

# Report of the Joint NCATE-CTC Accreditation Revisit to California State University Long Beach

## Professional Services Division

November 17, 2009

### Overview

This item is in follow-up to the accreditation visit to California State University Long Beach that was conducted April 30-May 2, 2007. The team's findings for NCATE and California's accreditation systems differed at the 2007 site visit. After the 2007 site visit, the COA adopted an accreditation decision of **Accreditation** while the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board adopted an accreditation decision of **Accreditation with Conditions** and required a Focused Visit in Fall 2009.

CTC Team Findings and NCATE Recommendations (May 2007)	CTC (2007)	NCATE Team	
		Initial	Advanced
1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Met	Met	Not Met
2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Met	Met	Not Met
3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Met	Met	Met
4) Diversity	Met	Met	Met
5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Met	Met	Met
6) Unit Governance and Resources	Met	Met	Met
<b>Accreditation Decision</b>	Accreditation	Accreditation with Conditions	

The NCATE-CTC Protocol requires all accreditation activities in California to be conducted jointly. Therefore, even though CSU Long Beach did not need to respond to any stipulations for the COA, Commission staff and a member of the original site visit team participated in the Focused Visit. This item provides the report of the joint NCATE-CTC team that conducted the November 15-17, 2009 NCATE Focused Visit.

### Staff Recommendation

This is an information item.

### Background Information

A joint COA-NCATE accreditation team conducted a site visit at California State University Long Beach on April 14-18, 2007. For the NCATE Focused Visit, the institution prepared a document indicating how each of the stipulations had been addressed and what changes had been made in areas of the standards identified by the team as needing attention. The institution prepared an interview schedule for the constituencies identified by the team. The revisit was conducted by an original team member and CTC staff consultant. After the interviews on campus, the team prepared an accreditation report that was presented to the institution. The report is now provided to the Committee on Accreditation for information.

**Team Leader:** **B. Grant Hayes, Co-Chair**

University of Central Florida

**Yvonne Lux**, Co-Chair  
California Lutheran University

**Jennifer J. Fager**  
College of Social Sciences, Health, and Education

**Natalie Randolph**  
Exceptional Needs Specialist, Virginia

**Staff:** **Teri Clark**, Administrator

California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) is a public, urban, comprehensive university located in Long Beach, a diverse city of about one-half million people. CSULB was founded in 1949, and at that time, was called Los Angeles-Orange County State College. In 1952, the institution was renamed Long Beach State College, Long Beach State University in 1972, and was named California State University, Long Beach in 1982. The university is a very diverse institution, serving the greater Los Angeles Basin with candidates representing various minority groups. CSULB has a total enrollment of over 37,000 and is the 24th largest university in the nation. The professional education unit at California State University, Long Beach offers programs at both the initial and advanced levels and is responsible for the management and coordination of these programs. The unit includes educator preparation programs in the College of Education and the College of Health and Human Services. The Dean of the College of Education is the director of teacher education at CSULB.

In fall 2008, 1615 candidates were enrolled in programs that prepare professional educators to work in P-12 settings. In fall 2008, the unit employed 72 full-time faculty, and 117 part-time/adjunct instructors. The unit offers preparation programs leading to the initial licensure of teachers at the undergraduate and graduate levels and advanced graduate programs for licensed teachers, which provide for continuing preparation of teachers. In addition, the unit offers advanced programs for the preparation of other school personnel in clinical rehabilitative services, educational administration, educational technology, librarianship, reading, school counseling, and school psychology.

Table 2 (initial programs) and table 3 (advanced programs) of the Institutional Report (IR) accurately reflects a list of licensure programs in the unit, along with the degree and program levels, and number of candidates enrolled in the program at each level. The unit is required to submit programs for state review. All programs have received state-approval by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC).

California is an NCATE partnership state. The joint, focused-visit was conducted by a four-member team which included one state member. In addition, the Administrator of Accreditation from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) accompanied the team. The state team member and state consultant participated in all team meetings, conducted interviews along with NCATE team members, and participated in all team discussions. The team thoroughly examined advanced programs, including other professional school personnel

programs within the unit in regard to NCATE Standard 1 and reviewed initial and advanced programs in regard to 2.

