

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

Professional Services Division

January 17, 2008

Overview of This Report

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

NCATE/Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions For all Programs offered by the Institution or Program Sponsor

NCATE Standards

	Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	X		
2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	X		
3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	X		
4) Diversity	X		
5) Faculty Performance and Development	X		
6) Unit Governance and Resources	X		

Program Standards

	Total # of Program Standards	Number of Program Standards		
		Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
Multiple Subject	19	19	0	0
Single Subject	19	19	0	0
Education Specialist: MM	12	12	0	0
Education Specialist: MS	13	13	0	0

	Total # of Program Standards	Number of Program Standards		
		Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
Education Specialist; ECE	17	17	0	0
Administrative Services	24	24	0	0
Reading and Language Arts	20	20	0	0
School Nurse	29	29	0	0
Clinical Rehabilitative Services	6	6	0	0

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, Fullerton 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
 - Preliminary
 - Professional
- Clinical Rehabilitative Services
 - Language Speech and Hearing
- Education Specialist (Special Education)
 - Preliminary Level I
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship
 - Early Childhood Education
 - Early Childhood Education Internship
 - Professional Level II
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
 - Early Childhood Education
- Health Services School Nurse
- Multiple Subject Teaching
 - Multiple Subject
 - BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
 - Multiple Subject Internship

- Reading and Language Arts Specialist
Reading Certificate
Reading and Language Arts Specialist
- Resource Specialist Certificate
- Single Subject Teaching
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

(2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted
- California State University, Fullerton be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, Fullerton be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2014-2015 academic year subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation visits by both the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Background Information

The California State University (CSU), Fullerton, located on 236 acres of what once was part of a vast orange grove, is the twelfth state college authorized by the Legislature. Classes began in September 1959 with 452 students at Orange County State College. Today, Cal State Fullerton is a comprehensive urban university with a student population of nearly 36,000, making it the most populous of the California State University institutions and the second most populous university in the state, with the University of California, Los Angeles as the largest. There were 2,099 full- and part-time faculty members for the 2005-06 year.

CSU Fullerton offers 105 degree programs, 55 undergraduate and 49 graduate programs including one doctoral program. The institution is organized into eight colleges: Arts, Business and Economics, Communications, Education, Engineering and Computer Science, Health and Human Development, Humanities and Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences and Mathematics. Teacher Education is a primary focus of the CSU system, producing 65% of the state's teachers annually.

In 2004, the College of Education (COE) was established. The new dean began in July 2006. The COE has five departments and three credential programs are housed in other colleges. The enrollment in the College of Education is approximately 2200 students. In 2005-2006, the institution recommended approximately 1100 candidates for credentials. There are 77 full-time faculty members, of which 56 are tenure-track. In addition, there are 21 full-time lecturers. There are 114 part-time faculty members who teach approximately 30% of the courses.

Although the university has three branch campuses, only the Irvine campus offers education programs. About one-half of its student population is comprised of education candidates. At the Irvine campus, candidates may complete the Multiple Subject credential, Preliminary

Administrative Services credential; and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist credential as well as prerequisite courses for initial credentials and some advanced courses. In addition, there are twelve school sites where a complete master's program in education is delivered. Thirty-seven courses are approved for online instruction.

Merged COA and NCATE Visit

This was a continuing accreditation visit by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The visit merged the accreditation processes of the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) according to the approved protocol. The Accreditation Team, which included membership from the COA and NCATE, received a single Institutional Self-Study Report, worked from a common interview schedule, and collaborated on all decisions related to accreditation standards.

The merged visit was based upon the partnership agreement reached between the COA and NCATE. The first partnership agreement was developed and signed in 1989. The Partnership was revised and renewed in 1996 and subsequently revised and renewed in 2001 and 2007. The Partnership Agreement requires that all California universities who are NCATE accredited or seeking NCATE accreditation participate in reviews that are merged with the State's accreditation process. The agreement allows the university the option to respond to the NCATE 2000 Standards, provided that the Commission's Common Standards are addressed in the context of that response. It also allows the subsequent accreditation team report to be written based upon those standards. California State University, Fullerton exercised that option.

In addition, the institution must respond to all appropriate Program Standards. The agreement also states that the teams will be merged, will share common information and interview schedules, and will collect data and reach conclusions about the quality of the programs in a collaborative manner. However, the accreditation team will take the common data collected by the team and adapt it according to the needs of the respective accrediting bodies. 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 for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant, Larry Birch, was assigned to the institution in Spring 2005, and met with institutional leadership October 2006. The meeting led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, and logistical and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone, e-mail and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. The Team Leader (Co-chair for the visit), Dr. Shane Martin, was selected in May 2007 as was the Chair of the NCATE Board of Examiners (Co-chair for the visit), Dr. Mark Goor. On October 5, 2007, the team co-chairs and the staff consultant met with the representatives of CSU, Fullerton to make final determinations about the interview schedule, the template for the visit and any remaining organizational details. Helen Hawley, consultant in the Professional Services Division, was also assigned to assist with the visit.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the NCATE unit standards and appropriate references to the California Common Standards. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution decided which of the five options in the *Accreditation Framework* would be used for responses to the Program Standards. Institutional personnel decided to respond using Option One, California Program Standards for all programs.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Dean and Faculty of the College of Education and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of twenty one, consisting of Co-Chairs for the visit, a Common Standards Cluster that would include six NCATE members and two COA members; a Basic Credential Cluster of seven members; and an Advanced Credential Cluster of five members. The Dean and Consultant assigned each credential program to one of the program clusters. The Commission Consultant then selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and training in the use of the *Accreditation Framework* and experience in merged accreditation visits.

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

Within days of the accreditation visit, two of the state team members who had agreed to be on the team had to cancel their participation in the visit due to personal emergencies. In the case of one team member, the decision made between the Commission consultant and the institution was that there was sufficient expertise on the team to move forward without replacing the team member. In the case of the other team member, expertise was needed in the particular credential area. Contact was made with as many potential replacement team members as possible, but none were available to help. Finally, with concurrence from the institution, a CTC staff member was assigned as a member of the team. This is highly unusual, but was felt to be the best solution, under the circumstances.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received electronic 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, November 3. On Saturday evening, the Team Leader and the COA members of the Common Standards Cluster and CCTC staff began their deliberations with the NCATE team members. It included orientation to the accreditation procedures and organizational arrangements for both the COA and NCATE team members. The Common Standards Cluster began its examination of documents on the campus on Sunday morning. The remainder of the team arrived on Sunday mid-day, November 4, 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, November 5 and 6, 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 all clusters, and much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Tuesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. On Tuesday morning, the team Co-chairs met with institutional leadership for a mid-visit status report. This provided an opportunity to identify areas in which the team had concerns and for which additional information was being sought. Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning were set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report. During those work sessions, cluster members shared and checked their data with members of other clusters and particularly with the Common Standards Cluster, since the NCATE/Common Standards findings also affected each of the Program Clusters.

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 narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then noted particular Strengths beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standards and possibly additional Concerns not rising to the level of finding a standard less than fully met.

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

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

Accreditation Decisions by the Team

The entire team met on Tuesday evening to review the findings and make decisions about the results of the visit. The team discussed each NCATE/Common Standard and decided about each of them for purposes of the NCATE report and determined if any areas for improvement should be identified. The six NCATE standards were then considered for purposes of the COA report to make sure that all elements of the CCTC Common Standards were addressed and met within the context of the NCATE report and if findings should be modified because of differences between the NCATE standards and the Common Standards. The team then made decisions about all of the program standards for every credential area.

Finally, the team made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Handbook*. The options were: "Accreditation," "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations," "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations," "Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations," or "Denial of Accreditation." After thorough discussion, the entire team decided 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 late Wednesday morning.

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

INSTITUTION: California State University, Fullerton

DATES OF VISIT: November 3-7, 2007

RATIONALE FOR THE ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATION:

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 recommendations pertaining to the accreditation status of California State University, Fullerton and all of its credential programs were determined based on the following:

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

PROGRAM STANDARDS: Team clusters for [1]Basic credential programs (Multiple Subject – including internship, Multiple Subject BCLAD Emphasis, Single Subject – including internship, Education Specialist in Special Education – Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe, and Early Childhood Special Education – including internship); [2] Advanced credential programs (Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services, Reading Certificate and Reading/Language Arts Specialist, Health Services School Nurse, Clinical Rehabilitative Services) reviewed all program areas. Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total merged team membership was provided for each of the clusters. Following these discussions of each program reviewed, the total team, including NCATE and state team members, considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns or not met.

BACKGROUND FOR ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus that the six NCATE Standards were met, with one identified area for improvement for purposes of the NCATE report. The six standards were met for purposes of the state team report, and all elements of the CTC Common Standards were addressed and met within the context of the NCATE report. The team decided that all Program Standards were fully met for all program areas. It is noteworthy that all

standards were fully met for the unit and all programs. In addition, a number of strengths were identified by the team. Overall, the institution and its programs are of high quality and are producing graduates who are highly valued by employers.

