

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

Professional Services Division

March 26, 2003

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at San Jose 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 San Jose 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 Credential
- Administrative Services Credential
 - Preliminary
 - Professional
- Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential
 - Language Speech and Hearing
 - Audiology
 - Special Class Authorization
- Education Specialist Credentials
 - Preliminary Level I
 - Deaf and Hard of Hearing
 - Early Childhood Special Education
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship

 - Professional Level II
 - Deaf and Hard of Hearing
 - Early Childhood Special Education
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities

- Health Services (School Nurse) Credential
- Library Media Specialist Credential
- Multiple Subject Credential
 - Multiple Subject
 - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Vietnamese, Spanish)
 - Multiple Subject Internship
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
 - School Counseling
 - School Counseling Internship
 - School Social Work
 - Child Welfare and Attendance
- Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential
 - Reading Certificate
 - Reading and Language Arts Specialist
- Resource Specialist Certificate
- Single Subject Credential
 - Single Subject Credential
 - CLAD Emphasis
 - Single Subject Internship

(2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted
- San Jose State University be permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- San Jose State University be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2007-2008 academic year subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation visits by both the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Background Information

San Jose State University, the metropolitan university for Silicon Valley, is a member of the 23-campus California State University, the largest public education system in the nation. Located in downtown San Jose (population 950,000), at the southern tip of the San Francisco Bay, San Jose State University is California's oldest public institution of higher education, San Jose State University began as Minn's Evening Normal School in San Francisco, in 1857. The campus was relocated to San Jose in 1870, and opened a branch in southern California in 1881, a center that was to become the University of California at Los Angeles.

From its beginnings as a normal school, the campus has matured into a comprehensive university offering 134 bachelors' and masters' degrees. San Jose State University is the seventh largest public-sector employer in the Valley, with approximately 3,000 employees and an annual budget of \$350 million.

Enrollment has increased nearly 5% during the last five years, from 26,989 to 28,007 students. About one-fifth of the students are enrolled as graduate students. The diversity of the area the University serves is reflected in its student body, where there is no ethnic majority. Over one-half (59%) of the University's students self identify as minority students: one-third (33%) classify themselves as Asian, 14% as Hispanic, 7% as Filipino, 4% as African American. Approximately one-fifth of the University's students are engaged in graduate or post-baccalaureate work, including graduate and credential programs. Overall, average student age is 36 (24.0 for undergraduates and 33.6 for graduate students). Slightly more than half of the University's students come from Santa Clara County, but the university draws students from a sizeable area that also includes San Benito, Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Mateo, and Alameda counties.

The College of Education is one of eight academic colleges at SJSU and had a full-time equivalent student enrollment of approximately 1,500 in fall 2001. The College is organized into eight academic departments: Child and Adolescent Development, Communicative Disorders and Sciences, Counselor Education, Educational Administration and Higher Education, Elementary Education, Instructional Technology, Secondary Education, and Special Education.

Table 1
Fall 2001 Enrollment by Academic Department

| <u>Department</u> | <u>Student Enrollment (FTES)*</u> |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Child and Adolescent Development | 246 |
| Communicative Disorders | 68 |
| Counselor Education | 141 |
| Educational Admin and Higher Ed | 245 |
| Elementary Education | 479 |
| Instructional Technology | 56 |
| Secondary Education | 102 |
| Special Education | 154 |
| TOTAL for Fall 2001 | 1,491 |

*FTES-one full-time equivalent student = 15 semester units

Merged COA and NCATE Visit

This was an continuing accreditation visit by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The visit merged the accreditation processes of the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) according to the approved protocol. The Accreditation Team, which included membership from the COA and NCATE, received a single Institutional Self-Study Report, worked from a common interview schedule, voted, 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 revised and renewed in 1996 and subsequently revised and renewed in 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 allows the university the option to respond to the NCATE 2000 Standards, provided that the Commission's Common Standards are addressed in the context of that response. It also allows the subsequent accreditation team report to be written based upon those standards. San Jose State University exercised that option. In addition, the institution must respond to all appropriate Program Standards. 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 and format of the NCATE standards rather than the language that is needed for the COA. As with the previous partnership agreements, universities are not required to submit Folios to the NCATE-affiliated professional associations if they are part of a state partnership.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant, Philip Fitch, was assigned to the institution in September 2000 and met with institutional leadership initially shortly after that time. Over the next two years, there were two 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. In addition, telephone, e-mail and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. The Team Leader (Co-chair for the visit), Joel Colbert, was selected in the Spring of 2002. The Chair of the NCATE Board of Examiners (Co-chair for the visit), Aileen Trainer, was assigned in September 2002. On October 25, 2002, the team co-chairs and the staff consultant conducted a pre-visit with the representatives of San Jose State to make final determinations about the interview schedule, the template for the visit and any remaining organizational details.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the NCATE unit standards and appropriate references to the California Common Standards. 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 Option One, California Program Standards, for all program areas, with the exception of the Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential Program. The standards of the American Speech/Language and Hearing Association (ASHA) were used for that program.

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 Education and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of eighteen consisting of a Team Leader, a Common Standards Cluster that would include four NCATE members and two COA members; a Basic Credential Cluster of five members; a Specialist Credential Cluster of four members, and a Services Credential Cluster of three members. The Dean and Consultant assigned each credential program to one of the program clusters. Then the team members were selected to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and training in the use of the *Accreditation Framework* and experience in merged accreditation visits.

The COA Team Leader and the Chair of the NCATE Board of Examiners served as Co-Chairs of the visit. Each member of the COA/NCATE Common Standards Cluster examined primarily the University's responses to the NCATE Standards/Common Standards but also considered the Program Standards for each credential area. Members of the Basic, Specialist and Services Clusters primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered unit issues.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Saturday, March 15. The Team Leader and the two COA members of the Common Standards Cluster and CCTC staff arrived on Saturday morning and began their deliberations with the five NCATE team members. In February, the NCATE chair requested the addition of another NCATE team member. This made the NCATE/Common Standards a seven-member team. The morning included orientation to the accreditation procedures and organizational arrangements for both the COA and NCATE team members. On Saturday afternoon and Sunday morning, March 16, the NCATE/Common Standards Cluster examined documents on the campus. There was a meeting of the Basic Cluster team members on Sunday morning from 10:00a.m. to noon. The remainder of the team arrived by Sunday at noon with a meeting of the entire team followed by organizational meetings of the clusters. The institution sponsored a reception from 5:00p.m.-6:30p.m. on Sunday evening to provide an orientation to the institution. The team members then met in cluster for the rest of the evening.

On Monday and Tuesday, March 17 and 18, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. The institution arranged to transport members of the team to professional development schools, and to various local school sites used for collaborative activities. 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 morning at 7:30a.m., the team Co-chairs 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 Common Standards Cluster, since the NCATE/Common Standards findings also affected each of the Program Clusters. All team reports for program areas were completed by 9:00a.m. on Wednesday morning. Response to the NCATE/Common Standards was completed by 11:00a.m. The merged team voted one final time on all findings on the standards.

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.

For each separate program area, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards pointing out any standards that were 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 at 11:00a.m. 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 and decided that all standards were fully met.

The team then specifically discussed each program area and decided that all Program Standards that were fully met, with the exception of two standards in one program area. The strengths and concerns related to each credential program were also reviewed. Even though there were two standards less than fully met, the team determined that there were numerous compensating strengths both institution-wide and in all program areas. The team concluded that all credential programs were strong, effective and of high quality.

The team made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Handbook*. The team decided on an accreditation recommendation 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 and that the overall evidence clearly supported the accreditation recommendation

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

INSTITUTION: San Jose State University

DATES OF VISIT: March 15-19, 2003

ACCREDITATION TEAM

RECOMMENDATION: ACCREDITATION

RATIONALE:

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

NCATE's SIX STANDARDS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: The university elected to use the NCATE format and to write to NCATE's unit standards to meet the COA Common Standards requirement. There was extensive cross-referencing to the COA Common Standards. Also, the corresponding part of this team report utilizes the NCATE standards and format. The total team (NCATE and COA members) reviewed each element of the six NCATE Standards, added appropriate areas of the Common Standards, and voted as to whether the standard was met, not met, or met with areas of improvement.

PROGRAM STANDARDS: Team clusters for (1) Basic credential programs, (2) Specialist credentials, and (3) Services credentials reviewed all data regarding those credential programs. Appropriate input was provided by other team members to each of the clusters. Following discussion of each program the total team, NCATE and COA, considered whether the program standards were either met, met minimally, or not met.

ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus that the six(6) NCATE Standards and the Conceptual Framework were met, with identified areas for improvement for purposes of the NCATE report. The merged team voted 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 for all but two program standards in the PPS-Counseling Program. The following report further explains these findings.

TEAM ROSTER

Co-Chairs

State Team:

Joel Colbert
California State University, Dominguez Hills

NCATE Team:

Aileen C. Trainer
University of South Carolina

Common Standards Cluster:

Elizabeth Butler (NCATE Member)
Inkom Elementary School (Idaho)

Dana Espinosa (NCATE Member)
East Carolina University (North Carolina)

Jeanne Middleton-Hairston (NCATE Member)
Millsaps College (Mississippi)

Helen Williams (NCATE Member)
Grant Middle School (New Mexico)

Arlinda Eaton (CCTC/COA Member)
California State University, Northridge

Bettie Spatafora (CCTC/COA Member)
Seneca Elementary School (California)

Basic Credential Cluster:

Michael Jordan, Cluster Leader
California State University, Fresno

Chris Hopper
Humboldt State University

Philip Romig
Elk Grove Unified School District

Kathleen Taira
CalStateTeach, Los Angeles

Carol Adams, Reading Specialist
Lompoc Unified School District

Education Specialist Credential Cluster:

Caron Mellblom, Cluster Leader
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Bert Goldhammer
Placer Hills Union School District

Candace Kaye
California State University, Long Beach

Nancy Tatum
California Department of Education

Services Credential Cluster I:

Mary Purucker
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District

Claudia Bays
California State University, Sacramento

Services Credential Cluster II:

Gary Hoban, Cluster Leader
National University

Marian Reimann
Los Angeles Unified School District

Marcel Soriano
California State University, Los Angeles

Santos Torres, Jr.
California State University, Sacramento

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog
 Institutional Self Study
 Course Syllabi
 Candidate Files
 Fieldwork Handbooks
 Field Experience Notebooks
 Schedule of Classes

Follow-up Survey Results
 Needs Analysis Results
 Information Booklets
 Advisement Documents
 Faculty Vitae
 Portfolios

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

| | Team Leader | NCATE Stands. Cluster | Basic Credential Cluster | Services Credential Cluster | Specialist Credential Cluster | TOTAL |
|------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Program Faculty | 9 | 72 | 81 | 49 | 39 | 250 |
| Institutional Administration | 7 | 11 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 40 |
| Candidates | 21 | 36 | 132 | 92 | 101 | 382 |
| Graduates | 6 | 17 | 27 | 31 | 33 | 114 |
| Employers of Graduates | 4 | 7 | 31 | 19 | 7 | 78 |
| Supervising Practitioners | 11 | 5 | 37 | 22 | 31 | 106 |
| Advisors | 2 | 13 | 11 | 7 | 17 | 50 |
| School Administrators | 6 | 7 | 29 | 31 | 19 | 92 |
| Credential Analyst | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 9 |
| Advisory Committee | 3 | 5 | 21 | 19 | 11 | 59 |

TOTAL**1080**

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.

NCATE STANDARDS/CCTC COMMON STANDARDS

STANDARD 1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, 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:

As a result of the concurrent visit, the California Commission for Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) team is recommending that all program standards be approved. Concerns raised by the team include:

- Uneven student advisement in the single subject credential program
- Lack of thesis and project assessment in the Special Education Master's program
- The ratio of full-time to part-time faculty in some programs, e.g., Hard of Hearing and Deaf program
- Uneven portfolio assessment and feedback across programs
- Inconsistent communication between the College of Education and other colleges, specifically in the Child Development program, Social Work program, and Adapted Physical Education program.

The unit and program specific conceptual frameworks are coherent and shared. The knowledge bases for some programs, such as those housed in the Department of Elementary Education, were comprehensively and cogently presented. However, for some other programs in the unit, the knowledge bases were minimally articulated.

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Teacher candidates at San Jose State University (SJSU) participate in initial credential programs that are aligned with content and specialty program standards as established by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). Candidates are assessed at program entry, during participation in the program, at midpoint and exit and through follow-up assessment strategies. Each initial credential program has developed an assessment plan that is consistent with the conceptual framework and the vision of the College of Education. At the time of the visit, implementation of each assessment plan had begun. Per the 2001-02 Title II Report, 100 percent of the initial program candidates passed the standardized assessment (California Basic Educational Skills Test) required for admission. This pass rate matches the statewide pass rate.

Assessment summaries of candidates; interviews with students, graduates, supervisors and employers; and the documents reviewed provide evidence that candidates at both the initial and advanced levels in each program have the appropriate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The CSU Systemwide Evaluation conducted by the CSU Chancellor's Office indicates that K-12 supervisors of SJSU teaching graduates who served as newly-certificated teachers in grades K-8 or special education classes in 2000-01 evaluated them as being prepared to teach and assess K-8 students in much the same way as supervisors of teaching graduates from other CSU campuses

evaluated their newly-certificated teachers. Comparison data indicate that SJSU teaching graduates were less prepared to teach K-8 science and K-8 history/social science.

| Preparation | SJSU | Other CSUs |
|---|------|------------|
| Preparation to teach K-8 reading/language arts | 83% | 81% |
| Preparation to teach K-8 mathematics | 79% | 80% |
| Preparation to teach K-8 science | 62% | 78% |
| Preparation to teach K-8 history/social science | 60% | 80% |
| Preparation of K-8 to assess and assist | 77% | 72% |

In California, the content knowledge that teacher candidates acquire is referred to as “subject matter competency” or “subject matter preparation.” There are two options in California law for candidates to verify subject matter competency. Some candidates for the Multiple Subject (elementary) Teaching Credential and the Single Subject (secondary) Teaching Credential establish their mastery of subject matter through completion of a state-approved undergraduate subject matter preparation program usually leading to the award of a bachelor’s degree. Other candidates demonstrate subject matter mastery by passing the *Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers* (MSAT) exam (now replaced by the California Subject Examination for Teachers) for elementary certification or the appropriate state-approved examination for each Single Subject (secondary) credentialing area. The 2000-01 Title II Report shows a 99 percent pass rate on MSAT, which matches the statewide pass rate. This same report indicates a 97 percent pass rate on the content area exams. The statewide pass rate in 2000-01 was 96 percent. The most recent Title II Report (2001-02) does not provide comparative data. SJSU has a 99 percent pass rate on MSAT and an 88 percent pass rate on the content area exams. Candidates for the Education Specialist Teaching Credential establish their mastery of subject matter as do either the Multiple Subject candidates or the Single Subject candidates.

