

# **Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at California State University Sacramento**

## **Professional Services Division**

**May 18, 1999**

### **Overview of This Report**

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at California State University Sacramento. 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, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

### **Accreditation Recommendations**

- (1) The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for California State University, Sacramento and all of its credential programs:  
**ACCREDITATION**

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

- Administrative Services Credential
  - Preliminary
  - Preliminary Internship
  - Professional
- Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential
  - Language Speech and Hearing
  - Special Class Authorization
- Health Services/School Nurse Credential

- Multiple Subject Credential
  - Multiple Subject,
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Cantonese, Khmer, Korean, Hmong, Mandarin, Filipino, Spanish, Vietnamese)
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Cantonese, Khmer, Korean, Hmong, Mandarin, Filipino, Spanish, Vietnamese) Internship
  - Middle Level Emphasis
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
  - School Counseling
  - School Counseling, Internship
  - School Social Work
  - School Psychology
  - School Psychology Internship
- Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential
- Single Subject Credential
  - Single Subject
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Cantonese, Khmer, Korean, Hmong, Mandarin, Filipino, Spanish, Vietnamese)
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Cantonese, Khmer, Korean, Hmong, Mandarin, Filipino, Spanish, Vietnamese) Internship
  - Middle Level Emphasis
- Education Specialist Credentials - Preliminary Level I
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
  - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Internship
  - Moderate/Severe Disabilities, Internship
- Concurrent Credential Options
  - Multiple Subject (CLAD Emphasis)/Education Specialist
  - Single Subject (CLAD Emphasis)/Education Specialist
  - Middle Level Emphasis/Education Specialist

(2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- California State University, Sacramento be permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, Sacramento be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2004-2005 academic year.

## **Background Information**

California State University, Sacramento has just celebrated its fiftieth year of operation. It is the sixth largest of the 22 campuses in the California State University System. Over 800 full-time faculty and 475 part-time faculty offer 73 baccalaureate and 38 masters degree programs, in addition to 75 credential programs at the post baccalaureate level. California state University, Sacramento is one of the largest producers of educator credentials among the public universities in California.

CSU Sacramento serves 23,000 students, with almost fifty percent of the student population coming from groups traditionally underrepresented among students at United States universities. There are two colleges within the university that offer educator credential programs: the College of Education and the College of Health and Human Services. Programs in Speech Pathology, School Nursing and School Social Work are located in the College of Health and Human Services. The remainder are located in the College of Education.

The mission of California State University, Sacramento is "to preserve, communicate, and advance knowledge; cultivate wisdom; encourage creativity; promote the value of humankind; and improve the quality of life for its graduates and the people of the region. The education of students is the central mission of the university. Therefore, the University faculty's primary responsibilities are teaching and the creation of an active learning environment for students."

## **Preparation for the Accreditation Visit**

The Commission staff consultant was assigned to the institution in Spring 1998 and met with institutional leadership shortly thereafter. Over the next two years, there were a number of consultant staff meetings with faculty, program directors and institutional administration. The meetings led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistical and organizational arrangements. The team size agreement was developed in September 1998. In addition, telephone and regular personal communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. The Team Leader, Dr. Robert Monke, was selected in July 1998

## **Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report**

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the Common Standards. These responses were developed in reference to all programs and for the institution as a whole. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution decided which of the five options in the *Accreditation Framework* would be used for responses to the Program Standards. Institutional personnel decided to respond using the California Program Standards for

all programs except the Clinical Rehabilitative Services Program that used National Standards supplemented by the California Standards found not to be present in the American Speech and Hearing Association Standards.

### **Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team**

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Dean and Faculty of the Colleges of Education and Health and Human Services and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of nineteen consisting of a Team Leader, a Common Standards Cluster of three members; a Basic Credential Cluster of five members, a Specialist Credential Cluster of four members, and two Services Credential Clusters of a total of six members. The Dean and Consultant assigned each credential program to one of the program clusters. The Commission Consultant then selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and trained in the use of the *Accreditation Framework*.

