interactions with unit faculty. Candidates report feeling a personal and professional relationship with unit faculty. Candidates interact with school personnel during their field and clinical placements. Both candidates and supervisors report a positive interaction as supervisors observe candidates in

their clinical settings weekly. White non-Hispanic faculty members constitute about 60 percent of faculty with the remaining 40 percent representing American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, and other ethnic groups. This compares to 60-90 percent white non-Hispanic population in counties served by the university. Unit and school faculty gender breakdowns are about 70% female and 30% male, and faculty from both settings are represented by more than two racial and ethnic groups for both initial and advanced candidates on all campuses.

Faculty has knowledge and experiences to help candidates work with students from diverse groups as evidenced in their scholarly work and their service work while at the unit. Many full time unit faculty have taught, and part time faculty continue to teach, within the surrounding communities and have access to current best practices and classroom situations that candidates may encounter. Interviews with faculty confirmed that members are committed to issues of diversity and actively seek to create an atmosphere of acceptance and growth for all candidates. According to interviews with the Clinical Experience Team, cooperating teachers are screened within school districts, observed by unit supervisors, and attend training to ensure that they are demonstrating appropriate, effective and research-based strategies for diverse learners. Cooperating teachers must also hold an ELL credential. The School-Site Supervisor Verification of Credential and Experience Form is a checklist that also verifies the level of knowledge and experience school site faculty must have. Candidate files checked validated completion of these forms. Clinical supervisors report that because observations of candidates are made weekly, school-based faculty are considered "Master Teachers" in all school settings where candidates are placed.

Interviews with unit leaders and faculty members, as well as the "Diversity Committee" verified how much the CEOL attempts to recruit a diverse faculty by appealing to potential diverse candidates in their advertising and interview processes. The unit attempts to achieve a high retention rate for all faculty. New faculty are assigned to a senior faculty member and have no committee assignments. An informal mentoring protocol has also been developed. Professional Assistance Committees have been adopted for use in the process of tenure and promotion as needed. An interview with the CDC revealed the CEOL has been in the process of forming a search committee for the position of Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) to further support diversity issues at the university for several years. Interviews with the Diversity Committee substantiate that the unit is continually hiring from a diverse field of candidates.

Candidates have the opportunity to interact with other candidates from diverse groups. A majority of candidates come to the university from local communities which have a high level of ethnic and cultural diversity as well as socioeconomic diversity. The university recruits candidates heavily from the surrounding geographic area which has high ethnic representation and retains students by supplying one-on-one academic counseling and small class sizes with flexible enrollment. Both initial and advanced candidates claim in interviews that "it was worth the money" to come to and stay at the unit throughout their educational programs because of the level of support and commitment to the candidates from unit faculty. The CEOL ensures that candidates develop and practice knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity during their field experience and clinical practice. Confirmed in data tables and in interviews, candidates have their field experience and clinical practice in diverse settings, and have specific assignments and assessments that include diversity-related concepts. The lesson

plan template and the Supervised Teaching Observation Report both have areas of diversity that need to be addressed by the candidates. Candidates state that from the first course, all facets of diversity are addressed and taught, and that is continued throughout the program. The unit has been recognized nationally by Forbes Magazine for its racial diversity. Graduation rates for African American and Hispanic students are typically above the national average. A complete summary of candidate diversity may be viewed in page 81 of the IR. Data tables provided depicts the representative community demographics, showing that they are similar to the demographics of the unit.

Program documents, candidate files, and interviews with faculty and candidates verified that field experiences and clinical practice occur in settings with students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, socioeconomic and exceptional groups. Data tables provided lists the demographics of school sites that accommodate candidates from both initial and advanced candidates. Interviews with candidates, school and unit faculty, and supervisors state that all field and clinical experiences occur in diverse schools. Candidates are required, through a variety of course assignments and assessment at both initial and advanced levels, to conduct field research around multiple issues of diversity.

Candidate and faculty interviews verified that candidates receive feedback from peers to reflect on their skills when working with students from diverse groups. Candidates may choose to remain within their original cohort where they have developed a working relationship and where formal and informal feedback takes place. Candidates are also evaluated on a Supervised Teaching Observation Report form that reflects state standards for the teaching profession. Candidates stated during interviews that they receive valuable feedback from supervisors during weekly visits and observations to their clinical placements. The Supervised Teaching Observation Report also has space for comments and questions that may arise during an observation to discuss during a conversation at a later date. Candidates and Supervisors report that reflective feedback is also given during email and phone conversations as needed by candidates. Candidates must submit lesson plans daily to field and clinical supervisors for review, and this also lends itself to an opportunity for feedback.

Recommendation for Standard 4
  Initial Teacher Preparation   **MET**
  Advanced Preparation   **MET**

State Team Decision: MET

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
Reviews of faculty vitae reveal that there are 59 fulltime faculty; of these, 33 are tenure-track. Sixteen faculty have the Ed. D.; 15 the Ph. D. and 2 have master's degrees. Of the 26 non-tenure track faculty, two hold the Ph. D., 6 have the Ed. D. and 12 have master's degrees;, all have the appropriate degree and professional experience.

There are 114 adjunct instructors. All hold a credential in their area of expertise. Adjunct faculty teaching in specific programs must have at least a BA degree but an MA is preferred for teacher education plus three letters of recommendation. For Advanced Studies, adjunct faculty must have an MA degree with extensive experience in the field. In the case of adjunct faculty holding only a BA degree, interview data indicate that such adjuncts are working toward a MA degree. Through interviews with program chairs, fulltime and adjunct faculty at the regional campuses, the same expectations for qualifications are held and met.

Interviews with program chairs and field coordinators confirm that school-based faculty must be tenured and credentialed within the field. Clinical faculty must have at least five years of experience, an MA degree and credentialed in the field that they are supervising. Interviews with clinical faculty, program chair and field coordinators verify that clinical faculty have extensive experience in their profession as teachers, principals, superintendents, counselors, etc.

A review of syllabi revealed that faculty use a variety of instructional strategies and activities (e.g., cooperative learning, demonstrations, action research projects, case studies, multimedia, instructional technology venues) that assist the candidates in the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving and the development of professional dispositions. Technology is an integral part of the instruction that candidates experience. Interviews with candidates, faculty and program chairs state that candidates have exposure to and use of Blackboard and newer delivery programs such as Jing and Softchalk. On-campus classrooms are smart rooms.

According to the off campus dean, most of the classrooms are smart rooms. Interviews with off campus candidates state that access to technology is not a problem though not all classrooms are smart rooms. Some faculty interviewed indicated that at the regional campuses some technology is unavailable. However, the Assistant Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning has developed accessible You Tube modules to assist distant faculty and candidates in addressing technology issues. Candidate interviews verify that instructors use a variety of instructional strategies and technologies. The poster session, presentations, and conversations demonstrate candidates' use of portfolios, and case studies, course activities such as: peer counseling, performing diagnostics, preparing conference presentations and action research projects. Assessments are an integral part of instruction with its emphasis on reflective practice. In addition, many courses are aligned with the required four TPAs and other key assessments supporting candidates' development.

