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

Professional Services Division

March 21, 2007

Overview of This Report

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

Accreditation Recommendations

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

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

- Administrative Services Credential
  - Preliminary

- Education Specialist Credentials
  - <u>Preliminary Level I</u>
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship
  - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
  - Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship
  - <u>Professional Level II</u>
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
  - Moderate/Severe Disabilities

- Multiple Subject Credential
  - Multiple Subject
  - BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)

- Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential
  - Reading Certificate
  - Reading and Language Arts Specialist

- Single Subject Credential
  Single Subject
  BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)

(2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- California State University, San Marcos be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, San Marcos be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits, as appropriate, subject to the newly established schedule of accreditation visits by both the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Background Information

California State University at San Marcos is a publicly supported institution, founded in 1989. The institution had the luxury of building its mission and program as a new California State University campus. While the conception of the mission has evolved, it remains focused on enhancing the quality of life in the region.
.
The campus has grown from 284 full time equivalent students (FTES) in fall 1990 to an enrollment of 6968 FTES on opening day of fall 2006, with a growth rate from 2005/06 to 2006/07 more than double the predicted amount. This FTES represents a headcount of 8461 students, including over 1400 freshmen (headcount) and 276 FTES of graduate enrollment.

The campus is located in San Marcos, CA within San Diego County, covering approximately 4,261 square miles stretching from the Pacific Ocean on the west to Imperial County in the east; the county extends 58 miles from the US-Mexico border to southern Orange and Riverside Counties with major population centers along the coast. San Marcos, ten miles from the Pacific Ocean, is a rapidly growing city of over 76,000 and is situated in "North County," a region of suburban, rural, and agricultural areas and the cities of Carlsbad, Vista, Escondido, Oceanside, and Encinitas, as well as San Marcos. The city of Fallbrook and the Marine Corps' Camp Pendleton defines the northern boundary while the communities of Rancho Bernardo and Rancho Santa Fe lie south of the campus. The university serves a booming population in one of the fastest growing regions of California, north San Diego County and southwest Riverside County. Since the 1980's San Marcos and Vista have nearly tripled in population.

The twentieth campus of the publicly-funded California State University (CSU) system, San Marcos State University was originally a branch of San Diego State University (SDSU), it evolved into an independent campus as the surrounding sister CSU campuses, SDSU, Cal State Fullerton, and Cal State Long Beach became severely overcrowded.

The unit

The School of Education consists of 21 tenured faculty members and 12 tenure track faculty members, along with two on the faculty early retirement program making a total of 35. With the

exception of the Distinguished Teachers in Residence, there are no full-time non-tenure track faculty. The DTiR program is a special arrangement with local districts that permits teachers to work full time at the university for two years and allows university faculty to work in the schools. The program is described elsewhere in this report. The unit employs 30 adjuncts in a given semester. There are no graduate teaching assistants. The unit is managed by two administrators, a dean and an associate dean. The Student Services Center has a staff of 9 professionals. The distribution of faculty by gender and rank are as follows:

ACADEMIC RANK	GENDER		Number of Faculty with Tenure	Non-Tenured Faculty	
	M	F		# on Tenure Track	# Not on Tenure Track
Professor*	3	11	14	0	0
Associate Professor	1	6	7	0	0
Assistant Professor	2	10	0	12	0
Instructor	0	0	0	0	0
Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate TAs	0	0	0	0	0
DTiRs*	1	5	0	0	6
Other – Advising					
Student Services Center Staff #	2	7			9

**Two professors are in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP)*

***Distinguished Teachers in Residence*

 # Student Services Center (SSC) are classified staff members with a unique function of advising and credentialing

Programs offered, and the number of students enrolled in each program, are identified in the following chart along with the status of the CTC review. The unit has chosen to use CTC review only and does not seek national recognition of any programs.

Programs are accurately classified as initial or advanced. The team expressed uncertainty about the classification of special education, which can be earned as an initial certificate. In this context, the certificate is earned along with a basic credential, and the basic credential is considered prerequisite for the special education certification. It is therefore reported as an advanced program.

PROGRAM	AWARD LEVEL	PROGRAM LEVEL	CANDIDATES ENROLLED Fall 2006	AGENCY *	STATUS of CTC REVIEW
Multiple Subject	Credential	ITP	203	CTC	Complete
MS B/CLAD	Credential	ITP	20	CTC	Complete
MS Integrated	Credential	ITP	214	CTC	Complete
MS Middle Level	Credential	ITP	25	CTC	Complete
Single Subject	Credential	ITP	70		
SS Intern	Credential	ITP	N/A	CTC	Under Review
SS B/CLAD	Credential	ITP	14	CTC	Complete
Education Specialist Level I					
Mild/moderate, moderate/severe	Credential	ITP	35	CTC	Complete
ES Intern	Credential	ITP	15	CTC	Complete
Education Specialist Level II					
Mild/moderate, moderate severe	Credential	ADV	124	CTC	Complete
Reading Certificate	Certificate	ADV	See MA Literacy	CTC	Complete
Reading & Language Specialist	Credential	ADV	See MA Literacy	CTC	Complete
Preliminary Administrative Services Tier I	Credential	ADV	48	CTC	Complete- for new standards
MA Education-Options	M.A.	ADV		Does not apply	
Critical Studies in Schooling, Language, and Culture	M.A.	ADV	26		
Literacy Education	M.A.	ADV	37		
Science, Math, & Technology	M.A.	ADV	57		
Special Education	M.A.	ADV	See Add on & Level II		
Teaching, Learning, and Leadership	M.A.	ADV	45		

**California does not require NCATE review or national recognition process*

The unit recently initiated an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership jointly with California State University, San Diego and The University of California at San Diego, which has no graduates as yet. The team examined the program and determined that learning standards and an assessment system is in place and that resources from for this program do not impact on the programs the team reviewed.

The unit offers no full programs off campus. It does offer graduate courses that are the same as on campus courses.

The unit does not offer courses through distance learning.

Changes Since Last Visit

1. SB 2042 standards passed by the California legislature resulting in a complete redesign of multiple and single subject credential programs. Among other things, the new standards required adherence to California's Teaching Performance Expectations and the preparation of all teachers to work with English language learners.
2. Discontinued Administrative Services credential Tier II program in order to collaborate with the San Diego County Office of Education that now offers that program.
3. Revised the Administrative Services credential program to be in alignment with the new standards, California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs). The program was approved in December 2006.
4. Launched a joint doctoral program with San Diego State University and University of California San Diego. The program does not yet have graduates.
5. Began the development of a Communicative Disorders program with the express mission of serving the needs of schools. The program is currently in the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) preliminary process.
6. Hired a new dean and associate dean with the retirement of the founding dean who had served for 17 years.
7. Added five new tenure track faculty members.
8. Adopted TaskStream as a vehicle to develop student portfolios and eventually as a basis for summarizing assessment data.

Merged COA and NCATE Visit

This was a continuing accreditation visit by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and a continuing accreditation visit for the Committee on Accreditation. The visit merged the accreditation processes of the COA and NCATE according to the approved protocol. The merged Accreditation Team included members for the COA and NCATE, received a single Institutional Self-Study Report (Institutional Report), worked from a common interview schedule, and collaborated on all decisions related to all 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 the response. It also allows the subsequent accreditation team report to be written based upon those standards. California State University, San Marcos exercised that option. In addition, the institution must respond to all appropriate Program Standards. The agreement also states that the merged team 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 requires a report that uses the familiar language and format of the NCATE standards rather than the language that is needed for the COA (i.e., information about Common Standards and Program Standards). Under the provisions of the partnership agreement, California universities are not required to submit

Folios to the NCATE-affiliated professional associations for review. The state review stands in place of that requirement.

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.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Dean and Faculty of the College of Education and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of fifteen consisting of a State Team Leader, a Chair of the NCATE Board of Examiners, a NCATE/Common Standards Cluster that would include four NCATE members and two COA members; and a Program Credential Cluster of seven members. The administrator for accreditation and state consultant then selected the team members 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 State Team Leader and the Chair of the NCATE Board of Examiners served as Co-Chairs of the visit. Each member of the NCATE/COA 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. The Program Credential Cluster members primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered responses to select areas of the NCATE Standards.

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 17, 2007. NCATE Interim Chair, the NCATE team, and one of the two COA members of the NCATE/Common Standards team began deliberations Saturday morning. The second of the two COA members of the Common Standards began working with the team on Sunday morning. Due to severe weather conditions, the NCATE Co-chair was not able to join the team until Monday evening, but was in communication daily with the team. It included orientation to the accreditation procedures and organizational arrangement for both the COA and NCATE team members. The Common Standards Cluster began its examination of documents on the campus the rest of Saturday and on Sunday morning. The remainder of the team arrived on Sunday morning, March 18, with a meeting of the team followed by organizational meetings of the clusters. The institution sponsored a poster session and reception on Sunday afternoon to provide an orientation to the institution. This was followed by further meetings of the clusters to prepare for the activities of the next day.

On Monday and Tuesday, March 19 and 20, 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 various local school sites used for collaborative activities. There was extensive consultation among the members of both 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, the team Co-chairs met with institutional leadership for 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, program cluster members shared and checked their data with members of other cluster, the Common Standards Cluster, since the NCATE/Common Standards findings also affected each of the program findings.

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 with Concerns." The team then wrote specific comments about each standard, providing a finding or rationale for the decision, noting particular strengths and concerns.

For each separate program area, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards pointing out any standards that were not met or not fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standard. 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 Decision by the Team

The entire team met on Tuesday evening to review the findings on all standards and make decisions about the results of the visit. The total merged team reached consensus about the number of concerns, areas of strengths and identified areas of professional comments. The team found that all the NCATE Standards were met and included all aspects of the CTC Common Standards. The team identified nine areas for improvement for NCATE purposes and for state purposes, the team decided that Standard One – Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions was met with a concern, Standard Three – Candidate Field Experiences and Clinical Practice was met with concerns, and Standard Six – Unit Governance and Resources was met with a concern.

The team decided that state program standards were met for all programs, but concerns were identified within elements of one standard for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Programs. For both of these programs, concerns were expressed about Program Standard 16 – Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors, and Program. For the Multiple Subject and Single Subject BCLAD programs concerns were expressed by the team in reference to Program

Standard 1 in addition to the concern with Program Standard 16. In addition, for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program, Program Standard 16: Advanced Clinical Experiences is met with concerns.

Overall, the team agreed that the institution was providing strong programs of preparation and that even though some concerns were identified, the accreditation decision should be "Accreditation."

The Team Report was written to provide the COA with team findings for NCATE purposes first and then separate findings for COA purposes. Not all NCATE "areas for improvement" were appropriate for recommending to the COA and certain findings in program areas that are stated as COA "concerns" were appropriate for the COA report.

The team then made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Handbook*. The options were: "Accreditation," "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations," "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations," "Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations," or "Denial of Accreditation." After thorough discussion, the entire team voted to recommend the status of "**Accreditation**". The recommendation was based on the unanimous agreement of the team and that the overall evidence clearly supported the accreditation recommendation. Following the decision, the team went on to complete the written accreditation report, which was reviewed by the team on Wednesday morning. A draft of the report was presented to the faculty Wednesday afternoon.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT

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

DATES OF VISIT: **March 17-21, 2007**

ACCREDITATION TEAM RECOMMENDATION: **Accreditation**

RATIONALE:
The accreditation team conducted a thorough review of the Institutional Report, the program documents for each approved credential program, and the supporting evidence. In addition, interviews were conducted with candidates in various stages of the programs, program completers who have been in the field for at least one year, faculty, staff and administration of the university, employers of graduates, field supervisors and advisory committee members. Team members obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making judgments about the educator preparation programs offered by the institution.

The recommendation pertaining to the accreditation status of California State University, San Marcos and all of its credential programs was determined based on the following:

> NCATE's SIX STANDARDS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: The university elected to use the NCATE (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education) format and to write to NCATE's unit standards to meet the (Committee on Accreditation) COA Common Standards requirement. There was extensive cross-referencing of the COA Common Standards. 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: A team cluster for credential programs (Multiple Subject, Multiple Subject BCLAD Emphasis, Single Subject, Single Subject BCLAD Emphasis), Reading/Language Arts Specialist, Education Specialist, Levels I and II – Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe – including internship, and Preliminary Administrative Services) reviewed all available data regarding those credential programs. Advanced Specialization programs were also reviewed by the NCATE team. Appropriate input by individual team members and by the total merged team membership was provided to the cluster. Following discussion of each program reviewed by the total team, NCATE and COA considered whether the program standards were either met, met with concerns, or not met.

ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus that the six NCATE Standards were met, with nine identified areas for improvement for purposes of the NCATE report and the six standards were met with four identified concerns for purposes of the COA report, that all elements of the CTC Common Standards were addressed and met within the context of the NCATE report. The team decided that state program standards were met for all programs, but concerns were identified within elements of one standard for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Programs. For both of these programs, concerns were expressed about Program Standard 16 – Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors, and Program. For the Multiple Subject and Single Subject BCLAD programs concerns were expressed by the team in reference to Program Standard 1: Program Design in addition to the concern with Program Standard 16. In addition, for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program, Program Standard 16: Advanced Clinical Experiences is met with concerns. The following report further explains these findings.

ACCREDITATION TEAM

State Team Leader: **Arlinda Eaton** (Team Co-Chair)
California State University, Northridge

NCATE Team Leader: **Nicholas M. Michelli** (Team Co-Chair and
Common Standards Cluster Leader)
City University of New York

NCATE/Common Standards Cluster:

Suzanne Brown (NCATE Member)
University of Houston-Clear Lake

Marriane H. Coleman (NCATE Member)
Hueytown High School

Cynthia Jackson Hammond (NCATE Member)
Winston-Salem State University

Kathlene S. Shank (NCATE Member)
Eastern Illinois University

Mel Hunt (CTC/COA Member)
Saint Mary's College of California

Gary Kinsey (CTC/COA Member)
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Program Credential Cluster:

Helene Mandell (Cluster Leader)
CalState TEACH

Barbara Black
San Juan Unified School District

Carol Franklin
University of Redlands

Beth Lasky
California State University, Northridge

Mary H. Lewis
Los Angeles Unified School District

Edmundo Litton
Loyola Marymount University

Melinda Medina
San Diego City Schools

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog
Institutional Self Study
Course syllabi
Candidate files
Fieldwork handbooks
Course materials
Information booklets
Field Experience Handbooks
Portfolios
Candidate work samples
Exit Survey results
Assessment data
Follow-up Survey results
Schedule of Classes
Advisement documents
Faculty vitae

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Common Standards Cluster	**Credential Cluster**	**TOTAL**
Program Faculty	19	59	78
Institutional Administration	5	6	11
Candidates	30	97	127
Graduates	14	66	80
Employers of Graduates	6	9	15
Supervising Practitioners	2	40	42
Advisors	5	11	16
School Administrators	15	28	43
Credential Analyst	2	3	5
Tech Support	0	0	0
Advisory Committee	3	4	7
Distinguished Teachers In Residence	9	5	14
On Site Supervisors	8	2	10
		TOTAL	**448**

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.

