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

Professional Services Division

May 8, 2007

Overview of This Report

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

Accreditation Recommendations

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

All of the recommended stipulations are for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program:
a.   That the institution send a letter to all candidates beginning coursework after August 1, 2006 notifying them that the program has not yet been approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Such notice must continue to be sent to any candidate admitted until full approval is achieved. A copy of the notification letter is to be sent to CTC staff.
b.   That the institution successfully complete the review process for program approval under the new standards for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program.
c.   That the institution provide a written report to Commission staff and team leader documenting a full plan of program assessment and implementation of said plan including candidate competence data, analysis, suggestions for program improvement arising from such analysis; and documentation that clinical experiences occur in diverse placements for all candidates (with individual documentation in student files prior to credential issuance).

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

- Adapted Physical Education Specialist

- Agricultural Specialist

- Administrative Services
  Preliminary

- Clinical Rehabilitative Services
  Language Speech and Hearing

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

- Library Media Teacher

- Multiple Subject Teaching
  Multiple Subject
  Multiple Subject Tri-Placement
  BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
  Multiple Subject Internship

- Pupil Personnel Services
  School Psychology
  School Psychology Internship

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

- Resource Specialist Certificate

- Single Subject Teaching
  Single Subject
  Single Subject – Blended Physical Education
  Single Subject Tri-Placement
  BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
  Single Subject Internship

(2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted

- California State University, Chico be required to remove the stipulations listed above within one year of the date of this action.

- California State University, Chico be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

- California State University, Chico be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2011-2012 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 Institution
California State University, Chico (CSUC) is one of 23 state universities in the California State University system. Located on 119 acres in a largely rural area of northern California, Chico is approximately 90 miles north of Sacramento. CSUC was founded in 1887 as the second California State Normal School. It became Chico State Teachers College in 1921 and Chico State College in 1935. In 1972, it became a comprehensive institution known as California State University, Chico. Today, CSUC draws its 15,919 undergraduate and graduate students from 39 states and 48 nations. CSUC has 913 faculty across 7 colleges.

CSUC offers more than 100 undergraduate majors and options and over 50 graduate programs including masters degree programs, options, and postbaccalaureate programs. The Colleges of the University are organized into two broad categories: liberal arts and sciences and professional studies. There are three Colleges within the Liberal Arts and Sciences: the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, the College of Humanities and Fine Arts, and the College of Natural Sciences. Four colleges make up the Colleges of Professional Studies: the College of Agriculture, the College of Business, the College of Communication and Education, and the College of Engineering. In addition, there are two interdisciplinary units: Undergraduate Education and the School of Graduate, International, and Interdisciplinary Studies. CSUC is accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

The Unit
The School of Education (SOE), housed within the College of Communication and Education, is designated as the unit. The unit is headed by the Dean of the College of Communication and Education. The unit also includes an Associate Dean who serves as the accreditation coordinator. During the 2006-07 academic year, the unit enrolled 752 candidates, 41 of whom are in programs located in the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences and the College of Agriculture. The chart below details the programs, levels, number of candidates, and program approval status of each program as well as the location of the program (by department or College) in the unit. The unit does not offer programs via distance learning and is piloting (fall 2006) the Preliminary Administrative Services (Educational Administration) program at an off-campus location.

Program or Pathway	Award Level	Program Level	Number of Candidates	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	Program Report Submitted for Review	State Approval Status	National Recognition Status by NCATE
Department of Professional Studies in Education							
Tri-Placement MS/SS	Credential	ITP	28	CCTC	Yes	Approved 2002	N/A
Bilingual MS	Credential	ITP	14	CCTC	Yes	Approved 2002	N/A
Bilingual SS	Credential	ITP	4	CCTC	Yes	Approved 2002	N/A
Concurrent	Credential	ITP	23	CCTC	Yes	Approved 2002	N/A
Education Specialist I	Credential	ITP	33	CCTC	Yes	Approved 1998	N/A
Education Specialist II	Master's/ Credential	ADV	43	CCTC	Yes	Approved 1998	N/A
LCDL	Master's	ADV	19	CSU, Chico	N/A	N/A	N/A
Reading/ Language Arts	Master's/ Credential	ADV	35	CCTC	Yes	Approved 2002	N/A
Department of Education							
Multiple Subject	Credential	ITP	161	CCTC	Yes	Approved 2002	N/A
Single Subject	Credential	ITP	148	CCTC	Yes	Approved 2002	N/A
Integrated Teacher Core (w/LBST)	Bachelor's Credential	ITP	92	CCTC	Yes	Approved 2002	N/A
PE/Teacher Ed. (w/KINE)	Bachelor's Credential	ITP	19	CCTC	Yes	Approved 2005	N/A
Adapted PE (w/KINE)	Credential	ITP	13	CCTC	Yes	Approved 2000	N/A
Agriculture Specialist (w/AGRI)	Credential	ITP	10	CCTC	Yes	Approved 2002	N/A
Curriculum & Instruction	Master's	ADV	27	CSU, Chico	N/A	N/A	N/A
Administrative Services	Master's/ Credential	ADV	37	CCTC	PENDING	Approved 1997	N/A
Library Media Services	Master's/ Credential	ADV	5	CCTC	Yes	Approved 2005	N/A
Department of Psychology							
School Psychology	Master's/ Credential	ADV	22	CCTC NASP	Yes	Approved 2004	N/A
Department of Communication Arts and Sciences							
Clinical Rehab. Services	Master's/ Credential	ADV	19	ASHA CCTC	Yes – ASHA	Approved 2004	N/A

The unit has 55 tenured/tenure-track faculty members and 56 supervisors of student teachers and interns. During the 2005-06 academic year, the unit employed 58 part-time faculty. The unit supports 3 Distinguished Teachers-in-Residence, a program that provides P-12 teachers the

opportunity to serve as CSUC faculty for one year with the option to renew the appointment for a second year. The unit does not use graduate assistants for instruction.

Merged COA and NCATE Visit

This was an initial 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. 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, Chico exercised that option. In addition, the institution must respond to all appropriate Program Standards. The agreement also states that the teams will be merged, will share common information and interview schedules, and will collect data and reach conclusions about the quality of the programs in a collaborative manner. However, the accreditation team will take the common data collected by the team and adapt it according to the needs of the respective accrediting bodies. This is because the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board requires a report that uses the familiar language and format of the NCATE standards rather than the language that is needed for the COA (i.e., information about Common Standards and Program Standards.) Under the provisions of the partnership agreement, California universities are not required to submit Folios to the NCATE-affiliated professional associations for review. The state review stands in place of that requirement.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant, Larry Birch, was assigned to the institution in Spring, 2005, and met with institutional leadership in February 2006. The meeting led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistical and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone, e-mail and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. The Team Leader (Co-chair for the visit), Dr. Judith Greig, was selected in July 2006. The Chair of the NCATE Board of Examiners (Co-chair for the visit), Dr. Maureen Gillette, was assigned in November, 2006. In December, 2006, Jo Birdsell, consultant in the Professional Services Division, was also assigned to assist with the visit. On February 12, 2007, the team co-chairs and the staff consultants met with the representatives of CSU, Chico to make final determinations about the interview schedule, the template for the visit and any remaining organizational details.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the NCATE unit standards and appropriate references to the California Common Standards. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution decided which of the five options in the *Accreditation Framework* would be used for responses to the Program Standards. Institutional personnel decided to respond using Option One, California Program Standards for all programs with the exception of the Clinical Rehabilitative Services credential program who used the American Speech Language and Hearing Association (ASHA) standards.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Dean and Faculty of the School of Education and Communication and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of eighteen consisting of Co-Chairs for the visit, a Common Standards Cluster that would include four NCATE members and two COA members; a Teaching Credential Cluster of seven members; and a Services Credential Cluster of three 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 Teaching Credential Cluster and the Services Credential Cluster primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered unit issues.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Saturday, April 21. On Saturday noon, 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 the rest of Saturday and on Sunday morning. The remainder of the team arrived on Sunday mid-day, April 22, with a meeting of the team followed by organizational meetings of the clusters. The institution sponsored a poster session and reception on Sunday evening 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, April 23 and 24, 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 with Technical Stipulations."** 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.

INSTITUTION: **California State University, Chico**

DATES OF VISIT: **April 21-25, 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 judgements about the educator preparation programs offered by the institution.

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

> NCATE's SIX STANDARDS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: The university elected to use the NCATE 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 utilized the NCATE standards and format. The total team (NCATE and COA members) reviewed each element of the six NCATE Standards, added appropriate areas of the Common Standards, and voted as to whether the standard was met, not met, or met with areas of improvement or concern.

> PROGRAM STANDARDS: Team clusters for [1] Teaching credential programs (Multiple Subject – including internship, Multiple Subject BCLAD Emphasis, Multiple and Single Subject Tri-Placement, Single Subject – including internship, Single Subject BCLAD Emphasis, Single Subject – Blended Physical Education, Adapted Physical Education Specialist, Agricultural Specialist, Reading Certificate and Reading/Language Arts Specialist, Library Media Teacher, Education Specialist in Special Education – Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe – including internship;) [2] Services credential programs (Preliminary Administrative Services, Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology including Internship, 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 member considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns, or not met.

BACKGROUND FOR ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend Accreditation with Technical Stipulations was based on team consensus that the six NCATE Standards were met, with five identified areas for improvement for purposes of the

NCATE report. The six standards were fully 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, with the exception of three credential programs. The Reading and Language Arts Credential program had two standards met with concerns, one at the certificate level and one at the specialist level. The Library Media Teacher Credential program had one program standard met with concerns. The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program was in the review process for the new CTC Standards but had not yet completed that process and numerous standards were not fully met. Overall, however, the institution and its programs are of high quality and are producing graduates who are highly valued by employers.

ACCREDITATION TEAM
RECOMMENDATION: **ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS**

All of the recommended stipulations are for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program:

1. That the institution send a letter to all candidates beginning coursework after August 1, 2006 notifying them that the program has not yet been approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Such notice must continue to be sent to any candidate admitted until full approval is achieved. A copy of the notification letter is to be sent to CTC staff.
2. That the institution successfully complete the review process for program approval under the new standards for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program.
3. That the institution provide a written report to Commission staff and team leader documenting a full plan of program assessment and implementation of said plan including candidate competence data, analysis, suggestions for program improvement arising from such analysis; and documentation that clinical experiences occur in diverse placements for all candidates (with individual documentation in student files prior to credential issuance).