All initial credential candidates must have their content knowledge verified prior to student teaching. However, candidates in the internship credential program must verify subject matter competency before beginning the internship assignment. Passage rates for candidates taking subject matter examinations, as noted above, essentially match passage rates at comparable institutions.

Approved subject matter programs leading to a CCTC-approved Single Subject Credential include art, English, foreign language, math, music, physical education, science, and social science. Subject matter programs for the Multiple Subject Credential are in Child and Adolescent Development, Creative Arts, Environmental Studies, Liberal Studies, Natural Science, and Social Science. The CCTC has adopted standards for all subject matter programs.

In addition to required coursework or evidence of mastery of subject matter through examination, the initial programs require candidates to demonstrate evidence of subject matter mastery through field experience. All candidates complete field experience as student teachers or interns. The California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) are used to measure their performance. Of the six standards, “Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning,” provides supervisors the opportunity to assess candidates’ subject matter mastery.

The unit provides three advanced programs for teachers which lead to a master's degree. One is in Elementary Education, another is in Mathematics, while a third is in Natural Science. Candidates are required to demonstrate an understanding of the central concepts and structure of their fields as delineated in professional, state and institutional standards through coursework and a culmination activity – project, thesis and/or comprehensive examination.

Content Knowledge for Other Professional School Personnel

The unit provides programs which lead to credentials for candidates in advanced programs demonstrating an understanding of the central concepts and structure of their fields as delineated in professional, state and institutional standards through course work, field experiences and for the master's degree, a comprehensive examination, graduate project, or thesis. The following credentials are offered in other professional areas: Adapted Physical Education Specialist, Administrative Services, Clinical-Rehabilitative Services, Education Specialist, Health Services, Reading and Language Arts Specialist, School Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance, Library Media, School Social Work and Child Welfare and Attendance. Candidates in these programs receive sufficient coursework and pedagogical training to meet the requirements as set forth by the CCTC and other national professional organizations such as ASHA.

In December 2002 the ASHA accreditation team cited six elements of three standards where compliance was not verified: one element under 1.0 Administrative Structure and Governance, two elements under 2.0 Faculty/Instructional Staff, and three elements under 3.0 Curriculum. The Department of Communicative Disorders and Sciences has now crafted and submitted responses to ASHA regarding the six elements and should hear the status of their submission in Fall 2003.

The Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Education Specialist Credential, Level I and Level II, are currently under review by CED. For the purposes of this site visit, the Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Education Specialist Credential program is being reviewed in accordance with CCTC Standards.

Some programs also require candidates to pass national certification exams to become licensed to receive their credential. In the Clinical Rehabilitative Services credential program, candidates in 2000-01 had a passing rate of 55 percent.

The Instructional Technology M.A. program is nationally recognized by AECT/ECIT. The July 2002 review by AECT states that all five ECIT Standards are met based on SJSU's written plan. Furthermore, it states that the next program report should focus on the aggregation of candidate performance evidence and the explication of how that evidence is aligned with the indicators of the five standards.

Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

The CCTC Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Multiple and Single Subject Credentials and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession are used for teacher candidates to demonstrate the pedagogical content knowledge acquired. Those enrolled in the Education Specialist program acquire pedagogical content knowledge in these areas through the methods courses required for the MS or SS credentials, as well as in their required special education courses. Grade point averages, portfolio evidence and classroom teaching performance are also used to demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge. Interviews conducted with mentor teachers, field supervisors and site administrators, indicated widespread satisfaction with

candidates' content preparation. Candidates likewise, expressed confidence upon completion of coursework because of the direct applications they were able to make from field work assignments. Other demonstrations of pedagogical content knowledge for teacher candidates came from student teaching critiques and tests.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

The unit has created, through coursework and field experiences, numerous opportunities for candidates to learn and demonstrate their knowledge and skills in the professional and pedagogical behaviors of teachers. The skills and knowledge teacher candidates master are defined by the CCTC *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Teacher Preparation Programs* and the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)*. Additionally, candidates in both the MS and SS Credential programs meet these standards through opportunities to practice the 13 Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are assessed through course assignments by faculty and in field experiences by both university supervisors and district field supervisors.

In 1998, California implemented a required exit exam for the Multiple Subject candidates in the area of reading. A passing score on the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) is required in order to receive a teaching credential. The exam is presently required only for elementary candidates and special education candidates. Evidence supplied at the time of the visit showed a 2001-02 pass rate of 96 percent for SJSU, which is comparable to the statewide pass rate of 97 percent.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel

Expectations of students in these programs are heavily driven by standards adopted by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and strongly influenced by the standards of national organizations. Collectively candidates demonstrate knowledge of learning, diversity, technology, ethics, policy issues, and pedagogy of their field through course assignments, field experiences, and a culminating capstone experience. These experiences differ by program but can include such items as an exit evaluation, an action research project, hundreds of hours of experiences in various clinical situations, or a certification examination aligned to a national professional organization and accepted by a licensure group.

Dispositions for All Candidates

The unit's mission statement provides a strong directive to the faculty and students regarding dispositions to be cultivated during the course of the development of teachers and other school personnel. Candidates in all programs are expected to adopt attitudes and values consistent with ensuring "equity and excellence for all students in a culturally diverse, technologically complex, global community." They are informed of program specific dispositions through course syllabi, program handbooks, meetings with advisors, group advisement sessions, and field experience evaluation forms.

Faculty in the Integrated Degree/Credential Program have developed a set of behavioral objectives that reflect the College of Education's dispositions and conceptual framework. Teacher candidates are assessed for their demonstration of these behavioral objectives by different people at several points in their preparation. The first assessment of the candidate is a self-reflection. Candidates are then assessed for their attainment of the dispositions by faculty in three courses and by resident and cooperating teachers in their three field experience

assignments. Each candidate completes a final self-evaluation at her/his student teaching exit interview.

Through interviews with faculty, support personnel and candidates, it was found that candidates value ethical conduct, reflective practice, diversity, and equity and social justice. Conversations with program leaders indicated a modeling of these dispositions through the way they articulated their approach to working with candidates and adapting their schedules and agendas to meet the needs of the diverse student population they serve. Additionally, the CCTC standards serve to reinforce this emphasis on the values that undergird competent professional educator behavior.

Student Learning for Initial Teacher Candidates

SJSU candidates are able to analyze student learning and monitor and adjust instruction to have a positive effect on student learning. Indicators of candidates having an impact on student learning have been made evident in the following ways. By reviewing the course content of methods classes and student work samples, it was clear that learning has occurred. In speaking with field supervisors and faculty, candidates have been required to assess their students' learning, reflect on reasons for the performance and then plan for future instruction. Through portfolio evidence, used not in a summative fashion, but as a reflective on-going assessment piece, candidates have provided evidence related to student learning to document achievement on experiences and assignments, as well as how to modify instruction based upon student outcomes. Artifacts exhibiting student learning that candidates have placed in their portfolios include student performance data, assessments and analyses of student work.

Student Learning for Other Professional School Personnel

Those school personnel who work alongside teachers to help create positive learning environments for all children play a critical role for each child. Candidates in all professional preparation programs are expected to accurately assess student learning and use results of assessment to make adjustments, and to have a positive effect on the learning of all students. The evidence seen, observed and heard, indicates that these professional partners have a good understanding of their role and skills in working with families and individual students to provide support and to assist teachers through collaboration and positive dialogue.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has provided evidence to indicate that teacher candidates and other school personnel demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions to meet program, state and national standards. While the unit and program-specific conceptual frameworks are found throughout the Unit's programs, some departments have not yet fully articulated the knowledge bases undergirding their conceptual frameworks.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Met

D. Areas for Improvement:

Old: The development of programmatic mission statements and related conceptual frameworks are uneven across programs.

Revised: The departmental knowledge bases are unevenly articulated.

Rationale: *While the mission statements and conceptual frameworks are well developed for the unit and the departments, the departmental knowledge bases are unevenly articulated.*

E. State Team Decision: Met

STANDARD 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.

A. Level: (Initial and Advanced)

B. Findings:

While the Unit does not have a overall assessment plan, departments in the Unit do and are involved in program assessment and assessment of candidates qualifications, progress, and competencies. These assessments reflect the Unit’s conceptual frame of *Excellence and Equity in Education*.

Assessment System

The unit does not have a unified, consistent assessment system. The Institutional Report included schemata showing the components of assessments. When queried about these components, the dean provided responded with the following statement:

“ The College of Education places tremendous faith in the integrity of each academic disciple, and does not intend to intrude upon this integrity. Instead, each academic department in the College has a fully developed plan for both candidate and program assessment, as shown in each of the Departmental binders in the Document Room. The intent of the College of Education, as a unified body, is to collate and orchestrate these assessments along a common set of values and beliefs, as shown in the College’s conceptual framework. The College also provides unifying direction for the individual department assessment, as shown in this timeline and statement of objectives for the unit assessment plan that was developed in conjunction with the entire leadership of the College.”

The timetable provided indicates that the unit is still in the development phase with the development of rubrics to begin in the fall. According to the Institutional Report, the College of Education is in the process of rethinking of the unit assessment plan so as to align it with the conceptual framework and standardize its elements across departments and programs.

The stated intent of the College of Education is to collate and orchestrate departmental assessments along a common set of values and beliefs as shown in the conceptual framework.

The lack of a unit assessment plan allows for inconsistencies in admissions requirements, expectations of candidate performance and exit performances.

Although the unit does not have a unified, consistent assessment system, each program within the unit has developed an assessment system with feedback from stakeholders. These programs incorporate knowledge, skills and dispositions that all candidates are required to have based on accreditation standards, state requirements, and faculty agreement about shared values. The degree to which national standards and/or standards of professional societies are used vary among programs. In all departments evaluations are ongoing and use multiple measures. In all departments evaluations are applied at candidates entry into the program, designated transition points, and exit from program.

Admission Assessments

Candidates admission assessments require transcript reviews and of an acceptable GPA (2.87 for multiple subject, 3.0 for Integrated Program, 2.75 for single subject programs, and 2.5 for advanced programs). All candidates must pass CBEST (California Basic Educational Skills Test) and must fulfill the state requirement on the US Constitution as evidenced by either passing a state-approved test or completing coursework. All applicants for the Multiple Subject credential programs must have passed the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) to be recommended for credential. . Passing scores on each of the three subtests of the California basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) are required for admission to all basic credential programs (Multiple Subject, Integrated, and Single Subject). All applicants for all Multiple Subject Credential programs who have not completed a diversified undergraduate major from an accredited program must take and pass the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT).

All applicants for the preliminary graduate credential must take the RICA if they do not hold in a multiple or single subject credential. As of spring 2003, all multiple subject candidates will be required to take the CSET. Currently, applicants for Single Subject Credentials who have not completed and approved undergraduate subject matter program or the equivalent must take and pass the approved as depending on their subject area (CSET and Praxis).

All programs have a minimum grade point average that candidates must maintain. While the average for Masters programs is typically 3.0 initial preparation programs may allow lower GPA.

Candidates for the Spanish or Vietnamese BCLAD credential are required to pass language and cultural knowledge tests in order to be in the program.

Multiple subject credential programs, with the exception of the Integrated Program, require candidates to successfully complete interviews prior to admission. Integrated Program candidates are required to meet with an adviser to determine if they meet entrance requirements. Secondary credential programs require candidates to meet with both a single subject advisor and a secondary education advisor prior to admission. All special education candidates are required to see an advisor prior to admission to ascertain that they have met entrance requirements. Some credential programs require formal interviews while others waive this.

Assessment of Candidates Progress and Exit

At both the initial and advanced levels instructors rely on multiple sources of data to determine grades. Instructors are revising coursework to emphasize candidates' demonstrated performance of competencies using multiple measures. Faculty in Administration and Higher Education had engaged in a two-year process to revise assessment to include a focus on equity to meet California standards for leadership and equity.

Data on candidates is collected from state mandated tests, admission interviews, academic transcripts, required program course work, and performance in field experience. Candidates enrolled in a Master's program may have a capstone course and / or a project or a thesis with an oral defense of the projects/thesis. Portfolio development is used to various degrees in the programs.

Each academic program has a distinct body of knowledge, a distinct group of faculty (some of which may work interdisciplinary), and unique ways of examining student learning. These methods of assessment for a single student product, such as a portfolio, naturally vary. In Elementary Education, for example, the portfolio is intended to be a product that the candidate can carry from the experience and continue to evaluate and use throughout an entire career. In Instructional Technology, a portfolio is a valuable tool to help obtain employment. How each goes about assessing candidate performance varies greatly.

Candidates in Child and Adolescent Development receive feedback on coursework in several ways. Grading criteria are discussed in class. Candidates receive feedback on assignments specifying strengths and areas for improvement. They are directed to campus services and Internet resources to assist them in improving their performance. Candidates are encouraged to meet with faculty to discuss individualized feedback and improvement plans. In all group activities, candidates participate in peer editing and response groups. Prior to submitting materials for grades, candidates are encouraged to present works in progress for instructor comments.

Many candidates in with Instructional Technology have provided copies of their portfolios for use as examples of exemplary work. The portfolios were developed using national professional standards. The construction, monitoring, and final assessment of these portfolios are exemplary.

There are scoring rubrics and methods for communicating expectations and remediation for candidates in the four Special Education credential areas. Faculty complete a scoring rubric, orally discuss the scoring results with the candidates, and return the portfolio to the candidate. Candidates in the Masters' program present their portfolios at the completion of their programs. The criteria for acceptable portfolio performance are unclear. It is also unclear how the criteria connects to state, national, or professional guidelines.

The Department of Secondary Education does not use portfolios. Student work is marked categories of 'exceptional' to 'poor.' While individualized faculty advising system allows for personal feedback and an individualized approach to personal growth as a teacher in training, some candidates report discrepancies in information received from instructors in the Department of Secondary Education and instructors in the department of secondary content.

