Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at California State University, San Bernardino

Professional Services Division

June 18, 2002

Overview of This Report

This agenda item includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at California State University, San Bernardino, which was conducted at the university from May 5-8, 2002. 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 Recommendation

The team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for California State University, San Bernardino, and all its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION**

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

- Multiple Subject Credential
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish) Internship

- Single Subject Credential
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Internship

- Education Specialist Credentials – Preliminary, Level I and Professional Level II
  - Preliminary Level I
    - Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe Disabilities including Internship
  - Professional Level II
    - Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe Disabilities

- Administrative Services Credential
  - Preliminary Administrative
  - Preliminary Administrative Internship
  - Professional Administrative

- Designated Subjects
  Adult Education
  Vocational Education
  Supervision and Coordination

- Pupil Personnel Services
  School Counseling
  School Psychology
  School Psychology Internship
  School Social Work

- Reading/Language Arts
  Reading Certificate
  Reading/Language Arts Specialist

- Health Services School Nurse

- Adapted Physical Education

Staff Recommends that:

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

- California State University, San Bernardino be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation

- California State University, San Bernardino be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2006 – 2007 academic year.

Background Information

Chartered in 1960 by the California Legislature, California State University San Bernardino (CSUSB) is one of 23 campuses in the California State University System (CSU), a public comprehensive university governed by a single board of trustees and serving over 300,000 students.

When classes began in the fall of 1965, 283 students enrolled at the San Bernardino campus. In the following 36 years, CSUSB has been transformed from a small liberal arts college offering a limited number of baccalaureate degree programs, to a multi-disciplinary university offering 46 baccalaureate degree programs, 22 master's degree programs, 21 educational credential programs, and 40 certificate programs. The fall of 2001 enrollment was 21, 374 full-time equivalent students (FTES) and a 15,985 headcount.

Located in Inland Southern California, about 70 miles east of Los Angeles, San Bernardino and the surrounding region are among the fastest growing areas in the United States. The population

of nearly 3.5 million has doubled since 1980. According to the recent census, no area in California grew as much as Riverside and San Bernardino counties between 1990 and 2000. The 27,400 square mile, two-county service area is the largest are served by any of the CSU campuses. With a population approximately that of Oregon and bigger that 10 states in area, the region presents both challenges and opportunities.

San Bernardino County's Hispanic population size is ranked among the top five in the state and 13th nationally. The county is the first in population growth of African Americans among counties with at least 50,000 African Americans. There is also a significant, and rapidly growing Asian population. Given the ethnic, racial, and socio-economic diversity of the service area. The University has made a commitment to provide access and meet student needs through a variety of scheduling options and delivery systems. Since the early 1970s, the College of Education has set the example in this area. All programs in the College of Education are available after 4:00 in the afternoon to full- and part-time students, and several programs are available at off-campus sites or in a weekend format spread throughout our service area. Additionally, other programs are provided through a combination of classroom and web-based instruction.

Most notable among the off-site offerings is the program at CSUSB's Palm Desert Campus. It was established twelve years ago to serve upper division post baccalaureate and masters students, and is now in the process of constructing permanent, privately funded facilities. The campus currently serves 173.8 full-time equivalent students (FTES) in professional education programs. In 1999, a second center opened to serve the High Desert communities. Housed on the campus of Victor Valley College, the program received initial funds through a U.S. Department of Education Title V grant for Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs). There are 60 FTES estimated for Spring quarter 2002, enrolled in 13 professional education courses. Additional centers will be added at regional community colleges with Title V funding over the next three years.

CSUSB's 420-acre campus has ample space for expansion of physical facilities. Since 1986, the campus has added over 927,000 square feet of instructional and office space, with funding of $161 million, primarily through general obligation bonds approved by voters. Construction on a $48 million College of Education building is scheduled to begin in AY 2003-2004, with anticipated occupancy in 2005-2006.

The full-time equivalent candidate enrollment for the various credential programs in 2001-2002 are as follows: Educational Administration-Preliminary and Professional-170 candidates; School Counseling-76 Candidates; School Psychology-27 candidates; School Social Work-26 candidates; Multiple Subject-690 candidates; Single Subject-317 candidates; Reading Certificate, Specialist-67 candidates; Designate Subjects-44 candidates; Special Education (Level I and II)-199 candidates; and Adapted Physical Education-32 candidates. In the credential programs listed above, there are 1,855 candidates, which is a 77% overall increase from 1995-96.

Merged COA and NCATE Visit

This visit merged the accreditation processes of the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The Accreditation Team, which included membership from the COA and NCATE, received a single Institutional

Self-Study Report, worked from a common interview schedule, and collaborated on all decisions related to accreditation standards.

The merged visit was based upon the partnership agreement reached between the COA and NCATE. The first partnership agreement was developed and signed in 1989. The Partnership was renewed and revised in 1996 and renewed again in October of 2001. The Partnership Agreement requires that all California universities who are NCATE accredited participate in reviews that are merged with the State's accreditation process. The agreement also states that the teams will be merged, will share common information and interview schedules, and will collect data and reach conclusions about the quality of the programs in a collaborative manner. However, the accreditation team will take the common data collected by the team and adapt it according to the needs of the respective accrediting bodies. This is because the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board needs a report that uses the familiar language of the NCATE standards rather than the language that is needed for the COA (i.e., information about Common Standards and Program Standards.) Under the partnership agreement, universities are not required to submit Folios to the NCATE-affiliated professional associations if they are part of a state partnership. The current partnership agreement allows institutions the option of responding to the NCATE standards in lieu of the California Common Standards and for the subsequent accreditation team report to be written based upon those standards. California State University, San Bernardino exercised that option.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Commission staff consultant, Philip Fitch, was assigned to the institution in the spring of 2000, and met with the institutional leadership for the first time in the fall of 2000. Over the following year and one-half, there were a number of meetings between consultant staff, administration, program coordinators, faculty and staff. The meetings led to discussions concerning team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistics for a merged visit and other logistical and organizational arrangements. Considerable discussion took place regarding the comparability of the new NCATE Six Standards and the eight Common Standards. In addition, telephone, e-mail and regular mail communication was maintained between the consultant and institutional representatives. The COA Team Leader and co-chair for the visit, was appointed in the spring of 2001, and the NCATE chair, and co-chair for the visit was appointed late fall 2001. A meeting was held on the CSU, San Bernardino campus with the NCATE co-chair, Dr. Dennis Koutouzos, and the COA co-chair, Dr. Bob Monke, on March 18-19, 2002 with the Dean, Associate Deans, selected faculty and the CCTC staff. The consultant, co-chairs and university administration reviewed plans for the meeting, reviewed documents, and finalized the schedule for the visit. There was an extended discussion regarding the use of the NCATE Standards and the COA Common Standards, and availability of the appropriate documents and documentation for each standard.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report – Use of the Six NCATE Standards

The COA approved a request by the institution to use the six new NCATE Standards submitted and cross-referenced with appropriate areas of the eight Common Standards as a basis for the

Institutional Self-Study document. The institution developed a side by side comparison of the two sets of standards, and cross-referenced all standard elements of both sets of standards. The institutional responses were developed in reference to all credential program areas and the institution as a whole. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution decided to use the California Program Standards

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

This visit was a merged Board of Examiners (BOE) and California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) visit. The four-member NCATE team and two-member CCTC common cluster team reviewed a single NCATE Self-Study Report, worked from a common interview schedule, worked together to gather and discuss the data, jointly visited off-campus sites, and then prepared a single report on NCATE standards. Fifteen additional state team members also reviewed specific credential programs. The merged visit enhanced the ability of the teams to collect data and to carry out the continuing accreditation process.

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Dean and Faculty of the School of Education, and the Commission consultant. It was agreed upon that there would be a team of nineteen, consisting of a Team Leader, four NCATE Team Members and two COA Members to review the NCATE Standards/Common Standards, a five member Basic Credential-Reading/Language Arts Cluster, a two member Special Education Cluster, a five member Services cluster including 2 members, Administrative Services, and three members reviewing the PPS-School Counseling. The CTC administrator for Accreditation and Consultant selected team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability in the use of the Accreditation Framework and additional experience in merged accreditation visits.

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 Saturday, May 4. The Team Leader and the two COA members of the NCATE/Common Standards Cluster began their deliberations with the four NCATE team members. It included orientation to the accreditation procedures and organizational arrangements for both the COA and NCATE team members. Saturday and Sunday mornings, May 5-6, the NCATE/Common Standards Cluster examined documents on the campus. The remainder of the team arrived on Sunday morning and afternoon with a meeting of the entire team at 1:00 followed by organizational meetings of the clusters. The institution sponsored a reception on Sunday evening to provide an orientation to the institution via a multi-media presentation and a welcome from the university president.