ACCREDITATION TEAM

State Team Leader: **Judith Greig** (Team Co-Chair)
Notre Dame de Namur University

NCATE Team Leader   **Maureen Gillette** (Team Co-Chair and
Common Standards Cluster Leader)
Northeastern Illinois University

NCATE/Common Standards Cluster:
Charles Love (NCATE Member)
University of South Carolina

Deborah E. Bordelon (NCATE Member)
Nicholls State University

Nancy Hallenbeck (NCATE Member)
Anne Sullivan Elementary, Sioux Falls, SD

Eileen D. Akers (NCATE Member)
Jackson-Via Elementary, Charlottesville, VA

Jody Daughtry (CCTC/COA Member)
California State University, Fresno

Bettie Spatafora (CCTC/COA Member)
Moreno Valley Unified School District

Teacing Credential Cluster:

Andrea Guillaume (Cluster Leader)
California State University, Fullerton

Cindy Grutzik
Pacific Oaks College

Glen Casey
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Mel Lopez
Anaheim City School District (Retired)

Beth Bythrow
Los Angeles Unified School District

Linda Smetana
California State University, East Bay

Al Brandenburg
Saddleback Valley Unified School District (Retired)

Services Credential Cluster:

Louise Adler (Cluster Leader)
California State University, Fullerton

Barbara Wilson
California State Department of Education (Retired)

Margaret Dee Parker
California State University, Dominguez Hills

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
Field Experience Notebooks
Schedule of Classes
Advisement Documents
Faculty Vitae

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Stands. Cluster	Teaching Credential Cluster	Services Credential Cluster	**TOTAL**
Program Faculty	33	44	29	18	**124**
Institutional Administration	6	29	12	4	**53**
Candidates	13	48	76	56	**193**
Graduates	0	16	32	24	**72**
Employers of Graduates	0	13	18	14	**45**
Supervising Practitioners	0	21	43	12	**76**
Advisors	0	6	7	11	**24**
School Administrators	0	25	18	14	**57**
Credential Analyst	1	1	1	0	**3**
Tech Support	0	1	0	0	**1**
Advisory Committee	0	15	14	16	**45**

TOTAL   691

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

NCATE STANDARDS/CCTC COMMON STANDARDS

STANDARD 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

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

A.   Content knowledge for teacher candidates: Initial and Advanced

The first candidate proficiency in the unit's conceptual framework is: Candidates demonstrate solid knowledge of and currency in their subject matter/academic discipline and a commitment to continue to expand their depth and range of understandings. The results of state licensure tests for content and key assessments of content knowledge suggest that candidates are fully competent in this element upon completion of the program. In California, candidates for an initial teaching or services credential or candidates who are applying for admission to a CCTC-accredited teacher preparation program must demonstrate proficiency in basic reading, writing, and mathematics skills by passing the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST). Candidates for the multiple subject (elementary education) credential must also pass the multiple subject California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET). Multiple subject candidates must also pass the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA). This assessment measures the candidates' knowledge, skill, and ability relative to effective reading instruction. Data from the 2005-06 exam show that 100 percent of the unit's initial candidates passed the CBEST and CSET exams, and 98 percent of the candidates passed the RICA.

Candidates for the single subject (secondary education) or education specialist (special education) credential must complete a major in a state-approved subject matter program or pass the appropriate CSET examination. Because California subject matter preparation programs for prospective teachers must meet state standards set by the CCTC, there is no requirement for candidates for these credentials to pass the CSET examinations. While most candidates meet the subject matter competence requirement prior to admission to initial credential programs, up to 15 percent may be admitted exceptionally (data from the fall of 2005 show 11 percent were admitted exceptionally during that time period.). Those candidates are not allowed to advance to their second student teaching assignment without completely meeting their subject matter competence requirement.

Course Alignment Matrices indicating the alignment of course objectives and assessments for candidates (for initial credentials in single subject and multiple-subject programs) demonstrate that candidates know the subject matter that they plan to teach. For example, in Task B of the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA), candidates are asked to design a target lesson based on state-adopted academic content standards for students and an assessment of student learning, making appropriate adaptations for focus students. Overall, they must demonstrate their ability to more fully assess and guide student learning and their own professional development.

Under the California/NCATE partnership, state program review substitutes for SPA program review. All initial credential preparation programs were approved by the CCTC during the last accreditation site visit in 1997. Since that time, certain programs were reviewed and approved

under revised CCTC program standards as indicated on the program chart in the introductory section. All initial credential preparation programs have been reviewed as a part of this accreditation site visit. No major difficulties were cited and all programs with the exception of the Administrative Services Credential have been found to meet the requirements for continued state approval.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, cooperating teachers, and school administrators, confirmed that candidates had been well prepared by the unit in content. Cooperating teachers and school administrators agreed that in the area of academics and content knowledge, unit candidates were very knowledgeable and well prepared.

The CSU System-wide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation provides the results of surveys administered to both graduates of initial credential programs (with the exception of Educational Specialist I – Special Education) completing their first year as in-service teachers and their employers. Survey data solicits the respondents' perceptions of the quality of preparation they received. The results for each campus are provided as composite scores on groups of questions substantively related to each other. Unit data shows the perceptions of both first-year teachers and their employers are consistently high across all categories and consistently above the average for all CSU campuses. Among the questions in the composites are those that address establishing challenging academic expectations, teaching according to the academic content standards, and knowing and understanding the subject in which the teacher is credentialed. Candidates were rated "well to adequately prepared" on items related to content knowledge in Reading/Language Arts (K-12), Mathematics (K-12), English (7-12), Mathematics (7-12), and Subjects Other than English-Language Arts and Mathematics (K-12).

The lowest score on the survey was for teaching subjects other than English and mathematics K-12. In response to these results and other data, the Single Subject Program has revised its EDTE 536 Subject Area Pedagogy course and now has a team of area teachers representing each of the content areas working with a university faculty member to teach the course.

Advanced programs for teachers include the MA in Education with options in Curriculum and Instruction; Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Learners; Reading/Language Arts Specialist and Education Specialist II (Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe). Admission to these programs is a two-part process that involves admission to the university through the Graduate School as well as acceptance into the specific preparation program. Since students admitted to the MA in Education must hold an acceptable baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution, content knowledge is assessed through each candidate's baccalaureate program. Candidates must have attained grade point averages of at least 2.5 overall, 2.75 in the last 60 units, and 3.0 in the last 30 units. To be admitted to Classified Status, students must also pass the Initial Educational Writing Assessment, a requirement of the CSUC system that requests an original sample of writing. The rubric used to assess the writing sample asks that the sample be interesting throughout, flow smoothly, have good transitions, be well-organized for the topic, and have an appropriate use of mechanics and sentence structure. Students who do not meet all these requirements may be admitted to Conditionally Classified Status to remedy deficiencies through additional preparation. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of their fields and can explain central concepts delineated in standards for their program and/or credential.

Key Assessment Alignment Matrices indicate the progress of candidates in furthering their content knowledge. These matrices also include directions, scoring tools and rubrics for the key assessments. Scores on these key assessments are used to monitor individual candidate

development of content knowledge and to determine competency. The results from these aggregated scores indicate that candidates completing the program have strong content knowledge and are well supported by their programs to be successful on the multiple measures of this element.

An analysis of the data from yearly exit surveys administered between 1995 and 2004 indicates that candidates rated their educational experience in the Master's in Education programs significantly more positively than the average for all graduate programs on many indicators. The indicators most closely connected to content knowledge included "Overall Quality of Graduate Education, Intellectual Challenge, and Quality of Thesis Advice."

All advanced programs were approved by the CCTC during the last accreditation site visit in 1997. Since that time, several programs were reviewed and approved under revised CCTC program standards. No major difficulties were cited, as approval is only granted when all program standards have been met. Because the CCTC only approves credential programs, the master's programs for Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Learners (LCDL) and Curriculum and Instruction (C & I) are not approved by any outside agency. All other advanced credential preparation programs have been reviewed as a part of this accreditation site visit and are recommended for approval.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, cooperating teachers, and school administrators indicate that individuals are well prepared in content knowledge. One administrator shared that the teacher from her school who had been in the advanced program in Reading/Language Arts had become a literacy leader in her school.

B.   Content knowledge of other school personnel
Advanced Programs that prepare other school personnel include Administrative Services; Clinical Rehabilitative Services (CRS); Library Media Teacher Services; and Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology. Each of these programs is aligned to state professional standards. All programs for other professional school personnel were approved by the CCTC during the last accreditation site visit in 1997 and since that time, some programs were reviewed and approved under revised CCTC program standards (see chart in introductory section). The School Psychology program is fully accredited through the National Association of School Psychology (NASP), and the Communication Sciences and Disorders program is fully accredited by the American Speech, Language and Hearing Association (ASHA). The candidates demonstrate knowledge of their fields and can explain central concepts delineated in standards for their program and/or credential.

All credential preparation programs have been reviewed as a part of this accreditation site visit and have met the requirements for continued state approval with the exception of Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (Educational Administration), which is currently undergoing a review by the CCTC in response to a new set of program standards.

Admission to these programs involves admission to the university through the Graduate School as well as acceptance into the preparation program. Just as advanced candidates in continuing preparation for teachers, the students in programs for other school personnel must hold an acceptable baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution. Content knowledge is assessed through each candidate's baccalaureate program. Candidates must have attained grade point averages of at least 2.5 overall, 2.75 in the last 60 units, and 3.0 in the last 30 units. Candidates

for CRS must pass the Graduate Record Exam or the Miller Analogies Test (MAT) in addition to meeting the admission requirements of the Graduate School.

Programs to prepare other school personnel admit strong applicants and add to the content knowledge of candidates through program courses and experiences. Connections between the program goals and objectives and content knowledge are indicated in programs such as Library Media Services in EDCI 674, Computer Graphics & Presentation K-12. Examples of content knowledge objectives include number 3, "Each learner will demonstrate use of a scanner, digital camera, and importing of images to selected graphic programs" and number 5, "Each learner will create and present hypermedia presentations that include examples of digitizing, scanning, importing created images, HTML, graphic editing, and DVD preparation editing."

Assessments are noted in programs such as CRS in course CMSD 630, Disorders of Articulation and Phonology. These assessments include a Group Project – Case Study that requires students to transcribe speech, analyze samples, diagnose specific problems and develop an appropriate intervention plan with rationales from treatment efficacy literature. Only CRS candidates are required to take a licensure exam to demonstrate knowledge of content. The pass rate for 2006 completers of the Praxis exam was 90 percent.

Interviews with candidates and graduates of advanced programs indicated that they had been well prepared in content by their programs. Internship supervisors and the school administrators of these candidates agreed that the candidates and graduates were well prepared and noted that they are the most professional of all the credential people that came to work in their districts. All programs administer exit surveys to their candidates and positive results were presented. No alumni follow-up data was reported for advanced programs.

C.   Pedagogical content knowledge for teacher candidates

The second candidate proficiency of the unit's conceptual framework addresses pedagogical content knowledge and states: Candidates demonstrate a sizeable repertoire of pedagogical and professional practice and select strategies, techniques and technological resources appropriately in relation to the learners. This proficiency is aligned with the unit disposition that states: The candidate believes that all children can learn, appreciates their varying abilities, and persists in helping all children achieve success. A primary goal of the SOE programs is to provide candidates with the broad range of strategies, techniques and resources that will allow them to persist with students and support their learning. The programs use the CA required Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) which are aligned with California program standards for teacher education and outline the pedagogical knowledge expected of candidates. Teaching Performance Expectations (TPAs) then assess the candidates on the expectations.