Each member of the Common Standards Cluster examined primarily the institution's responses to the Common Standards but also considered the Program Standards for each credential area. Members of the Basic, Specialist, and Services Clusters primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered Common Standards issues.

### **Intensive Evaluation of Program Data**

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Sunday April 11. The team arrived on Sunday afternoon with a meeting of the entire team followed by organizational meetings of the clusters. The institution sponsored a working reception on Sunday evening to provide an orientation to the institution.

On Monday and Tuesday, April 12-13, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. The institution developed a very ambitious interview schedule. A total of 932 group and individual interviews were conducted by the team members in the two days devoted to collection of data. Each team member made interview contact with nearly 50 interviewees in that time. There was extensive consultation among the members of all clusters, and much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Tuesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning were set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report. During those work sessions, cluster members shared and checked their data with members of other

clusters and particularly with the Common Standards Cluster, since the Common Standards findings also affected each of the Program Clusters.

### **Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report**

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met," "Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns or "Standard Not Met." The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then outlining perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard. The team determined that all Common Standards were fully met.

For each separate program area, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards that pointed out any standards that were not met or not fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team highlighted specific Strengths and Concerns related to the program areas. The team determined that all program standards were fully met in all programs but three. One standard was minimally met in the Multiple and Single Subject Programs, and one in the School Nurse Program was minimally met.

The team included some "Professional Comments" at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding of the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

### **Accreditation Decisions by the Team**

The team discussed an initial draft of the report on Tuesday evening and made a tentative accreditation decision. After the report was finished, the entire team met Wednesday morning for a final review of the report and a decision about the results of the visit.

The team made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Framework*. In its deliberations, the team decided that although three program standards were not fully met, the overall quality of the programs compensated for it. The team did list some concerns, but did not feel that the concerns were of sufficient magnitude make findings that any additional standards were less than fully met. The team then considered the appropriate accreditation decision for the institution. The options were: "Accreditation," "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations," "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" or "Denial of Accreditation." After thorough discussion, the entire team voted to recommend the status of "**Accreditation.**" The recommendation for "Accreditation" was based on the unanimous agreement of the team.



**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING  
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION**

**ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

**Institution:** California State University Sacramento

**Dates of Visit:** April 11-14, 1999

**Accreditation Team  
Recommendation:** ACCREDITATION

**Rationale:**

The team recommendation for Accreditation was the result of a review of the Institutional Self Study Report, a review of additional supporting documents available during the visit, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the unit. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the unit was based upon the following:

1. Common Standards - The Common Standards were first reviewed one-by-one and then voted upon by the entire team. All were judged to have been fully met. There was considerable discussion about Common Standard #4 in terms of whether or not a sufficient level of systematic, comprehensive evaluation exists. There was variation from one program to another on this standard; however the team decided that it did not warrant a finding of met minimally. The team found it as a concern.
2. Program Standards - Results of reviews of standards for individual programs were presented to the team by cluster leaders with additional comments as needed by cluster members. Following discussion of each program, the team concluded that program standards were met in five areas. However, in three programs, standards were judged to have been met minimally. Each of the standards minimally met are summarized by program area below.

In the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Programs, Standard 33 on Determination of Candidate Competence was met minimally with quantitative concerns because signatures required of both the district field supervisor and the university supervisor were not found on evaluation documents of candidates in field work.

In the School Nurse Program, Standard #1 on Program Design, Rationale and Coordination, was met minimally with qualitative concerns. The team found a lack of coordination between the program's faculty, staff, with the Education unit, and other departments on campus. A review of documents also revealed a lack of

distribution of content delineated in the standards across coursework required for the program.

3. Overall Recommendation - The decision to recommend Accreditation was, in part, based on team consensus that all Common Standards were met. Furthermore, after reviewing all programs only two standards were judged to have been met minimally, one with quantitative concerns and one with qualitative concerns. The team concluded that all programs are effective and generally of high quality. The Deficiencies noted by the team are balanced by compensating factors in the program areas. Thus the team reached the decision that the overall evidence suggested the recommendation of Accreditation for the unit.

