

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at
California State University, Los Angeles**

Professional Services Division

January 2021

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **California State University, Los Angeles**. The report of the team presents the findings based upon a thorough review of all available and relevant institutional and program documentation as well as all supporting evidence including interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation, with a 7th Year Report** is made for the institution.

**Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For All Commission Approved Programs Offered by the Institution**

Common Standards	Status
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Met
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	Met
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met
4) Continuous Improvement	Met
5) Program Impact	Met

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject, Intern	6	6	0	0
Single Subject, Intern	6	6	0	0
Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate, Intern	22	22	0	0
Education Specialist, Moderate/Severe, Intern	24	24	0	0
Education Specialist, Physical Health Impairments, Intern	27	27	0	0
Education Specialist, Visual Impairments, Intern	26	26	0	0

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Education Specialist, Early Childhood, Special Education, Intern	26	26	0	0
Education Specialist: Orthopedic Impairments Added Authorization	4	4	0	0
Education Specialist: Other Health Impairments Added Authorization	4	4	0	0
Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization	13	13	0	0
Speech Language Pathology	16	16	0	0
Clinical or Rehabilitative Services: Orientation and Mobility	19	19	0	0
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	32	32	0	0
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology	27	27	0	0
Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance	8	8	0	0
Preliminary Administrative Services	9	9	0	0
Bilingual Authorization	6	6	0	0
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	5	5	0	0
Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential	5	5	0	0
Teacher Induction	6	3	1	2

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 Documentation and Evidence
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

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

Institution: California State University, Los Angeles

Dates of Visit: November 15-18, 2020

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation, with a 7th Year Report

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
Date: October 20, 2011	Accreditation

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation, with a 7th Year Report** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel. The team 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 recommendation of **Accreditation, with a 7th Year Report** for the institution was based upon the following:

Preconditions

All preconditions were found to be Met.

Program Standards

There are 20 credential programs offered at the institution. All program standards were determined to be Met for all programs, with the following exception:

All program standards for the Teacher Induction program were met, with the exception of:

- a) Program Standard 3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System, which was **Met with Concerns**;
- b) Program Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection, and Training of Mentors, which was **Not Met**;
- c) Program Standard 5: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services, which was **Not Met**

Common Standards

All Common Standards were determined to be **Met**.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the fact that the team found all Common Standards to be Met and all standards for all programs were Met with the exception of the Teacher Induction Program Standard 3 – Met with Concerns and Program Standards 4 and 5 – Not Met, the team recommends **Accreditation with a 7th year report**.

The team recommends the following be addressed in the 7th year Report:

1. That in the Teacher Induction and Education Specialist: Visual Impairment programs all district-employed supervisors are consistently trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated, and recognized.
2. That in the Education Specialist: Visual Impairment program information and personnel are consistently accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements and support candidates who need assistance.
3. That in the Teacher Induction program: The ILP includes defined and measurable outcomes for the candidate and induction leaders provide formative feedback to mentors on their work, including the establishment of collaborative relationships.

In addition, staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- California State University, Los Angeles be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, Los Angeles 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

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to offer the following credential programs and to recommend candidates for the appropriate and related credentials upon satisfactorily completing all requirements.

Multiple Subject, Intern
Single Subject, Intern
Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate, Intern
Education Specialist, Moderate/Severe, Intern
Education Specialist, Physical Health Impairments, Intern
Education Specialist, Visual Impairments, Intern
Education Specialist, Early Childhood, Special Education, Intern
Education Specialist: Orthopedic Impairments Added Authorization
Education Specialist: Other Health Impairments Added Authorization
Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization
Speech Language Pathology

Clinical or Rehabilitative Services: Orientation and Mobility
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology
Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance
Preliminary Administrative Services
Bilingual Authorization
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization
Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential
Teacher Induction

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

James Zarrillo
California State University, East Bay

Maurice Belote
San Francisco State University

Common Standards:

Donna Elder
National University

Anne Delfosse
Capistrano Unified School District

Nina Potter
San Diego State University

Diane Sharken Taboada
Sonoma State University
California State University, East Bay

Programs Reviewers:

Karen Rock
Santa Clara Unified School District

Heather Dean
California State University, Stanislaus

Shane Jimerson
University of California, Santa Barbara

A. Josephine Blagrove
California State University, Chico

Cheryl Sjostrom
Brandman University

Staff to the Visit:
Miranda Gutierrez
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Iyore Osamwonyi
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission
Program Review Submission
Common Standards Addendum
Program Review Addendum

Course Syllabi and Course of Study
Candidate Advisement Materials
Accreditation Website
Faculty Vitae

Candidate Files
 Assessment Materials
 Candidate Handbooks
 Survey Results
 Performance Expectation Materials

Precondition Responses
 TPA Results and Analysis
 Examination Results
 Accreditation Data Dashboard

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	229
Completers	116
Employers	40
Institutional Administration	9
Program Coordinators	13
Faculty	61
TPA Coordinator	1
Mentors	7
Field Supervisors – Program	13
Field Supervisors – District	34
Credential Analyst	1
Advisory Board Members	32
Other Unit Staff	4
TOTAL	560

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed more than once due to multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background Information

California State University, Los Angeles (Cal State LA), founded in 1947, is a comprehensive public university that offers programs of higher education in more than 50 academic and professional fields. The university is organized into six colleges that house nearly 50 academic departments and divisions. Cal State LA's reputation as a center of learning attracts students from all areas of the United States and from many foreign countries. The university is dedicated to engagement, service, and the public good and ranked number one in the United States for the upward mobility of its students.

The university has one of the most diverse student population of any college or university in the nation. Cal State LA's fall 2020 enrollment was 26,342 students of which 58.2 percent are first generation students. The university's fall 2020 ethnic composition showed Cal State LA's students are 69.43 percent Hispanic, 11.58 percent Asian, 5.42 percent White, 3.55 percent Black, and 0.09 percent Pacific Islander. Building on the strengths of this rich diversity, Cal State LA prepares students for success in advanced studies, in their careers, and throughout their lives. Cal State LA graduates constitute a major leadership force in greater Los Angeles, a microcosm of the global society. The university is committed to free scholarly inquiry, to high-quality teaching, and to academic excellence in undergraduate, graduate, and other postbaccalaureate and continuing education programs.

Education Unit

The Charter College of Education (CCOE) at California State University, Los Angeles, is committed to preparing educators to transform public schools and related community service agencies. The CCOE offers a coordinated, transdisciplinary approach to the education of children and youth. Collaborating within the CCOE and with public schools and various educational agencies in the greater Los Angeles area, the faculty prepares professionals to become learner advocates who show competence in subject matter, professional knowledge, and skills, and are dedicated to improving the educational environment of all children and youth.

The CCOE was established in 1995 by faculty and staff, who shared a bold vision for change and a commitment to the needs of the urban community. The conceptual framework, which includes the mission and vision of the CCOE, was developed collectively by the members of the College and the community and reflects the beliefs and values of the faculty, staff, and students. The democratic structure of the SAW, or "School as a Whole," offers faculty and staff unique opportunities to investigate, examine, and respond to the challenges of preparing educators for the 21st century.

The CCOE is comprised of three divisions, Applied & Advanced Studies in Education, Curriculum & Instruction, and Special Education & Counseling. A 12-month faculty chair, assisted by an associate chair, leads each academic division. Most programs are coordinated by a tenure-track faculty member who is provided assigned time to facilitate program activities, including identifying fieldwork placements, placing candidates in fieldwork, and monitoring the fieldwork processes, collecting analyzing data for program improvement, providing input on staffing for courses, advising, assisting, with accreditation tasks, facilitating program meetings, and

reviewing program curriculum. Program coordinators hold meetings with faculty each semester. Coordinators communicate with program faculty, division faculty, the division chair, and personnel in the Office for Student Success. The Office for Student Services (OSS) provides centralized support for credential program admissions, advisement, fieldwork processing and credential recommendations. The director of student services manages the functions of the office. The unit head is the dean of the CCOE. The dean provides leadership for personnel, resources and the overall mission and strategic initiatives of the college. The associate dean provides leadership for academic programs, graduate admissions, curriculum and assessment and enrollment management.

Two of the unit’s credential programs are housed in the Rongxiang Xu College of Health and Human Services (HHS). The two programs, Speech Language Pathology and Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization, are completed in collaboration with CCOE.

Table 1: Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2019-20)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2020-21)
Multiple Subject, Intern	73	243
Single Subject, Intern	160	368
Bilingual Authorization, Intern	26	25
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization,	3	0
Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist	11	15
Adapted Physical Education Authorization	3	6
Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, Intern	81	198
Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe, Intern	23	53
Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education, Intern	33	77
Education Specialist: Visual Impairments, Intern	19	30
Education Specialist: Physical and Health Impairments, Intern	2	3
Education Specialist: Orthopedic Impairments Added Authorization	1	1
Education Specialist: Other Health Impairments Added Authorization	1	1
Speech Language Pathology	17	43
Clinical or Rehabilitative Services: Orientation and Mobility	1	16

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2019-20)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2020-21)
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	27	51
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology	22	47
Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance	49	98
Preliminary Administrative Services	50	66
Teacher Induction	6	18

The Visit

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this site visit was conducted virtually. The team and institutional stakeholders were interviewed via technology.

PRECONDITION FINDINGS

After review of all relevant preconditions for this institution, all have been determined to be met.

PROGRAM REPORTS

Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern

Program Design

The Multiple Subject credential program (MSCP) is offered at the undergraduate level or at the post-baccalaureate level. Prospective undergraduate candidates earning a Bachelor of Arts degree in the following fields may choose to earn a Multiple Subject Credential concurrently with their B.A.: Chicano Studies, Liberal Studies, and Urban Learning. The post-baccalaureate program can be done alone or concurrently with an added authorization or Master of Education programs. Prospective candidates interested in the multiple subject credential meet with an advisor from the Office for Student Services and select their pathway and roadmap for getting their credential.

Multiple stakeholders speak about the two-fold strength of having multiple options for the MSCP program: 1) students move through the program at a pace that meets their need and life circumstance and 2) students in their coursework experience a wide diversity of perspectives and situations that contribute to their understanding working collaboratively with diverse colleagues and of teaching diverse learners.

The MSCP coordinator holds three program-level *regular* meetings with program faculty each semester. Faculty attend and participate in analysis of student surveys, data related to program confidence, and discussion of the needs and suggestions for program improvement. Administration, Faculty and Lecturers concurred that the division chair and MSCP program coordinator model collaboration and are extremely supportive, and that across the various programs all work as a team.

Courses in the MSCP are in three groups: a) pre-requisites must be met prior to taking subject-specific methods courses; b) subject-specific methods courses; and c) the final semester of directed teaching with reflections and guidance for the assessment course. The courses provide a solid foundation with a focus on transformative education-the process of developing educators who are inclusive and change agent leaders, who critically improve teaching and learning with a simultaneous emphasis on the individual and community. All stakeholders affirm that there is an emphasis on transformative theory, which school site personnel (employers and site supervisors) applaud and appreciate.

Faculty and lecturers shared that there is a continual effort to link theory with practice. Candidates are taught to identify and apply the pedagogical principles of transformative education to the contextual learnings previously gleaned (keeping in mind the point at which the candidates are in their development) and apply the theories to practice with increasing

autonomy. Candidates and completers report that at times this link is difficult to see in their coursework, and a consensus is that they would like more balance between theory and practice; nonetheless they acknowledge that fieldwork allows them to observe, apply and reflect on what they are learning.

There are four pathways for the preliminary multiple subject credential: a) undergraduate integrated multiple subject credential program with a BA in one of the degree programs named above, b) undergraduate accelerated-dual multiple subject credential and education specialist credential concurrently with a BA in Urban Learning, c) post-baccalaureate (graduate) traditional program, and d) an internship credential program for those who are employed in full-time teaching positions by cooperating school districts. Coursework is the same for all except the undergraduate accelerated-dual credential program. There are 15-hour fieldwork requirements in four of the core subject methods courses (math, science, reading and writing, in addition to the culminating directed teaching experience. Completers and candidates spoke about two strengths of this design: 1) the community developed in their pathway and 2) many opportunities to observe and reflect with their peers on a variety of instructional settings prior to directed teaching, where they apply their growing understanding of instruction.

In 2016, when the campus moved from a quarter to semester system, program coursework was re-examined through the university curricular process. At this time, all candidates have either begun on the semester system or transitioned into it. During the 2017-2018 academic year, feedback from stakeholders was used to modify the program. During the 2018-2019 academic year said changes were put into practice. These changes have helped streamline the program to make course content and fieldwork more connected.

Stakeholders have structured opportunities for providing input. All candidates in the program are invited annually to fill out the Current Student Survey and rate their satisfaction with advising, course rigor, and program delivery. Candidates fill out a Student Opinion Survey each semester and rate their instructor's effectiveness. The college-level Assessment Task Force hosts an Assessment Advisory Committee where stakeholders' feedback is solicited and then used for program improvement. In addition, there is a Curriculum Advisory Board meeting once per semester where stakeholders' feedback is solicited and then used for program improvement. It is from these artifacts that the multiple subject faculties and the division of Curriculum and Instruction worked to modify the existing program for implementation in 2018-2019.

California State Department data is positive; employer and master teacher surveys were above the state mean. The chair, MSCP coordinator and faculty all described on-going efforts for program improvement in response to available data.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The multiple subject credential program begins with the completion of pre-requisite courses with a heavy emphasis on language acquisition in urban school populations, English learners, community engagement, and needs of special populations, and an introduction to the philosophy of transformative teaching. This is followed by courses focused on pedagogical

development in content-specific areas. All courses in the program require candidates to design content-based instruction and explain assessment of the instruction.

Candidates complete a continuum of fieldwork totaling a minimum of 600 hours that encourages reflection and practice aligned with state standards and evidence-based practices. Participation in early fieldwork forms a foundation for the culminating final student teaching or demonstration of competencies. Through the simulation classroom, TEACH Live, teacher candidates have an additional opportunity to practice their skills as they relate to the TPEs, in a low stakes environment with immediate coaching and structured reflection.

Candidates reported an emphasis on understanding and developing effective instructional response to diversity throughout their credential program. They also appreciate the clearly delineated series of courses, followed by the final fieldwork experience, which can be done as a demonstration of competencies (intern) or directed teaching (traditional student teacher and undergraduate student teacher). One candidate states “I had a clear pathway to meet my goal.”

The final fieldwork experience, directed teaching, is completed over a 16-week semester of 40 hours per week and is explicitly connected with a reflection course. An important part of the recent program improvement process has been to develop a data base (dashboard) to organize the process of field placements and monitor the efficacy of the placement sites and site supervisors (master/mentor teachers). Many stakeholders expressed the value of this resource.

Candidates agreed that during directed teaching with a weekly class, they were able to apply the theory and strategies they had learned, as well as share their concerns, reflect on them, and receive supportive responses. One candidate now teaching describes her experience, with accompanying nods from all her peers, “I’m happy to have gone through the program, I learned a lot and I made professional friends for life despite the challenges.” In particular, candidates in the program during the pandemic describe that they have felt ‘supported during the unknown’ due to Cal State LA’s quick and comprehensive response to the shift to distance learning.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed in all coursework and fieldwork placements, by faculty, university and site supervisors as applicable. Rubrics and checklists have been established, validated by, and calibrated with program faculty and clinical supervisors, and are used at the mid-term and end of directed teaching. Evaluation instruments are directly connected to the TPEs for California teachers. Although site supervisors are made aware of the assessments in many instances through university supervisor contact, all candidates emphasized that they are the primary bridge to their master/mentor teachers. The Directed Teaching Committee trains new university supervisors in use of the assessment instruments and leads faculty in discussions about the data collected each semester, for program improvement. Candidates reported that they are kept aware of their academic progress in a timely way throughout the program.