In Elementary Education, the scoring rubrics are used as formative and summative assessments in student teaching. The scoring rubrics are based on the state standards. The developmental continuum is also a rubric used in the coaching of student teaching. Candidates are not given letter grades because it is a Credit/No Credit class. The feedback is given during the coaching cycles and on the 'reflection' log (page) of the coaching cycle. Feedback from the cooperative teacher is represented in the weekly collaborative log.

The Department of Administration and Higher Education requires a portfolio of all candidates, which has specific guidelines, a rubric and an oral defense. The scoring rubrics have been adopted for all portfolios for graduation in May 2003. Evidence of student performance and reflection on each criterion is required. A summary reflection on the whole program experience is in the portfolio. Faculty from the Department have used feedback from a presentation in June, 2000 at the AACTE conference to revise the portfolio guidelines and rubric with reference to reliability and validity. During the second year of Tier 1 and the final semester in Tier 2, SJSU advisors and course instructors work with candidates writing and rewriting drafts of summary papers, reflection papers, and evidence documents.

The California State Accreditation team has examined portfolios in the Reading Specialist Program in the Multiple Subject Credential. These portfolios reflect state and national standards and were seen as exemplary.

The candidates in the integrated program are developing electronic portfolios that incorporate reflection and evidence of candidate performance. All multiple subject program candidates must complete a self-assessment portfolio evaluated by supervisors based on criteria established by faculty. Candidates in the Special Education departments developed a portfolio evaluated by the supervisor or the program coordinator using criteria and the rubric developed by the faculty. Candidates in Educational Administration produced a portfolio based on specific guidelines, evaluated with the rubric, and supported with an oral defense. A summary reflection on the whole program experience must be included in the portfolio.

Use of Data for Program Improvement

Program assessment is ongoing and is embedded in the unit and department assessments. Candidates evaluate courses each semester either with the Student Observation of Teacher Effectiveness (SOTE) or the Student Observation of Laboratory and Training Experience (SOLATE). This information on coursework and on the instructor's effectiveness is collated and analyzed at the University level.

Trend data in surveys from candidates have led to changes in programs. Specific examples of changes driven by assessment included the merger of classes 262 and the 225 to avoid redundancy of curriculum at the credential level and to introduce of the portfolio expectations earlier in the program.

A revision of the Single Subject Phase I and II student teaching assessment instruments was in response to feedback from field supervisors and candidates. The new instrument now reflects the skills and dispositions in a two-part continuum rather than one final assessment.

Analysis of dossiers of faculty seeking promotion and tenure by the College Personnel Committee suggested inequities in mentoring and development. The Committee recommended that the Dean consider strategies to provide mentoring to all those faculty members. The Dean, in

consultation with the council of chairs, created and advertised a half-time position for professional development. Dossiers submitted for the current cycle appear to be more carefully prepared and complete. The department chairs and the dean, in accordance with the negotiated agreement, address concerns arising about specific instructors or personnel.

Because of identified need, workshops have been held for field supervisors to address rating classroom performance. Some departments are working toward developing common rubrics and other ways to enhance reliability.

Summary

The use of departmentalized assessments in the place of an overall Unit assessment plan allows for a wide variation of program expectations. This is shown in the lack of consistent evaluation of portfolios, advisement of candidates, and the implementation of the NCATE plan.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Met

D. Areas for Improvement:

Revised Areas for Improvement

The unit neither systematically monitors nor consistently assesses the program of its candidates.

The unit does not have a unified, consistent assessment system. (I & A)

Rationale: *Although departments have assessment systems, there is no Unit assessment system in place.*

New Areas for Improvement

Some programs that use portfolio assessment do not provide adequate feedback. (I&A)

Rationale: *Some candidates report that portfolios were not assessed. Programs use portfolios for varying reasons and require varying levels of expertise. Lack of a unit assessment plan allows for a wide range of proficiency being acceptable.*

Continued Areas for Improvement

Quality of advisement is inadequate in some programs.

Rationale: *Single subject advisement is not consistent across the Department of Education and the content area departments.*

E. State Team Decision: Met

STANDARD 3 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

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

A. Level: (Initial and Advanced)

B. Findings:

Field Experiences conducted by the Unit are designed, conducted, and evaluated in accordance with state standards and credentialing criteria. These experiences enable candidates for teacher credentialing to develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners

San Jose State University shares and integrates resources and expertise to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice. In California, credentialing of teachers often coincides with a working contract for the intern. The term intern refers to a candidate who is contracting with a school district as a full-time teacher, and is working on credentialing through SJSU. A student teacher refers to a candidate who has chosen the more traditional route to credentialing and is completing field experiences while still attending courses offered by the Unit. In some school districts "cooperating teacher" is used to refer to the classroom teacher with whom the student teacher is working with or to the teacher who is coaching/mentoring an intern. "Faculty Associate" is used by other districts to refer to the person working in the same capacity.

Because the need in California for teachers is so great, many interns are working full-time in classrooms and working on credentialing requirements at the same time. This unique situation requires the Unit and the partnering school districts to work closely together. Many programs have been co-designed by the partnering districts and the Unit so that candidates can work in a classroom and on credentialing at the same time. The candidates are contracted by the school district, and then accepted by the university. Other candidates for credentialing are on emergency permits which are temporary and last for one year, but can be renewed for up to five years. These candidates have not yet demonstrated subject matter competency and are concurrently working on these requirements while on contract with a district. All persons interviewed spoke of the challenges California is facing with its shortage of teachers. They feel they have no control over this and in the ways described above, are continuing to try to meet the demands placed upon them.

The Unit and its school partners jointly determine field placements for candidates. A candidate chooses which geographical area he/she would like to conduct field experience in. The university supervisor covering that geographical area then finds a classroom teacher at a school in that area that meets the needs of the candidate and also meets the criteria set by the Unit for field experiences. The candidate is then placed by the supervisor. If an intern is hired by a school district, then the university will work with the intern and place the candidate in a credentialing program.

Evaluation of student teachers and interns is also a partnership with candidates receiving feedback both verbally and in writing by the university supervisors and cooperating teachers. Formal evaluations are done, copies of which are shared with the candidate and placed in permanent files. Informal assessment occurs on a daily basis in early field experiences and on a weekly or biweekly basis for candidates further into their field experiences. All candidates interviewed believed the feedback they are receiving is meaningful and helps them develop their knowledge, skills and dispositions.

The Unit is involved in several partnerships with districts and businesses in the community. *It Takes A Valley Service Learning Clinical Practicum for Students in High Needs Schools* is a program which uses experiential learning to expand the skills and knowledge of interns at high needs schools. This is a four semester, three setting internship. The interns begin their internship in the schools. They then spend a block of time working with a business which is technology oriented. Finally, the intern goes to Family Services and works here for a block of time before returning to the classroom to resume the teaching internship. At Family Services the interns how the social work system helps families and about the services which are available to families. This program gives interns the needed skills to work with the family populations as well as the students they teach. It also advances their technology skills which they pass on to the students they are teaching.

The Bay Tech Technology in Teacher Education Consortium is a school–university based business partnership to provide support for innovative improvements in teacher education aimed at helping tomorrow’s teachers to be technologically proficient.

The Gear Up partnership with San Jose Unified School District prepares disadvantaged middle school students to go to college. The Fulbright-Hayes Visiting Scholars program allows the Unit to work on cultural infusion and differences.

The Unit has a Community Advisory Committee which brings unit personnel together with those who have a stake in educating the students in the area. Discussions and program development are the focus of this unit community partnership. In addition, each department has its own advisory board.

Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

There are 13 initial and 18 advanced programs offered through San Jose State University’s College of Education. The Unit offers one program through which both a Bachelor of Arts degree and a Multiple Subject credential can be earned. All remaining credential programs are offered at the post baccalaureate level. All of these post-baccalaureate programs have field experiences embedded in the curriculum, but the amount of time spent at field sites, and the type of experience for each is very different. At this time, there is no culminating field experience in the undergraduate degree program, but 50 hours of time spent in schools is required at the undergraduate level. This requirement can be fulfilled by volunteering in a school, working as an instructional aide, a substitute teacher, lunchroom helper, etc. Plans are being made to begin some earlier field experiences.

Field Experiences conducted by the Unit are designed, conducted, and evaluated in accordance with state standards and credentialing criteria. These experiences enable candidates for teacher

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

Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners

San Jose State University shares and integrates resources and expertise to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice. In California, credentialing of teachers often coincides with a working contract for the intern. The term intern refers to a candidate who is contracting with a school district as a full-time teacher, and is working on credentialing through SJSU. A student teacher refers to a candidate who has chosen the more traditional route to credentialing and is completing field experiences while still attending courses offered by the Unit. In some school districts "cooperating teacher" is used to refer to the classroom teacher with whom the student teacher is working with or to the teacher who is coaching/mentoring an intern. "Faculty Associate" is used by other districts to refer to the person working in the same capacity.

Because the need in California for teachers is so great, many interns are working full-time in classrooms and working on credentialing requirements at the same time. This unique situation requires the Unit and the partnering school districts to work closely together. Many programs have been co-designed by the partnering districts and the Unit so that candidates can work in a classroom and on credentialing at the same time. The candidates are contracted by the school district, and then accepted by the university. Other candidates for credentialing are on emergency permits which are temporary and last for one year, but can be renewed for up to five years. These candidates have not yet demonstrated subject matter competency and are concurrently working on these requirements while on contract with a district. All persons interviewed spoke of the challenges California is facing with its shortage of teachers. They feel they have no control over this and in the ways described above, are continuing to try to meet the demands placed upon them.

The Unit and its school partners jointly determine field placements for candidates. A candidate chooses which geographical area he/she would like to conduct field experience in. The university supervisor covering that geographical area then finds a classroom teacher at a school in that area that meets the needs of the candidate and also meets the criteria set by the Unit for field experiences. The candidate is then placed by the supervisor. If an intern is hired by a school district, then the university will work with the intern and place the candidate in a credentialing program.

Evaluation of student teachers and interns is also a partnership with candidates receiving feedback both verbally and in writing by the university supervisors and cooperating teachers. Formal evaluations are done, copies of which are shared with the candidate and placed in permanent files. Informal assessment occurs on a daily basis in early field experiences and on a weekly or biweekly basis for candidates further into their field experiences. All candidates interviewed believed the feedback they are receiving is meaningful and helps them develop their knowledge, skills and dispositions.

The Unit is involved in several partnerships with districts and businesses in the community. *It Takes A Valley Service Learning Clinical Practicum for Students in High Needs Schools* is a program which uses experiential learning to expand the skills and knowledge of interns at high needs schools. This is a four semester, three setting internship. The interns begin their

internship in the schools. They then spend a block of time working with a business which is technology oriented. Finally, the intern goes to Family Services and works here for a block of time before returning to the classroom to resume the teaching internship. At Family Services the interns how the social work system helps families and about the services which are available to families. This program gives interns the needed skills to work with the family populations as well as the students they teach. It also advances their technology skills which they pass on to the students they are teaching.

The Bay Tech Technology in Teacher Education Consortium is a school–university based business partnership to provide support for innovative improvements in teacher education aimed at helping tomorrow’s teachers to be technologically proficient.

The Gear Up partnership with San Jose Unified School District prepares disadvantaged middle school students to go to college. The Fulbright-Hayes Visiting Scholars program allows the Unit to work on cultural infusion and differences.

The Unit has a Community Advisory Committee which brings unit personnel together with those who have a stake in educating the students in the area. Discussions and program development are the focus of this unit community partnership. In addition, each department has its own advisory board.

Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

There are 13 initial and 18 advanced programs offered through San Jose State University’s College of Education. The Unit offers one program through which both a Bachelor of Arts degree and a Multiple Subject credential can be earned. All remaining credential programs are offered at the post baccalaureate level. All of these post-baccalaureate programs have field experiences embedded in the curriculum, but the amount of time spent at field sites, and the type of experience for each is very different. At this time, there is no culminating field experience in the undergraduate degree program, but 50 hours of time spent in schools is required at the undergraduate level. This requirement can be fulfilled by volunteering in a school, working as an instructional aide, a substitute teacher, lunchroom helper, etc. Plans are being made to begin some earlier field experiences.

The chart below outlines field experiences for the various program within the Unit.

| <u>Program/Course</u> | <u>Unit Supervision</u> | <u>Student Hours on Site</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| <u>Elementary Education</u> | | |
| Orientation to Student Teaching | Weekly | 6-18 per week* |
| Student Teaching | Weekly | 12-30 per week |
| <u>Secondary Education</u> | | |
| Orientation to Student Teaching | Two | 25-30 hours |
| Student Teaching | Weekly/Biweekly | 200-375 hours per semester |
| <u>Counselor Education</u> | | |
| Supervised Experience in Counseling | One | 150 hours |

Mild Moderate

| | | |
|----------------------|-----|-----------------|
| Directed Teaching I | Six | 5 days per week |
| Directed Teaching II | Six | 5 days per week |

Moderate Severe

| | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-----------------|
| Observation/Practicum | 4-6 | 5 days per week |
| Student Teaching | 4-6 | 5 days per week |

Early Childhood Special Ed

| | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----------|
| Practicum and Student Teaching | 5-7 | 300 hours |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----------|

Deaf and Hard of Hearing

| | | |
|---------------------------|--------|-----------------|
| Observation and Practicum | three | 60 hours |
| Student Teaching | Weekly | 5 days per week |

Communicative Disorders and Sciences

| | | |
|---------------------------|-------|-----------------|
| Observation and Practicum | three | 5 days per week |
|---------------------------|-------|-----------------|

Education Administration and Higher Education

| | | |
|-------------------------|-------|----------------------|
| Advanced Fieldwork | | |
| Peer Coaching/Mentoring | three | 30-60 hours per week |
| Fieldwork in Higher Ed | 3-5 | 5 days per week |
| Field Experiences | three | 5 days per week |

School of Social Work

| | | |
|---------------|-----|-----------------|
| Fieldwork 232 | Two | 3 days per week |
| Fieldwork 233 | Two | 3 days per week |

Library Media Teacher

| | | |
|---------------|-----|----|
| Fieldwork 295 | One | 90 |
|---------------|-----|----|

Health Services School Nurse

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|---|
| Fieldwork 230B | One or more if needed | 225 hours total including seminars |
| Fieldwork 248 | One | 45 hours with MD or nurse practitioners |
| Fieldwork 238 | One or more if needed | 225 hours including seminars |

*Hours are given in a range depending upon how many units the student is taking that semester.