### **Accreditation Recommendations**

- (1) The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for California State University, Sacramento and all of its credential programs:  
**ACCREDITATION**

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

- Administrative Services Credential
  - Preliminary
  - Preliminary Internship
  - Professional
- Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential
  - Language Speech and Hearing
  - Special Class Authorization
- Health Services/School Nurse Credential
- Multiple Subject Credential
  - Multiple Subject,
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Cantonese, Khmer, Korean, Hmong, Mandarin, Philipino, Spanish, Vietnamese)
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Cantonese, Khmer, Korean, Hmong, Mandarin, Philipino, Spanish, Vietnamese) Internship
  - Middle Level Emphasis
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
  - School Counseling
  - School Counseling, Internship
  - School Social Work
  - School Psychology

## School Psychology Internship

- Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential
- Single Subject Credential
  - Single Subject
    - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Cantonese, Khmer, Korean, Hmong, Mandarin, Philipino, Spanish, Vietnamese)
    - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Cantonese, Khmer, Korean, Hmong, Mandarin, Philipino, Spanish, Vietnamese) Internship
    - Middle Level Emphasis
- Education Specialist Credentials - Preliminary Level I
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
  - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Internship
  - Moderate/Severe Disabilities, Internship
- Concurrent Credential Options
  - Multiple Subject (CLAD Emphasis)/Education Specialist
  - Single Subject (CLAD Emphasis)/Education Specialist
  - Middle Level Emphasis/Education Specialist

**Team Leader: Robert Monke**  
California State University, Fresno

**Common Standards Cluster:**

**Patricia Oyeshiku**, Cluster Leader  
San Diego Unified School District

**Carolyn Haugen**  
Walnut Valley Unified School District

**Curtis Guaglianone**  
California State University, Fresno

**Basic Credential Cluster:**

**Kathleen Taira**, Cluster Leader  
California State University, Dominguez Hills

**Clara Park**  
California State University, Northridge

**Carmen Delgado-Contreras**  
San Mateo County Office of Education

**Kim Breen**  
West Covina Unified School District

**Eileen Oliver**  
California State University, San Marcos

**Specialist Cluster:**

**Nancy Burstein**, Cluster Leader  
California State University, Northridge

**Brigid Richards**  
San Rafael High School District

**La Kecia Smith**  
Los Angeles Unified School District

**Mary Purucker**  
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District

**Services Cluster I:**

**Andrew Dubin**, Cluster Leader  
San Francisco State University

**Mark Fulmer**  
Saugus Union School District

**Louis Shaup**  
Rialto Unified School District

**La Verne Aguirre**  
Alum Rock Union School District

**Services Cluster II:**

**Judy Montgomery**, Cluster Leader  
Chapman University

**Christine Ridley**  
Perris Unified School District

## DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog  
 Institutional Self Study  
 Course Syllabi  
 Candidate Files  
 Fieldwork Handbooks  
 Follow-up Survey Results  
 Needs Analysis Results  
 Information Booklets  
 Field Experience Notebooks  
 Schedule of Classes  
 Advisement Documents  
 Faculty Vitae  
 Log of Clinic Hours

## INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

|                              | Team Leader | Common Stands. Cluster | Basic Cred. Cluster | Specialist Clusters | Services Cluster I | Services Cluster II | TOTAL      |
|------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Program Faculty              |             | 46                     | 64                  | 29                  | 34                 | 13                  | <b>186</b> |
| Institutional Administration | 12          | 14                     | 3                   | 2                   | 18                 | 8                   | <b>57</b>  |
| Candidates                   |             | 28                     | 73                  | 48                  | 73                 | 76                  | <b>298</b> |
| Graduates                    |             | 12                     | 30                  | 22                  | 39                 | 15                  | <b>118</b> |
| Employers of Graduates       |             | 18                     | 9                   | 2                   | 29                 | 10                  | <b>68</b>  |
| Supervising Practitioners    |             | 16                     | 19                  | 15                  | 23                 | 15                  | <b>88</b>  |
| Advisors                     |             | 4                      | 2                   | 0                   | 18                 | 5                   | <b>29</b>  |
| School Administrators        |             | 6                      | 7                   | 7                   | 25                 | 5                   | <b>50</b>  |
| Credential Analyst           |             | 3                      | 0                   | 0                   | 2                  | 2                   | <b>7</b>   |
| Advisory Committee           |             | 5                      | 2                   | 1                   | 9                  | 6                   | <b>23</b>  |
| Parents                      |             |                        |                     |                     | 8                  |                     | <b>8</b>   |

**TOTAL**

**932**

## Common Standards

### Standard 1 - Education Leadership

### Standard Met

The College of Education and the College of Health and Human Services articulate and support visions which value diversity, community, and collaboration in building quality teacher preparation programs. There is evidence of a vision that addresses the issue of serving students of diverse populations. Within the colleges, committees, such as University Teacher Education Committee (UTEC), promote a forum for open communication within and between programs. Most programs report evidence of systematic interdepartmental communication. Evidence based on interviews with students, faculty, employers, and community indicates that exceptional leadership in the program encourages strong support for partnerships with regional school districts and other educational agencies.

### Strengths

Strong departmental support has created a positive work environment. The President and Provost are to be commended for the high level of support for the College of Education and the College of Health and Human Services.

### Concerns

The team recommends more collaboration between the College of Education and the School Nurse Program.

### Standard 2 – Resources

### Standard Met

It appears that sufficient resources are consistently allocated for the effective delivery of each credential program. The resources enable effective coordination, admission, advising, curriculum, instruction, and field experiences. Library and media resources, computer facilities and support personnel, among others, are adequate.

Interviews with the President and Provost, College administration including department chairs, as well as faculty demonstrate a high level of support of all programs within the College of Education and College of Health and Human Services. Each credential program is provided adequate resources to fund personnel to effectively conduct business.

Resources in support of internship programs in each of the credential areas also appear sufficient for high quality teaching, advising, and supervision. Internship candidates as well as field supervisors, cooperating teachers, and university faculty report high levels of support from districts. Various partnerships have been established that provide additional access to resources which enable interns to successfully perform all professional duties.

### Strengths

Library materials and access to technological resources have increased significantly during the past two years.

Tenure track positions have increased in the College of Education and the College of Health and Human Services to accommodate enrollment increases in the educator preparation programs.

**Concerns**

Although there are sufficient resources for personnel, members of the faculty interviewed reported that instructional materials and office supplies are inadequate.

It is important to provide consistent remuneration for faculty, advisors, and coordinators during transition to the year around program.

**Standard 3 – Faculty**

**Standard Met**

Qualified persons are hired and assigned to teach all courses and supervise field experiences in each credential preparation program. The faculty is knowledgeable about cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity. The institution regularly evaluates the performance of instructors and field supervisors, and retains only those individuals who are consistently effective.

Following careful review of faculty vitae (by program) and interviews with faculty, students, district field supervisors, cooperating teachers, and other district personnel, it is clear that faculty at CSUS are knowledgeable of current research and best practices. Interviews with faculty reveal high expectations by College and University administrators as well as professional commitment by faculty for high quality teaching and community involvement.

**Strengths**

Candidates report support from full time and part time supervisors is invaluable to their success.

**Concerns**

There is a need for more professional growth funds and support for grant writing, research, sabbaticals, and scholarly activity.

**Standard 4 - Evaluation****Standard Met**

The team found that program evaluation in five of eight program areas exists utilizing multiple measures, including course evaluations, surveys of alumni, employers, and students at the end of program. District field supervisors and university field supervisors are evaluated on an on-going basis. Program changes reflect the comments and concerns of constituents resulting in both programmatic and personnel adjustments in regular programs as well as internships. Advisory committees also provide specific and general programmatic input which program coordinators use to improve program delivery.