Candidates are advised about program requirements at several points throughout the program. Advisement occurs as part of the program application process and at group orientation for those students about to start the program.

All candidates are required to complete their performance-based assessment, EdTPA, during the directed teaching semester, as part of the credential process. Candidates acknowledge that they are made aware of this benchmark assessment early in the program and offered two optional courses to assist in the completion of the EdTPA. They report awareness and support from their master/mentor teachers and supervisors of program requirements. One student, with unanimous agreement, commented “if I didn’t do the optional course, I would be so lost!” In both program and state assessments, candidates demonstrate their understanding of teaching and student learning in authentic ways while meeting the current TPEs.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern pathway program.

Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern

Program Design

The Single Subject credential program is organized and coordinated by a program coordinator. Within the program, there are three pathways: traditional student teaching, a residency pathway, and intern pathway. The course of study is similar for all candidates, but the fieldwork experiences vary slightly by pathway and related specifically to the subject area assigned to the teacher candidate.

In 2016, when the campus moved from a quarter to semester system, program coursework was re-examined through the university curricular process. At this time, all candidates have either begun on the semester system or transitioned into it. Nearly all candidates who began on the quarter system have now completed their credential program. Additionally, after three years under the semester system, the single subject coordinator worked with the division chair, associate chair, OSS, and single subject faculty to refine the existing program to streamline courses and fieldwork after receiving feedback from students and faculty in all three divisions, after having implemented the new program for a full three years on the semester system. During the 2017-2018 academic year, feedback from stakeholders was used to modify the program. During the 2018-2019 academic year said changes were put into practice whereas the 15-hour fieldwork components related to four of the courses in the single subject program were embedded into their requisite course as opposed to being offered as their own lab course. These changes have helped streamline the program to make course content and fieldwork more connected.

Stakeholders have structured opportunities for providing input. All candidates in the program are invited annually to fill out the Current Student Survey and rate their satisfaction with advising, course rigor, and program delivery. Candidates fill out a Student Opinion Survey each semester and rate their instructor’s effectiveness for each course they are taking. The college-level assessment committee, The Assessment Task Force, hosts an Assessment Advisory

Committee where stakeholders' feedback is solicited and then used for program improvement. It is from these artifacts that the single subject faculty and the division of Curriculum and Instruction worked to modify the existing program for implementation in 2018-2019.

Interviews with faculty, mentor teachers, university supervisors, program completers and current candidates confirm that the program is designed with an understanding of the community that surrounds Cal State LA and a strong desire to create competent new educators with a focus on equity to support the communities in the area.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Courses in the single subject program follow an intentional sequence of courses to introduce candidates first to understanding the foundational principles of transformative education, followed by an exploration of the context of urban classrooms including students, schools and communities. In the penultimate final semester, courses are designed to help candidates apply the pedagogical principles of transformative education to the skills and knowledge already acquired. Complementary coursework uses this course sequence as a means of developing pedagogical knowledge for teaching and learning, keeping in mind the point in which the candidate is in their development. There is an emphasis threaded throughout all coursework on a process orientation, a critical community literacy, real-world relevancy, and developing candidates as change agents.

Interviews with candidates and program completers confirm that the program focuses on transformative education and candidates view this as a strength of the program.

Candidates complete a continuum of fieldwork totaling a minimum of 600 hours that encourages reflection and practice aligned with state standards and evidence-based practices. Starting with early observations in selected classrooms and school sites and moving to signature assignments conducted in the field as they relate to their content related courses, candidates are engaged in meaningful teaching and learning experiences. Participation in early fieldwork forms a foundation for the culminating final student teaching or demonstration of competencies. Each fieldwork experience articulates closely with coursework in the program and provides candidates with multiple opportunities to put the knowledge and skills they have learned into practice. In addition, the division of Curriculum and Instruction offers teacher candidates an opportunity to practice their skills as they relate to the TPE's and course content through our simulation classroom, TEACH Live. This practicum experience provides teacher candidates the opportunity to develop their pedagogical practice in a safe environment that does not place real students at risk. TEACH Live affords our pre-service teachers a chance to interact with digital avatars for teacher training purposes to sharpen their skills while already out in real classrooms.

Interviews with candidates and recent program completers confirm that the program provides opportunity for fieldwork throughout the program. Candidates and completers were overwhelmingly pleased with their placements and their mentor teachers.

The single subject program has three separate strands that are supported through a multiple course sequence: Language and Literacy Development, Community Engagement, Pedagogical Development. These courses contain a heavy emphasis on language acquisition in urban school populations, English learners, assessment, reading methods, language, and literacy acquisition inside and outside of the school subjects. The Community Engagement courses emphasize the contextual understanding of urban schools and communities while focusing on instructional development and application. The Pedagogical Development courses focus attention on classroom management and the development and appropriate implementation of a variety of instructional strategies. There is also a dedicated course in assessment, that emphasizes standardized, norm referenced assessment, formative, and curriculum-based assessment as well as 21st century assessment skills and methods. All methods courses (across the 11 different subject matter areas) in the program require candidates to design content-based instruction.

Candidates are assessed in all fieldwork placements. Rubrics and checklists have been established and validated by program faculty and clinical supervisors. University supervisors and school site administrators, or district employed supervisors (master teacher), assess candidates on a host of competencies. University supervisors use a formative Likert-scale checklist based on the Danielson framework (2013) at each classroom observation. These forms are directly connected to the current TPEs. A summative rubric is used at the mid-term and of the fieldwork assignment to describe performance in the six TPE domains. The site administrator/master teacher uses a checklist to evaluate candidate performance at the mid-term and at the end of the fieldwork experience. All data is collected each semester, and is aggregated, analyzed, and discussed at program-level meetings throughout the academic year. The directed teaching chair trains new university supervisors in use of the assessment instruments and leads faculty in discussions about the data for program improvement.

University supervisors confirm the use of forms to evaluate student teachers as well as that visits are conducted a minimum of six times to allow for a lesson plan to be shared prior to the observation. Then the observation is conducted and a debrief follows within 48 hours.

Assessment of Candidates

Single subject candidates are assessed throughout their program with critical monitoring points strategically located within specific courses. These courses are also equally spread across the span of the program. The candidates receive information about their progress. Faculty collect and analyze aggregate candidate data to understand program quality and effectiveness and to consider ongoing program improvements. Several measures are used including rubric scored essays, signature assignments, and observation checklists and ratings. In addition, candidates are required to complete, submit and pass the edTPA in order to receive their preliminary credential. The purpose of edTPA is to measure novice teachers' readiness to teach in their subject area. As a performance-based assessment, edTPA is designed to engage candidates in demonstrating their understanding of teaching and student learning in authentic ways while meeting the current TPEs.

Candidates and program completers confirmed that there are structures in place to support the understanding of the EdTPA as well as to practice components required of the EdTPA.

Candidates are advised about program requirements at several points throughout the program. Advisement occurs as part of the program application process and at group orientation for those students about to start the program. After orientation, an advisor contacts each candidate for an advising appointment where they review the single subject program plan and information. Candidates confirmed that they attended an orientation to learn of program requirements and that advising is available to them.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Single Subject program, with Intern.

Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, with Intern Pathway

Program Design

The Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate program a two-year program with 240 current candidates, is the largest CCOE education specialist credential program. The program includes an undergraduate and graduate pathway along with three pathways for culminating fieldwork: traditional student teachers, interns, and residency student teachers. Candidates complete the program in two years with two clear fieldwork assignments.

Cal State L.A. is a comprehensive public university that supports a broad array of educator preparation programs that prepare candidates to work in diverse urban settings. The Charter College of Education comprises three divisions: Applied & Advanced Studies in Education, Curriculum & Instruction, and Special Education & Counseling. A 12-month faculty chair, assisted by an Associate Chair, leads each academic division. The Office for Student Services (OSS) provides centralized support for credential program admissions, advisement, fieldwork processing, and credential recommendations. The Director of Student Services manages the functions of the office. The Unit Head is the Dean of the Charter College of Education. The Dean provides leadership for personnel, resources, and the overall mission and strategic initiatives of the college. The Associate Dean provides leadership for academic programs, graduate

The word heard most often during interviews was “collaboration”. The mild/moderate program coordinator believes in a collaborative process that includes faculty, adjunct faculty, university supervisors, district employers, and advisory board members. District employers, university supervisors, completers, and candidates mentioned the ongoing, clear communication from the program coordinator and faculty. Faculty serve as content area advisors and support a candidate from their first or second semester throughout the program.

Formal community advisory committee meetings are held once a year as a collaborative process to review and make recommendations to the program. The active advisory committee works closely with the program coordinator between committee meetings to stay informed.

Within the CCOE, regular communication to enhance procedures and program development occur regularly.

The mild/moderate program courses are aligned to fieldwork throughout. Each course includes an opportunity for candidates to practice skills taught during their course. A distinguishing highlight of the program is the early fieldwork, a course in inclusive teaching for mild/moderate disabilities. Early fieldwork is completed at a clinic on-campus on a Saturday for 16 weeks. The first few weeks include the instruction to prepare candidates for the process. Candidates, faculty, adjuncts, and university supervisors echoed the benefit of the clinic practice with immediate feedback.

Stakeholders have structured opportunities for providing input. All candidates in the program are invited annually to fill out the Current Student Survey and rate their satisfaction with advising, course rigor, and program delivery. Candidates fill out a Student Opinion Survey each semester and rate their instructor's effectiveness for each course they are taking. The Special Education faculty host a biennial Community Advisory Day where community members (e.g., candidates currently enrolled in the program, program graduates teaching in K-12 settings, local schools, and district administration) are invited to meet with faculty to discuss issues affecting local districts as well as provide suggestions for improving the credential programs. The college-level assessment committee, The Assessment Task Force, hosts an Assessment Advisory Committee where stakeholders' feedback is solicited.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

A foundations course focuses on teaching diverse learners and legal aspects. Lectures (adjunct faculty) discussed the benefits of the course in that it sets guiding principles and expectations of future coursework by identifying needs, atypical and typical development, specific strategies, Universal Design for Learning, beginning IEP information, collaboration, co-teaching, and assessment of diverse learners.

Courses in the mild/moderate program follow an intentional sequence to introduce candidates to foundational knowledge in disabilities and special education policy and practices, first and second language acquisition and development, educational law, assessment processes, classroom management, and positive behavior support, and characteristics of learners with mild/moderate disabilities. Subsequent coursework uses this grounding as a context for developing pedagogical knowledge for teaching and learning. There is an emphasis threaded throughout all coursework on teaching candidates to identify learner strengths, accurately establish present levels of performance, and implement evidence-based practices based on assessment data.

The course of study reflects a planned developmental sequence of coursework, beginning with the introduction of content, moving to practice, application, and reflection. Faculty, Lecturers,

and candidates discussed the sequence of coursework and how courses build on each other. For example, candidates shared how assessment coursework was sequenced along with their understanding that introduction, practice, and application are provided across multiple courses. Candidates shared that they first learned the process, they learned how to apply and practice in different contexts in continuing coursework.

Candidates complete a continuum of fieldwork that encourages reflection and practice aligned with state standards and evidence-based practices. Candidates complete 600 hours of fieldwork through coursework, early fieldwork, and culminating fieldwork. Starting with early observations in selected classrooms and school sites and moving to signature assignments conducted in the field, candidates are engaged in meaningful teaching and learning experiences. Participation in early fieldwork forms a foundation for culminating final student teaching or demonstration of competencies. Each fieldwork experience articulates closely with coursework in the program and provides candidates with multiple opportunities to put the knowledge and skills they have learned into practice.

Coursework is aligned with a focus on meeting the diverse needs of urban children through effective evidenced-based strategies and supports. The mild/moderate program has a heavy emphasis on language acquisition in typical and atypical populations, English learners, assessment, and reading methods.

Following the organizing CCOE theme of “Preparing Educators to Sever the Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Population of Urban Schools and Related Institutions”, lecturers shared the success of the sequence of coursework related to teaching reading methods while meeting the needs of English Learners and students who are struggling. Three courses were reported by faculty to effectively sequence, meet this theme while addressing the educational needs of aspiring educators. One dedicated course on the topic of language and literacy acquisition focusing on both typical and atypical development. It also explores the intersection of language development, particularly for English learners, and disability. There are two reading methods courses highlighted by adjunct faculty. The first concentrates on how to teach reading, writing, listening, and speaking in English Language Arts. The second course offers an advanced study of literacy problems and methods for providing individualized and specialized literacy instruction. Lectures shared the sequence of literacy and EL instruction, building on resources and materials with each course.

There is a dedicated course in assessment that emphasizes standardized, norm-referenced assessment along with formative and curriculum-based assessment. All methods courses in the program feature a case study that requires candidates to use assessment techniques to establish a student’s present level of performance and design instruction based on that information.

Fieldwork begins with a lab course designed to have candidates observe in select classrooms and reflect on topics such as the inclusion of students with disabilities, use of positive behavior support, and standards for the teaching profession. Next in the program are three courses with

field-based signature assignments requiring candidates to use course content to conduct case studies of K-12 students involving language proficiency, assessment, and reading instruction.

These courses are followed by early fieldwork in the C. Lamar Mayer Learning Center, an inclusive clinical setting, where the candidates develop and collaboratively teach a 13-lesson unit focused on intensive remedial literacy instruction within the context of content area (social studies, science, art, etc.) teaching. Early fieldwork was discussed by lecturers, university supervisors, faculty, and candidates. Early fieldwork, while time-consuming and on Saturday, was highlighted as a memorable and powerful learning experience by completers and candidates who had participated. Candidates appreciated working in a “classroom” with students and the immediate feedback provided. They discussed the benefits of the center which included an opportunity to work with a general education peer, practice, lesson plan development, family involvement and communication, assessment, and reflection. Candidates shared that their assignment in the learning center was at a level other than their intern placement, allowing for work with a variety of levels.

Specialization coursework is then completed (also requiring field-based assignments) and followed by the final fieldwork experience, which can be done as a demonstration of competencies (intern) or directed teaching (traditional student-teacher) or fieldwork in residency (residents) in local schools. The early and final fieldwork experiences are designed to provide the candidates with the teaching experiences at primary and secondary levels; the fieldwork assignments target one-on-one, small group, and whole-class assessment and instruction.

Prerequisites for the early fieldwork in mild/moderate disabilities require candidates to complete foundational courses, an assessment course, and the initial reading methods course. Candidates are expected to draw on the content from these courses and put their knowledge into practice in the early fieldwork under the close supervision of clinical faculty. Candidates discussed the opportunity to practice skills learned from coursework in most of their assignments.

Candidates will have also completed several field-based assignments where they practiced assessing K-12 students, determined areas of strengths and weaknesses, and made recommendations for behavioral, language, and reading interventions. These skills are practiced again in the early fieldwork with an entire class of students (as opposed to the single student case studies). Candidates complete several specialization courses (with field-based assignments focused on the course topics) after the early fieldwork and before the final fieldwork. The specialization courses promote reflection of already acquired skills and knowledge to extend and enhance them. Specialization courses also introduce new topics and prepare candidates for the competencies they must show mastery of in their final fieldwork. Completers indicated that they felt prepared for their position and provided examples of practice activities such as the Learning Center that applied to their position. Completers indicated that the training on instructional strategies was beneficial to their current practice.