Throughout program key assessments, candidates show that they have broad knowledge of instructional strategies in the subject they plan to teach and can present that content in clear and meaningful ways. Assessments being used in the Multiple Subject Program, for example, are the TPAs for Practicum I and Practicum II Evaluation. TPAs expect candidates to demonstrate the ability to connect what they know about students to instructional planning and teaching.

Assessment was presented for all initial candidates. "Acceptable" results on assessments such as the Practicum Evaluation Rubric indicate that candidates understand the state content standards and use knowledge of the subject area to choose appropriate instructional strategies to help students learn. That data show that over 97 percent of candidates are fully competent in this

element based on admission requirements met and on key assessment results upon completion of the program.

During TPAs for Multiple and Single Subject Programs, candidates are expected to complete tasks that ask for comments on the technology resources that support instruction in the classroom and elsewhere in the school. During other programs for initial candidates, candidates are expected to check for evidence of planning for technology use (i.e., students assignments incorporating Power Point presentation, web research, spreadsheets, database, etc.). Examples of key assessments in programs other than Multiple and Single Subject Programs are case studies, classroom management synthesis papers, and an integrated unit plan.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, cooperating teachers, and school administrators indicate that individuals are well prepared in pedagogical content knowledge. One administrator shared that the unit candidates has a wonderful balance between their content knowledge, their technical ability to teach, and their passion for teaching children. Follow-up surveys of graduates from 2005-06 on items related to pedagogical/professional knowledge and skills indicated that graduates felt very well or adequately prepared.

D.   Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teacher candidates
Candidates for initial teaching credentials have broad pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills related to educational foundations; child and adolescent development; educational ethics, laws and policies; research; professional communities; diversity; and school, family and community contexts.   TPEs throughout programs delineate that candidates study and are assessed on: student engagement, developmentally appropriate teaching practices, teaching English learners, instructional planning, social environment, and professional, ethical and legal obligations.. Each program uses scores on key assessments to monitor candidate performance and to determine competency. The aggregated key assessment results show that 96 percent of candidates were successful on measures related to this element.

Data from the CSU System-wide Evaluation demonstrate that graduates feel adequately to well prepared on items related to pedagogical content knowledge. Scores range from 79.8 percent on "Know about resources in the school and community for at-risk students and families" to 98 percent on "Organize and manage a class or a group of students for instructional activities." This data set prompted faculty attendance at a professional development day to learn more about best practices for preparing candidates to work with at-risk students and their families.

Advanced programs for teachers also provide opportunities for candidates to learn educational foundations as well as concepts, theories and research on effective teaching practices related to the degree option and/or credential being earned. All candidates take a course entitled, "Foundations of Education in a Democracy." In courses and in field experiences candidates apply professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. For example, candidates in the MA in Curriculum & Instruction demonstrate commitment to education for democracy by completing a project in which they take public action. In the curriculum development course, they conduct an action research project to investigate and report on a curriculum problem at their school site or district.   Education Specialist Level II and Reading/Language Arts Specialist candidates demonstrate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills through planning and implementing services for K-12 students, their parents and families, and other school personnel in required field experiences.

Programs have identified a set of key assessments that measure candidate performance related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills and use scores on key assessments to determine competency and monitor candidate performance. An overall picture of the performance of candidates on this element shows that all candidates were able to meet the performance standards on assessments for this element. However, not all programs have collected sufficient, aggregated data to make reliable judgments about candidate performance. The MA in Curriculum & Instruction presented data for 3 of 15 completers. The data is from 2005-06 and was not broken down by semester. Data for students in the Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners program is also from 2005-06 and only includes two completers. The annual assessment reports indicate that "key assessment data will be collected in fall 2006" but no data for that semester was presented.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, cooperating teachers, and school administrators indicate that individuals are well prepared in professional and pedagogical knowledge. Follow-up surveys of initial graduates from 2005-06 on items related to pedagogical/professional knowledge and skills indicated that graduates felt very well or adequately prepared.

E.   Professional knowledge and skills for other school personnel
The unit programs for preparing other school personnel have been developed to increase the professional knowledge and skills of candidates. These programs lead to credentials awarded by the CCTC and are designed to assist candidates in meeting competencies specified in California standards. Candidates have a solid understanding of families, students, and communities, use current research to inform their practices, and support learning through professional practices. Programs integrate critical knowledge and skills throughout coursework, and field components provide opportunities for candidates to connect theory with supervisor-guided practice. Course syllabi indicate related learning objectives and assessments. For example, candidates in the CRS program participate in 375 supervised hours of clinical practica and are assessed using the W-PACC, a clinical evaluation tool. The Library Media Teacher Services Program evaluates candidates through course and field assessments and the LMT portfolio.

Key assessments are linked to professional knowledge and skills used by these programs and contain scoring rubrics as well. As previously indicated, the scores on key assessments are used to monitor candidate performance and to determine competency. Aggregated data for the unit shows that 100 percent of candidates performed at acceptable or target levels. Results for the Administrative Services Credential Program 2006 Exit Survey on indicators related to professional knowledge show a positive perception of the effectiveness of the program. Scores were recorded for a candidate's agreement or disagreement with the following statements: The program offered exposure to the essential themes, concepts and skills related to the performance of administrative services (85 % agreed); The program provided an opportunity to examine the principles of democratic education from a historical and policy perspective (79% agreed); and Courses provided multiple opportunities to learn, practice and reflect on the role of instructional leaders (81% agreed).

Results from The School Psychology Program 2006 Exit Survey on indicators related to professional knowledge show a positive perception of the effectiveness of the program. Scores were recorded on candidates' feelings of being "minimally" to "well" prepared on: Consultation and Collaboration, Evaluation/Assessment, Prevention and Intervention, Counseling, and

Working with Diverse Populations. These responses show positive perceptions of the effectiveness of the program, indicating that candidates feel well prepared on these indicators.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, internship supervisors, and school administrators indicate that individuals are well prepared in professional knowledge and skills; however, some programs have collected insufficient evidence upon which to base program improvement decisions.

F.   Dispositions
Candidates across all teacher preparation programs of the unit are expected to demonstrate a common set of professional dispositions. These dispositions are based on professional and state standards and the philosophy and mission of the unit. They were developed in consultation with faculty, administration, and K-12 partners and reflect a shared core of beliefs about the knowledge, skills and dispositions of professional educators.

- The candidate appreciates and values human diversity, recognizes community and cultural norms, shows respect for students' varied talents and perspectives, seeks to foster culturally appropriate communications, and demonstrates best practices in his or her field.
- The candidate believes that all children can learn, appreciates their varying abilities, and persists in helping all children achieve success.
- The candidate is committed to continuous, self-directed learning, critical thinking and reflection in order to refine instructional practice and deepen knowledge in the academic disciplines.
- The candidate demonstrates pride in the education profession and participates in collaborative relationships with colleagues, students, parents, and social and professional communities and agencies.
- The candidate is committed to the expression and use of democratic values and to the creation of a learning environment that fosters active engagement in learning and encourages positive social interaction.

A collaboratively developed Candidate Disposition Form and Disposition Rubric are used to assess the professional dispositions of candidates. A focus group discussed the dispositions that had been agreed to by the unit faculty and explored how those dispositions could be observed through classroom behaviors of student teachers at each level of field experience. The rubric draft that the focus group created was then circulated among faculty and supervisors and discussed at unit department meetings. K-12 representatives were encouraged to share the document with faculty at their school sites as well. The rubric provides behavioral examples of the dispositions in classroom practice. For example, on the first disposition which concerns human diversity, the "Needs Improvement" response states, "Unfairly interacts and responds to students; is unaware of opportunities to enhance cross-cultural understandings; is non-responsive to students' individual differences; misses opportunities to encourage cultural sensitivities and perspectives; is unaware of culturally responsive pedagogical practices." The final document was then presented to a meeting of the All University Teacher Education Committee (AURTEC) members and a meeting of the Arts & Sciences subject matter advisers from approved subject matter programs across campus. At a meeting of the Credential Programs Committee (CPC), the resulting forms were shared with coordinators of initial credential programs as well as advanced programs for both teachers and other school personnel. Programs adapted the forms to their own needs.

Supervisors were responsible for training the cooperating teachers in the use of the form and rubric and worked collaboratively on the completion of the form for each candidate. Formal implementation of the form and rubric was piloted in initial credential programs in the Department of Education during the fall of 2006. The results from the first semester of implementation of the Dispositions Form and Rubric for Multiple and Single Subject programs after the first and second practica indicate that 180 of 223, or 81 percent of the candidates performed at the acceptable level.

The proficiencies of the conceptual framework describe the knowledge and skills that are associated with candidate dispositions and are a way of translating the dispositions into behavioral terms. An example of the connections is between the disposition "The candidate believes that all children can learn, appreciates their varying abilities, and persists in helping all children achieve success" and the 2nd proficiency of Pedagogical/Professional Practice and the 3rd proficiency of Diversity. Formal implementation of the Dispositions Form and Rubric is now occurring across all programs. Interviews with unit faculty, university supervisors, candidates, and cooperating teachers indicated that candidates have opportunities to develop and demonstrate professional dispositions. Program syllabi provide links between course objectives and assessments and the dispositions. These syllabi provide further evidence of development and assessment of dispositions in their alignment to the candidate proficiencies connected to the dispositions.

Candidate dispositions are assessed at specific points throughout a candidate's program (admission, midpoint, and exit, for example). Concerns about candidate dispositions are addressed during coursework or fieldwork. If necessary, an improvement plan may be developed to address specific issues. University supervisors meet with cooperating teachers and candidates to discuss the candidate's progress in fieldwork and to assess skills and dispositions at the midpoint and exit transitions.

Because of the results of the 2005-06 CSU Exit Survey for initial program candidates on items related to dispositions, program improvement plans are already in place for the two lower score areas of working with at-risk students and those with special learning needs. Overall the results show positive self-perceptions on items related to dispositions. The CSU System-wide follow-up survey given to employers also indicated graduates' demonstration of unit dispositions.

G.   Student learning for teacher candidates
The unit conceptual framework and the candidate proficiencies addressing subject matter knowledge, pedagogical and professional practice and diversity identify student learning as a critical focus. The fourth candidate proficiency addresses assessment as well and states: Candidates have expertise in the assessment and evaluation of pupil needs and achievements and use data in decision-making.

TPEs 1 through 9 explain that candidates for initial teaching credentials have the ability to assess student learning, to use assessments in instruction, and to develop meaningful learning experiences that help all students learn. Coursework, field experiences, and the student teaching experience ultimately demonstrate the candidate's development and assessment of ability to enable students to learn. Teacher candidates focus on student learning as shown in their use of assessments in instruction and development of meaningful learning experiences for students. As an example, all candidates in initial credential programs develop content area units that include

varied and appropriate strategies that develop both content and language acquisition. Candidates then collect and analyze assessment data and plan appropriate instruction.