**ACCREDITATION TEAM
RECOMMENDATION:**

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION TEAM

State Team Leader: **Shane Martin** (Team Co-Chair)
Loyola Marymount University

NCATE Team Leader **Mark Goor** (Team Co-Chair and
Common Standards Cluster Leader)
George Mason University

NCATE/Common Standards Cluster:

Ronna J. Vanderslice (NCATE Member)
Cameron University (Oklahoma)

Kitty Jean Boitnott (NCATE Member)
Chamberlyne El. School, Glen Ellen, Virginia

William E. Geiger (NCATE Member)
University of Texas, Tyler

Nivia A. Fernandez (NCATE Member)
Universidad de Puerto Rico, Rio Pedras

Timothy W. Kopp (NCATE Member)
Naselle Youth Camp School (Washington)

Yvonne Lux (CTC/COA Member)
California Lutheran University

Mark Cary (CTC/COA Member)
Davis Joint Unified School District (Retired)

Basic Credential Cluster:

Linda Smetana (Cluster Leader)
California State University, East Bay

Reyes Quezada
University of San Diego

Maggie Payne
California State University, Chico

Carolyn Csongradi
Palo Alto Unified School District

Michele Britton Bass
Antioch University, Santa Barbara

Bob Loux
San Joaquin County Office of Education

Nancy Tatum
California Department of Education

Advanced Credential Cluster:

Marian Reimann (Cluster Leader)
Los Angeles Unified School District (Retired)

Denise Fleming
California State University, East Bay

Jan Jones Wadsworth
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Claudia Bays
California State University, Sacramento

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog	Portfolios
Institutional Self Study	Candidate Work Samples
Course Syllabi	Exit Surveys
Candidate Files	Assessment Data
Fieldwork Handbooks	Follow-up Survey Results
Course Materials	Electronic Exhibit Room
Information Booklets	Online Courses for Faculty
Field Experience Notebooks	Online Advising Program
Schedule of Classes	Recruitment Materials
Advisement Documents	
Faculty Vitae	

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Stands. Cluster	Basic Credential Cluster	Advanced Credential Cluster	TOTAL
Program Faculty	1	30	128	45	204
Institutional Administration	12	2	9	2	25
Candidates		13	332	119	464
Graduates	5	5	48	56	114
Employers of Graduates	5	6	16	16	43
Supervising Practitioners	4	8	25	16	53
Advisors	10	1	15	12	38
School Administrators	10	6	9	25	50
Credential Analyst		4	1	1	6
Advisory Committee	10	4	10	12	38

TOTAL 1035

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

NCATE STANDARDS/CCTC COMMON STANDARDS

STANDARD 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

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

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 1 was validated in the exhibits and interviews.

X Yes No

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation		X	
<p>Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation: Data indicate that candidates possess sufficient general skills and content knowledge with 100 percent pass rates on the CBEST and CSET state assessments and 99 percent on RICA for both 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. State Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) are aligned to conceptual framework expectations and identified in unit publications and course materials. Additional evidence of content knowledge comes from admissions GPAs for fall 2006/spring 2007 respectively with EDEL averaging 3.18/3.12, EDSC averaging 3.27/3.25, and SPED averaging 3.13/3.11. Since licensure programs require initial candidates to complete a content area major, admissions minimum GPAs also indicate content knowledge performance. Exit surveys of candidates and employers for 2006 indicate high confidence that initial candidates are well or adequately prepared with content knowledge, with candidate responses at 85 percent (EDEL), 90 percent (EDSC), and 59 percent (SPED), and supervisors responding with 93 percent (EDEL), 100 percent (EDSC) and 85 percent (SPED). Interviews with candidates and faculty support the rigor of coursework and depth and diversity of field experiences in the credentialing program and indicate a high level of proficiency demonstrated by candidates. (Note: Results from alternative routes to licensure, specifically the STEP and Internship Program, are included in aggregate data sets for initial programs. Candidates in these programs complete the same or equivalent coursework and assessments and meet the same field experience and clinical practice expectations. Irvine campus initial and advanced program data are aggregated into the unit data reviewed in this report.)</p>			
<p>Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation: Data indicate that advanced candidates have sufficient content knowledge. In three content knowledge courses, 91.2 percent of fall 2006 and 96.7 percent of spring 2007 EDEL-T candidates demonstrated acceptable or target levels of content knowledge averaging 3.38 and 3.43 GPAs respectively. In two content knowledge courses, 100 percent of MATS (SCED-T) candidates met target levels for both fall 2006 and spring 2007, averaging 4.00 and 3.93 GPAs respectively. In three content knowledge courses, 96 percent of EDSC-T candidates for both fall 2006 and spring 2007 met acceptable or target levels of mastery with 3.44 and 3.89 GPAs</p>			

respectively. In five content knowledge courses, 98 percent of fall 2006 and 96 percent of spring 2007 SPED-T candidates demonstrated acceptable or target levels of content knowledge averaging 3.52 and 3.39 GPAs respectively. On 2006 mid-term exit surveys of advanced candidates in all four programs, data indicate high confidence (80 percent and higher) that candidates are well or adequately prepared with content knowledge.

Interviews with faculty and candidates indicate coursework is rigorous and fieldwork is sufficiently diverse and extensive to demonstrate that advanced candidates develop strong content knowledge. Interviews with students and faculty as well as reviews of course syllabi and materials demonstrate a high degree of alignment of instruction and standards with conceptual framework outcomes.

1b. Content Knowledge for Other School Personnel		X	
---	--	----------	--

Summary of Findings:

Data indicate that other school personnel candidates have sufficient content knowledge. In two content knowledge courses for both fall 2006 and spring 2007, 100 percent of READ candidates demonstrated target level mastery with GPAs of 3.97 and 3.89 respectively. In eight content knowledge courses, 97 percent of fall 2006 and 94 percent of spring 2007 TESOL candidates demonstrated knowledge at acceptable or target level with average GPAs of 3.68 and 3.55 respectively. In three content knowledge courses, 99 percent of both fall 2006 and spring 2007 EDAD candidates demonstrated knowledge at acceptable or target level with average GPAs of 3.77 and 3.60 respectively. In eight content knowledge courses, 99 percent of fall 2006 and 100 percent of spring 2007 HCOM candidates demonstrated knowledge at acceptable or target level with average GPAs of 3.63 and 3.68 respectively. On 2006 unit exit surveys of other school personnel candidates in all four programs, data indicate high confidence (90 percent minimum for content related questions) that candidates are well or adequately prepared with content knowledge.

Interviews with faculty and candidates support that coursework is rigorous and fieldwork is sufficiently diverse and extensive to develop content knowledge in other school personnel candidates.

1c. Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teachers – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
---	--	----------	--

1c. Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teachers – Advanced Teacher Preparation		X	
--	--	----------	--

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Data indicate that initial candidates have sufficient pedagogical content knowledge. On 2006 clinical practice assessments, master teachers indicate that 85.1 percent and supervisors indicate that 88.1 percent of EDEL candidates achieve skilled or distinguished scores. For 2007, the data are 91.2 percent and 92.3 percent respectively. EDSC candidates had field experience passing rates of 100 percent (fall 2006) and 98.7 percent (spring 2007). SPED candidates passed field experiences at rates of 97.7 percent (fall 2006) and 100 percent (spring 2007). Data from core methods courses further demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge aligned with TPEs 2-7, 9 & 10. In eight core courses in both fall 2006 and spring 2007, 99.8 percent of EDEL candidates earned a grade B or better. SPED candidates achieved B or better in methods courses at rates of 98.2 percent in fall 2006 and 94.8 percent in spring 2007. EDSC rates for achieving B or better in six methods courses were 97.0 percent for fall 2006 and 94.8 percent for spring 2007. Exit surveys from 2006 of initial program graduates indicate high confidence in the unit's preparation of candidates from both graduates and unit supervising faculty. Results show that 85 percent of

EDEL graduates and 91 percent of unit supervisors felt candidates were adequately or well-prepared. For EDSC the rates were 83 percent (graduates) and 92 percent (supervisors) and for SPED the rates were 72 percent and 75 percent respectively. Further evidence of candidate proficiencies was presented in candidate, faculty, and employer interviews where interviewees emphasized the rigor of coursework and quality of field and course experiences in unit programs.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Data indicate that advanced candidates have sufficient pedagogical content knowledge. Data sets for standards-aligned courses in the advanced programs indicate pass rates well over 90 percent across both fall 2006 and spring 2007 semesters. GPA averages well exceed the 3.00 minimum. Disaggregated 2006 exit survey results from advanced teacher candidates indicate 80 percent or stronger confidence in the candidates' acquisition and mastery of pedagogical content knowledge. Advanced programs have implemented a writing assignment and data aggregated from this assessment and disaggregated by program indicate that MATS and EDSC candidates met acceptable levels at 100 percent while 95 percent of EDEL candidates and 78 percent of SPED candidates met the acceptable level. Candidates not meeting the standard receive remediation.

Advanced programs have implemented a diversity assignment. Data sets presented for this assignment are pass rates and are reported in Standard 4. Data and review of student work samples indicate that candidates are prepared to work with diverse students and other groups.

1d. Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge and Skills for Teachers – Initial Teacher Preparation

X

1d. Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge and Skills for Teachers – Advanced Teacher Preparation

X

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Data from signature assessments indicate candidates possess sufficient pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills. In fall 2006 and spring 07 respectively, 94 percent to 100 percent and 97 percent to 100 percent of candidates scored at skilled (3) or distinguished (4) levels on signature assignments in five methods courses. EDSC candidates averaged pass rates (3 or 4) of 96 percent, 96 percent, and 95 percent respectively for Tasks 1, 2, and 3 on the Teacher Performance Assessment from 2005-2007. The range across the eleven content areas and three tasks was 84 percent to 100 percent. From 2005-2007, 155 SPED candidates made satisfactory progress in completing portfolio assignments (3 did not) for a 98 percent pass rate. While EDSC and SPED data were not disaggregated by semester, the data presented reflect more than one semester's results according to unit assessment faculty.

Pass rates in standards-aligned courses were 99.8 percent, 95.3 percent and 99.1 percent for EDEL, EDSC, and SPED respectively across both fall 2006 and spring 2007 semesters.

