Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at University of the Pacific

Professional Services Division

April 3-5, 2011

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at University of the Pacific. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation** is made for the institution.

Common (NCATE Unit) Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For all Programs offered by the Institution

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

Program Standards

Programs	Total Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject, with Internship,	19	19		
Single Subject, with Internship,	19	19		
Education Specialist	16	14	2	
Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Preliminary	6	6		
Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Preliminary	8	8		
Preliminary Administrative Services	15	13	2	

Programs	Total Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Pupil Personnel Counseling: School Psychology, w/Intern	32	32		
Speech-Language Pathology	16	16		

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Institution: **University of the Pacific**

Dates of Visit: **April 3-5, 2011**

Accreditation Team
Recommendation: **Accreditation**

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

Common Standards
The entire team reviewed each of the six NCATE (CTC Common) Standards and determined whether the standard was met, not met, or met with concerns. The site visit team found that all NCATE Standards (Common Standards) are **Met** with the exception of NCATE Unit Standards 2 and 6 (CTC Common Standards 2 and 1 respectively) which were **Met with Concern.**

Program Standards
Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total team membership was provided for University of the Pacific. Following discussion, the team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns, or not met. The CTC team found that all standards are **Met** in all programs with the exception of the Education Specialist program standards, 1 and 16 which were **Met with Concern** and the Preliminary Administrative program standards, 7 and 9 which were also **Met with Concern.**

Overall Recommendation
The team completed a thorough review of program documents and program data, and interviewed institutional administrators, program leadership, faculty, supervising instructors, master teachers, candidates, completers, and Advisory Board members. Based on common and program standards findings the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation.**

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

Initial/Teaching Credentials	**Advanced/Service Credentials**
Multiple Subject,	Administrative Services
Multiple Subject Intern	Preliminary
Single Subject	Pupil Personnel Services
Single Subject Intern	School Psychology
	School Psychology Intern
Education Specialist Credentials	
Preliminary	Speech-Language Pathology
Mild/Moderate Disabilities	
Mild/Moderate Disabilities Intern	
Moderate/Severe Disabilities	
Moderate/Severe Disabilities Intern	
Added Authorization Autism Spectrum	
Disorders – New program	

Staff recommends that:

- the institution's response to the preconditions be accepted

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

- University of the Pacific 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

- the team recommends that steps taken to resolve the concerns be addressed by the institution in the next Biennial Report

Accreditation Team
Joint NCATE-CTC Accreditation Team

NCATE Co-Chair
Mary O. Dasovich
Saint Louis University, Missouri

California Co-Chair:
Judith Greig
Notre Dame De Namur University, Belmont

NCATE/Common Standards Cluster:
Lelia L. Vickers
Livingstone College, North Carolina

Deanna T. Rogers
Fulton County-Assistant Principal, Georgia

Karen A. Lea
Trevecca Nazarene University, Tennessee

James Richmond
California State University, Chico

Bonnie A. Konopak
California Polytechnic State University, SLO

Programs Cluster:
Gary Railsback
Point Loma Nazarene University, San Diego

Diana Wheeler
National University, Costa Mesa

Lettie Ramirez
California State University, East Bay

Michael Eliot
University of San Francisco

Staff to the Accreditation Team
Katie Croy, Consultant
Terry Janicki, Administrator
Roxann Purdue, Assistant Consultant

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog　　　　　　Course Syllabi
Candidate Files　　　　　　　Fieldwork Handbooks
Follow-up Survey Results　　　Program Assessment Feedback
Biennial Report Feedback　　　Field Experience Notebooks
Schedule of Classes　　　　　Advisement Documents
Faculty Vitae
College Budget Plan　　　　　PACT Data
Student Handbooks　　　　　　Flowcharts of Program Requirements
Assessment Protocol　　　　　Meeting minutes
Assessment Data

Interviews Conducted

	Common Standards Cluster	Program Sampling Cluster	TOTAL
Candidates	20	171	**191**
Completers	4	26	**30**
Employers	20	27	**47**
Institutional Administration	16	1	**17**
Program Coordinators	12	15	**27**
Faculty/Adjunct	24	30	**54**
TPA Coordinator	1	2	**3**
Field Supervisors – Program	0	16	**16**
Field Supervisors - District	15	21	**36**
Credential Analysts and Staff	8	0	**8**
Advisory Board Members	0	21	**21**
Other	7	0	**7**
Totals	127	330	**457**

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of program completers (2009-10)[a]	Number of Candidates Enrolled (10-11)[b]	Agency Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject	11	79	CTC
Multiple Subject, with Intern	1	0	CTC
Multiple Subject, BCLAD (No new enrollees as of December 31, 2010)	0	0	CTC
Single Subject	17	43	CTC
Single Subject, with Intern	1	0	CTC
Preliminary Education Specialist Credential: Mild/Moderate Disabilities	5	29	CTC
Preliminary Education Specialist Credential: Mild/Moderate Disabilities, with Intern	2	0	CTC
Education Specialist Credential Level I and Level 2: Mild/Moderate Disabilities	0	0	CTC
Preliminary Education Specialist Credential: Moderate/Severe Disabilities	3	12	CTC
Education Specialist Credential: Moderate/Severe Disabilities, with Intern	0	0	CTC
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology with Intern	4	27	NASP/CTC
Preliminary Administrative Services	26	15	CTC
Speech Language Pathology	27	58	ASHA/CTC

The Visit
The University of the Pacific (UOP) site visit was held on the campus in Stockton, California from April 3-5, 2011. This was a joint NCATE/CTC accreditation visit, piloting the Continuing Improvement model for NCATE. The site visit team consisted of a Team Lead, two California BIR members who served on the NCATE team reviewing the NCATE Unit Standards (Common Standards) and, because of the size and number of programs and pathways, four Program Standards members. Three Commission consultants accompanied the visit. The NCATE team arrived at the hotel on Saturday evening and the California state team arrived at 10:00 AM on Sunday, April 3, 2011. The teams met jointly on Sunday, and participated in a poster session and interviews with constituents beginning on Sunday afternoon and continuing on Monday. A mid-visit report was completed on Monday afternoon. The exit report was conducted at 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 5, 2011.

Board of Examiners Report for Continuous Improvement Pilot Visit
Institution: University of the Pacific

Team Recommendations:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
1.Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	M	M
2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluations	M	M
3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	M	M
4. Diversity	M	M
5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	M	M
6. Unit Governance and Resourses	M	M

1.1 Brief overview of the institution and the unit.

The University of the Pacific (UOP) is a four-year, private, co-educational, comprehensive, doctoral institution providing higher education in the liberal arts context. The Stockton campus which houses the Benerd School of Education is a traditional brick and ivy campus of 175 acres and more than 100 species of regional and international trees.

Founded in 1851 in Santa Clara, California, the campus was moved to San Jose in 1871 and moved again to Stockton, California in 1924. California's first chartered university, the institution offers more than 80 undergraduate majors and 17 graduate programs in nine schools and colleges. In addition to its Stockton campus, the university houses a dental school in San Francisco and a law school in Sacramento. 2009-10 university wide enrollment was 6,401. Combined enrollment in the Benerd School of Education was 523.

In the 1960s, UOP adopted a "cluster college concept," a concept that continues today in the various living and learning communities across campus. UOP 2010 entering freshmen held an average GPA of 3.56, an average SAT of 1198, and an average ACT composite score of 26. The institutions 2010 student-to-faculty ratio was 12:1. Full-time faculty housed on the Stockton campus was 317 with 92 percent of the faculty holding a terminal or doctorate degree.

From its inception, the Benerd School of Education made up a large proportion of the University's student body. The School of Education was formally organized in 1923 and recognized by the California State Department of Education in 1924. The School was renamed the Gladys L. Benerd School of Education (BSE) in 1992 after an endowment gift which continues to positively affect the School.

The School is divided into four divisions, three academic and a single service unit that serves the entire University. All divisions report directly to the Dean. The divisions of the School of Education are as follows:

- The Department of Curriculum and Instruction with primary responsibility for initial and advanced programs for educators.

- The Department of Educational Administration and Leadership with primary responsibility for programs preparing candidates for preliminary and professional administrative credentials.
- The Educational Psychology department with primary responsibility for the Pupil Personnel Services (School Psychologist) credential.
- The Educational Resource Center with primary responsibility for providing fundamental skills coursework, tutoring and supplemental instruction, and English language support and courses for international students and for domestic English Learners to the university as a whole.

The School currently offers both initial and advanced educator preparation programs. It offers the BA, MA, MEd, EdS, EdD, and PhD degrees, as well as California credential programs in elementary education (Multiple Subject), secondary education (Single Subject in English, mathematics, social sciences, science, music, art, physical education, and Spanish), special education (Educational Specialist, Levels I and II transitioning to preliminary), educational administration (Preliminary Administrative Services), and school psychology (Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology). All professional education programs are fully accredited by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The Educational/School Psychology program is approved through the Education Specialist level by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). The Speech-Language Pathology program housed in the Thomas J. Long School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences is accredited by the Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA).

The programs of the Benerd School of Education and the Speech Language Pathology program constitute the education unit of the institution. Academic year 2009-10 enrollment for the Education Unit was 670.

Stockton, California is the county seat of San Joaquin County and the 13th largest city in California with a population of approximately 290,000. The city is located in northern California, south of the capital of Sacramento and east of San Francisco. The census report of 2010 identifies the ethnic background of the city as 43.3 percent White, 11.2 percent Black or African American, 1.1 percent Native American and Alaska Native, 19.9 percent Asian, .4 percent Pacific Islander, 32.5 percent Hispanic or Latino, 17.3 percent from other races, and 6.8 percent from two or more races (does not equal 100%). The median income for a household in the city was $35,453 with 18.9 percent of family incomes falling below the poverty line.

UOP student demographics for fall 2010 identified 79 percent of students coming from California and 21 percent coming from 27 other states and 31 foreign countries. Undergraduate ethnic background for the same year was 35 percent Caucasian, Non-Hispanic, 34 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, 12 percent Hispanic, 4 percent Black, Non-Hispanic, 1 percent American Indian, 5 percent Multi-Ethnic, and 5 percent Race/Ethnicity Unknown. Fifty-five percent of undergraduate students were female and 45 percent were male. Over 80 percent of students received financial assistance.

1.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit. Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

This visit was conducted as a merged, continuing visit with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). The visit was conducted under the NCATE Continuous Improvement Pilot protocol with Standard Three being identified as the target standard. The state chair and consultants from the CTC assisted the NCATE Board of Examiners (BOE) with the visit and provided consultation regarding state program approval policies and processes.

The initial activity of the pilot process consisted of an offsite review conducted by conference call culminating in the preparation of an Offsite BOE Feedback Report. Three NCATE BOE members and two state team members appointed to the BOE team conducted the offsite review in November of 2010 in consultation with the state team chair, representatives from the CTC and the NCATE senior vice president. An offsite review report was completed and submitted to the institution in preparation for the onsite visit.

A previsit was conducted in person in February 2011. During the previsit discussion focused on identification of the state protocol, clarification of IR contents, review of an addendum to the IR (additional artifacts) prepared by the institution in response to the Offsite BOE Report, individuals to include in onsite interviews, roles of NCATE and state teams, and logistical plans for the onsite visit.

In California, institutions submit programs for review to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). State and NCATE teams shared information and workrooms, jointly attended interviews, and functioned as a single team as appropriate. Two state team members were appointed to join the NCATE-appointed team members resulting in an NCATE team size of six.