Key assessments identified by each program provide multiple measures of candidate performance in regard to student learning. All of the candidates in initial credential programs must pass a comprehensive, summative, performance-based assessment. In the Department of Education, the TPA is used. In the Department of Professional Studies in Education, this assessment is the portfolio. For candidates in the Department of Education, the TPA tasks are teaching events that are entirely embedded in the Teaching Practica. The lessons that candidates plan and teach for the TPA are designed to give them opportunities to make refined teacher decisions and collect evidence of their ability to affect student learning. Through TPA tasks, candidates must record, analyze and reflect on their teaching; plan and assess instruction; plan adaptations to meet the needs of specific focus students (one English learner, one with an identified special need and one who presents a different academic challenge); teach the lesson to be observed and/or videotaped; and analyze the lesson with the focus on determining the students' progress toward the lessons' learning objectives. Results clearly indicate that candidates did well overall.

The CSU System evaluates candidate preparation on items related to student learning - including preparation to foster motivation, to use good teaching practice, and to assess and reflect. Reports from 2003-04 on composite scores for "well to adequately prepared" give perceptions of both first-year teachers and their employers as positive across all categories. The results of the CSU Exit Survey of 2005-06 program finishers on items related to student learning show high levels of satisfaction among candidates regarding their preparation to assess student learning, to use assessment in instruction, and to develop meaningful learning experiences.

Student learning is a focus for candidates in advanced programs for teachers as well. Candidates are provided opportunities to learn about assessment and the development of meaningful learning experiences for students; syllabi indicate links to course objectives and assessments. Key assessments allow candidates to demonstrate that they can focus instruction on student learning. Each advanced program designs assessment of student learning in a different form; for example, the Reading Language Arts and the Educational Specialist Level II candidates use assessment data to design and implement interventions during clinical practice and field experience. These key assessments also show the relationship between program assessments and student learning and provide links to the key assessments and scoring rubrics. The progress of candidates is monitored and evaluated through the results of candidate performance on these key assessments. Combined results across programs indicate that candidates are highly successful on measures of this element. Other programs use action research, case studies, and projects focused on an educational problem or issue in the candidate's school or district.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, cooperating teachers, school administrators, and others indicate that candidates are able to assess student learning, use assessments in instruction, and develop meaningful learning experiences. Follow-up surveys of employers and graduates concur with that assessment.

H. Student learning for other school personnel

The ability to create positive learning environments that support student achievement is a focus for candidates in programs that prepare them for professional school roles. Candidates stress the proficiencies that address subject matter knowledge, pedagogical and professional practice, diversity, and assessment. In the Administrative Services Program, candidates focus on developing a shared vision of learning, creating and maintaining a school culture conducive to learning, and ensuring a safe and effective environment for learning. Working with diverse families, communities and service agencies continues to provide candidates opportunities to impact student learning. Reflections allow candidates to study their own attitudes and biases, articulate their personal and professional ethics, and develop a capacity for leadership. Candidates have opportunities to demonstrate their new skills and understandings on a variety of key assessments that are aligned to student learning

The 2006 Exit Surveys of the Administrative Services Credential Program indicate positive perceptions of the effectiveness of the program. An example of a statement on which candidates were to agree or disagree is "The program helped me learn how to promote the success of all students at my school through the development of a shared vision of learning." The lowest mean scores were on shared vision and working with diverse families and communities.

In the School Psychology program, course syllabi indicate course learning objectives and assessments that provide candidates opportunities to demonstrate their progress toward items related to student learning. Competencies that must be developed demonstrate knowledge of learning theory, instructional psychology, behavioral and cognitive theories, assessment and instructional interventions, and approaches to academic assessment. In fieldwork, candidates provide developmental social/emotional skill training to classrooms, provide in-service training to teachers, practice and advocate an effective student study team process, and work collaboratively with both families and community agencies. Results of candidate performance on these assessments are used to monitor candidate progress toward these competencies related to student learning. The School Psychology Program 2006 Exit Survey results show positive perceptions of the effectiveness of the program.

Candidates in the CRS program have numerous opportunities to develop competencies related to student learning. For example, clinical courses expose students to basic professional practice issues. Clinical practica provide experiences in data collection and analysis. Candidates have opportunities for reflection and self-analysis through both the development of the portfolio and clinical practice. Information on student learning is practiced during lesson planning, charting, developing of goals, collecting and analyzing data, problem-solving, and report writing. Key assessments in the program provide candidates opportunities to demonstrate their progress toward competencies related to student learning. Monitoring student progress toward these learning-related competencies continues as a result of candidate performance on these assessments.

Results of candidate performance on key assessments are combined across all programs for other school personnel and show that most candidates meet or exceed expectations for this element. As was noted earlier, some programs have not collected sufficient data on key assessments. Interviews with candidates, graduates, internship supervisors, school administrators, and others and follow-up surveys of graduates and employers indicate that candidates are able to create positive environments for student learning.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Available data indicate that initial and advanced candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required by the national and state standards related to the professions for which they are preparing. The unit uses assessment measures to evaluate candidates at the initial and advanced levels that make clear to candidates the performances that are being assessed. At the initial level, data assessing candidates at various points within the program are available. Data assessing candidates at various points within advanced programs are available but not consistent throughout programs.

NCATE Team Recommendation: **Standard Met**

Area for Improvement

The Preliminary Administrative Services (Educational Administration) program has not received approval from CCTC.

Rationale: This program has been under review at CCTC and the unit is awaiting approval. The unit received a technical stipulation from CCTC during the review regarding the admittance of candidates to a program that is not yet approved. The results of the program review should be available in the near future.

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.

Level: (Initial and Advanced)
A.   Assessment system
The unit's Assessment and Improvement Management System (AIMS) was developed by individual programs and the unit as a whole. At the program level, faculty, advisory council members, and other P-12 representatives, including cooperating teachers, were involved. At the unit level, an Assessment Committee made up of selected faculty, program coordinators, a department chair, the Director of Educational Services, and the Associate Dean of SOE also participated in developing the system, beginning in fall of 2004. The unit Assessment Committee first concentrated on developing a system for programs to assess their candidates in a way that data could be collected, aggregated, analyzed, interpreted, and used for candidate assessment and program improvement. This aspect of the system was reviewed and revised by program and by the faculty of the SOE as a whole. The Assessment Committee then expanded the assessment system to include unit resources and operations, which both influence and are influenced by the other components of the system.

Key assessments of individual candidates have been developed for programs that are based on the conceptual framework and the three sets of standards. Matrixes for the programs indicate which assessments address which standards and which aspects of the conceptual framework.

In initial elementary and secondary credential programs, key assessments also focus on Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) that are part of the California program standards for elementary and secondary teacher preparation programs. The candidate competencies assessed by each of the key assessments are clearly identified. The relationship between the conceptual framework, NCATE standards, California program standards, and key assessments is clearly shown in a matrix for each initial level program.

In advanced programs, key assessments have also been developed for all programs and the relationship between the conceptual framework, NCATE, and state program standards is clear for most of the programs.

Under the unit's assessment system each program is expected to evaluate candidates at admission, at one or more key transition points during the program, at exit, and post- exit. In initial level programs, candidates are assessed before admission to the program. They must meet the following requirements:

- GPA of 2.67 overall or 2.75 on last 60 units
- Passing score on the Multiple Subject California Examination for Teachers (CSET)-- required only for Multiple Subject Credential candidates
- Passing score on the appropriate CSET or completion of a subject matter preparation program which has been approved by the California Commission on Teacher

Credentialing prior to student teaching is required of Single Subject Credential candidates and Education Specialist (special education) credential candidates.
- Taking the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST).
- Certificate of Clearance--This verifies that candidates have not been convicted of offenses which would make them unsuitable for the profession of teaching.

For initial programs, in-program and exit assessments are somewhat different for the various programs. However, all initial programs have as key assessments; either the completion of two TPAs or the compilation of a portfolio, which contains assignments and reflections. The two TPAs, which were developed by unit faculty, are complex, multi-step tasks which assess the California TPEs. The portfolios contain selected assignments that reflect the accomplishment of the TPEs as well as student reflections about how their assignments document their achievement of the TPEs. The TPAs are evaluated at the end of the initial and final phases of student teaching. The portfolios are compiled throughout the program, with specific parts completed and assessed in connection with specific courses and field experiences, and assessed again when students have expanded their initial reflections at the end of the program. Candidates are also evaluated by supervisors of field experiences in terms of competencies required by program standards and dispositions.

Upon exiting the program, candidates for initial teaching credentials are surveyed about their perceptions of what they have learned in regard to state program standards. Post-exit surveys are sent to candidates after one year of teaching to assess their perceptions of how well they have been prepared in terms of the same state standards. Employers of candidates complete a similar survey of candidates in the first year of employment. This survey is conducted by the CSU system and the results are made available to the education unit on each campus.

In advanced programs, the only common admission requirement is a specific GPA, but the minimum required GPA differs from program to program. Other admission requirements related to candidate competence for one or more programs include a goal statement, an initial writing assessment, completion of prerequisite courses or a prerequisite program, recommendation letters, an interview, a letter of interest or intent, and a resume. All advanced programs have admission requirements designed to assess candidate competence in some way.

All advanced programs have identified key assessments administered in-program as well as some type of exit assessment. Some key assessments are embedded in individual courses or field experiences, some cross courses, and some are cumulative throughout the program. They range from evaluation of complex written tasks using rubrics to completing yes/no check-offs of candidate competencies. In key assessments, candidates are assessed via such diverse activities/products as community service projects, action research projects, development of assessment instruments, case studies, and ethnographic studies. Exit assessments include culminating activities, portfolio reviews, validation of competencies by faculty or supervisors, completion of comprehensive exams developed by the program, exit interviews, and completion of national exams.

Most advanced programs' post-exit assessment is limited to an alumni survey which is very generic in nature. While it a useful indication of graduates' general satisfaction with the programs, it is of limited use for program improvement since this self-report data comes before candidate have had the opportunity to fully undertake the roles for which they have been prepared.

The assessment measures identified by both initial and advanced programs, once implemented, are regularly used to determine admission, continuation, and completion of the program. In both initial and advanced programs, candidates who do not meet expectations can resubmit key assessments. Faculty members provide extra assistance to students who require it. In addition to the key assessments, initial and advanced candidates must complete specified courses with specified minimum grades to exit programs.

In the initial programs, while CBEST and CSET (for multiple subject candidates) are listed as admission requirements, candidates actually can be admitted without passing these examinations. However, multiple subject candidates must pass CSET before admission to the final phase of student teaching. Candidates in all initial programs must pass CBEST in order to be recommended for a credential.

A number of procedures have been used to ensure that the unit's assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias. At the initial level, multiple faculty were involved in the design of the key assessments with input from the field. Assessment procedures for each program were reviewed by the SOE's Assessment Committee. Two members of the Committee gave detailed feedback on each program's assessment plan. Rubrics are employed to assess many of the key assessments. Training and calibration activities help to ensure consistency among scorers. Blind scoring and double scoring contribute to unbiased and accurate assessment. Comprehensive exams are scored by at least two scorers. All of these procedures are not used in conjunction with every assessment.

In advanced programs, the process for making fair and unbiased summative judgments about candidate competence is less robust. For example, Educational Administration and the MA in C & I rely primarily on final grades as the main form of assessment. While courses are aligned with competencies on a matrix, there is no evidence that unbiased and accurate assessment occurs because grades are not tied specifically to assessments, but used as summative measures. Typically, a single faculty member teaching a course is assigning grades. Program faculty do not analyze the individual products that led to specific grades in order to make judgments about the relationship between the products and factors involved in the grading process and program competencies.