The program offers support to university supervisors, master teachers, and candidates. District employed site supervisor interviewed work with interns, traditional student teachers, and residency candidates. The overwhelming consensus was that the Cal State LA candidates were well prepared for final fieldwork and welcomed the opportunity to supervise. Each district employed site supervisor met with the university supervisor who provided updates.

Candidates are assessed in all fieldwork placements. Rubrics and checklists have been created and validated by program faculty and clinical supervisors. University supervisors and district employed master teachers assess candidates on a host of competencies.

University supervisors use a formative Likert-scale checklist based on the Danielson framework (2013) at each classroom observation. A summative rubric is used at the end of the fieldwork assignment to describe performance in four domains: assessment, curriculum, professionalism, and collaboration, and managing the classroom environment. University supervisors also evaluate candidates on the six domain areas of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs).

The master teacher reported the use of a checklist to evaluate candidate performance at the end of the fieldwork experience. Each district employed site supervisor is part of the evaluation process and receives a form to complete.

Assessment of Candidates

Mild/moderate candidates are assessed throughout their program with critical monitoring points strategically located in three courses and three fieldwork experiences.

Candidates receive information about their progress. Faculty collect and analyze aggregate candidate data to understand program quality and effectiveness and to consider ongoing program improvements. During the interview, faculty discussed the process to collect, analyze candidate data, and compare leading to program enhancement. The example provided focused on the review of the assessment class where scores were weak. Faculty clearly stated their commitment to the process, with an eye towards continuous improvement to benefit candidates and the program. Updating and improving course content to remain current and effective is a hallmark of the faculty team. Faculty are commended for their constant collaborative review of course content while they uncover each standard to address in coursework.

Candidates are advised about program requirements at several points throughout the program. Advisement occurs as part of the program application process and at group orientation for those candidates about to start the program. Information about the requirements are made available and included in various checkpoints. After orientation, a mild/moderate faculty contacts each candidate for an advising appointment where they review the mild/moderate program plan and information. Each candidate is assigned a faculty who serves as an advisor throughout the program. They meet once a semester to review their progress. Candidates are enrolled in a division Canvas site that provides timely and easy access to a variety of information sources such as how to apply for fieldwork and frequently requested forms.

Interviews indicate strong satisfaction with candidate advisement completed by the program faculty.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, with Intern.

Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Disabilities, with Intern

Program Design

The Moderate/Severe credential program includes three pathways: undergraduate integrated teacher education preparation program (ITEP), intern, and traditional student teaching. The course of study is similar for all candidates, but the fieldwork experiences vary by pathway as those on a traditional pathway are placed with master teachers and interns are the teachers of record in their own classrooms. ITEP participants have the option of choosing between a traditional pathway with student teaching or the intern pathway. Program completers reported that initial meetings with the program coordinator were very informative with clearly stated expectations. Overall, employers reported in interviews that graduates of the program enter the profession well prepared to meet the specialized needs of this student population. Completers and current candidates consistently cited the quality of coursework and faculty engagement.

The program is coordinated by a tenure-track faculty member who is provided assigned time to facilitate program activities. As evidenced in the review of documents, the Faculty Annotated Table confirms the program coordinator's strong background in all areas of moderate/severe personnel preparation, including transition, access to the general education curriculum, multicultural considerations, and STEAM subjects.

Stakeholders have structured opportunities for providing input. All candidates in the program are invited annually to fill out the Current Student Survey and rate their satisfaction with advising, course rigor, and program delivery, and complete the Student Opinion Survey to rate instructor effectiveness. The college-level assessment committee, The Assessment Task Force, hosts an Assessment Advisory Committee where stakeholders' feedback is solicited.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The program courses follow an intentional sequence that includes foundational knowledge in disability, first and second language acquisition, educational law, assessment processes, classroom management, positive behavior supports, and characteristics of learners with moderate/severe disabilities. Subsequent coursework uses this grounding as context for developing pedagogical knowledge for teaching and learning. Current candidates reported, however, that they appreciated the flexibility that was allowed within the sequence of courses to accommodate individual scheduling needs among candidates. There is an emphasis threaded

throughout all coursework on teaching candidates to identify learner strengths, accurately establish present levels of performance, and implement evidence-based practices based on assessment data. Program faculty reported that a strength of the content specific to positive behavior supports is a focus on addressing issues of culture and diversity as they relate to positive behavior support; this was confirmed among various stakeholder groups. Program completers agreed that the faculty's skill in modeling the use of innovative learning technologies such as Nearpod and Seesaw resulted in a smoother transition to remote learning during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Candidates complete a continuum of fieldwork that encourages reflection and practice aligned with state standards and evidence-based practices. Fieldwork begins with a lab course designed to have candidates observe in select classrooms and reflect on selected topics (e.g., inclusive practices and positive behavior support). Three courses with field-based signature assignments require candidates to use course content to conduct case studies of K-12 students involving language development, assessment, and functional communication instruction. These courses are followed by early fieldwork in the C. Mayer Learning Center. Program completers cited the C. Mayer Learning Center experience as a particular strength of the program, providing candidates with opportunities to have more realistic experiences. Many completers indicated that the C. Mayer Center was the best experience of the program. A division administrator also reported that the Saturday C. Mayer Learning Center activities include a parent counseling component, giving family members access to needed services while their children are actively engaged in learning activities. Specialization coursework is then completed (also requiring field-based assignments) and followed by the final fieldwork experience that is accomplished through a demonstration of competencies (intern) or directed teaching (traditional student teacher).

The program has an emphasis on communication skill and language acquisition in typical and atypical populations, English-language learners, assessment, augmentative and alternative communication (AAC), and sight word reading. There is a dedicated course on AAC focusing on communication skill development and the intersection of language development of various disabilities including English learners. There is also a dedicated course in assessment that emphasizes communication skill assessment including parent interviews, ecological inventory, and vocabulary dictionary along with formative and curriculum-based assessment. All methods courses in the program feature case studies that require candidates to use assessment techniques to establish a student's present level of performance and design instruction based on that information. There are two instructional methods courses: the teaching of reading, writing, listening and speaking in English Language Arts using various technologies, and advanced study of functional communication applied in school, home, and community settings with individualized and specialized instruction. A review of course sequence documents and course syllabi demonstrate additional focus on post-school success for students with moderate/severe disabilities through a dedicated course on building social competencies.

Prerequisites for early fieldwork requires candidates to complete foundational courses, an assessment course, and the initial reading methods course. Candidates are expected to draw on

the content from these courses and put their knowledge into practice in the early fieldwork under close supervision of clinical faculty. Candidates also complete several field-based assignments where they practice assessing K-12 students, determine areas of strength and needs, and make recommendations for behavioral and functional academic instructions. These skills are practiced again in the early fieldwork with an entire class of students (as opposed to the single-student case studies). Program completers confirmed that the emphasis on case studies, practice individualized education plans (IEPs), and role playing were salient features of the program. Candidates complete several specialization courses—with field-based assignments focused on the course topics—after the early fieldwork and before the final fieldwork.

District supervisors reported minimal training in support of their role as master teachers or intern mentors. University personnel reported that a handbook is used with district supervisors (i.e., *A Handbook for Master/Cooperating Teachers*), but a review of the handbook found it to be outdated with antiquated terminology and inaccurate information about California credentials. District supervisors reported that they could not remember if they were provided with this handbook but that they had received email instructions regarding policies and procedures. District supervisors reported that university supervisors communicated to them through the student teachers/interns but that the program successfully fulfilled the pledge of four site visits per semester, which was confirmed by the program completers. District supervisors also reported that the student teachers/interns were knowledgeable and very receptive to feedback. University supervisors also reported limited training but follow procedures that had been used when they were Cal State LA student teachers themselves.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed throughout their program with critical monitoring points strategically located in three courses and three fieldwork experiences. Candidates receive information about their progress in each course and faculty collect and analyze aggregate candidate data to understand program quality and effectiveness and to consider ongoing program improvements. Several measures are used including rubric scored essays, performance-based peer and self-evaluations, signature assignments, and observation checklists and ratings.

Candidates are also assessed in all fieldwork placements. Rubrics and checklists have been created and validated by program faculty and clinical supervisors. University supervisors and school site administrators, or district employed master teachers, assess candidates using a formative Likert-scale checklist. A summative rubric is used at the end of the fieldwork assignment to describe performance in four domains: assessment, curriculum, professionalism and collaboration, and managing the classroom environment. Site administrators/master teachers use a checklist to evaluate candidate performance at the end of fieldwork experiences. All data is collected each semester, and is aggregated, analyzed, and discussed at program-level meetings throughout the academic year. The program coordinator trains new university supervisors in the use of the assessment instruments and the use of data for program improvement.

Candidates are advised about program requirements at several points throughout the program. Advisement occurs as part of the program application process and at group orientation. After orientation, faculty contacts each candidate for an advising appointment where they review the moderate/severe program plan, and each candidate is assigned a faculty who serves as advisor throughout the program. They meet once a semester to review their progress. A division administrator within the Special Education Division also reported the recent development of a Canvas site (i.e., the Special Education Information and Resources site) that provides timely and easy access to a variety of information sources such as how to apply for fieldwork and frequently requested forms.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Disabilities, with Intern Pathway program.

Clinical or Rehabilitative Services: Orientation and Mobility

Program Design

There is one graduate pathway for the Clinical or Rehabilitative Services: Orientation and Mobility credential program. The course of study includes a master's degree in special education with an option in orientation and mobility, along with the credential preparation. Candidates can enter the program in the summer or fall but align by the spring semester. Recent modifications to the program have included the addition of content specific to high-leverage instructional practices, and human growth and development over the lifespan. Employers consistently report that program graduates are exceptionally well-prepared to enter the profession, and interviews with program completers demonstrate a remarkable sense of pride and distinction in being graduates of this program.

The orientation and mobility (O&M) program is coordinated by a non-tenure track lecturer with support from the associate dean, who is the project director on a federal grant that supports candidates in the program. The coordinator lecturer position assists with monitoring fieldwork processes, collecting and analyzing data for program improvement, providing input on staffing for courses, advising, assisting with accreditation tasks, and facilitating program meetings. Additional faculty, including lecturers with extensive professional clinical and university teaching experience, provide instruction and supervision. Stakeholders interviewed uniformly praised the knowledge and skills of program faculty and stated that faculty are always prepared for their respective courses and program activities.

Faculty members communicate regularly with candidates and, because of the small size of cohorts, this communication is frequently conducted via less formal systems such as group texts. Candidates and completers all reported that program faculty are exceptionally responsive to all communication and identified responsiveness and ease of access to faculty as strengths of

the program. Current candidates and completers reported that faculty members clearly communicated program requirements at the beginning and throughout the program. Program co-coordinators communicate with program faculty, division faculty, and the division chair to coordinate tasks, including admissions screening, orienting new candidates, curriculum development, and advisement throughout a candidate's credential program.

Stakeholders have structured opportunities for providing input. Program candidates complete the Current Student Survey and rate their satisfaction with advising, course rigor, and program delivery, and complete the Student Opinion Survey each semester to rate instructor effectiveness. The Special Education faculty host a biennial Community Advisory Day where community members are invited to meet with faculty to discuss issues affecting local districts and agencies as well as provide suggestions for improving the credential programs.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Courses in the O&M program follow an intentional sequence to introduce candidates to foundational disability knowledge, as well as content specific to visual impairments, including medical and psychosocial aspects associated with vision loss. All stakeholders reported that the course sequence is logical, and that course content is built on previous courses. Current candidates reported that the sequence is slightly altered due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the temporary suspension of internships at Veterans Affairs (VA) facilities, but candidates clearly stated that this does not impact program quality. Candidates are introduced to O&M techniques for learners with visual impairments and engage in practice-based learning through simulation of both total blindness and low vision, observation, practice teaching, and reflection. Program coordinators reported that low vision is emphasized in multiple seminars and includes skills specific to this population (e.g., scanning, tracking, glare remediation, etc.). Completers and current candidates report that the program effectively addresses the needs of children and adults who have degenerative conditions and progressive vision loss. Subsequent coursework uses this grounding as a context for developing pedagogical knowledge and skill for teaching and learning. There is an emphasis threaded throughout all coursework on teaching candidates to identify learner strengths, individualize instruction, accurately establish present levels of performance, and implement evidence-based practices based on assessment data. Program completers consistently reported that they were particularly well prepared for the general foundations of instructional planning for both children and adults (e.g., developing lesson plans, writing measurable goals, IEP development). There is a dedicated course combining assessment and instructional strategies for diverse learners. A second course addresses applied learning of assistive technology that emphasizes adaptations to mainstream technology (e.g., apps for orientation and visual interpretation that are readily accessed by smart phone technologies).

The program has an emphasis on sensory and concept development related to purposeful movement in a variety of travel environments found in home, school, and community settings. This includes the provision of O&M services to infants, toddlers and preschoolers. Program coordinators reported that meeting the needs of Part C (early intervention for babies and toddlers) and preschool children had previously been targeted as a program weakness, so changes were made in the program curriculum and design to address the needs of this

population. Program faculty reported that case studies as well as live and prerecorded video observation activities support training to meet the needs of young children. Throughout the interview process, program faculty highlighted the challenge of linking fieldwork participants and student teachers with programs serving very young children, as many young children do not have O&M services as part of their Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs). Employers, however, indicated that program completers have the requisite knowledge and skills to effectively meet the needs of young children.

Fieldwork experiences are a key feature of the program. Fieldwork begins in their first term observations of learners of all ages and ability levels across a range of settings. Upon completion of the O&M methods courses, candidates complete a full semester student teaching experience with a master teacher in a local education agency. Program coordinators reported that special attention is provided to ensure that student teachers are matched with master teachers who can best meet the specific needs of candidates and this was confirmed by faculty and program completers. Program coordinators reported that most master teachers/district supervisors are Certified Orientation and Mobility Specialists (COMS), granted by The Academy for Certification of Vision Rehabilitation and Education Professionals and recognized as the highest level of national certification in the O&M field. The culminating fieldwork experience is a full-time internship working with adults at one of three blind rehabilitation centers associated with the VA hospitals. Candidates report that the program ensures fieldwork placements provide opportunities to observe a diversity of students (e.g., ages, school settings, students with additional disabilities such as autism spectrum disorder, physical disabilities, and deaf blindness). Candidates complete several specialization courses during student teaching (i.e., working with infants and toddlers in Part C settings and preschool through transition-age students in Part B school settings (services for school-aged children with developmental disabilities 3 through 21 years of age) and the final VA internship.

Candidates are assessed in all fieldwork placements by university supervisors and district employed master teachers. To facilitate communication and a coordinated approach to supervision, university supervisors schedule fieldwork observations when district employed master teachers are present and available. Rubrics and checklists are established and validated by program faculty and clinical supervisors. University supervisors use a formative Likert-scale checklist for fieldwork observations, and a summative rubric is used at the end of the fieldwork assignment to describe performance in four domains: assessment, instruction, managing the learning environment, and professionalism and collaboration. Master teachers use a checklist to evaluate candidate performance at the mid-point and end of the fieldwork experience. All data are aggregated and analyzed at program-level meetings at the end of each academic year. The program coordinator and faculty train new university supervisors and master teachers in use of the assessment instruments and lead faculty in discussions on the data for program improvement. The program also developed a fieldwork manual titled *O&M Specialist Training Program Fieldwork Handbook* that includes guidelines for early fieldwork, student teaching, internship, and various forms including note taking and video release forms in multiple languages. District and university supervisors were unanimous in their praise for this handbook

and indicated that its comprehensiveness has significantly contributed to the success of all fieldwork activities.