The unit employs the Task Stream system as a means to manage candidate assessment collection and analysis. Interviews with candidates reveal that faculty incorporate an array of technologies into coursework, for example, blackboard, net books and clickers. Syllabi and candidate interviews verify the integration of technology and candidates' use and familiarity of various technologies.

The unit is in a transition period with its development of new expectations for scholarship. Using Boyer's definition and description of scholarship, the unit has identified the expectations for tenure and promotion from assistant to associate as having two peer-reviewed publications; and for promotion to full professor, an additional two peer reviewed publications. However, a review of faculty vitae, faculty publications and unit publications highlighting faculty

scholarship demonstrates that faculty are engaged in a variety of scholarship such as: regional, national and international conference presentations; grant writing; journal articles; book chapters and books; as well as written instructional guides and textbooks.

A review of promotion and tenure documents, faculty vitae and interviews with program chairs reveal that faculty provide service to the department, unit and university; to professional organizations; and to the community. Unit faculty are involved in service activities at the department, unit and university levels and to the various professional organizations serving as reviewers, chairs and co-chairs of professional organization committees. Faculty provide professional development to school districts, child development hospital units and other community groups through activities such as: Family Literacy Day, Early Child Conferences, Special Education Conferences and Literacy Tutoring Activities.

Based on interviews with program chairs, unit leadership, and a review of the unit's tenure and promotion documents, a systematic process details how fulltime and adjunct faculty are assessed. Fulltime faculty submit an annual report documenting their accomplishments related to teaching, scholarship and service. Faculty review and summarize course evaluations, and meet with department and program chair to review their annual performance. In addition, faculty develop goals and objectives for the coming year addressing improvements in teaching, scholarship expectations and service. Fulltime tenure track faculty have a third year review where documentation of goals and accomplishments are submitted in a portfolio for review. Interviews with program chairs reveal that adjunct faculty are evaluated for their instructional and content expertise and also submit written summaries of their course evaluations and meet with program chairs to discuss areas of improvement related to teaching. A new peer observation process reported in the IR and verified by the Peer Observation Document has been developed and is being implemented. Interviews with fulltime faculty and adjuncts express positive comments about the process. The peer observation process, along with compilation of the yearly performance document and reviews, serves as a means to assist faculty in teaching improvements. The IR, faculty, and program chair interviews reveal that monthly meetings, four annual college-wide meetings and one annual all-faculty meeting assist faculty in addressing teaching issues and introduce faculty to new teaching strategies. Adjunct faculty are invited to attend. A review of past agendas identify various teaching activities such as: writing workshop and new technologies such as Jing and Softchalk.

Data reveal that the unit faculty teaching evaluation ratings of 3.65 on a 4-point scale are slightly above the campus norm of 3.59.

Interviews and program agenda reveal that the unit has a systematic process for professional development for its faculty. Unit programs have monthly meetings to provide professional activities to its faculty. A yearly all-faculty meeting is used to provide professional development activities. Faculty minutes describe several discussions about the annual meeting addressing an agenda for professional development around new technologies such as Jing and Softchalk. Other examples include workshops related to diversity training and Safe zone training. New unit directions are introduced at the annual meetings. For example, transformative integrative education, authentic field based training models, and social justice and culture focused education. Faculty interviews reveal faculty interest in and appreciation for such professional

development activities. In addition, the CTL also provides professional activities for new technologies used for instruction. Interested faculty, fulltime and adjuncts, can apply for an advanced certification and receive a $500 stipend. For fulltime faculty, $1,000 is available to support travel expenses to attend professional development venues. In summary, the unit supports and provides opportunities for its faculty.

Recommendation for Standard 5
  Initial Teacher Preparation **MET**
  Advanced Preparation   **MET**

State Team Decision: MET

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources
Unit documents and interviews revealed that the professional education unit is comprised of the College of Education and Organizational Leadership (CEOL) and departments in the College of Arts and Science (CAS) that provide content instruction. The Dean of CEOL is assisted by an associate dean, three department chairs, and program coordinators. All off-campus operations are administered by the Dean, Regional Campus Administration (RCA) which includes nine regional campuses, and the Centers for Educators, the department which supports the unit's off-campus programs. However, the unit head retains authority over all academic quality decisions. The unit manages its programs through the work of its Leadership Team (department heads and program coordinators), monthly departmental meetings, quarterly meetings of faculty, and a system of faculty committees and task forces.

The unit's recruiting and admissions policies are clearly and consistently described in the publications and catalogs provided both in print and online by both the institution and the CEOL. Academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading policies, and advertising appear to be accurate and current. The institution reports it provides a three-year academic calendar on-line. Undergraduate and graduate student appeals committees are reported to meet monthly to consider grading policy issues.

Documents and interviews verify that each academic program has designated advisers at both the main campus and at all off-campus sites. Candidates may meet with advisers either face-to-face or using email. In addition to program advisers, candidates have access to two credential analysts who assist with questions about credentialing and personnel in the office of field experiences.

Interviews and documents viewed demonstrated the unit is engaging faculty, P-12 practitioners, and other members of the professional community in program design, implementation, and evaluation through several mechanisms. The Teacher Education Committee, comprised of representatives from the CAS and CEOL, constitutes a unit-wide advisory group that proposes improvements to teacher education. The Grant Advisory Committee also brings CEOL and CAS faculty members together on issues related to the preparation of mathematics and science teachers.

The university is a private, non-profit institution that relies on student tuition for 98 percent of its operating budget. Interview with the Vice President for Finance revealed that the CEOL was permitted to maintain 62% for its budget. The sister college Regional Campus Administration unit, that houses CEOL programs retained approximately 51% of its budget. The VP estimated that the RCA accounted for additional support to CEOL programs of about 20%. By contrast, the College of Business only retained 38% of its revenue and the College of Arts and Sciences retained 69% of its revenue. The institution has had budget cuts of 5% in the two past years; however, the unit has been able to replace retiring senior faculty and hire several additional junior faculty. The budget adequately supports on-campus and clinical work in addition to the off-campus programs.

Workload policies, as reported in the IR and including class-size and online course delivery, allow faculty to be effectively engaged in teaching, assessment, advisement, collaborative work with P-12, and service. Generally, faculty teach six courses (18 hours) per year although they may teach additional courses for additional pay. In Fall 2010, 20% of the faculty taught more than 3 courses. The university also provides a stipend for redesigning a course for online delivery. The unit equates the supervision of 5 student teachers as one 3-credit course for which the faculty member may have a course release or additional compensation. The institution is in transition from having a primarily teaching emphasis to a focus that encourages increased scholarship.

