

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

Professional Services Division

May 7, 2002

Overview of This Report

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

Accreditation Recommendations

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

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

- Adapted Physical Education
- Administrative Services Credential
 - Preliminary
 - Professional
- Education Specialist Credentials, Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
- Multiple Subject Credential
 - CLAD Emphasis
- Pupil Personnel Services
 - School Psychology
 - School Psychology Internship
- Reading Certificate
- Single Subject Credential

CLAD Emphasis

(2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Humboldt State University be permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Humboldt State University be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2007-2008 academic year.

Background Information

Humboldt State University, one of the 23 campuses within the California State University system, is located on what is known as the Northcoast in Arcata, California, 270 miles north of San Francisco. The campus and surrounding area are renowned for their physical beauty. The Northcoast's notable attributes include being situated on the Pacific Ocean and surrounded by giant redwoods, including some of the last remaining stands of old growth redwoods – immense, ancient trees which live up to 2,000 years. The University was founded as a Normal School in 1914, and Founder's Hall, the most prominent and oldest building on campus, is deeply rooted in the Humboldt history and tradition.

Humboldt has a distinct and cherished culture, one which is quite different from other universities within the CSU. Small class sizes are valued which foster strong student/professor relationships and increased learning. The "Humboldt spirit," is a palpable sense of community, dedication to service, protection of our environment, independence, and social and political activism.

Education has always been at the heart of HSU. From its beginning as a Normal School in 1914 to its credential programs today, the University has been continuously involved in the preparation of education professionals. One of every seven HSU students is involved in some phase of teacher education. Students come to the credential programs from a wide variety of undergraduate backgrounds that cross all three colleges: the College of Natural Resources and Sciences; the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Science; and the College of Professional Studies. In Spring 2001 HSU had approximately 6,800 students who carried an average unit load of 14.13.

Over the years, the institution has prepared many of the local teachers, administrators, and school psychologists. The geographical area does not have a teacher shortage as is being experienced throughout the state, and indeed each teaching vacancy has a long list of applicants. Humboldt State graduates are sought after and valued by local administrators. Students often express a desire to stay in the county, seeking positions within one of 32 school districts and four charter schools in Humboldt County Schools which have an enrollment of 21,196 students and boast an average class size of 23.1, lower than the state average.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant was assigned to the institution in September 2000 and met with institutional leadership shortly thereafter. Over the next two years, there were a number of consultant staff meetings with faculty, program directors and institutional administration. The meetings led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistical and organizational arrangements. The team size agreement was developed in June 2001 and modified in August 2001. In addition, telephone and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. The Team Leader, Mark Cary, was selected in August 2001

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

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

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Dean and Faculty of the College of Professional Studies and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of twelve consisting of the Team Leader, a Common Standards Cluster of three members; a Program Cluster I of four members, and a Program Cluster II of four members. In addition, a specially trained reviewer was added to Program Cluster I to review the implementation of the reading standard for the Multiple and Single Subject Credential programs. The Dean and Consultant assigned each credential program to one of the program clusters. The Commission Consultant then selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and trained in the use of the *Accreditation Framework*.

Each member of the Common Standards Cluster examined primarily the institution's responses to the Common Standards but also considered the Program Standards for each credential area. Members of the two program clusters primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered Common Standards issues. Two days before the visit was to begin, a member of Program Cluster I had to withdraw from the team because of illness. The team member was not replaced and team member duties were spread among remaining team members.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Sunday, April 14. The team arrived on Sunday afternoon with a meeting of the entire team followed by organizational meetings of the clusters. The institution sponsored a working dinner on Sunday evening to provide an orientation to the institution.

On Monday and Tuesday, April 15-16, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. The institution developed a very ambitious interview schedule. A total of 643 group and individual interviews were conducted by the team members in the two days devoted to collection of data. Each team member made interview contact with 50-60 interviewees in that time. There was extensive consultation among the members of all clusters, and much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Tuesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning were set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report. During those work sessions, cluster members shared and checked their data with members of other clusters and particularly with the Common Standards Cluster, since the Common Standards findings also affected each of the Program Clusters.

Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

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

For each separate program area, the team made a decision of "Standard Met," "Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns or "Standard Not Met." The team then prepared a narrative report about the program standards that pointed out any standards that were not met or not fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team highlighted specific Strengths and Concerns related to the program areas. The team determined that all program standards were fully met.

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

Accreditation Decisions by the Team

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

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

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

Institution: Humboldt State University

Dates of Visit: April 14-17, 2002

**Accreditation Team
Recommendation:** ACCREDITATION

Rationale:

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

1. Common Standards - The Common Standards were first reviewed one-by-one and then voted upon by the entire team. All were judged to have been met, however, one (Common Standard 4) was met minimally with qualitative concerns.
2. Program Standards - Findings about program standards were presented to the team by the Cluster Leaders, assisted by the Cluster members (for additional clarification). Following their presentation, the team discussed each program area and determined that all Program Standards were met in all program areas.
3. Overall Recommendation - The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus that all Common Standards and Program Standards were met. Although Common Standard 4 was found to be met minimally, the team felt that the overall strength demonstrated by the programs in meeting the other standards justified a recommendation of Accreditation. An examination of the evidence, including interviews with university administration, faculty, students, and local educators, revealed numerous areas of strength across education programs at Humboldt State University. The institution has been responsive to interests within the university and from the Chancellor of the California State University System to develop a strong program of teacher preparation. This has been done with significant, ongoing collaboration with local districts and has built on strengths of HSU faculty and local practitioners. The team concluded that all credential programs were effective and of overall high quality. Therefore, the team reached the decision that evidence supported the above accreditation recommendation.

Team Leader: **Mark Cary**
Davis Joint Unified School District

Common Standards Cluster:

Marsha Savage, Cluster Leader
Santa Clara University

Jim Reidt
San Juan Unified School District

Stephen Davis
University of the Pacific

Program Cluster I:

Carol McAllister, Cluster Leader
Los Alamitos Unified School District

Rita Mulholland
California State University, Chico

Bert Goldhammer
Placer Hills Union School District

Shelly Ramey
Center Unified School District

Program Cluster II:

Mel Lopez, Cluster Leader
Chapman University

Lawrence Pleet
Los Angeles Unified School District

Shane Jimerson
University of California, Santa Barbara

Barbara Gottesman
San Jose State University

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog
 Institutional Self Study
 Course Syllabi
 Candidate Files
 Fieldwork Handbooks
 Follow-up Survey Results
 Information Booklets
 Field Experience Notebooks
 Schedule of Classes
 Advisement Documents
 Faculty Vitae
 Strategic Plan
 Portfolios

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Stands. Cluster	Program Cluster I	Program Cluster II	TOTAL
Program Faculty	2	20	28	48	98
Institutional Administration	4	5	2	9	20
Candidates	6	48	45	91	190
Graduates		24	25	54	103
Employers of Graduates	2	6	1	12	21
Supervising Practitioners	2	15	22	59	98
Advisors		4	10	15	29
School Administrators		5	1	15	21
Credential Analyst		1		1	2
Advisory Committee		7	18	36	61

TOTAL

643

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

Common Standards

Standard 1 Education Leadership

Standard Met

Shortly after the last CCTC Accreditation visit in 1996, the Education Faculty began to restructure the credential programs at Humboldt State University. This restructuring process led to a number of positive changes that resulted in the program as it exists today. The most significant change has been the combination of a number of credential programs into the Department of Education within the College of Professional Studies. The Adapted Physical Education Program resides in the Department of Health and Physical Education within the College of Professional Studies. The School Psychology Program is provided through the Department of Psychology in the College of Natural Resources and Sciences. This structure has increased the effectiveness of the administration of the programs and promoted communication within the departments and among other departments within the University. Interviews with Faculty from across the University have provided evidence of the increased effectiveness of the leadership of the credential programs. Program Faculty and Administration indicated that the program is organized, governed, and coordinated with the active involvement of the credential faculty. Evidence indicates that the institution responds quickly and effectively to program needs.

