

**Report of the NCATE Accreditation Revisit to
California State Polytechnic University
June 2013**

Introduction

This agenda item is a report of the revisit to California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo (Cal Poly SLO) focusing on NCATE Standard 6 (Unit Governance and Resources). Mark Cary, Team Lead and Teri Clark, Consultant represented the Commission. NCATE (now CAEP) team included a team lead and three reviewers.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item. Because the visit was focused on an NCATE standard only, there is no need for additional action on the part of the COA.

Background

At the April 2012 meeting, the COA took action to change the accreditation status for Cal Poly, SLO from Accreditation with Stipulations to Accreditation. The [report](#) and [letter](#) from 2012 are linked for your review.

NCATE had a follow up focused visit in March 2013, focusing on NCATE Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources. The California co-chair from the initial visit attended the focused visit to provide information from the California perspective. CAEP will take action in Fall 2013 on the focused visit.

NCATE Report

The visiting team noted, “clear signs of progress since 2011, particularly in reference to unit leadership and authority, which was the subject of an Areas For Improvement (AFI) on the original visit”. Further stating, “Leadership of the SOE has been vested in a dean, whose responsibilities and authority are clearly defined... has systematically engaged faculty, staff, and P-12 partners...” The team noted significant improvements in program and unit operations.

The AFI was removed with the following rationale:

The unit has implemented a new governance structure that allows it to effectively plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs of study. (ITP & ADV)

The full report from the focused visit is provided in Appendix A.

Next Steps

No further action is needed.

BOE Report for Continuous Improvement Pathway

Summary for Professional Education Unit

Institution Name:

California Polytechnic State University

Team Recommendations:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 4: Diversity	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources	Standard Met	Standard Met

Not Applicable = Unit not reviewed for this standard and/or level

Team Recommendations on Movement Toward Target:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 4: Diversity	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Not Applicable = Unit did not select this as a target standard

I. Introduction

I.1 Brief Overview of the institution and the unit.

California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo is a component of the California State University system of 23 campuses operating under the governance of the Board of Trustees and the administrative control of the Office of the Chancellor.

Cal Poly is located in the city of San Luis Obispo, about midway between San Francisco and Los Angeles. The university offers a comprehensive undergraduate education combining technical and professional curricula with the arts and humanities. It has evolved into a comprehensive master's level university with an identity and reputation as a polytechnic institution. Nearly 75 percent of all students graduate in nationally recognized technical and professional programs that are balanced with the arts, humanities, and social sciences. Cal Poly views itself as a student-focused, learning-centered educational institution with an emphasis on experiential learning.

The university began as a vocational high school in 1901, added a junior college in 1927, became a three-year institution in 1936, and evolved into a baccalaureate-granting institution in 1940. Master's degree programs were added in 1949. In 1972, it became a University. The University awarded 105,078

bachelor's degrees between 1942 and 2003, and 9,468 master's degrees between 1951 and 2003.

The university's undergraduate orientation was established by original legislation and has not been altered in major ways since. Its emphasis on undergraduate education in applied technical and professional fields (engineering, agriculture, architecture, and business) has created a national reputation for excellence in these fields. The university is home to 24 accredited/recognized programs and it is the third most selective public university in California, ranking only behind UC Berkeley and UCLA. Admitted students come primarily from the state of California.

The School of Education (SOE) is the professional education unit at Cal Poly that prepares teachers, special educators, counselors, and school administrators. The SOE is composed of six programs: Agriculture Specialist (AGS), Counseling and Guidance (CGP), Educational Leadership and Administration (ELAP), Multiple Subject Credential (MSCP), Single Subject Credential (SSCP), and Special Education (SPED). Total enrollment for initial and advanced programs in 2011-12 was 225 (96 in MSCP, 67 in SSCP, 20 in SPED, 23 in ELAP, and 19 in AGS). The Counseling and Guidance program prepares candidates for positions in higher education. The unit is embedded within the College of Science and Mathematics, but has its own dean and is autonomous in all areas pertaining to educator preparation and certification.

Although faculty within the SOE bear primary responsibility for the preparation of teachers and other education professionals, they work closely with affiliated faculty in other colleges and departments to accomplish this task. For example, the Department of Liberal Studies offers a four-year program for undergraduates who aspire to become elementary school teachers. Almost all candidates who enroll in the Department of Liberal Studies elementary subject matter preparation program enroll in the post-baccalaureate or blended Multiple Subject Credential Program in the SOE. Similarly, many candidates who pursue the post-baccalaureate Single Subject Credential acquire their subject matter preparation through disciplinary programs/departments in other colleges in the university.