The unit uses a mix of full-time and part-time faculty for the delivery of instruction. In Spring 2010, approximately 40 percent of the instruction was delivered by full-time faculty and 60 percent by part-time faculty. There was a substantial difference in the ratios between on-campus and off-campus. In 2008, sixty-five per cent of on-campus courses were taught by full-time faculty but only 25 per cent of off-campus courses were taught by full-time faculty. Interviews with administration and faculty revealed that in 2010-11 the ratio changed to 60% adjunct/40% fulltime consistently across locations. Part time faculty are invited to participate online in a program orientation activity. Personnel policy and letters offering employment for full time faculty require six courses (18 units) per academic year. Beyond that faculty may have assigned administrative responsibilities. Faculty have opportunity to teach additional courses for additional compensation in January and in summers.

The unit has sufficient support personnel so that programs can prepare candidates to meet standards. On-campus there are nine full-time staff providing administrative support to the departments, office of field experiences, and dean as well as two credential analysts. The off-campus Centers for Educators have 4.5 FTE administrative assistants, two assistant directors/advisers, three full-time advisers, and one credential analyst.

Documents and interviews demonstrated that faculty are provided with adequate support for professional development, including approximately $1,000 per faculty member to attend local national professional conferences. Faculty are also eligible to apply for a sabbatical once every six years; three unit faculty sabbaticals have been approved in the last two years. The unit also provides workshops, through the Center for Teaching and Learning, to support faculty professional development in the use of technology, including support for work on Blackboard,

the online instructional delivery system. Faculty also receive technical training on CDrom and a stipend of $500 upon completion of training.

Program documentation indicated adequate campus and school space to support candidates in meeting standards. The CEOL is housed in four primary building on campus: Barkley Hall, Barkley Annex, Leo Hall, and the Organizational Leadership building. All full time faculty have private offices and a choice of desktop or laptop computers.

In the last two years, the dean's office suite has been built and other space has been remodeled to provide new faculty offices and conference space. In the next two years, the institution plans to add new offices for the Department of Organizational Leadership and the liberal studies program. The institution has a master plan to replace old classroom furniture and upgrade faculty office furniture.

On-campus facilities appear to support faculty and candidate use of information technology. The Center for Teaching and Learning has newly remodeled space that accommodates technology training. Leaders interviewed reported that all classrooms on-campus are "smart" classrooms and provide appropriate technology support as do those at the RCA's regional campuses. The availability of appropriate technology at RCA sites and in the schools where candidates engage in clinical practice varies although the unit works with the RCA to provide the needed support or to move courses or placements if the technology is not acceptable.

Documents and interviews demonstrated the degree to which the unit allocates resources across programs to prepare candidates to meet standards for their fields. In order to support, develop, and implement the unit's assessment plan, the unit has added a full-time director of assessment and accreditation and a full-time coordinator of teacher performance assessment. The unit has also internally funded TaskStream, the unit's operational assessment system for the past two years until a student fee-based revenue stream becomes active. TaskStream also interfaces with the institution's student information system, Banner. Through these and other actions, the unit provides adequate information technology to support faculty and candidates and to provide reliable, speedy, and confidential connections for faculty and candidates engaged in distance learning.

Professional education faculty and candidates interviewed explained how they have access to both sufficient and current library and curricular resources and electronic information. The Library houses over 40,000 electronic books and has access to the collections of over 40 libraries in California and Nevada. Faculty and candidates may also use LeoDelivers, the library's web-based inter-library loan system. The library has over 7,000 relevant journal titles available online and more than 10,000 additional resources.

Recommendation for Standard 6
     Initial Teacher Preparation   **MET**
     Advanced Preparation   **MET**

State Team Decision: MET

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:

University of La Verne has procedures in place for each credential program where the program faculty verifies that all credential requirements have been met by each candidate. Once the verification has been completed within the program, the candidate's file is provided to the credential analyst. The credential analyst verifies the information and maintains the candidate's file throughout the program and then submits the electronic recommendation to the Commission. There are two credential analysts for on-campus candidates and two for off-campus candidates in addition to a credential specialist. Interviews with four of the analysts and candidates confirmed the process is in place and is working smoothly. At the present time candidates have paper files but plans are in place to move to a completely paperless system.

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:

Program coordinators and faculty provide information to candidates on the requirements for the credential and monitor candidate progress towards the completion of the credential requirements. Candidates are assigned a faculty supervisor at the beginning of their program who stays with them throughout their entire program. Candidates are also given program handbooks and pamphlets with pertinent information. Additional assistance is available to candidates from the credential analysts as well. If a candidate does not make progress after receiving the additional assistance, the candidate is counseled out of the program.

IV. PROGRAM REPORTS

TEACHING CREDENTIALS

University of La Verne
Program: Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and BCLAD

Program Design
The Education Department mission statement states: "The mission of the Education Department is to provide students with the knowledge, skills, and value orientation to become competent facilitators of human development. Small class size and access to professional staff characterize the education environment. Leadership is provided by motivated faculty who possess appropriate academic preparation, extensive practical experience, and excellent teaching skills."

The University of La Verne Teacher Education Program notes that it fosters prospective teachers' ability to: (1) create an environment that incorporates communication with students, (2) develop an appreciation for differences, (3) understand the basis for a healthy self-concept, and (4) develop self-awareness, all within the context of appropriate pedagogical skills. The program is approved under the California SB 2042 standards. It offers programs for Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and BCLAD Multiple Subject credentials. Multiple and Single Subject tracks have four courses in common. BCLAD candidates take all Multiple Subject courses plus one additional course. All tracks complete two student teaching courses. The sharing of courses between tracks is a strength in the program; it assists the Multiple and Single Subject candidates in understanding the full range of issues in the K-12 system.

The University of La Verne collaborates with many school districts near program sites. Programs are offered at the main site, and at Bakersfield, Ventura, San Luis Obispo, Victorville, and Newhall. These partnerships serve an important purpose for the University and the school districts involved. These schools are utilized for fieldwork placement and to provide program feedback.

Interviews with candidates, faculty, and coordinators stressed the effectiveness of the program in supporting candidates' progress through both coursework and field practice. Candidates indicate that they receive a high level of support and personal attention from faculty and that the feedback is effective in assisting them to improve their knowledge and skills. This was a common theme throughout the visit.

The sequenced design of the program is based on a rationale that has a theoretical and scholarly foundation anchored to the knowledge base of teacher education. The program is designed with two supervised teaching experiences, one five-week session and one ten-week session. This model provides a developmental sequence for growth in teaching the content standards, understanding the school in society, and refining pedagogical skills. Syllabi reflected multiple philosophy, theories, and strategies of instruction. By design, the program provides extensive opportunities for candidates to: (a) learn to teach the content of the state adopted K-12 academic content standards to all students; (b) use state-adopted instructional materials, assess student progress, and to apply these understandings in teaching K-12 students; (c) know and understand

the foundations of education and the functions of schools in society; and (d) develop pedagogical competence as designed by the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs).