The institution solicited third party input. No responses were received.

1.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning?
The University of the Pacific does not offer initial or advanced education preparation programs solely at branch campuses, at off-campus sites, or via distance learning.

1.4 Describe any unusual circumstances that affected the visit.
No special circumstances affected this visit.

Conceptual Framework
The conceptual framework established the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

The conceptual framework of the professional education unit was first articulated in the IR prepared for the 2004 NCATE visit. Four important modifications to the 2004 conceptual framework are reflected in the current document. First, faculty unanimously approved the removal of explicit references to the American Psychological Association's "learner centered principles," instead incorporating these principles into the core values of the framework. Second, faculty expanded and revised the knowledge base underlying the framework as a response to a

change in faculty composition, to results emanating from practical knowledge and assessment data, and to the change in the knowledge based within and outside of the School of Education as a result of institutional and unit research. Third, faculty drew upon the core values within the framework to establish clear unit-wide goals that, in turn, guided all programs in the establishment of candidate outcomes that reflect desired knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Fourth, faculty built and implemented a comprehensive assessment system that is designed to determine the extent to which candidates achieve identified outcomes.

The fundamental mission of the Benerd School of Education is preparing thoughtful, reflective, caring and collaborative educational professionals for service to diverse populations. So stated, the conceptual framework for the professional education unit at the University of the Pacific articulates the unit's vision, mission, philosophy and core values, goals and standards, knowledge base, and assessment system. In addition to statement of mission, the framework includes the following elements:
- A discussion of the underlying philosophies and values that shape the unit's purpose, program design, and goals as well as the institution's standards;
- An overview of knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit;
- Identification of candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions expected of candidates in the unit's programs; and
- A brief description of the unit's assessment system.

The conceptual framework identifies six core values for the unit: scholarship, integrity and ethical conduct, diversity, social and community responsibility, collegiality, and teaching and learning. These are stated to represent the commitments that the unit seeks to model and promote through its programs, its work with partners outside the school and university, and its personal and professional relationships with all members of the unit. Within the scope of these values and the unit's mission each program identifies its specific purpose, goals, knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

The conceptual framework is informed by the rich tradition of theories that support the transformational power of schools. The work of John Dewey in his "Pedagogic Creed" and the work of George Counts form the historical basis for the framework. Contemporary input is provided through the words of Apple, McConough, Schon, Shulman, Boyer, Chang, Rogers and Oakes, and others.

The assessment system of the unit is articulated with the goals of the mission and goals of the unit and commits to:
- Focus on ensuring that the unit's work with candidates as well as the candidates' work in professional settings results in positive and demonstrable improvements in learning, human development, and individual, family, and community well-being;
- Systematically provides faculty and candidates with accurate and useful data to guide programs of learning;
- Systematically provides faculty with accurate and useful data about candidate learning to guide ongoing program improvement efforts;
- Enables faculty and candidates to be accountable to the various stakeholders who are concerned about learners and educational outcomes by providing them with clear

evidence that programs equip their graduates to have clear and demonstrable influence on learning, human development, and individual, family, and community well-being.

Further, the School directs its efforts toward researching the present and future needs of schools and the community, fostering intellectual and ethical growth, and developing compassion and collegiality through personalized learning experiences.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

1.1 Overall Findings

In California, the state's California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) defines 13 Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) for basic programs that describe candidate competence in relation to content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and professional knowledge and skills necessary to be recommended and awarded a state teaching credential. Specifically the TPEs include program content related to specific pedagogical skills for subject matter instruction, subject specific pedagogical skills for multiple subject/single subject teaching assignments, monitoring student learning during instruction, interpretation and use of assessments, making content accessible, student engagement, developmentally appropriate teaching practices, developmentally appropriate practices in grades K-3, 4-8, and 9-12, teaching English learners, learning about students, instructional planning, managing instructional time, maintaining clear expectations for academic and social behavior, professional, legal, and ethical obligations, and professional growth through continued study and consulting professional sources of knowledge about teaching and learning.

A required Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) that measures the candidate's abilities in relation to the TPEs encompasses all of the expectations associated with NCATE's Standard 1 in a comprehensive manner. The unit has chosen to use as their TPA, the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) as their measure of candidate competence in relation to the TPEs. The PACT specifically asks candidates to demonstrate their teaching competence in relation to planning lessons with consideration for English learners and other students with learning challenges, teaching the lessons to the K-12 students in public school classrooms, planning and giving student assessments or tests based on the lessons, reflecting on their own instruction, and examining student work and assessment results as evidence of the effectiveness of their instruction. In addition, initial credential program candidates, including those in special education programs, must successfully demonstrate competence in relation to subject matter/content knowledge through passage of the California Subject Matter Examination for Teachers (CSET), competence in basic skills through passage of the California Basic Education Skills Test (CBEST) and competence in the teaching of reading/language arts through successful passage of the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA), a state developed and managed assessment. Other programs, at the advanced level, use other means to assess candidate competence (such as the Praxis II for the School Psychology program). Findings from the examination of data related to the variety of assessment sources indicate that all programs are meeting Standard 1 requirements.

Specific data were obtained for all programs within the unit. For the Multiple/Single Subject programs, the reported data for embedded course assessments indicate rubric scores ranging from 2.39 to 4.0 on a four point scale. The required rubric score for passage is 2.0. A rubric score of 3 is evidence of fully meeting the standard, and a score of 4 is considered exemplary. There were a few candidates who did not meet the minimum rubric score for passage of one or more course related evaluations. A lower than a minimum passage score jeopardizes the candidate's continuance in the program. The state requires that all candidates recommended for a credential demonstrate knowledge of subject matter through the successful passage of the California Subject Matter Examination for Teachers (CSET). There is a 100 percent passage rate for all those recommended for a credential. The State of California requires that all those recommended for a MS credential must pass the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA). Therefore, 100 percent of completers who are recommended for a California teaching credential have passed the RICA examination. Pedagogical performance is assessed by the PACT (described above). There is a 100 percent passage rate for those recommended for a credential.

Education Specialist candidates must demonstrate proficiency in relation to 36 state required competencies. This set of primarily pedagogical performances is assessed using a portfolio process and scoring rubric using a four point scale. The 2009-10 cohort of education specialist candidates (22) evidenced a mean score for the portfolio assessment of 3.10 with scores ranging from 2.30 to 3.40. The 36 mandated competencies are also assessed in the field during student teaching by the supervising teacher and university supervisor in consultation with the candidate. In this case the assessment is made using a five-point performance scale. The reported mean score was 4.60 with scores ranging from 3.30 to 4.80. Course assessments are used to determine candidate knowledge and skill related to classroom assessment, capabilities of reflecting on their teaching, the utilization of student prior knowledge and experience in instructional planning, and the use of data to inform instruction. Using a four-point rubric to determine candidate performance the institution reports candidate scores ranging from 2.25 to 3.11 with 2.00 being an acceptable level of performance. One hundred percent of the Education Specialist candidates who are recommended for a credential pass the state required Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA).

There is a paucity of current, comprehensive and analyzed data for the administrative credential program. However, those data that do exist provide enough information to generally judge the effectiveness of the program. A field survey completed by employers indicates that administrative credential candidates are rated between 3.00 and 4.00 (on a four-point scale) indicating that when they enter the field they are performing as competent or superlative beginning administrators. The candidates themselves perceive their level of performance ranging from 3.00 to 3.67 using the same measure of competence. An additional survey's results indicate that field supervisors rate candidates with mean scores ranging from 3.25 to 4.67 on a 5 point scale, again suggesting those prepared to serve as school administrators are competent in relation to the knowledge and skills required to function as a beginning administrator.

A portfolio review process is used with school psychologist credential candidates. For the most recent two years that data is available (2008-10), all ratings are at a level of "competent school psychology intern" (score of 2 on a five point scale) or above with the range of scores from 2.25 to 4.33. Data available from an employer survey indicate that employers felt the preparation program for school psychology results in professionals who were competent or superlative as beginning school psychologists.

The Speech–Language Pathology program assessment data indicate passage rates on the Praxis certification/licensing examination are 100% for 2008 through 2010 cohorts. In addition to the Speech-Language Pathology program being nationally accredited by the Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA), the pupil personnel program is accredited by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP).

For the majority of the program areas, comprehensive sets of data are examined to formatively and summatively determine that all completers have reached an appropriate level of proficiency prior to being recommended for a credential and/or degree. The assessment points include course related assessments that are judged against faculty developed rubrics, and multiple formal transitions assessments where candidates meet with a team of faculty to present some aspect of their work to date and are judged on both the content of their work as well as the quality of their presentation using a set of rubrics. Each candidate must receive a passing score to proceed in the program. If a passing score is not obtained, the candidate is asked to provide some additional form of evidence they have reached an acceptable level of competence in order to continue in the program. Further evidence of candidate competence in relation to possessing the knowledge and skill necessary for teaching is obtained through an supervisor evaluations of teaching, the sign-off of the candidate having met the Teaching Performance Expectations by the cooperating teacher, a three-way 'Cooperative Evaluation' of the candidate's work between the cooperating teacher, the candidate, and the candidate's university supervisor. The Performance Assessment for California Teachers is used formatively during the program and in a summative manner close to the end of the program to make a final determination of the candidate's competence in meeting the program standards as determined by the CTC. At any time a faculty member is concerned about a candidate not making acceptable progress toward meeting any part of Standard 1, there is a "Red Flag" process to alert program leadership that attention needs to be given to the potential problem situation. The use of this process has resulted in candidates having to retake coursework in order to demonstrate competence not evidenced during the first attempt and, with approximately two candidates per year, the self-selection to exit the program. As a result of the careful monitoring of candidate progress, the programs assure that only candidates who are meeting expectations transition to the next program level. In addition to these assessments, candidates in advanced level programs concurrent with enrollment in an initial credential program successfully demonstrate an acceptable level of performance in relation to their master's degree project and a comprehensive case study of the teaching-learning process in a school setting.

Extensive interviews with public school personnel including school principals, assistant superintendents, program directors, and the leadership of another area higher education institution consistently stated that the candidates recommended for credentials by the unit are very well prepared for their role in professional education. Numerous public school personnel specifically indicate that program completers are well prepared to work with English Learners (ELs). It was stated that University of the Pacific program completers are able to, "Hit the ground running" as they enter professional roles.

1.2 Continuous Improvement
Not applicable to this standard.

1.3 Movement to the Target Level
Not applicable to this standard.

1.4 Strengths
None identified.

1.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?
No areas of improvement were cited for this standard at the previous visit.

1.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?
None

1.6 Recommendation for Standard 1
Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
Advanced Preparation: Met

CTC State Team Decision: Met

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1 Overall Findings
The unit has an assessment system that reflects the conceptual framework and is aligned with state and national standards for both initial and advanced programs. The assessment system includes data collection to monitor candidate performance at four transition points: pre-admissions, during the program, program completion and credential recommendation, and after program completion. The exhibit "An Overview of the Candidate Performance Measures" lists the internal and external sources of data from applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty, and members of the professional community.

For initial programs, the first transition point includes GPA, an interview, a certificate of clearance, and the GRE examination for the psychology and speech pathology programs. The second transition point includes course-based assessments, portfolio assessments, and state examinations when applicable. The third transition point includes demonstration of competence on California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), completion of field based experiences, completion of program requirements, and state examinations when applicable. The fourth transition point includes a graduate's self assessment and an employer survey.