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

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

California State University, San Marcos (CSUSM) teacher candidates in the College of Education (COE) gain knowledge of the subject matter in which they plan to teach as defined in the professional, state, and local standards through the mechanisms discussed in the following narrative.

Level: Initial Programs

Teacher candidates participate in general credential programs that are aligned with content and specialty program standards as established by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). The content knowledge that teacher candidates acquire is referred to as "subject matter competency" or "subject matter preparation." For the purpose of state licensure, California teaching credential candidates demonstrate their "subject matter competency" through the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET). However, single subject candidates may opt to demonstrate their knowledge of content by completing a "subject matter waiver program," a series of courses approved by the CCTC. The California State University system requires that all multiple subject and special education candidates have "subject matter competency" completed prior to admission to a credential program, and every credential candidate must have their "subject matter preparation" completed prior to the student teaching phase of their program. At CSUSM, candidates pass the academic content examinations or state-approved waiver programs required by licensure prior to admission to the initial credential programs.

Generally, CSUSM offers three initial core teacher preparation pathways: Multiple Subject (MS), Single Subject (SS), and Educational Specialist (ES). For candidates who opt to take the CSET, there is a 100 percent pass rate indicating teacher candidates possess an appropriate knowledge of content. The same would apply for subject matter waiver program candidates.

Table 1.1 - Unit Pass Rate on Content Tests for Completers of Initial Teacher Preparations*

CONTENT KNOWLEDGE EXAMS	2003 - 2004				2004 - 2005			
	# Tested	# Passed	Pass Rate CSUSM	Pass Rate State	# Tested	# Passed	Pass Rate CSUSM	Pass Rate State
CBEST	383	383	100%	100%	428	429	100%	100%
MSAT	75	75	100%	100%	32	32	100%	99%
CSET I	110	110	100%	100%	260	260	100%	100%
CSET II	110	110	100%	99%	259	259	100%	100%
CSET III	110	110	100%	100%	260	260	100%	100%
English SSAT	4	--	--	94%	1	--	--	99%
English Praxis	4	--	--	100%	1	--	--	100%
Spanish SSAT	3	--	--	100%	2	--	--	100%
Spanish Praxis (0192)	3	--	--	96%	2	--	--	92%
Spanish Praxis (0193)	3	--	--	91%	2	--	--	98%
Math SSAT	1	--	--	93%				
Math Praxis	1	--	--	100%				
Biology SSAT	1	--	--	92%				
Biology Praxis	1	--	--	100%				
Social Science SSAT	2	--	--	95%				
Social Science Praxis	2	--	--	99%				
Physics SSAT					1	--	--	100%
Physics Praxis					1	--	--	100%
CSET English I	12	12	100%	100%	17	17	100%	100%
CSET English II	12	12	100%	100%	17	17	100%	100%
CSET English III	12	12	100%	99%	17	17	100%	100%
CSET English IV	12	12	100%	99%	17	17	100%	100%
CSET Math I	2	--	--	98%	8	--	--	100%
CSET Math II	2	--	--	96%	8	--	--	100%
CSET Math III	2	--	--	90%	2	--	--	92%
CSET Social Science I	7	--	--	100%	12	12	100%	100%
CSET Social Science II	7	--	--	100%	12	12	100%	100%
CSET Social Science III	7	--	--	100%	12	12	100%	100%
CSET Science I	7	--	--	100%	9	--	--	99%
CSET Science II	7	--	--	100%	9	--	--	99%
CSET Science III Bio/Life	4	--	--	100%	7	--	--	100%
CSET Science III Chemistry	1	--	--	100%	1	--	--	100%
CSET Science III Physics	2	--	--	100%	1	--	--	100%

**Data for the 2005/2006 program completers was not available at the time of this report but should be available by the time of the visit. An addendum to this table will be provided as soon as the data is available.*

The CTC has adopted standards for all subject matter programs available in California. Of these programs, CSUSM has approved single subject credential programs for English, mathematics, science, social science, Spanish, and physical education. Candidates working toward a Multiple Subject credential at CSUSM have 4 programs from which to choose. Each of the programs have been specifically designed for a distinct candidate population having access needs which differ from one another. In the traditional post-baccalaureate program, candidates may attend the university full time for one year or take five consecutive semesters (including summer) as a part-time candidate in evening courses. These options have also been specifically designed to prepare teachers for the diversity of languages often encountered in California public school classrooms. The Integrated Curriculum Program (ICP) provides candidates the opportunity to earn their Bachelor of Arts degree with a major of Liberal Studies from the College of Arts and Sciences and a Multiple Subject Credential English Learner Authorization from the College of Education. A Concurrent Special Education option provides another Multiple Subject pathway and is designed to allow candidates to receive the Multiple Subject credential and the Preliminary Level I Mild/Moderate credential for Special Education over four consecutive semesters (includes two summers). An internship pathway for this last multiple subject option is available through a special collaboration with the San Diego Unified School District and the Capistrano Unified School District. Interns are candidates who are employed full time as teachers in these districts on a California Internship credential, but they have coursework remaining to be completed in order to earn their initial/preliminary credential.

Demonstration of content area competence by CSUSM candidates is also accomplished through the professional education coursework. Pedagogical content knowledge is specified in the California Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) for initial candidates. The TPEs on both content knowledge and pedagogy are assessed in a variety of ways including program specific coursework, field/clinic experiences, and capstone experiences collected through the electronic portfolio, TaskStream. Pedagogical content knowledge is assessed through course-based critical assessment tasks using rubrics and a variety of scoring methods. CSUSM implemented the use of TaskStream in 2004-2005 as a tool to document the assessment of student performance across the California TPEs. While candidates have ownership of the artifacts and reflections submitted through TaskStream, the COE retains the assessment data to document student performance across TPEs and field experiences. The resulting aggregate and disaggregate data will eventually be utilized for the purpose of program evaluation. Candidates must meet the standard for each TPE for each element of pedagogical content knowledge to obtain a passing grade or meet the standard in each program course. A TPE observation assessment provides the opportunity for university supervisors and cooperating teachers to raise issues on content knowledge, if necessary.

Teacher candidates enrolled at CSUSM and other California credential programs must pass the California Basic Education Skills Test (CBEST) for admission to a credential program. The CBEST is comprised of three distinct sections: reading, writing, and mathematics that measure basic comprehension, analysis, and communication skills. CSUSM candidates who do not pass CBEST are given information regarding test preparation and assistance.

Candidates for Multiple Subject (MS) teaching credentials and/or the Educational Specialist Level I (ES) authorization (for special education) are required to pass the state Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) with a score of 81 or better, as specified by the CCTC.

Table 1.2 - RICA Test Data

PROGRAM COMPLETERS	Multiple Subject			Interns		
	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006
Number Tested	320	352	N/A	24	6	N/A
Number Passed	319	351	N/A	24	6	N/A
Pass Rate	99.7%	99.7%	N/A	100%	100%	N/A

RICA test data for CSUSM indicate a high pass rate for both Multiple Subject and Intern candidates. The unit had expected to receive its official data for 2006 by the time of the accreditation visit, but had only been provided unofficial pass rates for each of the groups of 100 percent (unofficial 2006 data not shown in the chart above).

CSUSM candidates are required to meet a pre-requisite in technology proficiency through taking a prerequisite course prior to entering the program. This class provides candidates with skills and knowledge in a variety of technology tools and experiences for selecting, applying, evaluating, and integrating technology in their instruction. Teacher candidates are then required to use technology in their coursework, lesson plans, and teaching during the program.

In the CSU Program Exit Surveys, initial credential candidates assess the degree to which they feel prepared to deliver instruction and have pedagogical content knowledge to be successful. The exit data collected for the Multiple Subject (MS) candidates at CSUSM the past three years is relatively constant, despite the overall number of candidates for the Multiple Subject credential growing smaller (fewer MS candidates in recent years is a trend experienced by most of California's teacher prep programs). Exit data for the Education Specialist (ES) candidates at CSUSM was only collected in 2006, thus a comparison is unable to be made for analysis purposes. No data was disaggregated in the past three years for CSUSM Single Subject (SS) candidates.

Table 1.3 – Candidate Exit Survey – Pedagogical Content Knowledge – Percent rated themselves as very well or adequately prepared

Components of Pedagogical Content Knowledge – *"As I new teacher I am able to.."*	**F-05** N=74			**Sp-06** N=323*			**F-06** N=42		
PROGRAM	MS	ES	SS	MS	ES	SS	MS	ES	SS
Monitor student progress by using formal and informal assessments	96%	NA	NA	96%	100%	96%	95%	NA	NA
Promote academic skills at different levels of prior proficiency#	97%	NA	NA	96%	100%	97%	95%	NA	NA
Extend students' concrete thoughts by familiarizing them with more abstract ideas#	94%	NA	NA	92%	100%	97%	93%	NA	NA
Use language so pupils at different levels understand oral and written English	95%	NA	NA	96%	100%	NA	95%	NA	NA
Teach subject(s) according to state academic standards	97%	NA	NA	98%	100%	100%	98%	NA	NA
Use computer-based technologies to help students learn subjects of the curriculum	92%	NA	NA	90%	96%	91%	98%	NA	NA
How valuable or helpful was the program instruction in general pedagogy?									
Methods of classroom teaching and management	95%	NA	NA	94%	100%	91%	94%	NA	NA
Cultural Diversity and Multicultural Education	99%	NA	NA	98%	100%	97%	98%	NA	NA
Teaching of English Language Learners	99%	NA	NA	98%	100%	99%	98%	NA	NA
Teaching Students with Special Learning Needs	91%	NA	NA	92%	100%	97%	93%	NA	NA

DATA SOURCE – CSU Exit Survey – Sections B, C and D
**Most initial preparation programs conclude in spring semester. Therefore, the number of spring completers is always significantly higher than fall completers. #Phrasing of SS question varies from text printed.*

First year teachers (program alumni) and their employers responded to similar questions in annual surveys administered through the CSU Chancellors Office after candidates have completed their credential programs and have worked in a school district for one year.

For the four years of data provided as a composite by CSUSM (see below), the number of credential completers in 2004 were surveyed a year later in 2005 with 242 responding with generally high ratings. Over the four years of survey data provided, the ratings have remained relatively consistent, despite program changes. Candidates, who were part of the initial program transition, completed the credential requirements in 2003 and 2004. The data from their experience is the most recent two years of data provided. Preparation in the use of educational technology appears to be the weakest of the components presented below, but improvement is noted for the 2005 completers when they were surveyed in 2006 (score of 80 percent).

Table 1.4 - First Year Teacher & Employers Surveys (All Programs) – Pedagogical Content Knowledge

COMPOSITE	Completed	2002	2003	2004	2005
	Candidates Surveyed	2003 N=144	2004 N=141	2005 N=242	2006 N=170
Preparation to teach K-3 (MS & ES only)		81%	86%	82%	86%
Preparation to teach 4-8 (Mid lev only)		96%	100%	96%	97%
Preparation to teach 9-12 (SS only)		84%	85%	89%	87%
Preparation in subject matter		95%	97%	92%	94%
Teach to state academic content standards		95%	98%	96%	97%
Use educational technology		74%	77%	74%	80%
Use good Teaching Practices		86%	81%	83%	81%

DATA SOURCE – CSU Alumni & Employers Survey – Preliminary Work Product November 2006 Tabs 1, 2, 3, and 4

Upon review of assessment summaries of candidates, interviews with candidates, graduates, supervisors and employers and the documents studied, all provide evidence which demonstrates that candidates in all initial programs have the appropriate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. None of the unit's initial programs are accredited by another accrediting agency.

Level: Advanced Programs

Initial licensure programs (credential) are at the post-baccalaureate level and do not lead to an M.A. degree. Candidates seeking advanced licensure or non-licensure programs can earn an M.A. All of the CSUSM advanced programs require that candidates have a degree from an accredited institution, hold a teaching credential, have 2-3 letters of recommendation, and have at least one year of successful teaching experience. Content knowledge for subject areas is determined at admission by holding a valid teaching credential.

Pedagogical knowledge in advanced licensure and non-licensure problems is assessed by the unit through tasks and projects within specific coursework associated with the candidate's credential option selection. Candidates in the advanced programs are expected to know and use the California State Academic Content Standards, use student performance data coupled with knowledge of the student, family, and community to drive instructional decisions. The use of technology is an assumption in all programs as all advanced candidates must have previously met the entrance requirement that corresponds to the initial licensure programs exit requirement (TPE 14). Candidates then use technology appropriate for the area of the student, as part of communication, research, and class and collaborative project management.

Candidates are carefully mentored to facilitate completion of their culminating experience in a timely fashion. Though not reflected in the chart below, once a candidate reaches the last transition point in the program, the completion rate is approximately 95-97 percent, which provides some evidence of the level of support provided by faculty. Interviews with faculty and candidates also affirmed this outcome.