Exit data from candidate and employer surveys further support that initial candidates demonstrate strong pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Data indicate that advanced candidates possess sufficient pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills. In five standards-related courses, 100 percent of EDSC-T candidates in both fall 2006 and spring 2007 demonstrated target level acquisition of pedagogical knowledge and skills by achieving GPAs averaging 3.00 and 3.85 for 2006 and 2007 respectively. In eleven standards-related courses, 98 percent of EDEL-T candidates in fall 2006 and 100 percent in spring 2007 demonstrated acceptable or target level pedagogical knowledge and skills by

achieving GPAs averaging 3.39 and 3.50 respectively. MATS course GPA data was available for one standards-related course in one semester but showed 100 percent reached target level with a 4.0 GPA average. In six standards-related courses, 98 percent of SPED-T candidates in fall 2006 and 100 percent in spring 2007 demonstrated acceptable or target mastery with GPA course averages of 3.52 and 3.46 respectively. Additional evidence of candidate knowledge and skills comes from capstone assessment pass rates. In EDSC-T, SPED-T and EDEL-T capstone courses, 100 percent of advanced candidates passed the capstone assignment for both fall 2006 and spring 2007. A survey of sample assignments indicates knowledge and skills are taught, practiced and assessed. MATS did not have candidates completing the culminating experience in these semesters.

1e. Professional Knowledge for Other School Professionals

X

Summary of Findings:

Data indicate that other school personnel candidates have sufficient professional knowledge. On the writing assessment, 100 percent of EDAD, HCOM, and READ candidates passed at the acceptable level. Only 63 percent of SPED candidates met the acceptable level, but those who did not will receive remediation in writing. In five standards-related courses, 100 percent of EDAD candidates in fall 2006 and 99 percent of spring 2007 demonstrated target level acquisition of professional knowledge by achieving GPAs averaging 3.80 and 3.63 respectively. In three standard-related courses, 100 percent of READ candidates in fall 2006 and spring 2007 demonstrated target level acquisition of professional knowledge by achieving GPAs averaging 3.80 and 3.77 respectively. In seven standards-related courses, 99 percent of HCOM candidates in fall 2006 and 100 percent of spring 2007 demonstrated target level acquisition of professional knowledge by achieving GPAs averaging 3.75 and 3.77 respectively. In nine standards-related courses, 100 percent of TESOL candidates in fall 2006 and 98 percent of spring 2007 demonstrated target level acquisition of professional knowledge by achieving GPAs averaging 3.64 and 3.55 respectively. Capstone assessment data indicate that 100 percent of TESOL and READ candidates passed their culminating experience in both fall 2006 and spring 2007. Pass rates indicate a grade of 3.00 or higher and candidates must earn 80 percent or higher on rubric to pass. EDAD candidate capstone pass rates are 99 percent for fall 2006 and 95 percent for spring 2007. HCOM candidates do not complete a capstone project but do have a culminating experience including a comprehensive exam.

1f. Professional Dispositions – Initial Teacher Preparation

X

1f. Professional Dispositions – Advanced Preparation

X

Summary of Findings:

Initial candidates are assessed for dispositions at intake through a group interview activity. Candidates from all programs described going through the process, and faculty from all initial programs described using that assessment to make admission decisions related to dispositions. Candidates who present inappropriate dispositions in the interview activity are sometimes given a second interview to determine if the raters believe the students are ready and appropriate for the credential program. Data collected in EDSC program areas of Foundational Level Mathematics and Physical Education indicate 96 percent and 98 percent respectively met or exceeded acceptable entry level expectations in spring 2007. Data sets for assessment of candidate dispositions in the initial programs come from course pass

rates, field experience/clinical practice evaluations and exit survey results. Fieldwork summary of supervisor ratings of five dispositions for EDEL fall 2006 candidates indicate 96.4 percent met or exceeded the acceptable level. Pass rates on fieldwork assessments for EDSC candidates in the fall 2006 and spring 2007 semesters are 100 percent and 98.7 percent respectively. SPED candidates fieldwork pass rates for the same semesters are 97.7 percent and 100 percent respectively. Field experience and clinical practice assessment tools are not identical but are similar across programs. Dispositions-aligned course pass rates (acceptable or target) across the fall 2006 and spring 2007 semesters for EDEL, EDSC, and SPED are 99.8 percent, 99.1 percent and 98.9 percent respectively. Exit survey data for these same groups are 96 percent, 91 percent and 89 percent respectively.

Data sets for advanced programs are standards-aligned course GPAs. Dispositions-aligned courses pass rates (acceptable or target) across the fall 2006 and spring 2007 semesters for advanced teacher programs were 99 percent (EDEL-T), 100percent (EDSC-T), 100percent (MATS) and 98 percent (SPED-T). Dispositions-aligned courses pass rates (acceptable or target) across the fall 2006 and spring 2007 semesters for other school personnel programs were 99 percent (EDAD), 99.7 percent (HCOM), 99.7 percent (READ) and 99 percent (TESOL). Exit graduate survey items related to dispositions for both initial and advanced programs indicate greater than 80 percent confidence in candidates' knowledge and practice of professional dispositions. Additions dispositions data related to diversity are found in Standard 4. Interviews with faculty and students resulted in some concerns about how well dispositions are assessed (see Standard 2). What remains clear from interviews with candidates and faculty and from observations of classes is that initial and advanced candidates do possess and practice appropriate dispositions for the profession.

1g. Student Learning for Teachers – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
1g. Student Learning for Teachers – Advanced Teacher Preparation		X	
<p>Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation: Data indicate that initial candidates use student learning in assessing and planning instruction. The primary data set comes from pass rates on courses aligned with TPEs 3,6, 7 and 8. Candidates in EDEL, EDSC and SPED passed 99.9 percent, 99.1 percent and 98.9 percent respectively across fall 2006 and spring 2007 semesters. Additional evidence comes from interviews where candidates clearly expressed target levels of knowledge about student learning in assessment and instructional planning. Examination of student work samples gives further evidence that students are practicing knowledge and skills related to student learning in instruction.</p>			
<p>Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation: Data indicate that candidates use student learning in assessing and planning instruction. Standards-aligned courses indicate pass rates well above 90 percent for all advanced candidates aggregated across the fall 2006 and spring 2007 semesters.</p>			
1h. Student Learning for Other School Professionals		X	
<p>Summary of Findings:</p>			

Data indicate that other school personnel candidates understand uses of student learning in assessing and planning instruction. Standards-aligned course pass rates indicate high levels of acquisition and understanding of proficiencies related to student learning. TESOL, HCOM and READ candidates meet or exceed acceptable level at 100 percent for the fall 2006 and spring 2007. EDAD and HCOM candidates met or exceeded acceptable levels at 95 percent. Examination of student work samples and interview with candidates and faculty confirm this finding.

Summary of Strengths:

Unit faculty and candidates indicate confidence in the proficiencies demonstrated by both initial and advanced candidates. All programs assess and document candidate proficiencies and use that data to track candidate progress, remediate candidate deficiencies, and provide a strong advisement program that develops teachers committed to the unit's conceptual framework outcomes.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- AFIs corrected from last visit - None
- AFIs continued from last visit - None
- New AFIs - None

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 2 was validated in the exhibits and interviews.

X Yes No

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
2a. Assessment System – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
2a. Assessment System – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings:

The BOE Team received both the Institutional Report and the Education Unit Assessment System Document prior to the visit. The latter document clarifies and expands the Institutional Report on matters pertaining to Standard 2. Table 3 of The Education Unit Assessment System Document displays the alignment of each initial and advanced program to the three program outcomes (including the five dispositions adopted by the unit) of the Conceptual Framework and to state and professional standards.

The design of the Education Unit Assessment System (Figure 2.1) is comprehensive and will facilitate the integration of multiple types and sources of data compiled by programs within the system. The data collection and flow process for programs are outlined in Tables 2.5 and 2.6 of the Institutional Report. The processes used for program and unit evaluation are described in Table 9 of the Education Unit Assessment System Document.

Four major transition points are used to monitor the performance and progress of candidates in both initial and advanced programs. The titles for the transition points differ for the two levels of programs, but each level includes a review of candidates’ performance at admission to and exit from programs and two transition points in between. All initial programs have post program completion follow-up assessments. Most advanced programs do not. Detailed Key Transition Points and Performance Measure documents for all programs were among the exhibits available on campus. Interviews and documents confirmed that decisions are made on candidates’ performance at each of the identified transition points and that multiple assessment measures are a part of the process for monitoring the performance and progress of candidates.

Although the predictive ability of the assessments was not addressed clearly in the Institution Report and accompanying unit assessment system document, work on this aspect of assessment has occurred. It is clear that candidates in both initial and advanced programs who have performed successfully on the assessments have been successful as they transitioned into later stages of the programs and ultimately at program completion. For graduates of initial programs, comparisons have been made of exit survey results and post graduation surveys. The comparisons showed strong levels of agreement with candidates’ evaluations of their programs and employers’ evaluations of their preparation. Agreements were less strong when comparisons were made between the candidates’ responses at the time of completion of their programs and their responses after graduation. Work on the predictive value of assessments of candidate success is expected to continue in the future.

The Institutional Report provides general information on efforts to assure the quality and credibility of assessments used in programs. Clarification of these efforts is provided in the Education Unit Assessment System Document. Efforts to assure the fairness, consistency, and lack of bias of assessments as described in the assessment system document were verified by documents and interviews conducted on campus. The knowledge and skills established by state and professional standards and adopted in the unit’s conceptual framework were assessed accurately and commonly reported in course grades. Course grades were also commonly used as measure of dispositions in advanced programs. Because performance on many course assignments contributes to a grade, course grades are not direct measures of candidates’ dispositions.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, & Evaluation– Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
2b. Data Collection, Analysis, & Evaluation– Initial Teacher Preparation – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings:
 Most data related to the unit assessment system are available through the CSFU College of Education Master Database, the university’s SIS+ , university financial and administrative software, CSU system generated reports, and departmental spreadsheet software. An overview of the CFSU College of Education Master Database is provided in the Education Unit Assessment System Document. Some data on candidates’ performance is maintained solely in departmental files. The operation of aspects of the unit assessment system is clearly outlined in Tables 7, 8, and 9 in the Education Unit Assessment System Document. Documents and interviews confirmed the scope of the system and the fact that data are reviewed on a regular basis.