Strengths

The leadership of the Department of Education and the College of Professional Studies has provided strong credential programs through the restructuring efforts that have taken place since the last CCTC visit in 1996.

Faculty provide strong leadership for their respective programs and promote collaborative efforts to enhance all credential programs.

Concerns

While the program has a vision statement, which is referred to as their mission statement, the committee could not find sufficient evidence that the vision is widely articulated in a consistent manner. While some candidates, graduates, and District Field Supervisors could articulate the vision and explain its relevance to the program, many could not.

Standard 2 Resources

Standard Met

Interviews with administration and examination of the budget of the department indicate that sufficient funds are consistently allocated for the effective operation of the programs. Computer facilities for students and technology support for faculty are current and provide software for teaching and administrative activities. Interviews with the Education Librarian indicate that the Library receives its fair share of University resources to provide current materials and efficient access to them. There are collections that support the various credential areas within the Education collection. Assessment materials are readily available for School Psychology Credential candidates.

Strengths

An assessment librarian is available for the candidates in the School Psychologist Program.

Program coordinators receive assigned time for program coordination.

A number of full time tenure track positions have been added to the programs over the last few years.

Computers are replaced and upgraded on a regular basis.

Concerns

None noted.

Standard 3 Faculty

Standard Met

The Education Department employs eight full time faculty. An additional full time person will begin August 2002. Searches for two additional faculty are so far unsuccessful. The Psychology Department employs seven full time faculty who have direct responsibility in School Psychology. Faculty are selected on the basis of professional qualifications and experience. Adjunct faculty are hired from an adjunct pool when needs arise. A committee reviews applicants in the pool, ranks them and makes recommendations to the chairperson. Faculty members are universally praised for being dedicated, well prepared, accessible and concerned for the well-being and success of their students.

Strengths:

Faculty have earned universal respect from graduates, students and employers for being able to combine high demands with a caring commitment to help students succeed. Students appreciate being known personally by faculty.

Concerns:

Despite efforts to recruit from a variety of arenas, there is a lack of ethnic diversity in faculty across programs. The Administrative Services Program experiences a lack of gender diversity.

Standard 4 Evaluation

**Standard Met Minimally
With Qualitative Concerns**

The institution involves program participants, graduates, and local practitioners in the evaluation of courses and field experiences. However, the accreditation team found that the methods and procedures by which programs are evaluated lack consistency and are not comprehensive in scope. There was no clear evidence that a comprehensive system of evaluation is in place to regularly gather and assess program quality or to use assessment results in the design and development of courses or field experiences.

The accreditation team acknowledges that a number of important changes have been made in credentialing programs since the last CCTC accreditation visit. Interviews with faculty, staff, students, administrators, and graduates indicate that in many instances informal processes rather than formal and systematic procedures have been responsible for initiating change efforts.

Strengths

None noted

Concerns

Methods for evaluating program quality and effectiveness are inconsistent and not comprehensive in scope. Program improvement efforts are not always informed, or shaped, by the systematic assessment of courses or field assignments, including feedback from graduates working outside the North Coast area.

Standard 5 Admission**Standard Met**

Admissions criteria and the process for making admissions decisions are clear and well-defined. Admission information is readily available from multiple sources such as the department office, web site, and faculty conferences. Candidates and graduates indicate that the information obtained is accurate and consistent. Multiple measures are used for determining admissibility including characteristics deemed important for success as a professional educator.

Strengths

Education faculty work extensively with secondary methods faculty in other departments to develop intensive screening procedures for students who apply to the Single Subject program.

The department has developed a comprehensive admissions packet that provides students with procedures for applying to the program as well as steps for completing their credential.