Table 1.5 - Advanced Program Retention/Completion Rate

Program		Enrolled	Complete	Certificate	Credential	MA	Retention
Fall 2001	Administrative Education	32	29*	N/A	29	11	91%
	Literacy Education	20	13	0	7	10	65%
	Teaching, Learning & Leadership	13	8	N/A	N/A	8	62%
Fall 2002	Administrative Education	24	14**	N/A	14	8	58%
	Literacy Education	27	17	0	6	17	63%
	Teaching, Learning & Leadership	25	15	N/A	N/A	15	60%
	Science, Math, Educational Technology	4	3	N/A	N/A	3	75%
Fall 2003	Administrative Education	23	18	N/A	18	11	78%
	Literacy Education	28	18	0	11	17	65%
	Teaching, Learning & Leadership	31	19	N/A	N/A	19	62%
	Science, Math, Educational Technology	21	14	N/A	N/A	14	67%

**All Educational Administration candidates who qualify for the credential may elect to continue in the program to earn a M.A. degree. However, many already have M.S. degrees.*
***Of the 10 student who did not complete the program, 1 has re-enrolled, 1 passed the recently-instituted state test, and 8 elected to withdraw for personal reasons.*

Upon review of assessment summaries of candidates, interviews with students, graduates, supervisors and employers and the documents studied, all provide evidence which demonstrates that candidates in all advanced programs have the appropriate knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

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.

In the advanced program for educational leadership, candidates acquire and demonstrate a thorough understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of school systems as delineated in the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs). The program encompasses only the first segment of full licensure for school administrators (Tier I) and the unit has a collaborative agreement with the San Diego County Office of Education for the second portion of licensure (Tier II).

Each candidate presents a portfolio at the end of the program as evidence of mastery and integration with the CPSELs. The final portfolio assessment indicates an alignment between program/course content, knowledge, and disposition objectives and candidate mastery of CPSELs in both coursework and fieldwork. (California does not require the passage of a standardized exam to earn licensure in Tier I of the educational administration program).

Specifications for the exit portfolio include the following elements that demonstrate content knowledge in educational administration.

Table 1.6 - Educational Administration – Portfolio Specifications

Field Work Reflective Portfolio (626B) (Old-EDAD 642B)	Coursework Portfolio - (620) (Old-EDAD 638)
*Project Plan *Field notes *Reflective narratives *Summary	*In-class debates – one page summaries *Case studies with in-basket activities *Paper – Leadership philosophy, knowledge, skills, & wisdom w/ citations *Presentation – Most powerful learnings with significance and resulting action

Interviews and examination of evidence by the accreditation team found that candidates in this program receive sufficient coursework and pedagogical training to meet the requirements as set forth by the CTC and NCATE.

Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Level: Initial Programs

The CTC 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 required. Pedagogical content knowledge is specified more precisely in the California TPEs for initial candidates. The TPEs on both content knowledge and pedagogy are assessed in a variety of ways including program specific coursework, field/clinic experiences, and capstone experiences such as collected through TaskStream e-portfolio.

The TPEs, portfolio evidence, case studies, the California State Standards in English/Language Arts, English Language Development standards and classroom teaching performance are also used to demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge for the literacy courses. Interviews conducted with mentor teachers, field supervisors and site administrators, indicated general 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, tests and practicum.

Level: Advanced Programs

Pedagogical knowledge in advanced licensure and non-licensure programs for CSUSM is assessed through tasks and projects within the specific framework associated with the candidate's option selection. Because these assessments are not organized in a systematic manner across all advanced programs, it is not clear whether the data gathered is useful for unit management purposes. The exception is with the educational administration program due to its

state and national standards, coupled with the portfolio. The unit needs to clearly know whether teacher candidates have a broad knowledge of instructional strategies that draw upon content and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to help all students learn.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teachers

Candidates are required to create learning experiences that scaffold concepts to accommodate the cultural and linguistic diversity as well as students with special learning needs. 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. These skills and knowledge that teacher candidates master are defined by the *CTC Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Teacher Preparation Programs* and the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* (CSTP). 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.

Level: Initial Programs

Through a variety of experiences in coursework, candidates learn the ways that children and adolescents develop and how their development relates to their learning. The following table provides candidate performance data on the assessments tied to the TPEs associated with professional knowledge and skills through coursework and into classroom practice.

TaskStream ePortfolios are scored on a 4 point rubric in reference to meeting the TPE: (1) not met, (2) approaching, (3) meets (4) exceeds. A final assessment recorded at the maximum of level 3 “meets”. In the two semesters of data provided, most candidates are passing the assessments with a score of three, though it is unclear in interviews and in the limited data analysis available to the accreditation team, how many attempts are needed by candidates to remediate and successfully pass a particular TPE.

Table 1.7 - Initial Programs – TPEs Demonstrating PPKS

TPE	Course & Assessment (candidates applicable)	Spring 2006* (N=292)		Fall 2006** (N=109)	
		ePortfolio***	Adv. Stud. Teaching	ePortfolio***	Adv. Stud. Teaching
TPE 4 – Making Content Accessible	521 – Intervention lesson plan with modifications to meet needs of ELLs, Sp. Ed. Students, gifted, struggling students.	1 – 0 2 – 33 3 – 258	288 (4 no-pass, all of those still in progress)	1 – 0 2 – 11 3 – 98	109 (5 no-pass, all of those still in progress)
TPE 5 – Student Engagement	EDMS 545 – Exploration inquiry with lesson plan. (180)	1 – 0 2 – 16 3 – 164		1 – 0 2 – 5 3 – 103	
TPE 6 – Developmentally Appropriate Practices	511 – Student Study Team assignment (all); Analysis of role of various parties in the IEP process – emphasis on families	1 – 0 2 – 15 3 – 277		1 – 0 2 – 7 3 – 104	
	EDMX 633 – Developing instructional plans for students with mild to severe disabilities (53)	1 – 0 2 – 3 3 – 26		1 – 0 2 – 1 3 – 1	
TPE 8 – Learning about Students	522 – Student interview with content area lesson plan based on interview results.	1 – 0 2 – 23 3 – 269		1 – 0 2 – 12 3 – 97	
TPE 12 – Professional, Legal & Ethical	EDUC 350 & 512 – Credo for support (Sp.Ed Law), Philosophy of Education	1 – 0 2 – 5 3 – 287		1 – 0 2 – 4 3 – 105	
TPE 13 – Professional Growth	571/572 – Student Teaching – Participation in seminars, site PD, & create a PD plan	1 – 0 2 – 5 3 – 287		1 – 0 2 – 4 3 – 105	
TPE 14 – Educational Technology	EDUC 422 – Identification of ISTE standards, newsletter, proficiency in using software such as Power Point, Inspiration.	1 – 0 2 – 15 3 – 277		1 – 0 2 – 25 3 – 84	
TPE 15 – Social Justice & Equity	EDMS 555 – Social justice lesson plan	1 – 0 2 – 38 3 – 254		1 – 0 2 – 5 3 – 104	
	EDUC 422 – Social justice video	1 – 0 2 – 15 3 – 277		1 – 0 2 – 25 3 – 84	

**Includes 170 MS completers, 26 Middle Level, 64 Single Subject, 26 concurrent, & 6 Intern = 292*
*** Includes 101 MS completers, 1 Middle Level, 1 Single Subject, 1 concurrent, 5 Intern = 109*
****Indicates preliminary portfolio status on TPEs prior to coaching to completion*

Candidate program exit data for the three most recent semesters shows that candidates view that they are very prepared in the elements of professional pedagogical knowledge and skills. Disaggregating the composite data reveals that employers consistently rate first year teacher performance in professional and pedagogical knowledge significantly higher then candidates themselves.

Table 1.8 - First Year Teachers and Their Supervisors – Percent Well or Adequately Prepared in PPKS

COMPOSITE FINDINGS	Completed	2002	2003	2004	2005
	Candidates Surveyed	2003 N=144	2004 N=141	2005 N=242	2006 N=170
Education Technology		74%	77%	74%	80%
Assess and Reflect		83%	88%	84%	87%
Equity and Diversity in K-12		85%	85%	84%	80%
Teach English Learners		85%	89%	85%	82%
Teach Special Education in Inclusive Setting		81%	80%	80%	79%

Level: Advanced Programs

Regardless of the option or licensure program, advanced candidates are taught to recognize the individual differences that distinguish their students from one another and take into account these differences in their practice. Being reflective and using assessment as a basis for their teaching practice are additional tenets that are emphasized with the advanced program candidates.

Candidates consider the school, family, and community contexts in which they work and the prior experience of students to develop meaningful learning experiences.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel

Expectations of candidates in these programs are driven by standards adopted by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and are strongly influenced by the standards of state and national organizations. Collectively candidates demonstrate knowledge of learning, diversity, ethics, and the pedagogy of their field through reflection, case studies, action plans, and action research projects to collect and analyze data and reflect on their practice.

District leaders are highly complimentary of the leadership and management skills of the CSUSM graduates they receive. They speak specifically of candidate knowledge and attention to collaborative instructional leadership.

Dispositions for All Candidates

The dispositions derived from the conceptual framework and COE mission are a strong guide to faculty, staff and students at CSUSM. The dispositions appear to be embraced by most and are posted on the COE website and discussed in the context of the mission statement. Candidates are expected to work with peers, professional educators, families, and communities in ways that reflect the dispositions expected of professional educators, also outlined in the NEA code of professional conduct and the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Candidate dispositions are continually assessed in an informal, formative manner with formal assessment completed within the context of field experiences through the language in the TPEs.

For teacher preparation candidates in initial and advanced programs, the TPEs provide the framework for assessing dispositions. The inclusion of TPE 6D “Special Education” and TPE 15

"Social Justice" as well as the existing TPEs on "English Language Learners" (TPE 7), "Professional, Ethical, and Legal Obligations" (TPE 12) and "Professional Growth" (TPE 13) set a context in which faculty and school-based personnel can evaluate candidate dispositions.

The CSUSM dispositions include: (1) social justice and equity, (2) collaboration, (3) critical thinking, (4) professional ethics, (5) reflective teaching and learning, and (6) lifelong learning. Candidates continue to become informed of unit dispositions through course syllabi, program guides, meetings with advisors and field experience evaluation forms.

For other school personnel, EDAD candidates are required to develop a personal vision statement that demonstrates their awareness and understanding of the critical role of leaders in collaboratively creating and developing equitable schools. Candidates are expected to demonstrate these underlying values in their course assignments, reflections and leadership behaviors. The final portfolio provides artifacts of the candidate's reflections on these activities.

Through interviews with faculty, support personnel, area administrators, steering committee members and students, it was found that CSUSM candidates possess the dispositions necessary to be successful school leaders. Additionally, the CTC standards serve to reinforce this emphasis on the values that under gird competent professional educator behavior.

Student Learning for Initial Teacher Candidates

CSUSM candidates are able to analyze student learning and monitor and adjust instruction to have a positive effect on student learning. Teacher candidates conduct a variety of assessments to gain an accurate picture of student knowledge and understanding, monitor and adjust their instruction to continually meet student needs, and assess student learning during and at the conclusion of instruction. By reviewing the course content, student work samples, and interviewing candidates and faculty, it was clear that unit programs were accomplishing their goals.

Student Learning for Other Professional School Personnel

Candidates in the educational administration programs are expected to accurately assess student learning, use results of assessment to make adjustments, and to have a positive effect on the learning of all students. The program has critical assessments that focus on both creating a positive learning environment for all students with a focus on student learning. Course objectives are aligned with the CPSELs to ensure that candidates engage in content and experiences that create and sustain a school culture conducive to all students' achievement and the professional growth of all school personnel. Candidates demonstrate their abilities to create these environments through course assignments and field experiences.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit's candidates and graduates in both the initial and advanced programs have demonstrated attainment of the NCATE and state standards in their courses of study at CSUSM. Unit faculty, non-unit faculty, and community partners have designed learning experiences that well prepare candidates for their roles as professional educators, reflective practitioners, and educational leaders. The pursuit and awareness of social justice and the importance of collaboration are also clearly evident in this preparation.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard is met at the initial and advanced levels.

Areas for Improvement: Advanced- The unit does not have sufficient and uniform assessment processes to analyze and summarize data, excluding Educational Administration and Special Education, Level II.

Rationale – While at the initial level the unit uses TaskStream and in the advanced program level the Educational Administration and Education Specialist Level II programs use an extensive portfolio assessment, a uniform assessment process is needed for the other advanced programs to provide meaningful candidate performance data aligned to standards and program expectations.

State Team Decision: Standard Met with a Concern

Concern: Inconsistent attention was paid to the approved BCLAD Emphasis Credential Standards to guide the program.

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.

Level: (Initial and Advanced)

A. Assessment system

The unit has an assessment system that addresses applicant qualifications and includes transition point assessments. The unit assessment system began its evolution in 1990. As programs were added within the unit and state and NCATE standards were changed the assessment system was modified. Most recently, commencing in 2001, the system has been modified in response to the NCATE transition to more performance based assessment. In 2002 the unit assessment system was reconfigured to refine its alignment to the conceptual framework and the State of California Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE).

Written documents including "Assessment Meeting" agendas, draft plans, retreat agendas, proposals for use of a candidate electronic portfolio system, Curriculum Committee agendas and minutes, and a document prepared for the Chancellor of the California State University System reflect the varying ways attention has been given to the assessment system from 2001 through the present. These documents reflect on-going administrative, faculty, and unit internal committee attention to the assessment system and reflect that the California State University San Marcos unit assessment system is not a static document but rather reflects the changing nature of the institution, of standards, and state and national educational mandates and changes.

The development of the unit assessment system as with other initiatives of the unit resulted from on-going dialog of the faculty occurring in varying circumstances including program meetings, retreats, committee meetings, and unit Governance Committee meetings. At San Marcos all faculty and staff are part of the Governance Committee thus there have been considerable opportunities for faculty to be involved with or respond to additions and changes to the unit assessment system.

Faculty interviewed spoke eloquently to the perceived unit vision, mission, and the tenants of the conceptual framework. The unit assessment system embodies the unit's mission. Its evolution reflects the unit governance structure which is described by administration and staff as being "flat." "Flat" in this instance does not refer to lack of interest but rather to the nature of decision making. This process of decision making has resulted in the responsibility for unit assessment being dispersed across the unit necessitating that faculty and staff across the unit must be involved in the processes of the system at one or more of the transition points.

The most recent refinement of the unit assessment system aligned assessment components at the initial level with the state of California Teaching Performance Expectations. The next reiteration already being discussed across faculties will respond to the California State performance assessment initiatives still in proposal stage, one of which is called "Teacher Performance Assessments" which is four standardized assessments aligned with the state "TPE".