On Monday and Tuesday, May 6 and 7, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook.* The institution arranged to transport selected team members to public school campuses and their local satellite sites used for collaborative activities. On Monday and Tuesday afternoons, selected

team members visited the Palm Desert program where they reviewed facilities and budgets, as well as interviewed faculty, candidates, graduates and employers. 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. On Tuesday afternoon, the team Co-chairs, Consultant and Cluster Team Leaders met with institutional leadership for a mid-visit status report. This provided an opportunity to identify areas in which the team had concerns and for which additional information was being sought. 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 NCATE/Common Standards Cluster, since the 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 NCATE/Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met" or "Standard Not Met." The team had the option of deciding that some of the Standards were “Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns. The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then noted particular strengths beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standards and concerns beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standard. It was understood that the decisions on the standards might differ slightly for the NCATE team report and the state team report based upon differences between the national and the state standards. The four members of the NCATE team found that NCATE Standard 1 was met for Advanced Programs, but was not met for the initial or basic programs. The issue was subject matter verification for multiple subject and single subject candidates. The two COA team members on the NCATE/Common Standards Cluster, and all members of the COA team did not agree with the NCATE team findings, and voted that for the COA team report, Standard 1 was met for advanced and initial programs. It was explained on a number of occasions by the consultant, COA co-chair for the visit, and by team members, that subject matter verification was handled differently in California, and therefore was not part of the accreditation visit. The review process is part of the NCATE Partnership Agreement. There are three statements in Standard 1 that are not accurate for COA purposes, and these statements will be clarified at the COA meeting.

For each separate program area, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards pointing out any standards that were not met or not fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team noted particular Strengths beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standards and Concerns not rising to the level of finding a standard less than fully 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

After the report was drafted, the entire team met late Wednesday morning for a final review of the report and a decision about the results of the visit. The team discussed each NCATE/Common Standard. It was decided by consensus of the COA team, that although all of the NCATE/Common Standards were met for NCATE purposes, with one exception, that all elements of the CCTC Common Standards were addressed and met within the context of the NCATE report, and that all Program Standards were met, with two exceptions, for all program areas. Therefore, the team recommended **ACCREDITATION**.

The team made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Handbook*. The options were: "Accreditation," "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations," "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations," "Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations," or "Denial of Accreditation."

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
ACCREDTATION TEAM REPORT

INSTITUTION: **California State University, San Bernardino**

DATES OF VISIT: **May 5-8, 2002**

ACCREDITATION TEAM RECOMMENDATION: **ACCREDITATION**

RATIONALE:
The recommendation pertaining to the accreditation status of California State University, San Bernardino and all of its credential programs was determined according to the following:

> NCATE's SIX STANDARDS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: The COA approved a request by the institution to use the NCATE Standards and Conceptual Framework, and the NCATE team report format to meet the requirements of the CCTC's Common Standards. There was extensive cross-referencing of the NCATE Unit Standards with the CTC Common Standards. Also, the institutional report (Self Study Report) provided supplemental language, incorporating areas of the CCTC Common Standards not directly referenced in the NCATE Standards. Therefore, the corresponding part of this team report utilizes the NCATE standards report format. The total merged team, NCATE and COA, reviewed each standard and all standard elements including the NCATE Conceptual Framework and the supplemented areas of the Common Standards. The total merged team voted as to whether the standard was met, not met, or met with areas for improvement.
>
> PROGRAM STANDARDS: Team clusters for (1) Basic (multiple and single subjects and designated subjects) credential programs, (2) Special Education credential programs, and (3) Services (administration, pupil personnel, and school nurse) credential programs reviewed extensive data regarding all credential programs. Appropriate information and findings were provided by other team members to each of the various credential areas. Following discussion of each credential program area the total merged team decided whether the program standards were either met, met minimally, or not met.

ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend accreditation was based on consensus of the entire merged team including the NCATE team members and COA members. All elements of the eight COA Common Standards were reviewed by the entire merged team as they discussed the team findings on the Six NCATE Standards, and findings on their NCATE Conceptual Framework. One difference in the findings for the NCATE Report, and the COA report, were the team's findings regarding Standard 1. In the NCATE Report Standard 1 was met for all Advanced Programs, but was not met for Initial Programs. The COA team, and two state members of the NCATE/Common Standards Cluster were unanimous in the belief that Standard 1 was fully met for all Advanced Programs and for all Initial Programs. The

issue for Standard 1 for two members of the NCATE team was that the institution did not adequately address subject matter verification for the multiple subject and single subject programs. The COA consultant and the COA co-chair for the visit, as well as other state team members, explained on a number of occasions during the visit that subject matter verification for all initial programs is handled through a separate process from the team visit. This process is one of the key elements of the NCATE Partnership Agreement. As part of the NCATE procedures, the institution may rejoin this element of the NCATE Report to the Unit Accreditation Board of NCATE.

The total merged team did find that NCATE Standards 1, 2, and 6 were met with identifed "Areas For Improvement", which are listed in the COA Report as concerns. There was total agreement of the merged team on the areas of concern listed in the COA Report. The merged team determined that all Program Standards were met with the exception of Education Specialist Program-Level II Standards 10 and 11. Standard 10 was found to be minimally met with qualitative concerns. Standard 11 was not met as there were no clearly defined provisions and procedures for non-IHE activities. The following team report further explains these findings.

TEAM MEMBERSHIP
CO-CHAIRS
Robert Monke
COA Chair
California State University, Fresno

Dennis Koutouzos
NCATE Chair
Roosevelt University
Chicago, Illinois

COMMON STANDARDS/NCATE STANDARDS CLUSTER
Nicholas Michelli (NCATE BOE)
University of New York
Dean of Teacher Education
New York, New York

Qiuping Cao (NCATE BOE)
Ohio University, Lancaster
Lancaster, Ohio

Roberta Margo (NCATE BOE)
Media Specialist
Virginia, Minnesota

Shane Martin (CCTC BIR)
Associate Dean
Loyola Marymount University
Los Angeles, California

J. L. Fortson (CCTC BIR)
Director of Student Teaching
Pepperdine University
Culver City, California

BASIC CREDENTIAL CLUSTER
Barbara Price
Cluster Leader and Designated Subjects
Educational Specialist
Newport Beach, California

Bettie Spatafora
Teacher, Seneca School
Moreno Valley, California

Michael Jordan
Multiple Subject Coordinator
CSU Fresno
Fresno, California

Cathy Buell, Adaptive Physical Education
Chair, Secondary Education
San Jose State University
San Jose, California

Deborah Schurr
Science Division Chair
Rancho Cucamonga High School
Rancho Cucamonga, California

Carolyn Cogan, Reading Standard/Reading Certificate Specialist
Reading Specialist
University of California, Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, California

EDUCATION SPECIALIST CLUSTER
Sue Craig, Cluster Leader
Education Specialist
Redding, California

Linda Smetana
Special Education Professor
CSU, Hayward
Hayward, California

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION CLUSTER
Marcia McVey, Cluster Leader
School Administrator Professor
Azusa Pacific University
Azusa, California

Robert Hoffman
Administrator
Mission Viejo, California

SCHOOL NURSE CLUSTER
Patricia Ghiglieri
Public School Nurse
Folsom, California

PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES CLUSTER
M. Clifford Cole, Cluster Leader
Guidance Counselor
Roseville, California

LaVerne Aguirre
School Social Worker
San Jose, California

STAFF and OBSERVERS
Philip A. Fitch
CCTC Lead Consultant

Helen Hawley
CCTC Consultant

Kathleen Taira, NEA Observer
CalStateTeach
Regional Director
Los Angeles, California

DATA SOURCES		
INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		**DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**
Program Faculty	271	Catalog
Institutional Administration	77	Institutional Self Study
Candidates	573	Course Syllabi
Graduates	232	Candidate Files
Employers of Graduates	68	Fieldwork Handbook
Supervising Practitioners	151	Follow-up Survey Results
Advisors	83	Needs Analysis Results
School Administrators	67	Information Booklet
Credential Analyst	34	Field Experience Notebook
Advisory Committee	102	Schedule of Classes
Admission/Credential Analyst	12	Advisement Documents
Part-time Faculty	113	Faculty Vitae
Parents	26	Adjunct Faculty Files
BTSA Support Providers	13	University Annual Report
		Faculty Retreat Agenda/Minutes
		Budgets
		Budget Report
		Faculty Handbook
		Adjunct Faculty Handbook
		Student Handbook
		Schedule of Classes
		Cal STAT Grant
		Program Advising Minutes
		Student Evaluation of Faculty
		Student Placement Files
		Full and Part-Time Faculty Ethnicity
		Final Program Exams
		Final Course Exams
		Faculty Evaluations (Institutional)
TOTAL INTERVIEWS	1822	

NCATE STANDARDS/CCTC COMMON STANDARDS

1. Candidate Skills, Knowledge and Dispositions

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

A. Level: (initial and advanced)

B. Findings:

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

The following are CCTC approved subject matter preparation programs: liberal arts, English, Spanish, French, health sciences, mathematics, music, kinesiology, and science, and multiple subjects.

Until recently, all programs have been post secondary. In the face of a growing shortage of teachers a "blended program" leading to certification as part of a four-year undergraduate curriculum has been put into place. Relatively few students are currently in this program, taught with a liberal studies major, and none have graduated.

Currently between 75% and 80 % of students in both multiple subject and single subject programs are using the "intern" route for credentialing, California's alternate route to certification program. These students have secured full time teaching positions and complete a sequence at the university leading to a regular teaching credential. Not all of these students have completed their undergraduate programs at San Bernardino, although most have.

The evidence provided for content knowledge of teacher candidates does not differ by program type. That is, all students must complete a subject matter preparation program approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, or take an examination of content knowledge to demonstrate their competence. The vast majority of students use the subject matter preparation program approach. In the single subject area, for example, only 26 students took the examination in the most recently reported Title II outcomes. There were fewer than 10 students in each cell. All passed the examination.