Concerns

None noted.

Standard 6 Advice and Assistance**Standard Met**

Faculty are highly praised for their accessibility and responsiveness to students after they are admitted to the program. This assistance is provided not only by faculty but also by the credential analyst and the Career Center Counselor. Candidates and graduates indicate that advice and assistance received from field supervisors is helpful and consistent with information and advice received from campus sources. Faculty hold community forums that provide on-going assistance as well as an opportunity for candidates to collectively address issues and ask questions.

Strengths

The Career Center provides extensive assistance to individuals about careers in education, resume preparation, career fairs, etc. This information is presented early in the program and continues throughout the program so that candidates are assisted in obtaining jobs not only in the Humboldt area but also throughout California.

Concerns

None noted

Standard 7 School Collaboration**Standard Met**

The department has developed extensive collaborative relationships with local schools and districts to provide opportunities for students to participate in a well-planned sequence of professional field experiences. The department works closely with school district personnel to choose sites and mentor teachers that are well matched with the needs of each student teacher. The faculty has developed a two-year plan to increase the pool and move into more diverse school settings in southern Humboldt County. The Dean has also established a Strategic Planning Committee composed of school district personnel to establish long-term collaborative relationships on a broad scale. University faculty and district personnel work together to achieve the goals of this group.

Strengths

The process for matching mentor teachers and student teachers is carefully crafted to make sure that the best possible match is made. Interviews begin in the spring so that decisions are made early and student teachers can be in the classroom from the beginning of the school year.

Superintendents commended the Dean for his monthly calls to ask them “how things are going.”

Concerns

None noted

Standard 8 Field Supervisors

Standard Met

The department has developed a prescribed procedure for recruiting and selecting mentor teachers. These teachers participate in an orientation process, including training in supervision, prior to receiving their first student teacher. Extensive handbooks also guide working relationships among all constituencies across all programs. Candidates report that supervisors encourage them to use methods that they have been taught in their courses. Student teachers and university personnel evaluate supervisors. They are recognized at a yearly dinner and are paid a small stipend.

Strengths

No additional ones noted.

Concerns

None noted.

Multiple Subject CLAD Emphasis Credential

Findings on Standards

Upon review of the self study report, interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, supervisors, mentors, staff and specific documents, the team has determined that the program standards have all been fully met.

Throughout the entire Multiple Subject credential program, there is strong evidence that learning is the highest priority shared by all stakeholders. Faculty is extremely dedicated, and give high priority to meeting the needs of candidates taking into consideration geographical distances when scheduling class meeting times, location and frequency. They plan collaboratively and in an intentional manner to connect assignments between courses as well as field experiences. The organization of fieldwork rotates between coursework and field experiences to ensure application of newly acquired knowledge and methodologies in an actual experience. Fieldwork is also carefully coordinated to ensure candidates are placed in a grade level with support of a program supervisor and mentor teacher to maximize their success and preparation. These assignments are planned months in advance to ensure all participants can meet prior to placement and be comfortable with the situation. Efforts are also made to have faculty include current practitioners in the field capable of providing the best possible opportunities to instruct candidates. An example of this is the Distinguished Teacher in Residence program.

Standard 4a -- Interviews related to Reading Standard 4a consistently indicate candidates are well-prepared to deliver instruction, reading strategies and skills. Fieldwork and coursework are well connected and supervised in classrooms with practitioners who exemplify a balanced, comprehensive instruction consistent with current reading research.

Strengths

The Department of Education has made plans to promote further partnerships between Humboldt State University and local school districts through the Center for Education Renewal. The potential impact of this collaboration in the Multiple Subject Credential program is exciting.

Concerns

None noted.

Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Credential

Findings on Standards

After review of the Humboldt State University institutional report and supporting documentation and completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, school administration, faculty, supervising practitioners, employers, and advisory committee members, the team determined that all program standards are fully met.