At the initial level professional standards play a role only to the extent the state program standards align with the specialty professional association (SPA) standards. The state uses state standards to evaluate programs. Programs are not evaluated by specialty professional associations but rather are evaluated by a California team on-site review which occurred concurrently with the NCATE on-site review.

The unit assessment system at the initial level across programs has five transition points: admission, entry into student teaching, exit from student teaching, program completion, and after program completion. Advanced programs which culminate in licensure have a minimum of three transition points: admission, program completion and after program completion. Advanced programs which do not culminate in a license have two transition points, admission and completion.

Key assessments in initial programs at the five transition points vary some by program with each including: state required licensure tests; successful completion of coursework; TPE task completion with reflection on each of the tasks; successful completion of required general education, pedagogy courses and student teaching; and induction.

Advanced licensure programs have in common the requirement for a valid basic credential, completion of prescribed program consistent with state standards. Experiences in a K-12 are also required in California for advanced licensure.

Non-licensure advanced programs require one year of teaching and that all university and college requirements are met to earn the M. A. in Education.

For each of its M. A. options the unit has a prescribed set of benchmarks. Benchmarks are also tied to transition points similar to those defined in the unit assessment system. The three points common across programs include: admission process, advancement to candidacy, and program completion. Advancement to candidacy includes: grade point average of 3.0, completion of coursework, and completion of CLAD requirements. Program completion requirements vary by program with the repertoire of possibilities including: thesis, projects, a National Board of Professional Teaching Standard (NBPTS) portfolio, and/or exam.

The unit has aggregated state test score data for each of the tests that California requires for licensure in each of the areas in which the unit has a California approved program.

At the initial level the unit requires that every candidate must complete the TPE tasks and reflect on each task as to how it aligns to given TPE. Each candidate must meet this requirement to be recommended by the unit for licensure. At the advanced level the program specific program completion requirement must be met to earn the licensure or the M.A. in Education degree. These completion requirements are monitored by the program and uniformly applied across the unit.

In addition to the components of the assessment system focused on candidate progression and program completion the unit incorporates other forms of assessment into the assessment system. The California State University System conducts system wide evaluation of professional teacher preparation programs. These take two forms: survey of most recent graduates and survey of first year teachers and their employers. Data are analyzed at the system level and the institution

and unit receives the system wide data and its own institutional data. The data for the institution are aggregated across the unit and by credential programs within the unit. The recent graduate survey is a self report focused on how well prepared the graduate perceives himself/herself to be and a perspective on how well they feel the given institutional program prepared them to enter the teaching force. The first year survey has this same graduate self perception aspect but adds the element of employer perceptions of graduate preparedness and effectiveness.

Unit operations are also specified as a component of the unit assessment system. A unit analysis comparing CSUSM costs per unit plus application fee to other institutions was done when the unit was considering seeking university permission to raise its application fee. A similar type comparison was done when the unit was looking at the cost of books in each of the unit's courses. Another report shared by the unit analyzed admission data specific to ethnicity of applicants. The purpose of this unit data analysis was to look at admission equity program by program.

With a focus of the institution's relatively new president on data being transparent and her addition of new leadership and staff in the Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis more unit operation data will be available to each unit of the institution. This office generates retention and graduation rate reports. It also recently concluded analysis of an on-line survey of university graduates focusing on gathering alumni demography and satisfaction data. The Office of Institutional Planning has an ambitious plan for increasing data access for planning and decision making purposes. Included on the timeline for reports in addition to course evaluations routinely done are accountability reports, studies focusing on a specific body of data (e.g. institutional "Growth Study"), budget analysis, and college FTE related analysis. This office is working toward establishment of a Data Warehouse and its plan that each administrative unit will have ready access to all institutional data.

B. Data collection, analysis, and evaluation

The Student Services Center uses a "File Maker Pro" data system in the establishment of comprehensive candidate files. The file begins at the point of admission and is maintained across the candidates programs. Important artifacts specific to the unit assessment system are archived and available to advisors and faculty as the candidate progresses from admission to program completion. Maintained in this paperless file are transcripts of all prior college work, reference letters, interview rubrics and writing samples plus all other university and unit admission related materials. Materials added to the file as the candidate progresses include state basic skill test scores and all other state licensure test scores. Also, added to these paperless files are grades earned and advisement related materials. Administration and program faculty and staff, with access controlled on a need to know basis, have access to these candidate files and thus have access to readily determine candidate's status at the various unit/program transition points.

Candidate assessments at the initial level which include the formative components of performance in coursework including critical assessment tasks linked to "Teacher Performance Expectations" (TPE) and the summative reflective "e portfolio" are done on a schedule related to course completion. Typically the critical assessment tasks are done by mid-term of the given semester in which the course in which they are required is completed. The electronic portfolio which requires reflection on each of the completed critical assessment task products and the TPE to which it relates must be up loaded into TaskStream and reviewed by the respective program

coordinator to assure that all components are present and reflection has been done by the candidate before the program coordinator verifies program completion to the credential officer in the Student Services Office. Numbers of candidates completing initial programs are maintained. As all candidates must complete the portfolio to finish a program the data reflects a100% completion rate.

The data analyses aspects of TaskStream are not currently used by programs to collect, aggregate, and analyze data. The Multiple Subject program coordinator has initiated efforts to assure the integrity of the TaskStream process for her program candidates and has initiated data related activities. There are faculty in programs, such as the ICP program, who are enthusiastic about the capacity for data collection and analysis that the TaskStream technology provides. Barriers to use of the data capacity of this technology may be lack of uniform faculty and program coordinator commitment to the technology and/or the time commitment factor related to on-line grading and to do any meaningful data aggregation and analysis. Technology skill level may also be a factor. A year ago a TaskStream Task Force was initiated in the unit. One focus of this group has been mentoring which reflects that faculty technology comfort and skill may also be a factor in the lack of full use of the capacity of this technology.

In advanced programs the project, thesis, exam, or National Board for Professional Teaching Standards portfolio are summatively evaluated by program faculty before program completion can be verified by the program coordinator. The rubric used in evaluation of the thesis or project focus on components of the thesis or project which include: definition of the problem, literature review, and methodology. The thesis rubric has the added elements of data analysis and recommendations and the project rubric has the concluding component of "What I Learned." The timeline for program completion is program dependent. If the advanced candidate has met all requirements for licensure then the notification that the candidate is eligible for licensure goes to the credential officer in the Student Services Office.

The CSU system wide survey results for the previous academic year are received by November of each year. The Associate Dean in whom Deans' office responsibility is vested organizes the CSUSM institutional survey data by program and passes it on to each program coordinator. It is the coordinator's responsibility to share these data and the faculty teaching coursework within the given program with the data relevant to the given program. This is generally done by the January following receipt of the survey results. Program faculties then discuss these results in program faculty meetings.

Also, college faculty retreats are typically held in January or February and again in May and data are frequently shared at these retreats.

In addition to the TaskStream technology used in the summative initial candidate assessment process and the "File Maker Pro" software used in the paperless candidate file maintained by the Student Services Office the unit and institution is currently transitioning from Banner to PeopleSoft integrated information system. PeopleSoft will be the Student Services database. PeopleSoft has the capability to interface with TaskStream which should further provide capacity to initial programs and the unit to collect, analyze, aggregate, and summarize data.

The unit and its faculty are committed to student centered instruction as reflected in the unit mission statement. Consistent with good professional practice candidates are asked to first try to work out issues with the individual/faculty closest to the issue or situation. In the event the

complaint becomes formal candidates are asked to follow the "Student Grievance and Grade Appeal" process. The formal files are kept in the Deans' office. A committee evaluates the appeal and renders a decision. All materials and correspondence related to the complaint are retained in the file in the Deans' office.

C. Use of data for program improvement

Components of the unit assessment system from which data are used to make changes include: CSU system wide survey of first year teachers and the CSU graduate survey. Data from the CSU system wide survey of first year teachers resulted in addition of components to work with families in the school setting to required coursework. Based on CSU Graduate Survey results a course on classroom management was moved to the second semester of the two semester program based on data that reflected graduates felt that more preparation in classroom management was needed.

Recently the unit did its own survey of alumni using SpiderMonkey.com as it vehicle. Data from this survey resulted in changes in how courses were scheduled in order to better spread out significant projects and assignments. The survey results also caused faculty to rethink how advanced programs could be reconfigured to better meet the needs of teachers who were teaching all day.

Another recent change came about due to teachers in the areas expressed interest to be able to use advanced work to help them prepare for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standard process. To accommodate this conveyed interest in NBPTS use of the NBPTS portfolio was added to some advanced programs as an option to fulfill exit requirements.

Based on institutional retention data the unit initiated more efforts to provide support for candidates with second language issues to pass the state basic skill test and content area test.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has developed and implemented an assessment system. The system design includes: candidate assessments and unit assessments. Candidate assessments are both formative and summative. Unit operations are included in the system. Program assessment is also included in the system. The unit has the technology capacity to generate data for program improvement and unit management purposes. Data generated from components of the unit assessment system have been used to make programmatic changes.

NCATE Team Recommendation:
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation is met at the initial and advanced levels.

Areas for Improvement:
Initial and Advanced:
New
Technology is not used consistently by programs to collect, aggregate, and analyze program assessment data.

Rationale: While at the initial level the unit uses TaskStream and this technology has the capacity to collect and aggregate meaningful candidate performance data aligned to standards, the technology is being used only as a container for the required components of the electronic portfolio. At the advanced level technology is not being used for program assessment.

New
The unit does not summarize candidate program performance data in a systematic way useful for program improvement and unit management purposes.

Rationale: The unit assessment system provides varying program assessments at both the initial and advanced level. While at the initial level critical assessment tasks are used by each program aligned to TPE to assess candidate performance and there are some commonalities the tasks themselves are program specific. In advanced programs a culminating exit requirement exists in each program and again while there are commonalities the differences would preclude aggregation. It would therefore be anticipated that rather than aggregating data the unit would do a summary of program level data. No summary of program level performance data is done at either the initial or advanced levels.

Initial and Advanced Areas for Improvement continuing from "weaknesses" cited in the 2000 NCATE visit:

Two of the four "weaknesses" from 2000 continue to some extent as Areas for Improvement. As the NCATE standards have changed the standard with which the "weakness" was aligned is not consistent from 2000 to this 2007 visit.

Cited as a "weakness" in the 2000 report for Initial and Advanced programs was the following weakness: "The unit has not developed a formalized system by which academic programs are systematically evaluated" (IV.A). While an assessment system has been developed and academic program evaluation is part of the system the issue with "systematically" remains as cited in the "Areas for Improvement" above that say: The unit does not summarize candidate program performance data in a systematic way useful for program improvement and unit management purposes.

Advanced:

Continuing with modification
The absence of clearly articulated learning outcomes precludes assessment of candidates' performance in the non-credential based advanced programs.

The above area for improvement is derived from one of the "weaknesses" cited in the 2000 review at the Advanced level. The stated "weakness" was:
"The absence of clearly articulated learning outcomes precludes assessment of candidates' competence" (II. D)

Rationale: The Assessment System specifies that candidate assessments are formative and summative and are based on the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Teaching Performance Expectations are specific to programs which result in a credential as they are the California professional credential standards. Performance assessment based on these

standards is therefore not appropriate for non-credential based programs. There was an observable absence of evidence of clearly stated learning outcomes for the non-credential based advanced programs in the unit.

State Team Decision: Standard 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.

Collaboration between unit and school partners

The unit and area school personnel work together to facilitate the design, placement of candidates, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences. The unit has designed a model in which field experience is incorporated into the coursework. Coursework and field experiences in multiple subject and middle level subjects are taught on-site. The school based partners and the COE collaboratively developed this program.

In the first eight weeks of the first semester, candidates attend class three days per week and spend one day per week in observation/participation in public schools. The second eight weeks of the first semester candidates are in public schools five days per week in the Beginning Student Teaching experience. In beginning student teaching, candidates are involved in tutoring, observation, and take full responsibility for teaching one subject.

During the first eight weeks of the second semester candidates attend classes at two days per week and observervation/participation in public schools for two days. The second eight weeks candidates are enrolled in Advanced Student Teaching and spend five days per week in public schools. In advanced student teaching, candidates take responsibility for teaching the entire school day.

Field experience placement in advanced programs is usually determined by the employment of the candidate or is self selected by the candidate. Because of the nature and uniqueness of advanced program placements, collaboration and support from school partners is very important. Each school site provides an on site coordinator who supports, supervises, and evaluates the candidates.

Feedback from school partners has resulted in the unit rearranging the sequence of coursework so student teachers are better prepared for field and clinical experience. A site supervisor recommended and implemented weekly student teacher seminars that are held at each school site. The suggestion was embraced by the unit and this model has been shared and adopted by other participating schools. Another site supervisor suggested that single subject candidates serve as Advancement for Individual Determination tutors during their observation/participation field experience. This suggestion has been implemented by the unit.

The unit notifies the school's site supervisor of the number of student teachers to be placed in the school. The site supervisor confers with the department head and cooperating teachers are identified. The school principal approves the placement. In other places, the district human resources department makes the placements based upon the unit's criteria. The unit has the authority to veto any decision made by schools or districts.

Interviews reveal that the site supervisors play a major role in selecting cooperating teachers. The site supervisors recommend teachers who meet the experience and credential criteria, are highly respected, and demonstrate excellence as a classroom teacher. The field experience

coordinator makes the criteria known to principals in elementary and middle schools and works with them to identify cooperating teachers.

Field placements in the advanced programs are generally determined by employment. In the case of candidates not employed in a school, the candidate arranges placement with a school.

Design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice

The following chart describes field and clinical experience for the initial level.