We found little evidence that the Unit systematically determined if students who had completed the approved sequence or the examination demonstrated in their performance that they knew content at a level appropriate to successfully teach in single subject fields. Supervisors of students are not necessarily prepared in the subject of the students they observe. In one set of interviews recent graduates who were teachers of Spanish reported that their supervisors spoke no Spanish and were unable to provide an assessment of their competence. Neither could supervisors of students teaching advanced mathematics or science. One of more than 30 items on the checklist for the evaluation of single subject student teachers related directly to knowledge

of subject matter. It stated "demonstrates knowledge of subject matter and sources of curriculum." In a review of completed evaluation forms, the area was checked, as were all the others, but rarely was an evaluative comment made.

Attention to subject matter competence is clearer in the multiple subjects programs.

There was little collaboration between the Unit and the Colleges offering subject matter preparation, except in a few areas where there are joint faculty appointments such as biology. The documents prepared by the departments for state approval are not shared with faculty in education, and they were not available for review. While the catalog reports that the demonstration of subject matter competence is assessed by the faculty of the appropriate major, there is no evidence that this means more than completing the approved course sequence. Advisory groups meet infrequently and tend to have agendas that are information items rather than consultative or advisory agendas.

Principals of schools employing graduates of the university and supervisors of these students invited for discussion reported that they were for the most part satisfied with the content knowledge of students. Those interviewed were largely at the elementary or middle school levels. No systematic follow-up of the satisfaction of employers with this standard was in evidence.

A new California law will require an alignment of subject matter preparation in Arts and Science and credential programs taught by institutions. As part of this new program all candidates recommended for teaching credentials will need to pass a test of teacher performance that will include both content and pedagogy. At that time additional evidence of knowledge of subject matter should be available.

The institution does use portfolios widely, but these largely focus on other aspects of assessment and not on the content knowledge of the candidate.

Advice and Assistance

There was conflicting evidence regarding the quality of advice and assistance for candidates. The evidence indicates that there have been major procedural changes at the Credential Assistance for Students in Education (CASE) office to improve advice and assistance for candidates. Despite these changes, however, advice and assistance is not consistently coordinated between academic departments, professional credential programs, and CASE, resulting in some misinformation and candidate frustration. Candidates in off-campus programs do not receive consistent and equal access to information, policies and procedures to ensure successful completion of programs in a timely fashion.

Content Knowledge for Other Professional School Personnel

Content knowledge for programs for other professional school personnel was stated clearly. These include programs for adapted physical education, administrative services, career and technical education, instructional technology, educational specialist for those with mild/moderate or moderate/severe disabilities, school counseling, school psychology, social work, reading, school nurse, and supervision and coordination of designated services.

In every instance we found clear statements of content objectives tied to major national standards for these programs. Students in Masters Degree programs often chose a comprehensive examination to demonstrate their knowledge. Faculty in programs with internships assessed the content knowledge of students on the job.

Many programs for other professional school personnel used portfolios for evaluation of students, and these often included evidence that students had mastered the content knowledge. For example, students preparing to be administrators could demonstrate their ability to develop strategic plans, school social workers could prepare assessments of student needs based on their review, and reading teachers could demonstrate their ability to plan a remedial or enrichment reading program.

School administrators employing graduates of programs at this level reported satisfaction with their performance, although no formal follow up studies by the institution were in evidence.

The documents provided little evidence of the use of the conceptual framework in programs at the advanced level, though interviews indicated that some advanced programs had begun aligning curriculum with the conceptual framework.

Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Individual programs had statements of the pedagogical content knowledge expected of their students, but we could find no overall statement of pedagogical content knowledge aligned with the Unit's conceptual framework.

For secondary teachers, the methods course required prior to student teaching is often generic and not geared to the particular subject. During student teaching students take a methods course focused on methods and materials specific to the area.

Field experiences are sometimes linked to methods courses in both the single and multiple subject programs, but students often make their own arrangements for the initial placement.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

Student's professional and pedagogical knowledge appears to be strong and assessed through the use of portfolios and classroom observations. Nearly all items on forms used for the evaluation of SS and MS students in early and late experiences focus on professional and pedagogical knowledge. Little evidence of the conceptual framework can be seen in the assessment, however.

Through courses in the College of Education, students learn to understand the demographic and economic influences on education in the region. They are not systematically assessed on their ability to use such knowledge.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel

Students in advanced programs demonstrate professional/pedagogical knowledge and skills that are clearly delineated in program and course descriptions. Interviews with students and

employers in these programs confirm this conclusion. Their ability to plan and carry out professional responsibilities that require such knowledge and skills are evident in portfolios and descriptions of field experiences. Technology plays a significant role in programs for other school personnel.

Dispositions for All Candidates

The Unit has not systematically identified dispositions for teacher candidates. In an effort to develop such dispositions, a project is underway to develop common professional distributions for programs across the college, including programs for teachers, nursing, social work, etc. along with the consideration of the legal issues affecting the use of distributions. The conceptual framework has not been used for the development of the dispositions.

Dispositions are identified and in place for many of the advanced programs, but systematic evaluation of dispositions is not in place.

Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

Evidence of assessment of student learning is systematically connected in portfolios and adjustments to instruction based on student learning and reflection is clearly evident in multiple subject programs. Clear attention to student learning is less in evidence for single subject programs.

No follow-up studies focusing on the employers of graduates are in place to gather data on the perceptions of employers on the effectiveness of candidates in promoting student learning.

Student Learning for Other School Personnel

Clearly, programs for other school personnel—administrators, counselors, school social workers and the like—include study of what they can do to enhance student learning. The assessment of the effectiveness of other school personnel is uneven. Some programs, including school psychology and school nurse, clearly assess field performance to provide evidence in this area. Others do not.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Programs are designed and content undergo rigorous review by the California Commission on Teaching Credentialing. Evidence that this knowledge is used in the classroom and is adequate in practice is not evident in single subject fields as much as it is in multiple subject fields.

Pedagogical and professional knowledge is at a high level and assessed in programs for other educational personnel.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met: Advanced; Not Met: Inital
State Team Decision: Standard Met

D. Strengths

Attention to subject matter competence is clearer in the Multiple Subject Program.

Employers of candidates are largely satisfied with subject matter knowledge, especially at the elementary and middle school level.

There is a wide use of portfolio assessment.

Content knowledge for programs for other professional school personnel was stated clearly.

E. Concerns

In some cases, supervisors are not prepared in the subject area of the students they are observing in single subject areas.

There is limited evidence of collaboration between the unit and the colleges offering subject matter preparation.

2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

Level: (initial and advanced)

Findings

Assessment System (description of system)
Assessment has been a serious CSUSB University-wide initiative since the 1998-99 academic year. During that year, Provost Fernandez agreed to fund a portion of the costs of developing and implementing outcomes assessment plans.
Funded categories include:

1) Reward and support for implementation of approved assessment plans
2) Incentives and assistance for developing, improving and enhancing assessment plans
3) Coordination of assessment in colleges
4) Possible use of outside consultants for university-wide training and assistance

Program assessment outcomes were also initiated as part of the Western Association for Colleges and Schools Accreditation (WASC); CSUSB has instituted an annual program assessment procedure for each degree or credential producing Unit. This procedure is in its first year. Each program is required to submit an Annual Outcomes Assessment Report relating program data and how this data have been used for program improvement.

Required components of all program assessment plans (annual reports) include:

- Mission statement goals for each program and each sub-program
- Objectives related directly back to each goal
- Criteria (How will you know if students have met each objective? What level of achievement?)
- A methodology and time line for carrying out assessment
- Identification of who will do the assessment; collect/and analyze data
- Type of feedback reporting mechanism
- How data will be used to improve the program and revise the curricula

As a result of this university-wide initiative, a University Outcomes Assessment Committee-consisting of 2 representatives from each of the five colleges-reviews and assimilates an annual report on individual program activities for the year. Each college has an Outcomes Assessment Coordinator (a result of the initiative in academic year 1998-99) This position in the College of Education is working and has been viable for two years. Recently the individual has resigned from the COE Outcomes Assessment Coordinator responsibilities. As of this time, the position remains vacant.

There is a complete file of Unit Program Assessment Plans. Each program (advanced credential programs also) has beginning and ending assessment procedures as well as benchmark checkpoint assessments throughout. As of winter 2002, 16 (of the existing 18) Program Assessment Plans in the COE have been submitted for annual review. To date 4 (22%) have been approved.