Standard 4b -- It is apparent that when identifying classroom teachers to supervise candidates during extended field experience, the institution confers with district personnel and analyzes the pedagogical practices of the teachers and seeks to select teachers whose strategies for content-based reading instruction are balanced, comprehensive, and consistent with current research as reflected in state policy. Interviews with mentor teachers presently working with student

teachers, as well as interviews with field supervisors, indicate that some mentor teachers are not currently modeling or emphasizing research-based strategies for reading instruction within the content areas. The review team, however, recognizes that the SED faculty is presently developing ways to communicate state policy on content-based reading instruction to local district teachers to ensure that all candidates have the opportunity to observe and apply reading instruction during field experiences.

Strengths

The team found that the Single Subject Credential program is well-focused and does an outstanding job of preparing reflective practitioners to work in today's classrooms. This program's supportive administration, faculty, and staff ensure that the Single Subject Credential program is connective and responsive to the communities it serves, and that it places equal emphasis on both professional preparation and academic preparation for its candidates.

Some of the program's notable strengths include:

- Effective leadership which brings together both full and part-time faculty from different departments across campus, thus reinforcing the necessity that teacher education is an all-university function.
- Faculty commitment to the Department of Education's mission. This is evidenced in their course content and pedagogy.
- Strong partnerships with surrounding districts as exemplified by Arcata High School and Eureka High School and the university "Distinguished Teacher In Residence" Program.
- A well-balanced overall curriculum with strong attention to integrating theory and practice, and insuring pedagogical content area knowledge for all of its candidates.

Validation of the program's strength is evidenced in comments from mentor teachers, school administrators, and members of the advisory committee that candidates are well-prepared prior to student teaching and preference of graduates of the program in the marketplace.

Concerns

None noted.

Reading Certificate

Findings on Standards

Standard Met

After review of the program, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty and supervisors, the team determined that all of the program standards for the Reading Certificate have been met.

Strengths

- There is overwhelming evidence that students are able to communicate the research based and theoretical foundations with instructional decisions.
- The program develops flexible scheduling to meet the geographical needs of the candidates, who otherwise would not be able to pursue the reading certificate.
- Coursework is rigorous in requiring candidates to demonstrate understanding of assessment data and providing intervention strategies.

Concerns

None noted.

Preliminary Education Specialist Credential – Mild/Moderate

Findings on Standards

Standard Met

After reviewing the program, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervisors, the team determined that all of the program standards for Preliminary Education Specialist, Level I Mild/Moderate have been met.

Strengths

- Candidates expressed appreciation for the quality of assignments that are required in the various courses. They feel these assignments are of immediate value to them in their classrooms.
- Candidates offered many accolades regarding their professors and supervisors. They feel everyone connected with their program is helping them.
- Graduates expressed appreciation for being well prepared to work in a variety of classrooms. They feel they gained so much from student teaching and working with each other in their classes.
- Mentor teachers reported how excited the candidates are about beginning student teaching. The teachers feel that candidates are well prepared in working with students with a variety of disabilities and are eager to participate in developing case studies and planning for students in the classroom.

Concerns

Some graduates reported that they had training in assessment; but they were not able to effectively incorporate assessment results into their planning of curriculum, their communication with parents, meetings with staff and decision making in regard to a given student's behavior planning, vocational needs and life skills. The team noted that interviews detailed a few instances where materials were not available for student use. The students reported that the materials needed to be borrowed. This resulted in students being placed at a disadvantage, and in some cases, resulted in a need for an incomplete in the course.

Professional Education Specialist Credential – Mild Moderate

Findings on Standards

After reviewing the program, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervisors, the team determined that all of the program standards for Preliminary Education Specialist, Level I Mild/Moderate have been met. The program is in its first year with a small group of students who are in immediate need of completing the Level II requirements. The team is confident that the faculty has developed a program that will successfully meet the needs of Level II candidates.

Strengths

None noted.