All courses are offered at each of the sites and are offered each term. The same syllabi are utilized for each course at every site. Full-time faculty are required to teach at least one course each year at one of the off campus sites.

Candidates can complete the sequence in three semester terms with summer and winter sessions. Courses follow a strict sequence to support TPA completion and fieldwork opportunities. The first term includes the courses that cover diversity and the learning process. The final assessment for this term is the *Subject Specific Pedagogy* TPA task. The second term of courses prepares candidates to complete the *Designing Instruction* TPA task and take the RICA. The next term includes the five-week student teaching placement and completion of *Assessing Learning* TPA task. The final term is the ten-week student teaching placement and completion of the *Culminating Teaching Experience* TPA task.

Blackboard is utilized in each course and TaskStream is utilized for TPA submission. Using technology has been a focus and the programs are moving towards "scaffolding hybrid" courses. All faculty members are learning how to teach online courses.

The credential program is part of the College of Education led by the Dean. The Department of Education is led by a Chair and then each credential program has its own Chair. Off campus sites have their own regional directors led by a Regional Campus Administration Dean. They all collaborate with the program chairs. All three programs' faculty meet on a monthly basis to discuss program details and candidate data from surveys, writing assessments and TPAs. Currently the faculty are working on designing key assignments that will be added to the summative information they collect on candidate progress. There is an annual all-day Teacher Education retreat for all full-time and part-time faculty to discuss various aspects of the teacher education program. Every other month, the faculty of Teacher Education meet with the Liberal Studies and Arts and Sciences faculty to discuss course content. There is regular communication between the Dean, Chairs and the Provost of the University. Teacher education faculty attend all faculty assemblies.

The program effectively combines coursework with fieldwork experiences to link theory to practice. Each course has structured fieldwork that includes at least one supervised visit. A verification form is completed and signed by the site principal or teacher. During the two student-teaching experiences, candidates are observed at least once a week by the University Supervisor along with daily email communication regarding lesson plans. Courses at the other sites are ten weeks instead of 16 weeks, but use the same syllabus and cover all of the same content.

Faculty meetings have led to a redesign in the single subject reading course and more explicit standardized TPA vocabulary across all courses. RICA reviews have been reinstated based on data collected on passing rates. Data results have also led to a change from the five-week student teaching experience to occur during weeks 6-10 in the term to better align with TPA submission. Based on feedback from candidates and supervisors, two seminars have been added to the series to include more technology and classroom management.

Evaluations for fieldwork are given to all stakeholders to evaluate each other (university supervisors evaluate candidates and site supervisors, site supervisors evaluate candidates and university supervisors, and candidates evaluate both supervisors). University supervisors meet weekly with Master Teachers and site administrators to discuss candidate performance. These meetings are a means of collecting data to make program improvements for fieldwork. Candidates are able to provide input in the form of midterm and end of course evaluations. These data is used to improve courses and programs immediately, as well as for the following term. Candidates indicated that their feedback was valued and changes in the program/course were made. They believe that ULV is highly respected in the community as being an institution that produces well-prepared teachers. Area administrators confirmed this.

Course of Study

Courses are structured sequentially to support candidates with their TPAs and fieldwork experiences. The candidates are aware of the structure and feel that it is meaningful and very helpful. They feel that it is a well-planned, cohesive program that provides standards based strategies that they are able to utilize immediately in the classroom. Courses emphasize the importance of teaching to the state academic content standards. Each course is aligned and builds on prior learning. Students appreciate the fact that the faculty have all been, or still are, teachers and share their experiences when appropriate.

All courses have fieldwork components that directly relate to the content of that particular course. Candidates are both observing and teaching. Fieldwork experiences are supervised once by a university supervisor. Other experiences are verified by a principal or teacher. Candidates are given immediate feedback that relates back to their progress on the CSTPs and TPEs.

The very first course is *Diversity, Interaction, and the Learning Process.* This course starts their foundation of working with English learners and diverse populations. Each course builds on this foundation and is evident in course assignments, lesson plans, and TPAs. The first of the nine dispositions is diversity and each class provides time and resources that assist candidates in working with diverse learners.

The fieldwork component is a strength of this program. The coordinator has explicit criteria for selecting appropriate school sites for student teaching to allow candidates a wide range of fieldwork experiences. Each site must have a student population with 25% diversity to ensure candidates have experience with a variety of students. Candidates have input on where they are placed as long as it meets the criteria. Site supervisors are also selected based on criteria. University supervisors work closely with the site supervisors and administrators to train them and ensure a successful fieldwork experience for each candidate.

University supervisors are selected from applicants that have included a vita and three letters of recommendation. Most are retired educators and administrators or current faculty members. Supervisors are given a handbook of their responsibilities and are provided ongoing training. All supervisors are trained on TPAs in order to assist candidates in the process. In most cases the

same university supervisor is partnered with candidates for both the five-week and ten-week placements. University supervisors formally observe lessons at least once a week and provide immediate feedback based on candidates' progress towards CSTPs and TPEs. The university supervisor and site supervisors meet regularly to discuss candidates' progress. These meetings provide data for the advisory committee.

Candidate Competence
Candidates are assessed before, during, and after the program. Before they begin the program, candidates are given a writing assessment and need to pass it by the time they begin student teaching. Candidates are assessed weekly on their progress towards CSTPs and TPEs from both university and site supervisors. Candidates indicate that feedback is timely and effective in assisting them to improve their teaching. TPAs are placed strategically throughout the program to assess their progress towards meeting the TPEs. Candidate competence is also assessed through various assignments in each course. Data is used to inform program changes.

At the beginning of the program, handbooks are reviewed that outline the program and assessments. Candidates receive a list of Teacher Dispositions and a detailed list of what criteria they will be evaluated on during orientations and prior to fieldwork experiences. Training on TPAs is given during various courses to assist candidates in the use of TaskStream, and each TPA task. Candidates are provided rubrics in their orientation handbooks.

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

Education Specialist Mild/Moderate
Level I and Level II

Program Design
In keeping with the School of Education's mission of creating caring, diverse learning opportunities that foster intellectual, ethical, and social responsibility in order to imagine, explore, and design the future, the Special Education Program strives to prepare candidates that can tailor instruction to meet the needs of the increasingly diverse learning communities and classrooms. The Special Education program at the University of La Verne offers a Mild/Moderate Educational Specialist Level One credential for traditional candidates and intern candidates. It also offers the Level Two credential. Both levels are currently being re-designed to address the reauthorized 2010 CTC standards. With final CTC approval, the new Educational Specialist Preliminary credential will be implemented in fall 2011. The Unit anticipates implementation of the Clear Credential Standards in fall 2012 and they plan to offer the added authorization in autism. It is a goal to have this added authorization in special education approved in this next academic year. The department's long term goals include writing to the Early Childhood Specialist credential.