A transitional Unit Assessment Plan is in place with the following activities:

1) pursue approval for program assessment plans along with collecting and assessing outcomes assessment information
   Timeline: on-going
2) prepare to implement Senate Bill 2042 Program Standards for Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credentials
   Timeline: submission of program documents April 2003
3) revise the portfolio rubric within the MS teacher preparation program
   Timeline: piloted winter, and spring 2002, implemented fall 2002
4) implement a Professional Growth Plan for early identification of MS credential candidates who need further support in areas of content knowledge, pedagogical skill, and dispositions
   Timeline: approved winter 2002, implemented spring 2002
5) develop and improve means of including P-12 student learning evidence as indicators of candidate performance
   Timeline: fall 2002
6) update technology-related assessments as indicators of candidate performance within each program
   Timeline: annually
7) engage faculty in a more formal assessment of their impact upon candidate learning
   Timeline: fall 2002

Initial Credentials

Candidate assessments for initial teacher preparation are uniform across programs that prepare teaching for the initial credential:

<u>Initial Required Assessments</u>

- G.P.A.
- Interview and oral assessment
- Letters of recommendation
- Interview and transcript review of candidates with G.P.A. below 2.5
- Technology entry level assessment (MS & SS only-beginning spring 2002)

<u>On-Going/Mid Point Assessments</u>

- Portfolios-have been utilized in MS/SS for more than 5 years
- Early Fieldwork-MS/SS/ES candidates complete specific field observations and practice teaching assignments throughout their early course work;
  early assessments help identify students who need additional field experience, subject matter preparation, or counseling
- Program Panel Review-in the fifth year of MS and SS credential programs,

advancement to supervision is a formal assessment checkpoint; a faculty panel reviews students' progress and G.P.A.s in prior phase courses and fieldwork; concerns about content knowledge and/or dispositions are raised for review by faculty

- Subject Matter Exam Passage (or successful completion of at least 80% of content area course work
- CBEST Passage

End of Program Assessments

- Supervised Teaching Experiences
  Student teachers are supervised for two ten-week quarters (MS) or a full semester (SS), while interns are supervised for a full academic year
  A minimum of five visits is required during each quarter of supervision
- Mid-quarter Field Evaluations
- Final Evaluations
- Summative assessment & presentation of portfolio
- Passage of RICA (for MS and ES candidates)
- Completion of all subject matter coursework

Advanced Credential and Master's Programs

Assessment systems are uniform and have well-established assessments at each period of candidate development.

Initial Assessments

- Application letters
- G.P.A.
- Recommended Letters
- Faculty Interviews

On-Going Mid-point Assessments

- Advancement to Candidacy Checkpoint-Graduate Approved Program Plan
- Advisor Monitoring of Progress toward Exam/Project
- Portfolio Development and Monitoring
- Program Coordinator and Faculty Monitoring

End of Program Assessments

- Comprehensive Exam or Masters Project
- Benchmark Assignments within Courses and Fieldwork
- Portfolio Presentation and Review
- Program Coordinator and Faculty Monitoring

Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

As of the past five years, Unit candidates are surveyed annually. Survey forms are based upon a revision of the forms used in a Comprehensive Self-Study of Program and Results. Survey forms are given to instructors, administered during class time and returned to the instructor. Survey results (from years 1998-2001) describe student demographics, some current enrollment trends, and student opinions concerning Unit teaching, advising, and support services. Results are reported in an order generally consistent with the survey form used to collect the data. It remains unclear how these annual surveys are used by the **Unit as a whole** to assess and to monitor candidate performance and to determine that candidates have the knowledge, skills, and

dispositions required by the state and the institution. However, few of the assessment plans are derived from the conceptual framework.

Use of Data for Program Improvement

Survey data and reports are distributed to Unit leaders for discussion with faculty across programs. Additional program data generated from advisory group meetings, student feedback and faculty input are utilized to revise and to improve programs. For example, the MS Intern Program adjusted its course sequence as a result of input from districts and intern students. Through interviews it was determined that a Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Program was offered for the first time in the fall 2001 in response to district and to student requests. The Unit is also planning the following activities related to the use of data for program improvement:

- Faculty members will document their review and use of data in program meeting minutes
  Timeline: on-going
- Cabinet will review the newly instituted Annual Program Reports and distribution of an Annual Unit Report
  Timeline: beginning winter 2002
- Program faculty will develop and implement means to further involve P-12 Colleagues in the analysis and review of candidate performance data
  Timeline: fall 2003 as Senate Bill 2042 is instituted

Overall Assessment of Standard

There is evidence of assessment activities, and the operation of coherent programs of study. An unevenness permeates the Unit with regard to total coordination of all programs designed to prepare educators.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Met
State Team Decision: Met

D. Strengths

Assessment plans across all programs and departments throughout the college of education from the beginning of programs to the end are in place.

CSUSB administration provides financial support for planning assessment and improvement of programs.

The program data is collected, analyzed and evaluated. Action is then taken to make improvements where indicated and to be effective.

E. Concerns

The unit assessment plan moved beyond the status of transition into continuous planning and collecting of data for all programs.

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 personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners

Evidence was found in multiple arenas that the Unit and programs have well established collaborative relationships with surrounding school districts, some 59, in a two-county region. Personnel from local school districts participate in all phases of related field experiences and clinical practice, from design through implementation, in order to foster maximum success for all candidates in all programs.

For multiple subject and single subject credential candidates, field experiences and clinical practice begin at the start of each candidate's program. In addition to two, one- quarter pedagogically progressive field experiences that candidates are required to complete as part of their program, each student is required to have a minimum of 20 hours of pre-student teaching experience. In addition, each course taken by students prior to student teaching also incorporates an additional six hours of required field experience in relation to that specific course.

Placement determination is made based on fulfillment of state requirements, recommendations by district and site personnel and university faculty, field supervisors and student evaluations.

Education Specialist candidates are required to complete a minimum of 45 hours of field work in general education classrooms and a minimum of 80 hours of field work in special education classrooms.

In advanced programs, such as School Counseling, the same collaborative efforts are also evident. In the School Counseling program, candidates participate in 100 hours of practica (accumulated through the following courses: ED 632, ECLG 657 A & B and ECLG 678) prior to the required 600 hours of required field experience (which is divided into three courses, 200 hours each: ECLG 679A, and two of the following ECLG 679 B, C & D Elementary, Middle School, High School, respectively).

Design Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practices

Field experiences and clinical experiences reflect the utilization of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession as the foundation upon which candidates build pedagogical expertise by providing experiences for candidates to build on subject matter knowledge while using sound pedagogical judgment in guiding their students through uncharted waters of learning discovery.

Candidates are provided the opportunity to develop their pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions through field experiences and clinical practice in multiple settings and at various stages of their programs. For example under the newly created Blended undergraduate program recently initiated by the University, students have the opportunity to put theory into practice beginning in their freshman year.

The educational program also provides for field experiences and clinical experiences as part of the university professional preparation program. In these instances, students participate in the traditional student teaching modality in which each student is assigned to a specific site District Supervisor selected by the University in collaboration with District and site personnel. A specific rotation criteria of site assignments for each student is based on meeting the state requirements which ensure that individual students have an opportunity to experience pedagogical practice at two different educational levels and in a variety of socio-economic settings.

The Unit also provides fifth year candidates with two additional alternative methods for completing a credential program: Pre-Internship and Internship options. Both of these internship options allow candidates to be employed by a school district while pursuing a credential through a professional preparation program.

In order to help address the teacher shortage in the state, the University signed an agreement and is a co-sponsor of a Pre-Intern Grant with Alta Loma School District, Alvord Unified School District, Apple Valley Unified School District; Barstow Unified School District; Beaumont Unified School District; California Youth Authority Coachella Valley Unified School District; Desert Sands Unified School District; Hesperia Unified School District; Lake Elsinore Unified School District; Menifee Union School District; Moreno Valley Unified School District; Murrieta Valley Unified School District; Perris Elementary School District; Rialto Unified School District; Riverside County Office of Education; San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools; San Jacinto Unified School District; Snowline Unified School District; Upland Unified School District; and Victor Valley Union High School District.

In addition, the RIM School Districts (Adelanto; Alta Loma; Alvord; Apple Valley; Baker; Banning; Barstow; Beaumont; Central [in Rancho Cucamonga); along with Coachella Valley; Colton; Corona-Norco; Desert Sands; Etiwanda; Fontana; Hemet; Hesperia; Jurupa and Lake Elsinore) and Corona/Norco Unified School District; Hesperia Unified School District; Nuview Union School District; Upland Unified School District; and Rialto Unified School District all co-sponsor the Intern program.

Both Pre-Interns and Interns are employed by school districts as classroom educators. Pre-Interns complete specific classes prior to their reporting to their sites and both Pre-Interns and Interns are mentored by “Buddy” on-site colleagues.

Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions To Help Students Learn

Criteria for entry into and exit from field experience and clinical experiences are well defined and published in the handbooks of the units. Multiple sources of evaluation by university faculty

and site personnel provide a complete picture of the acquired competencies of each candidate. Candidates are visited frequently and consistently by university field supervisors a minimum of five times per quarter. At times, because of location and availability, single subject matter field supervisors and supervisors of educational specialists, may not have expertise in the particular subject area of the candidates that have been assigned to them. However, university supervisors do have expertise at the specific educational level of the candidates.

Field experiences and clinical experiences are geared towards meeting all state standards in all areas from having experiences at appropriate levels to opportunities of working with diverse populations.

Overall Assessment of Standard
The Unit, in collaboration with surrounding school districts, designs, implements, and evaluates field experiences and clinical practices so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

C. **NCATE Team Recommendation**: Met
   State Team Decision: Met

D. **Strengths:**

The Unit and programs have well established collaborative relationships with surrounding school districts.

Local school district personnel participate in all phases of related field experiences and clinical practice.

Mulitple progressive field experiences are geared to meet state standards.

Multiple alternative tracks (pre-interns, interns, and traditional) are available to candidates.

E. **Concerns: None**

4. Diversity

The Unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

A. Level: (initial and/or advanced)

B. Findings:

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

The Unit's commitment to diversity permeates throughout the curriculum and the field experiences that it provides for candidates. This was evident in all programs. For example, in teacher preparation, candidates complete the Crosscultural, Language, and Academic Development (CLAD) or Bilingual Crosscultural, Language, and Academic Development (BCLAD) in Spanish. Both programs provide candidates with knowledge and skills for working with diverse students and diverse contexts. Evidence consisting of course syllabi and interviews with candidates, graduates and faculty, indicates that the emphasis on diversity is woven throughout the courses and assignments.