For advanced programs, the first transition point includes GPA, the Graduate Record Examination, and an interview with program faculty and administrators. The second transition point includes course-based assessments, key anchor assignments, and a dissertation proposal

when applicable. The third transition point assessments are varied depending on the program, and the fourth transition point includes a graduate's self assessment and an employer survey.

Interviews and exhibits provide adequate evidence candidate assessment data are regularly and systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations in initial and advanced programs, except for the M.A./Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program in Educational Administration.

Data for the M.A. in Preliminary Educational Administration Services Credential are inadequate. The exhibits provided by the unit do not include data for the first transition point of the unit assessment system; data on candidate GPA's and data on initial interviews are not available in the exhibits for review. Admissions data include entering GPAs, gender of candidate, ethnicity of candidate, GRE (Verbal and Quantitative, etc.). The second transition point includes course-based assessments and data are limited to one course, EADM 280. For the second transition point, data for key assignments aligned with program outcomes are not available. For the third transition point data are not available in the exhibits for review: degree completion, portfolio, and exit interview. (NOTE- Sample portfolios were posted under Standard 2 C.5D. These did not, however yield data that were aggregated.) Exhibits are available for a master's oral examination; however, it is not clear if these data are for the Educational Administration program. For the fourth transition point data are not adequate: 10 out of 32 graduate surveys and seven out of 32 employer surveys. Multiple interviews verify data are not regularly and systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed for the Educational Administration program.

Unit documents indicate a commitment to assessment measures that are free of bias and include a process to ensure reliability and validity. The unit utilizes the technologies of Task Stream, the campus Banner system, and data collected by the Office of Institutional Research. Interviews indicate the unit has goals and is developing a timeline to strengthen the use of technologies in order to strengthen the assessment system.

Exhibits and interviews indicate candidate complaints are processed following the university's policies and procedures as outlined in official university documents. In addition, due to the relatively small size of the university and unit, many candidates approach professors and dean personally to discuss concerns and suggestions.

The unit uses assessment system data for course, program, and unit improvement. The exhibit "Overview of Data-Driven Changes" indicates data-driven decisions over the last three years have included reorganization of programs, a new classroom management course, and a reorganization of field experiences in the initial teacher education programs. Advanced programs have used student performance in courses to add a new course in special education, focusing on autism. Data have been used in the school psychology program to add additional courses and field experiences.

Interviews with advisory groups, site supervisors, and other individuals indicate the professional community is involved in the assessment system through regularly scheduled meetings or informal meetings to discuss data, the implications of data, and the assessment system for all initial programs and for advanced programs, except for the M.A. in Educational Administration/preliminary services credential. Data collected, analyzed, and used for course and

program improvement in the Speech Language Pathology program are not shared with the education unit as a whole entity or shared with the education unit stakeholders.

2.2 Continuous Improvement
Not applicable to this standard.

2.3 Movement to the Target Level
Not applicable to this standard.

2.4 Strengths
None identified.

2.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?
No areas of improvement were cited for this standard at the previous visit.
NOTE – a November 5, 2004 letter to President Donald DeRosa identified two AFIs related to Standard 2. These were:

- The Unit does not have a comprehensive document that outlines the assessment plan for credentialing programs, non-credentialing programs, and unit operations (Standard 2)
- The Unit does not have a clear timeline for review and analysis of data and reporting of results.

2.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?
None

2.5.3 New AFIs.

1. In the M.A. in Educational Administration/preliminary services credential, candidate assessment data are not regularly and systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.

Rationale: Data for the M.A. in Educational Administration/preliminary services credential is inadequate. Multiple interviews and review of pertinent exhibits indicate collection of data is limited to two of the four unit assessment points. In addition, analysis and dissemination of data are not supported by evidence.

2.6 NCATE Recommendation for Standard 2
Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 2: Met with Concerns
Based on AFI listed above

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

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

3.1 Overall Findings.

Field experiences and clinical practice are an integral part of all initial and advanced preparation programs to support candidates' development as teachers and other school professionals. Field experiences and clinical practice are grounded in the unit's conceptual framework of caring, reflective, and collaborative practice, and are tied to institutional goals of experiential learning and community engagement. The unit has developed tables for Teacher Education (Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Special Education), Educational Administration, School Psychology, and Speech Language Pathology programs that clearly show the alignment of university goals, School of Education (BSE) outcomes, Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) state requirements, NCATE standards, and assessments in course and fieldwork.

The unit has long standing partnerships with schools, districts, county offices of education, and other education agencies. Primary partners include Lodi School District, Stockton Unified School District, San Joaquin County Office of Education (SJCOE), and San Joaquin Delta Community College, as well as educational programs such as Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) and Migrant Education that are housed in the SJCOE. These partnerships serve as placement sites for candidates in initial and advanced programs. Each program has assigned unit coordinator(s) and selected key partners who jointly determine placements based on program requirements and the candidate's previous field experiences.

Each program tracks candidates' placements to ensure they have experiences with students with exceptionalities and from diverse backgrounds. Based on 2009-10 demographic information for P-12 students, San Joaquin County is approximately 45 percent Hispanic, 25 percent White, 15 percent Asian/Filipino, and 10 percent African American, as well as 25 percent English language learners (ELL), and 10 percent students with disabilities. For the 15 schools primarily used for placements, the unit's chart, *2009-10 Data Table Demographics of P-12 Students in Schools Used for Clinical Practice,* provides information on race/ethnicity, English Language Learners, students with disabilities, and students receiving free or reduced price lunch. All schools indicate some diversity in its student populations, reflecting the county's demographics; for example, the highest percentage of Hispanic students is 48 percent while the lowest is 18 percent. Candidates in a rare non-diverse school setting are required to have additional experiences in diverse schools.

Unit faculty and P-12 partners are involved in the design, delivery, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice. The unit and each program have advisory boards that include unit faculty and current P-12 practitioners in the field; these practitioners also may serve as site supervisors and/or adjunct instructors, and some are graduates of the BSE program. In interviews with advisory board members, many could articulate core values of the unit, such as reflective practice, ethical practice, diverse populations, and assessment, all of which ground field experiences. Further, many provided examples of recommendations they had made that were implemented, such as adding case management content to the Special Education program and reducing the number of candidates per site supervisor in the School Psychology program. In

addition, the unit receives feedback from cooperating teachers, other site supervisors, and school administrators on candidates as they complete field experiences and clinical practice. Example recommendations included adding additional coursework on classroom management for teacher education candidates and better aligning coursework content with field experiences across programs.

Unit faculty and P-12 educators also participate in professional development activities and instructional programs for candidates, as well as share expertise and integrate resources to support candidate learning. For example, in the teacher education program, the unit and Lodi School District partnered on a Comprehensive Teacher Education Institute (CTEI) grant to improve recruitment, preparation, induction, and retention of new teachers. A recommendation from this group led to the decision to create a year-long field and clinical experience in a single site. In addition, the unit works with AVID to prepare Single Subject candidates in AVID strategies and to place these candidates as observers and tutors in AVID classrooms. The department chair and director of Professional Practice/Student Teaching attend meetings of the Induction/Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA). This group developed an exit assessment that follows initial candidates into district BTSA programs and guides their induction experiences. At the advanced level, faculty collaborate with school educators on services to students and families, for example, Educational Administration's work with service area schools, School Psychology's support of Migrant Education, and Speech Language Pathology's efforts at the Pacific Speech, Hearing, and Language Center. Faculty in advanced programs also are active in their professional associations and collaborate with school faculty on current issues through professional development and applied research.

Candidates are mentored by university supervisors and site supervisors who understand the goals, values, standards, and expectations of the unit and program. Cooperating teachers and site supervisors meet program requirements, including holding valid credentials and professional experience in their respective fields. To prepare for their roles, they have training sessions available, confer with the university supervisor at the beginning of the semester, and are given a handbook that lists clear expectations for their roles as supervisors and for candidate outcomes. Further, they are in regular contact with university faculty throughout the fieldwork through meetings, emails, and phone calls. In interviews, cooperating teachers and other site supervisors confirmed that they understood the goals and expectations of the program and were comfortable with the level and variety of training available, as well as with the opportunities to contact faculty with questions or concerns.

Field experiences and clinical practice allow candidates to apply and reflect on their content, knowledge, skills, and dispositions in a variety of settings. Candidates are observed in practice by university and site supervisors and receive formative and summative feedback on their progress. Assessment results, such as the PACT for Multiple and Single Subject and final portfolio for Educational Administration, indicate that candidates are able to meet the standards of their respective programs. Candidates interact with P-12 students and their families on student progress issues and with their peers on collaborative projects, which also provide opportunities for critical reflection. All candidates have assessment experiences in gathering, analyzing, and reflecting on student data, with the focus on using data to improve student learning. They also utilize information technologies both for teaching and learning. In addition, candidates in advanced programs participate in theory and research based projects with application to real-world practice in their respective fields. Overall, initial and advanced candidates, university

supervisors, and P-12 supervisors identify a hallmark of the programs as the extensive and intensive nature of the fieldwork and culminating clinical practice that allowed candidates to grow and demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

In the document *Descriptions of Field and Clinical Experiences*, the unit provided summaries of activities, assignments, and assessments for field experiences and clinical practice in each program, as cited below. Review of program documents and interviews with candidates, university faculty, and P-12 educators confirmed these program components.

Initial Teacher Preparation Programs
- Features sequential field experiences that culminate in a semester long directed teaching experience or, in some cases, an internship. Sites for all field experiences are selected to ensure that candidates have opportunities to develop proficiencies in diverse settings with qualified, skilled and supportive mentors;
- Includes a number of course assignments (e.g. ethnographies in EDUC 140/141, literacy assessment case studies in EDUC162, analyses of specific teaching incidents, assessments leading to instructional plans in EDUC 151/152) that focus directly on field experiences and require and enable candidates to develop and demonstrate proficiencies;
- Includes a year-long placement (with one semester of field work and one semester of professional practice/student teaching) in a single site to give candidates opportunities to develop proficiencies and to work with learners in a single site over one academic year;
- Includes 20-200 hours of fieldwork and 620 hours of professional practice (student teaching) for a total of 740-820 hours; and
- Expects that candidates demonstrate proficiency on all teacher performance expectations (TPEs) through the successful completion of the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) assessment processes.

Educational Administration Program
- Features field experiences that extend throughout the entire program, with the number of hours depending on the individual candidate's program;
- Includes a number of course and fieldwork assignments (e.g. budget analysis in EADM 283, program evaluation guide in EADM 276) that require and enable candidates to develop and demonstrate proficiencies; and
- Includes the expectation that candidates will demonstrate proficiencies on state standards through the presentation of a portfolio that documents that he/she has met all CTC standards.

School Psychologist Program
- Requires candidates to complete a minimum of 450 hours of fieldwork prior to completing a full-time internship of 1200-1500 hours;
- Includes the selection of sites and the organization of coursework so that field experiences opportunities align with coursework;
- Features two School Psychology courses (EPSY 301/302) that accompany fieldwork. These courses provide candidates with opportunities to reflect on field experiences and to hone skills and proficiencies;
- Includes robust evaluations through fieldwork and internships and the expectation that candidates will produce portfolios that demonstrate the attainment of all outcomes; and
- Requires demonstration of knowledge by a passing score on the Praxis II.

Speech Language Preparation Program
- Requires candidates to complete a minimum of 375 hours of supervised clinical experiences that are structured to ensure that they have the opportunity to develop and demonstrate required competencies; and
- Ensures that every candidate works with a qualified supervisor who provides regular, consistent feedback about performance in relationship to required proficiencies.