The conceptual framework describes the vision and the purpose of the unit's efforts in preparing educators who are socially responsible leaders for a rapidly changing, technology-rich world who value diversity, service, and collaboration, and lifelong learning and professional growth. The framework that guides the efforts of the California State University, Long Beach's professional education unit is Teaching for Life-Long Learning, Professional Growth, and Social Responsibility. The unit's mission is to foster a learning and teaching community committed to student success and academic quality. The framework is a shared vision for the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. The unit's conceptual framework applies to both the initial and advanced programs and is closely aligned to the university's mission, outlining expected target competencies for all candidates (growth and learning; social responsibility; diversity; service and collaboration; school improvement; research, service and scholarship). The unit strives to prepare candidates who will meet the needs of a democratic society, preparing educators to work with students who are diverse in all respects and ensuring that they acquire the competencies and skills to be effective educators in P-12 settings. The unit's conceptual framework provides the thread that makes the programs coherent throughout the curriculum, field and clinical experiences, and multiple candidate assessments.

Grounded in a philosophical ideation of empowered educators, the knowledge base draws upon a host of researchers that include Alder (1982), Vygotsky (1978), Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton (1985), Gardner (1983, 1999), and Piaget (1973). Consistent with the mission of the university, the unit uses the six themes as guiding activities of the college. These initiatives are outlined on pp. 3-4 of the IR (AIMS version). A committee with representatives from each department within the College of Education and Affiliated Programs, in consultation with local school districts, reviewed and revised the unit's conceptual framework. Candidates, university faculty, unit faculty, school faculty, administrators, and the broader community have a clear understanding of the conceptual framework and are able to articulate its elements.

The conceptual framework describes the vision and the purpose of the unit's efforts in preparing educators to work in P-12 schools. There are elements that define the framework and this knowledge base and these skills and dispositions are linked to state and national standards and are assessed in a variety of ways at multiple decision points. These elements are emphasized in the professional education curriculum, form the basis for activities at the level of field experiences, and are the criteria by which candidates are assessed. The framework recognizes a scholarly commitment to professional knowledge, teaching competence, and student learning. The dispositions the faculty value in teachers are articulated and are used in assessing candidates' progress. The professional commitments and dispositions that shape the candidates' experiences at California State University, Long Beach are modeled by the faculty and demonstrated in the field. Individual courses document the richness of diversity and technology. The commitment to diversity and technology is clearly reflected in the conceptual framework. Program design includes requisite coursework, signature assignments, portfolios, case studies, professional work samples, and culminating experiences (e.g., comprehensive examinations, theses) that present the interrelationship of field and clinical experience to coursework. The value of diversity is actualized in the unit's efforts to incorporate and model the encouragement of diversity in candidate coursework. A commitment to educational and information technology is reflected throughout courses, experiences, and assessments. The candidates are entering the field

with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to utilize technology as an instructional tool to engage students in learning.

The unit's outcomes are aligned with professional and state standards and are reflected in the assessments of candidate proficiencies. First, the different programs adhere to professional standards in that discipline and those developed by the state. All outcomes meet the requirements of the framework in terms of addressing content, methods, and candidates. Second, these outcomes are seen in program assessments and are used to evaluate the progress and proficiencies of candidates. These assessments are reviewed regularly by the unit to ensure that current standards are met. These reviews include attention to changes in national and state standards as well as information received from faculty, candidates, school practitioners, and other P-12 professionals.

### **Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions**

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

#### **For Advanced Programs Only**

##### **1a. Content Knowledge for Advanced Teacher Candidates**

All five of the advanced teacher preparation programs [Adapted Physical Education, MA in Education (C&I), MA in Education (Early Childhood Education), MA in Education (Dual Language Development, MS in Special Education)] have developed candidate proficiencies aligned with the unit's conceptual framework, state certification standards, and, where available, national standards from respective organizations to develop student learning outcomes for each program. Additionally, each program has included a focus on content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, student learning, and professional dispositions within their respective program structures. Signature assignments and their companion rubrics are in place to assess both candidates and programs in each of these areas to determine whether candidates have developed the knowledge, skills, and dispositions expected for the programs.