**Strengths**

None noted

**Concerns**

All credential programs need to encourage more systematic approaches to program assessment accompanied by program improvement.

**Standard 5 – Admission****Standard Met**

Criteria for admission to program are clear and properly implemented. Admission procedures for programs are efficient and materials are available through a variety of sources including the college catalog, program brochures and fliers, and WEB pages. Scholarships are made available and awarded to underrepresented students by the Advisory Board for the College of Education.

**Strengths**

Centers provide comprehensive admission information that is instrumental in the recruitment of underrepresented student populations.

**Concerns**

The recruitment of faculty and students should continue to be strengthened in order to insure a diverse population across all programs.

**Standard 6 – Advice and Assistance****Standard Met**

The College of Education and the College of Health and Human Services staff and faculty provide candidates with academic, professional, and program advising. Adequate information is available to students during orientation sessions, through mailings, and on an individual basis. Support of second language learning and pre-advisement for potential candidates in the intern program is provided. Credential candidates consistently report that faculty are available for advising and support, both at the university and in the field.

**Strengths**

The strong bonding of cohort groups strengthens the advice and assistance for students.

**Concerns**

It is important to provide consistent information and communication regarding the year-round program and other new programs.

**Standard 7 – School Collaboration****Standard Met**

Faculty of the College of Education and the College of Health and Human Services are meeting the needs of the learning community in various ways including involvement of off-site centers that are each staffed by a coordinator. The university participates with many school districts in their service area by placing students for field experience, student teaching, and internship programs. Such collaborative efforts strengthen the curriculum and provide real life experiences for students.

**Strengths**

The College of Education, CSUS is to be commended for reform efforts at the K-18 level.

The off-site centers are professional prototypes of professional development and training for teacher candidates.

There is notable collaboration in the hiring of interns for district positions.

**Concerns**

None noted

**Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors****Standard Met**

Interviews with students and employers revealed evidence that field experience supervisors are carefully selected based on their experience in the field as well as academic credentials. Field experience faculty are evaluated on an ongoing basis and retained on the basis of quality performance.

**Strengths**

Candidates report that quality and accessibility for district field supervisors are excellent.

**Concerns**

None noted

## **Education Specialist Credential Programs: Preliminary Level I including Internship**

**Mild/Moderate Specialist Credential**

**Moderate/Severe Specialist Credential**

**Multiple Subject & Mild/Moderate or Moderate/Severe Specialist Credentials  
(with Crosscultural, Language, and Academic Development (CLAD) Emphasis option)**

**Middle Level Emphasis & Mild/Moderate or Moderate/Severe Specialist Credentials  
(with CLAD Emphasis option)**

**Single Subject & Mild/Moderate or Moderate/Severe Specialist Credentials  
(with CLAD Emphasis option)**

### **Findings on Standards**

On the basis of candidate, graduate, faculty and employer interviews, review of syllabi, and site visits, the committee finds that all Preliminary Level I standards have been met in the Education Specialist Programs for Mild/Moderate Disabilities and Moderate/Severe Disabilities, including Internship.

### **Strengths:**

Special Education faculty at California State University, Sacramento have established an excellent reputation in preparing teachers to serve students with disabilities. Specific strengths of the special education programs are described below.

The program's philosophy, emphasizing the preparation of candidates to serve diverse learners in inclusive settings, is well articulated throughout the course of study. Candidates consistently reported that the program reflected this philosophy and provided the necessary skills to teach in inclusive sites with diverse populations. Field supervisors are well trained and demonstrate practices consistent with the program philosophy.

The personal attention given to students is one of the outstanding components of this program. Candidates and graduates alike commented on the accessibility of faculty in initial and ongoing advisement and program assistance. Clerical staff were also reported to be "knowledgeable and helpful".