Assessment of Candidates

O&M candidates are assessed throughout their program with critical monitoring points strategically located in three courses and three fieldwork experiences. Formative and summative assessments also occur through evaluation checkpoints of candidate portfolios developed to demonstrate competencies in meeting the standards of the profession, and candidates receive information about their progress throughout the program. Faculty collect and analyze aggregate candidate data to understand program quality and effectiveness and to consider ongoing program improvements.

Candidates are advised about program requirements at several points throughout the program. Advisement occurs as part of the program application process and at the group orientation. Group advising to complete a program plan is completed at program orientation and faculty are available for ongoing individualized advisement. A division administrator within the Special Education Division also reported the recent development of a Canvas site (i.e., the Special Education Information and Resources site) that provides timely and easy access to a variety of information sources such as how to apply for fieldwork and frequently requested forms.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Clinical or Rehabilitative Services: Orientation & Mobility program.

Preliminary Education Specialist: Visual Impairment with Intern

Program Design

The credential program in Visual Impairments (VI) prepares teachers to serve students birth-22 years of age with visual impairments or blindness. The program features a combination of face-to-face, hybrid, and online learning. Most candidates are employed as interns and most typically provide services on an itinerant basis. Evening courses meet the needs of candidates who are working full-time as interns, teachers, or other educational support staff.

As evidenced in the review of documents, the Faculty Annotated Table confirms the program coordinator's extensive publishing history in all areas of educating students who are blind and visually impaired, including braille instruction, literacy, and assistive technology.

Employers of program completers consistently reported that their new Cal State LA hires were very well prepared. Employers stated that completers were positive, creative, and responsive to the needs of learners. Completers reported that while they were not fully prepared to enter the teaching profession, they were clearly aware that learning is a life-long process, and that experience-based learning is a significant feature of initial teaching experiences. The program coordinator also addressed this issue, specific to functional vision assessments, stating that the

heterogeneity of the population of students served challenges the program to prepare candidates to serve all students (e.g., ages, additional disabilities, visual conditions, etc.) and that students must understand that they will continue to learn once employed and teaching.

Online learning is offered through asynchronous and synchronous modalities using technology supports such as webinar meetings (e.g., Zoom) and learning management systems (e.g., Canvas). Key assignments prepare candidates to reflect upon inclusive practices, universal design for learning, instructional adaptations to curriculum, and approaches to support services in a range of delivery options. This was confirmed through a review of program documents including course syllabi.

The program reports that stakeholders have various opportunities for providing input. Candidates rate their satisfaction with advising, course rigor, and program delivery annually by completing the Current Student Survey and complete a Student Opinion Survey to rate instructor effectiveness. Additionally, community members are invited to meet with faculty to discuss issues affecting local districts as well as provide suggestions for improving the credential programs at the Special Education Community Advisory Committee.

A curriculum revision was approved by the university review committee to address the need for additional course content specific to learning media assessments and interviews with employers and program completers confirmed this need. The program coordinator reported that while this course addition was initially due to take effect spring 2021, it is delayed and will begin in 2022. The course will be a three-day fieldwork lab in which a face-to-face model will be used to offer candidates field-based experiences to conduct learning media assessments.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

All education specialist credential programs in the Division share a common core that provides candidates with foundational knowledge about disability, English language acquisition, educational law, general assessment processes, classroom management, positive behavior support, and characteristics of atypical learners with diverse learning needs, including students on the autism spectrum. The common core includes four introductory level courses: Foundations of Special Education; Language and Literacy Processes in Special Education; Reading Instruction; and Math Instruction. The program shares three courses with the credential program in Orientation and Mobility (O&M): Medical Aspects of Visual Impairments; Psychological, Sociological and Vocational Implications of Visual Impairments and Blindness; and Seminar in Visual Impairment and Additional Disabilities. Two VI credential course strands are intentionally sequenced: three braille courses (i.e., Literary Braille Code, Advanced Braille Codes, and Braille Competency Examination) and two courses that address assessment (i.e., Functional Vision Assessment Lab, and Assistive Technology). Program completers reported that they were well prepared to provide braille instruction. Other program courses are not sequenced, and current candidates report that this has presented challenges in their ability to successfully complete coursework dependent on prerequisite knowledge and skills not yet acquired. As evidenced by a review of documents, the program utilizes a roadmap (i.e., course

sequence) document and a candidate progress monitoring document to clarify program requirements and potential approved course substitutions.

Candidates complete a continuum of fieldwork—from early classroom observations to signature key assignments conducted in the field—that encourages reflection and practice aligned with state standards and evidence-based practices. Participation in early fieldwork forms a foundation for culminating final student teaching or demonstration of competencies. Fieldwork experiences are designed to align with coursework and provide candidates with multiple opportunities to put the knowledge and skills they have learned into practice. The program coordinator reported that faculty and university supervisors meet regularly to review documentation to ensure demonstration of competencies.

Specialization courses include medical aspects of VI including anatomy and physiology; psychological, sociological, and emotional impact of VI; curriculum for students with VI; functional skills from the expanded core curriculum (ECC); and two dedicated fieldwork courses. Key assignments feature several collaborative case studies highlighting specialized skills, including the application of skills to students with additional disabilities including autism and deaf blindness. In addition, data driven planning requires candidates to implement specialized assessment techniques, establish students' present level of performance, and design instruction. Candidates must pass the braille competency examination, which includes skills in transcribing literary Unified English Braille and mathematical braille code.

Program candidates participate in several field placements in a variety of settings. The introductory course requires candidates to conduct classrooms observations. Two key assignments in the VI specialization classes require fieldwork in elementary and high school settings with itinerant service models. The program offers a unique early fieldwork experience in which candidates participate in a 12-week VI learning community called the Expanded Core Education Learning (ExCEL) Academy. Distance candidates who cannot travel to the LA area have the option to complete early fieldwork in their intern placements and are supported by district intern support providers who monitor fieldwork experiences in collaboration with university supervisors. The culminating experience for candidates is final directed teaching in which demonstration of competencies may be met in intern or student teaching placements.

Candidates are assessed in all fieldwork placements using faculty-validated rubrics and checklists. University supervisors use a formative Likert-scale checklist at each classroom observation. A summative final fieldwork rubric describes performance in four domains: assessment, curriculum, professionalism and collaboration, and managing the classroom environment. All data is collected, aggregated, analyzed, and discussed at program-level meetings throughout the academic year and informs program improvement.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed throughout their program with critical monitoring points strategically located in two courses and four fieldwork experiences. The portfolio rubric, specialization skills rubric, and university supervisor rubrics have three points of entry, providing candidates with

formative and summative evaluation. Summative measures also include braille competency, support provider or administrator evaluation, and candidate self-evaluation/reflection.

Candidates are advised about program requirements at several points throughout the program. Advisement occurs as part of the program application process and at a group orientation. The program coordinator then conducts advising appointments to review the program plan and course sequencing. They meet at least once a semester to review progress and discuss course sequencing. Candidates are enrolled in a division Canvas site that provides timely and easy access to information sources and forms.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Education Specialist Program: Visual Impairments, with Intern.

Preliminary Education Specialist: Physical and Health Impairments, with Intern

Program Design

The Physical and Health Impairments (PHI) program is one of five education specialist credentials in the CCOE. There are three pathways for the PHI credential program: a) undergraduate integrated teacher education preparation (ITEP), b) intern, and c) traditional student teaching. The course of study is similar for all candidates, but the fieldwork experiences vary slightly by pathway. Candidates in the accelerated-dual credential program follow a course of study that also includes coursework for the multiple subject credentials. (See responses below.)

Stakeholders have structured opportunities for providing input. All candidates in the program are invited annually to fill out the Current Student Survey and rate their satisfaction with advising, course rigor, and program delivery. Candidates fill out a Student Opinion Survey each semester and rate their instructor's effectiveness for each course they are taking. The Special Education faculty host a biennial Community Advisory Day where community members are invited to meet with faculty to discuss issues affecting local districts as well as provide suggestions for improving the credential programs. The college-level assessment committee, The Assessment Task Force, hosts an Assessment Advisory Committee where stakeholders' feedback is solicited.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Courses in the PHI program follow an intentional sequence to introduce candidates to foundational knowledge in disability, first and second language acquisition, educational law, assessment processes, classroom management and positive behavior support, and characteristics of learners with physical and health impairments disabilities. Subsequent coursework uses this grounding as context for developing pedagogical knowledge for teaching

and learning. There is an emphasis threaded throughout all coursework on teaching candidates to identify learner strengths, accurately establish present levels of performance, and implement evidence-based practices based on assessment data.

Candidates complete a continuum of fieldwork that encourages reflection and practice aligned with state standards and evidence-based practices. Starting with early observations in selected classrooms and school sites and moving to signature assignments conducted in the field, candidates are engaged in meaningful teaching and learning experiences. Participation in early fieldwork forms a foundation for culminating final student teaching or demonstration of competencies. Each fieldwork experience articulates closely with coursework in the program and provides candidates with multiple opportunities to put the knowledge and skills they have learned into practice.

The PHI program has a heavy emphasis on language acquisition in typical and atypical populations, English learners, assessment, and reading methods. There is a dedicated course on the topic of language and literacy acquisition focusing on both typical and atypical development. It also explores the intersection of language development, particularly for English learners, and disability. There is a dedicated course in assessment that emphasizes standardized, norm reference assessment along with formative and curriculum-based assessment. All methods courses in the program feature a case study that requires candidates to use assessment techniques to establish a student's present level of performance and design instruction based on that information. There are six PHI methods courses specific to the credential in addition to the foundational and general courses.

Fieldwork begins with a lab course designed to have candidates observe in select classrooms and reflect over topics such as inclusion of students with disabilities, use of positive behavior support, and standards for the teaching profession. Next in the program are three courses with field-based signature assignments requiring candidates to use course content to conduct case studies of K-12 students involving language proficiency, assessment, and reading instruction. These courses are followed by early fieldwork in the C. Lamar Learning Center or placement in a classroom alongside a master teacher credentialed in physical and health impairments. Specialization coursework is then completed (also requiring field-based assignments) and followed by the final fieldwork experience, which can be done as a demonstration of competencies (intern) or directed teaching (traditional student teacher).

Prerequisites for the early fieldwork in physical and health impairments disabilities requires candidates complete foundational courses, an assessment course, and the initial reading methods course. Candidates are expected to draw on the content from these courses and put their knowledge into practice in the early fieldwork under close supervision of clinical faculty.

Candidates will have also completed several field-based assignments where they practiced assessing K-12 students, determined areas of strength and weakness, and made recommendations for behavioral and reading interventions. These skills are practiced again in the early fieldwork with an entire class of students (as opposed to the single student case studies). Candidates complete several specialization courses (with field-based assignments

focused on the course topics) after the early fieldwork and before the final fieldwork. The specialization courses promote reflection of already acquired skills and knowledge to extend and enhance them. Specialization course also introduce new topics and prepare candidates for the competencies they must show mastery of in their final fieldwork.

Candidates are assessed in all fieldwork placements. Rubrics and checklists have been created and validated by program faculty and clinical supervisors. University supervisors and school site administrators, or district employed master teacher, assess candidates on a host of competencies. University supervisors use a formative Likert-scale checklist based on the Danielson framework (2013) at each classroom observation. A summative rubric is used at the end of the fieldwork assignment to describe performance in four domains: assessment, curriculum, professionalism, and collaboration, and managing the classroom environment. The site administrator/master teacher use a checklist to evaluate candidate performance at the end of the fieldwork experience. All data is collected each semester, and is aggregated, analyzed, and discussed at program-level meetings throughout the academic year. The physical and health impairments program coordinator trains new university supervisors in use of the assessment instruments and lead faculty in discuss on the data for program improvement.

Assessment of Candidates

Physical and health impairments candidates are assessed throughout their program with critical monitoring points strategically located in three courses and three fieldwork experiences. Candidates receive information about their progress. Faculty collect and analyze aggregate candidate data to understand program quality and effectiveness and to consider ongoing program improvements. Several measures are used including rubric scored essays, signature assignments, and observation checklists and ratings.

Advisement occurs as part of the program application process and at group orientation for those students about to start the program. After orientation, a faculty contacts each candidate for an advising appointment where they review the physical and health impairments program plan and information. Each candidate is assigned a faculty who serves as advisor throughout the program. They meet once a semester to review their progress. Candidates are enrolled in a division Canvas site that provides timely and easy access to a variety of information sources such as how to apply for fieldwork and frequently requested forms.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Education Specialist Program: Physical and Health Impairments, with Intern.

Preliminary Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education with Intern

Program Design

Within the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) program, there is a robust system of communication and support within the educator preparation and other related discipline (e.g.: Speech Pathology) programs. In addition, stakeholders have structured opportunities for providing input. All candidates in the program are invited annually to fill out the Current Student Survey and rate their satisfaction with advising, course rigor, and program delivery. Candidates fill out a Student Opinion Survey each semester and rate their instructor's effectiveness for each course they are taking. The Special Education faculty host an annual Community Advisory Day where community members are invited to meet with faculty to discuss issues affecting local districts as well as provide suggestions for improving the credential programs. The college-level assessment committee, the Assessment Task Force, hosts an Assessment Advisory Committee where stakeholders' feedback is solicited.

There are two pathways for the preliminary early childhood special education credential: a) intern and b) traditional student teaching. The course of study is similar for all candidates, but the fieldwork experiences vary slightly by pathway.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

As evidenced through a comprehensive review of courses linked to program standards, the early childhood special education program follows an intentional course sequence to introduce candidates to foundational knowledge in disability, characteristics of children with special needs, special education law, first and second language acquisition in the context of cognitive development, social emotional development, and classroom management and positive behavior support. Subsequent coursework uses this grounding as context for developing knowledge for assessing, planning, and providing learning opportunities for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers. There is an emphasis threaded throughout all coursework on teaching candidates to communicate and partner with families, assess and identify learner strengths, develop developmentally appropriate goals, and implement evidence-based practices in naturalistic settings, including home and school.

Candidates complete a continuum of fieldwork that incorporates reflection and practice aligned with state standards and evidence-based practices. Starting with early observations in selected classrooms and school sites and moving to assignments conducted in the field, candidates are engaged in meaningful teaching and learning experiences. Participation in early fieldwork forms a foundation for culminating final student teaching or demonstration of competencies. The early fieldwork is complemented by a methods course that translates learning into practice. Each fieldwork experience articulates closely with coursework in the program and provides candidates with multiple opportunities to put the knowledge and skills they have learned into practice.

The early childhood special education program has a heavy emphasis on language acquisition in typical and atypical populations, English learners, communication and partnership with families, assessment, methods of instruction, and transition. There is a dedicated course on the topic of

language and literacy acquisition focusing on both typical and atypical development. This course also explores the intersection of language development, particularly for English learners, and disability. Another course focuses on working with families specifically on communicating and partnering with families of diverse backgrounds. A third course addresses the different types of assessment in early childhood special education, specifically standardized norm-referenced assessments along with formative and curriculum-based assessment. Lastly, a course on methods of instruction focuses on accommodations and adaptations in working with young children with special needs. Methods for transitioning students are embedded throughout the courses.

Fieldwork begins early, with a lab course designed to have candidates observe in select classrooms and reflect over topics such as inclusion of students with disabilities, use of positive behavior support, and standards for the teaching profession. Next in the program are two courses with field-based assignments requiring candidates to use course content to conduct case studies in early intervention and preschool settings, involving family supports and assessments. These courses are followed by early fieldwork in the C. Lamar Learning Center. Specialization coursework is then completed (also requiring field-based assignments) and followed by the final fieldwork experience, which can be done as a demonstration of competencies (intern) or directed teaching (traditional student teacher).