The data in Educational Administration, the MA in C & I, Library Media Services, and the Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Learners (LCDL) program is labeled "2005-06" and is not broken down by semester. Data is presented for spring 2006 completers. For example, the CLDL program has 2 completers and one was waived from one of the assessments. The C & I program had data for 3 of 15 candidates. The 2006-07 program goals for each of these programs, as written in the annual program assessment reports, stated that the faculty would "revise program curricula, "design a program assessment system" or "collect key assessment data in the fall of 2006." Program goals did not relate to improving candidate performance or the program based on specific data. It would seem that data related to these types of improvement goals would be available as early as next year.

In addition to program reports, the unit's evaluation system calls for the examination of budget, enrollments, faculty recruitment and retention, faculty professional development, facilities and resources, and technology resources. The budget of the College of Communication and Education was compared to the budget of other colleges within university. The number of faculty

at the various academic ranks was identified. The number of staff assigned to various departments, programs and offices was identified. Unit facilities and technology resources were described. This information was used to manage and improve the operations of the unit.

B.   Data collection, analysis, and evaluation

Candidate assessment data is collected each semester. Program Assessment Reports are submitted biennially. The Unit Assessment Report is also prepared biennially. The data are presented in tables contained in Program Assessment Reports. The analysis of the data is presented in a narrative format and summarized in tables. This is also true for the Unit Assessment Report. Both reports are prepared every two years. The program faculty and program coordinators summarize and analyze the data contained in the Program Assessment Reports. The SOE Assessment Committee summarizes and analyzes unit-wide data and program reports. The SOE Executive Committee provides input and all of this material is combined to create in the SOE Assessment Report. For example, a "Program Improvement Summary Table" is available that aggregates the areas of focus selected by programs each year and a Unit Improvement Summary Table is developed from which action plans for the coming two years derived.

All initial programs and most advanced programs collected and compiled sufficient data on key assessments in 2005-2006, which were summarized and analyzed in the Program Assessment Reports. Four programs did not. These were the MA in C & I, the MA in CLDL, the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program, and the Library Media Teacher Services Credential. These programs had limited data based on a low numbers of completers and program goals focused that on the "design of a program assessment system" or the "revision of program" based on factors other than candidate performance data.

A data management system designed by the College of Business, and other data management software are used to maintain the unit's assessment system. Work is currently being done with regard to connecting the SOE's data management system and the University's data management system through the Data Warehouse Initiative.

Formal records of candidate complaints are kept in two locations. Complaints and issues related to programs are handled and kept in the office of the Department Chair in each department. When issues arise related to clinical experiences for initial candidates, records are kept in the Educational Services Office. A candidate remediation plan is developed to assist the candidate in the successful completion of the experience.

C.   Use of data for program improvement

Candidates are given assessment data regarding their individual performance on key assessments throughout the program. If they do not meet expectations they can redo assessments. If they do not meet expectations on assessments related to field experiences, they meet with the supervisor to create an Improvement Plan.

Program faculty and other stakeholders can obtain data by reading the Program Assessment Reports and the SOE Assessment Document. Data collected for Program Assessment Reports is used to identify areas needing improvement, and these areas are specified in the reports. An action plan for program improvement is developed and the data needed to evaluate the success of the action plan is also described in the Program Assessment Reports.

As noted above, Program and Unit Improvement Summary Tables are developed. Programs have implemented a variety of data driven program changes. For example, based on data derived from the Teacher Performance Assessments and CSU candidate surveys, the Single Subject Credential Program is placing greater emphasis on teaching candidates to use technology in instruction. All initial programs used their data to specify program goals for the coming year that focused directly on candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions (e.g., use of technology, attention to students with special needs and English language learners). The various program changes planned for 2006-2007 based on data from 2005-2006 are summarized in the Program Assessment Reports. The programs mentioned earlier in this report that did not collect sufficient data on key assessments and thus, were not in a position to use this data for program improvement. These program selected goals that related to the design and implementation of program assessment systems and curricular revisions. Since key assessments are in place, these programs should have a year of data with a sufficient number of completers by next year and be in a better position to examine candidate outcomes and program improvement.

<div align="center">**Overall Assessment of Standard**</div>

The SOE has developed and implemented an assessment system which collects and analyzes data on candidate qualifications, candidate performance, and graduate performance. The primary method of collecting data on candidate performance is the evaluation of key assessments Program Assessment Reports provide evidence that this data is analyzed and used for program improvement in the majority of programs. The system also provides for the collection and analysis of key data on unit operations. The SOE Assessment Report documents that the results are used to improve the unit.

NCATE Team Recommendation: **Standard Met**

Areas for Improvement:
1)   The unit does not systematically collect and analyze data on key assessments in all advanced programs.

Rationale: Two programs, Educational Administration (Preliminary Administrative Services Credential) and the MA in C & I have not collected candidate performance data on key assessments. Programs depend on final grades as the key assessments, yet these final grades cannot be linked to student competencies in a way that is reliable and unbiased.

2)   Although programs are involved in the collection of data, the unit does not systematically ensure that all advanced programs have collected sufficient data and that all advanced programs are using data for program improvement

Rationale:. Three programs have not collected one year of data and annual assessment plans indicate that data is not informing program improvement. The CLDL program presented data for two completers, the MA in C & I program presented data on 3 of 15 completers, and the Educational Administration program presented data on 11 of 14 completers for the 2005-06 academic year.

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.

Level: (Initial and Advanced)

A.   Collaboration between unit and school partners

In initial programs, unit faculty and partner schools participate in the design, delivery and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences. The Director of Educational Services establishes five-year contracts with over 100 school districts in the region. Once partnerships are established, programs personnel place student teachers in appropriate locations. Although most placements are within the immediate area, the service area covered by the unit encompasses approximately 32,000 square miles.

Each initial program has a program coordinator and several also have a placement coordinator. These faculty and staff work with school partners to determine placements. P-12 faculty and administrators have also been involved in developing the guidelines for supervision, in sitting on advisory boards, and in providing feedback on candidates. P-12 partners contributed to the development of the unit's conceptual framework and have provided feedback and consultation as assessment rubrics were being developed.

Advanced programs each have a different process for selecting field and clinical placement sites. In several programs, candidates complete course-embedded clinical assignment at their place of employment. Because of the prominence of CSUC and the unit in the local area, faculty members in advanced programs have a close relationship with P-12 colleagues that facilitate communication and placement.

Not all programs have a process for evaluating cooperating teachers and other site-based supervisors. Candidates and university supervisors commented on the need for such a process.

Not all clinical and field handbooks and assessment instruments include or address the conceptual framework. Many cooperating teachers and administrators had difficulty discussing the organizing concepts of the conceptual framework. Faculty have aligned programs and field placements with the conceptual framework and P-12 partners can provide examples of how students are "effective, reflective, and engaged" when prompted. School partners would benefit from further orientation to the specific details of the conceptual framework in order to understand how field experiences and clinical practice contribute to candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the conceptual framework.

The unit is engaged myriad projects in collaboration with P-12 partners that lead to the effective preparation of initial candidates. For example, four exemplary teachers assisted a faculty member in redesigning a course to better prepare candidates in key areas (i.e., technology in the classroom, assessment strategies, and the integration of content area reading) that emerged from data collected by the unit. The SOE is involved in the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER). At CSUC, this collaboration includes SOE faculty and administration, and

the deans of four colleges in the university, three superintendents from Northern California county offices of education, and six school districts from those counties. Four priorities have been identified by the local network and these are visible in SOE goals and priorities.

Similarly, faculty members are also involved in the life of the school communities where candidates are placed. For example, the Education Department Chair attends a monthly County Superintendent's Council and most initial programs include a service learning component that brings unit faculty to after-school programs and other community-based projects. The unit also has been active in training for the CA Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment project, a program that uses experienced teachers to assist beginning teachers in the first two years. This provides additional information on the unit's graduates as well as helps to maintain connections to local schools and teachers.

The unit has enjoyed a long and positive history with local districts. It regularly holds appreciation events for P-12 partners. Such events make teachers and administrators feel appreciated. All programs have advisory boards that provide feedback on all aspects of the program, but especially on candidate performance in the field. Interviews with superintendents, principals, and cooperating teachers and mentors indicate that candidates at both the initial and advanced levels are well prepared for their field and clinical placements.

B.   Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Placements
Field and clinical experiences across all initial programs are sufficiently intensive and extensive as to ensure that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for competence in their professional roles. Initial-level evaluation forms used in field experiences and clinical practice reflects candidates' competence to teach all learners. Candidates are expected to conduct specific assignments focusing in student learning and those assignments are structured throughout initial programs to build candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. Additionally, assignments and assessments reinforced the conceptual framework's focus on developing teachers who are "effective, reflective, and engaged." For example, initial programs typically require candidates to complete structured lesson plans that focus on diversity (i.e., English language learners) and students with special needs. Student teachers are observed once a week. Following the observation the student teacher, cooperating teacher and supervisor meet to discuss the lesson. Structured and unstructured reflections required candidates to focus on instructional strategies and student achievement. If candidates are having difficulty, specific improvement plans are developed that speak to required candidate proficiencies.

Interviews with candidates and P-12 faculty and administrators reinforce the review of documents and confirm that the unit's initial candidates are well-prepared for their roles. Most employers interviewed noted that the unit's graduates are the preferred candidates. Candidates confirm that technology is embedded in all of their coursework noting that initial programs might consider dropping the required technology course since its content is infused throughout the programs.

Program and placement coordinators in initial program personnel ensure that all cooperating teachers are qualified for their positions. While variations exist, each program uses a cooperating teacher application form that describes the desired cooperating teacher qualities and qualifications. While not all applications provide solicit information on all aspects of the conceptual framework, this process ensures that cooperating teachers are credentialed in the

field, have sufficient teaching experience, can teach to standards, and are effective in the classroom. Each applicant must be recommended by an administrator.

The unit no longer provides financial remuneration for cooperating teachers but they are invited to campus workshops and events. Several cooperating teachers indicated that did not feel adequately prepared for the role and would appreciate a course or workshops to assist them in the development of appropriate skills for working with initial candidates in field and clinical experiences.

Advanced-level candidates across programs work with program faculty to determine appropriate placements. Often, advanced candidates complete field work in their own classroom or district, although candidates are encouraged to complete placements in a variety of settings. Program faculty verify the qualifications of the site-based supervisor. In programs such as School Psychology and Clinical Rehabilitation, candidates are able to make use of the on-campus Autism Clinic and work in collaboration with program faculty.

In other programs, it was difficult to confirm that collaboration exists between program faculty and school partners. For example, it does not appear that Education Administration candidates' site supervisor participates in the final evaluation of the field experience. In the Reading and Language Arts masters program, it is not clear if the candidates are required to work with a diversity of students as clinical assignments and assessments are course embedded and it appears that most candidates work with children in their own classroom. Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners and the Masters in Curriculum and Instruction have course embedded clinical assignments and it does not appear that collaboration is required in the completion of the assignment or in the analysis of candidate performance on the assignment.