The ultimate goal of the initial and advanced programs is to positively impact P-12 student learning. Each program has designed its fieldwork so that candidates develop and demonstrate proficiencies that support learning for all students, including students with exceptionalities and those from diverse groups. In teacher education, candidates complete assignments, such as a case study in EDUC 162: Literacy Assessment, that focuses on assessing and analyzing the reading and writing skills of individual students, including English learners, and reflecting on the impact on student learning. Another example is the PACT Teaching Event, a capstone assessment, which requires candidates to instruct students, including those from diverse backgrounds, assess their learning, and reflect on teaching and learning. At the advanced level, candidates in the Educational Administration program conduct assignments intended to impact student learning that are documented in personalized portfolios and evaluated by university and school-based supervisors.

These assignments meet Standard 10 Vision for Learning, Standard 11 Student Learning and Professional Growth, and Standard 12 Organizational Management and Student Learning. While assessments had been based on the professional judgments of the supervisors, the program currently is piloting a rubric for also scoring the candidates' fieldwork and portfolio. The School Psychology program uses multiple measures to assess their candidates' impact on student learning and/or learning environments. These measures include a consultation case study, a case study in student diversity, a crisis intervention paper, a mental health referral project/paper, and a research project. Candidates in the Speech Language Pathology program are required to demonstrate their skills in conducting evaluations that ensure clients receive an appropriate diagnosis and intervention. These evaluations target a range of areas such as articulation and phonology, audiology, language disorders, and fluency disorders.

Overall, evidence provided in unit documents, observations at school sites, and interviews with initial and advanced candidates, university faculty, and P-12 educators strongly support the continuing effort of the unit to design and implement field experiences and clinical practice that prepare teachers and other school professionals to help all students learn.

3.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?
Evidence from unit documents, onsite observations, and interviews with candidates, graduates, university faculty, and P-12 educators shows a dynamic process of continuous improvement for the unit. That is, the unit has developed a culture of collaboration and accountability that invites, and uses, feedback from multiple stakeholders to improve its programs. The unit has developed formal (e.g., advisory boards) and informal (e.g., university/site supervisor interactions) to gather

information and use where appropriate. Examples of continuous improvement efforts, based on campus and partnership recommendations, are given below.

Unit
Since the previous visit, the unit has emphasized the development and implementation of an assessment plan. Goals include the creation of databases, decisions on data collection, identification of key measures, development of procedures, and plans to use the assessment results to improve programs and unit operations. The assessment plan has been implemented across all programs except Edcuational Administration and Speech and Language Pathology, and is being evaluated to ensure that it provides timely and appropriate information.

Teacher Education Programs
The teacher education programs undertook an extensive review of their curriculum and fieldwork and, with feedback from partner school educators, redesigned its programs to be more developmental and sequential, with greater links between coursework and fieldwork. As seen in the AACTE/NCATE Annual Reports and verified onsite, the programs planned and implemented changes over a period of time. It is important to note that all changes were made and are being evaluated in collaboration with P-12 partners.

In 2005, the teacher education programs more carefully scheduled when field experiences took place to better align with curriculum courses (e.g., CURR 105 Introduction to Education, CURR 130 Teaching and Assessment, CURR 137 Teaching English Learners). In 2006, the programs more carefully selected placements that emphasized subject areas, such as science in select elementary schools and social studies at a local history museum. In 2007, the programs worked to (1) better align course assignments and fieldwork assignments and (2) better coordinate field experiences with school instruction (i.e., reading and language arts in the morning and math and science in the afternoon). In 2009, the programs developed a two-semester field experience and clinical practice at the same school site, at the same time renaming student teaching as "Professional Practice."

In 2010, the programs expanded their partnerships to improve services to candidates. They established a relationship with AVID programs housed in the San Joaquin County Office of Education for training and placements of candidates in the Single Subject program. They also initiated an Urban Teacher Residency Program with Aspire Public Schools whereby candidates participate in a joint credential/masters program. In addition, they implemented a restructured Single Subject M.Ed. program designed to allow candidates to complete in one year through intensive fieldwork combined with coursework.

Advanced Programs
The advanced programs each are engaged in a continuous improvement model. Examples range from revising programs based on new standards to working with new P-12 partners to mutually support its candidates/students.

The Educational Administration program has undertaken curricular and fieldwork changes. In 2006, the program was revised to comply with new CTC standards at preliminary and professional clear levels and to align with ISLLC national standards. In 2007-2008, the program continued working with the San Joaquin County Office of Education to expand placements in a

variety of settings throughout the county. In 2009, the program began an assessment of its measures to evaluate candidate proficiency. It drafted and currently is piloting a rubric for its personalized portfolios that will provide quantitative data in addition to its qualitative data.

The School Psychology program also has conducted a review of its program, seeking to enhance experiences for its candidates. In 2007, the program developed a document for National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) review, which was approved. In 2010, it collaborated with Region 23 Migrant Education on a Jumpstart Program whereby candidates provided services to migrant students and their families, including assessments in Spanish.

The Speech and Language Pathology program also continued to review its program to enhance opportunities for its candidates. In 2006 and 2007, faculty worked with the San Joaquin County Office of Education to prepare speech language pathologists to work in county schools. Recently, the partnership initiated an additional program with a second cohort of candidates.

3.3 Movement toward Target Level.
The unit has identified Standard 3 as the target standard for the current NCATE review. Specifically, 17 areas are detailed in Elements 3a Collaboration between Unit and School Partners; 3b Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice; and 3c Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn.

Evidence from the IR; unit reports including state accreditation; program syllabi, handbooks, and other materials; candidate assignments and assessment results; and interviews with candidates, university faculty and supervisors, and P-12 teachers and administrators support the unit's movement toward target on Standard 3. Evidence shows that initial and advanced programs can demonstrate in-depth collaboration with schools; well designed, implemented, and evaluated field experiences and clinical practice; and candidates who can ably demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn.

With respect to collaboration between unit and school partners, evidence shows that university and school faculty collaborate in designing, implementing, and evaluating the unit's conceptual framework and school programs, as well as are involved in professional development activities and instructional programs for candidates. Additionally, they share expertise and integration of resources to support candidate learning, and jointly determine school placements to maximize learning experiences for candidates and P-12 students. Examples of on-going collaborations include joint service on advisory boards where the conceptual framework is reviewed and program recommendations are made and implemented, joint decisions on placing candidates in appropriate school sites, regular interactions between university and site supervisors to monitor and assess candidate progress, partnerships to offer programs to candidates in a variety of settings, partnerships to offer services to P-12 students and their families, cooperative professional development to support candidates and experienced educators, and teaming to explore educational issues through applied research. New initiatives include expanding avenues to gain feedback, such as greater emphasis on exit and follow-up surveys, a web-link with opportunities to provide comments, and pilot use of new student emails as communication with the unit.

In reference to the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice, evidence shows that field experiences and clinical practice extend the unit's conceptual framework and allow candidates opportunities to apply and reflect on their knowledge skills and dispositions in a variety of settings. Candidates interact with peers, university and school educators, and families and the community, and are involved in instructional and other school-based activities, including the use of technology. Candidates in advanced programs critically use theory related to classroom practice for their own applied research and conduct projects with real-world application, including the use of technology. Examples to support candidates' development as professionals include fieldwork assignments in multiple and diverse settings, use of documents and assessment measures that reflect unit core values and appropriate standards, joint supervision of candidates by university and school educators along with regular feedback for candidate reflection, requirements to implement critical practices such as use of assessments and technology to support student learning, and opportunities to collaborate with peers and school personnel on teaching and other professional practices. New initiatives include plans for candidates to more systematically document their experiences and reflections around core values, more deliberate interactions with families on student issues, new rubrics for evaluating candidates' proficiencies in the Educational Administration program, and a review of the assessment system to ensure that all programs require at least two technology supported projects to support teaching and learning.

To facilitate their development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions, candidates are provided opportunities to work collaboratively with other educators to reflect on their practice. Candidates develop and demonstrate proficiencies that support learning by all students, including students with exceptionalities and those from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups. Examples to support candidates' growth as professionals, particularly on positively impacting student learning, include extensive and intensive fieldwork with placements in a variety of diverse settings, a team of university and P-12 educators to support the development of their proficiencies, and opportunities to work with peer in schools and at the university on educational issues. In addition, all candidates have program requirements that target learning by all students, including those with exceptionalities and from diverse backgrounds, such as case studies, evaluation and remediation, site-based projects, portfolios, and service components. A key factor in all these requirements is the candidate's reflection on teaching and other professional practices and on student learning. New initiatives include plans for more comprehensive annual reviews of candidates, refinement of data collection and assessments around working with diverse students, and enhancement of measures showing impact on student learning and achievement.

3.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
The unit is addressing all elements of Standard 3 at the target level.

Consistent with the institution's focus on experiential learning as described in its strategic planning document, *Pacific Rising 2008-2015*, the unit has made field experiences and clinical practice the hallmark of its programs. All candidates participate in intensive and extensive fieldwork with supervision and guidance jointly shared by university and P-12 educators. In these experiences, candidates have a range opportunities to help them grow as professionals, including developmentally applying their knowledge and skills as teachers and other professionals, working collaboratively with peers and school personnel, having meaningful interactions with P-12 students and their families, receiving on-going evaluations from supervisors, and critically

reflecting on and improving their practice. Importantly, this fieldwork takes place in schools and other education agencies (e.g., youth detention centers) with a diverse student population, including students with exceptionalities and from diverse racial/ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. Candidates, graduates, university faculty, and P-12 educators all verified that the unit is preparing professionals with proficiencies to help all children learn.

Also consistent with the institution's recent focus on community engagement, *Beyond Our Gates*, the unit continues to establish and nurture relationships with school and community partners to help prepare highly qualified professionals as well as to provide service to students and families. Among numerous projects, the unit has worked collaboratively on teacher recruitment and retention efforts with Lodi School District, on training and placements for Single Subject candidates with the AVID program, on P-12 math learning in the "Math Steeplechase" with the math department and local schools, on P-12 enrichment through Jumpstart and the Jose Valdez Mathematics Institute with the Migrant Education program, and on school psychological services to migrant students and their families also with Migrant Education. Currently, the unit is developing a plan for more comprehensive engagement with the local region. Named the *Tomorrow Project*, it will include multi-year "academies" as opportunities for unit and school partners to share expertise and resources to support candidate learning and to promote a positive impact on student learning.

3.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?
Not applicable to this standard.

3.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?
Not applicable to this standard.

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

3.6 Recommendation for Standard 3
Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 3: Met

Standard 4: Diversity
The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all student learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools.

4.1 Overall Findings

This unit has a commitment to preparing candidates to work effectively with diverse populations. Diversity is one of the six core values of the unit, which is articulated in the conceptual framework and Unit Diversity Plan. It is reflected in the curriculum, in candidate and faculty recruitment, and in the selection of field experience supervisors. The University is located in a diverse, low-socioeconomic area of California making its commitment to diversity critical to its success.

All initial and advanced programs in the School of Education include coursework and fieldwork that is focused on ensuring candidates are equipped to work effectively with all students. The commitment to diversity is evidenced by the Unit Diversity Plan. In Teacher Credential programs, the unit provides courses for candidates to learn (1) community and cultures of the students at their field work sites, (2) how to organize cooperative group activities that provide access to the curriculum for all kinds of learners, and 3) differences between home and school discourse as well as strategies that enable candidates to use both in ways that impact student learning. Various fieldwork assessments document candidate experiences with diverse students. Examples stated in candidate interviews include: an ethnography assignment where candidates analyze and affirm diversity in their fieldwork site, a reflection on their experiences with diverse learners as part of the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) Event, and exit surveys completed by candidates and field and university supervisors that include statements on diversity.