Transition points and performance measure documents were available for all initial and advance programs. These documents provide evidence of multiple assessments at key transition points for each program. Performance information is obtained from applicants, candidates, graduates, employers, and faculty. The use of multiple assessments was confirmed by other documents and through interviews with faculty and students. Although data on key common assessments have been compiled, summarized, and analyzed regularly, interviews and a review of documents revealed that data on key assessments for one initial and some advanced programs had not been systematically compiled and analyzed regularly. Data on clinical experiences and student teaching for the initial special education credential program have been aggregated for only one semester. Performance data for the master’s degree in educational leadership, reading, TESOL, and level II education specialist credential have been collected and maintained in student folders but have not been aggregated.

Data in the Institutional Report were frequently not disaggregated by program. Data were also not disaggregated by program location (on campus and off-campus); and data for the program that was offered 49% by distance education were not displayed separately.

As was mentioned previously information on students’ performance is managed through a variety of technological means. The Institutional Report implies that advanced programs use technology to manage program-specific transition-point data. Interviews revealed that this was not the situation for some advanced programs. Performance data on some key assignments used to assess performance at transition points were available only in individual student folders.

Interviews and documents supported that data are compiled on candidates' complaints and their resolution as described in the Institutional Report. Some complaints are addressed and resolved at the departmental level; others are addressed in the dean's office.			
2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement – Advanced Preparation		X	
<p><i>Summary of Findings:</i></p> <p>The Institutional Report provides an overview of how the unit uses data for program improvement. Additional information is provided in the Education Unit Assessment System Document. Documents and interviews with faculty and stakeholders confirmed that the results of assessments managed by the unit's database are regularly shared with chairpersons, faculty, and stakeholders. Candidates reported that they are frequently provided feedback on their performance in their respective programs.</p> <p>Most programs have advisory bodies composed of stakeholders with whom performance assessment results are shared. In addition to these groups, there are more than ten unit stakeholder groups who receive the results of evaluations.</p> <p>The Education Unit Assessment Committee serves as a vehicle for coordinating and advancing the development of the unit assessment system. The committee provided leadership for the collection of unit-wide data. The Education Unit Assessment Committee is a mechanism for sharing assessment processes for program-specific assessments and for disseminating the results of facets of the unit's assessment system.</p> <p>Documents and interviews with faculty and members of advisory and stakeholder bodies confirmed that many changes have been made based on the results of various assessments. These changes have been made to curricula and to unit operations.</p>			

Summary of Strengths:

Area for Improvement and Rationale:

The unit has not assured that all programs regularly summarizes and aggregates data on all key transition-point assessments at this time.

Data on clinical experiences and student teaching for the initial special education credential program have been aggregated for only one semester. Performance data for the master's degree in educational leadership, reading, TESOL, and level II education specialist credential have been collected and maintained in student folders but have not been aggregated.

Corrections to the Institutional Report - None

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

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.

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 3 was validated in the exhibits and interviews.

X Yes No

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
3a. Collaboration between Unit & School Partners – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
3a. Collaboration between Unit & School Partners – Advanced Preparation		x	

Summary of Findings:

This unit offers three initial programs: the Multiple Subject Credential, the Single Subject Credential, and the Education Specialist Credential for candidates seeking to teach special needs students in grades K-12.

Candidates seeking the Multiple Subject Credential typically complete a bachelor’s degree in either Liberal Studies or Child and Adolescent Studies. Candidates seeking the Single Subject credential typically complete a bachelor’s degree in the subject area in which they plan to teach. Subject matter areas include English, English (theatre arts), modern languages including Chinese, French, German, Japanese, and Spanish, social science, mathematics, and science including biology, chemistry, geology, and physics.

The Education Specialist Credential prepares candidates who seek a credential to work with special needs students. Within this credential, there are three options: mild/moderate (K-12), moderate/severe (K-12), and the early childhood special education credential for preparation to work with young children with special needs.

The unit offers nine advanced degrees—eight master’s and one Ed.D. The eight advanced programs include a preliminary special-language pathology services credential; a Master of Arts in communicative disorders; an administrative services credential; an advanced credential in reading and language arts; an advanced credential in special education; a Master of Science in education in bilingual/bicultural education; educational administration; educational technology; elementary curriculum and instruction; reading; secondary education; special education; a Master of Science in education for teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL); and a Master of Arts in teaching science. In addition, a doctoral program provides an Ed. D. in educational leadership.

Field experiences and clinical practice are provided as integral parts of the overall program for initial and advanced teacher candidates as well as for candidates preparing for other school personnel roles. As a result, candidates have opportunities to practice and develop professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions in a variety of settings that are appropriate to their specific programs of study.

The unit and its school partners cooperate with each other through the mechanism of unit advisory groups through which the partners participate in the design, delivery and evaluation of initial programs. Partners meet at regularly scheduled meetings to discuss matters of common interest and concern. Items that are discussed include ways to refine field placement processes, explain new procedures, discussing candidate performance data, exit data, and school district recommendations for program improvements. Archived minutes found in the document room reflect the discussions that have taken place over time. During face-to-face interviews on the visit, several stakeholders, including administrators and master teachers, commented on the exceptional responsiveness of the unit in addressing expressed needs for changes in the design, delivery or evaluation of the initial programs.

Candidates in advanced programs generally perform their clinical practice in the schools where they are already employed. Clinical practice and field experience are embedded throughout each advanced program, and many courses have field-based assignments that are designed to strengthen the link between theory and practice. For most advanced candidates, the candidate's school site serves as the field site for implementing instructional practice. If the candidate does not have a school site or classroom, he/she is responsible for finding a setting with school administration and faculty approval, where she/he can complete the necessary field requirements. Prior to the start of each semester, the block leader who serves as an advisor to each cohort of candidates, serves as the coordinator for student teaching placements. The university supervisors who work with each block contact the principals of the designated schools and jointly select the master teachers. Individuals interviewed during the visit indicate that this arrangement has created long-term relationships based on trust and shared goals between the program faculty and the school site personnel. It also makes for open communication between the block leader, university supervisor, and the site administrator. Candidates have benefited from this open communication and report feeling strongly supported by their block leaders, their university supervisors, their site administrators and their master teachers during the course of their student teaching experiences.

3b. Design, Implementation, & Evaluation of Field Experiences & Clinical Practices – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
3b. Design, Implementation, & Evaluation of Field Experiences & Clinical Practices – Advanced Preparation		x	

Summary of Findings:
 Candidates in the initial program for the Multiple Subject Credential must complete a minimum of 155 hours of field experience while taking certain courses, and a minimum of 390 hours of student teaching with the time breaking down as follows: 5-8 weeks primary level; 5-8 weeks upper elementary; a total of 13 weeks of full-time teaching. For candidates in the initial program for the Single Subject Credential a minimum of 160 hours is required as field experience and 390 hours for student teaching or clinical work. Candidates in the Special Education program are required to complete a minimum of 95 field experiences hours and a minimum of 480 hours of student teaching or professional clinical work.

Field experiences include classroom observation, tutoring individual students, and helping out in general as opposed to teaching classes. Work samples and reflective writing entries are collected for evaluation purposes during these required experiences. During their first semester of student teaching, candidates start by observing and move gradually toward taking on more and more

classroom responsibilities. By the time student teachers start their second semester of student teaching, they are expected to take over full-time teaching and classroom management responsibilities for their assigned class(es). Candidates are evaluated by master teachers as well as by their university supervisors in post-observation interviews that are conducted after each classroom visit. In addition, candidates routinely self-evaluate their own performance through reflective writing which is submitted as part of end-of-course requirements.

Clinical practice and field experience are embedded throughout each advanced program. Many of the courses in each program have field-based assignments that serve to strengthen the link between theory and practice. In most cases, the advanced candidates are already employed and as a result, the candidate’s school site serves as the field site for implementing instructional practice from class. If the candidate does not have a school site or classroom, it is up to him/her to find a setting that meets with school administration and faculty approval.

Candidates are required to use student assessments for all students including English language learners and special needs students. Program policies for the initial programs require that all candidates teach in a school where they will be teaching students from diverse backgrounds.

Because the majority of candidates in advanced programs are practicing in their own classrooms, a transition point to clinical practice is not included in the program; however, several courses include assignments such as case studies or action research projects. In addition, advanced candidates are required to complete a capstone experience that involves several options including a master’s project and a comprehensive exam. Candidates in both initial and advanced programs are required to use appropriate information technology in order to support teaching and learning during their clinical practice.

Clinical faculty members are accomplished school professionals who have been trained and are recognized as accomplished school professionals. Clinical faculty provide regular and ongoing support for student teachers and other interns by a variety of methods including observation, conferencing, group discussion, email, and the use of other technology as appropriate. During interviews, candidates were particularly effusive about the amount and type of support provided to them by the clinical faculty, the university supervisors, and the block leaders.

3c. Candidates’ Development & Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, & Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Initial Teacher Preparation		x	
3c. Candidates’ Development & Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, & Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Advanced Preparation		x	

Summary of Findings:
 Entry and exit criteria exist for candidates in clinical practice. Assessments are linked to candidate competencies outlined in professional, state, and institutional standards. Multiple assessment strategies are used to evaluate candidates and their effect on student learning. Time for reflection is allowed and feedback is offered. All candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practice that include students with exceptional needs as well as students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups in order to facilitate the candidate’s development of skills in helping all students learn.

Candidates demonstrate mastery of content areas and pedagogical and professional knowledge before admission to and during clinical practice. Assessments used in clinical practice indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards and have a positive effect on student learning. Field experiences and clinical practice facilitate candidates' exploration of their knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to all students. This is borne out in various documents found in the exhibits room and in interviews with individuals during the visit.

Summary of Strengths:

The unit is to be commended for the high level of professionalism that is consistently exhibited by both the individuals who work for the unit as well as the candidates who participate in the unit's education programs. This strength was noted consistently throughout interviews with administrators and master teachers who regularly work with faculty and candidates from this unit.