Prerequisites for the early fieldwork in early childhood special education requires candidates to complete three foundational courses. Candidates are expected to draw on the content from these courses and put their knowledge into practice in the early fieldwork under close supervision of faculty. Candidates will have also completed several field-based assignments where they practiced assessing children in early intervention programs or preschool settings, determined areas of strength and weakness, and made recommendations for supports and services for the family and/or child. These skills are practiced again in the early fieldwork with an entire class of students (as opposed to the single-student case studies). Candidates complete several specialization courses (with field-based assignments focused on the course topics) after the early fieldwork and before the final fieldwork. The specialization courses promote reflection on already acquired knowledge and skills to extend and enhance learning. Specialization courses also introduce new topics and prepare candidates for the competencies they must show mastery of in their final fieldwork.

Assessment of Candidates

Early childhood special education candidates are assessed throughout their program with critical monitoring points strategically located in courses every semester. Signature assignments are embedded into courses to assess candidates' competencies. Three fieldwork experiences are also required. Candidates receive information about their progress. Faculty collect and analyze aggregate candidate data to understand program quality and effectiveness and to consider ongoing program improvements. Several measures are used including rubric-scored essays, signature assignments, and observation checklists and ratings.

Candidates are advised about program requirements at several points throughout the program. After orientation, an early childhood special education faculty member contacts each candidate for an advising appointment. Each candidate is assigned a faculty member who serves as advisor throughout the program. The candidate meets at least once a semester with the adviser to review their progress. Candidates are also enrolled in a division Canvas site that provides timely and easy access to a variety of information sources such as how to apply for fieldwork and frequently requested forms.

Candidates are assessed in all fieldwork placements. Rubrics and checklists have been established and validated by program faculty and clinical supervisors. University supervisors and school site administrators, or the district employed master teacher, assess candidates on a host of competencies. University supervisors use a formative Likert-scale checklist based on the Danielson framework (2013) at each classroom observation along with qualitative feedback. A summative rubric is used at the end of the fieldwork assignment to describe performance in four domains: assessment, curriculum, professionalism, and collaboration, and managing the classroom environment. The site administrator/Master Teacher use a checklist to evaluate candidate performance at the end of the fieldwork experience. All data is collected each semester, and is aggregated, analyzed, and discussed at program-level meetings throughout the academic year. The early childhood special education program coordinator trains new university supervisors in use of the assessment instruments and leads faculty in discussion of the data for program improvement.

Summary of Findings

After review of institutional reports, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, completers, field work/cooperative teachers, master teachers, faculty, and employers, the team determined that all program standards are fully **met** for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education, with Intern.

Speech-Language Pathology: Speech, Language, and Hearing

Program Design

The Speech-Language Pathology (SLP) credential program is housed in the Department of Communication Disorders in the Rongxiang Xu College of Health and Human Services. Because the master's degree in Communication Disorders (COMD) is required for the SLP credential, only candidates in the COMD master's program are admitted to the SLP program. The program is a two-year full-time program that follows a cohort model with 24 students being admitted to the program per year.

The SLP program is coordinated by the chair of the Department of Communication Disorders. The chair is provided assigned time to facilitate program activities in addition to other duties; including a) monitoring fieldwork placements, b) collecting and analyzing data for program improvement, c) staffing courses, d) advising, e) completing accreditation tasks, and f) and facilitating program meetings. Two other faculty members in the department also coordinate

key program activities: The clinic director coordinates all on-campus clinical practicum, and the field placement coordinator coordinates student teaching activities.

The department chair holds weekly meetings with both the clinic director and the field placement coordinator. The department chair also holds bi-weekly meetings with all program faculty. A subgroup of three adjunct program faculty meet less frequently (two or three times per semester) to coordinate tasks such as program assessment, curriculum revision, and strategic planning. The Department of Communication Disorders is one of seven departments/schools in the College of Health and Human Services. The dean of the college provides leadership for personnel, resources, and the overall mission and strategic initiatives of the college. The COMD department chair meets individually with the dean of the college every other week. The department chair also meets with the dean, associate dean, and other department/school chairs/directors once a month.

Program modifications over the past two years have been relatively minor, consisting primarily of adjustments to correct issues that arose out of a curricular revision that occurred in 2016. In 2016, the entire campus moved from a quarter to a semester system. During the curricular revision process necessitated by semester conversion, the program faculty decided to make substantial changes to the program to strengthen the clinical preparation of the candidates and better align the program's curriculum with the current scope of practice in speech-language pathology. As a result, the revised curriculum included several new courses, including Bilingual Speech Language Pathology, Medical SLP, and a Colloquium in Educational Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology. It also included expanded clinical practicum experiences, with candidates now participating in four semesters of on-campus clinic in addition to fieldwork experiences in school and medical settings. The most significant change in the past two years arose out of the expanded on-campus clinic experiences in the new semester curriculum. As new clinicians developing their clinical skills, initial on-campus clinical practicum consists primarily of one-on-one service provision with clients. This model of service provision is necessary during the earlier stages of clinical education. With the added clinical practicum in the new curriculum, the program was able to add group therapy experiences for the candidates while still maintaining the necessary foundational one-on-one clinical experiences. Group therapy experience in the on-campus clinic during the first year of the program provides for a smoother transition to fieldwork placements in the second year.

Stakeholders have multiple opportunities for providing input. Candidates fill out Student Opinion Surveys each semester and rate their instructor's effectiveness for each course they are taking in addition to completing evaluations of their supervisors for clinical practicum experiences. The field placement coordinator solicits input from Speech-Language Pathologists in multiple school settings every fall and spring. In addition, clients and their families in the on-campus Speech and Language Clinic are asked to complete surveys every semester.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Prior to entering the credential/master's Program, candidates take foundational courses in speech-language pathology and audiology. These courses lay the groundwork for subsequent

graduate level courses. During the first semester of the graduate program, candidates take courses essential for clinical practicum experiences (diagnostic and intervention procedures) and a colloquium in evidence-based practice that serves as a basis for the remainder of the curriculum. The remainder of the courses in the first year of the program focus on phenomenology, assessment, and treatment of various types of communication disorders. Courses in the second year of the program focus primarily on topics with a broader focus that build upon knowledge and skill acquired during the first year of the program (e.g., professional issues, bilingual SLP, etc.). A colloquium in legal aspects (IDEA, IEP development and compliance) of special education is also provided.

The course sequence provides evidence that Cal State LA's SLP program fully meets each performance expectation as they are introduced ("I"), practiced ("P"), and assessed ("A"). A Commission on Teacher Credentialing to American Speech Language Hearing Association Alignment Matrix provided crosswalk reference to these standards.

Because candidates in the credential program are also in the COMD master's program, their coursework, on-campus clinical practicum, and fieldwork prepare them to work with clients in a variety of settings that includes public schools, but also includes hospitals, private practice, and other settings. The disorder specific courses taken in the first year of the program cover assessment and treatment of clients with specific communication disorders in the context of the settings within which candidates might work with clients. (The school setting is one of those settings.) While taking these courses that cover assessment and treatment in the school setting, candidates are also working with clients (many of them school-age) in the on-campus clinic. In these clinical practicum experiences, candidates acquire the skill of assessment and treatment by applying the knowledge acquired from their coursework.

In addition, the credential/master's program has a heavy emphasis on assessment, evidence-based practice, and working with culturally and linguistically diverse clients. There is a dedicated course on assessment that candidates take in their first semester of the program. This course focuses on standardized, norm-referenced assessment in addition to informal, criterion-based assessment. All subsequent disorder-specific courses build on that foundation. In their first semester candidates also take a colloquium in evidence-based practice which similarly serves as a foundation for most of the subsequent courses in the curriculum. Working with culturally and linguistically diverse clients is infused throughout the curriculum, but candidates take two courses that focus, specifically on that topic. A Cultural and Linguistic Diversity in Communication Disorders is one of the foundational courses that candidates take prior to entering the graduate program, and candidates take a Bilingual Speech-Language Pathology course in the second year of the graduate program. To ensure that all candidates have taken all foundational courses, including Cultural and Linguistic Diversity in Communication Disorders, a transcript analysis of each candidate is conducted prior to the beginning of the credential/master's program, and missing foundational courses, if any, are added to each student's program.

Prior to participating in fieldwork, candidates take multiple foundational courses and participate in at least three semesters of clinical practicum. These courses and clinical practicum experiences provide the necessary knowledge and skills candidates need to effectively work with clients in a school setting. Courses include two clinical methods courses (one in assessment and one in treatment), courses that cover communication disorders commonly seen in school settings (e.g., language disorders in children, speech sound disorders, fluency disorders, etc.), and a course specifically about working in school settings. While taking these courses, candidates are also working with school-age clients in the on-campus clinic to apply their newly acquired knowledge to a clinical setting. In addition, while participating in student teaching, candidates meet weekly for a “student teaching lab” to discuss their experiences and promote reflection.

Candidates complete a field placement in a school setting (i.e., student teaching) during their second year in the program. Candidates who complete student teaching in the Fall are placed in a school setting four days a week for 15 weeks. Candidates who complete student teaching in the spring are placed in a school setting five days a week for 11 weeks. During student teaching, candidates take over the caseload of their master teacher(s) under their direct supervision.

Assessment of Candidates

There is significant evidence that candidate competency is assessed throughout the coursework programming. Additionally, the department utilizes a CALIPSO Clinical Performance Evaluation process to ensure that only highly qualified candidates are recommended for the SLP credential. The areas of evaluation and intervention are evaluated for competencies in varying disability areas (articulation, fluency, voice, language, hearing, swallowing, cognition, etc.). Through this matrix, candidates are also evaluated for preparedness, interaction (including integration of research principles into evidenced based practice), and personal qualities.

The SLP candidates are assessed throughout their program. One means of assessment is the tracking of candidates’ acquisition of competencies through an online system. Candidates enter knowledge and skills acquired into this online tracking system at the end of every semester, which are then evaluated by program faculty. Candidates’ clinical skills are also assessed every semester in the program using competency-based evaluation tools.

Master teachers evaluate candidates during fieldwork using a competency-based evaluation tool developed by the program faculty. This evaluation tool utilizes a 5-point Likert-scale to evaluate candidates’ competencies in diagnostic skills, reporting and conferencing skills, therapy skills, client interaction skills, personal and professional qualities, and general effectiveness and potential. Candidates are evaluated twice during their field placements: at the midterm point and at the completion of the placement. Master teacher evaluations are validated via conferences between master teachers and the field placement coordinator, which are conducted two or three times during the field placement.

Candidates are advised about program requirements at several points throughout the program. Initial advisement regarding program requirements and how candidates will be assessed is covered throughout the first semester in a one-unit colloquium. Key information about

program requirements and assessment is also included in a handbook available to candidates online in Cal State LA's learning management system. Advisement continues throughout the program, primarily during clinic labs that candidates take each semester, but also through one-on-one advisement meetings with the clinic director and/or program coordinator.

Summary of Findings

After review of institutional reports, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, completers, field work/cooperative teachers, master teachers, faculty, and employers, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Speech Language Pathology: Speech, Language, and Hearing program.

Orthopedic Impairments and Other Health Impairments Added Authorizations

Program Design

The Orthopedic Impairments and Other Health Impairments Added Authorization programs prepare teachers to serve students with disabilities in urban classrooms using a variety of instructional models. The programs serve a small number of candidates.

Candidates who are pursuing or who hold a moderate/severe, early childhood special education, visual impairments, or deaf and hard of hearing credential may earn the Added Authorizations in OI and OHI. The coursework includes all the specialization courses in the Physical and Health Impairments credential program and candidates take their coursework with candidates in the PHI program.

Stakeholders have structured opportunities for providing input. All candidates in the program are invited annually to fill out the Current Student Survey and rate their satisfaction with advising, course rigor, and program delivery. Candidates fill out a Student Opinion Survey each semester and rate their instructor's effectiveness for each course they are taking. The Special Education faculty host a biennial Community Advisory Day where community members are invited to meet with faculty to discuss issues affecting local districts as well as provide suggestions for improving the credential programs. The college-level assessment committee, The Assessment Task Force, hosts an Assessment Advisory Committee where stakeholders' feedback is solicited.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Courses in the added authorization programs build on foundational knowledge in disability earned in an initial credential. Specialization coursework in OI and OHI leverages candidates' first credential area knowledge (e.g., moderate/severe; visual impairments etc.) as the context for developing pedagogical knowledge for teaching and learning in the authorization areas. There is an emphasis threaded throughout the specialization coursework on teaching candidates to identify learner strengths, accurately establish present levels of performance, and implement evidence-based practices based on assessment data. Candidates complete fieldwork experiences as part of their initial credential.

Candidates complete fieldwork experiences as part of their initial credential. Candidates shared that their placements in the field allowed opportunity to practice skills learned on the job.

Assessment of Candidates

Added authorization candidates are assessed throughout their program with critical monitoring points located in each of the four specialization courses. Candidates receive information about their progress from the course instructor and program advisor. Faculty collect and analyze aggregate candidate data to understand program quality and effectiveness and to consider ongoing program improvements. Several measures are used including rubric scored essays, signature assignments, and objective exams.

Candidates are advised about program requirements at several points throughout the program. Advisement occurs as part of the program application process and at group orientation for those students about to start the program. After orientation, a faculty contacts each candidate for an advising appointment where they review the Added Authorization program plan and information such as maintaining a GPA of 3.0 or above and individual course grades no lower than a C. Each candidate is assigned a faculty who serves as advisor throughout the program. Candidates are encouraged to meet with their faculty advisor once a semester to review their progress.

Candidates are enrolled in a division CANVAS site (Cal State LA's Learning Management System) that provides timely and easy access to a variety of information sources such as how to apply for fieldwork and frequently requested forms.

Findings on Standards

After review of institutional reports, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, and employers, the team determined that all program standards are fully **met** for the Orthopedic Impairments and Other Health Impairments Added Authorization programs.

Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization

Program Design

The Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization (APEAA) program is based on a cohesive design intended to provide professional preparation for educators to provide instruction to students with disabilities in physical activity and lifelong wellness.

The Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization is housed in the Rongxiang Xu College of Health and Human Services, School of Kinesiology and Nutritional Science. The Added Authorization coursework is completed in association with the CCOE. The APE program coordinator communicates regularly with CCOE services to complete a variety of tasks. Leadership in the program feels supported and included by the CCOE as well as within the Rongxiang Xu College of Health and Human Services.

Prospective candidates must complete an intake interview and develop a program plan with the APE program coordinator and the PE subject matter preparation program coordinator to be filed in the CCOE. The coursework study and field experiences are the same for all candidates.

The seven courses, which make up the design of the APEAA program, have interrelated activities, assessments, and overlapping areas of study in physical education and special education. APEAA candidates have a minimum of 170 hours of fieldwork integrated throughout the program from early peer mentoring when prospective APE novice candidates shadow a veteran candidate to midpoint opportunities in the Physical Activity Center for Education (PACE). PACE provides candidates an on-campus practicum experience delivering games, sports, 2 rhythmic movements, aquatics, fitness, and fundamental skills to the younger individuals with disabilities and then transitional planning when working with clients involved in community activities. Graduates of the program feel very prepared by their experiences in these programs, and employers are happy with the graduates they are hiring.

The culminating fieldwork experience opportunities are delivering services to a variety of students with disabilities supervised by certified adapted physical educators at public school sites and participating and promoting transitional sites for lifelong physical activity in the community such as Special Olympics, Kids Enjoy Exercise Now (KEEN), adapted rowing, and aqua therapy. The candidate's final coursework includes activities to prepare their portfolio and present it as evidence in their exit interview. A post exit survey is also sent to each completer for additional program improvement and refinement information.