In the programs in Educational Administration, the unit provides courses for candidates to learn ways to structure a school and its processes and programs to ensure that all students and families receive respect, support, and optimal learning experiences. In addition, there are various courses focused on ensuring that candidates have the capacity to work effectively with teachers, staff, other administrators, families, and community agencies to support learning of students with exceptionalities as evidenced by electronic exhibit document E.2, Curriculum Components that Address Diversity Proficiencies.

In the School Psychology program, candidates learn about human development and the impact of a wide range of diverse conditions on development. Candidates demonstrate their competence in working with diverse learners through completing a "Case Study in Human Diversity" assignment. Candidates also develop their capacity to work with learners with exceptionalities through a range of course and field experiences that allow them to interact and demonstrate competence with diverse students.

In the Speech-Language Pathology programs, candidates are assigned to work with learners with IEP's during their school-based clinical experiences. Confirmed by interviews with faculty, they are placed in three settings throughout their program of study to ensure they have the opportunity to work with "client populations across the life span and from culturally/linguistically diverse backgrounds and with various types and severities of communication and/or related disorders, differences, and disabilities."

All fieldwork and clinical practices take place in diverse settings. The schools in San Joaquin County are rich in diversity; therefore, candidates working in almost any setting have the opportunity to develop and demonstrate their competence in working with all learners as stated during interviews with student teachers. As confirmed by interviews with candidates, the

directors of every program also ensure that each candidate is placed in one or more setting where learners come from a variety of ethnic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

Assessments of candidates' proficiencies related to knowledge, skills and dispositions to work effectively with all students are embedded in many forms across courses and field experiences. Candidates are given assessments that evaluate their capacity to support the learning of all students in the Teacher Preparation program. In the program in Educational Administration, assessments include a diversity communication plan and problem-based project in Educational Administration (EADM) 278 and the candidates demonstrate competence in fieldwork. In the program in School Psychology, a major assessment is a "Case Study of Student Diversity" and candidates are assessed on their capacity to work with learners with disabilities. Speech Language Pathology candidates are evaluated for their effectiveness in working with all learners and clients by University and clinical supervisors.

The unit is committed to build a diverse candidate community by providing opportunities for candidates to interact with one another in various ways. The unit also makes a concerted effort to increase the diversity of their community by hiring an enrollment counselor from a diverse population represented at the college to deliberately recruit in venues that are likely to attract a diverse group of potential students. In the 2009-10 academic year, approximately 50 percent of the candidates were persons of color. There are required collaborative activities, assignments, and assessments included in the various programs that require candidates to interact with one another. The unit also sponsors a range of social, club, professional, and service activities to provide opportunities for interactions among diverse candidates. Some of the activities include: Kappa Delta Epsilon, School of Education Student Association, Association for Supervision of Curriculum Development, and Math Steeplechase.

Initial and advanced candidates engage with faculty of diverse backgrounds. Exhibits validate that the unit is committed to recruit and retain diverse faculty. Thirty percent of the full-time professional education faculty identify themselves as persons of color. The university has in place a diversity hiring plan, including a handbook and resources for search committees. Since 2005, the unit has hired 10 full time faculty members, half who identify themselves as persons of color. In order to enhance the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to work with diverse student populations, faculty are required to take a one week seminar entitled Difference, Power and Discrimination. This is confirmed by interviews with faculty members.

The University has deepened and strengthened its commitment to diversity. Five specific initiatives include the establishment of the Assistant Provost for Diversity position, the development of a "Diversity and Inclusive Excellence" position paper, the creation of a "Diversity Scorecard," the adoption of a diversity requirement for undergraduates, and the development of a diversity hiring plan.

The unit has developed many partnerships to deepen the understanding of and capacity to engage with diverse communities, to gain knowledge of and respect for the students and families who live and learn in them, and to develop competence in working effectively with all learners. These include (1) Region 23: Division of Migrant Education Jumpstart program bringing migrant adolescents and their families to campus through the year for academic support, mentoring, parent education, and college focused work; (2) San Joaquin County Office of Education's Teacher Development Division establishing an Evening Degree Program for Educational

Professionals (EdPro2) that brings local paraprofessionals through bachelor and credential programs; and (3) 2+2+2 Teacher Apprentice Program designed to develop a group of competent math teachers for the local community that brings high school mathematics students who have demonstrated the capacity to teach math through bridge, community college, bachelor and credential programs.

Per the Unit's Policies and Procedures for Recruiting and Retaining Diverse Candidates, it has also developed an enrollment initiative to recruit diverse candidates in all programs, but more specifically the Teacher Preparation programs. These include: (1) EdPro2 (Evening Degree Program for Education Professionals) where 29 out of the 57 candidates have identified themselves as persons of color, and (2) 2+2+2 Teacher Apprentice Program where all six participants in 2010 identified themselves as persons of color. In addition, the unit created a new "enrollment services" position in 2007 to assist with recruitment efforts. The Enrollment Services Counselor is a university alum, an immigrant from Mexico, and a first generation college graduate. The Enrollment Services Counselor's work focuses on recruiting candidates for all programs especially the Teacher Preparation programs. Prior to the creation of this position, 60 percent of the candidates served by the School of Education were White. In 2008 and 2009, 49 percent of the candidates (across all programs) were White and 51 percent were persons of color.

Exhibits and interviews validate that the unit currently does not offer any programs that are entirely online. The unit does, however, support the development and implementation of on-line and blended courses.

4.2 Continuous Improvement
Not applicable to this standard.

4.3 Movement to the Target Level
Not applicable to this standard.

4.4 Strengths
None identified.

4.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?
No areas of improvement were cited for this standard at the previous visit.

4.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?
None

4.5.3 New AFIs.
None

4.6 Recommendation for Standard 4
Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 4: Met

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

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

Faculty members within the unit are qualified for their roles and responsibilities at the initial and advanced levels. Data from the exhibit "Faculty Qualifications" show that of 23 faculty members, 15 are tenure/tenured track and 22 have the terminal degree. Only one individual is an instructor who holds the master's degree and serves as Curriculum and Instruction Field Work Coordinator. Based on the evidence presented, it is clear that all faculty members have expertise in their areas as well as recognized experiences in the professional and clinical settings.

Among the evidences of expertise were professional affiliations as directors on boards, coordinators of specialty area projects, editors of professional journals, evaluators on accreditation boards, and presenters at various conferences including American Education Research Association. The exhibit "Faculty Qualifications" shows that faculty members have demonstrated other contemporary professional experiences, including but not limited to, working in public schools, clinics, and community programs. For example faculty work with Head Start Programs, direct Positive Behavior Support Initiatives and professional partnerships, and sponsor the Northern California Bilingual Roundtable for schools. Collectively, faculty have served more than 24 years in the K-12 schools. Evidence presented in this exhibit "Faculty Qualifications' shows that faculty hold licenses in the various programs for supervising students in multiple subject, administration, and other school professions. Adjuncts who serve in various departments for different periods of time bring exceptional expertise to the specific program.

Expectations for teaching are cited in the *University of Pacific Handbook*. The unit's commitment to teaching and learning is infused through the conceptual framework, selection of faculty, clinical experiences, and evaluation of faculty. For example, during interviews candidates are required to make presentations that focus on their research and provide an opportunity for search committees to observe their teaching. Prior to hiring, the unit attempts to determine the degree to which prospective faculty members are committed to teaching and learning. An examination of course syllabi show that faculty use various methodologies, assessment strategies, taught critical thinking, problem solving, and in addition, modeling professional dispositions. Moreover, the integration of experimental lessons, use of technology as a learning tool, and incorporation of multi-intelligences reflect sound differential pedagogy. Interviews with school partners, advisory boards, faculty, and candidates indicate that faculty demonstrate best practices in teaching. According to the dean, data show that, compared to other units, the faculty members in Benerd School of Education have higher ratings on teaching than other faculty. Faculty in the Speech, Language Pathology program are evaluated by their dean and also achieve high ratings. Faculty are invited by other professional schools at the university to teach their faculty how to improve instruction.

Many of the scholarship activities reflect faculty engagement in the community and school settings in support of teaching and learning. The exhibit "Samples of Faculty Scholarly

Activities" has samples of faculty scholarship and research related to teaching and learning, leadership, assessment, technology, and diversity. The exhibit "Faculty Qualifications" includes a compilation of all faculty members scholarship related to their specific discipline. Faculty members published eight books, 32 articles and reviews in various journals, made 10 presentations and discussions at various professional meetings, and served on more than 65 professional affiliations in roles as editors, reviewers, and examiners. Thirteen faculty members served in roles related to grants including coordinator or external evaluator of grants. The engagement of the faculty in scholarship demonstrates best professional practice.

The exhibit "Summary of Faculty Service and Collaboration Activities" shows that100 percent of faculty engage in various types of service to the community, higher education, and professional organizations. All faculty members engage in supportive school services with local, state, and national organizations and collaborate with other faculty in the unit and across the university to provide a wide range of services related to improving education. They are involved with various committees of the Teacher Education Council to develop and implement policies to improve candidate performance, teacher education practices, assessment of candidates, and school partnerships. Documentation shows that faculty have reached out to other universities and school districts through grants and professional organizations.

The *University of the Pacific Faculty Handbook, Section 7, Promotion and Tenure, 2002* has specific guidelines for faculty evaluation, tenure and promotion. *Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation in Gladys L. Benerd School of Education at the University of the Pacific* 20*04* provides specific directions for evaluation of faculty in the unit. The evaluation procedure for tenure and non tenured faculty allows department chairs to conduct an annual evaluation of faculty with dean review. The dean evaluates the chairs. A summary of evaluations shows all faculty (22) were found to be satisfactory and or superior. Regarding tenure and promotion, a committee conducts the tenure evaluation which is reviewed by the dean. Faculty members have an opportunity to review and comment on the evaluations. Recommendations from the committee are sent to the provost and president for final decisions. Evaluations are used to guide teaching, scholarship, and service. According to the dean, when a faculty is found less than satisfactory, an improvement plan is developed that includes a timeline, released time, and resources. Members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee also note that feedback and support are provided for faculty to meet standards for tenure and promotion.

Documents verifying requirements for licensure for Educational Administration, site placement supervisors and field work supervisors for School Psychology, and supervisors for other programs were available for 2008-2009 and 2009-2010.

Faculty evaluations show a need for faculty to become more efficient and productive in publication of articles in refereed journals. To address this need a task force revised the unit's scholarship expectations, purchased data bases to access national data sets, and increased financial assistance.

The unit has organized resources to ensure opportunities for faculty members to engage in professional development. Faculty interviews acknowledge that the unit is committed to ensuring faculty members have resources they need to create teaching and learning assessments, attend and participate in professional conferences, conduct research projects, utilize technology for

teaching and learning, participate in workshops and seminars, build effective syllabi, and engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

The Multi Cultural Center offers professional development related to diversity, emerging practices, and the Unit's Conceptual Framework. Professional development is also offered in the Center for Teaching and Learning, a facility with flexible space, smart boards, white boards, movable furniture, and space for formal and informal collaboration between and among unit faculty. Through faculty interviews, the Center for Teaching and Learning was identified as a vibrant and supportive resource for faculty to improve as teachers and scholars. Untenured, new, and continuing faculty take advantage of topics on technology to support effective online courses and strategies to promote learning. Professional development has improved faculty capacity to model best practices in scholarship and service, and to assess their own effectiveness, and to collaborate with colleagues in other disciplines.