Each of the advanced teacher preparation programs includes signature assignments designed to assess content knowledge. Each assignment includes a four-point scoring rubric. A review of the data resulting from the assessment of signature assignments offered in Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 suggests candidates meet expected learning outcomes in the area of content knowledge. The rubric scores on the four-point rubric ranged from 3.61 to 3.88 for 286 candidates. These data were further substantiated through interviews with candidates and graduates as well as faculty who confirm that the expectations for content knowledge were clear and the candidates felt they were prepared in this area. Samples of the signature assignments and clinical experiences (i.e., portfolios, action research projects, journal reflection assignments) shared during interviews also confirm that candidates and graduates possess content knowledge in their chosen fields of study. Through interviews with unit faculty, candidates, the team learned that unit candidates feel well prepared in terms of content knowledge and have a solid foundation. Overall, advanced teacher candidates demonstrate that they are well grounded in the content knowledge of their discipline.

### **1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Advanced Teacher Candidates**

As stated in the element above, all five of the advanced teacher preparation programs have developed candidate proficiencies aligned with the unit's conceptual framework, state certification standards, and, where available, national standards from respective organizations to develop student learning outcomes. Additionally, each program has included a focus on content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, student learning, and professional dispositions within their respective program structures. Signature assignments and their companion rubrics are in place to assess both candidates and programs in each of these areas to determine whether candidates have developed the knowledge, skills, and dispositions expected for the programs. Each of the advanced teacher preparation programs includes signature assignments designed to assess pedagogical content knowledge. Each assignment includes a four-point scoring rubric. A review of the data resulting from the assessment of signature assignments offered in Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 suggests candidates meet expected learning outcomes in the area of pedagogical content knowledge. The rubric scores on the four-point rubric ranged from 3.05 to 3.79 for 417 candidates. These data were further substantiated through interviews with candidates and graduates as well as faculty who confirm that the expectations for pedagogical content knowledge were clear and the candidates felt they were prepared in this area. Samples of the signature assignments (i.e., portfolios, action research projects, journal reflection assignments) shared during interviews also confirm that candidates and graduates possess pedagogical content knowledge in their chosen fields of study.

### **1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Advanced Teacher Candidates**

As stated in the element 1a. above, all five of the advanced teacher preparation programs have developed candidate proficiencies aligned with the unit's conceptual framework, state certification standards, and, where available, national standards from respective organizations to develop student learning outcomes. Additionally, each program has included a focus on content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, student learning, and professional dispositions within their respective program structures. Signature assignments and their companion rubrics are in place to assess both candidates and programs in each of these areas to determine whether candidates have developed the knowledge, skills, and dispositions expected for the programs.

Each of the advanced teacher preparation programs includes signature assignments designed to assess professional knowledge and skills. Each assignment includes a four-point scoring rubric. A review of the data resulting from the assessment of signature assignments offered in Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 suggests candidates meet expected learning outcomes in the area of professional knowledge and skills. The rubric scores on the four-point rubric ranged from 3.00 to 3.93 for 529 candidates. These data were further substantiated through interviews with candidates and graduates as well as faculty who confirm that the expectations for professional knowledge and skills were clear and the candidates felt they were prepared in this area. Samples of the signature assignments (i.e., portfolios, action research projects, journal reflection assignments) shared during interviews also confirm that candidates and graduates possess professional knowledge and skills in their chosen fields of study.

### **1d. Student Learning for Advanced Teacher Candidates**

One or more signature assignment based on learning outcomes for candidates in the domain of student learning are evaluated with a four point rubric. In all five of the advanced teacher

preparation programs the learning outcomes are aligned with the conceptual framework. Outcomes for Adapted Physical Education are also based on state certification standards. Outcomes for Education Specialist Level 2 are based on state certification standards and standards of the Council of Exceptional Children. The Early Childhood, outcomes are based on the standards of the National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Signature assignments for student learning include reflections on lesson plans, case study evaluations, action research proposals and curriculum audits. In the five advanced teacher preparation programs the average mean scores for the signature assignments for student learning for Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 ranged from 3.42-3.86 on the four point rubric. The median of the scores was 3.63.

Interviews with candidates and graduates of the programs confirm that they feel prepared and confident in their ability to support student learning through analysis of assessment data, understanding of theories and concepts of student learning and the use of school and community resources.