The Special Education Program is administrated by a program chair. The chair works in concert with the intern and fieldwork coordinator to oversee the instructional operations within the special education program and to ensure that special education competencies and requirements are met. Special education credentials are offered at the main campus and the Bakersfield regional center. Interviews revealed that an additional full time faculty member at the Bakersfield regional center, eight adjunct faculty members, and two university supervisors round out the instructional team. The department has established numerous partnerships at the initial intern credential level to include Pomona Unified School District and the Kern County Consortia. As such, they belong to and attend the Inland Empire-East Los Angeles County Intern Consortia, Region 5. At Level Two, they partner with the Los Angeles County Office of Education Special Education Local Planning Area BTSA Collaborative to support candidates in clearing their credentials.

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing and Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards guide program development, key assignments and program modifications. The program engages in a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure that coursework meets the required competencies as well as the needs of the learning communities. One year out completer surveys and employer surveys are distributed each year. These survey results are analyzed by the Center for Teacher Quality. Evidence of course evaluation results was provided to the reviewer by the Office of Institutional Research, documenting the ongoing assessment of coursework. Stakeholders, inclusive of candidates, university and field supervisors, program completers, and adjunct/full time faculty give input at annual gatherings for program improvement. Interview responses from multiple interviews provided evidence that data gathered from these stakeholders is used for program improvement. The Special Education Advisory Council members consist of program completers and candidates.

Course of Study

Level I Credential
The Level I credential is comprised of two phases. The first phase is the completion of four general education core courses and one five week general education clinical practice. Education Specialist candidates are exposed to reading instruction, English as a second language instruction, general education standards and lesson planning with their general education peers. Education Specialists are responsible for all requirements in these courses including the Teaching Performance Assessments (TPA) 1, 2 and 3. They are also required to pass the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA). The second phase focuses on the specific Education Specialist preliminary training which includes the following courses: Communication and Collaboration, Assessment, Caseload Management and Planning, and Specialized Instruction and Behavior Support. The Level I credential coursework culminates in a ten week student teaching experience that emphasizes the demonstration of mastery in instructional practices, ongoing professional reflection, knowledge of technology, and the creation of a professional portfolio. Level I also includes an in-depth course designed by special education program faculty and shared by several other programs (General Education, Child Life, Early Childhood, and as a general elective). This course provides opportunities for the Education Specialist candidates to practice listening to and communicating with multiple and single subject candidates; an ability

they will need in their teaching practice. In addition to the pre-service training previously described in Level I, candidates enrolled in the Communication and Collaboration course have an opportunity to hone their professional development skills by presenting a half day conference for the local community on special education issues. Candidates may earn their credential in the traditional methods or as an intern teacher, where the candidate is the teacher of record while simultaneously taking coursework. As confirmed by interviews with candidates and course review, the Unit's professional dispositions are emphasized in the initial application process, throughout the courses, in fieldwork experiences, and in clinical practice.

Level II Credential
The initial course in the Level II credential that guides the professional growth plans of the clear Education Specialist candidates is the Special Education Professional Induction Seminar. In this course, candidates develop specific individual professional goals which are contextualized in required advanced courses: Legal Issues, Advanced Behavior Issues, Advanced Assessment, Advanced Curriculum Issues, and Life Cycle Issues. Once goals have been established, a project-based action plan is developed. At each seminar session these plans are reviewed for relevancy. The candidates' projects include requirements for discussion with appropriate community members identified as stakeholders in the particular issues brought forth in the plan. These stakeholders can be district personnel, parents, students, and outside experts. The culminating activity for the Level II credential is a presentation of the candidates' experiences with the stakeholders who have shared in the shaping of their professional practice. The courses at Level II are designed to meet the CTC standards, CEC standards, and NCATE standards. The Unit's dispositions are emphasized in all the courses and the application process. The CEC ethics are emphasized in the application process and in the Special Education courses.

Level I and II
The Special Education Program requires and supports candidates' use of a variety of technologies to engage in and extend coursework at both levels. As evidenced in interview responses and coursework review, candidates use technology tools to facilitate their communication, collaboration, research, understanding, reflection, application and presentation of course content. The university provides candidate access to Blackboard, which the program brands as "E-class." With access to E-class, candidates participate in discussion boards, retrieve course materials, compose journals and blogs, exchange e-mail, submit assignments, and check grades.

As evidenced in course syllabi and interview responses, candidates also interact with and gain exposure to assistive technology, remedial software, and other technology tools that target the achievement needs of students in special education, and those who are also English Learners. Within clinical practice, a rubric for knowledge of assistive technology is included in their culminating portfolio.

A course review confirmed that candidates are exposed to ethnic, social, cognitive, and cultural diversity within their learning communities. The caseload management project requires the candidates to plan and coordinate services for a typical caseload of students with a representation of diverse backgrounds. Two of the Unit's dispositions, *empathy* (demonstrates patience, flexibility, and compassion in working with others and is relaxed around adults and children) and

socio-cultural competence (able to give students positive attention and reinforcement and demonstrates good attending behavior and is respectful of differences in values, styles, and cultures) supports in the transferring of these theoretical principles of social justice into educational practices throughout their course of study. Dispositions are identified and tracked with each course.

Field Experience and Clinical Practice
The program's handbook for Education Specialist Mild Moderate Credentials at both levels guides the practica experience for faculty, master teachers, and candidates. All practica occur in school sites where at least 25% of the students are from ethnolinguistically diverse backgrounds. Program completers confirmed that key course learnings, especially those related to instructing "the many faces of diversity," afforded them with the "tools in their toolbox" required to be successful in the field.

Level I
The Education Specialist Level I program provides a sequence of eight field experiences totaling approximately 15 hours in each course. These experiences collectively represent a variety of general and special education classroom experiences. General Teacher Education fieldwork includes observing classroom instruction, the planning and teaching of lessons, and keeping of reflective logs. Education Specialists complete a series of fieldwork experiences that are also embedded within the preliminary special education coursework.

All preliminary candidates complete five weeks of supervised general education clinical practice and ten weeks of supervised clinical practice in school environments. Candidates attend supportive seminars in both student teaching experiences. This extensive clinical practice experience provides candidates an intensified focus in various instructional delivery models. Program completers identified small group instruction, co-teaching, and universal access lesson planning as exemplars of instructional delivery. Evidence, provided in a culminating portfolio, confirms candidates' demonstration of the professional and dispositional competencies required for recommendation for the Level I credential.

Level II
Program partnerships with Los Angeles County Office of Education Special Education Local Planning Area BTSA Collaborative support advanced candidates in clearing their credentials. During this time, candidates complete BTSA fieldwork-related tasks in their educational working environments. The Special Education program enhances this fieldwork with the offering of an advanced reflective coaching seminar. This course offers a forum for discussion with appropriate community members identified as stakeholders in the particular issues brought forth in the seminar.