San Jose State University candidates have several options available to them to become credentialed teachers in the State of California. Teacher candidates in elementary education, known as a Multiple Subject credential in California, can go the traditional route to becoming credentialed earning a baccalaureate degree, or candidates can receive a baccalaureate degree and go through the post-baccalaureate credentialing courses and field experiences to become a teacher. There are several choices in credentialing programs at the Multiple Subjects level. At the secondary level, known as a Single Subject credential, students must receive a baccalaureate

degree and can then enter one of several programs available for teachers. In these candidates seek either the credential or a master's degree.

Since 1960, teacher candidates in California, do not receive majors in education, rather they major in an academic area and then take a fifth year of credentialing courses to become certified teachers. Until recently, early field experiences were not allowed in the State of California. However, this is changing and by 2004 the Multiple Subject credential will begin field experiences at the undergraduate level. By 2005, these changes will also be made in the Single Subject Credential program at SJSU. The undergraduate studies department and the Unit have this plan in hand and are very excited about infusing field experiences into its undergraduate courses. Many proposals for course changes and new courses have been made by the department. The undergraduate studies department states they have a very strong working relationship with the unit. They believe the students they prepare to become teachers are some of the best quality students on campus.

At the Multiple Subjects level, students can chose to be involved in the TE Collaborative 20% Internship Program. This program was designed by two local elementary school districts and the Unit. In the first year of the program, candidates are contacted by the school district for 20 percent of the pay of a beginning teacher. The Unit accepts the candidates which the district contracts with for this program if they meet the admission requirement set by the University and the Unit. The candidate works in the classroom side by side with a Faculty Associate three days a week and attends classes and university seminar on the other two days of the week. During the second year of the program the candidate is coached by a district Faculty Associate and a University Supervisor while working full-time in a classroom under contract by the district. This year counts as a year of tenure for the candidate. During the third year of the program, the candidate is coached by a district support provider under the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program. According to district superintendents and human resource personnel, they are getting exactly the kinds of teachers they want working with the students in their districts through this program. The candidates interviewed in this program felt very strongly that this experience has prepared them for the intense and diverse climate which exists in California schools. Principals and Faculty Associates who were also interviewed stated that this program has produced some very strong teachers, the best they could hire. All candidates in this program are admitted by the Unit and then interviewed and contracted with by the district. Candidates receive feedback on a daily basis from their Faculty Associates, university supervisors and/or peers at the beginning of the field experience. They also receive written and oral feedback from the University Supervisor who visits the candidate several times throughout each semester during the first two years. The observations gradually decrease over time, but all interns in this program believe the support of the district and the Unit to be outstanding.

Data gathered by the Unit on candidates consist of candidate work evidence, videotaped lessons with analyses, scripted lesson plans with analyses, and observational data gathered by Faculty Associates, university instructors, and site administrators. Candidates state that the focus group discussions, which are a part of this program, are of great benefit to them. Here feedback is given and concerns and questions can be worked out. Interns are assessed using both formative and summative evaluations. They keep a reflective log of what is working, what the next steps are, etc. The interns respond to the program with a mid-year survey and an end of the year survey. The Faculty Associates also fill out these two surveys which are then used by the Unit to improve programming.

Candidates keep a portfolio of their experiences for this internship. A list of required elements is given to them at the beginning of the program and they are required to meet a very strict time line in this program. Although most candidates report an informed feedback process, some candidates stated that they turned in their portfolios, but, did not receive any written or verbal feedback on the portfolio.

An advantage to this program as seen by many students is that most of their coursework for credentialing is on the school site. There are seminars which they attend at the university campus also. Another advantage of this program as seen by the students, Faculty Associates, Principals and Superintendents is that the candidate is a part of the classroom from the first day of school, until the last day of school. The candidate is required to help the classroom teacher get the classroom ready for the year and is there the first day of school to be introduced to the students and parents as a co-teacher. All state that parents and children view the candidate as another teacher in the classroom. Both the Unit and the district share responsibility for development and implementation of this program. They also share accountability for the program results.

Another available option for Multiple Subjects credentialing is the Integrated Degree Credential Program. This program takes a traditional approach in that candidates take their coursework at the university during the day and then do a block of student teaching towards the end of the program. In this program field experience is done the last two semesters of the program. The candidates gradually work into the classroom environment, observing, helping out and then teaching a few lessons. Toward the end of the first coaching cycle, as these blocks are called, the candidate takes over some of the responsibilities in teaching lessons. Detailed lesson plans are developed and followed by the student teachers. They receive a great deal of written and verbal feedback from their cooperating teachers as well as from university supervisors. There is a close link between university course work and fieldwork. Candidates in this program student teach in two different grade areas. They are required to work in two areas choosing from K-3, 3-5 and 6-8 grade levels. They must also be placed in a “hard to staff” school and/or a school with English learners. This program aligns the pre-service program, preparation, teaching, performance standards and assessment practices with districts’ beginning support system and vision.

Candidates interviewed in both of these Multiple Subject programs understood and articulated what the phrase *Equity and Excellence* meant to them. This phrase is the one used by the Unit to connect its conceptual framework to all entities of programming. Students gave very powerful statements about equity and working with all students in the classroom. Cooperating teachers also reinforced the fact that the interns and student teachers have a very strong knowledge of *Equity and Excellence* and teach them new ways to infuse this in their classrooms on a regular basis.

There are also several program options at the Single Subject level of credentialing. In the Single Subject intern program, students work as a cohort for two years towards a credential. These candidates are certified subject matter competent and have obtained a paid teaching position in the cooperating district. They have a coach and a monthly cohort group. These students keep collaborative assessment logs and receive feedback from each other, their support partners and university supervisors.

An interesting partnership exists with a very large public high school in the area. At Independence High School in San Jose, approximately 30 single subject interns attend Unit driven classes on the high school campus and then go into the many classrooms to do their fieldwork. This high school has a diverse population, a wide variety of courses, uses the progressive approach and says that it gives interns extreme experiences in working with high school students. There are approximately 4000 students at this high school and the school is divided into four smaller "Villas." This high school has a teacher preparation academy for high school students who wish to be teachers. The principal of this school told accreditation reviewers that she has students who speak no English, students who are moderately to severely disabled, students who are off to Harvard and Yale, and students from many ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds. In walking around the campus, this was very evident. The principal stated that approximately 35 percent of the students are English Language Learners and 70 percent come from homes where English is a second language. She stated that the school has a population that is approximately 35 percent Asian population, 30 percent Hispanic, 19 percent Filipino, 10 percent white, 6 percent African American population.

During the first phase of internship, the candidates, university supervisors and principals meet each Friday for training. The principal stated this training was hands on and practical. Monday through Thursday, the students' coursework focuses on theory. The students observe for 4-5 weeks and then gradually move into more responsibilities in the classroom.

The interns in this program report that their coursework is very relevant and is preparing them for their student teaching experience. Many candidates have had very positive things to say about their psychology course and their methods courses which prepare them to teach their content areas. The candidates observe in many classrooms and decide where they would like to do the first portion of their internship. They are then placed by the department heads in these classrooms or counseled to teach in classrooms where exemplary teaching and varied experiences will be obtained. The second block of internship for these candidates is usually done at another high school, but the principal stated she hires many of these candidates at her high school when they have completed their internships. She likes this program because she said she can hire "the cream of the crop" and has access to teachers whose abilities she is familiar with.

The candidates interviewed at this program felt that the experience they are getting in this program is superior to that which some of their peers are receiving through a more traditional program. These candidates have access to many courses and teachers and can walk into a classroom on Independence campus anytime and are welcomed. They feel that they are learning the culture of the school and learning the inner workings prior to the time when they will be working in this environment.

In the internship at Independence High School, the candidates gradually work into the classroom environment and eventually take over the teaching duties for that subject. Cooperating Teachers state that these candidates are very well prepared in their content areas as well as their classroom management and other dispositions. Cooperating teachers at this site state that there is no training given by the unit for working with candidates. They are given a handbook, and sometimes meetings are called, but many of them cannot attend and do not receive a lot of support from the unit.

Single subject candidates can also receive their credentials in the APEX program. This Accelerated Professional Education for Excellence program allows full interns to work on contract during the day and coursework is taken at night on campus. This is an intense program, and coursework is completed in two semesters, along with some work done in the summer (14 months). This program relies heavily on district partnerships utilizing on-site mentors provided by the district. Some coursework is done on site and distance learning is also used. Unit faculty and Faculty Associates work closely with interns in this program

All Single Subject interns and student teaching programs use a wide variety of assessments such as observations, lesson planning with modifications for diverse student populations, video taped lessons with analyses, portfolios, collaborative logs, summative and formative evaluations, student work samples and analyses. The experiences cover a wide range of teaching experiences and develop the content, profession and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions delineated in the standards. Self-assessment is also implemented in internships and student teaching experiences. Candidates are asked attend a school board meeting, and participate in other professional development opportunities as well as conduct parent teacher conferences.

Technology use and skills to use it with student populations is a strength of the Unit. All students are required to use technology in course work and are prepared to use it in the school settings. Students are prepared to teach Excel, Word and Power Point to students in the elementary grades. Technology ties are used in lesson plans prepared by the candidates.

Advanced programs also incorporate adequate field experiences into their programs. Because these school leaders are contracted, field experiences have been developed to help them attain the skills and dispositions they need for advanced work and remain working full time as well. Throughout the classes, the advanced candidates do collegial sharing, shadowing, and coaching with peers. Advanced candidates work on a professional development plan, and keep a portfolio of research and experiences. Advanced candidates are required to attend graduate seminars and participate in large and small group activities and are to complete reading and writing assignments.

Criteria for clinical faculty are clear and known to all involved parties. The Unit has an application process whereby teachers in the field can apply to have interns and student teachers in their classrooms. Cooperating teachers must have taught for three years and must be working in their credentialing areas. However, principals have a great deal of influence in where candidates will intern and student teach. All principals interviewed stated that they allow only those teachers with exemplary teaching skills and dispositions to work with candidates. Clinical faculty provide regular and continuing support for student teachers and interns as acknowledged by cooperating teachers and candidates. This is a strength for the Unit.

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

Entry and exit criteria exist for candidates in clinical practice at both the initial and advanced levels. Formative and summative evaluations done by cooperating teachers and university supervisors, are all based on the state competencies and institutional standards. Numerous and varied assessments are completed by unit supervisors and Faculty Associates/Cooperating Teachers.

Multiple assessment strategies are used to evaluate candidate performance and effect on student learning. Students across programs are required to keep collaborative logs, do video lessons and critiques, keep portfolios, keep reflective logs and student work samples. Candidates are required to address lesson modifications in all lesson plans. Candidates, university supervisors, cooperating teachers and sometimes principals fill out competency forms on candidates and then use these for assessment. Candidates are required to do observations and reflect on these observations. Candidates keep weekly collaborative journals in which they address what is working, current focus, next steps and who will provide support. Students also rate programs, university instructors and supervisors, and course work using course effectiveness surveys.

Some of the assessment tools used to evaluate these candidates include formative and summative evaluations, transparency presentations, electronic journals, continuum of skills and dispositions, mini lesson presentations, best practice classroom management plan, portfolio which reflects on experience, and observations with verbal and written feedback. Evaluations are based on California Standards for the Teaching Profession.

Candidates interviewed stated that adequate time was allowed for reflection and assessment of performance. They receive feedback from peers, unit supervisors, and field teachers. Candidates believe that this is a strength in their programs and believe that they learn a great deal about themselves as teachers from this process.

Field Experiences are a strength for the Unit across programs. Field Experiences prepare candidates to work with a wide variety of students and in a wide variety of setting. Candidates are ready to teach in California's public and private schools when they complete this program. Candidates exhibit and demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Met

D. Areas for Improvement: None

E. State Team Recommendation: Met

STANDARD 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 Advanced)

B. Findings:

Commitment to the value of diversity is a major underlying theme which underscores all programs at both the initial and advanced levels in the College of Education at San Jose State University. The ethnic and cultural diversity of the COE faculty, combined with the diverse student population at the University and in the College of Education facilitate the implementation of a comprehensive program that infuses diversity throughout.

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

In keeping with its theme, *Equity and Excellence*, the mission of the College of Education is to prepare educators who have the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions to ensure that all K-12 students have access to a high quality education based on fairness and respect for all forms of diversity. The College defines “all students” as “students who vary according to: (1) cultural identity, (2) ability levels, (3) family income status, (4) first language status, (5) gender, and (6) sexual orientation. All programs, at both the initial and advanced levels, demonstrate the College’s commitment to preparing teachers and other school personnel who are able to recognize and overcome the barriers that exist in our society that prevent all students from accessing a quality education. Each credential program has at least one course with an explicit component designed to address the needs of diverse student populations.

The curriculum, field experiences, and clinical practice required at the initial and advanced programs designed to help candidates understand the importance of diversity in teaching and learning; and allow candidates ample opportunity to plan, develop, teach, and assess lessons that incorporate diversity, and to reflect on their own teaching competence and ability to develop a classroom and school climate that values diversity. Candidates at all levels also are expected to demonstrate dispositions which are consistent with ensuring “equity and excellence for all students in a culturally diverse, technologically complex, global community.”

All programs require that candidates complete a variety of assignments to demonstrate their ability to help all students learn. For example, in ChAD 122, *Learning and Adaptation in the Classroom*, candidates observe, discuss and collect assessment data on one English learner and one mainstreamed special needs student to determine the linguistic, academic and social challenges that the students confront, and to deliver appropriate interventions to ensure that the students learn. In EDEL 103, *Foundations of Socio-Multicultural Education*, candidates select a school in an urban setting, observe and interview two students whose backgrounds are different from their own, and submit a reflective analysis of their findings, including ideas and insights describing how their inquiry impacts their teaching ability. In Science Education 173, *Science Methods for Secondary Teachers*, candidates create a teaching unit with five different lesson plans that incorporate teaching strategies to address the needs of English learners. All student

teaching courses are designed to respond to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, which require candidates to build on students' prior knowledge, life experience and interests, use a variety of instructional strategies and resources to respond to students' diverse needs, actively engage all students, and create access to curricula for all students in learning environments that are safe and facilitative. Further, College of Education faculty use a variety of assessments (including videotapes of performance, peer assessments, self assessments, portfolio assessments, and faculty observations) to determine each candidate's success at meeting the needs of diverse learners and to give feedback to the candidates so that they might improve their practice. Cooperating teachers and faculty supervisors indicate that COE candidates are well prepared to facilitate the learning of all students.