For all advanced programs, employers state that candidates are effective and skilled practitioners. School districts, county offices, and other education-related employers actively recruit unit graduates.

C.   Candidates development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn
Clinical assignments, assessments, and clinical evaluation forms focus on the initial candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. Daily journals are used in most programs and the cooperating teacher and supervisor give feedback in the journal. During the term, the cooperating teacher and supervisor meet with the student teacher as a team to discuss lessons and school activities in order to support the candidate. If a candidate is having difficulty, there is process and protocol to assist the candidate. Few students fail as they have received extensive feedback and remediation if needed prior to student teaching. Documentation was presented that in the past few years, only three students have been dismissed from an initial program following due process and ample opportunity for improvement.

The unit values service learning. Projects are incorporated across initial programs and candidates could give detailed descriptions of projects that enhance their knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn.   Additionally, initial candidates reported that they are required to carry out activities such as attending a school board meeting and interacting with parents as part of the student teaching experience.

All programs at the initial level presented data verifying that all candidates have an opportunity to work with diverse learners at some point in the program. Demographic data on participating schools and districts is kept in the Educational Services Office and the unit has discontinued placing candidates in a school or district that lacked diversity.

In the advanced programs, the clinical practitioners do self-evaluations and journals that are reviewed by field supervisors and university faculty. Individual assignments differ by program and are designed to ensure that state and professional standards are covered while working with P-12 students in the target area.

No tracking mechanism is in place in advanced programs to ensure that all candidates have the opportunity to work with diverse learners or to create positive learning environments for all learners. Candidates reported that they are strongly encouraged to complete a clinical experience with diverse students, and most take this recommendation very seriously. It appears possible though, for a candidate in Reading, Educational Services (Administration), Curriculum and Instruction, and Library Media Services to complete the program without having worked with a diverse P-12 student population.

<u>**Overall Assessment of Standard:**</u>

The unit collaborates with its school partners for the design, delivery and evaluation in the area of field experience for initial and advanced programs. Initial and advanced candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. While initial programs could provide evidence that all candidates had the opportunity to work with diverse learners, some advanced programs had not implemented a mechanism to verify such opportunities for candidates in those programs.

NCATE Team Recommendation: **Standard Met**

Areas for Improvement:
None

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.

Level: (Initial and Advanced)

A.   Design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences

CSUC President Paul Zingg has made a university commitment to diversity, proclaiming it as a fundamental institutional value. He clearly asserts that "diversity is a commitment to enrich the social, cultural and intellectual fabric of the campus by increasing the numbers in our own faculty, staff and student diversity communities."   The motto of CSUC, "Today Decides Tomorrow," demonstrates the vision of the university and focuses on the concept of quality education for all students. The expectation is that the educators that the university prepares will play a key role in preparing generations of students for life in an increasingly global and multicultural society. CSUC has created a Diversity Webpage that is accessible from the university home page. It contains a statement from President Zingg on the value of diversity and contains many resources for faculty and students. CSUC send a clear message to its faculty and students that diversity is valued on the campus.

The third component of the candidate proficiencies addressed in the unit's conceptual framework states: *Candidates are knowledgeable to the needs of all learners, including linguistically and culturally diverse learners and special populations.* All programs focus on developing the knowledge and skills to work effectively with all learners. Specific, related knowledge and skills are described in program competencies.

Unit-wide candidate dispositions that support this proficiency are that each candidate:

- Appreciates and values human diversity,
- Recognizes community and cultural norms,
- Shows respect for students' varied talents and perspectives,
- Seeks to foster culturally-appropriate communications, and
- Demonstrates best practices in his or her field.

A clear understanding of diversity is embedded into the curriculum through a sequence of assignments and assessments designed to enable candidates to demonstrate knowledge, skills and dispositions of culturally responsive educators.

Courses, objectives and assessments in the initial and advanced programs are aligned with diversity proficiency indicators and dispositions. Each program has developed an alignment matrix that provides and overview of where diversity is addressed in course objectives. Additionally, all initial credential programs, candidates must complete ENGL 371 *Principles of Language* and ENGL 470 *Second Language Acquisition* as part of their interaction with English language learners.   Advanced candidates take a course that addresses diversity such as

foundation of Democratic Education and content from that course is covered in summative evaluations such as a comprehensive examination.

An assessment matrix also provides evidence that the faculty have aligned content and outcomes for diversity with the conceptual framework. The unit uses the standards for initial credential programs, as evidenced in the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Attention to English language learners and students with special needs is highlighted in the TPEs. Interviews with initial candidates indicate that they understand the meaning and importance of diversity in their program of education. Candidates cite clear examples of curricular and co-curricular activities that support their development of diverse perspectives and ability to help all students learn. Key assessments in initial credential programs provide information on the candidates' knowledge and skill levels in the area of diversity. For example, every initial candidate has to attend one day of training in working effectively with culturally and linguistically diverse learners. Candidates also learn and are required to use the Sheltered Delivery of Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) protocol during field experiences. Summative assessments, such as the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) and portfolios show mastery of knowledge and skills related to diversity.

Beginning in the fall of 2005, all campuses in the California State University (CSU) system participated in a system-wide exit survey of initial credential program graduates. The results of the 2005-06 survey indicated that initial candidates in the unit showed high levels of satisfaction regarding the preparation they had received in areas that were related to diversity.

In addition, the CSU System-wide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation conducts surveys which are given to the graduates of initial credential programs completing their first year as teachers, as well as their employers. The results of these surveys consistently show that the composite scores are in the range of *adequately to well prepared* for items related to diversity, including Preparation to Use Good Teaching Practice, Preparation for Equity and Diversity in Education, Preparation to Teach English Learners, and Preparation to Teach Special Learners in Inclusive Schools.

In advanced programs, the learning objectives and course assignments that address diversity are visible throughout the program. Candidates are able to verbalize their commitment to diversity and its role in education and the world. In examining syllabi and portfolios, it was clearly apparent that diversity was interwoven in all lessons and projects prepared by the candidates. Some programs include an assessment of diversity in their exit survey. For example, the Administrative Services survey indicated that only 52 percent of completers agreed with the statement that the program "helped them learn how to promote the success of all students through working with diverse families and communities;" however, programs did not always use such results to set goals for program improvement.

The Resources in International Study and Education (RISE) Library, formerly one of the California Subject Matter Projects, is an important resource for supporting faculty and candidates in developing multicultural curricular experiences. It is now co-sponsored by the College of Communication and Education and is housed on the campus. It contains standards-aligned multicultural and global curricular materials, artifacts, costumes, books, CDs and videos. Tours and workshops are provided for in-service and pre-service teachers, as well as undergraduate students and university faculty.

B. Experiences working with diverse faculty

The recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty is a high priority at CSUC. In 2004 the Faculty and Staff Minority Recruitment and Retention (FSMRR) Plan was developed as a result of a university-wide task force on diversity. This comprehensive plan was created to improve recruitment and retention of minority faculty and staff. In conversations with faculty members, it appears that present recruitment efforts are targeting the proposed student population extremely well. The Diversity Scorecard, a committee comprised of CSUC faculty members and deans, is exploring the topic of Dimensions of Campus Diversity and creating action plans to improve diversity on the campus. At the present time, the upper level administration report that while much progress has been made in recruiting and retaining a diverse student body, they have not been as successful in recruiting diverse faculty and much more work remains in relation to this goal.

At the present time, faculty demographics do not mirror the demographics of northern California, the state, or nation. Demographic data on the unit's faculty mirrors that of the university and are provided in the chart below. Demographics have remained relatively stable over the last few years and given that some faculty members are double counted in initial and advanced programs, the CSUC and unit faculty remain predominately white.

SOE Faculty Demographics	Faculty in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs	Faculty in Advanced Programs*	All Faculty in the Institution	School-based faculty
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2 2.0%	2 3.2%	7 .7%	1 .2%
Asian or Pacific Islander	4 4.0%	1 1.6%	58 6.0%	4 .9%
Black, non-Hispanic	0 0%	0 0%	13 1.3%	2 .5%
Hispanic	7 7.0%	6 9.6%	43 4.5%	22 5.2%
White, non-Hispanic	83 83.8%	52 83.8%	807 83.6%	386 92.5%
Other/unknown	3 3.0%	1 1.6%	37 3.8%	2 .5%
Total	99 100%	62 100%	965 100%	417 100%
Female	70 70.7%	41 66.1%	415 43.0%	279 67%
Male	29 29.2%	21 33.8%	550 57.0%	138 33%
Total	99 100%	62 100%	965 100%	417 100%

*Faculty are counted in both initial teacher preparation and advanced programs if they teach at both levels.

The SOE faculty has a variety of international experiences that contribute to the multicultural awareness woven into the programs. Forty seven percent of faculty have lived overseas; 46 percent have studied overseas; 30 percent have taught overseas; 35 percent have done international consulting; and 8 percent have been exchange teachers. Many of the faculty are multilingual and several have specific expertise in areas of diversity such as teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students, assistive technology, adaptive physical education, and multicultural teaching strategies. Faculty use these strengths to share their interest in the global community.

Through professional development opportunities, as well as personal and professional experiences, unit faculty members work with diverse populations. Some examples are engaging in teaching experiences with special needs students, English language learners and students in low socioeconomic status schools. Others may volunteer, do community service, coach International Special Olympics, teach on Native American reservations, and coordinate international exchange programs.

Recruiting minority faculty poses many challenges. Presently, the Dean and Associate Dean of the College of Communication and Education meet with each Department Chair to review search applicant pools and to encourage search committees to consider minority candidates. All ads contain references to the university's desire to recruit diverse faculty and the unit's ads contain the expectation that all applicants will be able to "demonstrate ability to work with diverse populations." Unit administrators concur that further efforts are needed in this area.

Figure 4.3.1 Candidate Demographics (2005-06)	Candidates in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs	Candidates In Advanced Preparation Programs	All Students in the Institution	Demographics of Geographical Area Served by Institution
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	5 1.2%	0 .0%	179 1.1%	93 1.5%
Asian or Pacific Islander	11 2.6%	4 5.0%	953 5.9%	490 7.8%
Black, non-Hispanic	2 .5%	2 2.5%	305 1.9%	79 1.3%
Hispanic	30 7.2%	5 6.3%	1728 10.9%	700 11.1%
White, non-Hispanic	321 77.3%	63 79.7%	10470 65.8%	3970 100%
Other/ unknown	46 11.1%	5 6.3%	2284 14.3%	959 15.2%
Total	415 100%	79 100%	15919 100%	6291 100%

There are special, concerted efforts underway university-wide to recruit and retain diverse students for CSUC. As a result of these efforts, the number of Latino students doubled in the last few years. Administrators agree that focused efforts must now be directed at recruiting African-American students. Some components of this four-part plan are to improve the climate and intergroup relations, provide access and success, show the viability and vitality of the institution, and highlight education and scholarship. Using traditional and innovative strategies, CSU has been successful in increasing the diversity of the student body.