Concerns

None noted

Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology including Internship

Findings on Standards

After careful review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews with candidates, interns, graduates, faculty, employers, and field supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Pupil Personnel Service in School Psychology.

Consistent with stated program objectives, the School Psychology program prepares highly qualified professionals who apply psychological principles in a proactive and a responsive manner to assist teachers, parents, administrators, and professionals from other disciplines to facilitate the optimal development of all children. This preparation includes developing skills in problem analysis, consultation, psychoeducational assessment, counseling and crisis intervention, intervention design and implementation of programs, development and evaluation, research, and other direct and indirect interventions. Such comprehensively prepared School Psychologists play a vital role in assisting schools and communities in maximizing the educational and personal development of all students. The School Psychology program prepares School Psychologists to assist parents, teachers, and other school and community professionals to maximize the cognitive, social, emotional, academic, and vocational development of students. The program has emphasized training standards in both the design of the courses and fieldwork experience as well as the evaluation of student competence. The School Psychology program also facilitates the development of passionate, committed, and empowered educational professionals and leaders who aim to facilitate the educational and developmental success of all students. Also, the program attracts many highly qualified applicants. The success of the program in accomplishing the above is reflected in the highly recognized and highly valued reputation of the School Psychology program across the State.

Strengths

It was clearly evident that the School Psychology program has a cohesive and coherent program design, rationale, and coordination. Training philosophy and objectives are well articulated and understood by faculty, students, supervisors.

Practica and Fieldwork Placement and Supervision and Mentoring were consistently reported as exceptional in quality. All evidence indicates that both site-based and University based supervisors were recognized as very important in the School Psychology program.

Ample evidence demonstrates the quality of the collaboration between the University and school districts.

The comprehensive nature of the School Psychology preparation places an emphasis on collaboration and consultation. All evidence indicated that this is an important strength of the program.

Abundant evidence indicates that preparation regarding Assessment and Data-Based Decision Making is excellent, including knowledge of formal and informal test administration, socio-emotional and behavioral assessment, ecological assessment, as well as assessment methodologies to define a student's needs. There is particular emphasis on preparing candidates to use data-based decision making to improve the outcomes for instruction, development of cognitive and academic skills, and the development of life competencies.

Emphasis on the importance and understanding of theory and research addressing human development as related to student's strengths and weaknesses that affect learning in the school and in family environments, was also highlighted by all sources of information.

All sources of information highlight that the School Psychology program faculty are exceptional on multiple fronts including program management, communication, teaching, research, expertise, professional involvement, and supervision. Furthermore, evidence indicates that program faculty are receptive and responsive to candidates' input.

Concerns

None Noted.

Adapted Physical Education

Findings on Standards

After a careful review of the institutional report and documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, the program administrator, mentor teachers, employers, and members of the advisory board, the team has determined that all program standards have been met.

There is evidence that careful attention is given to the qualifications of applicants seeking admission to the program. Once candidates are admitted they are provided on-going advisement and assistance in experiencing opportunities available for them as practicing professionals through collaboration with community agencies such as the Disabled Students Services Office and the County Office of Education.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, field supervisors, and mentor teachers support the university commitment to providing a well rounded program to help graduates become proficient and caring practitioners. Field placements are varied to help candidates experience real world working conditions.

Demonstration of competence by candidates is assessed on an ongoing basis as well as by the presentation of a comprehensive portfolio in which the candidates demonstrate the ways they meet the program standards.

Strengths

The team found that the adapted physical education program, while serving a small number of candidates, produces graduates who are highly qualified and sought after by the school administrators. It enjoys an excellent reputation.

The graduates of this program provide much needed services to an underserved population of students. Therefore, the university's willingness to sustain this program, despite the limited number of candidates is laudable.

Effective leadership brings together a team of dedicated faculty members, mentor teachers, and local school administrators.

The faculty at the University and the mentor teachers in the field are passionate about the program and ensure that graduates possess the competencies they need to be successful once they are employed.