PROGRAM	PRE CLINICAL EXPERIENCE	CLINICAL EXPERIENCE(Student Teaching)
Multiple Subject – Full-time and part-time	EDUC 350 – 45 hrs. early field experience in schooling EDUC 364 – 20 hrs. – Casey Foundation tutoring with foster children (service learning sections) METHODS COURSES – 64 hrs. per semester course related observation and practicum. TOTAL Pre-Clinical Hours = 173-193	Two 8- weeks, full-time student teaching placement in two settings….. TOTAL Clinical Practice 640
MS - ICP	Observation, participation and tutoring 150 hours per semester TOTAL = 300 plus same as Multiple Subject TOTAL Pre-Clinical Hours = 473-493	All clinical practice is the same as Multiple Subject TOTAL = 640
MS – Middle Level	EDUC 350 – 45 hrs. early field experience in schooling EDUC 364 – 20 hrs. – Casey Foundation tutoring with foster children (service learning sections) Required observation and participation days TOTAL: 144-152 TOTAL Pre-Clinical Hours = 189 - 217	Two 8- weeks, full-time student teaching placement in two settings….. TOTAL Clinical Practice 640
MS - Concurrent with Special Education	EDUC 350 – 45 hrs. early field experience in schooling EDUC 364 – 20 hrs. – Casey Foundation tutoring with foster children (service learning sections) TOTAL Pre-Clinical Hours = 45-65	One full day in a High School Setting (6 hours) Two 8-week periods of one full day per week in student teaching placements (128 hours) Two 8-week, full-time student teaching placement in two settings (640 hours) TOTAL Clinical Practice 774 hours
Single Subject Full-time and Part-time	EDUC 350 – 45 hrs. early field experience in schooling EDUC 364 – 20 hrs. – Casey Foundation tutoring with foster children (service learning sections) METHODS COURSES – 64 hrs. per semester course related observation and practicum. TOTAL Pre-Clinical Hours = 173-193	Full Time -two 8-12 week, full-time student teaching placements in two settings. TOTAL = 640-960 Part-Time – one 10 -12 week part-time student teaching , one10-12 full-time student teaching placement in two settings. TOTAL = 550 - 660

The following chart summarizes the field experiences required for each advanced level program. It was developed from information provided in the Institutional Report.

Program	Type of Field Experience
Reading Certificate (Advanced Licensure)	2 case studies. Candidates select a struggling student and complete an in-depth case study by administering literacy assessments and creating an instructional plan for the student. The plan is implemented, and candidates are encouraged to re-assess and modify the instructional plan to meet the student's specific needs half way through the semester.
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program (Advanced Licensure)	2 case studies (above) AND Candidates must identify two students for a case study; one must be an English learner, both students must be struggling readers and writers, and each must be from a different grade level.
Other School Personnel	Each candidate selects a school site that offers an opportunity to apply leadership theory into practice. The nature of the field experiences include but are not limited to: shadowing successful administrators; sharing leadership responsibilities; assuming complete responsibility for administrative tasks; and planning and implementing collaborative professional development activities.

Candidates are taught theory through coursework and then are given the opportunity to observe, assist teachers, and tutor students. They are then given the opportunity to demonstrate what they have learned through student teaching. Interviews with student teachers revealed that they are very aware of the unit's conceptual framework, state, and professional standards. Cooperating teachers say candidates demonstrate proficiency in the dispositions that make up the conceptual framework, state, and professional standards.

The unit has made a commitment to the use of technology as evidenced by the addition of TPE 14 which evaluates the student use of technology. Minutes on file show that the entire September, 2006 University Supervisor Workshop was devoted to technology in student teaching. Interviews with student teachers and university supervisors revealed that candidates are taught the latest technology and use it in their clinical practice. In schools where technology is not available a unit technology support provider assists them in finding equipment to check out.

Advanced level candidates use the technology that is available to them in their classrooms. Some research projects and case studies do not lend themselves to technology; however, candidates use technology to report their findings.

Cooperating teachers must have a minimum of three years teaching experience, hold a valid teaching credential, and be considered highly qualified by their district. Criteria published in handbooks also address teacher dispositions. Interviews with cooperating teachers, principals, and site supervisors show that the criteria are clear and known by involved parties.

In advanced licensure programs clinical school-based faculty are required to hold a credential in the field in which they supervise.

Evidence, in the form of University Supervisor Workshop Agendas, shows that university supervisors attend and participate in one workshop each semester and a series of monthly meetings that provide training in all aspects of supervision. Once cooperating teachers have been identified and student teachers assigned, the university supervisor meets with the cooperating teacher to discuss the handbook. Interviews revealed that some cooperating teachers do not believe they had sufficient training in the supervision of student teachers.

Interviews with student teachers, site supervisors, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors reveal that student teachers receive regular and continuous support in the form of formal and informal observations, conferences, group discussions, telephone calls, and email. Because students have several field and clinical experience placements, the field experience coordinator and university supervisors make sure that students are placed in diverse settings. However; part-time students arrange their own observation/ participation.

Interviews with candidates reflect that they consider their clinical faculty to be very supportive. Their site supervisor supports them during their project and is available to answer questions that arise. They also discuss projects and case studies with candidates and help them reflect on their practice.

Candidates' development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn

The unit has specific entry and exit criteria for candidates in clinical practice. The requirements for entry and exit into clinical practice are verified by the field placement coordinator and university supervisors. The following data is available for the multiple subject, middle level, ICP, and concurrent special education candidates.
Fall 2006 – 510 candidates were eligible; 505 completed, Spring 2006 – 418 candidates were eligible; 416 completed, Fall 2005 – 389 candidates were eligible; 387 completed.

Each advanced level program has admission criteria. The criteria for other school personnel is three years teaching experience, a valid teaching credential, and passing scores on the basic skills examination. Licensure program candidates must have a basic credential and be eligible for field placement. The entry and exit criteria are strictly enforced.

Multiple assessment strategies are used as evidenced by the field experience forms. In beginning student teaching cooperating teachers complete the Observation/Participation Evaluation and university supervisors complete the Beginning Student Observation Form. In advanced student teaching cooperating teachers complete The Advanced Student Teacher Observation Form. At the end of each experience the university supervisor completes the Beginning/Advanced Student Teacher Summary. The cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and student teacher meet to discuss the summary in an exit conference. Student teachers reported that they received informal evaluations from their cooperating teachers and university supervisors continuously during their field experience.

Advanced level candidates are assessed by multiple tools. They are observed by their on site supervisor and also by the university supervisor. They are also required to complete case studies, research projects, and reflective portfolios.

Candidates are placed in school sites as a cohort. This model provides opportunities for candidates to reflect on their classroom performance and receive feedback from peers. Candidates said their cooperating teachers and their university supervisors require them to reflect. University supervisors gave examples of questions they ask candidates to facilitate reflection. Candidates are required to maintain a reflective portfolio during their clinical experience.

Advanced level candidates reported that they reflect on their clinical experience regularly. The university supervisors require them to reflect after observations and during university classes

because their clinical experience and coursework are concurrent. Reflection in class allows them to get feedback from peers. Candidates are required to create a reflective portfolio. This provides an opportunity to reflect on coursework, fieldwork activities, and academic progress.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The BOE team believes the unit has met Standard Three. The unit has designed field and clinical experiences that are an integral part of the program. Collaboration with school partners is evident. Field and clinical experiences provide opportunities for candidates to apply their knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Met at the initial and advanced level.

Areas for Improvement:

New

Initial:
The unit does not ensure that part time candidates are assisted in securing pre-clinical field placements, including placements in diverse settings.

Rationale: The unit does not arrange pre-clinical experiences for part-time candidates. Part-time candidates arrange their own pre-clinical field experience. Because part-time candidates arrange their own field experience the unit cannot ensure that each candidate is placed in settings where they are exposed the entire spectrum of diversity.

Initial and Advanced:
The unit does not ensure that cooperating teachers and on-site supervisors, excluding Education Administration and Special Education, are trained in supervision.

Rationale: All cooperating teachers responsible for student teachers do not consistently receive training in supervision and evaluation. The unit does not have a uniform system for training cooperating teachers.

State Team Decision: Standard Met with Concerns

Concerns:

There is unevenness in the orientation for cooperating teachers in some initial credential programs, and there is no evidence of training in supervision for cooperating teachers in most initial credential programs.

The Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential program does not ensure that candidates are assisted in securing appropriate clinical sites. As a result, there is no assurance that the on-site supervisors are Reading Specialists.

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.

Level: Initial and Advanced

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

CSUSM has a demonstrated commitment to diversity as evidenced in their conceptual framework strands: "commitment to diversity, education equity and social justice;" and "a deeper understanding of the students they serve." Candidates are expected to fulfill the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE) at the Multiple and Single Subject program levels of preparation. Both English Learners (EL) programs are based on state standards with emphasis on cultural language learners and bilingual cultural language academic development.

A commitment to social justice is reflected in (TPE 16), Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices- Special Education (TPE 7), and Teaching English Learners (TPE 15). SB- 2042 credentials require proficiencies in three domains: Language Structure in first and second language development; Methodology of Bilingual, English Language Development and Content Instruction; and Culture and Cultural Diversity.

Coursework designed to provide diversity knowledge and experiences are evident in initial programs and advanced programs. At the initial level, Multicultural/Multilingual Methods (3 units), EDSS 555 is a core course offered for EDMS/EDMI/EDSS Elementary level/middle/secondary levels. At the credential level, the course EDSS 531, the needs of special education students are addressed. The BCLAD option, courses EDML 553 and 554 address Spanish language proficiency and appropriate strategies for English learners in their primary language; and supporting the identity development of bilingual learners.

At the advanced level, there are core courses that are a part of the Master of Arts program options. One of the core courses is EDUC 602 – Schooling in a Multicultural Society. Because the EL authorization is a requirement for advance program admittance, there is an expectation that cultural language for diverse learners competency is met. The social justice theme reflected in the conceptual framework is embedded in the EDUC 602, and it is required that candidates complete a course project that addresses social justice and content related issues. Other coursework with major diversity components at the advanced levels are EDUC 602, 612, 613, and EDAD 610. Evidence of diversity knowledge, skills and dispositions are found in learning outcomes such as case studies, and thesis or projects that impact student learning.

Initial and advance programs use system-wide generated data for program improvement; and at the advance level, the Graduate Program Committee meets bi-weekly to discuss advanced program issues, and examine input survey data to make program modifications. Advanced program curricula are designed according to the California Standards for Program Quality Effectiveness (CSPQE) and candidate diversity competencies are derived from the CSPQE. The Graduate Committee has made program modifications but it is not evident that internal, program data are summarized in a way that informs the decisions for program changes.

CSUSM College of Education has intentionally added three additional TPEs as program competencies. The additional TPEs that specifically address diversity proficiencies are TPE 15: Social Justice and TPE 16: Biliteracy. TPE 12 addresses Professional, Legal and Ethical Obligations and requires that candidates …"understand important elements …pertaining to education of English learners, gifted students and individuals with disabilities…". Data indicate that the majority of candidates at the initial levels meet TPE 12, 15 and 16. Exhibit 3.22 shows candidates who were listed under "Statement of Concerns" (SC) in meeting TPE 12, 15, and 16. The number of SC candidates with issues relating to TPE 12, 15 and 16 represents less than .5% of the total candidate population at the initial levels.

Advanced level programs rely on EL authorization as providing advanced candidates with foundational diversity preparation. The advanced programs extend diversity design through the social justice theme which addresses multi descriptors of diversity. Case studies, and action projects at the graduate level indicate that the social justice theme is reflected in various elements of diversity in curriculum design, implementation and evaluations. Assessments of candidate proficiencies provide data to faculty and candidates at the initial and the advanced levels.

Experiences working with diverse faculty

There are 35 full-time tenure faculty members in the College of Education. Table 26 of the IR identifies the racial and ethnic diversity of the faculty.

Table 26 - Faculty Demographics

FACULTY Year			COE Faculty Initial & Advanced			All Faculty in the Institution		
	03	04	05	06	03	04	05	06
American Indian	3.4%	3%	3.2%	0%	1.1%	2%	1.6%	1.1%
Asian or Pacific Islander	13.8%	12.1%	12.9%	13.3%	15.3%	14.6%	13.7%	15%
Black, non-Hispanic	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	3.2%	3.2%	2.7%	3.7%
Hispanic	17.2%	15.2%	16.1%	16.7%	16.3%	17.3%	15.3%	15%
White, non-Hispanic	48.3%	51.2%	51.6%	53.3%	56%	56.8%	55.7%	56.7%
Other	0%	0%	3.2%	0%	0%	0%	3.3%	0.5%
Ethnicity unknown	10.%	12.1%	6.5%	10%	7.9%	7%	8.2%	8.%
Total Faculty	29	33	31	30	190	185	183	187
Female	75.9%	78.8%	77.4%	80%	48.4%	51.4%	49.7%	51.3%
Male	24.1%	21.2%	22.6%	20%	49.5%	48.6%	50.3%	46.5%
Unknown	0%	0%	0%	0%	2.1%	0%	0%	2.1%
Total Faculty Members	29	33	31	30	190	185	183	187

DATA SOURCE: CSUSM Human Resources and Institutional Planning & Assessment Offices

The College through survey analysis provided additional data on faculty, staff and administrative diversity. Seventy one persons were surveyed and 50 responses were received. The analysis revealed that faculty represented other diverse characteristics in the following categories:

- Ability/ Exceptionality: (10%)
- Culture: (65%)

- Faith/ Religion: (90%)
- Gender: Female (76%), Male (22%)
- Sexuality: Heterosexual (70%), Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer (11%), No Response (19%)
- Socio-Economic Class: Middle Class (76%), Upper Middle Class (13%), Lower Middle Class (5%),
- Geographic Region: California (52%), Multiple Regions (12%), Mid West (11%), East Coast (3%), Borderlands Mexico/United State of America (2%), Central America (2%), Hawaii (2%), Louisiana/Alabama/Mississippi Region (2%) Mexico (2%), North East (2%), North West (2%), South Western (2%), Utah/Westerner (2%)

Candidates have opportunities to engage with diverse unit faculty in classes and in out-of class activities. An example of candidates and diverse faculty joint involvement is reflected in the World Aids Day, where students learned through non-traditional class experiences about the effects of AID/HIV on families, children and learning, and global health crisis. Throughout the poster presentations, it was evident that many community projects were prepared by faculty and students as teams.

The unit attempts to place candidates in schools with cooperating teachers who represent diverse ethnicities, race, and cultures; however, the teacher demographic characteristics of the counties and schools that service CSUSM do not reflect high diverse representation. The cooperating teachers used in field experiences and clinical practice are primarily white and female.