In 2016, when the campus moved from a quarter to semester system, program coursework was re-examined through the university curricular process. At this time, all candidates have either begun on the semester system or transitioned to it. Nearly all candidates who began on the quarter system have now completed their APEAA program.

There are many structured opportunities designed for candidates to provide input. In addition to candidates completing the Student Opinion Survey rating instructors for each of their courses, candidates have an opportunity to also reflect on course and fieldwork experiences. Each semester candidates are asked to reflect on program activities, rigor of the materials and advising. The School of Kinesiology and Nutritional Science also hosts an annual advisory committee meeting encouraging community members to meet with faculty to discuss issues affecting local districts as well as provide suggestions for program improvements. Employers also feel that their feedback on recent graduates is encouraged and that there are good communication channels between employers and the university. Cooperating teachers also felt that they were connected to the program, that communication was positive, and their needs were heard and supported.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The program is strongly committed to the development of APE teachers to effectively instruct the diverse student populations and disabilities attending the California public schools. The courses for the APEAA are sequential and intentionally begin with foundational knowledge and "shadowing" field experiences before integrating sound evidence-based practices with

supervised on and off campus practicum experiences. This sequence of coursework ensures candidates have relevant experiences regarding the school environment for teaching and learning as well as continual demographic change. This was evident in the program matrix, description of classes and focused assignments and experiences provided throughout the program.

Field experiences are an integral part of the program and essential for linking course work to practice. All candidates receive properly supervised comprehensive field experiences designed to allow them to observe, apply, and demonstrate theoretical pedagogical content knowledge learned in coursework. Properly supervised field and teaching experiences afford candidates the opportunity to provide instruction to individuals with diverse needs and various disabilities in both on-campus and public-school sites that include a broad range of settings, delivery service models, and various disabilities across the lifespan. Candidates also attend the San Bernardino Disability Festival corresponding with coursework content related to transitioning and athletic participation. Application of assistive technology is reinforced by attending the Los Angeles Expo for Disabilities, and the National Adapted Physical Education Conference solidifies the roles and responsibilities and other competences necessary to be an adapted physical educator. Cooperating teachers felt that there was a strong connection between classroom learning and what was being asked of the students in the school placements.

Fieldwork begins with the introductory course and a minimum of 20 hours as a clinician assistant in the PACE, an on-campus clinic serving children from the community with a variety of physical and/or cognitive disabilities. Clinician assistants work with a PACE clinician for a semester learning about the clients and the procedures for delivering services. The candidates second placement is as a PACE clinician for one year and a minimum of 90 hours assessing and programming appropriate physical and social activities for a variety of children with disabilities K-12. Though candidates return to PACE more than once, the program coordinator works with each candidate to make sure that there is a breadth and depth of experience provided to these students where they experience various types and ages of disabilities in both aquatic and gym settings. A culminating placement is when candidates assist clients to transition from PACE into a community physical activity such as Special Olympics, fitness clubs, or other suitable organizations. Candidates also complete a minimum of 60 hours in the school district working with an adapted physical educator performing a variety of roles and responsibilities, (e.g., assessments, individualized family service plan/individualized education plan/individualized transition plan meetings, delivery of instruction etc.) This was confirmed by completers, cooperating teachers and current students. Completers and current candidates share that they felt able to provide high level instruction to a wide variety of individuals with disabilities across the lifespan. Cooperating teachers share that they feel candidates are well prepared to work with students with disabilities with a wide range of needs and cultural backgrounds.

These comprehensive field experiences in the APEAA program follow a planned sequence from the beginning to end of their coursework and include experiences in a broad range of service delivery options, with students of varying ages and disabilities. Each semester candidates are participating in at least one field experience making it very easy to integrate practicum

experiences with coursework knowledge on a regular basis. In both the clinic and school sites, candidates are required to develop 6 case studies and program plans for students with different disabilities, at the elementary, middle, and high school level to ensure that candidates have in-depth-field experiences with diverse students and settings. The PACE program is tied closely to course work and experiences within that program are brought into the classroom frequently for embedded teaching experiences.

Meaningful and appropriate verbal and written feedback by qualified personnel is provided during all field experiences. The APE coordinator and the physical education single subject coordinator collaborate with local school district personnel regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, and site-based supervising personnel. Cooperating teachers felt that their feedback was valued and heard, and all stakeholders reported that feedback was frequently given in a variety of modalities and everyone felt that this process led to meaningful feedback to students at many points in their curriculum.

The candidate benefits from ongoing evaluation in their fieldwork placements. Quantitative feedback from rubrics and qualitative comments are used to critique application activities and delivery of instruction and services of the candidate. Summative evaluations by university supervisors and district master teachers are collected using a Likert-scale checklist of the APEAA program standards and other competencies related to the roles and responsibilities of an adapted physical educator. Candidates also complete a similar Likert-scale checklist and are asked to write a narrative reflection after each field experience. Each semester data is collected, aggregated, analyzed, and used for program improvements and documentation.

Assessment of Candidates

APEAA candidates are required to maintain a 3.0 or better grade point average on all coursework to remain in good standing in the university, and to be recommended for the APEAA. Multiple measures of candidates are conducted on an ongoing systematic basis from admission, advancement, and exit. The APE program coordinator, with faculty input, is responsible for coordinating the evaluation of all candidates during APEAA coursework, field experiences and the final summative portfolio and exit interview. This assures continuity and consistency for each candidate's evaluation. All candidates are advised how they will be assessed in the program and informed of the results of those assessments. Proper candidate assessment includes documentation and written verification of all assignments conducted by various faculty and supervisors that includes; student learning outcomes or key APE assignments and application activities during identified coursework, fieldwork and student teaching experiences and summative candidate portfolio evaluation. Candidates are assessed on student learning outcomes that reflect the conceptual framework for the APEAA program that include educational theories and models regarding diversity, growth and learning, collaboration, and social responsibility. This was confirmed in interviews with program completers and document reviews.

All candidates complete a portfolio and exit interview with the APE coordinator to evaluate candidate's competence that adheres to the APEAA program standards and national

professional standards. If there is a dispute between the candidate and the APE coordinator then an additional instructor can be brought in for evaluation. This is the culminating experience for each candidate. During this exit interview, the candidate presents their APE teaching portfolio. The candidate's portfolio evaluation is based on the following criteria: (a) meeting both knowledge & application based on the 13 APEAA standards through coursework completed and (b) providing quality samples of their work. Faculty works with candidates to ensure any weaknesses are identified and addressed in their final course. This was confirmed in interviews with program completers and document reviews.

APE candidates answer a post exit survey of APE program effectiveness. The survey is an 11-item questionnaire. In general, these questions ask the candidate to what degree the APE program has helped them attain certain specific competences related to teaching APE. Included in the survey are three open ended questions regarding program strengths, suggestions for improvement and candidates' most significant learning experience. These questions are discussed with the candidate during the exit interview and all information is used for reflection and improvements for the APEAA program in the future. This was confirmed in interviews with program completers and document reviews.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, program completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization program.

Teacher Induction

Program Design

The Cal State LA Teacher Education Induction Credential Program (TEICP) is coordinated by a part-time lecturer who is also the faculty instructor for two courses. The current induction coordinator is a recent addition to the role. Through a personal document review and looking at candidate surveys she made many adjustments to the program. One mentor commented that hiring the coordinator was a good move and that the conversations have been more productive than in the prior years. Candidates also feel very supported by the coordinator and appreciate the changes made under her leadership. They appreciate her organization and quick response time.

The program is designed to provide a two-year (four semester) individualized, job-embedded system of mentoring, support, and professional learning. Advisement and mentoring of the new teacher are a shared responsibility between the TEICP, and each teacher's mentor and administrator. Teachers, mentors, administrators, and Cal State LA faculty and staff work together to enhance teacher effectiveness and support reflective practice to assist teachers in meeting their goals.

The TEICP program is supported by Student Services creating Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with participating districts. Credential analysts for the university work ensuring that they remain current on Commission updates, requirements, and available services. While the division chair attends monthly meetings with the dean, associate dean, director, and other CCOE chairs to ensure a regular communication channel for discussion of issues pertinent to the credentialing programs, Induction is currently not part of the meeting, or part of the advisory committee.

Candidates have structured opportunities for providing input. Candidates fill out a Student Opinion Survey each semester and rate their instructor's effectiveness for each course they are taking. Candidates also complete surveys about the program and their mentor. The coordinator has created a new survey for the mentor to be used later this year.

Currently at the beginning of the year the coordinator meets with the mentor and candidate to review the Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) and its components. It was shared during interviews that this meeting was very helpful to understanding the program. As confirmed in interviews, candidates meet with their mentor weekly to discuss their goals and current needs. The coordinator checks in with the candidate and their mentors two separate times during the semester to see the candidates progress in their goals. If the candidate needed additional resources this would be the time to ask for them. These meetings are appreciated by the candidates and mentors as shared in interviews.

The mentor is selected by the candidate and/or the administrator at the candidate's site. The candidates are given the task to find a mentor. They are given the mentor criteria and qualifications. If they cannot find a mentor, the coordinator will call the administrator and try to find them one. The mentor then has a meeting with the candidate and coordinator to review the components of the ILP.

The team found no convincing evidence that ongoing training and support for mentors is provided. Documents provided to the team indicated that training resources are available. However, no convincing evidence was provided on the specific training and support each mentor received so that it could be determined that each mentor received training in coaching and mentoring, goal setting, use of appropriate mentoring instruments and best practices in adult learning. This was confirmed in all interviews. There also was no reflection on their own mentoring practice and opportunities to engage with mentoring peers in professional learning networks. Interviews supported the conclusion that ongoing training and support does not occur for many mentors.

In addition, there was no evidence that the induction leaders provide formative feedback to mentors on their work, including the establishment of collaborative relationships. This was also confirmed through interviews with mentors.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The ILP is designed based on the candidate's needs. It is developed within the first 60 days of the candidate's enrollment in the program with a mentor. Each semester candidates work on a

new ILP and take a semester Induction class, which includes work on their ILP goals, and weekly cohort meetings with similar candidates to talk about their teaching assignment in a structured way. They are also required to sign up for an advanced teaching course of their choice. It is encouraged to take one that aligns with a goal they have. In the beginning of the semester the candidate, mentor, induction coordinator, and the candidate's administrator (if available) meet to review the goals set by the candidate. If the administrator cannot attend the meeting the candidates share their goals with them as confirmed in interviews with candidates and completers.

Although the ILP has growth goals and a description of how the candidate will work to meet these goals there is no convincing evidence that defined and measurable outcomes are developed for induction candidates. Recent changes were made to the ILP form, but the ILP's currently in use have no place to state defined and measurable outcomes. Interviews supported this conclusion, that defined and measurable outcomes do not play a role in a candidate's current development.

The candidates do a new ILP each semester giving them the opportunity to select new goals based on their current needs after reflecting on the Continuum of Teaching Practice. They work on these goals and other needs at their school site during their weekly meetings with their mentor. All interviews confirmed that candidates were meeting with their mentors and getting feedback from their mentors. Most candidates can observe colleagues and peers, but that is only if their site is able to make arrangements. Most candidates and completers interviewed were able to observe colleagues at least once while in the program.

Assessment of Candidates

The formative assessment system, which is conducted at the end of the candidates' first, second and third semesters, is designed to evaluate their success in meeting their goals in preparation for moving on to the next semester. Utilizing the assessment results, the induction coordinator, candidate, and mentor identify next steps to improve the candidates' expertise in meeting the needs of all students. Candidates need to achieve an 87% or higher in the classes they are enrolled in to pass. In the final semester a portfolio presentation and an online portfolio are required assignments. Each is scored using a rubric. Once candidates complete all four semesters of class their names are given to the credential analyst for a clear credential recommendation.

Findings on Standards

After review of all available information including interviews with candidates, program completers, program personnel, mentors, coaches, and other stakeholders, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Teacher Induction program except for the following:

Standard 3: Program Standard 3 – Met with Concerns

There is no convincing evidence that defined and measurable outcomes are developed for induction candidates on their current ILP.

Standard 4: Program Standard 4 – Not Met

There is no convincing evidence that the program is providing ongoing training and support for mentors, including: coaching and mentoring; goal setting; use of appropriate instruments; best practices in adult learning and reflection on mentoring practice, and opportunities to engage with mentoring peers in professional learning networks. After reviewing all documentation shared by the university, and after interviewing mentors it was clear this was not part of the induction program.

Standard 6: Program Standard 6 – Not Met

There is no convincing evidence that the induction program leader provides formative feedback to mentors on their work, including establishment of collaborative relationships. This was evident after interviews with stakeholders.

Preliminary Administrative Services

Program Design

The Preliminary Administrative Service Credential (PASC) is Cal State LA's only educator preparation program in the Division of Applied and Advanced Studies in Education as shown in the organizational chart. In 2018-19, the program faculty began a full revision of the program to align the program with the expectations of the California Administrator Performance Assessment (Cal APA). To support the transition to the Cal APA, the program hired a Cal APA coordinator who aids candidates in understanding the technical structure of the Cal APA and assists candidates by leading support sessions each month and individual support as needed, as confirmed in interviews. Furthermore, over the past two years, the program has developed new university program learning outcomes, and organized the program in three blocks of coursework, each block with a cohesive theme, for better alignment to the Cal APA Leadership Cycles.

In the interest of ongoing continuous improvement, current candidates and program completers report the PASC program is very responsive to feedback. Each cohort of candidates selects a cohort representative, who gives feedback once a semester on the program and serves as a conduit to the faculty with any candidate concerns or issues. This was confirmed in completer interviews. The PASC program also receives feedback at the end of each course taught through class evaluations. Completers stated in interviews they felt comfortable talking to the faculty when issues arose, and they felt they were heard. Secondly, the adjunct faculty pool for the program consists of experienced leaders from the surrounding school districts who have a long and supportive relationship with the program. The program asks that these leaders use their leadership expertise "in just in time" decision-making to assist the full-time faculty in the development of course content and signature assignments to improve the leadership development of the candidates. Thirdly, the Educational Administration Advisory Board, which consists of leaders of partner schools and school districts, plays an essential role in providing the program with insights about long-term trends in the educational field and how the program should engage in visioning work to prepare for the long-term trends. Each year, the advisory board convenes to discuss and strategize about how the program should prepare and position

itself to respond to these more macro issues. Lastly, the feedback the program receives from all stakeholder groups (candidates, adjunct practitioner faculty, and the advisory board) is shared with the college-level assessment committee, The Assessment Task Force, to determine areas of program improvement.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The program has implemented a course block structure. Each block is themed around three essential aspects of school leadership. Block 1: Understanding the School/Community Context begins the program by having candidates understand the context in which schools, especially urban schools are situated. Block 2: Leading to Learning then moves the candidates in developing the knowledge and skills transforming schools and instruction for all students. In Block 3: Sustaining and Supporting Learning Communities, candidates examine the practical skills that define school operations. The candidates are in cohorts and go through the blocks together. Each block is aligned with Leadership Cycles in the CalAPA.

While all the courses in the program confront equity issues, a course in collaboration, pluralism, and social justice provides for the candidates the theoretical grounding for social justice and equity in schools. With this grounding, the candidates examine issues such as deculturalization, cultural hegemony, white privilege, and historically marginalized communities and students. Completers stated that they felt prepared to work with diverse students and families and appreciated the lens of diversity apparent in all courses.

In each course the candidates complete 20 hours of required content-specific activities. The program has seven field-based courses for a total of 140 hours of content-specific fieldwork. Candidates are required to complete 45 hours of clinical internship in the last term of the program.