The relationship with the surrounding districts and the Humboldt County Office of Education has evolved into a strong partnership.

Validation of the program's quality is evidenced by comment and support expressed by school administrators, mentor teachers, and advisory board members.

Concerns

None Noted.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Professional Administrative Services Credential

Findings on Standards

After the review of the Humboldt State University report and the supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with Administrative Services Level I and Level II candidates, graduates, faculty, university supervisors, mentors (district field supervisors), employers, and Advisory Board members, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and the Professional Administrative Services Credential. The Administrative Services programs demonstrated a strong collaboration with the County Office of Education, districts, and schools. The programs have progressed to an entirely practitioner-based approach with superintendents teaching as adjuncts, clearly defined courses and field work experiences which meet the CCTC standards, careful and close advisement and assessment of candidate abilities and needs, scheduling to meet the needs of a wide spread candidate population, and excellent matching of candidates with mentors in field placements. The programs have practitioners as faculty and managing schools as the primary focus, but the balance with theory and practice in the programs is not apparent.

Strengths

The program leader and the faculty are widely respected in the field and are all current superintendents, giving the program a practitioner credibility which is highly commended by the candidates themselves. Fieldwork experiences are carefully matched to the needs of individual candidates, and mentors expend considerable time, thought, and reflection on meeting the needs of candidates at the site placements. The cohort arrangement is a considerable asset to the program and to the candidates who form networks for increasing their knowledge base and their professional contacts which last long after they exit the program. An open door policy of advisement and problem solving seems to exist between any given candidate and faculty, university supervisor, mentor, and especially the highly regarded program leader. This relationship clearly endures for many graduates long after exit from the program and supports them during many phases of their careers. The overall strength of the program echoed by all constituencies is the close relationship among candidates, faculty, and supervisors.

Concerns

The Administrative Services programs have no full time tenure track university faculty. Evidence of a theoretical base infused in all aspects of the programs was not apparent.

Professional Comments

Common Standards

The team suggests that the department consider developing procedures to provide program information to undergraduates prior to their junior year to enable them to complete additional program options early (e.g., supplementary authorization, CLAD)

At the point of service, faculty are making every effort to be responsive to student concerns and needs. Faculty actually feel a sense of empowerment at this level.

Pupil Personnel Services – School Psychology

Based on review of the information provided in documents and interviews it appears that the School Psychology program may further consider the development of student portfolios to provide additional systematic review of student competence. Students and faculty commented on the potential value of student portfolios. The program is encouraged to engage in further discussions regarding the relative merits and limitations of developing School Psychology student portfolios.

Administrative Services Programs:

- The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program is offered in alternative years with the Professional Administrative Services Program. As the number of students in the program continues to increase, consideration might be given to simultaneous offerings.
- The current small number of students allows faculty and supervisors the ability to assess student abilities and needs on an informal basis since they know each other so well as professional educators in the school or district. More formal processes and structures will be useful as numbers of students increase.
- In the selection criteria for mentors (district field supervisors), it is clear that administrators serve in this capacity. However, the first listed criterion states that a mentor must have a teaching credential and three years of experience. It is recommended that the first criterion be related to the administrative credential.
- In the current stage of development of the program, courses are clear and separate. The progression might be toward course articulation, less overlap, a wider repertoire of teaching strategies, action research which covers several domains, less reliance on textbook coverage, and clearer distinctions between Level I and II course work and expectations.
- Consideration might be given to offering a program which would allow candidates to obtain an M.A. along with the Administrative Credential.

Single Subject Credential Program

The institution is encouraged to continue efforts to increase the pool of mentor teachers for candidates' field experience.

Education Specialist

The team recommends that faculty develop in-class assessment assignments that would allow for guided practice in interpreting pupil data. This practice would provide students the opportunity to think in terms of planning instruction and developing IEPs based on formal and informal data results. The team also recommends that candidates have the access to the assessment materials required for their active involvement in their coursework.