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

There are 192 tenured, tenure-track, and temporary faculty employed in the College of Education. Sixty-six percent (66 percent) of the total faculty are white and 34 percent are non-white. Forty-two percent (42 percent) of the tenure/tenure track faculty and 25 percent of the temporary faculty are proficient speakers of either Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, or Tagalog, all widely represented languages in the COE service area. Candidates in all programs have the opportunity to study with diverse faculty in the College of Education; however, 91 percent of the off-campus and temporary faculty assigned to the Education Administration program are Caucasian.

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Enrollment in the College of Education reflects the prevailing ethnic population of the surrounding service area. 2001 Enrollment Data provided by the unit show the 2001 teacher education candidate enrollment to have been at 2696 candidates. Of this total, 80 percent were female and 19 percent were male. African Americans made up 3 percent, Hispanic 16 percent, Asian 12 percent, American Indian and Eskimo less than 1 percent, Filipino 3 percent, and Pacific Islander less than 1 percent of this total enrollment. According to the data provided 36 percent of the teacher education student population was minority, while 50 percent were white.

All candidates interviewed reported working with diverse peers. A diverse group of candidates, faculty, supervisors, cooperating teachers and administrators were available for interview during school site visits, university classes and other interviews. Candidates indicate that they work with other candidates from a variety of racial, gender, language, and socioeconomic groups in their courses and in their field experiences.

Candidates of many different backgrounds stated that they have always felt that their ideas and active participation in all areas of their work in the College of Education have been valued and validated. The candidates feel that their backgrounds have never been an issue and they feel that all candidates are treated fairly in courses and by College of Education faculty.

Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

Placement of candidates in area schools ensure that candidates have an opportunity to interact with diverse P-12 students. All public schools in the area and those partnering with San Jose State University have student populations which are diverse racially, culturally, and socioeconomically. Some of these schools are entirely English Language Learners, and some

schools have lower or higher socioeconomic populations than others, but other types of diversity do exist in these schools. All schools in California have inclusion programs for special education and children with exceptionalities are mainstreamed into the regular school environment.

The College of Education placed candidates in 22 schools in the fall semester of 2002. The ethnic composition of the student populations of these 22 schools was diverse with respect to ethnicity. The average percent of white students in these schools was 36 percent; of Hispanic students was 30 percent; of Asian students was 23 percent; and of black students was 3.5 percent. The median percent of white students in these 22 schools was 38 percent; the median percent of Hispanic students was 23 percent; the median percent Asian students was 20 percent and the median percent of black students was 4 percent.

Internships take place in school settings where an intern is already working. If a student is contracted in a school which the Unit deems to be not diverse, the intern is required to do observations or tours in five other schools which do have diverse population. These interns are given release time by their contracted school districts to make these observations and tours. Interns who are contracted with private schools, are allowed to continue the credentialing process through San Jose State University only if the school has a diverse population and is accredited. Otherwise all internships and student teaching experiences are done in public elementary, middle and secondary schools.

Student teachers are placed in two different field settings for their field experience. The Unit maintains a data base of field experiences fulfilled by the interns and student teachers. Student Teachers are placed in field experiences by the Office of Field Experiences and the Unit supervisor. Students can make requests for a geographical area and are then assigned to a supervisor for that geographical area. The supervisor finds a placement which they feel will be a good match for both the school and the student teachers and places the student. If a student teacher is placed in a school which is not multiculturally and/or linguistically diverse, the student teacher will be moved to a more diverse setting for his/her second student teaching experience.

Interns interviewed described their schools and classrooms as being very diverse in gender, exceptionalities, socioeconomic status and ethnicity. They believe their coursework and the support given by the school, district and by the Unit has prepared them to work with diverse populations. Faculty Associates and Cooperating Teachers state their interns and student teachers have a good knowledge base and good skills and dispositions to work with the diverse populations in the schools. They believe these interns and student teachers are much better prepared for today's diverse classrooms than they were when they were beginning teachers. They state they learn a great deal about equity in the classroom from their interns and student teachers.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Met

D. Areas for Improvement

The off-campus and temporary faculty in the Education Administration program do not reflect the ethnic diversity of the population in the service area of the College of Education.

Rationale: Ninety-one percent (91 percent) of the off-campus and temporary faculty assigned to the Education Administration program are Caucasian.

E. State Team Decision: Met

STANDARD 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:

The faculty in the College of Education are well qualified for their assignments. A majority of the tenure-track and temporary faculty are recognized as good teachers, involved scholars, collaborators with school personnel and community stakeholders, and professionals who give service to their university and larger service area.

Faculty and Faculty Qualifications

Faculty in the SJSU College of Education are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching. All sixty-six of the full-time tenure-track faculty have earned doctorates as well as exceptional expertise that qualifies them for their assignments. Of the 126 temporary faculty who teach one or two courses or supervise students in field settings, forty (32 percent) have earned doctorates and the remainder have the Masters degree as well as exceptional expertise in the areas to which they are assigned. Of the tenure-track faculty, 94 percent of the Elementary Education faculty, 79 percent of the Secondary Education faculty, 90 percent of the Special Education faculty, and 100 percent of the Education Administration faculty have contemporary professional experiences in K-12 school settings. Of the temporary faculty, 100 percent of the Elementary Education faculty, 100 percent of the Secondary Education faculty, 89 percent of the Special Education faculty, and 100 percent of the Education Administration faculty have contemporary professional experiences in K-12 settings. University policy allows for temporary faculty to teach a full load, however, this is seldom the case as temporary faculty usually teach only one or two courses. The number of part-time faculty headcount is over 100, but in terms of full-time equivalency, this number is closer to twenty. During the fall 2002 semester, only three temporary faculty in the College of Education held a full-time load.

The College of Education temporary faculty have exceptional expertise in their areas of assignment. For example, several have served as district superintendents, county superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, teachers, and directors of school reform initiatives and human resources. At the beginning of their affiliation with the College of Education, tenure-track and temporary faculty at both the initial and advanced levels participate in COE and university orientation programs to ensure that they are well informed about the

unit's conceptual framework and the expectations regarding their employment at the university. Tenure-track faculty participate in a mentoring program to facilitate their success in achieving tenure. Temporary faculty are involved in faculty retreats, policy deliberations, and are expected to be involved in the life of their respective programs. Temporary and tenure-track faculty at both levels have extensive K-12 school experience, serve on the committees and boards of local, state, and national professional education associations, and have earned the respect and admiration of their school and community constituents as a result of their professionalism, knowledge, and expertise, their success at preparing competent teachers and school administrators, and their willingness to serve the educational needs of the county, state, and nation.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Faculty in the College of Education are recognized for their excellence in teaching and are rated very highly on the University's Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) survey. Candidates indicate that COE teachers are very knowledgeable in their assigned areas, are leaders in school reform initiatives, model best practices in teaching by using collaborative teams, infusing technology across the curriculum, employing action research, data analysis, inquiry and reflection, problem solving, authentic assessment, and other methods and techniques that are presented in the literature on good teaching. COE faculty indicated on a Fall 2002 Faculty Survey on scholarship and teaching pedagogy that they use a variety of pedagogical techniques and assessment strategies to ensure the success of their students. Candidates and school-based educators strongly concur and recognize COE faculty as teachers and scholars who are very committed to achieving equity and excellence for all learners.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

COE faculty demonstrate scholarly work in their fields of specialization and are especially productive in research publications and presentations that are consistent with the conceptual framework and its focus on equity and excellence. Seventy-eight percent of the tenure-track faculty have published in refereed journals and 86 percent have presented their research at professional conferences in the last five years. Thirty-one percent (31 percent) of the temporary faculty have published and 82 percent have presented at professional conferences. Both tenure-track and temporary faculty have published and presented in the areas of equity (access and diversity) and excellence (instruction/assessment/ curriculum/best practices in instruction). In 2000, a team of senior faculty developed a document to spearhead an initiative designed to broaden the definition of scholarship in order to include more recognition for the worth and value of the partnerships and collaborations around action research that faculty and candidates conduct in the schools.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Faculty in the College of Education provide service to the college, university, and larger community in several ways that are consistent with the mission of the COE to pursue *equity and excellence* in education. Within the University, faculty participate in committee service at the department, college, and university levels, faculty governance, assist in unit and campus-wide student activities, and assume a variety of university assignments. Sixty percent (60 percent) of the tenure-track faculty have been elected to leadership positions on university committees. A COE faculty member is the outgoing director of the University's Center for Faculty Development and Support, completing several years of service in this important university-wide capacity. Sixty-three percent (63 percent) have served on boards and committees in the local

community. Sixty-four percent (64 percent) of the faculty have been elected by their peers to serve in leadership positions in state, national, and international professional organizations. The Teacher Recruitment Project is an example of a COE initiative that has provided long-term assistance for paraeducators who are culturally, ethnically, and linguistically underrepresented in the teaching profession and who wish to become credentialed teachers. By awarding financial and academic support to low-income paraeducators (who are mostly bilingual, female, age 35-50 with families), the COE has increased the pool of qualified teachers for the Santa Clara County community and beyond.

Collaboration

The faculty of the College of Education have extensive service and involvement in the public schools of the greater Santa Clara County area. The COE has established innovative partnerships with schools and communities to enhance the quality of K-18 education. A few examples of the extensive and successful collaborations between the College of Education and larger community which the university serves include: the “Technology to Teaching” project, a partnership with Workforce Investment Boards, Teacher Recruitment Centers, and the Department of Secondary Education, supports career “retraining” for people leaving a career in technology to become teachers. The Department of Counselor Education was awarded several GEAR UP grants from the U.S. Department of Education (over \$10 million across five years) to provide counseling and academic support services to low-income students to enable them to prepare for a college education. The Department of Special Education developed a Collaborative Intern Credential-Mild/Moderate Disabilities with eight school districts for which the courses are planned collaboratively and team-taught through release days at school sites and online. The SJSU LEAD Center is the newest of 19 regional centers of the Coalition of Essential Schools, established to support local high schools as they work to maximize learning for all of their students. The Bay Area Technology in Teacher Education consortium (BayTech) is a university, school, and business partnership supported by a federal grant to promote the innovative use of technology in teacher preparation. The Accelerated Professional Education for Excellence (APEX) project, serving 72 students in 25 schools throughout four counties, enables those who are teaching with emergency permits to earn teaching credentials in twelve to fourteen months by working around teachers’ schedules and time constraints. The It Takes a Valley project prepares teachers to be successful in high-need schools and the Teach for Tomorrow project works through a consortium including San Jose State, CSU-Monterey Bay and ten local community colleges, to recruit teachers and facilitate their transfer from community colleges to four-year undergraduate and credential programs.

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

The COE conducts systematic and comprehensive evaluations of faculty teaching performance as specified in the terms of the Agreement between the California State University and the California Faculty Association. The office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs has oversight of the faculty evaluation process. Performance reviews are conducted annually following the first year of the tenure-track appointment and require detailed reporting of faculty performance using a standard SJSU Personnel Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) dossier format that includes explicit and specific documentation of activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The faculty member submits a less extensive documentation during the first, third, and fifth years of service and a much more extensive documentation of activities and accomplishments during the second, fourth, and sixth years of service. At the time the faculty person is under consideration for tenure, his or her dossier is

examined by the appropriate Department Review Committee, the Department Chair, the College of Education Review Committee, the Dean of the College of Education, the University Personnel Committee, the Provost, and finally the President of the University who has final authority regarding tenure. Decisions regarding promotion involve the same committees and administrators, with the exception of the University Personnel Committee, which is not involved with the promotion process. Temporary faculty in the College of Education are evaluated annually, using student evaluations and involving peer, committee, and administrative review. Tenured faculty are evaluated at least once every five years.

Under the agreements reached by the CSU Board of Trustees and the California Faculty Association, tenured and tenure-track professors must be evaluated by students in at least two classes each year using the Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) instrument. In addition to the SOTE, evaluation of tenure-track faculty also includes peer review in the form of classroom visits by faculty colleagues to observe instructional practices. The observer uses an observation instrument, and the results are submitted to the faculty member and the department chair.

Temporary faculty are evaluated each year using the SOTE in a minimum of one course each semester and a written account of professional activities. The program coordinator and/or department chair evaluates these materials, together with course syllabi and peer observations. Decisions to rehire non-tenure-track faculty are made by the department chair based on this documented evidence.

All faculty who have supervisory responsibilities are evaluated by the students they supervise and by the cooperating teachers or other field professionals with whom interns or student teachers are placed, using the University-developed and approved Student Opinion of Laboratory and Teacher Effectiveness (SOLATE) instrument.

Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

The College of Education provides systematic and comprehensive opportunities for the professional development of both tenure-track and temporary faculty. Support includes grants for professional development research and projects, workshops designed to enhance quality of instruction, and seminars, forums, and retreats to enrich the vitality of the college culture. Faculty development in the COE includes New Faculty Assigned Time for first year tenure-track faculty to give more time for new faculty to develop their courses and carry out scholarly and service activities by reducing their teaching load by three units (one course); Sabbatical Leaves; Faculty Development Assigned Time for faculty involved in activities directly related to the mission of the COE; Faculty Professional Development Enhancement Awards (\$500 per grant) to support the mission of the College and typically awarded to support faculty travel and research; CSU Research Grants to provide seed-money for larger research projects, the purchase of specialized instructional equipment, or summer salary for research or service projects (in 2001-2002 COE faculty received four of thirty-six awards); Lottery Funds awards to fund activities that improve classroom instruction; and SJSU Foundation awards to provide clerical and grant writing assistance to any faculty member who seeks external sources of funding.

The SJSU Center for Faculty Development and Support sponsors a comprehensive faculty development program, including workshops, seminars, retreats, forums, and meetings, publication of the CFD newsletter, and recognition of faculty excellence in research and

teaching. The CFD sponsors the New Faculty Orientation and Workshop Program and the Teacher Scholars Program. Ninety faculty in the College of Education participated in one or more CFDS workshops, event, or activities during the 2001-2002 academic year.