Through documented evidence it is apparent that the unit faculty members have conducted scholarly activities in the form of state, regional, and national presentations and publications in refereed journals on a variety of diversity topics. The unit presented the following evidence of their scholarship (partial list) on diversity:

- Journal articles = 100
- International/national presentations = 131
- Books and contributions to books= 43
- Regional/state/local presentations = 65
- External and internal grants = 20
- Regular journal columns = 83

The existing unit faculty, professional education community faculty clearly articulated their understanding, value and commitment to social justice, equity, affirmation to diversity and preparation of their candidates to address diversity through systemic preparation at the initial and advanced levels.

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Table 28 of the IR identifies the ethnicity of the COE candidates from 2003 through 2006. The data indicate that there is a marginal increase in diverse candidates in some groups and in some categories there is no increase at all over the three year period. Females represent 60% or more of the student population across each of the years reported.

Table 28 - Candidate Demographics 2003-2006

Ethnicity	2003-2004			2004-2005			2005-2006		
	Initial	Adv	ALL	Initial	Adv	ALL	Initial	Adv	ALL
Am Indian	7	2	1%	4	0	0.4%	0	1	0.1%
AfricanAm	13	4	2%	19	0	2%	12	2	2%
Latino	105	18	13%	121	17	15%	114	16	15%
White	490	79	61%	470	75	58%	461	79	62%
Asian	27	3	3%	39	2	4%	35	7	5%
Other	24	0	3%	14	3	2%	11	2	1%
Decline to state	140	24	17%	118	31	16%	107	25	15%
TOTAL	806	120	926	814	128	942	740	132	872
Female	658	80	79%	660	103	81%	603	108	81%
Male	148	40	20%	154	25	19%	137	24	18%
TOTAL	806	120	926	814	128	942	740	132	872

DATA SOURCE – COE SSC Database and Title II Report

The unit's Student Service Center engages in several recruitment efforts in forums that are noted for high diverse populations. Some of those forums are Upward Bound programs, high minority high schools and in areas where families do not have a history of the college experience. Another initiative at the initial level is the Integrated Credential Program (ICP). This is a blended program that allows undergraduates to take courses in the initial program prior to admittance to the initial program. This program has seen an increase in participation and data show that from 2004 the 2005, the Latino population has doubled.

The initial level candidates are placed in cohorts according to specific criteria established by program faculty; however, diversity is not one of the identified cohort placement criteria. At the advanced level, programs with internships and or field experiences or often self-selected sites. Consequently, the unit does not ensure that candidates have an opportunity of working with other diverse candidates.

Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

The unit places the majority of its candidates in P-12 schools that represent diverse student populations. Five schools were identified as "special education" schools because of the high concentration of students with exceptionalities. Thirty-nine school districts serve as sites for field experience and student teaching experiences. Of the thirty-nine host P-12 schools,

These school districts collectively have the following demographic data:

Total School Population	White/%	Minority/%	Exceptionalities/%	English Lang. Learners/%
633,962	249,791 (39%	352,615 (56%)	66533 (1%)	124020 (20%)

The demographics of gender and specific data on socioeconomic groups were not available as indicated by exhibit 4-23; however, the school districts where the majority of candidates are placed indicate that Hispanic students represent the largest populations in the top three districts: San Diego, Riverside, and Union District.

The unit places candidates in diverse P-12 schools at the initial level, but there is no evidence that there is a system for ensuring that all candidates will experience the ranges of diversity. Furthermore, it is not evident that non-credential candidates in the advanced programs have opportunities to gain experiences with diverse students in P-12 settings.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit provides evidence that the curricula at the initial and advance levels are designed, implemented, and evaluated to prepare candidates with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all student learn. The unit faculty and professional community are diverse and provide experiences that assist candidates to work in diverse P-12 settings.

NCATE Team Recommendation: MET-Initial and Advanced

Areas for Improvement:

Initial and Advanced:
The unit does not ensure that candidates interact and work with candidates from diverse, ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups in professional education courses and in school settings.

Rationale- There is no evidence that the unit ensures candidates work with diverse candidates.

Advanced:
The unit does not ensure that all advanced candidates are placed in settings with diverse P-12 students.

Rationale: There is no evidence that the unit ensures that advanced candidates work with diverse P-12 students.

State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 5. FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE, AND DEVELOPMENT

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

Level: Initial and Advanced

Qualified Faculty

The unit has 35 full-time faculty and six distinguished teachers in residence (DTiR). Exhibit Room evidence indicates there are 30 part-time faculty and 40 student teacher supervisors. All tenured/tenure track faculty hold doctoral degrees and have a minimum of three years of public school teaching experience. DTiRs are considered exemplary teachers and hold valid credentials in the areas they teach and supervise. Part-time faculty have a minimum of a master's degree and if they teach advanced or master's level courses hold a doctoral degree or have exceptional experience. Student teacher supervisors have masters or doctoral degrees, have exceptional experience in the field, and have been rated consistently high by their peers.

All tenure and tenure track faculty members typically supervise six student teachers each year. In addition, faculty participate in schools through the Distinguished Teacher in Residence Program Assigned Time Grants. The Distinguished Teacher in Residence Program is arranged with local school districts and permits teachers to teach full time at CSUSM for two years and allows university faculty to work in the schools through competitive Assigned Time Grants. The grant participation varies from teaching writing, conducting in-service program, analyzing student performance data, demonstration teaching etc. Exhibit Room evidence indicates that in 2006-2007, 10 DTiR Assigned Time Grants were supported. Example projects are: Developing and Implementing a District Wide Writing Assessment Plan, Fostering Elementary School Science Teaching and Learning through Collaboration, and Networks of Inquiry: An Alternative Perspective on Professional Development.

Interview with part-time faculty indicate that part-time faculty are mentored by full-time faculty. An example of co-teaching with full-time faculty was described. In addition, part-time faculty discuss submitting their syllabus to their full-time faculty mentor, receiving suggestions for change, and making the suggested changes. Part-time faculty indicate a feeling of connection to CSUSM.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

The mission of the COE is to "collaboratively transform public education by preparing thoughtful educators and advancing professional practices." Faculty members' teaching assignments and scholarly pursuits are mutually supportive. Faculty encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions through the use of a variety of assignments including mock student-study teams, role playing, collaborative unit planning, discussion and project dyads, and small group work inside and outside of class. Candidates are engaged in reflective practice beginning with readings and progressing to

reflecting on their teaching. Candidates participate in end-of-course as well as end-of-program reflection on their learning.

Faculty survey data indicate faculty incorporate rhetorical questions, case studies, sheltered English, English language development strategies, student critical judgment and/or reflective or analytical decision making, quizzes, storytelling, modeling, brainstorming, role-playing, group activities, technology, portfolios, as well as other strategies in their teaching.

In classroom observations, the faculty observed teaching were using technology, manipulatives, rhetorical questions, direct questions, English language development strategies, and modeling. One faculty with more than 10 years of teaching experience administered a mid-class check she developed. Sample questions asked were: "What is going well for you in this class," "Any way in which things might go better for you in this course," "Is this class meeting your expectations?" In the classes observed, candidates were working in groups, giving PowerPoint presentations, and reflecting on field experiences.

Faculty create various assignments, such as cultural plunge, case studies, and mock interviews to assist candidates in their formation of diverse perspectives. Faculty members also conduct research and inquiry in diverse settings. Each classroom activity and assignment requires candidates to consider students from diverse cultural settings, English learners, those served by special education, gifted, and others who do not have identified labels. Candidates are challenged and encouraged to view each student as an individual, respecting their diversity and acknowledging their gifts and talents.

Faculty members regularly use WebCT for online course management, TaskStream for digital portfolios, PowerPoint for presentations, Internet sites and education technology materials and equipment, and education-specific software such as Inspiration for concept mapping. In some classes, candidates make their own web pages, make short films, and create and scan original artwork. In other courses candidates create lessons using technology such as handheld devices or blogs. In classroom observations, faculty and candidates observed were delivering PowerPoint presentations.

CSUSM has six student evaluation forms of course instruction: lecture classes, small seminar-type classes, laboratory/discussion sections, research-based/service learning courses, teaching methods courses, and on-line courses. Data from the "Student Evaluation of Teaching Form" indicate candidates are pleased with the quality of faculty instruction: average ratings exceeded 4.0 on a 5-point scale on all items. Interviews with candidates indicate a high degree of satisfaction with the quality of teaching. One candidate, for example, has attended six different universities and stated CSUSM had the best, most dedicated, and most knowledgeable faculty.

Interviews with area administrators indicate they are very pleased with teachers prepared by CSUSM. They find CSUSM graduates have the skills to successfully teach students from diverse backgrounds and will hire them whenever they can.

To assess and reflect on their own teaching, faculty members use verbal feedback from candidates, mid-course questionnaires, candidate quick-writes, oral questioning during class and candidate evaluations conducted at the end of the course. In addition, faculty members use the performance of candidates on assessments to evaluate the effectiveness of their own teaching.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

Faculty are expected to focus their scholarly research on the transformation of public education by preparing thoughtful educators and advancing professional practice. Over the last five years, faculty in COE have produced over 224 books, chapters, peer reviewed journal articles, and other publications. They have presented at over 556 national/international, state/regional, and local conferences. In addition, COE faculty have been awarded over 190 external and internal grants. Also, over 96 applied research projects have been undertaken by faculty in K-12 schools, the community, and other venues. They have developed over 121 curricular projects, guidebooks, media items, online courses, and other materials to use in either their practice or the practice of K-12 educators. Nineteen faculty members have received research honors, awards, and fellowships. Over 99 editing and refereeing projects for books and journals have been part of the work of COE faculty.

All faculty are involved in some area of scholarship, including lecturers and distinguished teachers in residence. Tenure track faculty are prolific, publishing in every category of work outlined in the college and university mission and vision. Faculty can receive a three unit reallocation from the 24 unit teaching requirement by conducting a Mission in Action Plan (MAP) and the majority of faculty conduct a MAP.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Faculty provide service in numerous ways. Examples of faculty service and service accomplishments include serving on the University Executive Governance Committee, the Education Professor of the Year for the Associate of California School Administrators, and the 2005/06 CSUSM President's Award for Service. In addition, faculty have served: on the NSTA Board/Council and chaired the International Conference of the Association for Science Teacher Education, as the national chair of the International Society for Technology in Education Annual Conference, and as a board member of NCSS. In terms of service to K-12 schools, in 2006 COE full-time faculty provided 36 workshops, supervised 133 candidates, served as consultants seven times, served on 14 boards/agencies/committees, mentored 16 teachers, participated in 12 grant writing activities, and conducted 25 demonstration lessons. Data provided indicate that in 2006, 100 percent of the faculty were members of professional organizations, 78 percent served on departmental committees, 78 percent served on college committees, and 87 percent served on university committees. In terms of service to K-12 school, 78 percent of the faculty supervised candidates and 52 percent provided workshops or seminars for area schools.

Collaboration

The College of Education collaborates with area school districts in the Distinguished Teacher in Residence Program. Each year this program brings to campus at least three teachers to serve as COE faculty members for two years. In addition the University makes available to the participating school districts the equivalent of 54-68 units of assigned time per academic year for tenured/tenure track faculty members to assist districts with specific needs. All COE faculty also supervise student teachers in conjunction with district master teachers. The COE has worked with the faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences to develop the Integrated Credential Program (ICP), an alternative pathway to multiple subject credentials for early-deciding candidates. Other examples of collaboration are the North County Professional Development Federation, the Joint

Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership with San Diego State University and UC-San Diego, and the Border Pedagogy Initiative with the Universidad Iberoamericana in Tijuana.

Interviews with public school partners indicate a high degree of satisfaction with CSUSM partnerships. Those interviewed discussed the desire of the university to work with them to meet the needs of P-12 students and teachers. The university has been extremely proactive in initiating collaborative experiences with public schools. The North County Professional Development Federation, for example, meets on a monthly basis with representatives from 26 area school districts, CSUSM, and the San Diego County Office of Education. Interviews with College of Arts and Science faculty who teach in the Integrated Credential Program describe a high degree of collaboration between COAS and COE in the development of the ICP program. Faculty from both schools worked together for two years to develop the program and continue to work together to maintain and improve the program. Faculty from COAS and COE have a luncheon once a semester to bring together faculty involved in the ICP program.

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

All instructors in the COE including tenured, tenure track faculty, distinguished teachers in residence, and lectures are evaluated each year. The statistical average for student evaluations of instruction is very high. The mean performance on each category is well above 4.0 on a 5.0 scale. Tenured faculty members undergo a post-tenure review every five years. The University has a policy on retention, tenure and promotion and the COE has a document "College-Specific Retention, Tenure, and Promotion" that further clarifies the college expectations. According to the University Post-Tenure Review Policy a peer review committee of the department and the dean of the college conduct the review, and faculty undergoing review submit a report that addresses the faculty member's work in all areas considered for retention, tenure, and promotion for the years under review. Since this policy was implemented, all COE faculty who have undergone post-tenure review have been successful.

Interviews with administrators indicate faculty receive a summary of their student evaluations as soon as they have submitted grades for their courses. The data are reported in graphical form and a line graph provides a comparison of the individual faculty with all COE faculty. In addition, the written comments by candidates are included with the summary. The dean or associate dean meet with all faculty who have means less than 4.0 and all faculty who have shown improvement in their student evaluations.

Many faculty members add specific questions to their evaluations to further examine their teaching: some have candidates complete a mid-term evaluation in order to formatively assess changes they have made. Faculty members rely on multiple measures to assess their performance and reflect on how to improve their work.

Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

College of Education faculty are encouraged through the process of retention, tenure and promotion, and post-tenure review to continually keep current with their pedagogy and professional practice. Experienced faculty members provide expert advice to help mentor new faculty. The college has a professional mentoring committee to assist all faculty members. Recent initiatives by the committee include supporting faculty during the tenure process by sharing successfully organized personnel files, supporting the initiative to re-establish social

justice in coursework, and soliciting assistance in mentoring others in using TaskStream. The university has established a Faculty Center to encourage faculty to continually develop their professional skills. The college provides a base allocation of $500 per faculty member for professional development. Faculty who choose to teach up to three units above the 24-unit expectation could enhance their funding up to $3000. Interviews with faculty indicate both the COE and the university provide ample opportunities for faculty professional development.

Faculty document a total of 1,122 instances of faculty professional development over a four-year period. Faculty interviews indicate faculty feel supported in their attendance in professional development activities. In addition to COE support, the University has professional development funds available for faculty on a competitive basis.