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

This was a focused visit conducted as a joint visit with the state of California, with four BOE members and a state team member who served as co-chair. There were no deviations from the state protocol.

I.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

There are no unit programs offered electronically or at branch campuses or other off-campus locations.

I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

There were no unusual circumstances that affected the visit.

II. Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and

continuously evaluated.

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P–12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

II.1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

III. Unit Standards

The following pages contain a summary of the findings for each of the six NCATE unit standards.

Standard 1

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.

1.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 1.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

1.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

1.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

1.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

--

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

Target	Moving Toward Target	Insufficient Progress
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in all elements of the standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in some components and/or elements of the standard with plans and timelines for attaining target level in all elements of the standard.	Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that the unit is moving toward target level with plans and timelines for attaining target level for the standard.

1.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales**1.3.a What AFIs have been removed?**

AFI	AFI Rationale

1.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

1.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale

1.4 Recommendations**For Standard 1**

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	
Advanced Preparation	

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	
Advanced Preparation	

Standard 2

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.

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.

2.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 2.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 2.2.b.

2.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

2.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

2.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

Target	Moving Toward Target	Insufficient Progress
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in all elements of the standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in some components and/or elements of the standard with plans and timelines for attaining target level in all elements of the standard.	Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that the unit is moving toward target level with plans and timelines for attaining target level for the standard.

2.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale

2.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

2.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale

2.4 Recommendations

For Standard 2

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	
Advanced Preparation	

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	
Advanced Preparation	

Standard 3

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

3.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.

3.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

--

3.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

--

3.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

--

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

Target	Moving Toward Target	Insufficient Progress
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in all elements of the standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in some components and/or elements of the standard with plans and timelines for attaining target level in all elements of the standard.	Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that the unit is moving toward target level with plans and timelines for attaining target level for the standard.

3.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale

3.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

3.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale

3.4 Recommendations

For Standard 3

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	
Advanced Preparation	

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	
Advanced Preparation	

Standard 4**Standard 4: Diversity**

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

4.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 4.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

4.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

4.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

4.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

Target	Moving Toward Target	Insufficient Progress
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit	Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that

presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in all elements of the standard.

is performing at target level in some components and/or elements of the standard with plans and timelines for attaining target level in all elements of the standard.

the unit is moving toward target level with plans and timelines for attaining target level for the standard.

4.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale

4.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

4.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale

4.4 Recommendations

For Standard 4

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	
Advanced Preparation	

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	
Advanced Preparation	

Standard 5

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance And Development

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

5.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

--

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 5.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 5.2.b.

5.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

--

5.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

--

5.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

--

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

Target	Moving Toward Target	Insufficient Progress
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in all elements of the standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in some components and/or elements of the standard with plans and timelines for attaining target level in all elements of the standard.	Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that the unit is moving toward target level with plans and timelines for attaining target level for the standard.

5.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale

5.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

5.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale

5.4 Recommendations

For Standard 5

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	
Advanced Preparation	

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	
Advanced Preparation	

Standard 6

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.

6.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The School of Education (SOE) is the unit responsible for the preparation of professional educators at California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo. The SOE resides within the College of Science and Math (CSM). Unit leadership is provided by the dean of the SOE, who serves under the dean of the CSM. The SOE dean has the responsibility and authority for (a) maintaining educator preparation certification at the university and for maintaining accreditation of all education credential programs offered by the university; (b) appointing SOE program coordinators, faculty lecturers and staff, and, in the case of tenure-track faculty appointments, making recommendations for their appointment, retention, promotion, and tenure to the CSM; (c) requesting an annual SOE budget through the CSM dean to the provost and, once approved, autonomously managing the school's budget with support from the CSM staff; and (d) reporting to the dean of the CSM, attending meetings of the CSM Dean's Council, and working in concert with the CSM dean in representing the needs of SOE programs within the institution. The SOE dean also works with the unit's Coordinating Council, which is comprised of representatives of key constituencies involved in the preparation of educators, including those situated outside the SOE. Although the SOE is a unit within the CSM, the SOE dean participates in a university-wide committee with other deans, ensuring a voice in larger institutional discussions.