Additionally, the unit is to be commended for its extraordinary accessibility and responsiveness to candidates, master teachers, and administrators in dealing with any and all problems that might periodically arise during a candidate's field or student teaching experience. This exceptional accessibility was a common theme that arose during the course of a variety of different interviews with different stakeholders.

Finally, it should be noted that all tenure-track faculty have a minimum of three years of classroom teaching experience. Full-time and part-time lecturers meet university and education unit requirements that include holding a master's degree, a teaching credential, and at least three years of teaching experience.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- AFIs corrected from last visit - None
- AFIs continued from last visit - None
- New AFIs - None

Corrections to the Institutional Report: None

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 4: Diversity

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

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 4 was validated in the exhibits and interviews.

Yes No

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
4a. Design, Implementation, & Evaluation of Curriculum & Experiences – Initial Teacher Preparation			X
4a. Design, Implementation, & Evaluation of Curriculum & Experiences – Advanced Preparation			X

Summary of Findings:

Diversity is one of the core elements and values found in the institutional and the education unit mission statements. In the Professional Dispositions Statement the unit expressly states that it is an expectation that candidates will *promote diversity* in their teaching work. Examination of an inventory of candidate testimonies and coursework samples demonstrate their awareness to become *reflective and responsive practitioners who promote diversity and think critically, and committed and caring professionals who become change agents. Candidates reflect and seek necessary educational modifications to improve learning for all students* (program outcomes 2.a, 3.a and 2.d).

Exhibits consistently reveal the alignment of standards and diversity expected outcomes throughout the requirements and assignments embedded in coursework, field experiences and clinical practice. Candidates have extensive and intensive opportunities to contextualize, observe, practice and assess the impact of their teaching in student learning. Each program has a well-developed knowledge base document that substantially supports conceptualizations of diversity.

Initial and advanced programs have a specific 3-unit required course that provides context and construct for examining diversity. This course includes a substantial assignment to be conducted in at least one classroom with a minimum of 25 percent students who are ethnically, racially, culturally, exceptionally, an/or linguistically different from the candidates themselves. On this assignment, candidates are required to earn a minimum performance score of 75 percent in order to demonstrate their ability to work with diverse students. A second requirement is a course on teaching English Learners that addresses theoretical and practical models, assessments, and effective strategies for lesson design and delivery. Upon completion of an initial credential, candidates will have completed a minimum of 20 course assignments that address some aspect of diversity, and a basic minimum of 200 hours in a supervised clinical experience, directly designing and delivering instruction to diverse students. Data from student teaching assessments show that candidates consistently exceed the minimum average score of 2.85 in the final placement.

A review of candidate work samples for TPA task 3, which requires adaptations for two focus students, an English learner and a special needs student, reflects how the design guides the process for student learning assessments and how formative and summative assessments are used by candidates to improve their own practice. University faculty and supervisors scores on Task 3 for spring 2005 through fall 2006, reveal that 423 candidates (95%), representing the 11 subject areas, met or exceeded the acceptable level.

MSCP cohort candidates enrolled in the Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) Program engage in additional coursework to develop the professional skills to teach in English and a target language. These candidates work with students and their parents in linguistically and culturally competent ways. Minutes provided of the MS Community Advisory Board have noted the high level of satisfaction with Fullerton BCLAD-prepared teachers.

Course syllabi, assignment descriptions, scoring guides and work samples on key diversity assignments were found in each program's exhibit files. Two items from the common evaluation form rate candidate's abilities and dispositions toward promoting diversity. Fieldwork evaluation average scores for Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 show that both master teachers (3.74 and 3.72) and supervisors (3.49 and 3.56) rated nearly all EDEL candidates (97.6 and 99.4%) as performing at acceptable (3) or exemplary (4) levels (IR, Table 1.16). The education unit has in place an alert and improvement procedure for candidates experiencing difficulty maintaining professional dispositions.

Detailed examination of a substantial sample of syllabi for initial and advanced courses shows up-front statements indicating the unit's intentionality and commitment to "provide opportunities to engage in critical dialogues concerning planning for instruction and assessment of learners in linguistically and culturally diverse classroom settings." Using the same course and field specific assignments and scoring rubrics (diversity assignments, signature assignments, case studies, action research, final projects, etc.) candidates learn to incorporate knowledge from professional literature, develop, practice, and demonstrate their abilities to work with diverse students. Exhibits include samples of required lesson plans with adaptations for differentiated instruction, reflections of candidates about the effectiveness of their teaching, and proper modifications according to on-line feedback and formative assessments of university supervisors and master teachers.

Candidates' performances as related to diversity are addressed as the unit assesses their progress on state competencies and specific program standards. Initial candidates pass rates for Fall 06 and Spring 07 on the three TPEs related to diversity show a consistent performance increase trend: English Learners, 83 to 90 percent; Learning about students, 93 to 95 percent; and Social environment, 90 to 92 percent. Aggregated scores for the key diversity assignment demonstrate that advanced candidates meet or exceed program expectations (Fall 06, 96 %; Spring 07, 99%; Summer 07, 100%). Results on the exit survey show that most of the candidates agree and strongly agree that "my program helped me improve my ability to promote equity and diversity" (Summer 06, 96%; Fall 06, 89%; and Spring 07, 96%). Summarized data from the CSU system-wide survey reveal a general upward trend indicating that program graduates and their immediate supervisors are increasingly satisfied with the level of preparation to teach all students.

Examination of the documents provided confirms recently implemented measures to improve

strategies to teach all students.

Class observations confirmed that candidate interaction with diverse faculty in initial and advanced programs is constant. In spring 2007, of nine sections of multicultural or second language courses in initial programs, five were taught by faculty of color. During interviews, initial and advanced candidates provided multiple examples of the ways that faculty presented content knowledge and insights of their professional expertise and personal experiences with many facets of diversity.

The faculty draw on a broad and rich knowledge base in matters pertaining to diversity. Of the education unit's full-time faculty, 47 percent have published at least one peer-reviewed article in the past ten years, (282 articles total) that address some aspect of diversity. Some examples of faculty research and scholarly work relate to topics about gender difference effect on student achievement, teacher preparation for English learners, increasing teacher diversity, leadership and diversity, involving minorities in urban education, cultural worlds of bilingual children, and building a bilingual learning community. Exhibits provide sufficient supporting evidence that faculty diversity expertise is shared in ways that demonstrate their commitment to and involvement in local, state, and professional communities.

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation			X
4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Advanced Preparation			X

Summary of Findings:

The institution has a rich diverse student population. [Diverse Issues in Higher Education](#) ranks CSUF fourth in the nation in degrees awarded to minority students (June 2007). [Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education](#) (May 2007) ranks CSUF first in the state and fourth in the nation for the number of bachelor's degrees awarded to Hispanic students, based on 2006 data from the USDOE. Nationally, CSUF is listed as number three in education degrees granted to Asian Americans, and five in education degrees granted to Hispanics. The university is included in the Top 25 Hispanic Enrollment for graduate schools listing (April 2006). In 2004, CSUF was designated a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) by the USDOE.

Candidates' ethnicity, race, and gender in the education unit for fall 2006 are presented in Table 4.7 of the IR. The education unit makes efforts to increase diversity among candidates. About 70 percent of juniors and seniors enrolled in the Future Teachers program are Hispanic, and support funds are provided for those who go on to add math or science authorization to the basic teaching credential. Also, through the Regional Teacher Education Council (RTEC), several local community colleges partner with the education unit to provide a continuum of preparing teachers for P-12 settings, as a cost-effective and credit-efficient route to a teacher credential that provides access to a significant number of candidates of color. In 2006-07, 203 candidates were registered as STEP students in the community colleges, who will transfer to CSUF. It is expected that 61 candidates will be enrolled in the credential program phase III in the 2007-08.

The institution and the unit provide candidates of all backgrounds opportunities to interact with each other in academic and non-academic settings. The Assistant Dean for Student Affairs provided information documenting ongoing assessment of candidate and alumni needs and ways to keep informed faculty and staff of current issues. Support and advice are provided to candidates to form department and college based groups, clubs, councils and advisory boards,

and for responsible use of computers and the Internet, which is an essential resource to enhance interactions.			
4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students to P-12 Schools			X
4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students to P-12 Schools – Advanced Preparation			X
<p><i>Summary of Findings:</i></p> <p>The P-12 student population in the surrounding area is recognized as one of the most diverse in the nation. Demographic data of the ten school districts that receive a large percentage of the unit’s student teachers each year (table 4.8 of the IR) show the diversity of the student population.</p> <p>Initial candidates are placed in diverse school settings and are required to have at least one full-time student teaching experience with English learners and special needs students. To ensure that candidates develop and practice to the expected performance level, a set of signed placement and exit forms, field and clinical observation and supervision forms are utilized. University supervisors and master teacher are required to provide candidates formative and summative feedback on their ability to address teaching and learning for all students. The use of Blackboard has been noted by candidates to be effective for peer and faculty feedback. Exhibits present numerous examples of candidates reflections papers and assessments on their ability to address diversity issues in the classroom.</p> <p>In addition to the key diversity assignment, advanced candidates complete assignments in other courses and in field or clinical experiences that require them to work in diverse settings. These experiences are frequently completed in their own classrooms since most are practicing P-12 educators. Exhibits document examples of required assignments which include case studies, action research, self-analysis and a video critique of one’s own teaching. It is also noted that as part oral presentations on their coursework and field assignments candidates have opportunities to receive feedback from peers, and from faculty.</p>			

Summary of Strengths:

The education unit has designed and implemented curriculum and field experiences ensuring that all candidates have meaningful ways to develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. All candidates experience interactions with diverse faculty and other candidates and have field experiences with diverse students.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales: None

Corrections to the Institutional Report: None

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 5: Faculty 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.

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 5 was validated in the exhibits and interviews.