Overall Assessment of Standard

College of Education faculty have extensive academic backgrounds with 100 percent of the tenured and tenure track faculty holding doctorate degrees. The faculty are effective teachers who model best teaching practices in instruction. They are productive in many scholarly areas and provide extensive service to the university, the unit, and the community. All faculty are systematically evaluated using CSUSM Student Evaluation of Teaching Forms. All tenured faculty are required to participate in a post-tenure review every five years. Part time faculty and DTiRs are also evaluated and their classes are included in the candidate review of instruction. All CSUSM faculty serve on committees at the university, participate extensively in P-12 schools, and local communities. Faculty are also highly involved in local, state, and national professional organizations.

NCATE Team Recommendation: MET at the Initial and Advanced Levels

Areas for Improvement: None

State Team Decision: Standard 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.

Unit Governance and Resources

The COE provides effective leadership and exercises oversight over all programs designed to prepare professionals in P-12 schools at the university. Since its inception, the COE has had a tradition of using a flat governance structure based upon the Governance Community (GC), a committee to which all COE faculty, administrators and staff belong. The GC meets monthly and makes its decisions on a consensus basis. Any member of the GC has the right to suggest a motion. A reliance on consensus decision making helps to ensure that the voice and the needs of the smaller programs and interest groups are not overlooked.

The members of the GC recognize that the body can be flooded with motions of varying quality and as a result a filtering body called the Executive Council (EC) has been established. With membership from every committee in the COE, the EC, when necessary, refines items brought forward to the GC and can also act independently on time sensitive administrative matters. Several committees, including the Program Coordinators Committee, the Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Programs Committee report directly to the EC, before their agenda items are passed on the GC for confirmation.

Although the IR notes that the current governance structure can be very time consuming, both faculty and staff express a commitment to and a satisfaction with the current governance model. Evidence that the current governance structure is effective can be seen in the unit's successful response to two recent state-mandated changes: the truncation of the Administrative Services Tier II credential program and the integration of the once stand-alone CLAD English Learner authorization into all of the basic credential programs.

The Integrated Credential Program (ICP) combines an undergraduate degree in Liberal Studies and an extra semester for a Multiple Subject credential and is the only program that is not housed entirely within the COE. Participants in the program declare ICP as a major as juniors and then participate in four semesters of focused subject matter and teacher preparation coursework, followed by a semester of field placement. The leadership and faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences (COAS) are fully committed to the mission and vision of the COE and strongly support the IPC even though it receives a higher proportion of resources for faculty release and field supervisions per capita then other COAS majors.

The COE community is aware the current "flat" governance structure may not survive significant enrollment growth in the programs the unit offers. Should the "flat" structure become unmanageable it can be anticipated that the COE will make further appropriate modifications to its governance model, as it did when the EC was created.

The involvement of the unit with the local P-12 community is extremely close and productive. P-12 practioners from through out the service area were uniform in their enthusiastic praise of the impact the COE had on their schools. The most significant element in this collaboration is the Distinguished Teacher in Residence Program (DTiR) which has been in existence since the COE

was founded. The program is funded in part by contributions from the participating districts and the COE. The DTiR's remain on the payroll of their home district while at the COE.

The K-12 teachers are selected through a competitive process that ensures that over each six year cycle each district in the three clusters has one DTiR teacher. Once selected the teacher joins the COE faculty for two years. Districts report that the DTiR's leave them as excellent classroom teachers and return as excellent teacher leaders, ready to teach adults as well as K-12 children.

The DTiR's reported that they felt "embraced" by the COE community and were fully involved as if they were regular faculty. DTiR's who sometimes had expected that they would only be allowed to supervise student teachers, instead teach a regular load of courses (three) and supervise for three WTU's nine student teachers.

The second part of the program comes from faculty release time when the DTiR's take over COE courses. The savings are transferred to the District teachers in Residence Program Assigned time Grants. Regular COE faculty, in partnership with DTiR program districts can access these funds to develop projects that meet local district needs. The project focus areas can be suggested either by the K-12 partner districts or by the COE faculty.

The COE also participates as a partner in North County Professional Development Federation (NCDPF). It is funded jointly by the school districts, college and the county office and has its own paid staff. The NCDPF has begun to serve schools outside San Diego County, reaching into southern Riverside County. Meetings have become an informational clearing house for the participants on all aspects of K-16 education in which COE representatives are seen as significant and important sources of information to the P-12 community.

A local superintendent stated that when he became a principal the COE was already involved with his school without his even needing to ask for help and that as his career advanced to the central office the COE remained an active partner with the district and his work. In addition to institutionalized contacts, many informal meetings also occur between the dean and other COE staff and representatives of the local P-12 community.

Unit Budget

The COE receives funding at a higher per capita ratio than do the other colleges within the University. The addition funds are in recognition of the need for the COE faculty for addition release time and for the funding of student clinical field experiences. Funding is also allocated for all full-time faculty to supervise six students in the field each academic year as part of their normal workload. This practice ensures that even veteran faculty remain current with the conditions in the surrounding K-12 schools.

The COE has also been supported in the establishment of off-campus cohort locations at the initial certification level. The school sites chosen have been selected as being among the lowest performing in the region with high minority, second language and low socio-economic enrollment. Funds have been raised to build a state of the art observation classroom at one of the sites.

As part of a broader initiative, the university has partnered with business and at least two K-12 districts to guarantee acceptance to the university to ALL district students who finish high school

and meet the CSU system entrance requirements. Since the percentage of CSUSM students who work twenty hours or more per week while enrolled in studies is twice the statewide average, the ability to begin college close to home is an important benefit.

Personnel

Workload policies and staffing are consistent with the established standards for teaching and supervision of clinical practice. The work climate in the unit encourages intellectual activity and both faculty and staff are engaged in innovative research and changing practices for the delivery of services. Faculty is closely and effectively engaged in the P-12 schools on a continual basis. Collaboration in research with local schools is actively encouraged and supported. In most areas, adequate staffing for teaching and support services are maintained.

Facilities

Sufficient facilities are provided on campus for the operation of the COE activities, both in terms of classrooms and faculty office space. While many programs operate one or more cohorts or courses offsite, the decision to do so was based not upon the lack of campus space, but because the locations at existing K-12 school sites provided significant program advantages over campus space. Ever classroom on campus is provided with a smart station for technology services and the offsite locations are provided with wireless internet technology.

The COE has also obtained portable office and classroom space when necessary to support off site locations and has also raised funds to construct model instructional classrooms at selected partner sites.

Unit Resources including Technology

COE resources in the new Kellogg Library are superior. Opened in 2005, the library's fifth floor is being converted into an educational center for the COE. The COE space includes two curriculum libraries, as well as classroom and curriculum laboratory space. One of the curriculum centers, the Barahona Center contains a world class collection of children's literature, non-fiction works, and works in translation in Spanish and also has instructional facilities available to those using its materials. On the same floor is the endowed Hansen Curriculum center with an attached curriculum lab in which the curriculum materials can be demonstrated. In addition, the library is moving elements of its regular collection, such as juvenilia, to the fifth floor to concentrate materials for the COE research activities.

Offsite facilities have been established at Alvin Dunn Elementary School, at Ronald Regan Elementary School, at Valley Elementary, at Bonsall West Elementary, and at the Woodland Park Middle School. A satellite center has also been developed in Riverside County to serve schools districts in the southern part of the county.

A Center for Children and Families is under construction on campus to house a preschool and daycare center that will house the emerging Early Childhood program. This effort is supported in part by a tax the student body imposed on itself through the student government process.

CSU SM maintains a campus computer refresh program that renews the computers on campus every three to four years. The program also ensures that while the computers are in use their

software is up to date and functional. When a campus computer is retired under the system the university pays to have the unit professionally swept clean of data. The computers are then donated to local partner school districts. The units are maintained at the school sites until replaced by newer refresh program retired systems. In addition, the university has ensured that all the COE off site teaching locations noted above have been provided with wireless connection services to students and faculty using them can connect to the home campus.

The Student Services Center (SSC) has established an innovative program to convert all admissions materials and student files into paperless computer records. This system allows authorized unit staff and faculty to view student records and admissions materials wherever access to a connection is available. Conversion of old student records is nearly complete and the files of current students have already been included in the new system. The system can be modified to provide tracking of data and information as required by specific program and will be an important foundation upon which an assessment system can be developed.

The SSC has also become a place where all credential program faculty and students can turn to for advice on both the university and state requirements for teacher credentialing and other SOE. As a result the essential information on admissions and credentialing is provided in a uniform manner across programs and at the off site locations that the COE maintains. The SSC staff also tracks changes in state credentialing regulations in a timely manner, allowing the unit to respond quickly to the changing mandates and requirements.

Summary for Standard

NCATE Team Recommendation: **Standard met at initial and advanced levels.**

Area for Improvement:

There are not adequate resources for personnel to support the assessment system.

Rationale*:* Consistent findings of the examiners and explicit comments from the GC establish the need for the unit to improve its capacity to conduct program evaluation and collect outcomes The COE should consider allocating funds to create one higher level position to create and supervise a unit assessment system and another position in the Student Services Center to manage assessment data collection and data entry in a systematic manner for all programs. The need for these additional personnel will only become more essential as the state institutes its revised accreditation system and the teacher performance assessment becomes a legal requirement in July 2008.

State Team Decision: Standard Met with a Concern

Concern:

There are not adequate resources for personnel to support the assessment system.

INTERNSHIP ISSUES FOR STATE REPORT

Common Standards 1 and 2 – Leadership and Resources

The COE has official agreements with each school district in which an intern is employed. Each district provides each intern with a support provider, and when needed, additional support.

Common Standard 4 – Evaluation

The Student Services Center evaluates candidates to ensure that all requirements for the initial internship as well as the final credential are completed before licensure. The program uses the exit survey, the CSU one year out survey and comments from the principals at the school sites where the interns are placed as their program evaluation tools.

Common Standard 5 – Admission

The Student Services Center evaluates candidates to ensure that they have met the requirements for admission and for the Internship credential. The evaluation for admission includes a validation of prior candidate experiences that prepare them for the increased responsibilities of an internship position.

Common Standard 6 – Advice and Assistance

The Student Services Center provides all interns with information about credential requirements and program-specific coursework and requirements. Specific handbooks are available to each candidate. The on site supervisor holds regular meetings with the interns during their employment so the intern can seek guidance.

Common Standard 7 – School Collaboration

The selection of the site provider is made with the assistance of the site leadership.

Common Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors

Field supervisors take on a special role for interns already teaching in schools. The university provides supervisors with regular training opportunities.

PROGRAM STANDARDS
Multiple Subject Credential Program

Findings on Standards
After review of the Institutional Report and supporting documentation, and completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors was met with concerns and all other program standards are met for the Multiple Subject Program.

Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors-Met with Concerns
There is unevenness in the orientation for cooperating teachers in the Multiple Subject Program and no evidence of training in supervision. While the program documentation lists specific eligibility requirements for cooperating teachers, there were instances when cooperating teachers had not met the criterion regarding years of teaching experience.

Standard 16 states, " . . . except in unusual, unanticipated circumstances, fieldwork assignments occur at pre-selected sites. . .," yet in several instances, candidates and program faculty reported that part-time candidates selected their own fieldwork sites. This can result in inconsistency in the quality and diversity of the Early Field Experiences. While it is challenging for part-time candidates who work during the day and take classes in the evening to complete the field-based assignments, it is the process of selecting the sites to conduct these field experiences that is the basis for concern.

Representatives from all stakeholder groups agree that CSUSM Multiple Subject candidates are well regarded in the community and highly desired for employment. Program faculty have a significant presence in the public schools, and several newly designated "lab schools" are facilitating this. One factor contributing to the two-way partnership is the highly competitive and long-standing, Distinguished Teacher in Residence Program. This program brings K-12 teachers into the campus community for a two-year period, and financially supports campus faculty to conduct research studies at school sites. Classes are taught to theme-based cohorts at school sites, and in many cases, there are designated classrooms that are used solely for teacher preparation classes.

Strengths
CSUSM's College of Education has strong partnerships and relationships with the P-12 community. This was evidenced at a Sunday night poster session where there was a large turnout of K-12 administrators, teachers, program faculty and teacher candidates.

The College Administration and Program Faculty reported they have been working closely with school site personnel to develop several sites as lab schools.

The use of technology by candidates and faculty is well-supported. Significant resources are allocated for teacher candidates and faculty in both hardware and software. The university Instructional Technology (IT) Department acknowledges that the COE is a leader in this area.

Many candidates and graduates had positive comments regarding the quality of advising from both program faculty and Student Services professionals. The Credential Analysts, the Field

Experience Coordinator, the Outreach Coordinator and other Student Services advisors demonstrated ready availability and a willingness to meet candidates' individual needs.

CSUSM candidates in and graduates of the Multiple Subject Credential Program including the Integrated Credential Program, without exception, described their program as a highly positive experience and felt confident and well prepared to respond to their student teaching assignments. The Middle Level Certificate Program is one of few programs in the State that focus on preparing middle school teachers.

Concerns
No additional concerns

Multiple Subject Credential Program
BCLAD Emphasis: Spanish

Findings on Standards
After review of the Institutional Report and supporting documentation, and completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that Standard 1: Program Design and Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors are met with concerns and all other program standards are met for the Multiple Subject Program BCLAD Emphasis in Spanish.

Standard 1: Program Design-Met with Concerns
For the BCLAD Emphasis Credential program, the team found inconsistency with respect to element 1(a) of Standard 1. This element states, "the design of the program and the selection of prerequisites are clearly grounded in a well-reasoned rationale, which draws on sound scholarship and theory anchored to the knowledge base of teacher education, are articulated clearly, and are evident in the delivery of the program's coursework and fieldwork." Through interviews, the team learned that curricular decisions are not consistently made based on the CTC standards upon which the BCLAD Emphasis Credential Program was approved. The team acknowledges that the BCLAD Emphasis Credential is in a state of transition in light of the new SB 2042 Credential. However, CSUSM continues to recommend candidates for a BCLAD Emphasis Credential. Thus, CSUSM must be able to articulate a clear rationale for the current BCLAD program. Standards for the program must be articulated and until new bilingual standards are issued by the CTC, changes that are made to the program must be grounded in State standards for the BCLAD Emphasis Credential.

Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors -Met with Concerns
There is unevenness in the orientation for cooperating teachers in the BCLAD Emphasis Credential Program and no evidence of training in supervision.

The BCLAD Emphasis Credential program at CSUSM consists of the entire Multiple Subject Program with the addition of two classes, passage of a language proficiency exam, and a field placement in a designated bilingual setting where both primary and secondary language and English instruction are provided. The two additional classes are designed to provide candidates with knowledge on various Latino/a cultures and methodology for primary language instruction. An examination of documents showed that required assignments in these classes are lesson plans

and thematic units in Spanish, written reflections and dialogues on WebCT. Through interviews, the team determined that candidates for the BCLAD Emphasis Credential were very pleased with their program. They consistently praised their professors and cooperating teachers for their professionalism and modeling how to develop collaborative relationships. From school site visits and interviews, the team determined that graduates of the program are teaching in dual immersion schools and affirmed that they were well prepared to teach in Spanish and to differentiate instruction for English language learners.

Strengths
Candidates in the BCLAD Emphasis Credential Program are provided with various opportunities to learn about bilingual methodology and Latino/a cultures outside of the two BCLAD classes. For example, candidates are able to participate in "Border Pedagogy," a project where BCLAD candidates engage in conversations with teachers in Tijuana for the purpose of designing lessons that meet the needs of children who attend schools in border towns in the United States and Mexico. Some candidates elect to participate in a summer program in Guanajuato, Mexico, where they complete their two BCLAD classes and a portion of their student teaching assignment. Additionally, candidates are able to participate in a service-learning project in Guatemala.

BCLAD candidates make use of the Barahona Center for the Study of Books in Spanish, a facility on campus that houses over 100,000 English, Spanish and bilingual books.

BCLAD Emphasis Credential Program faculty have created professional partnerships with various schools that ensure candidates in the BCLAD program have access to excellent field experiences during student teaching.

Concerns
No additional concerns

Single Subject Credential Program

Findings on Standards
After review of the Institutional Report and supporting documentation, and completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that Program Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors is met with concerns and all other program standards are met for the Single Subject Credential Program.

Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors-Met with Concerns
There is unevenness in the orientation for cooperating teachers in the BCLAD Emphasis Credential Program and no evidence of training in supervision. While there is clear evidence that cooperating teachers are oriented to the program, there is lack of evidence that supervision training is provided.

Representatives from all stakeholder groups agree that CSUSM Single Subject candidates are well regarded in the community and highly desired for employment. According to program faculty, candidates are held to high standards of professional conduct. This is further supported

through the course syllabi, professional portfolios, artifacts indicating successful demonstration of the teaching performance expectations (TPEs) and reflective journals.

College of Education faculty reported they feel valued and supported by each other, which ultimately contributes to program candidates' success in their coursework and field experiences. Through interviews, CSUSM candidates in and graduates of the Single Subject Credential Program, without exception, described their program as a highly positive experience and felt confident and well prepared to respond to their student teaching assignments.

Based on documents and stakeholder interviews, the team determined that the Single Subject Credential Program is an excellent model of academic coursework, fieldwork, and student teaching. A unique aspect of the CSUSM model is the organization of interdisciplinary teams, whereby candidates collaborate and problem-solve with colleagues across disciplines. Candidates reported that this approach encouraged them to view themselves as proficient teachers of reading, as well as proficient teachers in their chosen discipline. There was significant evidence that processes for formative assessment were in place and contributed to comprehensive summative assessment practices.

Strengths
The positive and collaborative relationship between program faculty, candidates and graduates is a definite strength of the program. Also noted as a strength is the delineation of "Attributes of Highly Effective Teachers."

The use of technology by candidates and faculty is well-supported. Many graduates indicated that they regularly communicated with their pupils' parents via email, a practice begun while they were students at CSUSM.

Without exception, candidates and graduates praised the program faculty for their passion for education and willingness to share their expertise.

Concerns
No additional concerns

Single Subject Credential Program
BCLAD Emphasis: Spanish

Findings on Standards
After review of the Institutional Report and supporting documentation, and completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that Standard 1: Program Design and Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors are met with concerns and all other program standards are met for the Single Subject Program BCLAD Emphasis in Spanish.

Program Standard 1: Program Design-Met with Concerns
For the BCLAD Emphasis Credential program, the team found inconsistency with respect to element 1(a) of Standard 1. This element states, "the design of the program and the selection of prerequisites are clearly grounded in a well-reasoned rationale, which draws on sound scholarship and theory anchored to the knowledge base of teacher education, are articulated clearly, and are evident in the delivery of the program's coursework and fieldwork." Through

interviews, the team learned that curricular decisions are not consistently made based on the CTC standards upon which the BCLAD Emphasis Credential Program was approved. The team acknowledges that the BCLAD Emphasis Credential is in a state of transition in light of the new SB 2042 Credential. However, CSUSM continues to recommend candidates for a BCLAD Emphasis Credential. Thus, CSUSM must be able to articulate a clear rationale for the current BCLAD program. Standards for the program must be articulated, and until new bilingual standards are issued by the CTC, changes that are made to the program must be grounded in State standards for the BCLAD Emphasis Credential.

Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors -Met with Concerns

There is unevenness in the orientation for cooperating teachers in the BCLAD Emphasis Credential Program and no evidence of training in supervision.

The BCLAD Emphasis Credential Program at CSUSM consists of the entire Single Subject program with the addition of two classes, passage of a language proficiency exam, and a field placement in a designated bilingual setting where both primary and secondary language and English instruction are provided. The two additional classes are designed to provide candidates with knowledge on various Latino/a cultures and methodology for primary language instruction. An examination of documents showed that required assignments in these classes are lesson plans and thematic units in Spanish, written reflections and dialogues on WebCT. Through interviews, the team determined that candidates for the BCLAD Emphasis Credential were very pleased with their program. They consistently praised their professors and cooperating teachers for their professionalism and modeling how to develop collaborative relationships.

Strengths

Candidates in the BCLAD Emphasis Credential Program are provided with various opportunities to learn about bilingual methodology and Latino/a cultures outside of the two BCLAD classes. For example, candidates are able to participate in "Border Pedagogy," a project where BCLAD candidates engage in conversations with teachers in Tijuana for the purpose of designing lessons that meet the needs of children who attend schools in border towns in the United States and Mexico. Some candidates elect to participate in a summer program in Guanajuato, Mexico, where they complete their two BCLAD classes and a portion of their student teaching assignment. Additionally, candidates are able to participate in a service-learning project in Guatemala.

BCLAD candidates make use of the Barahona Center for the Study of Books in Spanish, a facility on campus that houses over 100,000 English, Spanish, and bilingual books.

Concerns

No additional concerns

Reading Certificate
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Findings on Standards

After review of the Institutional Report and supporting documentation, and interviews with candidates, graduates and faculty, the team determined that all program standards are met for the

Reading Certificate Program. For the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program, Standard 16: Advanced Clinical Experiences is met with concerns. All other standards are met.

Program Standard 16: Advanced Clinical Experiences-Met with Concerns
Standard 16 requires that clinical activities include intensive work with beginning readers and in-depth experience with students who have severe reading difficulties; however, interview evidence and examination of case studies indicated that some candidates are receiving limited experience, working only with beginning, primary-age readers, or only with older students needing intensive intervention. Candidates are allowed to arrange their own field experience, resulting in program inconsistency. On-site supervision can also be problematic, depending on the location of the candidate. In some cases, principals or teachers who are not certified in reading/language arts are providing supervision because there are no on-site specialists.

Strengths
The design of the program allows candidates to move through the program in a sequential manner. Coursework prepares candidates to evaluate research, assess reading progress, provide interventions and work effectively with students. The Literacy Program Leadership course prepares candidates to provide professional development and become leaders in their schools and districts. Interviews with recent graduates of the program were uniformly positive; graduates indicated that they received strong support from faculty and voiced appreciation for the cohort model.

Concerns
No additional concerns

Education Specialist Credential Programs:
Mild/Moderate Level I, Including Internship
Moderate/Severe Level I, Including Internship
Mild/Moderate Level II
Moderate/Severe Level II

Findings on Standards
Based on a review of the institution's responses to the appropriate Program Standards, interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, supervising practitioners, university administrators, and employers, the team finds the following: all standards are fully met for both the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe with English Learner Authorization Level I Education Specialist Credential Programs, including Internship Credential Programs. All standards are fully met for the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe with English Learner Authorization Level II Education Specialist Credential Programs.

After reviewing documents and conducting numerous interviews, the team determined that the Education Specialist Credential candidates are well prepared for special education teaching positions. Faculty are highly qualified and committed to best practices in teacher preparation and special education. Teacher candidates reported initial and ongoing advisement as helpful, with faculty being very responsive to their needs throughout the program. Faculty have excellent

collaborative relationships with school districts; graduates are highly regarded by employers. The Level II program provides advanced curriculum and also meets the needs of new teachers with regard to data-based decision making and emerging research and practices.

Strengths

The candidates and graduates interviewed consistently expressed appreciation for the passion, accessibility, and support of the faculty. They stated the program prepared them extremely well to be special education teachers. Employers were very pleased with the close partnerships and the quality of the credential candidates, reporting, "they are better prepared than candidates from other programs." Specific program strengths include:

- Support of candidates by faculty.
- A summer class on effective instruction taught by a part-time faculty member.
- Content on collaboration.
- The ability of the faculty to model best practices within their courses.
- Faculty-student relationships.
- The use of case studies and action research.
- The Technology Grant Assignment.
- Relevant, hands-on experiences with specific tools for the classroom.
- Intern program design that fosters school-university collaborative relationships, and ongoing classroom support.
- Level II requirements designed and agreed upon with a coalition of other IHEs in the San Diego area.

Concerns

None noted.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

Findings on Standards

After reviewing the Institutional Report; the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program document; supporting documentation; course syllabi; candidate work documenting learning outcomes; interviews with candidates, graduates, full- and part-time faculty, Student Services Program Advisor and Credential Analyst, university fieldwork supervisors, K-12 superintendents serving on a program advisory board, and supervising practitioners; the NCATE/CTC team determined that all the program standards are met for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program.

The recently approved Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program is one of the advanced program options within the College of Education, offering candidates the opportunity to add two research courses to complete a Master of Arts in Education degree. The 24-unit cohort-based credential program integrates field experiences with coursework each of the four semesters in the two-year program. Currently, a cohort starts once a year. Preliminary Administrative Services Credential candidates must achieve competence to instruct English language learners. If candidates do not hold the CLAD Certificate or a 2042 Credential, they must take additional coursework to obtain full EL authorization.

The integrating themes of the program are mission-driven, based on the conceptual framework and vision, and provide strong bridges between theory and practice. A strong fieldwork component requires candidates to complete at least two approved projects per term to increase competence in the practice of school leadership. University supervisors work closely with candidates as they build a series of field experiences to support learning in the concurrent courses (i.e., developing a newsletter for teachers and administrators in their districts to report on legal issues paired with EDUC 616A, Education Law and Personnel Administration).

Coursework provides a rigorous engagement in issues, knowledge, skills, and dispositions to meet the CTC program standards and national standards for educational leaders. As both a formative and summative assessment of learning, candidates develop reflective portfolios, which are presented at the end of the program along with oral presentations of the two "most powerful" leadership learnings from the program. In addition, candidates revisit their leadership philosophy as they embrace school leaders' primary mission to ensure the achievement of every student.

Both part-time and tenure-track faculty are highly respected and take ownership of the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program. Candidates are attracted to the program based on the opportunity to work with these former superintendents and current administrators from the region as well as the experienced full-time faculty who are scholar practitioners.

Strengths:
The quality of the faculty is the most "highly prized" aspect of the program. The faculty model professional behavior and have high expectations for candidates in coursework and fieldwork. The candidates are proud to have CSUSM degrees and credentials. Candidates and graduates are very supportive of the program and clearly articulate that the program prepared them for their administrative positions. The community of learners that develops from the cohort model becomes an important professional and personal support system. The candidate-friendly, one-night-a-week schedule is important to the candidates. The candidates believe they are making a difference in the education experienced by the children in the region. CSUSM has given them the tools to do this job as well as reinforced a passion for life-long learning.

Concerns:
None noted

Professional Comments

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

Multiple Subject
The BCLAD Emphasis Credential Program document was not provided to the team in advance of the site visit. No student work or evidence related to the BCLAD program was included in the Exhibit Room. The team had to ask for evidence in order to determine if standards had been met. Faculty are encouraged to update the BCLAD document so that BCLAD competencies are clearly articulated with the SB 2042 Credential Programs.

Single Subject
The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing has recently approved the CSUSM Single Subject Internship Credential Program. No candidates are currently enrolled.

The BLCAD Emphasis Credential Program document was not provided to the team in advance of the site visit. No student work or evidence related to the BCLAD program was included in the Exhibit Room. The team had to ask for evidence in order to determine if standards had been met. Faculty are encouraged to update the BCLAD document so that BCLAD competencies are clearly articulated with the SB 2042 Credential Programs.

Education Specialist
It is recommended that the Special Education Program establish a Community Advisory Board composed of school district teachers and administrators, program graduates and program faculty, to involve P-12 in the development of program rubrics, evaluations, etc.

Reading Certificate and Reading/Language Arts Specialist
Case studies and work found in evidence boxes displayed uneven quality, indicating inconsistent expectations. Providing specific formats and rubrics for assessment would establish minimal standards and would ensure that candidates understand what should be included in writing a professional report.

Administrative Services (Preliminary)
The collaboration between both the part- and full-time faculty and the Advisor/Credential Analyst is very apparent and contributes to the high quality of this program. There are opportunities for summer courses; however, candidates do not universally understand the process. It could be helpful to offer specialized seminars or indicate opportunities for candidates to widen their skill set by selecting a second summer course from other COE offerings. Although these courses are not required, they could broaden aspiring administrators' skills (i.e., reading, special education, culture and language, or technology). As the program grows, the need for additional faculty will become increasingly critical. Candidates would like to further their understanding of diversity by going deeper in the issues and broadening their study. The College of Education will want to continue its efforts in outreach to diversify the candidate pool.