The special education program is highly regarded by candidates, graduates, and employers. Candidates found faculty to be caring and supportive. They repeatedly spoke of outstanding instructors who were knowledgeable about best practices and research and provided coursework that was relevant and practical. Employers indicated that candidates from CSUS were well prepared to serve students with disabilities and the credential candidates, themselves, felt well prepared to teach. The faculty should be commended for their exemplary practices in the preparation of special educators.

Faculty have developed excellent relationships with school districts throughout and beyond the CSUS service area. They conscientiously supervise student teachers, visiting classrooms,

providing guidance, and collaborating with field supervisors. Given the distances they travel, this is a very time intensive effort and much appreciated by candidates, field supervisors, and site administrators.

Students progressing through the program as cohorts, emphasized the supportive nature of their program. They consistently discussed the feeling of “community” or “family” and the support from one another.

**Concerns:**

While written materials are available for the new programs, there is some confusion among students regarding program requirements, scheduling of courses, costs, etc. Students report better articulation is needed among faculty to improve the consistency in advisement for the new programs. They also report that because of the prerequisites, the program is much longer than anticipated.

Materials regarding the intern program need to be further developed. Candidates are unclear about the qualifications of an intern, prerequisites needed, and the benefits of an internship.

General education faculty are teaching special education candidates about instructional methods in inclusive environments. Students report that the general education faculty are good instructors and knowledgeable in their content areas. However, some of the instructors, as indicated by students, have little experience or expertise in adapting curriculum and instruction for students with disabilities.

Several classes are 2 units with a 1 unit lab. Students report there is inconsistency among instructors regarding the lab and the assistance they receive in fieldwork assignments. Interviews with faculty also indicated that faculty responsibilities for the 1-unit lab needed clarification.

All coursework in the new programs for the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe credentials are combined with the exception of student teaching. Students report that the program provides breadth but are concerned about depth. Emergency credential teachers were particularly concerned about the need for preparation in their specialization. Several students in the Moderate/Severe specialization indicated that most coursework emphasizes Mild/Moderate disabilities. Students also reported the need for more coursework on assistive technology and transition from school to work.

## Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential

### Findings

Based on documentation and interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, and employers, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential.

### Strengths

Particularly strong components of the program are:

Balance of the faculty and the rich array of their diverse points of view which range from skill-based to whole language.

Cohesion of the faculty under the auspices of Goals 2000 in coming together to address the changes brought about by new legislation, the revised framework, renewed interest of communities in literacy, emphasis on basics, the Reading Initiative, and RICA.

Highly focused commitment to candidates and their present and future needs in classrooms with students and in schools and school districts working with teachers.

The fusion of theory with practice linking program content with practical applications and strategies.

Collaboration with schools and school districts through offering credential and master's programs based on the voiced needs of the districts.

### Concerns

None noted.

## **Pupil Personnel Services : School Counseling, School Counseling Internship, School Psychology, School Psychology Internship, School Social Work,**

### **Findings on Standards**

All standards are met in the Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology; Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology Internship (using National Association of School Psychologists Standards); Pupil Personnel Services School Social Work; Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling (PPSC); Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling Internship

### **Pupil Personnel Services : School Counseling, School Counseling Internship Strengths**

From obtaining information on school counseling, to acceptance, advisement, and assessment throughout the program, faculty and others involved have been readily available and accessible to students.

Program faculty emphasizes multi-cultural and diversity issues through coursework, discussion, and assignments. Field experiences provide each candidate numerous opportunities to counsel a mix of students with personal issues and concerns. The candidates and graduates reflect cultural, linguistic and ethnic diversity.

### **Concerns**

None noted

### **Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology, School Psychology Internship Strengths**

Students, faculty, and field supervisors report that specific training is provided in the areas of human diversity and socialization including a specialized course and appropriate content imbedded in other courses

Students, faculty, and program documents evidenced an integrated and sequential program of study that allowed individual student needs to be accommodated. There was substantial evidence that the current program is built upon a well articulated program rationale.