The advanced programs' exit survey in Spring 2009 had a total of 108 responses. Respondents represented all of the College of Education's advanced programs. Of the 108 respondents 72 percent answered that their program had contributed a "great deal" to their ability to "Promote intellectual growth for ALL students/clients".

#### **1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals**

One or more signature assignments based on multiple candidate learning outcomes for knowledge and skills are evaluated with a four point rubric in programs for other school professionals. Learning outcomes are aligned with the conceptual framework and based on state certification standards for Administrative Services Levels I & II; on International Society for Technology Education standards for Educational Technology; on state certification standards for Librarianship; on International Reading Association and state certification standards for Reading and Language Arts; on state certification and American School Counseling Association standards for School Counseling; and on state certification and National Association for School Psychologist standards for School Psychology. In these seven programs the average mean scores of the signature assignments for student learning for Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 ranged from 3.92-3.28 on the four point rubric. The median of the scores was 3.67. The signature assignments included case studies, action research projects, field experiences, parent interviews, management plans and internship evaluations. In the Speech and Language Pathology program in which learning outcomes are based on state certification and American Speech and Hearing Association standards 100 percent of the candidates passed the PRAXIS examination at the conclusion of their programs in 2007, 2008, and 2009.

Interviews with candidates and graduates of the programs confirm that the candidates feel that their programs have provided the knowledge and skills needed for practice and research in their fields.

The advanced programs' exit survey in Spring 2009 had a total of 108 responses. Respondents represented all of the College of Education's advanced programs. Of 107 respondents 95 percent felt confident in basic software use, 84 percent were confident in their use of internet safety and security skills, and 85 percent were confident in their ability to evaluate on line resources in their fields. Of the 108 responses 60 percent indicated that their program had contributed to their ability to promote school improvement, 76 percent to their ability to engage in research to inform

practice and 71 percent in their ability to engage in ongoing evaluation of practice. In the Speech and Language Pathology program completers responded to a confidential survey to evaluate their clinical experiences in which 34 out of 36 candidates responded and rated 94% of their clinicians as very good or exceptional in providing them fieldwork experiences to prepare them to successfully assume the duties of a speech language pathologist in the public schools.

#### **1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals**

Each of the programs for other school professionals has one or more of the state and national standards based candidate learning outcomes that address student learning. Learning outcomes are aligned with the conceptual framework and based on state certification standards for Administrative Services Levels I & II; on International Society for Technology Education standards for Educational Technology; on state certification standards for Librarianship; on International Reading Association and state certification standards for Reading and Language Arts; on state certification and American School Counseling Association standards for School Counseling; and on state certification and National Association for School Psychologist standards for School Psychology. One or more signature assignments address the learning outcomes. The signature assignments are evaluated with a four point rubric. In these seven programs the average scores for Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 ranged from 4.00 -3.37 on the four point rubric with a median average score of 3.78. In the Speech and Language Pathology program in which learning outcomes are based on state certification and American Speech and Hearing Association standards 100 percent of the candidates passed the PRAXIS Examination at the conclusion of their programs in 2007, 2008, and 2009.

The advanced programs' exit survey in Spring 2009 had a total of 108 responses. Respondents represented all College of Education's advanced programs. Of the 108 respondents 72 percent answered that their program had contributed a "great deal" to their ability to "Promote intellectual growth for ALL students/clients".

Interviews with candidates and graduates of all the programs confirm that they feel prepared and confident in their ability to support student learning through analysis of assessment data, understanding of theories and concepts of student learning and the use of school and community resources.

#### **1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates**

The conceptual framework key ideas and state and professional guidelines form the basis for the signature assignments which assess professional dispositions. Signature assignments for designated candidate learning outcomes are evaluated with a four point rubric. For Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 the average scores ranged from 3.25 to 3.91 on the four point rubric. The median of the scores was 3.69. Signature assignments include philosophy statements, position papers, research reports, model program projects and reflections.

The advanced programs' exit survey in Spring 2009 had a total of 108 responses. Respondents represented all of the College of Education's advanced programs. An average of 68.9 percent of the responses to the nine key concepts of the conceptual frameworks indicated that the respondents believed that their programs had contributed a "great deal" to their ability to demonstrate the professional dispositions represented in the conceptual framework.