The emphasis on diversity extends to field placement in all programs, reflecting the regional demographics, which are very diverse in terms of ethnicity, race, and socioeconomic status. Assessments of candidates in field and clinical experiences address their knowledge and skills in responding to diversity.

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Faculty members in the Unit reflect the diversity of its service area. Of the 64 full-time tenure-track faculty members, 4 are African American, 9 are Latina/o, 3 are Asian/Pacific American, and 1 American Indian/Alaskan Native, resulting in 17 tenure-track faculty members from diverse ethnic backgrounds. The 12 full-time lectures include 2 African Americans and 1 Latino. Thus the Unit has 25.3% full-time ethnic minority faculty members. The 157 part-time faculty members include 7 African Americans and 15 Latina/os. The University has established guidelines and procedures to recruit faculty candidates from under-represented groups, and provides a special assistant to the provost to oversee this process.

The College of Education faculty are involved in several innovative projects concerning diversity. The Center for Equity in Education, co-directed by two ethnic minority faculty members from the College of Education sponsors several education-related projects including "Excellence and Equity in Teaching: Building for the Future Today," and "Preparing Paraprofessional for the Teaching Profession." The former is a project in its eleventh year whose goal is to increase the number of minority teachers in the Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, and the latter is a Title VII grant funded to prepare paraprofessionals and other employees to become qualified teachers of English Language Learners.

A major initiative supported by the University and College of Education was the inauguration of a new scholarly referred journal, *The Journal of Latinos and Education*. Founded and edited by College of Education faculty member Dr. Enrique Murillo, the journal provides a forum for research by diverse scholars, and it gives the University and College national prestige as the sponsoring institution for this important resource. The University contributed 80% of the start-up monies for the journal.

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Candidates in the Unit represent a diverse student body. According to University statistics, Unit enrollment in Fall 2001 includes 366 minority students (35.8%) out of 1022 total students.

The University is designated as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI), meaning that it has a total enrollment of at least 25% Latina/o students. This designation facilitated the awarding of two Title V Grants, "Improving Access to Information Services at Hispanic-Serving Institutions: A Cooperative Arrangement," and "Bridging the Distance: Creating a Distributed Learning Network." The former is a $3,118,853 collaborative project among five HSI-designated community colleges and state universities, and the latter is a $2,000,000 collaborative project with 10 HSI-designated community colleges.

Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

As indicated above in 4.1, field experiences and clinical experiences include ethnic and linguistic diversity. This is guaranteed by the requirement that placements be made in schools and districts with at least 25% diverse students. The demographics in the region ensure that candidates have experiences working with diverse students in P-12 public schools. Of the 33 school districts in Riverside County and the 36 school districts of San Bernardino County, (69 total districts), only 3 districts have less than 25% ethnic minority diversity. Of the 69 total districts in these two counties, 43 have ethnic minority student enrollments greater than 50%. Interviews indicate that classroom faculty and field supervisors regularly provide feedback and instruction to candidates regarding their performance with diverse students.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Responding to the ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity of the region is a major hallmark of the College of Education. The professional preparation programs and outreach programs model the types of responses possible for an IHE. The Unit is to be commended for its strength in this area.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Met
State Team Decision: Met

D. Strengths:

Responding to the ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity of the region is a major emphasis of the College of Education.

The professional preparation programs, community outreach and faculty recruitment model the types of responses possible for a college of education.

As a Hispanic Serving Institution, the unit has taken the lead in providing resources through grants for a consortium of colleges and university.

The College of Education has contributed significant resources to sponsoring *The Journal of Latinos and Education*, a major scholarly referred journal.

E. Concerns: None

5. Faculty Qualifications

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.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

Faculty members in the Unit model effective teaching practices and are actively involved in scholarship and service. There are 79 full-time and 157 part-time faculty members. Of the 64 full-time tenure track faculty, 12 are assistant professors, 15 are associate professors, and 37 hold the professor rank. In addition, the Unit has 15 full-time lecturers. Two tenured professors hold joint appointments with the College of Natural Sciences. Of the 157 part-time instructors, 96 serve as field supervisors for interns and student teachers.

Qualified Faculty

All tenure-track faculty in the Unit hold terminal degrees with majority having extensive P-12 experience. More than 50% of the full-time lecturers also hold terminal degrees. Approximately 25% of the part-time faculty members hold terminal degrees. All part-time faculty members are credentialed and have demonstrated experience and expertise in the areas in which they teach. Multiple sources are utilized in the selection of part-time faculty, including recommendations by program directors, coordinators, and faculty. The vast majority of part-time faulty are practicing educators or recently retired educators from the local school districts. All field supervisors hold advanced degrees or have done graduate work in the areas of their supervision. In Single Subject program, however, some supervisors may be assigned to student teachers in content areas different from their areas of training and expertise. In such cases, cooperating teachers are relied upon to provide content monitoring and assessment. Cooperating teachers are selected in a process involving consultation between university faculty, school district personnel, and school principals.

The majority of faculty members in the Unit have extensive experience P-12 experiences. Faculty teaching methods courses are required under law to document time spent in P-12 schools at least once every three years. Many of them choose to take on clinical supervision to update their school experience and enhance their teaching.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

The College of Education places a strong emphasis on effective teaching. The Unit has implemented a peer visitation system to ensure the quality of instruction. Some departments in the Unit require course-alike instructors to interchange the administering and grading of examinations to ensure the quality of the content of the courses. Other departments develop course rubrics according to the current state and national standards for their disciplines.

Faculty course syllabi, course assignments, and candidate interviews provide evidence of the Unit faculty modeling best professional practices in teaching. Some course objectives are aligned

with the Unit conceptual framework with evidence of faculty spending time to explain the conceptual framework to students. Candidates report faculty often use active learning, reflective journaling, case study, collaborative projects, peer teaching or interview, presentation and other teaching strategies in their teaching. In advanced degree programs, faculty also engage candidates in theory learning, practical application, debates, personal reflections, project presentation and mini research projects. Candidate work samples, such as portfolios, indicate that reflection, critical thinking and problem solving are embedded in course work.

Diversity is emphasized in most courses. Many course assignments require candidates to address diversity issues in their areas of specialization. Area employers speak highly of the candidates' sensitivity to student diversity and issues of diversity.

Faculty in the Unit use a variety of technology in teaching. Technology utilized include email, power point, internet site research, web enhanced course delivery, Web CT and Blackboard. The College of Education's PT3 grant which provides technology equipment and training, has enabled many faculty to further integrate technology into their teaching.
Depending on the subject matter or discipline, the assessment of candidate performance in the courses takes many forms. Field supervisors utilize uniform evaluations to assess candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions. Written feedback from supervisors and cooperating teachers are evidenced from candidates portfolios. Faculty also engage in self-assessment. Faculty activity reports show that they reflect on their own teaching activities from student feedback from course evaluation or supervisor evaluation feedback. Faculty voluntarily participate in teaching effective workshops or teaching enhancement workshops to improve their teaching.

The Unit faculty's rating mean on Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE) in the last five quarters from Fall 1999 to Spring 2001 were consistently over 3.5 on a four-point scale from Excellent to Poor. On the "Overall quality of instruction in this class" item, the mean range were from 3. 58 to 3. 63. Candidates in both initial credential and advanced programs expressed very positive remarks of the Unit faculty's teaching quality. These comments have been validated by area employers.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

The College of Education expects faculty to engage in scholarship and professional growth. Over 97% of the full-time faculty are active in various scholarly activities. In the 2000-2001 academic year, faculty reported 295 publications including books, book chapters, refereed journal articles, invited and web-based articles, and other publications; however, an overall bibliography was not available, and because final figures arrived late in the visit, analysis and verification of them could not be done. Faculty also reported 432 presentations and conducted other creative works at international, national, state, and regional professional conferences; again, the final figures arrived late in the visit. In addition, faculty received a total of $2,294,652 grants from federal, state, and local agencies. Several faculty members also collaborate with former graduates of advanced degree programs to participate in state, national, and international conferences in different parts of the country, other countries, and a few of them published book chapters and articles with their program graduates.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Service is another component of the faculty expectation in the College of Education. Faculty activity reports and vitaes show that all faculty are actively involved in some type of service. They include service to the program, department, college, university, and external community. Many of the external community service involve expert service, and appointed and elected memberships in national, state and local education agencies. Faculty have served as presidents of National Science Teachers Association and International Reading Association, memberships in California State Committee on Accreditation, and California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Many faculty members also hold multiple offices in professional organizations at various levels.

Collaboration

In 2000-2001, faculty reported 355 collaborative projects or research in many P-12 districts. One of the major collaboration is the College's partnership with Hillside-University Demonstration School where Unit faculty members and other university faculty have opportunities to work with students and team teach with P-12 faculty. Students teachers participating in this partnership are regarded as well-prepared for the classroom. Faculty involvement in the external community was highly commended by local P-12 school districts personnel. Internal collaboration is evidenced from two Unit faculty members' joint appointments with the College of Natural Sciences and some faculty members' team teaching effort and informal advising and course related collaborations with other faculty from other colleges in the university.