Effective practical experiences are supported by well developed collaborative relationships with regional school districts, agencies, and allied University departments. Students consistently reported they were provided with a broad range of field experiences throughout their program that were of value for their professional development.

Students are placed in appropriate internship settings and faculty are considerate of the individual needs and career objectives of students

Program documents, student and faculty reports provide evidence of systematic evaluation procedures. Mid-term evaluations of the instructional program have been implemented to support continued program improvement.

Faculty, student, and field supervisors' reports and course syllabi reflect attention to instruction across the broad range of approaches to individual assessment. Internship experiences appear well constructed and students consistently report satisfaction with the quality of their internship experiences.

**Concerns**

None noted

**Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work**

**Strengths**

Qualified, dedicated and enthusiastic staff is evidenced through interviews with faculty and students.

It was noted that efforts are being made to coordinate a more systematic process for program evaluation.

Strong theoretical content is operationalized in fieldwork experiences as reported in interviews with faculty, students, district field supervisors, alumni, and employers.

Dedicated, experienced district field supervision is evidenced by supporting documents, and faculty and student interviews.

Collaborative learning experiences exist among school social workers, teachers, school psychologists, school counselors, and administrators as verified through interviews with university administrators, faculty, students, and field supervisors.

On an individual basis, the Department addresses the curricular requests made by post Masters of Social Work graduates for the PPSC.

**Concerns**

None noted

## **Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Internship, Professional Administrative Services Credential**

### **Findings on Standards**

All standards are met in the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, the Preliminary Administrative Services Internship and the Professional Administrative Services Credential.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Internship

#### **Strengths**

The program evidences a strong faculty who are committed and active in professional organizations. The internship program was strong with respect to support and selection of candidates. There was an effective application of cohort grouping within the internship program.

University supervision was strong and consistent. There was strong collaboration between field and University in course development and faculty selection. The faculty were highly qualified.

#### **Concerns**

None noted

### **Professional Administrative Services Credential**

#### **Strengths**

There is a strong faculty who are committed and active in professional organizations. There is an effective collegial professional atmosphere.

There is effective coordination of program elements.

The curricula is relevant and practical.

Mentor qualifications were very strong. Students indicated a strong desire to maintain mentoring and the supervision component.

#### **Concerns**

None noted.

## **Clinical Rehabilitative Services: Language Speech and Hearing and Special Class Authorization.**

### **Findings on Standards**

The institution responded to the national standards of the American Speech Language Hearing Association (ASHA) and additional supplementary Commission on Teacher Credentialing standards. All standards are met.

### **Strengths**

There is evidence of comprehensive self analysis and resulting program improvement every two years.

The program offers candidates an exceptional learning experience with augmentative communication.

Offering the Special Class Authorization (SCA) greatly enriches the general education curriculum for the itinerant speech and hearing specialists as well. All students are aware of the positive effect of managing learning environments and collaborating with colleagues on a school site.

The program offers candidates an exceptional learning experience with augmentative communication.

The program has a “lock-step” sequence of coursework and clinical education that was greatly appreciated by candidates, and facilitated accurate and meaningful advisement.

### **Concerns**

Candidates and field supervisors reported there was limited course content, and clinical practicum in the language area of autism and pervasive developmental delay.

Record of scholarly activity in the past five years is limited to only two faculty members.

## Health Services/School Nurse Credential

### Findings on Standards

The team's findings and recommendations are that all standards met, however Standard 1 (Program Design, Rationale and Coordination) was met minimally with qualitative concerns.

Standard 1 Program Design, Rationale and Coordination addresses the course organization in accordance with a cohesive design with a cogent rationale. The team found a lack of effective coordination and collaboration between the Nursing unit and other academic departments on campus for specific credential classes. The review of documents and interviews revealed a lack of distribution of standards across all course work required for the credential.

### Strengths

The use of a List Proc system enhances the program by networking students with each other, their instructors and course materials.

Students felt that this program meets the needs of long distance commuters by providing core credential courses in a creative weekend schedule.