Yes No

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5a. Qualified Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
5a. Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation		X	
<p><i>Summary of Findings:</i> There is a total of 77 full-time faculty members. There are 56 tenure-track (18 full, 18 associate, and 20 assistant) professors. All tenure track faculty have doctorates. In addition, there are 21 full-time lecturers. Based on a review of vitae, it is apparent that all faculty members have expertise in their assigned areas as well as documented experiences in professional and clinical settings. Faculty in supervisory roles either hold current licenses in the fields they supervise or have been licensed in the area previously. The list of faculty qualifications documents an impressive number of years in P-12 settings. A major strength of the college is the vast amount of contemporary professional experiences of the faculty in their areas including work in public schools (supervision, teaching, workshops for professional development), clinics, community programs and other professional settings.</p> <p>There are 114 part-time faculty members who teach approximately 30% of the courses. Faculty members, including part-time and adjunct show relevant and contemporary experience in the field to which they are assigned, as well as knowledge of the content in their areas. These faculty participate in orientations, department meetings, and training sessions to ensure they are aware of unit emphases and program standards.</p>			
5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Initial Teacher Preparation			X
5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation			X
<p><i>Summary of Findings:</i> Student evaluation of teaching and course satisfaction is very high according to summaries of several semesters of end-of-course evaluation as well as glowing reports from interviews with students and alumni. Alumni described their preparation as rigorous; they felt ready for the challenges of teaching. Faculty have aligned course syllabi with the conceptual framework and state standards. Assignments and assessments used by faculty engage the candidates in the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving and professional dispositions. This is accomplished through instructional strategies such as experimental lessons, discussions, journal writing, portfolios, collaborative problem solving and exceptionally creative use of instructional technology. Syllabi indicate that faculty use varied resources within their classes to adapt instruction and provide models for the candidates.</p>			

Syllabi show the integration of diversity and technology throughout the programs of professional study. It is a goal of faculty to prepare individuals who believe everyone is worthy of the opportunity to learn and to act on the belief that diversity is to be valued. Technology is incorporated into courses in a variety of ways: development of portfolios, use of electronic media, use of technology as a tool for teaching and learning, and the collection and analysis of data. Media include videos, slide and overhead projectors, bulletin boards, blackboard, video cameras, computers, and podcasts. Computer usage is required in all courses in the writing of lesson plans, interdisciplinary unit plan, papers and all other written work submitted for evaluation.

Interviews with many different student and alumni groups emphasized how faculty knew their students and supported them through learning challenges and personal crises. Several faculty members have received teaching awards at the state level.

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings:
 CSU Fullerton has clear personnel statements detailing the expectation for faculty scholarship. A review of vita as well as a collection of sample publications reveals a productive faculty in terms of applied scholarship. Faculty engage in a broad range of scholarly activity including the systematic inquiry into areas related to their teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel. Faculty have made these activities public through journals (refereed national as well as regional and state), books, grants and presentations. Unit faculty have, over the past two years, published 8 books, 13 book chapters, 29 articles in refereed journals, presented 39 times at national and international meetings and 17 times at state and regional meetings. The publications and presentations listed by faculty include rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, the application of current research findings in new settings, as well as pragmatic and practical information for all professions. In the last two years, faculty have received 6 national grants and 1 state grant. In addition, 21 faculty serve as editors or on editorial review boards. Many of the scholarship activities reflect faculty engagement in the improvement of schools, teaching and learning. Based on a review of vitae, the majority of faculty are engaged in some form of scholarship.

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings:
 All faculty in the college of education are expected to provide meaningful service at the local, state, regional, national, and international levels as appropriate to his or her duties and rank. It is similarly expected that faculty be willing to engage in various program, school, college, and university service roles. The unit includes programs in multiple colleges, interaction and collaboration is encouraged and nurtured. Faculty from all colleges serve on various CSU Fullerton committees and work together collaboratively on curricular changes, leadership, sharing ideas regarding the college and proposal writing and grant getting. Faculty from other colleges participate on committees that advance the mission of the unit (e.g., the Conceptual

Framework Committee and the Education Unit Assessment Committee). Interviews with deans, department chairs, and program coordinators revealed a high level of support for collaborative efforts. Faculty maintain contact with public schools in their multiple roles including a minimum of 30 hours every three years as mandated by the state, thereby assuring contemporary professional experience.

Faculty are engaged in a variety of ongoing collaborative projects and experiences within school settings. There are professional development schools, advisory committees, professional development workshops, collaborative grants, and program evaluation.

Faculty are engaged in a wide range of service activities that include editorships, reviewers for professional journals, presidents and board members of national associations, presidents and board members of state associations, as well as a full range of department, college and university committees. As part of the process of improving learning, faculty are engaged in partnerships with schools and agencies across the state which go beyond traditional workshops including a high level of collaboration with community colleges from the region.

Based on a review of vitae, 100 percent of faculty are engaged in some form of service.

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
--	--	----------	--

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Advanced Preparation		X	
---	--	----------	--

Summary of Findings:
All faculty in the unit, full- and part-time, are evaluated by the unit, and by the candidates in each course that they teach. As specified in the department-level personnel standards document, the university administration carries out specific evaluation procedures developed in consultation with the faculty to provide some tangible basis for making judgments on teaching, scholarship, and service. If issues arise, a detailed written plan for corrective action is specified by the unit administrator. For untenured faculty this is an annual process. For tenured faculty, it is required every three years although goals are set every year. For adjunct, visiting and graduate assistants, the annual evaluation is used as a means for reappointment.

During the annual review the administrator and the faculty member collaborate on determining the goals and potential areas for improvement for teaching, scholarship and service. Faculty reflect upon their self-established teaching goals each year. A key document for review is the evaluation of instruction, which is submitted to the school/department head as part of the appraisal process. Tenured faculty members submit the documentation annually and are formally evaluated in years two, four, and six. Untenured faculty submit documentation annually and are formally evaluated on a yearly basis.

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
--	--	----------	--

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation		X	
---	--	----------	--

Summary of Findings:
The university has a rich offering of professional development opportunities. An interview with the director of the Faculty Development Center resulted in an extensive list of weekly, semester,

and summer offerings to improve teaching, scholarship, and use of technology. Attendance records show that the unit faculty are regular participants and sometimes workshop leaders in these university professional development activities. There are regularly scheduled college and department retreats designed to promote collegiality and training sessions for developing skills.

New faculty members are assigned mentors and receive one course release each semester for two years. All faculty may receive \$1,500 from the college and department for professional activities at the state and national levels. New faculty receive \$4,000 for faculty development. The dean's office also re-assigns time for special projects.

Faculty (adjunct/part-time, tenured and non-tenured faculty) regularly participate in professional development activities both on and off campus.

Summary of Strengths:

The unit has a strength in the vast amount of P-12 experience that full-time and part-time faculty bring to their teaching. Most full-time faculty have 5-20 years of professional experience in schools as teachers, administrators, and other personnel. Part-time faculty have an average of 20 years of experience in P-12 environments.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- AFIs corrected from last visit – None
- AFIs continued from last visit – None
- New AFIs – None

Corrections to the Institutional Report: None

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

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.

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 6 was validated in the exhibits and interviews.

X Yes No

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
6a. Unit Leadership & Authority – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
6a. Unit Leadership & Authority – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings:

The dean of the College of Education (who also serves as the director of teacher education) is the unit head who has responsibility for oversight of planning, delivering, and operating coherent programs of study that prepare professionals to work in P-12 settings. The dean is supported in this role by an associate dean, assistant dean of students, and five department chairs. Program coordinators for each of the initial and advanced programs report to department chairs. A variety of departmental and college level faculty committees provide opportunities for communication and shared decision-making. Key committees and their role in the unit are listed on page 97-98 in the IR. Several boards external to the university such as the Credential Programs Committee, the Unit Assessment Committee, the All-University Responsibility for Teacher Education Committee, and the Secondary Education Cooperative for Teacher Education Program advise the dean and provide a mechanism for communication across programs. Minutes of committee meetings and interviews confirm collaboration about program decisions across campus.

The university Advisement Center provides academic counseling for undergraduates from the point of admission to teacher education. The office of Admission to Teacher Education allots five full-time staff to assist candidates with the admission process. The Center for Careers in Teaching supported by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs also assists with early and accurate advisement. The center also provides advisement at the Irvine campus. A faculty member from the College of Education serves as the director and is assisted by 14 staff members. Advanced candidates receive advisement from designated full-time faculty in each area. In addition, orientations are held and cohort coordinators ensure that current information is disseminated to all graduate candidates. One graduate advisor commented that advisement is “even easier” with off-campus candidates. The college also has a full time assistant dean of students who provides individual counseling, guidance, and support for candidates who experience personal and/or academic problems. Interviews with candidates confirm that academic advisement is consistent from the time of entry to the university and that support is provided to program completion. Admission criteria for each program are available to candidates on the website and the departmental website. Information is accurate and current. Deans across campus also confirm that the Center for Careers in Teaching provides extensive counseling services to education majors across campus. Academic calendars, catalogs, and publications are accurate and current. Candidate interviews confirm that information provided to