Interviews with faculty, candidates and graduates of the programs confirm that professional dispositions are aligned with the guiding principles of the conceptual framework and are

assessed by their programs with student reflections, signature assignments and clinical evaluations.

### **Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

The conceptual framework key ideas and state and professional guidelines form the basis for the signature assignments which assess professional dispositions. Signature assignments for designated candidate learning outcomes are evaluated with a four point rubric. For Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 the average scores ranged from 4.0-2.94 on the four point rubric with the median of the scores at 3.82 for the eight programs. Signature assignments include portfolio presentations, urban school studies, clinical assessment reports, internship evaluations, theses, case studies, field experiences ethical dilemma presentations, ethics projects and practica evaluations.

The advanced programs, exit survey in Spring 2009 had a total of 108 responses. Respondents represented all of the College of Education's advanced programs. An average of 68.9 percent of the responses to the nine key concepts of the conceptual frameworks indicated that the respondents believed that their programs had contributed a "great deal" to their ability to demonstrate the professional dispositions represented in the conceptual framework.

Interviews with faculty, candidates and graduates of the programs confirm that professional dispositions are aligned with the guiding principles of the conceptual framework and are assessed by their programs with student reflections, signature assignments and clinical evaluations.

### **Overall Assessment of Standard 1**

Candidates in advanced programs for teachers and other school professionals in the unit are being well prepared to work in schools. These candidates know and are able to demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. In addition all assessments pertaining to advanced programs are aligned to professional, national and state standards as well as the unit's conceptual framework. Advanced candidates are able to apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions reflected in the conceptual framework as well as their proficiencies outlined in the unit, state and professional standards.

### **Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation**

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

#### **2a. Assessment System**

The assessment system was redesigned following the 2007 NCATE visit. Important changes include the adoption of an assessment plan template for use by all programs and the use of analytic rubrics for data collection. Each student-learning outcome is mapped via the assessment plan template to the Conceptual Framework (CF), NCATE, state and /or national standards. The Unit's Assessment Committee, which was created in fall 2007 in cooperation with community partners, is responsible for the development and implementation of the unit assessment system. The candidate outcomes outlined in the conceptual framework are clearly reflected in the assessment system for both initial and advanced programs. The programs have identified proficiencies based on state and national standards. The unit has a comprehensive, systematic assessment system that has been aligned with the conceptual framework (CF) and state, national

and/or professional standards. An Assessment Office consisting of two half time faculty, one administrative assistant and two graduate assistants supports the Assessment Committee and the unit.

The assessment system is accurately described on pages 21-23 of the IR and provides for the collection, analysis and use of data to make decisions about initial and advanced candidates, programs and unit operations. The system for evaluating candidate performance in initial and advanced programs at unit transition points is accurately described in Table 6 on page 18 of the IR. Candidates at the initial and advanced levels are required to engage in reflection on unit lesson plans, portfolios, case studies, field based projects and performance based assessments through coursework. As documented through exemplars, interviews and exhibits reviewed during the visit, key assessments at both the initial and advanced level are used to measure candidate performance starting with entry into the institution and culminating with program completion. Decisions about candidate performance at both levels are based on multiple assessments. Interviews indicated assessment data is shared with candidates and faculty to help them reflect on their performance and to make improvements. All programs regularly survey graduates to monitor program quality.

Multiple assessments are administered regularly and systematically to manage and improve the operations of the unit. Examples of these assessments are employer surveys, exit surveys and alumni surveys. The unit has implemented analytic rubrics to ensure that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent and free of bias. The unit provided extensive workshops and training opportunities for faculty in relation to assessment tools as reported in the IR and interviews. Faculty collects exemplars to review at annual assessment meetings and calibrate across sections of a course. Electronic versions of these exemplars are stored on the Candidate and Operations Support System (COSS) database for easy reference to program learning outcomes. COSS is being developed to allow for web-based data entry. This will allow faculty to access data and reports on candidates, cohorts, and courses. Additional work on reliability of signature assignment data is targeted to begin after spring 2010. The advanced program portion of the assessment system mirrors the initial program in the scope of its alignment with the standards and the conceptual framework, adherence to California's content knowledge criteria, use of a rubric and the use of an electronic assessment system for the maintenance of data.