Faculty participated in unified work on assessment going beyond state, institution, and professional mandates. The collaborative work on assessment with Stanford University, CSU Chico, CSU Sonoma, and CSU Sacramento contributes to improvement in faculty practices. Data on assessment and professional development are used for decision making to impact unit-wide teaching and learning and alignment of outcomes to institutional goals.

The unit provides a modest increase ($1,500 to $1,750) in resources to support professional development, specifically travel. Funds are distributed to both candidates and faculty to support teaching, travel and research. According to the dean, additional resources are available from the university to support faculty scholarship.

5.2 Continuous Improvement
Not applicable to this standard.

5.3 Movement to the Target Level
Not applicable to this standard.

5.4 Strengths
None identified.

5.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?
No areas of improvement were cited for this standard at the previous visit.

5.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?
None

5.5.3 New AFIs.
None

5.6 Recommendation for Standard 5
Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 5: Met

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

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

6.1 Overall Findings.

The University of the Pacific is a private institution operating under a Board of Regents. The President of the University reports directly to this Board. The Gladys L. Benerd School of Education and the Speech, Language Pathology program housed in the School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences serve as the unit for the preparation of teachers and other school personnel. The Dean of the School of Education is the unit head and as such is responsible for the overall administration and operation of the unit.

Governance of the unit follows the general principles outlined in the institution's Faculty Handbook. Primary authority on financial matters and personnel matters lies with the Deans of the School of Education and Pharmacy and Health Sciences and, ultimately, with the University Provost. Following the protocol of shared governance, a Dean's cabinet and other constituent groups/committees have advisory roles on most unit decisions. Primary responsibility for curricular decisions rests with the unit faculty which is administered through the School's Faculty Council. At the unit level, the Faculty Council also has responsibility for representing the interests of the faculty with respect to modifications to promotion and tenure, to faculty benefits and to privileges.

Exhibits, interviews with administrators of the unit and programs within the education unit as well as interviews with faculty and staff within the unit did not verify operation of the unit as a single entity. Thus, the unit is not responsible for the quality of all school personnel prepared at the institution regardless of where the program is administratively located within the institution. Minutes from the Education Unit Committee, formally known as the Education Council, are unable to identify faculty or administrators of the Speech and Language Pathology (SLP) program as members of the Council. Documentation indicates a paucity of interaction between the departments housed in the Benerd School of Education and the SLP department. Specifically, interviews with faculty of the SLP program failed to disclose evidence of the existence of, or the need for, a collaborative relationship between SLP and the programs housed in the School of Education. Data collected by these entities are not collected in a collaborative manner, are not analyzed for the good of the unit as a whole, and are not disseminated for the good of the unit as a whole. What evidence that does exist implies collaboration limited to that commonly found among departments located within a given institution and the absence of the collaborative enterprise as described by the NCATE definition of an education unit.

Unit admission and degree requirements for all departments and programs are aligned with the University's mission and the unit's conceptual framework. The admission, retention, and graduation protocols of the educator preparation programs as well as programs for other school personnel, initial and advanced, are consistently described among the university catalogs, School

materials, and online resources. Application procedures for both initial and advanced programs as well as key transition points within programs are clearly articulated and available to candidates at several sites and in several formats.

Artifacts including review of the 2009 Part C of the AACTE/NCATE Annual Report indicate the Benerd School of Education operational expenses rely on a budget largely supported by an endowment. Additionally, the endowment supports the salaries of a limited number of faculty. Additional funding is made available through institutional resources, the use of unit reserves, and additional accounts. The University's Academic Division funds the salaries, wages, and fringe benefits of the Dean and the Dean's staff and of most faculty, department staff, and all graduate assistants and work study students.

Facilities available to the Bernard School of Education ensure that candidate experiences continue to be strong and positive. Both hard copy and electronic library resources are sufficient to support the academic and professional development of both initial and advanced level candidates. Recent equipment upgrade in the School of Education includes installation of ELMO (Digital Visual Presenters: equipment to project two and three dimensional materials). In addition, the university wide migration to SAKAI enhances the online electronic storage and retrieval capabilities across campus.

Artifacts presented for the Speech Language Pathology program indicate budgetary needs are met primarily through university budgetary procedures with some additional support from grants and contracts. The SLP program is well supported with respect to faculty, staff, facilities, technology, and support materials including laboratory facilities appropriate to the program. Library resources are sufficient to support the academic and professional development of candidates within the program.

6.2 Continuous Improvement
Not applicable to this standard.

6.3 Movement to the Target Level
Not applicable to this standard.

6.4 Strengths
None identified.

6.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?
No areas of improvement were cited for this standard at the previous visit.

6.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?
None

6.5.3 New AFIs.
The education unit does not directly manage or coordinate all programs offered at the institution for the initial and continuing preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel.

Rationale: Unit leadership and authority arrangements do not result in coherent planning, delivery, or operation of all programs in the unit. Specific disparity is identified with respect to the active participation of the SLP program within the unit.

6.6 NCATE Recommendation for Standard 6
Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 6 (CTC Common Standard 1): Met with Concerns
Based on AFI listed above

CTC COMMON STANDARDS NOT ADDRESSED BY NCATE UNIT STANDARDS
CTC Common Standard 1.1   **Met**

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

Findings:
UOP has procedures in place for each credential program where the credential analyst verifies that all credential requirements have been met by the candidate for the multiple and single subject programs. For all other programs, verification is completed within the program by the directors and a program completion notification is provided to the credential analyst. The credential analyst verifies the transcripts and completion documentation and then submits the electronic recommendation to the Commission. She consistently attends all available credential requirement workshops and reviews all information that is distributed from the Commission. The analyst also provides faculty and administration with new official correspondence from the Commission related to their respective programs.

The credential analyst provides advisement to candidates regarding credential requirements for the state and the application process within the introductory program courses and again in their final semester or the program. The credential analyst is also available to all applicants and candidates for questions.

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

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

Findings:
Across all credential programs, candidates are advised and assisted by faculty advisors, who provide academic and professional guidance. A number of professional staff, including the Credential Analyst, the Enrollment Specialist, and the Director of Field Experiences also meet

individually with students to provide consistent advice and assistance. Candidates report a clear understanding of the requirements for course sequence and field work placements. Information is provided to candidates through handbooks, tracking forms, and the website. The University also provides additional career services support to candidates.

The University provides a range of support for candidates who need special assistance, including counseling services, an Office of Services for Students with Disabilities, and the Education Resource Center. Test preparation is offered for the CBEST and CSET exams. Advisors and program chairs meet with students to create remedial plans if necessary, based on feedback from assessments (such as PACT) or other evidence of difficulty (such as field work evaluation) at the various stages of the programs. If candidates are unsuccessful after implementation of remedial plans, they would typically be counseled out of the program. Candidates report successful remediation provided based on specific learning disabilities, presentation skill development and advanced writing.

University of the Pacific Program Accreditation Reports
Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Program

Program Design
The mission of the Gladys L. Benerd School of Education (BSE) is to prepare thoughtful, reflective, caring and collaborative professionals for service to diverse populations. Six core values guide this mission (1) scholarship, (2) integrity and ethical conduct, (3) diversity, (4) social and community responsibility, (5) collegiality, and (6) teaching and learning. "Reflective Practice" is how the MS and SS candidates and graduates describe their experience at University of the Pacific.

All interview participants expressed how comfortable they feel with the leadership of UOP. Stakeholders reported all personnel go out of their way to support and guide their education. The faculty often gives candidates their phone numbers and even responds to texts when they cannot talk. Communication with the institution and credential programs happens through formal and informal meetings. Advisory Boards, Cooperating Teacher Orientation, and BTSA as well as dinners with candidates are often times when issues are brought up and discussed. Employers and Stakeholders shared how the BSE maintains open avenues of communication.

Field Experiences take place with cooperating teachers in local elementary, middle, and high school public school classrooms according to the Multiple Subject or Single Subject program the candidates choose. These experiences prepare them to scaffold their instruction to the needs of the students. The focus of the field-based experiences offers the candidates the opportunity to observe classrooms, implement lessons and reflect on the importance of their planning, curriculum, materials, classroom organization, and teaching strategies. Single subject candidates reported they need additional literacy materials, because most are geared toward the multiple subject candidate.

All candidates conduct two semester long field-based experiences to gain hands-on experience in literacy assessment and instruction across the content areas in which they select and implement several assessment instruments appropriate to grade level and abilities to determine each student's English language proficiency.

Various modifications have taken place within the multiple and single subject credential programs. The classes are sequenced and are based on a theoretical and scholarly foundation anchored to the knowledge base of teacher education and informed by adult learning theory and research. Faculty reported this restructuring took place over several months. During this restructuring, faculty met to evaluate, reorganize, sequence and renumber the classes, field experience and, assessment. Candidates reported classes and field experience are now spiraled and more effective. Employers reported that ideas are shared, and if problems arise, they are often resolved as a result of informal communication in meetings or phone calls.

Course of Study
Candidates reported the Dean's Seminar provided the foundation and guidance they needed throughout the program. In addition, all candidates received advising throughout their program. The preliminary teacher preparation program and its prerequisites include a purposeful, interrelated, developmentally-designed sequence of coursework and field experiences, as well as

a planned process for comprehensive assessment of candidates that effectively prepare to teach K-12 students.

Field placements usually take place in Stockton, a highly diverse area in which candidates often work with English language learners. Candidates and employers shared how the assignments from their classes are aligned to the fieldwork. All employers reported candidates to be prepared to teach and meet the needs of their students. Candidates highly valued their field placements. Classes gave the candidates the strategies needed to implement in their field placement.

Candidate Competence
A multi-tiered assessment system is used to verify multiple and single subject candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. A panel of full-time faculty members interviews multiple and single subject candidates at key points throughout the program using questions to foster reflection, critical thinking, integration of theory and practice. All employers interviewed shared how UOP candidates were highly qualified to teach.

Candidates must demonstrate their ability to be competent in the 13 Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE's) as evidenced by approval from a cooperating teaching and a university supervisor, and successful completion of the Performance Assessment for California Teacher (PACT) Teaching Event.

As a member of PACT, the University of the Pacific's teacher preparation program has designed an assessment program that is developmental and is organized to reflect the three tier curriculum design. This is a multi-tiered system that reflects the trajectory of teacher candidate development. The tiers are described below:
1. Tier 1: Coursework, PACT Embedded Signature Assessments (ESAs), Content Area Tasks (CATs), and Teaching Events (TEs): Data collected from coursework, PACT, ESAs, CATs, and the capstone TE;
2. Tier 2: Key Transition Point Assessments:
   Out-of-class, program assessments based on the Guiding Concepts; and
3. Tier 3: Other Considerations: Identified learning needs and support plan for assisting teacher candidates

All assessments are scored using a four-point rubric in which scores of two, three, and four are considered passing. If a student scores a one on a particular component, the student may be asked to revise and resubmit his or her work. As in the PACT rubric ratings, a score of one is not passing; two is passing at a level appropriate at this time in the program; three is passing with a strong recommendation; and four is passing with a strong recommendation with distinction. Candidates reported they received support and guidance in their classes, and felt comfortable once they submitted their PACT and took the exams such as RICA.