them is accurate and updated consistently.			
6b. Unit Budget – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
6b. Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation		X	
<p><i>Summary of Findings:</i></p> <p>The College of Education’s base budget in FY 2006-2007 was 9,229,769, representing an increase of 45% since the 2001-2002 school year. Budget allocations were decreased in 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 due to reductions in state funding; however, there has been a 15% increase since that time. In comparing the College of Education’s budget to other academic units, the college currently ranks second in allocation rate by full time equivalent students. According to the president, eighteen new tenure track faculty positions have been added in the college in the last two years, representing approximately 10% of tenure track positions filled across the university. Administrators and faculty acknowledge that the university provides the college resources necessary for professional activities, technological advancement and program growth.</p>			
6c. Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
6c. Personnel – Advanced Preparation		X	
<p><i>Summary of Findings:</i></p> <p>Cal State Fullerton System considers 15 units per semester a full-time load for both undergraduate and graduate faculty. Tenure track faculty members in the unit carry a teaching load of 12 units with 3 units for services and research activities. Release time may be granted for program coordination, program development, etc. New faculty are given a three unit reduction each semester for the first two years. NCATE guidelines for graduate teaching (9 hours per semester) are lower than that of Cal State Fullerton; however, it is our opinion that the higher teaching load does not have a negative impact on productivity of faculty. Online course delivery and work load policies are governed by collective bargaining agreements. Clinical supervision for initial programs is rated as .5 per student teacher or 2 student teachers per unit.</p> <p>The College of Education employs 56 tenure track faculty and 21 full-time lecturers in the unit. Full and part-time lecturers are required to hold a master’s degree, professional certification, and have a minimum of 3 years P-12 teaching experience. Documents show that 70% of courses on the Fullerton campus and 61% of courses on the Irvine campus are taught by full-time instructors. The president is committed to maintaining a low student to faculty ratio within the College of Education. A plan is in place to automatically fund the number of faculty positions needed to maintain the current student-faculty ratio. The Faculty Development Center provides technological support and professional development activities to assist full-time and part-time faculty. Support in using technology is provided by IT in the form of equipment, troubleshooting, and training. There are 22 full-time staff positions in the College of Education. Faculty interviews reveal the perception that additional clerical support is needed.</p>			
6d. Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
6d. Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation		X	
<p><i>Summary of Findings:</i></p> <p>Faculty interviews confirm that the unit has adequate facilities to support candidates in meeting standards. The Education Classroom Building which currently serves as the primary facility for the unit has several “smart” classrooms, four computer labs, four conference rooms, and several faculty offices. The College of Education has just moved to a newly acquired, larger facility. A</p>			

plan is in place for most faculty offices and some classrooms to be moved to the newer building in the next few months.

6e. Unit Resources including Technology – Initial Teacher Preparation			X
--	--	--	----------

6e. Unit Resources including Technology – Advanced Preparation			X
---	--	--	----------

Summary of Findings:

The unit allocates resources across program to prepare candidates to meet standards for their fields. The full academic suite of Blackboard is available and usage is extensive with 34,000/37,000 of the total student body logging in within the first week of school. Personnel are assigned to assist in the development, implementation, and maintenance of the unit’s assessment system.

Information technology resources supporting faculty and candidates are extensive and reflect what the Chief Technology Officer calls an advanced technology infrastructure. All classrooms are smart classrooms, and all faculty have up-to-date computers, printers and software due to a roll-out plan used by the university. In addition, all new faculty are provided laptop computers, iPods, digital voice recorders, external hard drives, and access to a VPN (virtual private network). Wireless access is available in every corner of every building. Six information technology staff members are shared with another college. The IT staff oversees the faculty technology center which houses a variety of equipment available for checkout. A \$70,000 university grant was awarded to the College to open a small podcasting studio. In partnership with Apple, the college is establishing an iTunes U site to allow faculty to deliver audio and video content to candidates. According to the Chief Technology Officer, a laptop cohort study was also funded recently that provides laptops, PDA’s, and iPod touches to candidates to study different ways to deliver technology and how it impacts candidate achievement.

Library resources are extensive. A College of Education librarian assists faculty and candidates with research, attends departmental meetings, collaborates with faculty and supports the use of library resources. Library resources are available to candidates both on and off campus. Interlibrary loan materials are scanned and sent to off-campus candidates as a PDF file. Books are delivered to their homes at no charge. Ask a librarian services are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Curriculum materials are housed and available for check-out. A Professional Activities Center is available for faculty in the Pollack Library. The Donoghue Children’s Literature Center houses award-winning books available for candidate check-out.

Summary of Strengths:

The unit has shown a strong commitment to technology. Resources are abundant and faculty utilize technology in their classes.

Candidate interviews confirm that advisement provided by the unit is extensive and intensive. Candidates are notified of schedule changes that could impact enrollment immediately via email and Blackboard.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- AFI corrected from last visit – Graduate teaching load is excessive and detrimental to professional productivity.
- AFI continued from last visit – None
- New AFIs – None

Corrections to the Institutional Report: None

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

State Team Decision: Standard Met

INTERNSHIP FINDINGS FOR STATE REPORT

Common Standards 1 and 2 – Leadership and Resources

The College of Education has a memorandum of understanding 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 Credential Programs Committee oversees and coordinates all credential programs for the College of Education in collaboration with the Unit Assessment Committee. Each program has a community advisory board consisting of program faculty and staff and school district personnel. The community advisory boards serve as the primary liaisons between the departments and the school districts that participate in internship programs.

Common Standard 5 – Admission

Admission of intern candidates is coordinated by the Admission to Teacher Education Programs Office (ATEP) and with intern program coordinators. Each internship program evaluates candidates to make certain that they meet admission criteria.

Common Standard 6 – Advice and Assistance

Once accepted, intern candidates are met with on a regular basis and given program information which details requirements and deadlines as well as course information. During the supervised fieldwork, regularly scheduled meetings are held with the interns. There are multiple opportunities for interns to obtain assistance and advice.

Common Standard 7 – School Collaboration

Administrators at the school sites and the university intern program coordinators complete the selection process for all site support providers.

Common Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors

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

PROGRAM STANDARDS

Multiple Subject Credential Multiple Subject Internship Credential Multiple Subject Credential BCLAD

Findings on Standards:

Based on review of the response to Program Standards and documents such as course materials and based on interviews with program constituents and stakeholders, the team finds all program standards in the Multiple Subject program to be met. Candidates, graduates, faculty, field personnel, and employers uniformly judge that the program prepares individuals who are ready to teach children in California's classrooms. The team unanimous in its judgment that the program prepares educators who are committed to the learning and development of all students, who embrace multiple perspectives and model the passion for education that they intend candidates to display throughout their careers.

Strengths:

Candidates and faculty spoke highly of the block model. They believe it fosters collaboration and builds community among candidates, faculty, supervisors and cooperating teachers. Over the course of the program, candidates form a closely-knit group that supports academic, professional, and personal growth. Communication among course instructors and supervisors within the block is frequent and leads to a set of experiences that build upon each other and enable candidates to meet the Teaching Performance Expectations.

Master teachers spoke highly of candidates, supervisors and block leaders. Master teachers continually commented how much they appreciated the availability and accessibility of the block leaders and supervisors when questions or concerns arise. Master teachers always receive copies of the written feedback from supervisors and are invited to campus faculty development and Master Teacher Academy activities. Master teachers indicated that CSUF candidates are pedagogically well prepared to teach diverse students, including English language learners.

Since the faculty also serve as block leaders, course instructors, and field supervisors, they are able to link theory and practice across coursework and fieldwork in unique ways. Candidates felt that they were continually presented with best practices for teaching and fostering student learning. Candidates stated that they could clearly see how topics that were raised in courses were immediately addressed in classrooms. The close link between theory and practice enabled candidates to draw connections across their experiences.

The faculty, supervisors and master teachers model the reflective practice they expect of their credential candidates by implementing regular assessments, reflecting on their findings, and using them to make changes to the program.

The BCLAD faculty is to be commended for persistence in supporting BCLAD candidates to ensure that all candidates complete the program. It was evident in the student comments how much they appreciate their BCLAD faculty for fostering a "familia" (family) environment. BCLAD candidates reported that the faculty go out of their way to support them throughout the program. They can approach them for support both in their academic and personal advising.

BCLAD faculty also reported that the strength of their program is having seven bilingual faculty in the unit to support the BCLAD Program.

Concerns:

None noted

Single Subject Credential Single Subject Internship Credential

Findings on Standards:

Based on the review of the institutional report and supporting documents, as well as interviews with candidates, graduates, cooperating teachers, program faculty, institutional administration, employers, school administrators, and advisory committee members, the team has determined that all program standards are met.

Faculty in the College of Education, working in close partnership with both the academic departments and K-12 practitioners, provide a carefully sequenced professional program that effectively prepares candidates who are steeped in knowledge and pedagogical practices specific to their content areas and qualified to meet the needs of diverse learners in secondary schools. Guided by a thoughtfully designed conceptual framework and the Teaching Performance Expectations, this program provides many opportunities for candidates to explore educational theory and then link that theory to their classroom teaching. Feedback from candidates, graduates, and employers validates that program graduates are knowledgeable and competent, reflective and responsive, collegial and caring professionals.

Strengths:

A significant strength of the program is the close collaboration with faculty in the academic departments who provide advising for students in the subject matter preparation and credential programs, teach the content-specific methods courses and oversee the field-based components. Extensive training and discussion of program policies for faculty in the academic departments, as well as adjunct K-12 practitioners who teach the methods courses, occurs during Secondary Teacher Education Program (SecTEP) meetings. Designating a single faculty person who acts as a Course Custodian insures content consistency among faculty members who teach sections of the same course.

The Single Subject Program has also developed strong relationships with school districts through implementation of the Professional Development District (PDD) model in which district personnel assist in the placement of externs and student teachers, serve as speakers and adjunct faculty, and host Friday seminars at district offices. The university, in turn, provides training for master teachers and is responsive to the needs of the districts in developing program focuses.

The program has been actively piloting the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA), which has been thoroughly tested and integrated into the program, including extensive support for candidates to insure candidate success.

There is evidence that the program uses multiple data sources, including in-program assessments of candidate performance, exit and follow-up survey data, and feedback from candidates and K-12 partners to inform program improvement.

Interns who have completed all program prerequisites and participated in an intensive orientation in advance of placement are prepared to begin their teaching. They are well supported in the field and in the scheduling of their coursework.

Concerns:

None noted.

Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Level I Including Internship
Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Level I, Including Internship
Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education
Level I, Including Internship

Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Level II
Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Level II
Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education Level II
Early Childhood Special Education Certificate

Findings on Standards:

Based on the institution's responses to the appropriate Program Standards, review of documents, interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, supervising practitioners, supervisors, university administrators and employers, the team has determined all standards are met for both the Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate and the Moderate/Severe Level I programs including Internship and all standards are met for both the Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate and the Moderate Severe Level II credential programs

Education Specialist credential candidates are well prepared to assume the roles and carry out the duties of a special education teacher including assessment, program planning and development, and collaboration with general education teachers. In addition, candidates state that they feel confident to interface and collaborate with parents and other service providers. Program graduates are highly regarded by employers.