Two university supervisors have been working with the program for five years. Monthly meetings are held to discuss updates in the field and progress of their candidates in the clinical practice experience. Master teachers must hold the same credential the candidate holds, have three years experience in the field, and three letters of recommendation. They are trained by the fieldwork coordinator at the main campus or at school sites. Using the clinical handbook, master teachers are familiarized with the roles and responsibilities and the required forms and logs.

Interviewees stated that many of the master teachers were graduates of the University indicating a strong sense of community and continued partnership between the University of La Verne and program completers. All candidates and program completers interviewed confirmed they felt feel adequately prepared, supported, and mentored throughout the program.

Candidate Competence
Before recommendation of a teacher credential at the preliminary or advanced level, the candidate is required to have passed *multiple checkpoints* that have been monitored by the program chair and advisor(s) to assure that the state-driven competencies and performance criteria have been met.

Level I
During Level I, the program first requires a satisfactory completion of coursework. Second, the candidate must have passing scores in the content knowledge licensure assessment (CSET) and the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA). Successfully passing Teacher Performance Assessments (TPAs) 1-3, is also required for Education Specialist candidates. In addition, candidate achievement is traced and monitored as it relates to four key course assessments. These assessments are uploaded to TaskStream, a web-based data storage system, and evaluated by course instructors. Review of rubrics showed inconsistent styles in rubric development. Evidence of key assessments and supporting rubrics were provided to the reviewer.

Performance evaluations in clinical practice provide a means for ascertaining that candidates have demonstrated competence in applying the knowledge, skills, and dispositions associated with each of the standards in an educational environment. The evaluations in clinical practice are formative and rubric-based. Eight weekly evaluations are conducted by university supervisors to monitor ongoing candidate progress and kept in the candidate's file. Candidate portfolios are submitted at the end of the clinical practice documenting their cumulative growth and progress throughout the preliminary program. An additional culminating project for preliminary candidates is the development, planning and presentation of an all day professional development activity.

Level II
Candidates seeking a Level II credential complete a professional growth plan which includes a targeted area of specialization and supporting goals. The candidate, with the support of a mentor/coach, monitors self-growth and goal achievement. A project highlighting the new learnings of the professional growth plan is celebrated in a culminating activity. The program tracks and monitors candidate achievement as it relates to four culminating course assessments. These key assessments are uploaded to TaskStream and evaluated by course instructors. The reviewer was provided evidence of keys assessments and supporting rubrics.

For both levels of credentialing, credential analysts review the candidate's program requirements and completed work. When the candidate has satisfactorily met all program requirements, the credential analyst forwards a formal recommendation for the appropriate credential.

Candidates struggling to meet competencies are given multiple chances to succeed. They are provided with advisement and coaching by faculty, field supervisors and mentor teachers or

district support providers. Candidate and program completer interviews corroborated this safeguard. Dispositions data of candidates is also assessed and monitored throughout Level I and Level II programs to ensure candidates are suitable matches for the field of special education.

Findings on Standards:
This program is in the process of transitioning to the newly adopted CTC standards. The program will be expected to submit a program assessment document one year after transitioning to the new 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 current program standards are **met.**

Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Programs

Program Design
Leadership provided by the program faculty is very effective and includes management and oversight of a Literacy Center that is a training site for candidates in both the Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential programs. A strong sense of collaboration and community is evident based on interviews of many individuals representing a broad array of constituencies associated with the program. Faculty in the Reading Specialist Certificate and Credential programs are highly regarded by peers, graduates, employers, and candidates. The candidates and graduates who were interviewed expressed appreciation for the availability, accessibility, and warmth of faculty, staff and administrators provide them. Candidates also expressed appreciation for the quality of professional and personal advisement and support that they receive. Further, they appreciate the small low candidate/faculty ratio in their that allowed them to receive a significant level of personal attention.

The Literacy Center, a renovated church on the University of La Verne campus, greatly enhances the program by providing real life tutoring opportunities with K-12 students who have been identified by school personnel as needing these services. Students in the K-12 system, as well as their parents and families, greatly benefit from the services provided at the Center. Grant monies have been pursued by the Program Coordinator to supplement funds provided by the University for operation of the Center. The Program Coordinator has also provided leadership that has resulted in significant modifications to the program based on formal and informal assessments over the past several years.

Recent changes include: (1) changes of course titles that have been updated to reflect contemporary practices, (2) an increased emphasis on the teaching of writing to K-12 pupils, and (3) technology enhancements and technology training for candidates and faculty. These changes were based on deliberations over candidate performance data as well as data gleaned from course evaluations, end of program assessments, faculty feedback and advisory board input. An active advisory board comprised of multiple constituencies, including family and community members, meets at least once annually to assess the effectiveness of the Literacy programs and Literacy Center. This board generates ideas for funding and grant opportunities and provides future strategic directions for the Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential programs. Many graduates of the program proudly maintain affiliations with the

Center and reportedly enjoy the special sense of community that has been generated in recent years.

Course of Study

Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential program faculty at the University of La Verne have developed a teacher education model that results in the delivery of quality program experiences for candidates. Candidates pursue coursework in a logical sequence with the content of each course building upon the prior course throughout the program of study. Faculty have been responsive to needs expressed by administrators and teachers in surrounding schools, and the community at large, by developing coherent programs of study for this important area. Candidates take 12 classes (5 of which are designed to meet Standards 1-11, and the other 7 which are designed to meet Standards 12-20, leading to the Reading and Language Arts Credential. Eight of the classes require ten hours each of intensive one-on-one or small group tutoring with children. The integrative program design is creative in that candidates tutor K-12 at the Literacy Center students at the beginning of their class period, setting the stage for rich discussions and presentations for the remainder of the class session. This delivery model provides an effective means of linking theory with applied experiences. The tutoring process is overseen by university professors who offer immediate feedback tailored to the needs of the candidates and their tutees. Tutees consist of children from the community in grades 1-12 who are recommended by their schools as needing additional support in reading and writing. They include English learners and special needs students. New formal and informal literacy assessments are introduced in each course, and students readily utilize those assessments in their carefully crafted fieldwork experiences in the Literacy Center. Students are provided with multi-level advisement and support from admission through completion of their program of study.

Candidate Competence

Very importantly, candidates pursuing the Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential are held to high standards throughout their program(s) of study. Candidate performance is carefully monitored by faculty members in each class where feedback is regularly provided, including feedback on each tutoring experience. Students must regularly prepare lessons for K-12 pupils by assessing, diagnosing, planning, teaching, and re-assessing students in this continuous cycle of assessment and instruction for the duration of the class. Assessments of candidate competence are conducted routinely by faculty and include a culminating portfolio. A comprehensive examination is required for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential. Course and program assessments have either been refined or newly developed and are being used appropriately. Candidates will benefit greatly with ongoing future refinements to assessment practices and the assessment system made in the true spirit of continuous program improvement.