The PASC links the candidates' coursework to the field experiences. Signature assignments are aligned to the practical application at their sites. These signature assignments require the candidates to describe these field experiences and connect the field experiences to the theoretical knowledge base previously acquired. The signature assignments serve as evidence through the portfolio, the program's summative assessment.

Each candidate has a district supervisor. The university supervisors have an initial meeting with them to outline their expectations and responsibilities. The district supervisors all confirmed that they met with their candidates throughout their time in the program. They understood their responsibility as a supervisor and appreciated that the assignments were aligned with the work the school was already doing. Completers also confirmed that they met with their district supervisor consistently throughout their time in the program and felt supported.

Candidates assess the performance of their site supervisors to determine appropriate placements. Furthermore, the university faculty are in contact with site supervisors through email correspondence, phone/Zoom conversations, and school visits as needed as confirmed in interviews.

Assessment of Candidates

Advisement begins with a group orientation at the start of the program in which the cohort is assigned an advisor. In the first semester of the program, the candidates enroll in Introduction to the Educational Administration and Laboratory for Educational Administration Digital Portfolios and review the California Administrative Performance Expectations (CAPEs) and California Administrative Content Expectations (CACEs). Throughout the program, the candidates and faculty review the alignment of the CAPEs, CACEs, coursework, fieldwork, and the portfolio. Interviews confirmed that through feedback and changes in the program, the course block (CAPE's, signature assignment) sequence is now aligned with the CalAPA.

Candidates in the PASC program are assessed in all fieldwork placements. As a part of the courses, district supervisors are responsible for guiding and assisting as the candidates complete the required field experiences aligned to the signature assignments assigned to each course. Using rubrics and checklists, site supervisors assess candidates' fieldwork performance. Candidates are also assessed using rubrics on their signature assignments and digital portfolio.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Administrative Services program.

Reading and Literacy Added Authorization and Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist

Program Design

The Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA) and the Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist (RLLS) preparation goes beyond the point of preparation received by pre-service teachers and helps candidates to apply a deeper level of understanding of research and pedagogy related to literacy for all learners. Candidates can be, and generally are, concurrently enrolled in a master's program or another authorization program (such as the Bilingual Added Authorization).

There is a planned process of comprehensive course work, field experiences and candidate assessments to prepare candidates to teach diverse learners and provide literacy leadership to schools. The combined coursework begins at the added authorization level with a set of five courses and expands with additional coursework and fieldwork for more advanced learning in the specialist credential program if candidates choose. The program design provides multiple and systemic opportunities for the application and demonstration of the pedagogical knowledge and skills identified in the reading and literacy program standards. There is individualized support at the onset and on-going assistance to each participant throughout the program, as well as collaborative experiences with colleagues and support during their clinical practice. Completion of the RLLSC program culminates in a comprehensive exam that requires students to do a case study on two elementary children who are English Language Learners.

In 2016, when the campus moved from a quarter to semester system, program coursework was re-examined through the university curricular process. The program coordinator collaborates with faculty and the chair to examine and refine the existing program after receiving feedback from students and faculty in Curriculum and Instruction.

Stakeholders have structured opportunities for providing input. All candidates in the program are invited annually to fill out the Current Student Survey and rate their satisfaction with advising, course rigor, and program delivery. Candidates fill out a Student Opinion Survey each semester and rate their instructor's effectiveness for each course they take. The college-level assessment committee, The Assessment Task Force, hosts an Assessment Advisory committee where stakeholders' feedback is solicited and then used for program improvement.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Coursework in the RLAA and RLLS programs provide classes to enable candidates to provide leadership in their school or district around improving reading and language arts for a diverse population of students. Courses introduce educational theory, strategies and assessment, theories, and strategies to support literacy acquisition. Candidates and faculty alike describe an asset-based approach to instruction, with an emphasis on the needs of diverse students, and student performance data analysis. Candidates report, "it was very impactful to see students through a growth mindset; to stress that they are striving readers and writers, and our role is to facilitate their learning." "Entering the program taught me a lot about how to work with students who speak another language."

In the last semester of both the authorization and specialist programs, candidates participate in fieldwork in which they apply all that they have been learning. The first fieldwork experience takes place in the C. Lamar Mayer Learning Center, where candidates have tutoring or coaching roles in a PreK-12 literacy intervention and educational enrichment program for students from diverse cultural backgrounds. This reading practicum also serves as a model for outreach to the surrounding community; clinic responsibilities can include designing and implementing parent workshops and discussion groups. The second field work experience, at the end of the specialist credential program, provides candidates with experience in a range of after school programs and independent reading clinics, sometimes in their own school site or district, to demonstrate their leadership ability. Participation in courses and fieldwork forms a foundation for candidates to take leadership roles in curriculum and instruction at their school sites and districts, corroborated by these candidates' statements, "You do become a leader at your school; I've grown a lot as a professional, and still I continue to grow." "I've learned to contribute to the school community through advocacy, assessment and using assessment to drive instruction, not just label levels. I am well prepared with data, qualitative and quantitative."

Assessment of Candidates

Each course has a clear set of core assignments with an accompanying evaluation process. RLAA and RLLSC candidates are evaluated in the reading clinic practicum and final fieldwork for how well they assess students, understand the assessment results of the children, and how they apply appropriate strategies to meet the needs of the student. The culminating assessment is a comprehensive exam in which candidates assess two elementary English Learners, analyze

data, and recommend the best course of instruction and theoretical rationale to assist the students in their literacy performance.

Candidates are advised about the program requirements and informed of their progress at critical points throughout the program: during admittance counseling, through coursework evaluation, and via the comprehensive exam. Completers concur that in the courses, assignments encourage reflection not just on strategy and practices, but also on how to communicate to other teachers and administrators, and, in general, on their new role as literacy specialist.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization and Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist programs.

Bilingual Authorization

Program Design

The Bilingual Authorization (BA) is designed to 1) provide candidates who already have obtained their multiple subject, single subject, or education specialists teaching credentials an opportunity to add the bilingual authorization and 2) allow interested candidates enrolled in the multiple subject program to take courses towards the BA.

Each member of the leadership team brings diverse and specific areas of expertise, skills, and teaching experiences. The division chair provides leadership for the bilingual authorization program with direct input from the Office for Student Services. At the time of entering the Program Review, the faculty consisted of one full-time faculty, and one designated part-time faculty. Both currently teach the three required courses, and the part-time faculty member is responsible for program operations, including but not limited to: a) monitoring fieldwork processes, b) collecting and analyzing data, c) providing input on staffing for courses, d) advising, and e) recruitment.

The bilingual authorization program incorporates a purposeful, logically sequenced structure of three core courses that has the purpose of supporting candidates be able to:

- Develop, implement, and adapt instruction for bilingual, dual language, and cross-cultural settings,
- Support classroom teachers who work in bilingual, dual language, and cross-cultural settings, particularly those working with English learners
- Obtain post-credential certification outside of the traditional credential pathways

Courses are relevant to the current conditions of teaching English learners and teaching in bilingual settings. The program design provides systemic opportunities for the application and

demonstration of the pedagogical knowledge and skills acquired in the bilingual authorization program via coursework and portfolio requirements. In addition, faculty provide coordination of the administrative components of the program such as admission, advisement, participant support and assessment, and program evaluation. Cal State LA's bilingual authorization is approved for the following languages: Cantonese, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish, and Tagalog.

In 2016, when the campus moved from a quarter to semester system, program coursework was re-examined through the university curricular process. At this time, all students have either begun on the semester system or transitioned to it. All candidates participating in the Bilingual Authorization program are under the semester program only. The recent addition of a full-time faculty and half-time lecturer will allow for further examination of the program design and efficacy.

Stakeholders have structured opportunities for providing input. All candidates in the program are invited annually to fill out the Current Student Survey and rate their satisfaction with advising, course rigor, and program delivery. Candidates fill out a Student Opinion Survey each semester and rate their instructor's effectiveness for each course they are taking. Program faculty host a Community Advisory Board where community members are invited to meet with faculty to discuss issues affecting local districts as well as provide suggestions for improving the credential programs. The college-level assessment committee, The Assessment Task Force, hosts an Assessment Advisory Committee where stakeholders' feedback is solicited and reviewed for program improvement.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The BA coursework is comprised of three courses to be taken in sequential order. The signature assignments in each course illustrate student competency and understanding of the areas of knowledge called out in the program standards. All courses emphasize the needs of English learners and dual language learners. Candidates and completers comment that the multiple target languages represented by their peers 'creates a sense of diversity, and an understanding of how to be inclusive and meet diverse students' needs'. Faculty indicate that they seek ways to include pedagogy and research relevant to all language groups and are working on expanding and improving the program to include access to more diverse faculty. Nonetheless, several completers shared that this program taught them how to address language needs in instruction and meet the needs of students with different target languages.

Fieldwork (10 hours) is linked to the development of two lesson plans in the target language, which are then taught in a fieldwork classroom and reflected on in a program reflection assignment. Teachers currently in the field are encouraged and supported to find placements other than their own classroom. Faculty stated, and candidates confirmed, that there is support for finding fieldwork placements as needed. With distance learning, alternatives have been established, including video observation of instruction.

Assessment of Candidates

The program culminates in a final bilingual authorization portfolio that provides evidence that candidates have demonstrated competence in the required coursework. Fieldwork in an elementary or secondary classroom demonstrates competency in teaching content in two languages, English and the candidate's target language in which they are obtaining the bilingual authorization. Candidates are required to present their portfolio or portions of it to their professor and classmates. The professional portfolio also contains "reflection" pieces that discuss the significance of each item that is included and which student learning outcomes it addresses. Items to be included in the portfolio are assignments from selected courses such as lesson plans with photographs or videos of them being carried out, literature reviews, issue or problem-based research or thematic unit, and learning center with photographs, etc. The bilingual authorization portfolio is submitted to Canvas for ease of online review.

To meet language competence the program has developed a set of language assessments which candidates are required to complete before entering the program. Qualified evaluators in the target language evaluate these assessments. Faculty, candidates, and program completers concurred that faculty provide general and individual support, and information, relative to meeting the language proficiency requirements. Program candidates are expected to meet the passing standard on the appropriate CSET: World Languages examination to gain their bilingual authorization.

Candidates are advised about program requirements at the beginning of the program. Advisement from OSS staff and course instructors occurs as part of the program application process and again throughout participation in the program.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Bilingual Authorization program.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology
Child Welfare and Attendance

Program Design

The Pupil Personnel Services (PSS): School Counseling, School Psychology, and Child Welfare and Attendance credential programs at Cal State LA are offered in the Charter College of Education. Regarding program leadership, there is a coordinator for each of the PPS credential programs. Based on communications in advance and with the confluence of information revealed during the site visit, there is ample evidence that program coordinators communicate and collaborate with each other and with colleagues, administrators, and staff within the institution. Ample evidence was available pertaining to communications within the credential program and institution regarding course offerings and coverage, student evaluation and progress, engagement with practica and internship supervisors, and with community

stakeholders. The school psychology program is a three-year program, including a year-long internship. The school counseling program is a two- or three-year program, including a year-long internship. The child welfare and attendance program is included in tandem with both the school counseling and school psychology programs. Each of the programs involve rigorous preparation through course work and field work to meet the state and national training standards in school counseling and school psychology.

Each of the programs has a strong emphasis on social justice and multicultural counseling, as evidenced by the coursework, advising, and supervision.

Based on feedback from candidates, supervisors, and evaluations the school counseling and school psychology faculty have continued to refine each of programs during the recent two years, including updates to course curriculum and fieldwork activities. There are multiple examples of content in specific courses being modified to include contemporary evidence-based practices, as well as modifications to further meet the needs of the candidates. Candidates, faculty, and completers provided evidence of modifications to each of the programs. For instance, the school psychology program has used the data and feedback continuously, for instance, in recently examining the feedback from fieldwork supervisors, it became evident that candidates needed additional preparation in academic interventions. Based on this, the faculty developed further emphasis and assignments to specifically build candidates skills in these areas. In addition, the school counseling program also uses data and feedback to inform and further develop their program. A recent example includes using the student feedback to evaluate the fieldwork sites and the supervisors, and then adjusting in future opportunities at a specific site, due to external supervisors who were not as available, thus, certain sites have been removed from the directory. Another example is the use of the comprehensive exam data, which revealed that in the PPS exam option, there were a lot of candidates who were struggling with this, so the faculty developed a new assignment within their course sequence to help better prepare candidates, through providing scaffolding and attempting to better prepare them for the subsequent exam. These efforts have yielded increasing passing rates on the comprehensive exams.

Given the large number of fieldwork placements and supervisors across the programs, the programs engage in extensive collaboration and communications with stakeholders in the region to obtain input. This includes a community advisory board as well as input from the fieldwork supervisors. There was clear and converging evidence that the faculty used this input to continue to refine their program, including modifications to course content to further address contemporary topics in the local school districts (e.g., professionalism related to interviews, fieldwork placement fair, highlighting the specific timing of content). For school counselors, there is an annual focus group (Community Advisory Committee) in the spring providing consultation and information to further inform the program. For each of the programs, there are regular communications with the fieldwork supervisors to obtain their input about how to further enhance the program.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The candidates in the school counseling, school psychology, and child welfare and attendance programs each take a combination of courses and integrated fieldwork experiences across the years of each program. Each of these programs is briefly described below.

The M.S. in Counseling, Option in Marriage and Family Therapy with an emphasis in School-Based Family Counseling (i.e., School Counseling) is designed to prepare family systems-oriented counselors who are eligible to apply for licensure in California as Marriage and Family Therapists (MFT) and Licensed Professional Clinical Counselors (LPCC). It also includes the PPS credential in school counseling and the added authorization in child welfare and attendance (CWA) as part of the master's degree. The distinguishing feature of the program is the focus on School-Based Family Counseling, which equips candidates with all the competencies and skills of an effective school counselor, while providing an increased understanding of mental health issues and family systems, to work directly in public schools and school-based related agencies.

The M.S. in Counseling, Option in School Psychology is designed for candidates who plan to work as school psychologists who will focus on the psychoeducational development of individuals from birth to age 21, their abilities and potentialities, biological, emotional, behavioral, and cultural factors that influence the learning process. Candidates who earn the master's degree with this option also qualify for the PPS credential in school psychology and in child welfare and attendance services. The distinguishing feature of the program is the ecological behavioral emphasis, including the importance of socio-cultural considerations. There is also an emphasis option for the behavior analyst certificate.

As evidenced in the review of documents, and interviews with candidates and alumni, each of the programs (school counseling, school psychology, child welfare and attendance) offer candidates a balance of rigorous curriculum and field experience covering all areas of necessary professional development (e.g., assessment, intervention, systems, consultation, etc.), which prepares graduates extremely well for their careers in their respective field.

The school psychology program is three years full-time, 72-76 units, with about 24 candidates enrolled in each cohort. The program includes 450 hours of practicum and 1,200 hours of internship for a total of 1,650 hours of fieldwork. For completion of the child welfare and attendance, the program includes 150 hours of fieldwork, built into the 450 hours for school psychology, with CWA supervisor.

The school counseling program is generally two years full-time (or three years of part-time study), 73-77 units, about 24 (was 36 for a few years) candidates enrolled in each cohort (with possible entry during Summer semester, and most enter in the fall). The program includes 110 hours of practica, and 600 hours of internship and 450 hours required for the MFT, for a total of 1650 hours of fieldwork. Completion of the CWA program includes 150 hours of fieldwork, built into the 600 hours of school counseling, with CWA supervisor.