Strengths:

The faculty is recognized for their significant efforts to provide field support to candidates and a strong advisement system with clear expectations and requirements including research, critical thinking, and best practices.

Faculty are trained in the use of platforms that support the effective use of instructional technology, including on-line reflection, conversation, and collegial support.

The role of family in special education is carefully woven throughout all coursework in both Level I and II with multiple opportunities to explore parental perspectives and learn appropriate communication, assessment, and family systems for collaborative relationships that benefit students with disabilities.

Faculty are highly qualified and accessible to teach and model best practices in teacher education and special education. They collaborate with colleagues across disciplines, school-based field administrators, teacher mentors, and supervisors and support providers to provide well-coordinated, high quality education specialist programs in pre-service and induction.

Teaching performance expectations (TPEs), California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), and the CEC Standards for Professional Practice are used as a common language and evaluation framework throughout all stages of the program, including admissions, course evaluation, field work assessment, and Level I and II candidate competence assessment.

Program faculty have created a strong collaborative environment that includes university supervisors, part time faculty and induction support providers. For example, a Level II course on consultation and coordination is a venue for candidates from multiple subject induction and Level II special education to engage in meaningful and real world practices.

Concerns:

None noted

Reading Certificate Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Findings on Standards:

Based on a careful review of the institutional report, the program report, syllabi, faculty vitae, assignments, rubrics, student work, handbooks, observation of the Reading clinic, site visits and numerous interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty and CARR Fellows, the team concluded that all program standards are met for both the Reading Certificate and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Programs.

The Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential are housed within the Master of Arts in Education degree program designed to provide advanced professional preparation in the field of reading and language arts so that teachers may work more effectively with P-12 students, other teachers, administrators, and community members. The program is consistently perceived by its various constituents as well-designed, rigorous, and responsive to the needs of its students.

Both programs are clearly focused on preparing candidates to support *all* students in developing proficiency as readers through systematic planning and organization of instructional activities based on comprehensive assessment strategies. Candidates become skillful in using assessment and intervention strategies that are effective with students at all grade levels within the context of a variety of subject-matter disciplines.

In most cases, candidates are full-time teachers, and their courses include requirements to apply what they are learning in fieldwork assignments associated with several courses. In addition, a sequence of clinical courses provides candidates with in-depth opportunities to engage in assessment and intervention practices in a supervised setting. This is a noteworthy strength of the

program and one which the candidates experience as particularly gratifying.

Coursework both in the certificate program and in the specialist program is rigorous, challenging candidates to critically evaluate and synthesize a broad range of theoretical and research-based readings and practices. Assessment, intervention, and instructional planning activities are grounded in application of the theoretical models under study. Candidates are required to analyze and articulate the rationale behind their decisions through use of an ongoing process of assessment, evaluation, and instruction. Candidates cite expert instructional modeling by the faculty and a strong emphasis on diversity as key to helping them understand and meet the diverse interests, needs, and abilities of their P-12 students and to utilize differentiated instructional methodologies to support the success of English language learners and students with special needs.

In the specialist program, candidates report that they emerge as highly competent to assume responsibility for providing leadership as reading professionals. They express confidence in their ability to cite relevant research as a basis for their recommendations and practices. In this regard, advanced clinical experiences develop candidates' ability to skillfully and sensitively assess the needs of struggling readers and to prescribe appropriate and effective interventions.

Candidates repeatedly cited the cohort system, the "rigor" of the program, and the competence and accessibility of faculty as strengths. Programs offered at other sites retain the same quality of instruction and resources as those offered at the main campus. The department chair and faculty encourage the candidates to become actively engaged in the reading field through action research, presentations, and membership in professional organizations.

Strengths:

Candidates were universally enthusiastic about the quality of instruction and support in the reading programs. They especially appreciated the theoretical and practical melding of instruction and modeling in all courses and the opportunity to grow as scholar-practitioners. Both candidates and employers reported that candidates are exceptionally well prepared for leadership roles in reading/language arts and that the programs at CSU Fullerton enjoy an excellent reputation among district administrators throughout the region.

Concerns:

None noted.

Health Services School Nurse Credential

Findings on Standards

After faculty, adjunct faculty, program director, candidate, administrator, graduate and preceptor interviews and the review of all documentation, the team determines that all standards are met.

In 2005, in response to candidate and community need and input, the School Nurse Program at California State University, Fullerton became the first university in Orange County to offer the School Nurse Services and Special Teaching Authorization in Health (STAH) Credential. This graduate program is unique not only because all the classes are offered in an on-line format, but

also the candidate has the option of earning the school nurse credential, the STAH and the Master's in Science in Nursing at the completion of the program.

Strengths

The coordinator of the School Nursing program and the faculty are to be commended for their enthusiastic and comprehensive initiative in response to the community need for the School Nurse Preparation Program.

The coordinator of the program welcomes suggestions, is responsive to student needs, and makes changes as suggested and appropriate. The coordinator is flexible and creative in course development and makes distinct efforts to coordinate the program with all faculty members. Attention to students' individual needs in regard to study plans, scheduling, scholarships and advising is a strength of the program. The development, coordination and implementation of the program were accomplished in only a year, yet the program is rigorous and challenging. Good use was made of resources and stakeholders such as veteran school nurse consultants, community agencies and other professionals to design the program.

School Nurses on the faculty are respected leaders practicing in the community and enthusiastically support the program.

Faculty outside the department of nursing participated in the program design and created on-line courses specifically for school nurses. Strong cadres of preceptors who are widely respected in the school nurse community voluntarily supervise the candidates during their clinical experience.

A rich technology base supports this 100% on-line program.

The students themselves are a definitive strength in this program. Their professionalism and varied knowledge and experience base contribute to the success of the entire program.

Concerns

None noted.

Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, supervising practitioners, employers and members of the Advisory Board, the team has determined that all program standards for the Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential in Communication Sciences and Disorders are met.

The students record their progress through the program via an online tracking system which includes all important documents related to the passing of the KASAs, seminars and courses completed, and evaluations. The system also provides clinical hour logs and tracking of the requirements for the credential, as well as other related documentation.

The program offers an undergraduate and a graduate degree in Communication Sciences and Disorders. About 90% of the candidates in the graduate program complete the requirements for

the Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential. The faculty has developed an intensive program that allows the candidates to complete the degree in five comprehensive semesters. Various seminars provide practicum experiences in Dysphagia, Fluency Disorders, Voice Disorders Phonological Disorders, Augmentative Alternative Communication and Multicultural areas. In addition, multicultural research and practices are incorporated throughout the academic coursework and all clinical placements. A new seminar is being planned in Autism Spectrum Disorders. Credential candidates have an opportunity to work with students who are in general education settings as well as those who have a variety of disabilities in the on-campus clinic and the public school practicum. Candidates are trained in ways to work collaboratively in school settings and to communicate effectively with school personnel and the families of children with disabilities.

The faculty engage in classroom teaching strategies and methods and hands-on experience with state-of-the-art equipment. The program Advisory Board, which meets two times a semester, has made recommendations which the faculty has implemented.

Strengths

The faculty and supervisors on and off campus provide continuing feedback to candidates at all stages of the program. Graduates of the program praise the faculty for their consistent guidance through the program and continued advice and counsel after graduation. Candidates are very appreciative of faculty accessibility.

Various faculty members facilitate a number of community service related projects which include but are not limited to:

- the Center for Stuttering,
- an on-campus grant supporting candidates' work with the National Stuttering Association and fluency disorders,
- the Autism Intervention Project,
- a parent support group for Korean parents of children with autism and
- various multicultural focused activities.

The diversity of the faculty with specialized expertise throughout the multicultural environment they embrace is to be commended given the population of the students within the program and the community which the university serves.

The program is also to be commended for providing a Peer Mentor Center to facilitate collaboration among candidates and faculty in both the undergraduate and graduate program.

The administration of the Department of Human Communication Studies and the Dean's Office is to be commended for its continuing program support by meeting faculty, student and community needs.

.

Concerns:

None noted.

Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Credential

Findings on Standards

After review of the submitted program document, additional document review, and interviews of candidates, faculty, graduates, employers, supervisors and members of the advisory committee, the team determined that all standards were met.

The organizational structure of the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program embeds the requirements for Tier 1 in the Master's Program. The requirements for the Professional Administrative Services Credential (Tier 2) are similarly embedded in the Doctoral Program. Candidates who wish to pursue Tier 2 alone may do so via a Mastery Program without going through the Doctoral Program at the University.

Candidates' progress is closely monitored by an advisement program administered by full-time faculty. The faculty continuously reviews the courses of instruction and the sequence of courses to maintain the relevance of the programs offered. In addition, full-time faculty are course monitors for all courses taught by adjunct (part-time) faculty and work closely with them to ensure that the curriculum is appropriately delivered using the prescribed syllabi and materials.

Strengths

The Education Leadership Department faculty operates in a highly collaborative mode which is reflected in its course delivery. The collegial atmosphere modeled by the Department faculty is remarkable. Students feel that they are heard and that they matter.

The continuous support that is obvious across all program areas enhances the effectiveness of the department. Rigor in program delivery renders candidates in the program well-prepared to meet the challenges they currently face in the workplace and for future advancement in the educational field. All professors (full-time and adjunct) must hold doctoral degrees, which contributes significantly to the academic strength of the program. The program operates in a technology rich environment.

The Educational Leadership Department administration pays close attention to student needs and utilizes the academic and personal strengths of the faculty to enhance an exceptional, solid instructional model.

Concerns

No concerns 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 Multiple Subject program is encouraged to continue to diversify their faculty including tenure track faculty, lecturers and university supervisors.