The assessment system for advanced programs gathers information used for assisting candidates to apply knowledge as compared to the information gathered for initial candidates which is used to inform the unit about the developmental needs and progress of candidates. Initial and advanced faculty serves on the Assessment Committee and accept equal responsibility for candidate success and program and unit improvement.

## **2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation**

The unit regularly and comprehensively gathers, compiles and analyzes assessment and evaluation information on candidates, graduates, courses, and programs at the initial and advanced level. Data analysis takes place primarily through the use of Excel and Task Stream and is imported into COSS. Data management is supported by both COSS and Task Stream. COSS is the final location for all college data related to assessment and is evolving to meet the unit's assessment needs. These assessments are aligned to the unit's CF, state, and/or national standards. The unit provides the Assessment Office website (link on page 23 of IR) and resources for assessment support. An assessment coordinator was hired and an Assessment Committee was formed in 2007. Assessment efforts have been refined with the use of rubrics,

mandated by the Assessment Committee in fall 2008. Currently data is reported using rubric-level candidate performance. Data are collected on all signature assignments and other data sources across all transition points. The Assessment Office aggregates data across semesters within a year. Program level data for an academic year is aggregated around the CF and NCATE standard elements. The Assessment Committee reviews the data each fall.

Data are collected at the end of each semester and annually. The program faculty meets annually to review data for learning outcomes and program improvement. Candidates with alternate routes to a teaching credential are held to the same learning outcomes and signature assignments as their peers. These candidates have declined in number and reflect a very small portion of enrollment.

Formal academic grievances brought by candidates are processed by means of a clearly established grievance policy. Candidates are notified of their rights in the student handbook and university website. Formal grievances are maintained within confidential files in the dean's office. Matters of a grievous nature, including grade appeals, petitions, and grade review, and other appeals are reviewed through the College of Education Grade Appeals process. In the past three years there have been two grade appeals.

Data in the IR pertaining to the unit's assessment system were validated in exhibits and interviews. Online exhibits and interviews were essential in helping the BOE Team fully evaluate this standard.

### **2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement**

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data. The data is used to improve candidate performance, programs and the unit operations. The team confirmed data driven improvements listed on pages 26-27 of the IR. The Assessment Coordinator, Data Assessment Coordinator and members of the Assessment Committee were able to cite specific examples of different ways the unit is made aware of concerns. For example, the unit offered alternative formats for the signature assignment for Education Specialist Level I candidates after data indicated surprisingly low scores in 07-08. This was impacted by the rubric that is being redesigned to track more closely student learning outcome. This was a direct result of the Assessment Committee identifying the average score on this outcome and the connection between program and unit level data review.

The unit has incorporated plans to promote immediate access for faculty to performance data. Interviews with faculty, unit administrators, and Assessment Committee members all provide convincing evidence that the unit is committed to building their assessment system (COSS) and transitioning the database to a new generation of software. Plans include faculty entering candidate performance data into a web interface. The new system will allow faculty immediate access to candidate performance data, real time summaries at the program level, and automatically generated reports for candidates at risk of not succeeding.

Performance data are shared with candidates, unit faculty and part time faculty (practitioners in their field). As a result of the Assessment Committee, Assessment Office and the implementation of the new assessment system, there is visible increase in the collaboration of faculty in the unit and across programs. Interviews with faculty and members of the Assessment Committee confirmed the unit's sentiments about the powerfulness of COSS to illustrate the new culture of evidence advocated by the unit. COSS will supply a systematic way of evaluating programs and the unit and receive input from the unit faculty.

## **Overall Assessment of Standard 2**

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the candidates and graduate performance and unit operations and evaluates and improve the unit and its programs. The assessment tools and strategies employed in the initial and advanced programs are aligned with the conceptual framework, state expectations and national standards. Initial and advanced programs utilized multiple measures to assess candidate progress. Data regarding candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions at key transition points are regularly and systematically compiled, summarized, analyzed, distributed and acted upon.

## **Areas for Improvement**

At the initial site visit in 2007, eleven areas for improvement (AFI) were identified by the joint team. At the Focused Visit, the joint team has confirmed that all eleven AFIs have been corrected by CSU Long Beach. No additional AFIs were identified at the Focused Visit.