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

The College of Education conducts regular, systematic, and comprehensive faculty evaluations. Probationary faculty performance is assessed in three forms. 1. Faculty Activity Report where the faculty member reports a self-assessment of his/her teaching effectiveness, scholarly activity, and service. 2. Peer class visitations which are conducted by peers each year except the fifth year; 3. Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness which is required by the university and administered by the department for first-third-and fifth-year faculty in selected courses. Part-time faculty members are evaluated by the students for each course they teach. There is a mechanism of thorough evaluation for tenured and full professor as well.

A review of written evaluation reports by peer class visitation, elected department committee, department chair, and the Unit dean shows that the evaluation process is thorough in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. The assessment data is used to commend faculty strengths and suggest areas of improvements.

Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Faculty in the Unit are supported for professional development in a variety ways. Each full-time faculty member receives a minimum of $1,000 for travel per year. Untenured faculty members are provided with additional funds for professional development. Faculty may also secure funds from related activities and university money for technology training. Faculty may also apply for release time to engage in research, grant-funded activities and other scholarly activities. In the 2000 to 2001 academic year, over 31 full-time faculty received release time.

In addition, the Unit and the university provide workshops and training to support faculty teaching and grant writing activities. Many faculty actively participate in these activities. For example, when the technology mentoring program was introduced through the PT3 grant, 34 faculty participated. Participants reported very favorably, indicating that the program enabled them to enhance their use of technology in their teaching.

Overall Assessment of Standard
Faculty in the Unit are qualified and model best practices in teaching, scholarship and service. They receive high ratings on their teaching effectiveness from students, are productive scholars and actively engaged in a variety of services to the university and the P-12 communities.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Met
State Team Decision: Met

D. Strengths
All tenure track faculty hold terminal degrees.

A majority of Unit faculty have extensive P-12 experience.

Faculty model best practices in their classes.

Faculty participate in many collaborative activities within their local communities.

The College of Education places a strong emphasis on effective teaching.

E. Concerns: None

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.

A. Level: (initial and/or advanced)

B. Findings:

The Unit is identified as the College of Education. The Dean serves on a Dean's Council with other deans and the Provost. Not all programs are within the Unit. Social work, nursing, and adaptive physical education are outside the Unit.

Unit Leadership and Authority

The College of Education depends on the developing of content sequences by arts and science faculty for programs leading to MS and SS credentials. The sequences have been developed and approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing in all-important areas. The Dean's of other colleges report that there is interaction with the College of Education.

The curriculum development process is complex and involves independent actions by as many as nine individuals, half of them outside the Unit. Review of curriculum proposals, including the minutes of the University curriculum committee, indicate that the Unit's proposals are treated fairly and the academic competence of members of the Unit respected.

Departments within the college actively engage in curriculum development. Two associate deans and all chairs, along with a director of the Division of Teacher Education and program coordinators provide leadership and inter-departmental linkages.

Programs that cross Colleges in education-related fields require the sign-off of the dean of education. The dean serves as certification official for all programs.

While an elaborate committee structure is in place, the committees meet only three times each year. Minutes suggest that they are more focused on information transmittal than discussion of and advice on critical issues.

Unit Budget

All report that the budget provided the College of education is adequate and comparable to other budgets. Our analysis of the budget, in light of student's enrolled as majors in the college, suggests a significant support for the college. In terms of per-student expenditures, the College is the most expensive of the university's colleges. Per-student expenditures for the 2001-02 academic years are as follows:

Education	$7,000
Arts and Letters	$2,974
Social and Behavioral Sciences	$3,487
Natural Sciences	$4,741
Business and Public Admin	$2,880

Personnel

Faculty workloads in the College of Education are consistent with the load of other faculty. Faculty members typically teach three courses per quarter. No adjustment is made for graduate teaching.

The faculty load for supervision is eight students per four courses in a quarter. Grant writing, administrative service, and research are supported in the College though reassigned time.

The College reported 133 courses were taught by full time faculty, and 135 by part time faculty. The Unit has 63 full time faculty and 23 support staff, a ratio comparable to other units. The faculty loads seem to allow for both research and service as reflected in our discussion of Standard 5.

Part time faculty are invited to participate in faculty activities, including committee service and meeting attendance. Our assessment is that they are high quality professionals who feel connected with the College and University and serve students well.

CASE, the Credentials Assistance to Students in Education office is staffed by three program analysts and two "front office" persons. The office manages to process credentials efficiently and meet deadlines.

Unit Facilities

The Unit is spread over four old buildings dating from the 1960's. A new building is planned, and included in the state budget. Faculty are hopeful that the building will become a reality. Faculty have reasonable access to 'smart classrooms," mostly in the evenings when most of their students are on campus.

Resources on the Palm Desert campus are less desirable. Currently using temporary classrooms, plans are in place for a new building, but it is several years off. The program, with 791 students in education and growing rapidly, is badly in need of additional facilities.

Unit Resources Including Technology

The Unit seems to have distributed its resources equitably and based on the size and cost of programs. There is little Unit level support for the development of grants, but several faculty have pursued grants. The Unit now holds a PT3 grant supporting the integration of technology into instruction.

A technology plan for the institution, developed under the aegis of the Vice President for Information Services is a detailed plan, still in draft form. It takes clearly into account the needs of the College of Education and specifically recognizes the importance of technology in teacher

education and calls for the University to ‘commit itself to preparing teachers to use technology for effective teaching and learning.

Faculty use technology regularly, and students are encouraged to use it in their instruction.

Admissions
The criteria and procedures for admissions exceptions are not well-defined and consistent across programs.

Overall Assessment of Standard
The Unit is well managed by a popular dean who is seen as representing the interests of the Unit well. An adequate budget is in place.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Met
State Team Decision: Met

D. Strengths:
The Unit’s curriculum proposals are given equal standing to other units at the university.

There is some interaction among college deans regarding College of Education issues.

Generally, part-time faculty are included in Unit activities.

Faculty are provided with numerous opportunities for professional development.

The University, the College of Education, the Unit faculty, and students recognize, demonstrate, and model the importance of using technology in the teaching/learning process.

A new facility on the main campus has been approved and will be built as soon as state funding is approved.

E. Concerns:
Resource allocations are not equitable at the Palm Desert campus for the unit faculty and students. There appears to be minimal consideration for Palm Desert students, who represent the largest student population in the system, in unit planning.

The criteria and procedures for exceptions to the admissions policy are not well defined and consistent across programs.

Program Standards

Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish)Emphasis including Internship

Findings on Standards:
After careful review of the program documents, and interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, institutional administrators, cooperating teachers, university supervisors and employers, the team determined that all program standards are fully met.

Standard 4a:
The team found this standard to be met. The program provides a balanced, comprehensive reading program that includes meaningful, applied instruction. Evidence from selected texts, course syllabi, and interviews with faculty and candidates ensure that the program is standards-aligned, research-based, balanced, and comprehensive. The program provides instruction in reading, including instruction in basic reading skills and comprehensive strategies for all students, including students of varied reading levels and language backgrounds.

California State University, San Bernardino School of Education offers two multiple subject programs: the Multiple Subject Credential with Cross-cultural, Language, and Academic Development (MS CLAD) emphasis, and the Multiple Subject Credential with Bilingual Cross-cultural, Language, and Academic Development (MS BCLAD) emphasis. Each of these programs credentials can be obtained through one of the several program options. These options include:

1. Student Teaching Option,
2. Intern Option, or
3. Professional Development Site (PDS) Option

Candidates evidence a genuine commitment to respond to the educational needs of all students through their development as wise, reflective, professional educators who will work toward a just and diverse society that embraces democratic principles. This is consistent with the program's goals dedicated to producing teachers who

- Possess rich subject matter knowledge
- Use sound pedagogical judgment
- Have practical knowledge of context and culture
- Acknowledge the relativism associated with variations in the values and priorities of both their peers and their students.
- Are comfortable with the uncertainty of the outcomes of instructional decisions.

Candidates benefit from a program that provides multiple entry points and a seamless flow through the preparation system. Connections have been established between program faculty, undergraduate faculty, school districts, community colleges, and communities in the area. Expectations are clearly articulated and communicated in the student handbook, course syllabi, and advising orientations.

Strengths:

- The quality of instruction and professional knowledge of the faculty are of the highest levels.

- Technology resources are abundant and highly integrated into the program instruction and content.

- RIMS Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program is in place and provides strong ties between the university program and county offices and districts.

- Commitment to off campus satellite programs is evident in the implementation of quality program delivery. This commitment is especially challenging due to the size of the service area.

- Qualitative preparation of students to teach a dynamically diverse population is a centerpiece of the program. The graduates exhibit qualities inherent in the conceptual framework and are expressly equipped to face the challenges of teaching in the new millennium.

Concerns:

- Initial and programmatic advising is spread across a variety of venues that has proven to be problematic for students. Candidates often receive inconsistent information.

Single Subject CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis Credential including Internship

Findings on Standards:

After an in depth review of the program supporting documentation, and completion of interviews with candidates graduates, faculty, employers and university supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are fully met.

Standard 4b:

The team found this standard to be met. Single Subject candidates are provided instruction in content reading areas and writing areas appropriate for all types of students of varied reading levels and language backgrounds. The program places Single Subject candidates in field experiences, and student teaching experiences that are linguistically and culturally diverse. The methods and teaching approaches are consistent with a balanced, comprehensive program in reading.