Findings on Standards:

This program is in the process of transitioning to newly adopted CTC standards. It will be required to submit a program assessment document one year after implementing the new program. After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

Program Design

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program is built upon the pillars of the Conceptual Framework. Leadership for the program is provided by the Program Coordinator at the main campus who regularly collaborates with other full-time and part-time faculty throughout the university system as well as with site-based supervisors. The candidates and graduates who were interviewed expressed their appreciation for faculty members' availability and caring demeanor. Each course has objectives related to program outcomes.

The program design effectively links coursework with fieldwork experiences. Candidates reported that they are required to complete a total of 21 project-based activities in their program, seven of which are at the elementary level, seven at the middle or secondary level, and seven that are completed as part of their coursework.

Interviews with candidates indicated that they felt they were progressing in their development as leaders throughout the program.

Although approved for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, including the intern option, there are no interns at the program at this time.

Course of Study

Preliminary Administrative Credential program faculty have designed a program that results in the delivery of quality program experiences for candidates as verified by interviews with various stakeholders in the program. Current candidates reported that there were extensive opportunities to apply what they learned throughout the program. Thoughtfully designed fieldwork projects serve to link theory with practice. University of La Verne faculty meet regularly with candidates in the field. The first meeting is an overview of the program and its expectations. Principals are provided a handbook that delineates their roles and responsibilities as site supervisors. Successive visits are noted in an observation log.

Faculty have led continuous program improvement initiatives by thoughtfully integrating technology projects into courses and using technology for teaching newly developed hybrid online courses. The Blackboard online platform is used for posting information about course and program requirements so that it is understood by faculty and candidates across all program locations.

As candidates proceed throughout the program, they compile their course projects and fieldwork experiences and reflections for their culminating professional portfolio.

Assessment of Candidate Competence
Each course includes at least two major assignments, one of which is linked to fieldwork. In addition, candidates compile a portfolio of their work as evidence of growth. Candidate performance is carefully monitored by faculty members in each class where feedback is regularly provided. The culminating professional portfolio is evaluated by faculty. Candidates and program completers noted their appreciation for the timely feedback provided by faculty.

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 of the program standards are Met with the exception of Standard 9 which is Met with Concerns.

Rationale:
Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Performance specifies that, "Satisfactory performance is defined as achieving competence as expected for entry-level administrators." Evidence indicated that emphases is actually placed on criteria focused on mechanics and organization rather than on a more deliberate assessment of the specific knowledge, skills and disposition competencies associated with the standard. For example, the rubric elements for the portfolio assessment specify "choice of documentation, organization, mechanics, personal reflection and overall portfolio impact." Assessment of candidate competence can be further enhanced by more closely aligning rubric elements explicitly with CTC program standards. Candidates will benefit greatly from ongoing future refinements to assessment practices, including the constructive use of performance assessment data used for continuous program improvement.

Pupil Personnel Services
School Counseling Services Credential Program

Program Design
The educational counseling credential program at the University of La Verne is a graduate level professional preparation program that prepares candidates to become holistic, academically well prepared leaders, advocates and social change agents in their respective communities. Faculty at the University of La Verne and at off-campus locations promote social justice, mindfulness, creativity, excellence, and community involvement in candidates. From interviews with faculty, candidates, completers and supervisors these ideals were clearly articulated and implemented.

The Pupil Personnel Services credential program in Educational Counseling offered at the University of La Verne is located on the main campus as well as in four off-campus sites throughout the state. The main campus has approximately 140 candidates, and is staffed by four full time faculty members, one of whom is the coordinator of the fieldwork component of the program statewide. There are also several adjunct faculty members teaching in the on campus program. The off campus program, housed under the University's Regional Campus Administration (RCA), is staffed by four full time Lead Regional Faculty members who oversee, administrate, and teach within their respective regions.

The University of La Verne College of Education and Organizational Leadership's (CEOL) Professional School Counseling Preparation Program has offered the Pupil Personnel Services Credential with a specialization in School Counseling since 1974. The Professional School Counselor Preparation Program is designed to meet the standards set forth by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential in School Counseling, including the Internship Credential, and the requirements for the Master of Science in Educational Counseling. Graduates of the program are able to effectively function at an entry level position as a Professional School Counselor. The Professional School Counselor Preparation Program strongly embraces the National Standards for School Counseling set forth by the American School Counseling Association as well as the comprehensive school counseling and guidance model. Candidates who complete the program receive both the Master of Science in Educational Counseling and the Pupil Personnel Services Credential in School Counseling. The Professional School Counseling Program consists of 48 semester units of course work. There are eighteen (18) courses required in the Professional School Counselor Preparation Program, including 100 hours of practica and 600 hours of supervised field work experience. It is expected and emphasized that program graduates will continue professional development throughout their careers as Professional School Counselors.

Program modifications over the recent two years in Educational Counseling have included the following: refinement of the Evidence of Meeting Learning Objectives (EMLO) to more clearly reflect the knowledge attained by candidates as related to course material and requirements; all exceptions to the 2.75 GPA entrance requirement will be determined solely by the PPS program admissions committee; implementation of key assessments that better reflect knowledge, use of assessment, planning, diversity and technology; establishment of a mandatory annual training day for all statewide part-time and full-time faculty; establishment of a process of electronic collection for all fieldwork evaluations; and lastly, replacement of the current writing assessment with one that is refereed and standardized.

Interviews confirmed that stakeholder input is solicited from the Advisory Board, practicum and fieldwork supervisors, and employers. The Advisory Board meets twice a year and provides programmatic review. For example, these members were engaged in the development of the newly funded Spanish Bilingual Bicultural Counseling Certificate. Supervisors and employers provide feedback to the program through individual consultations, group meetings and evaluation instruments.

Course of Study
Candidates are admitted in both fall and spring terms and may complete the program within two to three years depending upon course availability and candidate schedules. The sequence of courses is developmental with a combination of didactic and practicum/fieldwork courses. For example, in four classes the practicum requirements are embedded in the course, thus, allowing instructors to align and oversee the acquisition of counseling skills as set forth in the syllabus and aligned with program standards. Candidates, completers, and on-site supervisors commented on the strength of this combination as it provides good preparation prior to entering the fieldwork experience.

Candidates and fieldwork supervisors indicated that the sequence of coursework is effective in preparing candidates prior to fieldwork and at program completion.

Evaluations for fieldwork are given to all stakeholders to evaluate each candidates, site and university supervisors. Evaluation summaries and stakeholder interviews indicate that all involved believe that the fieldwork experience is a positive one. Fieldwork placements are the responsibility of the full-time fieldwork coordinator and lead regional faculty at the off campus locations.

The effectiveness of coursework in critical areas for candidates is addressed in specific coursework such as Counseling Diverse Populations and in dispositions rating forms.

Candidate Competence
The Educational Counseling program ensures candidate competence through an assessment system that is continuous, developmental, and standards based. These standards relate to CTC credential standards, National Counselor Standards and program EMLO's and student dispositions. These assessments occur at four transitions points. The first transition point occurs at point of formal admission to CEOL programs; the second transition denotes Fieldwork Ready and occurs upon admission, throughout coursework and before entry to fieldwork in CEOL programs; the third transition point occurs at the end of fieldwork and program completion or graduation; and the fourth transition point occurs after program completion or graduation.