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

Education Specialist Mild/Moderate
Education Specialist Moderate/Severe

The UOP Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Credential Programs are transitioning currently from Level 1 and 2 programs to a Preliminary only program. The Program summary report and reviewer's data collection and observations at the UOP campus were used to compile this report.

Program Design
The program consists of both Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe coursework tracks that lead to credentials in each of these areas. Candidates may elect to complete either or both of these tracks to obtain either or both credentials. In addition, either track may include a either a traditional student teaching segment or an internship, in which the candidate serves as a teacher of record under an internship credential, near the end of the coursework.

The Curriculum & Instruction Department Chair and Special Education Program Coordinator provide day-to-day leadership of the program. The Dean of the Benerd School of Education is responsible for oversight of faculty and unit operations. Program faculty work with the Credential Analyst in the School of Education to ensure that all requirements for the credential have been met. The program faculty include the Special Education Program Chair/Program Coordinator, and several adjunct instructors. The Program Chair/Coordinator is also the fieldwork coordinator and fieldwork supervisor for all student teachers and interns in the program. In addition, this person supervises the adjunct faculty activities, course structures, key program assessments and rubrics for those assessments, advisory board, and student advising.

As part of the Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) Department, the many courses of the Program are also required of multiple and single subject candidates so the Program is well integrated into the C&I functions. Program faculty meet regularly as part of all C&I department meetings. The Program Chair/Coordinator meets and consults regularly with adjunct faculty members. Communication takes place among the Program Chair/Coordinator and program faculty routinely through informal one-on-one sessions, which occur as needed or when questions arise. Reviews of assessment data, strategic planning and program revisions occur as part of the standard C&I processes, with input provided by adjunct faculty.

Course of Study
The Special Education Programs in Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe are planned sequences, with the order of courses building upon a sound foundation of general education knowledge and field experiences in schools. The complexity of special education courses increases as the candidate progresses through the program. In each course there is some engagement with schools in the form of either classroom fieldwork or interaction with decision makers at schools, non-public agencies or non-public schools serving students with disabilities.

In 2007, two new 3 semester-unit courses were added as electives: SPED 293a Autism Spectrum Disorders and SPED 293b Early Onset Bipolar Disorder. These were added to prepare candidates to address the changing landscape of disabling conditions in the schools. The program is transitioning to the newly adopted Education Specialist credential standards, currently ending the Level 1 and 2 and only accepted candidates for the Preliminary credential in Fall, 2010. All

courses were in the process of being upgraded over the last two years and have been updated to meet the new Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Standards for 2011.

Faculty advisors meet regularly with each candidate to gain his or her perspective and thoughts on needs relevant to the field of special education. Candidates in student teaching assignments meet with program faculty (the Program Chair/Coordinator) once per week during their student teaching placement. Additionally, a program faculty member (the Program Chair/Coordinator) meets with the cooperating teacher of each student teacher multiple times during the placement. Cooperating teachers have additional input on candidates' performance through formal surveys. The advisory board, consisting of four faculty members, meets semiannually. There is a concern that, other than faculty, two of which are also cooperating teachers, there are no other stakeholders involved on the advisory board.

Candidates must complete certain pre-requisite coursework prior to enrollment in the professional program. Coursework is appropriately sequenced and builds from overview to in depth and increased breadth among all needed topics.

The teaching of English language learners is specifically addressed in one course and is fully integrated into the content, activities, and fieldwork in many other courses.

The use of scenarios, actual court case materials, and mock meetings are employed to provide decision making skills regarding the provision of Free and Appropriate Public Education. Each special education course has legal and ethical components integrated into activities and assignments.

Candidates engage in fieldwork in each course, starting with the general education sequence. Each candidate will have a wide range of field experiences, both in general education and in programs that serve students who are exceptional, with different types and levels of disabilities, and from different grade levels, kindergarten through high school. Each course requires fieldwork that is matched to the learning outcomes of that course. Fieldwork experiences reflect the high levels of diversity in both culture and language that is reflective of the community in which they take place. Although it appears that informal discussion often occurs between the program coordinator and the co-operating teachers, there is a concern that the co-operating teachers do not appear to be provided any formal professional development training to prepare them for supervising the work of student teachers.

Field experiences support candidate development through exposure to additional practitioners and service delivery models. These models include variations in the levels and types of disabilities, grade and age levels of students, and again in the diversity of culture and English language development levels experienced by candidates. These variations are tracked by both the program coordinator and the cooperating teachers to assure that candidates receive a wide variety of field experiences both before student teaching and during. Interns receive similar tracking and variations before the internship and throughout their jobs, which is also assured by the program coordinator.

In the Special Education courses, candidates visit one to two field settings per course, consisting of a combination of special centers, special day classes, intensive intervention classes, resource specialist programs, and full inclusion programs. Emphasis is placed on how candidates impact

student learning. The candidates are evaluated by the co-operating teacher, the program coordinator, and through self-evaluations based on the TPEs through surveys.

Candidate Competence
Candidates are assessed at the time of admissions, during the program, and at the end of the program. Assessments include grades, test scores, signature assignments, projects, research papers, presentations, portfolios, oral interviews and questioning, and follow-up surveys from the program coordinator, cooperating teachers in fieldwork, and candidate self-evaluations.

All course assessments, interview questions, mid-candidacy and end of program interviews, portfolios, and candidate evaluation surveys have been redesigned incorporating the Teacher Performance Expectations for Special Education (TPEs). Candidates' assessments are based primarily on rubrics created by the program coordinator or by course instructors and reviewed by the program coordinator. There is a concern that the rubrics have not been subject to any process or review to eliminate bias or subjectivity. There is also a concern that a formal process for data processing and use to inform candidates and improve the program is not yet fully in place or implemented.

As reported by the program coordinator, instructors, current candidates, and completers, the Directed Teaching Portfolios consist of artifacts, each of which matches one of 67 subportions of the TPEs. Candidates are given a list of these TPEs parts and develop artifacts throughout their courses and field experiences that may include activities and lessons performed, projects, presentations, capstone course assignments, and other documentation of activities performed relating to the TPE topics. In addition, each artifact must be accompanied by an explanation of how the artifact demonstrates the candidate's achievement of the TPE topic as well as a reflection that demonstrates the candidate's understanding of that TPE topic.

Candidates in the program are presented with an overview of the BSE assessment system in EDUC 140, their initial course, meet regularly with faculty advisors, and are informed in their classes. With the new standards in place, candidates beginning the program in 2011 will receive copies of assessment tools in advising appointments in packets provided prior to the beginning of each segment of their fieldwork. They are also presented with references to both the TPEs and Program Standards in each syllabus for all courses in the program.

Findings on Standards:
Because the program is transitioning to newly adopted Education Specialist standards, a program assessment document will be expected one year after transition. After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met with the exception of parts of Program Standards 1 and 16, which are met with concerns as follows:

Standard #1. Integrated /Blended Program delivery model:
Standard 1 reads, "*An Integrated/Blended Program of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation provides candidates with explicit and supported mechanisms for collaboration among all involved in the design, leadership, and ongoing delivery of the program.*"

Evidence suggests that not all appropriate stakeholders are involved in collaboration, due in part to the use of practicing professionals who also serve as university adjuncts, on the special education advisory board.

Standard 16.
Standard 16 states, "Prior to recommending each candidate for a teaching credential, one or more persons responsible for the program shall determine on the basis of thoroughly documented evidence that such candidate has demonstrated a satisfactory performance on the full range of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) as they apply to the subjects and specialties authorized by the credential. Verification of candidate performance is provided by at least one supervising teacher and one institutional supervisor trained to assess the TPEs."

Evidence suggests that the rubrics designed to assess TPE achievement for various assignments, presentations, oral questioning, projects, and portfolios were not subject to review or a process that verifies lack of bias or subjectivity. There is additional concern that a formal process for collecting, examining, analyzing, reporting, and making use of the data to improve student learning and inform candidates about their progress has only been addressed informally in discussions and appears to be a work in progress.

Speech-Language Pathology

Program Design
The Speech-Language Pathology Services Credential program is offered by the Department of Speech Language Pathology in the Thomas J. Long School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences. The Department Chair and Program Director provide day-to-day leadership of the program. The Dean of the Thomas J. Long School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences is responsible for oversight of faculty and unit operations and works collaboratively with the Dean of the Benerd School of Education who provides oversight on features of the program linked to the credential and credential standards

Program faculty meet regularly to address program and student concerns. The Department Chair and Program Director for the SLP program work to ensure that the program is aligned with and supportive of all appropriate California Standards. Program faculty are active participants on a number of University committees including Academic Affairs, Promotion and Tenure, Council of Graduate Studies, and others. These roles provide additional venues for communication.

The SLP program has 3 options: a 15 month program from those candidates who have a Bachelor's degree with a speech-language pathology background, a 24-month program from those candidates who have a Bachelor's degree with a non-speech-language pathology background, and a 30- month option for candidates who are working and must attend classes in the evening.

The SLP Program is a structured program. Candidates take courses and complete clinical practicum experiences in appropriate sequence. Clinical practicum experiences are an integral part of the candidates program. Placement is offered in public schools with clinical experiences, also provided at the University SLP clinic.

Program modifications made during the recent two years include the addition of a 3-unit course, SLPA 241 – Research Methods in Communication Disorders; reorganization of two current courses SLPA 205 – Adult Neurological Disorders and SLPA 221 – Motor Speech Disorders; the reduction of units from SLPA 213 Advanced Audiology from 3-units to 1-unit to cover the area of auditory processing disorders; and the introduction of a new 2-unit graduate course, Autism Disorders, to expand on the autism sequence already offered in the Language Disorders II and III courses offered at the graduate level.

Faculty and candidates both expressed their satisfaction with the changes. Candidates stated they had asked for the addition of information on Autism and were pleased with the swift process by the University, School, and Department in scheduling the course.

Field-based partners have both formal and informal mechanism to provide input. These include informal and formal meetings between University and field-based supervisors, supervisor and preceptor evaluations, annual meetings of an advisory board, and employer surveys.

Field-based supervisors stated they enjoyed their role with candidates and were well received by the department. They were frequently on the UOP campus as they supervised clinical experiences; therefore, much of the information they received was informal.

Course of Study
Candidates must complete certain pre-requisite coursework prior to enrollment in the professional program. This includes appropriate coursework in biological sciences, mathematics, physical science, and social behavioral sciences. Also required are foundational courses in normal human communication processes.

The professional coursework is carefully structured to ensure that candidates develop knowledge and skills in a logical manner. Coursework and fieldwork has been carefully sequenced in order to maximize the development and demonstration of knowledge and skills. A portion of each day is in class, with the second half of the day in clinical experiences. Structured clinical practicum experiences are aligned with course content and provide candidates with opportunities to develop and demonstrate required knowledge and skills.

Fieldwork is organized to provide candidates with opportunities to develop skills that are linked to course content. Candidates begin their clinical work in on-campus clinics where they serve clients that range from preschool to adults. Department faculty provide supervision in the on-campus clinics. In addition to the on-campus clinical experiences, candidates complete the practicum courses SLPA 287A Internship and SLPA 287B Fieldwork. These courses require the candidate to obtain clinical experience in California public schools two days per week for eight months. Candidates provide speech-language pathology diagnostic and therapy services in the schools all day every Tuesday and Thursday from October to May each year. Candidates typically obtain between 150 – 200 clinical hours during this experience. During the final semester in the program, all candidates complete the practicum course SLPA 288 Externship, which is a 14-week, full-time medical clinical experience at sites throughout the state and country. Candidates typically obtain between 150 – 200 clinical hours during this experience.