The College of Education views itself as having a strategic role in the community providing numerous resources for all area educators. The Single Subject Credential Program features CLAD, BCLAD integrated Single Subject Credentials, and includes an Internship program. This program encompasses a vast geographical area of 27,000 square miles and prepares candidates to be teachers for a wide variety of Single Subject settings. There is evidence that the Program meets the conceptual framework statement of the College of Education and is dedicated to the development and support of wise, reflective professional educators who work toward a just and diverse society that embraces democratic principles. Faculty model and candidates demonstrate strong understanding and application of teaching and content standards. The

College of Education full and part-time faculty possess a collective wealth of P-12 experiences and serve as leaders in state and national professional service activities. The candidates also are versed in the curriculum standards of their professional organizations, read the publications and utilize the models of curriculum and instruction within their content area. The teaching within the program involves critical understanding of the relationships between content learning and pedagogy. Celebration of diversity is inherent within the delivery and practical application in experiences for the students throughout this program. Students have an appreciation for the critical ability to be effective communicators with colleagues, students, parents and administrators. Field assignments are designed to provide the candidates the ability to meet the needs of diverse students.

The program is strongly supported by department faculty and staff, as well as school district personnel. In addition, the program has various advisory committees, which advise on the strengths and areas for improvement. Specifically the Faculty Advisory Committee gives input on academic subject specific information.

Strengths:

- Candidates and graduates report that the preparation for teaching reading is exemplary.

- Candidates and graduates applaud the preparation received throughout the program in multiculture and equity preparation.

- Candidates and graduates report that they feel well prepared for their daily teaching assignments.

- The College of Education in response to service area districts requires all candidates to complete a CLAD/BCLAD program.

- The program effectively recruits underrepresented candidates, which reflect the school population. The program coordinators endeavor to actively meet the needs of the geographic area where the programs are located.

Concerns:

1. The duration of early field experience required throughout the coursework varies in hours listed in syllabi, in graduate catalog and in COE publications.

2. Academic and professional advisement appears to be inconsistent as reported by some candidates.

Designated Subjects Teaching Credential, Adult Education and Vocational Education & Designated Subjects Supervision/Coordination Credential Program

Findings on Standards:
After an in depth review of the program supporting documentation, and completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, university supervisors and advisory committee members the team determined that the program standards are fully met.

The Designated Subjects Credential Program and the Designated Subjects Supervision/Coordination Credential Program in the College of Education at California State University San Bernardino are exemplary models offering comprehensive preparation for candidates to teach and supervise a wide variety of vocational occupational programs. Because scholars, as candidates are referred to in this program, usually are employed in their vocational subject areas prior to entering the credential program, there is urgency on their part and that of the employing school districts, county offices and Regional Occupational Programs to begin preparation for clear credential course completion. The state has reduced the time regulations for completion and is studying further revision of the program regulations Scholars state that they learn so much valuable information from the very first class through to the last. To quote several current students, "Every prospective teacher in any program should have to take the initial class in this program. It is the best information on teaching preparation available." The scholars not only can discuss the education standards related to this program but they demonstrate application in a professional manner. Reflection is clearly understood and practiced throughout the program. The program is founded on the basic premise of competency-based education that follows the standards of the teaching profession. Instructors are able to indicate the standards that scholars are able to exemplify and thus scholars are able to do the same for their students. The Designated Subjects Credentail Programs have been designed to develop skills in defining what scholars should be able to do as a result of instruction, developing effective evaluation instruments, and mastery of specified competencies.

The programs include knowledge and skills that a mature adult who has been successful in business, industry, trade or occupation must have in order to help his/her students learn how to achieve similar success. The faculty in the Designated Subjects Credential Programs, in consort with the College of Education Adult/Vocational Teacher Education Advisory Committee, has developed an extensive list of basic instructional competencies for each course.

The program is committed to on-hands learning in small class size settings, thereby giving each scholar individual attention to assure success. All scholars must demonstrate competency in all standards or be removed from the program.

Strengths

- Scholars are most appreciative of this program, its coordinator and the professors who provide the high quality preparation for the Designated Subjects Credential and the Designated Subjects Supervision/Coordinatioin Credential.

- The Coordinator has installed a very user-friendly WEB site and has also included all necessary and current information regarding the programs on the Internet. Students can access information not available for other programs to facilitate their admissions and all other services.

- One of the major strengths of this program is the Designated Subjects Advisory Committee. This committee represents all of the CSUSB service area. They have been in existence for many years and have added a quality dimension to this program, which is impossible to quantify. When needed members of this committee have worked with the coordinator to meet with key professionals in the College of Education to solve problems which occur for scholars. The cooperation resulting from actions taken by PACE are viewed as strengths by this program.
- The Designated Subjects Advisory Committee has continually taken an active role in ongoing recommendations for revision of syllabi, materials, technology and offerings to insure quality for both the teaching credential and the supervision credential.

- Local employers and advisors provide incentives for credential completers. This encourages students to begin the program within a year of entering employment.

- The curriculum and education activities were are relevant and current.

- Note was made that these programs involve the most cutting edge technology -- not only taught and modeled but also practiced by scholars.

- The fact that the local school districts are involved in the field supervision activities and projects of the candidates is a strength providing assistance to the student and validation to the programs.

- The constant follow-up system is a strength to be noted. There is evidence that the information garnered from this process is used to make changes and improvements in the programs.

- Only the best qualified candidates are retained in the program. There is an ongoing advisement system which assists in the retention of the qualified candidates and removal of the unqualified candidate.

Concerns

None noted.

Education Specialist Credential Program-Level I, Mild/Moderate Moderate/Severe Disabilities including Internship and Level II, Mild/Moderate Moderate/Severe Disabilities

Findings on standards:
After careful review of the educational specialist programs, supporting documentation, and completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and other stakeholders, the team determined that all program standards for Education Specialist Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Level I and Level II, and Internship are fully met except for Level II Standards 10 and 11. Standard 10 was found to be minimally met with qualitative concerns. There does not appear to be a uniform system for selection of support providers, that are qualified, prepared for their responsibilities, assigned appropriately, evaluated for their effectiveness and recognized for their contributions. Standard 11 was not met as there are no clearly defined provisions and procedures for the inclusion of non IHE activities in the Level II programs.

The team was impressed with the program's responsiveness to the diverse communities throughout the service region. The programs have produced graduates who are committed to their students, and are knowledgeable of best practices and curriculum for students with mild/moderate and moderate/severe disabilities.

Strengths

- Faculty are to be applauded for their commitment to excellence in teaching, community involvement, and program development.

- Candidates were well prepared to work with diverse populations

- The well-developed use of technology expands program instruction, advisement, as well as communication among candidates, faculty and the community.

- Recent graduates have demonstrated a strong command of proactive classroom management skills, excellent pedagogical content knowledge and the ability to assess students needs and customize instruction accordingly.

- The department chair and faculty are in the process of developing a web-based virtual Level II program. This program will provide Level II content, coursework and assessment for candidates in a large geographical area. The use of department designed web based courses will become a service delivery model for other institutions.

- The program's faculty is receptive to input from candidates, employers and course instructors. The resulting changes in course sequence have strengthened the programs.

- Program faculty are to be commended for their accessibility as well as their ongoing, supportive, responsive advice and assistance to candidates throughout the Level I and Level II programs.

- The faculty is developing Level II courses that will be available online and accessible through the web. These will enable candidates throughout the service area to participate in a comprehensive Level II program that reflects the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Educational Specialist Credential Programs.

Concerns:

- Since there is no formal procedure for the inclusion for non-IHE activities in the programs, candidates do not have sufficient opportunity for the continued development of a specific area of emphasis as outlined in Level II mild/moderate and moderate/severe Standard 17.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential including Internship Professional Administrative Services Credential

Findings on Standards:

The CSUSB Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program, Internship Program, Professional Administrative Services Credential Program meet all program standards. This conclusion was reached after the review of the following: the institutional report and supporting documentation: completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, mentors, advisory committee members, field supervisors, and examination of student work. The program mission is to prepare educational leaders who have the interpersonal, conceptual, and practical skills to effectively serve in educational leadership roles. The program design is coherent, relevant, and cohesive. The Administrative Services Programs demonstrate on-going programs developments, address the CCTC program standards, respond to the identified needs of candidates, and develop strong partnerships with local school districts to serve students in diverse settings. The CSUSB programs serve students on the main campus and four satellite campuses with comparable program curriculum and delivery systems. Candidates experience an integration of the theory and practice and an opportunity to engage in relevant field experiences that are embedded in the core courses.

Strengths:

- The Program Coordinator's personal commitment and concern for improving the program organization, relevance, and effectiveness is commendable.

- The institution ensures that each credential, field experience, and internship program is assigned to a faculty member who has an appropriate background of advanced study and professional experience that are directly related to his/her assignment(s) in the program.

- The institution regularly involves program participants, graduates, and local practitioners in the evaluation and assessment of each program. This is based upon criteria that are related to the design, rationale, goals and objectives of each program, and to the competence and performance criteria that are used to assess candidates in the program.

Concerns:

None noted.

Pupil Personnel Services School Psychologist Credential Program

Findings on Standards
Following extensive interviews and a thorough review of submitted documentation, including course descriptions, faculty vitae, curricula descriptions, student work and numerous other artifacts, it is concluded that the School Psychology Program meets all standards.