Documents and interviews reflect the integration of the School Nurse credential course work embedded in a strong Nursing Masters Program.

Interviews with faculty and students revealed that faculty are current and knowledgeable regarding school nursing issues.

This credential program piloted the recently adopted Special Class Authorization for Health Education to anticipate implementation concerns for all institutions.

Student interviews reflected exemplary advising and support from the program coordinator for individual students through out their credential education.

### Concerns

Unable to locate the count of multi-cultural school nurse credential candidates.

There is evidence of course evaluation done in previous years with no documentation reflecting data analysis and resulting program changes.

## **Multiple Subject and Single Subject CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish, Cantonese, Mandarin, Cambodian/Khmer, Hmong, Korean, Philipino, Vietnamese) Credential Programs, Including Internship**

### **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met with the exception of Standard 33 Determination of Candidate Competence (Program Standard 21) which is met minimally with quantitative concerns.

Standard 33 Determination of Candidate Competence. Determination of candidate competence is not consistently verified by at least one supervising teacher and one institutional supervisor.

### **Strengths**

Organization of Multiple Subject Program into centers encourages healthy teaching and learning environments. There is extensive collaboration within Multiple Subjects centers among all constituencies.

Multicultural Center candidates and graduates are extremely positive about their experiences.

Program faculty provide ongoing support through mentoring and professional development.

There is significant support from cooperating teachers.

CLAD and BCLAD candidates report being well prepared to work with diverse learners as a result of multicultural education coursework and field experiences in diverse settings.

The cohort model enables students to form strong professional relationships.

Articulation between coursework and fieldwork facilitates teaching success.

BCLAD candidates exhibit strong theoretical background and teaching strategies.

Administrators, field supervisors, candidates and graduates are pleased with university's partnership and collaboration which facilitate field-based instruction and employment opportunities.

**Concerns**

Based on review of documents and interviews with university supervisors, the team determined that candidate competence is not verified by at least one supervising teacher and one institutional supervisor.

**Middle Level Emphasis  
Credential Program****Findings on Standards**

After a review of the institutional report and limited supporting documentation and interviews of graduates and faculty, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Middle Level Emphasis.

**Strength**

Graduates highly value their experiences in the program.

**Concern**

A limited amount of information is available because the program has been inactive since 1997.

## Professional Comments

### **Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Internship**

Attention should be given to exit assessment because there appears to be no formal "closure" process for students.

### **Education Specialist**

Considerable time is spent by faculty to establish off-campus centers/sites and to travel for teaching and supervision purposes. Given a heavy load, it is suggested that faculty be provided additional support to sustain quality partnerships.

Given an increasing emphasis in education on collaboration and the inclusion of students with disabilities, general and special education credential candidates would benefit from courses taken together.

### **Basic Credential Programs: Multiple and Single Subject**

Supervising faculty outside of the College of Education need to be informed of credential program changes.

### **Basic Credential Programs: Middle Level Emphasis**

Revised advising procedures and extensive recruitment efforts have generated program interest from twenty-five potential candidates for Fall 1999.

This program will require extensive institutional support to be successful

### **Clinical Rehabilitative Services**

This program has a comprehensive special class authorization and internship (student teaching and practicum).

### **School Nurse**

With a growing program of 40 plus current candidates it is questionable if .2 coordination time is sufficient to provide the needed teaching, advising, management and collaboration this program demands for the geographical area encompassed.

It is recommended that the leadership for the school nurse credential take an active role in initiating collaboration between individual faculty in the nursing and education departments. This collaboration can only strengthen the program by improving communication and understanding of individuals in their respective roles in the educational setting both on and off campus.

It is recommended that the nursing credential program actively seek student, faculty, field preceptor and employer program recommendations in a timely manner. This data should be formally organized and evidence provided of the prescriptive program changes.

It is recommended that some standards be embedded or identified through out other course work required for the credential. This will increase collaboration between departments and reinforce student learning.