Candidates expressed the importance of the field experience and the supervision they received from the faculty.

Candidate Competence

Candidates are assessed at the time of admissions, during the program, and at the end of the program. Assessments include grades, test scores, signature assignments, formative assessments, the comprehensive assessment, and follow up surveys.

Candidates in the program are presented with an overview of the assessment system in the Handbook and it is reviewed as they complete various parts of the program. This year, candidates participated in the new 15 point formative assessment at the mid-point of the program. Candidates whose scores fell one standard deviation below the class mean were required to meet with faculty to discuss the evaluation. Candidates stated they were aware of the assessment process and could explain it to others.

Findings on Standards:

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

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program

The University of the Pacific (UOP) has an approved preliminary administrative services credential program. The department offers candidates the options of completing the credential as a stand alone program or embedding it in an MA degree.

Program Design

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program is monitored by the chairperson of the Department of Educational Administration and Leadership. The Department chair also serves as the program director of the administrative services credentials. The Department chair reports directly to the Dean of the Benerd School of Education (BSE). The department has a full-time clinical faculty member who meets regularly with field experience candidates and field supervisors to obtain feedback on candidate performance and program needs.

The administrative services credential program has an enrollment of about 20 candidates with about half enrolled in the first year and the other half in the second year of the program. The department is served by a full-time administrative assistant that communicates regularly with candidates and faculty in the program. Department faculty reported a high level of communication among themselves, with candidates, and partnerships. Interviews with candidates confirmed this high level of communication.

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program is a three-semester program consisting of 18 units of coursework and 3 units of field experience.

Through courses and field experiences, the program delivers a cohesive set of learning experiences that are informed by adult learning theories. Administrative courses and field experiences have been organized around the 14 Learner Centered Principles developed and promoted by the American Psychological Association (APA). These Learner Centered Principles focus on cognitive and metacognitive factors, motivational and affective factors, developmental

and social factors, and individual differences factors that must be attended to when making educational decisions at all levels of learning and for all learners.

No program modifications for the Preliminary administrative services credential were reported in the 2010 CTC Biennial Report or from interviews with faculty and candidates.

The Department of Educational Administration and Leadership at the University of the Pacific has both strong informal and formal avenues for stakeholder input. There is an ongoing partnership with the San Joaquin County Office of Education (SJCOE) for the professional preparation of school administrators. Through the San Joaquin County Office of Education, candidates have access to all public school districts in San Joaquin County. The SJCOE and BSE jointly identify field sites. All aspects of the program, including recruitment of candidates, selection and advisement of candidates, development of the curriculum, delivery of instruction, selection of field sites, design of field experiences, relation and preparation of field experience supervisors, and assessment and recommendation for credential are a joint effort between the SJCOE and BSE/University of the Pacific. Once a year, an Advisory Board, comprised of practicing administrators, meet to discuss program strengths and offer suggestions for improvement. Minutes of the Ed Admin advisory board and a roster of members were available to reviewers. The roster of members represented a wide variety of stakeholders including individuals from the California Department of Education, area superintendents, deputy superintendents, and UOP Faculty.

Course of Study
Stakeholders and candidates report an effective sequence of coursework for candidates in the preliminary administrative services credential.

Coursework and field experiences are consistent with the Benerd School of Education's goal to plan learning experiences for candidates to develop into reflective and effective practitioners. Most candidates enroll in one unit of field experience for three consecutive semesters. There is an optional intern program but no candidates have been enrolled in the Administrative intern program for a number of years due to limited hiring by school districts of administrative interns. Through planned course discussions, case study analysis, simulations, scholarly book reviews, practitioner interview, course projects, authentic learning activities, etc. the candidate has multiple opportunities to review, discuss, and analyze the broad range of foundational issues and theories and their relation to professional practices in schools and classrooms. Site supervisors, candidates, and recent program completers reported a high level of satisfaction with the program outcomes.

All programs include extensive instruction in successful experiences for all types of learners. Candidates are assigned specific readings and hear from various speakers about the needs, strengths and challenges of many diverse learners and communities in California, including African Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, Latino/Latina Americans, gay, lesbian, and transgendered Californians, English learners and native English speakers, and others.

Site supervisors, candidates and program completers reported that field placements prepared program completers to serve in California's diverse school settings and at both elementary and

secondary levels. All program candidates are employed as full-time teachers resulting in the majority of their primary placement being at this site, with supplementary placements in another setting at another level, a supplementary placement in another setting at another level, or supplementary placements in other settings and levels.

Site supervisors, program candidates, and program completers all report high levels of satisfaction with the effectiveness of field supervision, advisement, and evaluation.

Candidate Competence

The assessment system for the Preliminary administrative services credential is primarily informal and comprised of end of course grades. Candidates receive informal feedback as formative assessments throughout the program. Rubrics for the program assessment have recently been developed and are yet to be implemented. The program has an extensive follow-up survey of graduates but does not include data from applicants, candidates in the program, or culminating assessment. Therefore data has not been aggregated, analyzed, summarized and used for program effectiveness.

The development and maintenance of a learning portfolio is a center piece of the assessment process. The portfolio has several purposes. One purpose of the portfolio is to enable the candidate to track his/her learning experiences and growth in the program. Second, the portfolio provides the university supervisor and program advisor with a means to guide and monitor learning and development throughout the Preliminary Credential program. Finally, assessment of the portfolio is one mechanism by which the program ensures that candidates have achieved program outcomes and demonstrated competence in relationship to CPSEL standards. In reviewing the results of candidate portfolios, the program director in consultation with the university and district supervisor validates each candidate's competence and performance. Data from this culminating experience is not analyzed or aggregated to provide feedback to candidates about their performance, or to provide feedback to the program about program improvement.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report, Biennial Reports and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met with the exception of the following, which are Met with Concerns, 7(e), 9(b), (e) (h):

7: Authentic and significant experiences addressing a variety of school levels and a variety of school settings are required for each candidate, including field experiences, at least one of which involves a site with a diverse school population. The program strives to place candidates in more than one level yet did not provide evidence that all candidates meet this requirement due to complications with employment at one setting.

9: There is a systematic summative assessment administered by qualified individuals who are knowledgeable about the standards of candidate competence in Category III. Candidates are assessed using documented procedures or instruments that are clear, fair and effective. The program includes a Portfolio based on appropriate program standards that serves as a summative assessment at the completion of the program. The procedures for assessment of this culminating portfolio were not evident to reviewers as being well documented and the rubric has just been developed but is not currently in place.

The program staff periodically evaluates the quality, fairness and effectiveness of assessment practices and uses assessment data as one source of information about the quality of the preparation program. There is no evidence that the program staff use assessment data to assess program quality.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology

Program Design
The School Psychology program at the University of the Pacific is a department within the Benerd School of Education, under the leadership of the Dean of the School. The current leadership for the School Psychology program consists of a Chair who is the primary administrator and three full-time faculty. Adjuncts are hired on an "as needed" basis. All faculty have had extensive experience in schools as support personnel and hold both credentials and licenses in California.

The Department of Educational and School Psychology is one of several departments in the Benerd School of Education at the University of the Pacific. Within the Unit, formal and informal communication between faculty of this program and other programs occur in departmental meetings and council meetings.

A typical cohort consists of approximately 6-7 candidates; at the present time, there are currently 25 candidates in the programs. At the conclusion of 60 semester units and 1650 fieldwork/intern hours, a candidate may be recommended for a California State credential with authorization in School Psychology. The majority of the fieldwork and internship is completed in a K-12, public school setting. Courses, fieldwork, and internships meet the 10 domain requirements of the National Association of School Psychology (NASP).

Candidates stated they like the cohort approach and graduates said they keep in touch with their cohort members now that they are in the professional field. Candidates stated they felt confident and competent as a school psychologist as a result of the program. Courses were sequenced and there was faculty support at any time if it was needed.

During the past two years, the School Psychology program has made several changes in the curriculum. They have added a course in Program Evaluation and revised several courses, adding a home/school component. All changes were made in response to analysis of assessment and other data. The table below provides an overview of these changes.

Data Source	Actual or Planned Change
1. Low ratings on fieldwork evaluations (years one and three) on Home/School/Community Collaboration 2. Feedback from NASP evaluation 3. Feedback from CTC program review	1. Will add to the Consultation course (EPSY 308) more parent consultation, and will include parent behavior management curriculum. 2.Candidates will be required to interview a parent in EPSY 301 3. Will add a therapeutic assessment component to the Emotional Disturbance portfolio requirement. (#12) This will require parent involvement in setting the

	goals of the assessment. 4. Will add a parent component to the Counseling Case portfolio requirement (#4).
Feedback From NASP review in the area of Program Evaluation	1. Added course on Program Evaluation to curriculum. 2. Require interns to conduct a quantitative program evaluation during internship.

Field based partners have both formal and informal mechanism to provide input. The Program Advisory Board consists of fieldwork and internship supervisors. This Board meets with departmental faculty three times a year. Fieldwork and internship supervisors also review each candidate they supervise every semester. Further, the instructors responsible for the Fieldwork and Internship seminars are in contact with field-based supervisors.

Site Supervisors and employers stated they would take a UOP School Psychologist over other program candidates because UOP candidates were well prepared, confident, competent, and could function independently, if necessary.

Course of Study
During the first two years candidates are involved in full-time coursework and four semesters of continuing fieldwork that is sequential and designed to prepare them for their internship. Candidates in the program are admitted as a cohort and courses are aligned in lock-step mode. A department Handbook is provided to the student at the Orientation, which outlines the entire program including assessments, timelines, and expectations. This information is discussed and reinforced throughout the program. Candidates stated they were well aware of the sequence of assessments and understood their value.

Many courses within the program have field-based assignments and assessments that force candidates to explicitly connect course and field experiences. Candidates who are enrolled in the program in school psychology and who are preparing for the Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology Credential are required to take four one-unit courses in EPSY 294b School Psychology Field Work, for a total of 4 units and 450 clock hours of practica.

Candidates also take required courses: EPSY 294A and B and EPSY 398 in conjunction with their fieldwork and internships. These courses meet weekly and require candidates to reflect on their capacity to make connections between the coursework and the experiences they have in the schools during their fieldwork/internship.

Candidates liked having the fieldwork beginning immediately in the program. They stated the "hands-on" made them feel a part of the profession right away and gave them an opportunity to have many experiences. By working in a team with 2nd and 3rd year candidates gave them the opportunity to learn from others.

Candidate Competence
Several assessments are used to evaluate candidate competency in the School Psychology program. These include the following:

Grades in required program courses
Scores on the Praxis II Examination in School Psychology
Three Portfolio Evaluations:
    a.   At the Master's level
    b.   At the Internship Credential level
    c.   At the Final Credential level
Practicum Level Evaluations (conducted each semester by field work supervisors)
Internship Level Evaluations (conducted each semester by field work supervisors)

In addition to the above assessments, the program utilizes the following measures to obtain additional information about candidate and program completer performance or program effectiveness that informs programmatic decision making:
Annual Reviews
Graduate Exit Surveys
Graduate and Supervisor Surveys (conducted at least one year following graduation).

An individual annual review is conducted with faculty which provides another opportunity to discuss expectations and candidate progress. As a culminating experience, candidates must pass the PRAXIS II with a score of 160 or better. All candidates have received this score on the first or second attempt.

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