Strengths:
- The psychometric lab is an outstanding example of program support for candidates, interns and practitioners.

- Classes exclusively after 4 p.m. allow working individuals to enroll in the program.

- Diversity of students is the second most diverse program on campus.

Concerns:
None noted.

Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling Credential Program

Findings on Standards:
Based on a representative sample of interviews with all cohorts in the program including staff, students, faculty, institutional representatives, graduates, supervising practitioners, field visits and a thorough review of documentation provided by the institution, it is determined that the program meets all standards.

Strengths:
- The faculty in School Counseling is not only well-trained and educated, but has a commitment to training and supervision.

- The students in the program voiced their appreciation of their levels of instruction and are very specific regarding key courses in their professional development.

- Five professional off-campus schools assist students in understanding and implementing their course work.

- A natural sequence of courses, culminating in supervision, evidences strong developmental criteria.

- The scheduling of classes at the end of the professional day for students allow those who work adequate time for class instruction.

Concerns:
None noted.

Pupil Personnel Services School Social Work Credential Program

Findings on Standards:
After careful review of program documents and interviews with candidates, graduates, full and part-time faculty, institutional administrators, field supervisors, university field liaisons, school district administrators, potential employers and community council advisory members, it is determined that all program standards are met for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential authorization in School Social Work.

The Department of Social Work will be undergoing Council on Social Work Education accreditation in Fall 2004. The Social Work Department begins its intensive self-study this Fall 2002.

The Pupil Personnel Credential Program authorizing School Social Work began in Fall 2000. At this time the program is small and has one graduate MSW who has fully completed all requirements and received the PPS Credential. Graduate and current candidates report strong student interest in obtaining the PPS Credential. Potential employers express strong interest in hiring trained school social workers. A process is being developed to formalize procedures as the program continues to grow.

Strengths:
- The tenacity and dedication of the faculty to develop a credential program is commended.

Concerns:
None noted.

Health Services School Nurse Credential

Findings on Standards:
The findings and recommendations are based on data gathered from the program report, review of supporting documentations and interviews with faculty, candidates, graduates, employers, supervisors, and advisory committees. All program standards for the School Nurse Credential are met**.**

Strengths:
- The School Nurse Credential Program Coordinator is to be commended for working tirelessly to put together the credential program and return it to CSUSB. The school community is enthusiastically supportive of the return of this credential program and is encouraged that a program has been provided closer to home for many interested nurses.

- There is strong input and feedback from an advisory committee consisting of the school-nursing professionals from the community.

- There is a sound theoretical basis relevant to the contemporary issues of school health and strong clinical objectives.

- Candidates and graduates interviewed reported on the high quality of the faculty and the appropriateness of the courses to school nursing practice. They all spoke to the availability of the program coordinator and her accommodations of the needs of all candidates.

- There is a strong preceptor and field supervision program with clear preceptor guidelines and candidate expectations of roles and responsibilities.

- While offering the School Nurse Credential program in the Health Science department is not the norm within the CSU system, it is highly innovative and lends itself well to integration and collaboration between multiple educational professionals.

- The majority of classes are offered either at the end of the instructional day or Saturdays.

- The program is developing at least four on-line courses for future offerings. The integration of technology throughout the majority of courses is evident.

Concerns:

- The program coordinator appears to have an excessive load of students to advise, while the program is increasing in size.

Adapted Physical Education Credential

Findings on Standards:

After review of the program supporting documentation and completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, university supervisors, and public school colleagues, the team determined that the program standards are fully met.

The Adapted Physical Education Program, which resides in the Kinesiology Department at Cal State University, San Bernadino, was approved by CCTC in 1998. This program operates peripherally to the College of Education. Candidates may complete the coursework 1) as undergraduates, 2) concurrent with the credential program, or 3) after completing a Single Subject Credential Program in Kinesiology. Candidates who complete the coursework as undergraduates may choose to complete the credential at San Bernadino or may go through a credential program at an institution of their choice. Candidates who complete the Single Subject Credential at CSUSB are able to coordinate student teaching experiences between physical education and adapted physical education. Student teachers in adapted settings are placed with effective teachers who have an Adapted Physical Education Credential and are supervised by individuals identified by the Kinesiology department as conversant in the area of Adapted Physical Education.

Graduates, students, and public school colleagues are equally enthusiastic about the content and delivery of the Adapted Physical Education coursework. Field experiences are built into each class and as one student explained, "The content really 'clicked' for me when I did my field experience."

San Bernadino candidates are hired readily to fill open positions in the area; in several local districts, 80% of the adapted physical education teachers completed the program at San Bernadino. Students attributed the strength of the program to caring, knowledgeable faculty who understand both the complexity of preparing to work with students with many different disabling conditions and the needs of public school teachers. When asked if they would feel comfortable using the faculty at San Bernadino as a resource in the future, both the graduates and the current students quickly and enthusiastically answered yes. Public school personnel also sit on Advisory and External Review Boards.

The fulltime faculty member primarily responsible for the Adapted Program is
well-published and professionally active. Part time faculty teaching in the program have significant successful, public school teaching experience and have made numerous professional presentations. Course syllabi indicate a knowledge base built on the work of historically and currently respected researchers and professionals.

Strengths:

- The program is highly regarded by all constituencies.

- Current students and graduates reported that the program effectively prepared them to teach children.

- Many graduates of the program are now teaching in the area and provide excellent laboratory settings for field experiences and student teaching.

Concerns:

- The program requires two-unit quarter courses with content and work that exceeds the credit.

Reading Certificate and Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential Program

Findings on Standards
Review of program documents and interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty and employers verified that the program standards for the Reading and Language Arts Certificate and Specialist Credential are fully met.

The current reading standards will be replaced next year with the new SB 2042 Standards 7a and b, but the changes and improvements have been in the process of implementation for many years.

Strengths
- There was uniform agreement among graduates that the caliber of the faculty is outstanding. Faculty are praised as models who "instill a hunger for further research".

- Courses in the Reading and Language Arts Certificate and Specialist Credential program are cohesively designed. Scholarly theory is balanced with practice relevant to students' needs.

Concerns
None noted.

Professional Comments

(These comments and observations from the team are only for the use of the institution. They are to be considered as consultative advice from team members but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.)

Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs

- The Single Subject Handbook needs revision to include information and materials, which might serve to facilitate the candidates' smooth passage through their programs. Recommend explore the development of blended programs for Single Subjects candidates. Explore the possibility of conducting classroom management and behavior modification workshops early in the program for interns.

Education Specialist Credential Programs

- The community has articulated a need for an Early Childhood Special Education Certificate and Credential Program to prepare teachers for pre-k special education programs. The department is encouraged to seek the resources for the development of such a program.

- In the Level II programs, both mild/moderate and moderate/severe candidates complete the same sequence of courses. Although instructors provide multiple options for candidates to meet the course competencies, candidates in the moderate severe program felt that the options continued to focus on students with mild/moderate disabilities. Content differentiation would enable moderate/severe candidates to receive additional instruction in areas of need.

- Currently BTSA support providers are part of a web based pilot program to provide orientation to their responsibilities and improve their connection to the university and their peers. Continued development of this program will strengthen the assistance given to candidates.

Educational Administration Credential Program

- The acquisition, use, integration, and evaluation of technology are important skills for educational leaders. The team encourages the program coordinator, in collaboration with staff and students, to develop a plan to integrate a portion of the classes offered, into the administrative services curriculum.

- The team encourages the program faculty to address diversity both as an integrated thread in the content of the program, and a focus for recruitment and retention of candidates and faculty.

- Sufficient resources and on-site personnel should be made available, for each adjunct faculty member, at all satellite campuses.

- In recognition of the geographical make-up of CSUSB responsibilities the team would suggest that there be formed a Community/School Based Advisory Council that would not only include educators, but community members, community agencies and private sector parties.

- There should be an organizational structure that forms a logical sequence among course offered, particularly in the Tier I and Tier II programs. There should be an effort to coordinate the two offerings so that there is a minimal amount of redundancy in the Tier II program.

- A checklist of responsibilities and pertinent information for beginning faculty members should be made available.

- The requirement for a writing test, writing class, or waiver received considerable comments from students related to the procedures utilized by the University.

Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling Credential Program

- Part-time faculty would benefit from a more structured orientation and collegial experiences.

- Advisory Committee members should include members from outside the educational community

- CSUSB should consider expanding the number of sites at which parents and students may participate in its outreach experiences.

Pupil Personnel Services School Social Work Credential Program

- It will be important to the future of the program to develop technological resources that school social workers will encounter and use in school settings.

School Nurse Credential Program

- The School Nurse Credential program does not have its own budget. Although generously supported by Nursing and Health Science it might be more beneficial for future continuance of the program and sustainability to provide the program with its own budget.

- Several candidates expressed the desire to have an additional Special Education course as one of the electives. Changing the Audiology course to a prerequisite and adding an additional Special Education course could provide this opportunity.

- There needs to be a reconsideration of time allocation for the program coordinator.

Reading Certificate and Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential Program

- Graduates of this program find themselves in leadership positions in their schools and districts, even as new employees.

- Field Supervisors are sometimes retirees who aren't knowledgeable about current methods.

- The Practicum class does not include enough work with middle or high school students. A second level practicum in which candidates work with older students was suggested.

- Graduates of the program articulated the need for additional training that would enable them to more effectively teach the students transitioning from bilingual to English only classrooms.