The COE sponsors a variety of events to develop a collegial community of teacher-scholars, typically developed around themes related to the conceptual framework. The COE collaborates with other funded projects (e.g., BayTech) or industry (Intel) to present professional development opportunities in specific skills areas. The annual Villemain Lecture is sponsored by the COE in partnership with the College of Humanities and Arts to bring a recognized scholar on campus to deliver a formal address to the university faculty and students. The COE also provides mentoring to tenure-track faculty to facilitate their success in the retention, tenure, and promotion process. In 2002, the College of Education established the Professional Development Coordinator position (with assigned time) to coordinate professional development activities and mentor tenure-track faculty on an individualized basis to ensure equity and excellence in the preparation for tenure and promotion.

Summary

The College of Education faculty at SJSU are recognized teachers, scholars, and professional who give invaluable service to the COE, the University, and the larger community.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Met

D. Areas for Improvement: None

E. State Team Decision: Met

STANDARD 6 Unit Governance and Resources

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

A. Level: (Initial and Advanced)

B. Findings:

Unit Leadership and Authority

Since the 1998 NCATE visit the Unit has restructured (Spring 2001) from four College Divisions to eight academic departments. This restructuring was undertaken to facilitate equitable governance and to enhance communication across the Unit.

The Unit is comprised of a Dean, who is the Chief Academic Officer of the College of Education, has authority and oversight of eight academic departments, led by eight Academic Chairs. An Associate Dean reports to the Dean and assumes line authority to technology, support staff in the Dean's Office, budget oversight and payroll, and Human Resources.

Within the Unit are 13 initial and 18 advanced programs. The Elementary Education Program offers both a bachelor degree and a multiple subject credential. All remaining programs are considered post baccalaureate.

Academic departments within the Unit include Child and Adolescent Development, Communicative Disorders and Sciences, Counselor Education, Education Leadership, Elementary Education (one undergraduate program), Instructional Technology, Special Education, and Secondary Education which includes multiple subject areas in which faculty work collaboratively with other Colleges.

Programs in the Unit that are housed outside the College of Education are the College of Science which offers the Science Education Program, MA in mathematics with a concentration in math education, College of Applied Sciences and Arts which offers the School Nurse and K-12 Physical Education Credentialing program, College of Social Work offers credentialing in Pupil Personnel Services and Child Welfare and Attendance, College of Social Sciences which offers both single and multiple subject programs in Environmental Studies. Communication Studies Department cooperates with the English Department to prepare students for credentialing in English, and the College of Humanities and the Arts which provides credentialing in English and Comparative Literature, Foreign Languages, Liberal Studies and Creative Arts programs.

Although outside the Unit, Deans of each of the Colleges and the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies (responsible for the School of Library Science programs) work in concert. This leadership meets bi-weekly with the Provost in the Council of Deans. Discussions at these meetings include issues related to faculty recruitment, development and diversity, resources, accreditation, review of data related to student success and program quality.

Each of the Colleges is also supported by leadership of an Associate Dean which meets on a monthly basis. Discussions primarily relate to curricular matters including course assessment and program reviews.

The All Unit Teacher Education Committee includes representatives from all Colleges and the Library. This is a standing committee of the Faculty Academic Senate whereby curricular and program changes are reviewed.

All credentials recommended by the Unit are reviewed and processed by the Credentials Office under the direct supervision of the Dean. Information related to credentials or M.A. degrees is provided to academic deans and the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies by the Credentials Office and/or the Dean of the College of Education.

Unit Budget

The budget allocation for the unit is adequate.

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Budget</u> | <u>FTES</u> | <u>Cost/FTES</u> |
|-------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|
| 1997-8 | \$5,088,563.00 | 1352 | \$3,763.73 |
| 1998-9 | \$5,560,587.00 | 1369 | \$4,061.79 |
| 1999-0 | \$5,762,369.00 | 1445 | \$3,987.80 |

| | | | |
|---------|----------------|------|------------|
| 2000-01 | \$6,285,178.00 | 1412 | \$4,451.26 |
| 2001-02 | \$6,950,346.00 | 1698 | \$4,093.25 |

*Over the past five years, the unit budget has risen commensurate with the number of FTES. The average cost/FTES during this time was \$4,072. Resources allocated to the SJSU College of Education are slightly higher than other similar California State University campuses and most departments at SJSU.

The Dean, in consultation with the Council of Chairs, annually reviews the college budget. Allocations to departments include funds for faculty and staff salaries and operational expenses from the State of California’s General Fund. Other sources of revenue are courses taught during special sessions via the Continuing Education Office and revenues from the State of California Lottery (\$75,000 in 2002-2003).

The Provost has “built a wall around instruction” indicating that instructional budgets would not be subject to reduction.

Personnel

Full-time tenure track faculty teach (per the Collective Bargaining Agreement of the CA State University System) 12 units (typically four courses) and provide 3 units of advising/service. Selected faculty are given assigned time to perform coordination of various programs, serve as investigators of grants, advise students, and participate in additional professional development. The Provost is currently developing a program (Academic Innovation Model), which will allocate resources from Academic Affairs to reduce faculty workload by 20percent (or one three-unit course). This program will allocate a portion of the Academic Affairs budget to reach ten million dollars over the next five years.

Support staff for the Unit includes 16 positions. Resources for new positions for support staff is formula driven and based on Full Time Equivalent Students.

As an initiative to ensure success in the Promotion and Tenure Process of faculty, the unit Dean, in collaboration with faculty, created a 12-month position of Coordinator of College of Education Faculty Development. A professor from the Department of Child and Adolescent Development holds this half time position. In addition, a 20% release time per semester is given to provide on-going support to new faculty for research and/or professional development. A formal mentoring process is in place for faculty prior to the second, fourth, and sixth-year review and tenure process. Further, there is a formal follow-up process with the Unit Dean at each level.

Unit Facilities

Since the last visit, significant improvements have been made to upgrade the facilities in the unit. Since January 2001, the Provost funded and initiated, in collaboration with the Dean, a major renovation of Sweeney Hall. Initially, funds were provided to cosmetically update the building and upgrade for electrical power. In 2003, the unit’s Speech and Hearing Clinic near Sweeney Hall was renovated. Additionally, an old computer lab was renovated and converted into office space for 16 temporary faculty. Ten classrooms in Sweeney Hall have been renovated for use of wireless technology. Three computer labs have been updated to include one Macintosh lab with 15 computers for an “Open Student Lab” (open 20 hours per week) staffed by student workers

along with two full-time instructional technology staff. The other Macintosh Lab (19 i Macs) along with one Personal Computer lab (25 Dell Pentium IV Towers) are used primarily for teaching.

Office space of all forms remains inadequate. Most faculty share an office and in some cases, there are three faculty to one office. The Provost's highest priority has become the continuation of responding to the needs of the unit. Informal plans are to move the non-education components out of Sweeney Hall in order to provide full use, (i.e., additional faculty office space) for the unit. A time table for completion is not available.

Unit Resources Including Technology

Due to the advent of *PeopleSoft* and the *Common Management System* initiative (mandated by the CA State University System) and the MAC computer incompatibility to access the Student Software System, the existing "technology plan" is under collaborative revision (via Technology Committee).

As a result of the migration of PCs from Macintosh products and the unit restructuring from four divisions to eight departments, there has been a conceptual shift from operating under a centralized purchasing of technology to departmental based purchases. For example, this allows the Department of Educational Leadership to purchase laptop computers for new faculty rather than desktops due to their off-campus-based (cohort) programs. In contrast, the Department of Communicative Disorders and Sciences utilize fairly complex and sophisticated data analysis programs for monitoring speech patterns; these computer needs are best met by desktops. Based on departmental priorities, faculty member use and need, and funding sources available, computers are typically replaced on a four year cycle.

When faculty choose to teach an on-line course, they have the option of receiving \$1,500 for course development or they can expend the funds to purchase a newer model computer. This added monetary incentive has led faculty to create and teach more online courses.

In August, 2003, the University will move into the Martin Luther King Jr. Library, a joint project of the University and the City of San Jose. This unique, innovative collaboration is the first of its kind in the United States. Collections will number 1.3 volumes (2 million volume capacity) and include materials in 58 languages.

The University Library includes over 900,000 books and 3,500 periodicals. In the last five years the library has moved to electronic and full text resources and offers over 180 electronic databases.

In 2001-02, the University Library spent \$621,938 for books, and \$1,220,071 for periodicals and electronic material access. Expenditures dedicated to the College of Education in 2001-2002 included \$46,545 for books, \$31,574 for periodicals, and \$3,700 for non-print materials such as ERIC microfiches and K-12 software.

The University Library houses the Education Resource Center, formerly housed in Sweeney Hall as the Learning Resources Display Center. The Center is one of California's twenty-two regional resource centers for the public display of adopted and submitted materials for K-8. The Center's collection includes all California state-adopted materials.

External funding from grants and contracts totals over \$14,265,182 for the past three years.

A portion of funding from indirect costs recovered on externally sponsored grants and contracts are distributed within the academic units in one-third increments to the college, department, and principal faculty investigator. The University Library also receives an allocation from indirect cost revenues. The distribution is intended to further support the mission of increasing sponsored programs at SJSU by providing a resource base with which to invest in research and related activities, assist the library in its support of research, and stimulate the expansion of externally sponsored grant and contract activities at the University. The distribution of funds is contingent on the overall SJSU Foundation budget and its financial ability to provide for all allocations.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The College of Education, as the teacher education unit at San Jose State University, has the authority and resource support to maintain its programs in an efficient and effective manner. With the exception of the limited interactions between the programs in the College of Science and the College of Education and the lack of communication between the full-time and part-time faculty of the Counselor Education program, the unit's resources are adequate to the delivery of high quality programming.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Met

D. Areas for Improvement

(Advanced) There is a lack of effective coordination between the College of Education and the College of Science regarding the M.A. in Mathematics (Math Education concentration) and the M.A. in Natural Science (Science Education concentration).

Rationale: *The College of Education is not always cognizant of the programs in the College of Science.*

Office space is inadequate.

Rationale: *Faculty continue to share offices designed for one person.*

(Old) The unit employs an excessive number of part-time faculty members.

(revised) (Advanced) Due to excessive use of part-time faculty, tenured/tenure faculty are carrying excessive advising loads in the counselor education program and part-time faculty are not cognizant of the policies and requirements of the program.

Rationale: Unit-wide, the number of part-time faculty has been reduced and orientation and assessment practices put in place to ensure that part-time faculty are integrated into the unit. However, in the Counselor Education program there are insufficient numbers of full-time faculty to support the program's advising load.

E. State Team Decision: Met

Internship Issues for State Report from the Common Standards:

After a careful review of program documents and interviews with all constituents, the accreditation team found that all of the internship elements of the Common Standards are met. This includes all issues related to Leadership and Resources (Common Standards 1 and 2), Advice and Assistance (Common Standard 6), School Collaboration (Common Standard 7) and District Field Supervisors (Common Standard 8).

Internship Issues for State Report: Administrative Services Internship

Includes Common Standards 1 & 2 – Leadership and Resources

Appropriate leadership and resources for the operation of a Tier 1 Administrative Intern program are evident. There is close collaboration between the University and participating districts. A full-time faculty member is assigned to coordinate the intern program and there are field supervisors who directly work with intern students in a fieldwork configuration that is structured appropriately to meet the intern's assignment.

Common Standard 6 – Advice and Assistance

A full-time faculty member assigned to the program as well as field supervisors designated specifically for this program provide student advice and assistance. This is primarily done through the professional mentoring done by the designated field supervisor. Appropriate paperwork verifying intern assignments is kept by the University.

Common Standard 7 – School Collaboration

The University Intern preparation program allows for students to be integrated into the regular program while receiving specialized field experiences. This is done at the request and with the collaboration of participating school districts.

Common Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors

There is evidence of strong collaboration between district/site based field supervisors and the University field supervisors to provide meaningful professional growth experiences, as reflected in appropriate administrative activities, for the intern.

PROGRAM STANDARDS

Multiple Subject Credential Multiple Subject Internship Credential Multiple Subject BCLAD Emphasis Credential

Findings on Standards

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

Strengths

The Multiple Subject Program features several options which include: The Basic Multiple Subject Program, a non-cohort model that provides for the greatest flexibility for students; The School-University Partnership (SUP), a full-time intern model operating in collaboration with 17 district models; the Teacher Education Collaborative (TE), a two-year 20% intern model collaborating in 3 area school districts; the Accelerated Program for Excellence in Education (APEX), which addresses the needs of teachers on emergency permits who are teaching primarily in poor, urban school districts; Spanish and Vietnamese BCLAD Emphasis programs which lead to certification for candidates teaching in settings where Spanish and Vietnamese are the language of instruction; and the Critical Research Academy (Academy for Research on Language, Culture and Society), a program option in which students can earn their multiple subject teaching credential while making substantive progress toward a masters degree. The Multiple Subject program is holistic and student centered and encourages reflective practice and close integration of theory and application in a variety of diverse settings. The focus on meeting the needs of student and community is a hallmark of the program and is threaded throughout all of the available program options.

Multiple entry point options in the Multiple Subject Program reflect the needs of the candidates and the community as a whole.

There is evidence that all Multiple Subject Programs have a strong emphasis on content standards and pedagogical preparation of specific content instruction. In addition, there is evidence the program design will focus on Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) to assess candidates' knowledge and understanding, application of knowledge, and implementation of pedagogical tasks.

Candidates learn how to implement an instructional program based on assessment results that facilitate literacy development for all learners and across all content areas.

Concerns

None noted

Child and Adolescent Development Multiple Subject Integrated Program

Findings on Standards

The team finds that all standards for the Multiple Subject Integrated Program are met. The team's finding is based upon a thorough review of institutional reports and program documents and on interviews with program candidates, graduates, faculty, and school administrators who employ graduates.

Strengths

The Child and Adolescent Development Integrated Program provides a cohesive program of study that effectively blends subject matter and pedagogy. The program design enables candidates to complete well-planned field experiences that are connected to coursework.

Candidates complete coursework in the Child and Adolescent Development undergraduate major that provides a strong foundation for the prospective teacher. In this subject matter program, candidates have opportunities to gain practical experiences working with children. In addition many of the courses strongly contribute to content knowledge and pedagogical skills.

The required courses in the integrated professional program provide candidates with the skills and abilities to teach the core K-8 curriculum. Candidates learn how to plan lessons that include: The state adopted K-8 content standards, strategies for teaching English language learners and instructional adaptations for children with disabilities. The carefully sequenced coursework provides candidates with the confidence to design and develop instructional plans for children in their fieldwork and student teaching.

Candidates are strongly supported in their fieldwork by K-8 teachers and administrators. High quality fieldwork placements enable the candidates to develop effective teaching skills.