The Coordinating Council membership includes the program coordinators for each of the unit's initial and advanced programs: Single-Subject, Multiple Subjects, Special Education, Educational Administration, and Agriculture, as well as an elected staff member, an elected lecturer, the coordinator of the Counseling and Guidance program, and a representative of the Department of Liberal Studies (the department in which candidates receive undergraduate subject preparation). Non-voting members include the dean of the SOE, who serves as chair, and the assessment coordinator. The Coordinating Council meets regularly throughout the year and advises the dean on administrative policies and procedures, budget, and strategic planning, as well as considering recommendations from members of the larger governance community. Interviews with members of the Coordinating Council, other faculty,

the dean of the SOE, and the dean of the CSM consistently reported that this structure facilitated good communications and transparency, served as an effective decision-making body, and had improved faculty morale since its inception after the 2011 visit.

Recruiting and admissions materials for prospective candidates are prepared by each program with the assistance of the credential analyst and are posted on program and SOE websites. The credential analyst is responsible for regularly reviewing and updating all calendars, catalogs, publications, and policies for the unit. A review of online and print documents confirmed that these materials are current, accurate, and consistent across programs and sources. Advice and assistance for prospective and current candidates are provided by program coordinators, faculty advisors, and the credential analyst. The credential analyst is a member of the Coordinating Council, where changes in certification requirements, program operations, and other advising issues are discussed in order to ensure consistency and effectiveness in advising. Interviews with candidates and recent graduates indicated that advisement and assistance is of uniformly high quality across all programs in the unit.

Interviews with institutional and unit leadership, faculty, and Coordinating Council members provided evidence that collaboration takes place through multiple channels and at all levels of unit and institutional operations. Examples include collaboration between SOE faculty and faculty in liberal studies, science, and mathematics on a wide range of partnerships and research projects; collaboration between Multiple and Single Subject credential faculty and P-12 partners in implementing a co-teaching model for fieldwork in those programs; participation of P-12 partners in program and SOE advisory boards to discuss design, implementation and evaluation of program and unit operations; and inclusion of SOE faculty and staff on key university-wide committees. Those interviewed consistently stressed the value of these collaborative efforts and the ways in which those currently being undertaken are serving as models for new collaboration proposals.

Budget documents and interviews demonstrate that the unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations proportionate to other units within the college and university. The budget for the unit reflects support for on-campus and clinical work essential for preparation of professional educators. Although university budgets have been constrained in the past several years, the unit has been able to support its programs adequately and has, in fact, converted several part-time positions to tenure-track positions in the past two years. Budgets are decentralized at the college level; the unit submits its requests through the College of Science and Mathematics but has autonomy in administering the budget within the SOE.

Documentation and evidence from interviews clearly demonstrate that faculty members are effectively engaged in teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, collaborative work in P-12 schools, and service. Weighted teaching units by quarter for full-time tenure-track faculty are determined in collective bargaining agreements and translate into twelve hours per quarter distributed among instruction, supervision, SOE governance work, and service and/or scholarly activity. Interviews with faculty confirm that their work load and assigned release time provide ample opportunity to engage in academically related responsibilities and that they appreciate the support they receive from the administration to pursue research and professional development activities. New faculty members receive one-course release time and additional resources from the SOE. The university Center for Teaching, Learning and Technology provides additional resources for faculty travel. New faculty members also receive \$500.00 to purchase library materials.

The unit makes appropriate use of full time and part time clinical faculty. Currently there are five P-12 teachers-in-residence who serve as an integral part of the SOE faculty. The teacher-in-residence program ensures contribution to the unit and its academic programs by clinical faculty. Part-time faculty members enrich the teacher education curriculum by providing a link between research and practice. Part-time faculty members receive support for attendance at conferences and are able to bring back information

and resources to help improve programs. Part-time instructors collaborate with full-time faculty through participation in unit meetings. Upon entry to programs, single-subject candidates are advised by faculty members in their subject departments and are often supervised by the same faculty members during field experiences. Faculty members who were interviewed spoke highly of the Co-Teaching Model from Saint Cloud State University and the training and support they have experienced while integrating this model into candidates' field experiences

The School of Education is located in a well maintained building with adequate space for classrooms and faculty offices. Within the past two years, the unit has improved internal communications by ensuring that SOE staff are housed in the same building. All SOE classrooms are equipped with LCD projectors and SMART boards. There is also a computer lab with 21 recent desktop computers, printers, scanners, SMART board, and document camera. This room can be scheduled for whole-class instruction and is open to candidates on a drop-in basis the rest of the time. The SOE also has a classroom set of iPads and laptop cart available for student use.