Candidates receive information about how they will be assessed in the program through the student handbook, academic advisement, fieldwork manual, and in each course syllabus. Candidates are informed of the results of these assessments through consultation with faculty, supervisors and in their individual portfolios.

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 with the exception of Standard 15: Technological Literacy which is Met with Concerns

Rationale:
Standard 15 requires that, "the program provides candidates with opportunities to understand and demonstrate skills in current technology…in order to facilitate effective and appropriate outcomes in program management and individual student achievement." A review of documentation such as course syllabi, student portfolios, rubrics, as well as interviews with faculty and candidates confirm that technological literacy is included in coursework and fieldwork. However, candidates indicated minimal coverage of the use of K-12 student databases. The program has responded to this need by recently modifying courses to introduce candidates to Management Information Systems designed for schools and counseling as well as highlighting the usefulness of data bases to support the school counselor's role. Interviews with candidates indicate that this is an important area of training. Because this aspect is new, the

program is encouraged to continue the emphasis of competence in technological literacy within the sequence of courses.

Personnel Pupil Services
School Psychology Services Credential Program

Program Design
The School Psychology Program is designed to meet the standards of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential in School Psychology, including the Internship Credential, as well as the requirements for the Master of Science in School Psychology. Graduates of the program have the ability to effectively function at entry-level positions as a professional school psychologist. The School Psychology Program strongly embraces the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) domains of school psychology training and practice standards. It is expected that program graduates will continue professional development throughout their careers as school psychologists.

The Chair of the School Psychology Preparation Program has academic oversight responsibilities over the program. The chair has assembled a large network of advisors to provide feedback on course development and candidate competencies. This network consists of school psychologists in the field, special educators, administrators, adjunct faculty and candidates. The program is the result of this full participation and input from these constituencies. The administrative oversight of the program rests with the Chair of the Education Department and the Dean of the College of Education and Organizational Leadership. The Chair of the School Psychology Program is responsible for admitting all students into the School Psychology Preparation Program. The chair also provides advisement to candidates and interacts with the credential analysts of the college to ensure candidate compliance with credential and graduation requirements.

The program is evaluated annually by the Chair of the School Psychology Preparation Program, program faculty, School Psychology Program Advisory Committee, the chair of the Education Department, and Dean of the College of Education and Organizational Leadership. In interviews, the advisory board members indicated a strong commitment to the school psychology program. They regularly review course syllabi, make suggestions for course modifications and development, and discuss candidate progress. Part-time faculty meetings are held bi-annually. In addition, part-time instructors receive course outlines and syllabi templates prior to teaching a course. On-going support from the program chair is provided. Part-time faculty, several of whom serve on the advisory board, remarked on the thoroughness of the program preparation. Part-time faculty report that program direction and course preparation is an active and on-going process that is encouraged by the chair of the school psychology program. In multiple candidate and completer interviews the impact of current practitioners as instructors was deemed an outstanding component of program preparation. In addition, candidates evaluate the program in focus groups, at the conclusion of their program, and after they secure employment in school psychology. Needed programmatic modifications are made annually. Evidence of the effectiveness of this collaboration and communication was seen in decisions made about the program such as, revision of all program handbooks, development of a program website,

incorporation of more assessment topics and revision of the sequence of courses to better meet candidate needs.

Course of Study

The school psychology program is offered on the main campus only. It consists of 23 courses (61 units) taken on a part time basis for a period of two to four years. The program chair and seven adjunct professors teach the majority of the classes and four additional general education classes are taught by College of Education faculty. The sequence of coursework ensures that candidates acquire the necessary knowledge, skills and dispositions in an incremental and developmentally appropriate manner as confirmed by candidate, supervisor and advisory board members. Included in the program is an emphasis on action research that is completed at school sites with diverse student populations. The value of action research and its connection to the community served has been commended by school community members. Another community endeavor is the School Psychology symposium where candidates present topics such as those related to student performance and intervention strategies. Participants are school psychologists and administrators.

Four hundred and fifty (450) hours of practica are required before beginning fieldwork. Practica consists of a series of supervised experiences, are conducted in laboratory and/or field-based settings, and provide for the application of knowledge and mastery of distinct skills. After the completion of the 450 hours, supervised fieldwork under the direction of a university supervisor and site supervisor may be started. Two handbooks for university supervisors of field experience and on-site supervisors have been developed and are specific to the roles and commitments of the supervisors, expectations of students, and assessment and evaluation of candidate competencies. Fieldwork is divided into 600 clock hours in two practicum courses for a total of 1200 hours, which is consistent with credential and national standards. Candidates meet bi-monthly with university supervisors. Feedback from candidates and fieldwork supervisors reveal the high caliber of training.

University supervisors conduct site visits each semester during practicum to ensure that a candidate's fieldwork experience is effectively coordinated. The handbook for School Psychology covers performance expectations; assessment and evaluation of dispositions, knowledge and skills; and fieldwork requirements. Through interviews candidates and supervisors confirm that the fieldwork experience is a vital and positive culminating experience. Evaluations are completed by all stakeholders of each others' performance and reflect high levels of satisfaction.

Candidate Competence

School psychology candidates are systematically assessed on an ongoing basis in three ways: (l) comprehensive student assessment in courses, (2) assessment during practica and fieldwork, and (3) portfolio assessments. All key assessments in this program are used to ascertain program effectiveness as it relates to candidate competence. Determination of candidate competence is accomplished through the use of the national training standards adopted by the National Association of School Psychologists. An Individual Education Program simulated presentation is made by all candidates at the end of their Individual and Advanced Assessment courses. Candidates submit 15 assessment reports during assessment courses and make case presentations

as part of class assignments. Summary data on assessments is provided for the School Psychology Program faculty and School Psychology Program Advisory Committee and used for program revisions.

From the beginning of all candidates' admission into the program, they are advised about program requirements and assessments. Candidates are provided program handbooks. The school psychology program has also developed a website for updates and current information.

At the end of the program, candidates submit two portfolios. The first portfolio is the compilation of previous coursework products with reflections on Evidence of Meeting Learning Objectives (EMLO), as well as evaluations and disposition rating forms of candidate work. The second portfolio is unique to La Verne and is the employment portfolio. This portfolio is intended for future employment and showcases candidate strengths. Rubrics are used to determine adequacy of the two portfolios. Candidates remark that this process is meaningful and helpful as it encapsulates the training experience. The national Praxis exam in School Psychology, which is developed by the National Association of School Psychologists, covers the domains of knowledge and skills required of nationally certified school psychologists and is completed in the last year by candidates. Passing scores on this exam, as displayed by candidates of this program during the third year, ensures the highest levels of professional competency.

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