In interviews with the Directors of pre-college outreach programs such as Outward Bound, Teacher Recruitment Project, and Mini-Corps success stories were shared about candidates who have been recruited and are finding success in the college setting. There continues to be a high level of interest and involvement in these endeavors. The programs, only three of the many which are in operation, are given support from the entire university community. Other efforts include a collaborative effort between CSUC and Butte Community College to increase the enrollment of Hmong and Mien students in teacher preparation programs. The unit is active in these recruitment efforts and there is a clear commitment to increasing the diversity of the candidate population in the unit.

The demographics of the student population in the School of Education mirror that of the university as well as the service area. The largest population is White (77.3% initial, 79.7% advanced), followed by Latino (7.2% initial, 6.3% advanced) and Asian or Pacific Islander (2.6% initial, 5.0% advanced). A demographic survey was developed by the SOE faculty and given to the program candidates in the spring of 2006. The aggregated data is presented below:

Candidate Demographics 2005-2006

Programs	Males	Females	Age	Native American	African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	White	Multi-racial	Other	1st Language not English	2nd Language Fluency	DSS
Multiple Subject	22	130	22	2	3	2	1	136	0	8	3	No data	No data
Bilingual Program (MS/SS)	3	14	27	0	0	9	3	4	0	1	8	17	2
Tri-Placement Program	1	20	23	1	0	0	0	16	1	3	0	1	1
Concurrent Program	2	17	29	0	0	2	0	17	0	0	0	0	1
Single Subject (incl. Ag. Spec. & PETE)	55	67	24	3	2	6	4	105	0	2	17	No data	No data
Adapted Physical Education	2	2	24	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	No data	No data
Educational Specialist Level 1 (M/M & M/S)	2	2	50	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Educational Specialist Level 1 Internship	6	17	38	0	0	0	1	22	0	0	1	1	2
Curriculum and Instruction	4	23	0	0	2	0	2	16	1	6	0	No data	No data
Linguistically, Culturally Diverse Learners	1	10	27	0	1	0	1	9	0	0	1	1	0
Reading Language Arts	1	6	38	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	1	0
Education Specialist Level 2	9	35	37	0	0	3	2	39	0	0	0	0	1
Special Education Masters	7	35	39	0	0	2	0	39	0	1	No data	No data	No data

Administrative Services	17	20	0	1	0	1	1	30	0	3	0	No data	No data
Library Media Teacher Services	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	5	0	No data	No data
School Psychology	6	15	28	0	0	3	1	13	3	0	0	7	2
Clinical Rehabilitative Services	1	46	25	0	1	4	4	31	0	8	0	No data	No data
Total (607)	**140**	**467**		**7**	**9**	**32**	**20**	**496**	**5**	**37**			

Because of the success of the recent recruitment efforts, a variety of opportunities are available to candidates to interact with diverse peers through programs, student organizations, events, and available resources. It is anticipated that the recruitment efforts of the university and the unit will result in continued success in recruiting a diverse student population and have a "trickle up" effect into the unit as current first and second-year students advance to major areas of study and postbaccalaureate work.

C. Experiences working with diverse students in P-12 schools

The service area for CSUC covers 32,200 square miles, or approximately 21% of the state of California, with a resident population of about 740,000. It extends north to the Oregon border and east to the Nevada border. The land is rural, and, at some point, becomes mountainous. Demographics on the approximately 90 clinical sites in this area for the Initial programs are varied. For example, one school in the Chico Unified District has a student population that is 79.9 percent White, 9.8 percent Hispanic, 11.1 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, and has 20.7 percent of its students on free /reduced lunch status. Another school in the same district has a student population that is 23.1 percent White, 36.9 percent Hispanic, and 28.3 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, with 86.2 percent of its students on free/reduced lunch status.

In initial programs, advisors and program coordinators use a variety of forms and other devices to track clinical and field experiences. It is mandatory that each candidate has at least one diverse experience during the time within the program. In most cases, there is more than one experience in a diverse setting. Because of the nature of the programs in the unit, many of which are small, much attention is often given to carefully matching candidates to programs and cooperating teachers. Flexibility is always necessary. For example, a student teacher that was a quadriplegic was able to complete a student teaching experience because of a collaboration effort between the SOE, advisor, principal, university supervisor, cooperating teacher, DSS advocate and the candidate. Time and workload accommodations were made, and the candidate had a successful student teaching experience.

Candidates learn to use a variety of methods to meet the needs of the population of students that they serve. They learn to value diversity and to plan instruction that meets the needs of diverse learners.

Although there are field or clinical experiences associated with the advanced programs, there is no evidence of a systematic, program tracking or any method of assuring that there will be a diverse experience in most programs. The candidate, in consultation with program faculty, selects a site to compete clinical assignments. In some programs, all of the assignments are course embedded and, in many cases, all of them may be carried out in the candidate's own classroom. There is no mechanism by which classroom demographics of candidates are documented and efforts made to ensure at least some experience in a diverse setting. Exceptions

to this occur in CRS and School Psychology where candidates have experience in the Autism Clinic. Additionally, diversity is embedded in LCDL where, by virtue of being in a program that focuses on diverse learners, candidates are expected to conduct assignments in the field.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Curriculum, field experiences, and clinical practice enable candidates to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity. The unit assists the candidates in becoming excellent teachers by allowing them to integrate coursework with classroom practice, form collaborative relationships with school partners, and engage all students in learning. The university has a strong plan to recruit diverse student and faculty. Gains have been made in recruiting students that should improve the demographics in the unit before the next NCATE visit.   However, candidates have limited opportunities to interact with faculty from diverse backgrounds and those plans for recruitment and retention of diverse faculty have not been implemented at this point. Initial candidates have opportunities to work with a diverse population of P-12 students. There is no evidence of a system that provides data that advanced candidates have an opportunity to complete field and clinical experiences in diverse settings.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Areas for Improvement:
1)   Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with faculty from diverse backgrounds.

Rationale: CSUC has a well-developed plan for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty however the university and the unit have not yet implemented the plan. The faculty at the university and in the unit continue to be 85% White.

2)   The unit does not ensure that candidates in all advanced programs have an opportunity to complete field or clinical experiences in diverse settings.

Advanced programs could not provide documentation that all candidates work with diverse P-12 learners, in some settings. No demographic data on clinical or field settings was available and no mechanisms were in place for tracking such information.

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.*

Level: (Initial and Advanced)

A.   Qualified faculty

Interviews with faculty, department chairs, the associate dean, and dean as well as a review of faculty vitae indicate that professional education faculty in the unit are well qualified and possess academic credentials and expertise that qualify them for their field of specialization. The unit currently has 50 full-time faculty and five full-time faculty members in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) for a total of 55 full-time faculty members. Forty-eight of the tenured/tenure track faculty hold doctorates. Of the full-time faculty, 20 are professors, 10 are associate professors, and 14 are assistant professors. There are currently 58 part-time faculty. Most of the part-time adjuncts have a minimum of a master's degree and extensive field experiences in PK-12 schools. Reviews of faculty vitae and interviews indicate that faculty who teach in the initial and advanced programs have P-12 teaching experience and certification or licensure in their discipline area.

Part-time faculty and supervisors in field and clinical experiences are hired based on their experiences in P-12 schools and their expertise in the area they teach or supervise. Documents indicate that supervisors of field experience are both site and university-based. These part-time faculty and supervisors have extensive experience working with school districts in the service area.   The cooperating teachers all hold at least a bachelor's degree, have a minimum of three years teaching experience, and are certified in the area they supervise. For initial programs, cooperating teachers must complete an application and be recommended by the district site administrator and approved by the SOE program coordinator.

Faculty are expected to work with the P-12 community as part of the mission of the unit and the university. Faculty are engaged in the P-12 settings through supervising field experiences, working with P-12 teachers, America Reads project, and working on special projects such as the Northeastern California Teacher Education Cooperative.

B.   Modeling best professional practices in teaching

The unit's mission is to produce teachers and leaders who are informed decision-makers who are able to work collaboratively to apply the best research-based practices in their fields to enhance and support the learning, growth and welfare of their students. The professional education programs at CSU, Chico inspire their candidates to accept the challenges to remain reflective practitioners, serve as agents of change, exercise responsible leadership, model lifelong learning, and contribute to our democratic society. The unit's conceptual framework focuses on preparing candidates to be effective, reflective and engaged. The conceptual framework is integrated in coursework and activities as evidenced by alignment matrices and interviews with candidates and faculty.

Faculty model a variety of teaching strategies in their courses as evidenced by faculty vita and course syllabi. Interviews with candidates and faculty confirm that a wide range of instructional techniques are being used. Teaching strategies include lecture, discussions, small group projects, and lessons. Course activities and assessments within the initial programs course work include quizzes, exams, case studies, lesson plans, management plans, portfolios, individual projects, group projects, field experiences, and service learning activities. Faculty are using technology for course content delivery and management. Candidates are using technology for many of the course assignments. Technology is infused in both teaching and course assignments. This is evidenced by course assignments, such as the examples shared on the "Technology Assignment Examples" webpage. At the advanced level, course activities include discussions, exams, action research, case studies, small group projects and other interactive strategies.

Technology used by the unit faculty and expected of candidates includes activities such as having candidates create PowerPoint presentations, electronic portfolios (Education Specialist I and II), Internet resources, DVDs, and technology-infused instructional plans. Technology workshops for faculty development and training are offered through the Technology and Learning Program (TLP) and the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT). The TLP and CELT are university-wide programs. Faculty from the unit actively participate in these offerings. Further, faculty in the unit have access to state-of-the-art technology-enhanced classrooms. The School of Education has four 'smart' (technology rich) classrooms for which it has priority access. Each classroom is equipped with a large-screen projector, instructor computer, DVD, CD, video player, and a cart with 15 laptops available for student use in the rooms. All rooms have wireless access to the Internet. When the four "smart" rooms are booked, high priority is given to obtaining other campus smart classrooms for Education classes.

Diversity issues are addressed through coursework, materials, strategies, and assessments. The Resources in International Education (RISE) library provides students with books and artifacts for enrichment of the curriculum. The Meriam Library has a dedicated K-12 curriculum section on the third floor. Instructional strategies designed to model best practices for teaching diverse learners are integrated into coursework at the initial and most of the advanced programs.

To ensure that unit faculty are qualified to model best practices, candidates evaluate all faculty every spring semester. Non-tenured faculty are also evaluated by candidates every fall semester. In addition, all faculty (full-time and part-time) are evaluated annually through the college's review process that documents their teaching, scholarship, and service.

C.   Modeling best professional practices in scholarship

Faculty believe that scholarship is necessary in order to remain current in their academic disciplines and have participated in such activities. The unit supports scholarly activities and each department is currently working on clearly defining scholarship. This will be documented in the new handbooks for each department, which will be available during the 2007-2008 academic year. Approximately 85 percent of the unit's tenured/tenure track faculty were engaged in scholarly activities over the past five years. Documents and faculty vitas indicate that the tenured/tenure track faculty have been involved in the production of 15 books, 37 journal articles, 165 presentations, 28 grants/grant related activities, and 125 other scholarly activities including peer reviews, exhibitions, unpublished research, and inventions. Approximately 32 percent of the unit's temporary or part-time faculty were engaged in scholarly activities over the past five years. Temporary or part-time faculty have been involved in the production of two

books, seven journal articles, 19 presentations, 35 grants/grant activities, and 18 other scholarly activities.