The SOE allocates resources across all programs to prepare candidates to meet standards for their fields. Interviews with institutional and unit faculty verified across-the-board allocations sufficient to meet the needs of the unit and its candidates. The unit provides adequate resources to develop and implement the unit's assessment system. The SOE has a full-time Assessment Coordinator to help with implementation of the Performance Assessment for California Teachers as well as other assessment-related functions for the unit. The full-time SOE Information Services Director provides support and assistance to candidates, faculty, and staff for all technology resources above and beyond the campus-wide instructional technology support services available to all students at the institution. The SOE received a Teacher Quality grant in which assessment and technology are key reform elements. Interviews with faculty affirmed that sufficient resources are provided to support the SOE assessment system.

Professional education faculty and candidates have access to sufficient and current library and curricular resources and electronic information. The library houses a variety of resources and services available to all faculty and candidates, including a computer lab building. A tour of the library and onsite interviews verified that resources are adequate.

The institution does not offer any off-campus, distance learning, or alternate route programs. Interviews with faculty, candidates, and graduates indicated that hybrid courses are provided in which candidates have cohort discussions online in addition to face-to-face seminars with unit and school-based faculty.

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 6.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 6.2.b.

6.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

NA

6.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Although this focused visit was not structured as a Continuous Improvement process, the visiting team noted clear signs of progress since 2011, particularly in reference to unit leadership and authority, which was the subject of an AFI on the original visit.

The Focused Visit team conducted interviews with institutional and unit leaders, program faculty, and program and institutional support staff. These interviews, along with evidence submitted by the institution, clearly and consistently confirmed that significant changes have taken place in leadership and governance. Leadership of the SOE has been vested in a dean, whose responsibilities and authority are clearly defined in a governance document adopted by the institution. In this role, the interim dean has systematically engaged faculty, staff, and P-12 partners in identifying program, unit, and district needs and has created collaborative work groups (including the Coordinating Council, Governance Community, and Assessment, Curriculum, and Personnel committees) that represent all constituents involved in SOE operations. These collaborative groups have proved very effective in bringing understanding, transparency, trust, and focus to the work of the SOE—within a very short period of time. All constituent groups interviewed reported that the actions taken to strengthen SOE leadership have promoted fundamental changes in how faculty and staff collaborate within and across programs in the SOE and with P-12 partners in the SOE service area, and that these changes have already fostered significant improvements in program and unit operations. In the past year, the governance document has been amended twice as a result of input from the Coordinating Council in order to further clarify and strengthen governance within the unit.

Results of governance and leadership changes within the SOE and CSM include:

- Increasing transparency of program and unit operations and promoting greater collective understanding of individual program operations and needs
- Increasing transparency of budget and resource allocation decisions and faculty participation in resource decisions
- Promoting higher morale and collective sense of purpose among unit personnel
- Integrating the credential analyst into SOE operations to improve service to candidates and faculty
- Moving the Liberal Studies program (the primary undergraduate pathway into credential programs) from the College of Liberal Arts into the CSM
- Promoting more effective science and math education for prospective educators
- Using candidate proficiency data across programs to inform unit improvement efforts
- Developing procedures to support faculty release time for scholarship

6.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

--

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

Target	Moving Toward Target	Insufficient Progress
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in all elements of the standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in some components and/or elements of the standard with plans and timelines for attaining target level in all elements of the	Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that the unit is moving toward target level with plans and timelines for attaining target level for the standard.

	standard.	
--	-----------	--

6.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit does not have a governance structure to effectively plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs of study. (ITP & ADV)	The unit has implemented a new governance structure that allows it to effectively plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs of study. (ITP & ADV)

6.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	NA

6.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	NA

6.4 Recommendations

For Standard 6

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

IV. Sources of Evidence

Documents Reviewed

--

Persons Interviewed

--

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

List of persons interviewed.docx
Cal Poly Documents Reviewed.docx

See **Attachment** panel below.

V. State Addendum (if applicable)

Please upload the state addendum (if applicable).