The cohort model used by the program provides a supportive and collaborative environment for the candidates. The cohesiveness of the program is enhanced with organized and detailed academic advising and strong professional support and guidance from faculty. The faculty have conducted special outreach efforts with regional community colleges to facilitate the transfer of students into the Child and Adolescent Development Integrated Program.

Concerns

None noted

Single Subject Credential Single Subject Internship Credential Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Credential

Findings on Standards

After reviewing the institutional report, supporting documents, and the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, university supervisors, supervising practitioners, employers, and advisory committee members, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Strengths

The team found the single subject credential program making good progress toward implementing the SB 2042 standards.

The program is in the process of phasing out CLAD Emphasis candidates and incorporating CLAD components into the new program.

In preparing candidates to provide instruction in content-based reading and writing skills, there is a strong emphasis on practical application activities correlated with theory and pedagogy in course offerings.

Candidates learn how to implement and adapt instructional programs based on assessment results that facilitate literacy development for all learners and for all content areas.

In collaboration with Independence High School, single subject practicum students, student teachers, and intern teachers receive mentoring, instructional support, and supervised classroom experiences. Along with coursework, field experiences are coordinated by a site-based university faculty member.

The intern program works closely with local school districts. Through the Intern Advisory Committee, partnership districts actively participate in program development and contribute to the quality and effectiveness of candidate preparation.

Concerns

Although the standard is met, the team noted that single subject program advisement is inconsistent. Candidates receive incomplete program information from education faculty, subject area faculty, and the credentialing office.

Adapted Physical Education Credential

Findings on the Standards

Upon completion of this review the team agrees that the standards for the Adapted Physical Education Specialist Credential are met.

Strengths

The program provides a strong foundation for candidates preparing to teach adapted physical education in the public schools of the Bay Area. Coursework enables candidates to teach

physical education to children and youth with disabilities in a variety of educational environments.

Courses in the program provide community service learning opportunities in a variety of community agencies. Candidates assist regional agencies in providing community recreation and leisure activities including the Special Olympics and Wheelchair basketball.

The program includes multiple opportunities for observations and field experiences in diverse regional schools. These experiences complement the coursework and contribute to the effective preparation of adapted physical educators.

Concerns

The supervision of candidates during student teaching in adapted physical education is conducted by the physical education program. The adapted physical education coordinator is not included.

Education Specialist Credential Programs

Level I

**Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe including Internship
Deaf and Hard of Hearing
Early Childhood Special Education**

Level II

**Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe
Deaf and Hard of Hearing
Early Childhood Special Education**

Early Childhood Special Education Certificate

Findings on Standards

Based on interviews with candidates, faculty, employers, advisory board members, graduates, supervising practitioners, credential analysts, instructional administrators and document review, the team determines that all standards are met for the following education specialist programs; Level I, Level II and the Early Childhood Special Education Certificate. This endorsement by the team applies to all programs.

Strengths

Faculty members have developed online course work using campus access to the Web CT site that is equitable with on-campus course offerings. Additionally, students indicated that online course access provided a level of convenience that was appreciated. Students are able to choose enrollment in either online or face-to-face courses and to transfer between sections if needed for their greater success in content completion.

Interviews supported the strong linkages among graduates, faculty and employers.

The pilot department assessment efforts (Spring 2003) reflect an evolving enhancement of the programs and the desire of the faculty to support continuous improvement and responsiveness to stakeholder input. Such work is also evident at the individual program levels.

The accreditation team found compelling and consistent evidence that the faculty members in the Department of Special Education are hard working, dedicated, caring and passionate professionals. For example, candidates and stakeholders stated that faculty are available through multiple media sources, (email, voice mail, phone contacts and/or office hours) for consultation given freely of expertise, support, advisement, and mentoring. The faculty are to be wholeheartedly commended for their consistency in exemplary modeling of best practices in candidate preparation and content pedagogy.

The programs have active Community Advisory Councils that include on-campus faculty involvement.

Evidence was provided to support the inclusion of part-time faculty in the department decision-making process.

Candidates consistently noted the usefulness of course assignments and their ability to immediately use the information learned in their university courses at their school sites with their own students.

The caliber of the capstone projects reviewed was impressive, reflected by the excitement that students shared as they discussed their work.

Concerns

The Master's programs in Special Education require a thesis or project as a capstone experience. The project needs an articulated focus of expectations for successful completion. It is unclear what procedures exist for those students whose capstone project is deemed unsuccessful. While the team saw evidence of many exemplary projects, it was unclear how these projects were evaluated.

Evidence was presented that demonstrated the use of portfolios in both Levels I and II of the programs. However, little consistency was noted from student to student. In fact when interviewed, some students seemed unsure of what was to be included. Recently, faculty have created and circulated a list of items to be included in the portfolios and have begun to help the students differentiate between a Level I portfolio and a Level II portfolio.

Deaf and Hard of Hearing Credential Program: Level I and Level II

Findings on Standards

Based on interviews with candidates, faculty, employers, advisory board members, graduates, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all standards are met for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Level I, and Level II.

Strengths

The strength and success of this program is based upon dedicated faculty who prepare quality candidates and graduates to work in the field of education

Communication and collaboration are evident at all levels.

Stakeholders feel that the program coordinator provides the necessary leadership to guide the growth, development and continuing improvement of the program.

District, county office, and service provider relationships have been strengthened. Creative distance learning programs have been developed to meet state shortages.

The unit mission is modeled in the program. Faculty and students reflect excellence, diversity, and equity.

A 5-year plan has been developed with specific goals for more systematic program evaluation. Level II has two graduates.

Concerns

Both students and faculty expressed frustration with the full-time faculty/student ratio and the inequities this created for advisement. Greater support is needed for the program to meet the needs of the candidates, faculty and the service area.

Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential Reading Certificate

Findings on Standards

The team finds that all standards for both the Reading Certificate and the Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential Program at California State University at San Jose are met. The team's finding is based upon a thorough review of institutional reports and program documents and on interviews with program students, graduates, and faculty.

Strengths

Both reading programs are based on a well-articulated sequence of courses and field practices which prepare experienced teachers to assume either school or district level leadership roles in the assessment, development and implementation of effective reading intervention practices for all learners K-12.

Candidates are well-prepared to serve as curriculum leaders, to conduct research and program assessments, as well as to provide inservice in standards-based reading and writing development for fellow educators.

Candidates focus on excellence in scholarship and develop professional skills to act as change agents for equity on behalf of all learners.

Formal criteria are in place for the formative and summative evaluation of candidate competency. In addition, portfolios are developed throughout the program to showcase candidate assignments that move theory into practice.

The long-term collaboration with Washington Elementary School, a local professional development school, enables candidates to complete their clinical experiences at this after-school reading clinic. Candidates have the opportunity to participate in a school environment that expands their professional disposition.

Concerns

None noted.

Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential Language Speech and Hearing Special Class Authorization

Background

Provision is made in the Accreditation Framework to substitute the standards and site accreditation visits of COA recognized national professional organizations for the COA process and Commission standards. The professional standards and accreditation procedures of the American Speech Language Hearing Association (ASHA) were deemed comparable and appropriate by the COA. On October 28-29, 2002, a site accreditation visit was conducted for ASHA. The findings of the team were incorporated into the state process by the state team. Following is a synopsis of the team findings.

Introduction and General Information

The Council on Academic Accreditation's (CAA) site visit team conducted an accreditation site visit of the graduate program in speech-language pathology at San Jose State University (SJSU) on October 28-29, 2002. Clinical facilities and faculty offices are located on the first floor of Sweeney Hall. The program offers B.A. and M.A. degrees in Communicative Disorders and Sciences. The site visit team met with Provost Marshall Goodman; Dean of the College of Education, Dr. Susan Meyers; Associate Dean of the College of Education, Dr. Michael Miller; Chair of the Department of Communicative Disorders and Sciences, Dr. Jean Novak; two full-time tenured faculty members, Dr. June McCullough and Dr. Gloria Weddington; two full-time tenure-track faculty members, Dr. Henriette Langdon and Dr. James Kuo; and three part-time non-tenure-track faculty members, Dr. Marion Myerson, Ms. Jean Jackson, and Ms. Patti Solomon-Rice (who also serves as Clinic Coordinator). The team interviewed approximately fifteen undergraduate students (in the context of a larger meeting), and thirty-six graduate students (in two meetings), and conducted telephone interviews with two speech-language pathology supervisors who supervise clinical experiences off-campus (internships). A public meeting was also scheduled, which was attended by the above-mentioned undergraduate students, graduate students, and members of SJSU's "Advisory Committee".

Findings and Standards

Based on interviews with candidates, faculty, clinical supervisors, employees, advisory board members, graduates, university supervisors, field supervisors, document review, and site visits,

the team determines that all standards are met for the Clinical Rehabilitative Services credential in Language, Speech and Hearing, the Special Class Authorization, and Audiology with the exception of ASHA standards 1.7, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3. The team requested more information for each of these standards, and the institution has responded for each standard.

The content areas for each standard are as follows:

- A. 1.7—Documents student progress toward completion of the graduate degree for qualifying for certification and licensure;
- B. 2.1—Faculty/institutional staff are qualified and competent by virtue of their education, experience and professional credentials;
- C. 2.2—Number of full-time doctoral level faculty in speech—language pathology, audiology and speech, language and hearing sciences;
- D. 3.1—The curriculum is consistent with the mission and goals of the program and ASHA standards;
- E. 3.2—Academic and clinical education reflect current knowledge, skills, technology and scope of practice;
- F. 3.3—The scientific and research foundations of the profession are evident in the curriculum.

All standards were met. ASHA has indicated that the program will have continuation of accreditation.

Strengths

The individual responsible for the program of professional education holds a graduate degree with a major emphasis in Speech-Language Pathology. Interviews with university administration, faculty, and students indicated that the program director provides effective leadership for the program.

Equitable treatment of students, staff, and clients is assured by institutional compliance with relevant laws, regulations, and executive orders. This was confirmed by interviews with faculty, students, and administrators; and review of published information.

The program has processes for assessing and revising the academic and clinical education. These include standard course evaluations, and student clinic practicum evaluations for both on- and off-campus practicum experiences. The program provided numerous examples of assessment tools, activities, and data for the site visitors. The department also holds an annual retreat during which the faculty discuss program strengths and weaknesses.

Discussions with administrators and review of faculty vitae reflect institutional commitment to the continuity of the program by maintaining sufficient number of doctoral level faculty.

Faculty/instructional staff maintains continuing competence. This was confirmed by a review of faculty vitae, as well as interviews with individual faculty members and higher administration.

A review of class syllabi and catalog descriptions indicates that the curriculum stresses the interaction and interdependence of speech, language, and hearing in the discipline of human communication sciences and disorders.

Interviews with students and instructional staff, and inspection of student files confirm that course work dealing with the basic sciences of communication precedes the study of communication disorders and their treatment. In addition, a review of student records, as well as staff and student interviews, confirms that professional course work in communication disorders either precedes or is concurrent with clinical education in these disorders.

Clinical education includes a variety of clinical settings, populations, and age groups. This is ensured largely through external practicum site placements. This was confirmed via interviews with faculty and students. A review of 14 graduates' files suggested that students had a variety of experiences.

Inspection of 10 current student files and 14 graduates' files indicated that criteria employed for accepting students into graduate study met or exceeded institutional policy.

Information from documentation provided by the program and interviews with faculty and students indicate that the program has access to a client base that is sufficiently large and diverse to permit students to meet the ASHA CCC requirements in speech-language pathology. Many of these clients are seen at off-campus sites.

Health Services (School Nurse) Credential

Findings on Standards

The findings and recommendations are based on data gathered from the program report, review of supporting documentation, site visitations, and interviews with faculty, administration, candidates, graduates, employers, supervising practitioners, the advisory committee of Santa Clara County School Nurse Coordinators, and graduate committee. It is the finding that all program standards for the School Nurse Credential are met.

Strengths

The SNCP coordinator is serving the diverse needs of the candidates with much dedication and enthusiasm. The program is currently mentoring two faculty members toward completion of school nurse credentials so that they can assume greater leadership, teaming with the coordinator to provide program continuity.

There is a strong input and feedback system from an advisory council consisting of school nursing professionals from the community. This advisory council assists by consulting on the changes and enhancements in the curriculum to reflect best practices in school nursing and school health. This exchange advances the levels of expertise of school nurses in the community and provides on-going professional development as preceptors for candidate field experiences.

All candidates are mentored through the process of research and publication to professional journals. Of the 100 per cent submitted, 30 per cent are published.

A strong personalized and multifaceted approach to recruitment consistently results in a culturally diverse candidate population reflecting the needs and population in the schools. The coordinator has held significant leadership roles in California School Nurse Organization, this last year as chair of the state conference where the two other credentialed school nurse faculty

members had significant roles. This leadership has resulted in continual recruitment of enthusiastic candidates into the program. “She is the glue that binds the program together.”

Candidates, graduates, and community school nurse professionals interviewed reported on the high quality and professionalism of the faculty. They spoke to the flexibility and creative approaches to accommodate their educational and practice needs.

Internet access to courses and advising as well as WEBCT courses, both in real and archival time, have facilitated learning opportunities and professional growth for all the students, especially those from distant geographic areas.

Concerns

None noted.

Library Media Teacher Credential

Findings on Standards

All Standards are met. The findings are based on data gathered from the program report review of supporting documentation and interviews with faculty, candidates, graduates, employers, advisors, advisory committee members and by observations of classes online. Candidates receive the skills and knowledge to be well-trained library media teachers who can serve California’s diverse student population.

Strengths

The Library Media Teacher Credential Program Coordinator provides creative and visionary leadership for the program. The program design, coordination, and quality control are exemplary. The curriculum is current, forward-looking, and effective.

Technology is infused throughout the curriculum. The use of technology to deliver instruction to students can serve as a model to other departments on the campus and to other state/national universities. Students have access to the following electronic tools: Course listservs, BLOGS, email access to faculty and peers, web sites (which contain the Green Sheets (syllabi), course outlines, assignments, office hours, contact phone numbers and email addresses of faculty, full text of reading materials, Blackboard, computer labs, and other electronic information and databases. Most important is the ongoing dialogue between/among students and faculty about course work, librarianship, readings, electronic resources, and current issues. Their innovative approach guarantees that California State University, Fullerton is a full part of the program.