Evidence in the materials, conversations with program administrators, faculty, and candidates confirmed that coursework is coordinated with field work and connected for both the school

counseling and the school psychology programs. Each program involves extensive fieldwork, and each includes assignments in the coursework that are fulfilled within the context of fieldwork, thus, there is clear evidence of coordination. Completers and employers highlighted the extensive fieldwork resulting in extraordinary professional preparation for school counseling, school psychology, and child welfare and attendance graduates. Supervisors and employers consistently noted that Cal State LA graduates are highly prized and preferred in the local school districts.

For each of the programs, field supervision, advisement, evaluation is received from both the program personnel and the district employed individual (practica, fieldwork, and internship supervisors). Documentation and interviews revealed a high level of coordination in supervision across both university and district employees. There was outstanding commitment across the university and field supervisors pertaining to establishing the goodness-of-fit between student needs and school-supervisor opportunities. Given the large number of candidates engaging in fieldwork each quarter, the absence of any serious concerns reflects an extreme commitment to supporting and supervising candidates in their fieldwork.

Assessment of Candidates

Related to the assessment of candidates in each of the PPS credential programs, there have been numerous administrative changes during the past few years. Overall, these changes have been very positive for the coordinators and credential programs. For instance, there has been additional support for the credential infrastructures, specifically as related to increased supports for the data collection, management, and organization. These additional office supports are reported to have helped greatly. There is still some information that the credential coordinators collect and coordinate (e.g., signature projects, comprehensive exams). Thus, the infrastructures to support the assessment of candidate competencies appears to be robust.

Review of program documents and interviews with candidates, alumni, supervisors, and faculty revealed a series of assessments, including evaluations and key assignments to evaluate student performance and progress in each of the programs. Interviews with candidates revealed that they receive advance notice of the assessment requirements and that they received timely feedback about the results of each of the assessments. The candidates reported ongoing direct feedback from the instructors in their course, as well as regular feedback from their faculty advisors. There is follow-up on fieldwork evaluations if there is anything to be discussed further. Reports from candidates, alumni, supervisors, and faculty consistently revealed the value and timeliness of these assessments and feedback.

In addition, school psychology candidates complete the PRAXIS national exam by the end of the fall of the third year and receive evaluation on their fieldwork in year two and internship in year three. This national exam provides further evidence of the core knowledge of graduates of the programs. Survey data and information from the interviews provided converging evidence that candidates felt that they were well prepared.

School counseling candidates receive evaluation on their fieldwork and internship each semester. Candidates in the school counseling program are also encouraged (but not required)

to complete the licensing for the MFT clinician and for the LPCC. The graduates are eligible to pursue these licenses after accruing additional hours, post degree. Survey data and information from the interviews provided converging evidence that candidates felt that they were well prepared.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, fieldwork supervisors, intern supervisors, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling, School Psychology, and the Child Welfare and Attendance programs.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

California State University, Los Angeles (Cal State LA) provides high quality professional preparation for candidates in 20 credential programs. All programs are housed in the university's Charter College of Education, except for Speech Language Pathology and the Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization, which are housed in the Rongxiang Xu College of Health and Human Services. There is a solid unit identity as administrators and faculty from both colleges frequently interact both formally and informally.

The several strengths of the unit and its programs include:

Cal State LA's candidates are among the most diverse in California's professional preparation programs, with a majority identifying as Latinx. A large number are first generation college graduates. Cal State LA plays a key role in diversifying the educator pool in California.

A clear strength of the unit is the advanced level of collaboration and interaction with local school districts. Documentary evidence and interviews revealed these relationships are ongoing and effective. When interviewed, district-level and school-site administrators from several districts unanimously spoke of the high quality of Cal State LA completers employed in their districts.

Another unique strength is the on-campus centers/clinics that serve preK-12 students and their parents: The C. Lamar Mayer Learning Center, the Robert L. Douglass Speech and Language Clinic, and the Physical Activity Clinic for Education (PACE). The C. Mayer Learning Center serves hundreds of children and their parents on Saturdays and provides valuable clinical experience for candidates in the PPS, education specialist, and reading programs.

The education unit and its programs have sophisticated and effective continuous improvement processes that are well integrated with campus-wide assessment efforts. Documentary evidence and interviews established that at both the program and unit level, meaningful data is gathered, analyzed, and used for unit and program improvement.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:	<i>No response needed</i>
The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California’s adopted standards and curricular frameworks.	Consistently
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	Consistently
The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation.	Consistently
The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development/instruction, field-based supervision, and clinical experiences.	Consistently
The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.	Consistently
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	Consistently
The institution employs, assigns, and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. Qualifications of faculty and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service.	Consistently
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 1: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Based on document review and interviews with leadership, faculty, staff, candidates, and completers, the team finds Cal State LA and the education unit have an infrastructure in place to operate effective educator programs.

This infrastructure includes a research-based vision of teaching and learning. The vision seeks to create a learning community of faculty, administrators, staff, students, and community members who work collaboratively to provide programs that allow all P-12 students to succeed, honor diversity, and promote equity. A cornerstone of the vision is the goal of producing completers who are reflective practitioners.

The institution actively involves faculty and stakeholder in the decision-making process for all programs and the unit. Documentary and interview evidence demonstrate that several governance committees operate effectively. This high level of ongoing and effective involvement is particularly noteworthy given the large number of programs in the unit and the fact that two programs are housed outside of the Charter College of Education. The Assessment Task Force allows for unit level coordination of the continuous improvement model. The Assessment Advisory Committee is just one of many existing structures that provide forums for P-12 stakeholder input (along with the advisory groups for programs).

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Team Finding
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	<i>No response needed</i>
The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	Consistently
The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.	Consistently
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements.	Consistently
Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 2: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Through review of documents and interviews across all stakeholders, it is evident that the Unit posts clear admissions criteria for all potential credential candidates and recruits, admits, and supports candidates to diversify the educator pool in California. Recruitment materials are aligned with these criteria and other university information. The CCOE recruiter works across all credential programs to recruit and guide potential applications through the process. The undergraduate student population at Cal State LA and the local catchment area has a diversity that reflects the schools in the local area. Recruitment efforts are purposefully focused on local community colleges, Cal State LA undergraduate student population and prospects from the surrounding communities in Los Angeles County. Employment demographic data indicate that the Cal State LA Charter College of Education is making positive strides in contributing to the diversity of the pool of educators in the surrounding areas. The outreach done through many initiatives support this effort. In interviews with employers, it was clear that the recruitment efforts use partnerships with employers to provide a diverse candidate pool. As was stated in interviews an effort is made to recruit from local communities to connect with the demographics of that community.

Throughout the admission process, the admission team maintains contact with applicants via a combination of electronic and in-person information sessions and phone call contacts to provide support and guidance. For admitted candidates, a program orientation is hosted. Once enrolled in the program, the Unit employs/assigns a combination of professional advisors and faculty advisors to develop program plans, roadmaps, make field placements and mentor matches, and provide ongoing advisement and guidance. Professional advisors are available Monday – Friday for pre- scheduled and walk-in appointments. Faculty advisors and program coordinators maintain posted office hours and provide an abundance of email/online advising to educator candidates. Candidates are notified of upcoming events such as career fairs and upcoming application and paperwork deadlines. One program of the 20, Education Specialist: Visual Impairments, is not consistent in the advisement of candidates. This is a small program, but several the candidates interviewed did not feel they were advised and were confused about the progression through their program. They shared that was challenging to find answers to their questions.

Credential candidates receive academic support from their course instructors related to the foundations of teaching, teaching methodology and preparing for fieldwork assignments. General support for subject matter competence assessments, teacher performance assessments, and other state and national assessments relevant to the individual credential programs is provided in the form of sharing available resources, free summer workshops, and courses and faculty guidance.

The Charter College of Education has a comprehensive approach to candidate advisement and support for the edTPA and Cal APA.

Faculty advisors assume responsibility for credential program advisement in the educational specialist programs, added authorizations, pupil personnel services, child welfare and attendance, reading literacy and leadership specialist, clinical rehabilitative services orientation and mobility, speech and language pathology, and administrative services programs. Program coordinators assist faculty in advising teacher education, administrative services, and induction candidates and serve as a liaison with local school partners as needed.

Whether advisement and support are provided by professional staff advisors or faculty advisors, department chairs and the director of student services work closely to ensure that advising is accurate, consistent, and provided in a caring manner to guide candidates through the credential process. Candidates who experience academic, dispositional, or personal challenges while enrolled in a credential program are provided with additional support from advisors and program coordinators. Challenges that cannot be resolved at this level are referred to the director of student services and division chair for additional support and guidance. While advisement is often focused on academics, fieldwork, and Commission regulations, guidance is provided with a mindful career focus for all candidates.

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards.	Consistently
The unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.	Consistently
The unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors, and school sites, as appropriate to the program.	Consistently
Through site-based work and clinical experiences, programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	Consistently
The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	Consistently

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	Consistently
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	Consistently
For each program the unit offers, candidates have significant experience in school settings where the curriculum aligns with California’s adopted content standards and frameworks, and the school reflects the diversity of California’s student and the opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 3: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Of the 20, 15 programs require fieldwork that involve placing or working with employed candidates at a school site. Through review of documents and interviews, it was demonstrated that the CCOE reprograms offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.

Through interviews and document review it is evident that there are strong partnerships formed with local school districts to provide collaboration in selecting appropriate placements and experiences for candidates. In review of demographic data and confirmation by stakeholders’ candidates are provided with diverse settings. The CCOE has put in place strategic plans to work with local districts in partnership to provide diverse student placements. Programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites, as appropriate to the programs. Each of these programs have an orientation at the beginning of the program to provide students the pathway for the program and all testing and additional credential requirements.

Some programs have a process to ensure that district employed site supervisors (DES) and mentors are (1) appropriately certified and experienced, (2) trained and oriented to the role, and (3) evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner. Each of the programs verifies that DES are appropriately certified and experienced in a minimum of two of the three methods indicated – Commission website, screening form/resume, and employer letter/program coordinator recommendation.

Some of the programs provide DES training and orientation using a handbook, PowerPoint, and either group, individual or combined orientation. Individual programs conduct surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of DES support provided to candidates and in spring of 2020, the

Unit moved towards the use of one survey to evaluate the DES from most programs. Eight of 16 credential programs provide DES with a stipend. At the annual Day of the Educator celebration, DES are recognized for exemplary service. Starting in spring 2020 a letter of appreciation is issued to all DES. There is variance in the quality and support given to DES. In interviews with DES groups, it was shared that they only receive an email with attachments and are not supported through the clinical practice placements. Other DES interviews shared that they did receive both training and support.

The added authorizations in bilingual, orthopedic impairments, and other health impairments require fieldwork experiences that are embedded within coursework as assignments or portfolios for candidates. These field experiences are part of the coursework completion to become eligible for an added authorization on top of a qualifying preliminary credential. The reading and literacy leadership specialist credential and added authorization provide field experience that is conducted on campus as part of the C. Lamar Mayer Learning Center under the supervision of a qualified university faculty. The C. Mayer Learning Center provides candidates with an opportunity to have a field experience with children from the community who are seeking educational enrichment and supports. These students represent the full range of ages and include students with and without disabilities. There is no DES involved in this advanced credential and added authorization.

Based on the work of the Assessment Task Force and input from the Assessment Advisory Committee, the unit has undertaken efforts to improve overall coordination of fieldwork across programs through the development of a centralized fieldwork dashboard. The dashboard will systematize and provide real time, on demand information that district employed site-based mentors are (1) appropriately certified and experienced, (2) trained and oriented to the role, and (3) evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner. The fieldwork dashboard was demonstrated and does provide the needed information for coordination of all needed information across the credential programs.

Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner is met inconsistently across programs. In interviews with DES across programs it was evident that there was inconsistency in the training, supervision, and evaluation of site-based supervisors. Some programs only provided an email with attachments for the site-based support provider with no on-going support or feedback to the site-based support provider. Some programs did provide training, supervision, and evaluation. The CCOE has recently implemented a dashboard to assist in consistency across all clinical practice programs to begin to address this area.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.	Consistently
The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.	Consistently
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completion data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.	Consistently
The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from key stakeholders such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 4: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

As evidenced in the Graphic Depiction of the Unit Assessment System, unit leadership have oversight for assessment and program improvement and work collaboratively with divisions/departments, program coordinators, staff, faculty, students, and university and college committees to ensure that assessments are conducted, data gathered and analyzed, and plans are put in place to make changes that are indicated by the data to improve processes, practices, and programs. The associate dean and the assessment coordinator have been working with an educator preparation data coach with the Educator Quality Center (EdQ) from the CSU Chancellor's Office, to improve their processes and continue to build a culture of using data for continuous improvement rather than simply for compliance.

The Assessment Advisory Committee, made up of external and internal stakeholders, review unit level assessment data and make suggestions for unit operational as well as program improvements. The Assessment Taskforce (ATF), composed of division chairs, faculty, and the assessment coordinator, receive reports from the Assessment Advisory Committee, review data and go through a “Plan, Do, Study, Act” (PDSA) cycle as part of the continuous improvement process. The work that they do informs the continuous improvement processes at the program level carried out in division/department faculty meetings.

During interviews with the Assessment Advisory Committee, members confirmed that the CCOE regularly uses data for continuous improvement and the committee determines what changes could be made to improve programs. The unit and programs share data with their stakeholders regularly and value their input to help interpret the data. The committee members confirmed

that they regularly review data from a variety of sources, share insights and ideas, and that they felt their input was highly valued.

Interviews with ATF members provided additional evidence that the CCOE has a culture of using assessment data for continuous improvement efforts. Members of the ATF provided examples of bringing the data and data sharing protocols that they learned about in their meetings to division level meetings where the program faculty engaged in analyzing data and using it to make program improvements.

Examples of data sources that are regularly analyzed at the unit level include program completer surveys, admissions data, enrollment data, and graduate retention data. At the program level, faculty and staff review the same data as well as candidate assessment data such as course assignments and performance assessments. The unit provided multiple examples of ways that they used unit and program level data to improve operational systems and program design. One such example was the creation of a unit fieldwork dashboard which was undertaken to streamline and coordinate all fieldwork related processes in response to data that indicated fieldwork processes could be improved.

Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Team Finding
The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.	Consistently
The unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California’s students.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 5: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard.

As evidenced through a review of assessment data, program completer surveys, and interviews with district personnel and other graduate employers, the institution ensures that all candidates are prepared to serve as professional school personnel, and that program completers meet all Commission-adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards. Current candidates and program completers report that they feel prepared to begin their professional careers. Community partners confirmed that the CCOE is an important partner to the local schools during interviews. They have high regard for the programs and services offered by the CCOE and hire their graduates confident that they are well prepared for their future careers.

The CCOE and unit demonstrate a positive impact on the teaching and learning in schools that serve California's students. This positive impact is evidenced by: federal, state and local grant funding that support credential candidates and program improvements; services, professional development, credential candidate school projects, workshops and conferences provided to the surrounding community; faculty publications that build and expand upon the evidence-base that informs teaching and learning in California schools, and credential completer and employer survey data that demonstrate specific strength areas in the teaching credentials. There are numerous examples of clinics, camps, academies, and related services offered directly to students and their families in the local area. Candidates in the education specialist credential program are joined by candidates from the reading and literacy leadership program to support children, grades pre-K-12 at the C. Lamar Mayer Learning Center. Other clinics, centers, academies, and events include: the California Academy on Transition Studies (CATS), the ExCEL Academy, the Reading Camp, the Speech and Language Pathology Clinic, the Physical Activity Center for Education (PACE), and Cane Quest. These outreach activities have a positive impact on the community by providing direct services to children and their families that supplement those services received in California schools.