Under the leadership of the Graduate School Dean, School of Library and Information Science Director, and Library Media Teacher Credential Program Coordinator, multiple interactive distance learning methods are used to meet the statewide need for qualified school library media teachers: Online courses combined with scheduled “face-to-face” class meetings either at San Jose, Fullerton, or San Diego (a current satellite); traditional classroom teaching; solely online teaching; and, interactive television.

The mix of full-time and adjunct faculty adds to the strength of the program providing theoretical and practical knowledge. Candidates and graduates interviewed universally praised the

knowledge, quality, and responsiveness of the faculty. Part time faculty interact with full-time faculty, attend workshops on using Blackboard, and are systematically evaluated. In addition, because of their use of online classes, students are able to take advantage of faculty expertise throughout the country.

The school continues its outreach to strengthen the diversity of the student population. Both the School of Library and Information Science Director and the Library Media Teacher Credential Program Coordinator have gone throughout the state to recruit students. Enrollment has increased substantially.

The advisement and exit screening for candidates is handled consistently and professionally. Assessment, evaluation, and advisory services are ongoing as candidates, the coordinator, and other professors are constantly available and active continually online both through email, the web based BLOG process, by phone and in person.

The school is proactive in grant writing and has received over \$500,000 in grants over the last five years.

The school is using its expertise and knowledge in research that benefits the school library community throughout the state, and indeed, throughout the United States. Materials that faculty members have written are widely read and used throughout the library world. In addition, they are helping to finance and provide expertise for a study that will correlate school library media teachers, school libraries, and their roles in schools.

Concerns

None noted.

Pupil Personnel Service Credential: School Counseling, Including Internship

Findings on Standards

Upon review of the institutional self-study and related documents, as well as interviews with candidates, graduates, alumni, tenure-track and part-time faculty, employers, program administrators, university and field supervisors, the team found that all standards in the Pupil Personnel Services Program, with specialization in School Counseling were met with the exception of Generic Standard 2, Growth and Development and Generic Standard 4, Assessment, which were minimally met with qualitative concerns. The team also finds that the Advanced authorization in Child Welfare and Attendance Services meets all applicable Standards.

The program institutional self-study was based on the new (1999) Pupil Personnel Service Credential Standards for School Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance Services which has been submitted for approval to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Program Standard 2: Growth and Development - Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns:

There is a lack of consistency in the format, quality and currency of program syllabi with respect to content related to generic and program standards. One example is EDCO 248 which has no reference to typical and atypical development in the syllabus, an element in Generic Standard 2.

Program Standard 4: Assessment Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns:

EDCO 282 does not adequately address elements of Generic Standard 4 pertaining to theories and methods for using data to support data-based decision making in program outcomes and school climate.

Strengths

There are numerous strengths in the program for which faculty should be commended that enhance the learning and achievement of school counseling candidates, as evident from interviews with all constituents. Program faculty are clearly committed to an appropriate balance between scholarship and practice which is effectively modeled for students and reinforced with the choice of adjunct faculty who provide a link to the community. The program highlights a strong collaborative partnership between the University, the local school districts, community agencies and practicing school counselors who in many cases are alumni of the program. This partnership provides a strong foundation for diverse opportunities for candidates to learn and practice in culturally and linguistically diverse communities. An example of this partnership is the active professional partnership through the Gear-Up Project which provides paid internship experiences for current candidates and alumni in the program.

Interviews with program faculty, community partners, field supervisors, candidates and employers revealed an experience-based program design that effectively blends theory and practice, while affording candidates a rich array of practical and field experiences in diverse settings. Affectionately referred to as the “scholar-practitioner” model by one of the superintendent partners, program candidates were consistently praised as representing well qualified practitioners.

Candidates, alumni and district partners consistently praised most of the part-time adjunct faculty who brought a strong degree of practical currency to their teaching with relevant case-based examples from their practice of school counseling. Distance learning programs were also strongly supported as meeting the needs of candidates who are geographically located at great distance from the main campus.

Concerns

While part-time faculty were considered a strength of the program by candidates and alumni, there were expressed concerns about the lack of consistency in course content between some part time and full-time faculty members. Further, there is no systematic process or mechanism to assist part time faculty with new program requirements that must be reflected in their syllabi.

Another concern is the apparent lack of a clearly defined program advisory group with a specifically defined program advisory role that can serve in both, a professional advisory and program evaluation capacity. The current “Community Partners” that are part of the Gear-Up Project are being considered by the program faculty as program advisory members. However, this role was not substantiated by them through the interviews.

Although current tenure-track faculty were praised as being responsive and accessible, candidates expressed the lack of sufficient access to advisors, as well as lack of information about the program and their status from admission to program completion. Candidates expressed that there are too many students seeking assistance from only four full-time faculty members.

Pupil Personnel Service Credential: School Social Work and Child Welfare and Attendance Specializations

Findings on the Standards

Based on a careful and thorough review of the institutional report, supportive documentation, and interviews conducted with candidates, graduates, faculty, collaborating schools and agencies, field instructors, it was determined that all program standards are met for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential (PPSC) and Child Welfare and Attendance Credential Program (CW&A) in the College of Social Work at San Jose State University.

Strengths

The PPSC in SSW and CW&A programs are well designed with a logical and well organized rationale and structure that reflects the mission, goals and objectives of the graduate program in the College of Social Work. The widely known and well respected program coordinator is to be commended for his incredible dedication, professionalism, and overall investment to the task of preparing school social work and child welfare and attendance professionals. It must be noted that all constituencies interviewed reported easy and regular access and support from the program coordinator.

Constituent groups reported regular and useful communication with program personnel, especially the coordinator, and felt that there was regular and useful input to and from the program. Constituent groups were able to describe various ways in which their input was solicited and actually informed meaningful program changes. An example of this is the collaborative development of a proposed course (SW272) to directly address pupil learning styles and theory, introduction to the interpretation of psychological assessment protocols used in schools and introduction to special education and alternative learning settings. At the time of this report the Associate Dean (also current Chair of the Curriculum Committee in the College of Social Work) reported that approval of the SW272 course is imminent.

Program alumni and candidates are to be commended on their demonstrated enthusiasm and dedication to serving the children, families and communities of the many schools and agencies in which they are employed and/or complete their internships.

Program candidates are exposed to a well-established field instruction experience which appropriately addresses CTC standards for types, levels and hours for high quality field experiences. Field instruction procedures and its educational value appear to be understood and greatly appreciated by program candidates. The collaborating field instruction personnel, schools and agencies are to be commended on their strong commitment to providing quality learning opportunities to program candidates.

The College of Social Work is to be commended for its long history of preparing social work professionals specializing as PPSC in SSW and CW&A candidates: a history rooted in long tradition of educational leadership and excellence throughout the state.

Concerns

There appears to be a “disconnect” between the narrative information contained in the institution’s self-report and the fuller story obtained through supplemental materials provided through on-site as well as information derived from interviews. Programs strive to tell their

stories as clearly as possible, using the accreditation guidelines effectively, but often do not succeed.

There also appears to be a “disconnect” in the communication between the Colleges of Education and Social Work in terms of how, what and when materials for the combined NCATE and CTC site visit were to be prepared and accessed by team members.

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

Findings on the Standards

The team examined program documents and supporting documentation and interviewed current candidates, program graduates, employers of graduates, part- time and full-time faculty, and advisory committee members. The team determined that all program standards for both the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and the Professional Administrative Services Credential were met.

After review of the documents and interviews with faculty, students, graduates, employers, and members of advisory boards, it is dramatically apparent that significant and substantive changes have been made in the Tier 1 and Tier 2 programs during the past seven years. Among the more compelling pieces of evidence is the fact that enrollment in the program (both Tier 1 and Tier 2 combined), has grown from 75 to over 500 students. Programs are offered not only at the main campus, but also in cohort groups at numerous off-site locations.

Central to this change has been a revision of the focus of the curriculum which now provides a healthy balance of theory and practice that addresses the issues that school administrators face on a daily basis. The Tier 1 program is heavily based upon a leadership theme that permeates the program. There is a great emphasis upon communication and interpersonal relationships which are hallmarks of transformative leadership. This transformative leadership approach has proven to be effective not only with prospective school administrators but also with teacher leaders, both of whom, upon successful completion of the Masters degree in Educational Leadership, qualify for recommendation for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential.

The revised Tier 1 program addresses all of the standards required for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and aligns them admirably with the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs). A major objective of the program is to produce sensitive and culturally aware administrators who are prepared to solve everyday school problem while, at the same time, relying on Commission mandated administrative skills that are integrated into the coursework. The program is strong in providing a variety of approaches to meeting the needs of diverse learners.

The Professional Administrative Services Credential Program (Tier 2) also reflects substantive revision that meets the standards and at the same time is well-aligned to the CPSELs. Last year, the Tier 2 program was reconfigured from a two year program to a one year program which better meets the needs of beginning administrators in the region. The Tier 2 program, like Tier 1,

relies heavily on providing leadership in an environment where change is the norm. Among the most frequently cited characteristics of the Tier 2 program are the support given by the faculty to students, the mentoring component in field services, the ability to network among peers, and the practical orientation of the more formalized coursework. Graduates of the program report that they have established peer relations which continue to assist them in their professional work once the program has been completed. The design of the program, especially its use of regional field service meetings, lends itself to the building of long-lasting professional relationships.

Strengths

A major strength of both the Tier 1 and Tier 2 programs is the San Jose State University Educational Leadership faculty, both full and part-time. It is a cohesive group committed to the School of Education's vision and mission. Interviews with numerous constituencies confirmed that the faculty is committed to excellence and equity. Faculty members are very responsive to student needs and are accessible for academic and professional guidance. Faculty members have demonstrated a sensitivity to encouraging and implementing change in the program's curricula in response to student input. The faculty members model a variety of teaching methods and enable students to access an appropriate array of educational resources.

Both the Tier 1 and Tier 2 programs reflect a strong commitment to outreach to a variety of educational communities in a relatively large geographic area. This is evident in the number of cohorts founded upon district needs to prepare administrators from their own ranks as well as the need to prepare administrators with special professional emphases. For example, there exist strong cohort groups in Gilroy and Salinas and there is a large cohort program built around the needs of urban high schools. There is also an affiliation with the Coalition for Essential Schools.

There is an appropriate ratio of full-time faculty with terminal degrees who interact with students and teach fifty percent or more of the courses in any cohort. Part-time faculty members bring a wealth of expertise to specialized subject areas and to well-supervised field experiences. The field experiences are extensive and reflect the practical application of formal coursework. There is evidence of this through student action research and student portfolios presented at exhibitions to colleagues. Part-time faculty members work closely with full-time faculty members in regularly scheduled meetings to develop and align curricula to assure consistency in coursework.

Concerns

While the team commends faculty for the changes made in the Tier 1 program, it should be noted that several students voiced concern that the level of emphasis on Law and Finance may not be sufficient and that content coverage be more comprehensive. Several students expressed that more time and attention need to be given to these critical areas of study.

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 Subject Credential Programs

There is an obvious movement toward the adoption of SB 2042 Standards as shown by:

- Program options are suited to the needs of the community.
- Multiple and meaningful opportunities for reflection for candidates are provided.
- Providing candidates with the knowledge and skills to effectively teach diverse students and insuring that all students have access to equitable educational opportunity.
- Continuing to use multiple means of communicating program/department changes, program requirements, etc. to candidates. The use of email and the school website with current and updated information postings will provide candidates with the latest and most accurate information regarding program changes.
- Providing admission forms and information on a website to facilitate ease of access to programmatic requirements for the candidates.

Multiple Subject Integrated Program

- Candidates and graduates noted a need for more in-depth analysis of classroom management strategies.
- The selection criteria for master teachers needs to be more fully developed and shared with all program constituents.

Health Services (School Nurse) Credential Program

Now that there will be three faculty team members with the school

Nurse credential, they can schedule regular meetings on the Monday Calendar to discuss program and course planning and evaluation. This collaboration could eliminate gaps in the process of managing the program and evaluations as well as share coordination and community outreach and recruiting. .

Consideration for consistent allocation of WTU, release time for the Coordinator in the same ratio as the release time for other coordinators seems appropriate to reduce overload, to assist with advising, assessing progress of candidates and performing the exit interviews for the credential candidates

A more formal linking with the DOE would facilitate CTC program evaluation and coordination with the other credential programs. DOE could communicate with nursing to increase understanding of mutual programs. The Deans communicate and collaborate with each other.

Students suggest more content in ethical issues and community health. They express that the newly added Pathophysiology course in School Nursing is well received.

Library Media Teacher

- Continue to strengthen the ties between the Fullerton and San Jose and develop satellites, such as San Diego as funds allow.
- Continue to search for funding to expand the number of classes offered to accommodate the many students who are eager to take them.
- Broaden access for their workshops to include faculty from other departments, particularly for Blackboard, and using BLOG
- Continue to put course descriptions, the Green Sheets (syllabi) faculty information, and related program information online so that all students in library programs can examine information for every course before they enroll.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Credential (including Internship)

There is an apparent lack of information provided to students about their eligibility to include the Child Welfare and Attendance Authorization. This was evident in the Institutional Review documents, the lack of visible information available to students in the program, or any systematic access to information about the authorization. Interviews with candidates, part-time adjunct faculty and community partners resulted in only a handful of respondents who knew of the availability of the program, its requirements for completion or the relevance and importance of this authorization to the counseling professional.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work Credential and Child, Welfare and Attendance Credential

The program should follow through in its efforts to formalize the inclusion of the proposed SW272 into the set of required (s) electives in the program as this will greatly enhance the program's ability to more fully deliver on key CTC standards (5 and 11).

The program should consider developing clearer articulation of efforts to address a key CTC standard (15).

The program should consider developing distinct ways in which in which aggregate data, reflective of key program elements (ex. program candidate enrollment, field placement utilization patterns, etc.) are maintained as well regularly disseminated to relevant audiences.

The program should address ways to assure that candidates complete field placement in a concurrent timeline as the coursework (specifically, so that the are concurrent in the second year).

Education Administration

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential enables its holder to serve at grades K-12. Standard 7 indicates that students are to engage in at least one fieldwork experience at which they do not ordinarily work. Since several of the cohorts reflect only a high school composition, it is recommended that experiences be provided at elementary and middle schools. This observation could be carried beyond fieldwork into regular coursework to recognize the need for different educational approaches for all developmental levels. The same observation would hold, should a cohort be composed of students exclusively from one district, that exposure to multiple level perspectives offers benefits to students.