Scholarly work of the unit is diverse and is related to the fields in which faculty teach. Faculty scholarly work contributes to the professional practice of their disciplines and assists faculty in integrating new strategies into their instructional practices. Interviews with faculty confirmed that faculty view scholarship as a way to inform their practice and expand their knowledge.

Interviews and documentation indicate that most faculty (initial and advanced) teach a 12 hour course load. The actual faculty load is considered 15 hours, with 3 hours assigned for advising, research and service to the community. This work load and advisement schedule poses a challenge for faculty in having the time to pursue scholarly work. New faculty are provided with a three hour course release to pursue scholarship and are encouraged to work with more senior faculty. Senior faculty may also apply for three hours of release time under "Faculty Development Assigned Time" to pursue scholarly activity.

D.   Modeling best professional practices in service
Service activities by faculty are integral to the mission of the unit and university. Faculty members are required to do service as one component of the rank and tenure protocol. Approximately 90 percent of the full-time faculty are engaged in service activities and 80 percent of the part-time faculty are engaged in service activities Service may be done at the department, college, university, professional, and community levels. Activities include service on departmental, college, and university committees. Faculty are involved in advisory councils at the university level such as All-University Responsible for Teacher Education (AURTEC) and Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT) as well as at the P-12 schools.

Professional service includes editorships for journals and books, leadership roles in professional organizations at the local, state and national levels, reviewers for books, articles, and presentations. Faculty have been invited keynote speakers for various professional associations such as the National Arts in Education.

Faculty serve as advisors for candidate organizations such as Student Council for Exceptional Children as well as Special Olympics and bilingual after-school tutorial programs. Service learning is integrated into all of the courses as evidenced by syllabi, and interviews with candidates and faculty. One faculty member was a national finalist for the Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award for Service Learning. She has served as project director for two national service-learning grants, that have helped develop curriculum in her department and involved other faculty in service learning activities. She has published a video on service learning as pedagogy. She has worked with other national leaders in producing policy documents. Her work is contained in the Corporation for National Service and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education publication, "Service Learning in Teacher Education: Enhancing the Growth of New Teachers, Their Students, and Communities." There is an on-line course development by faculty to assist other faculty in developing meaningful service learning courses. The website is at http://www.csuchico.edu/psed/servicelearning/. Based on the documentation obtained, it is clear that service learning and service to the community is an important component of the teacher preparation experience.

E.   Collaboration

Collaboration is evident throughout the College of Communication and Education and the university. The dean, associate dean, and department heads of the college have made it a priority for faculty to collaborate with Arts and Sciences faculty and the P-12 community. Collaboration is evident in the All-University Responsibility for Teacher Education Committee (AURTEC), which is comprised of deans and associate deans from Arts and Sciences, faculty from Arts and Sciences, Professional Studies in Education department head, Education department head and school district representatives. This committee is charged with approving teacher education programs at the university level prior to submission to the CCTC..

Collaboration is viewed as an instrument for improving teaching and candidate learning. Faculty are actively involved in the Northeastern California Teachers Education Collaborative (NECTEC) and the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER). On an international level, faculty participate in programs through the School of Graduate and International Studies that provide opportunities for international teachers and administrators (PIE - Partners in Education, 3TP-Teachers teaching Teachers Program, and TEA) to enrich their educational systems by learning about American education through our teacher educators.

Candidates confirmed the faculty's commitment to service through examples of how their instructors were actively involved in the P-12 school sites and the community. County superintendents from Butte and Sutter counties and Chico Unified School district also commended the unit for the faculty's high level of collaboration with the districts. Faculty are actively involved in the Early Assessment Program, which incorporates the CSU – Chico's placement standards into existing high school standards tests in English and mathematics. Unit faculty have also worked with P-12 faculty through the California Subject Matter Projects. Some professional development activities are also collaborative through bringing in guest speakers, such as Jim Trelease and Diane Browning Wright. These events involve P-12 and education faculty. These collaborative efforts have led to strong relationships within community and schools resulting in improved student learning

Faculty emphasized that through collaborative research and grant projects, they were able to model best practices for their candidates and develop their research agendas. Collaboration is essential if the unit is to meet the diverse needs of the community and schools that it serves.

F.   Unit evaluation of professional education faculty performance

Each department has a Department Personnel Committee (DPC). As stated in the Personnel Policies and Procedures manual, each committee consists of five members, at least three of whom are at the rank of Professor. Periodic evaluations and performance reviews are conducted by the Department Personnel Committee. Performance reviews are conducted annually following the first or second year of probationary (tenure-track) appointment, depending on the initial appointment of the probationary faculty member. Performance reviews include detailed reporting of performance using the dossier format articulated in the university's Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (FPPP) for tenure and promotion decisions. For periodic evaluations, the Department Personnel Committee evaluates faculty in the areas of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, Other Contributions to the University and Community. For performance reviews, faculty are evaluated on their contribution to strategic plans of the department, college and university. If a faculty member does not meet the expectations, then the faculty member is paired with a mentor in the department and is encouraged to participate in additional faculty development activities at the department and university levels.

Part-time faculty are evaluated using the same procedures as outlined in the Personnel Policies and Procedures manual. New adjuncts are paired with experienced faculty to assist in planning courses. Sample syllabi, textbooks, and assessments are made available for the adjunct to use; however, adjunct faculty have said that they are encouraged to incorporate their professional knowledge into the courses. Observations of adjunct teaching are conducted by the chairs and members of the Departmental Personnel Committee. Adjuncts who are only serving in the supervisory roles are evaluated by the student teacher or intern and the cooperating teacher. Adjunct faculty who are not successful after receiving support are not rehired.

Candidates evaluate teaching faculty (full-time and part-time) through the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET), which is a university-wide system. The SET consists of ten items and is scored on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "Strongly disagree" and 5 being "Strongly agree." In spring 2005, the mean scores on the ten items for the unit ranged from 4.4 to 4.6. In spring 2006, the mean scores on the ten items for the unit ranged from 4.2 to 4.6. These evaluations play an important role in rank and tenure decisions as well as in decisions for continuing employment for part-time faculty. In addition, untenured faculty in the unit are evaluated by their peers. The peer evaluations are conducted by the members of the Department Personnel Committee and involve classroom observations. In the Department of Education, the chair also conducts classroom observations of all faculty.

G.   Unit facilitation of professional development

Professional development is promoted in the unit and is expected of all faculty. Opportunities for professional development exist within the unit and at the university level. The Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT) has been reinstated this year after a two year hiatus due to budget cuts. The mission of CELT is to facilitate professional development across disciplines and colleges. The CELT director, who is .50 FTE as director and .50 FTE as faculty in Psychology, emphasized the importance of the College of Education faculty in planning topics for workshops and other professional development activities. One unit faculty member, who serves as the CELT Advisory Council chair, continued to implement professional development activities for the university during the two-year hiatus even though funded had stopped. Upcoming workshop topics include Universal Design for Learning, Best Practices in Teaching, Using Clickers in the Classroom, and Writing across the Disciplines. The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning also hosts a three day conference each year. Faculty in the unit submit presentation proposals and present at this conference each year. Grants are also available through CELT. Faculty can write for Institutional Improvement grants, which focus on innovative teaching and may be funded up to $4,000 dollars or Impact grants, which focus on efforts by multiple sections of a course, academic departments, or units to redesign curriculum or develop programs that will have a significant impact on candidate learning. Impact grants start at 4,000 and may be funded for higher amounts.

Faculty are supported in their efforts to make effective use of technology through trainings and workshops. Additionally, the Technology and Learning program provides "a collaborative and supportive environment that empowers faculty to utilize technology to enhance learning outcomes."

Professional development activities are supported within the unit in a variety of ways. In the Education Department, faculty share their expertise on a variety of topics during monthly faculty meetings. Additional funding from the university supports professional development. Each

college in the university receives a performance award if the FTE targets are met and other goals achieved. This money may be used to support professional development activities. In addition, funding from foundation is also used for professional development. Every new faculty receives $1000 a year for two years to support professional development activities such as conference attendance, research, etc. Third year faculty and beyond receive $600 each to support professional development.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Professional education faculty in the unit are well qualified and possess academic credentials and expertise that qualify them for their field of specialization. The unit currently has 50 full-time faculty and five full-time faculty members in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) for a total of 55 full-time faculty members. There are currently 58 part-time faculty. Most of the part-time adjuncts have a minimum of a master's degree and extensive field experiences in PK-12 schools. Unit faculty are effective teachers who model best teaching practices in their areas of specialty. They are productive in many scholarly and creative areas, are highly collaborative, and provide extensive service to the university, the community and to the unit. All faculty are systemically evaluated through a departmental personnel committee, by candidates, and peers. Professional development opportunities are readily available to all faculty.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Areas for Improvement:
None

State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 6: Unit Governance and Resources

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

Level: (Initial and Advanced)

A.   Unit leadership and authority

The School of Education is the professional education unit at California State University, Chico. The unit has the authority and responsibility for planning, delivering, and operating all programs for the preparation of teachers at both the initial and advanced levels. The unit manages and coordinates the delivery of education content courses that candidates take as part of their programs with other departments on campus. The School of Education includes programs within three academic units. All but two of the programs are housed in the College of Communication and Education (CME), with the remaining two programs, School Psychology and Agriculture Specialist, housed in the colleges of Behavioral and Social Sciences (BSS) and Agriculture (AGR) respectively

The unit is lead by the dean of the College of Communication and Education. The dean is the administrative head of the College charged with the oversight and implementation of all teacher education programs. The associate dean, the director of the Education Services Center, and department chairs, who serve as the unit academic leadership team, all report directly to the dean. Coordinators for each of the initial teacher preparation and advanced program pathways, report directly to the department chairs.

The unit head coordinates programs through regular meetings with all education faculty, department chairs, advisory committees and the University Academic Deans Council. Unit faculty are actively involved in program development and decision-making. Faculty meetings are held monthly for all unit faculty with additional meetings held as necessary.

Three committees have been established to coordinate various aspects of the programs. The School of Education Executive Committee, which is chaired by the Dean and composed of the Associate Dean, the Director of Education Services, the Chairs of the Departments of Education (EDUC) and Professional Studies in Education (PSED), and two faculty representatives, meets once a month to discuss coordination of programs, policy issues, state legislation and mandates from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, special events, public relations and program and unit assessment.

The Credential Programs Committee (CPC), which is composed of the Associate Dean, the Director of Education Services, and the coordinators of all initial and advanced programs within the unit, meets once a month to address issues related to professional education programs offered through the School of Education. During CPC meetings, coordinators have an opportunity to exchange information across all programs, both for coordinators within the College of Communication and Education and for programs housed in the other colleges.

The Unit Assessment Committee includes the Associate Dean, the Director of Education Services, and faculty representatives from a variety of programs within the SOE. This committee monitors the unit assessment system. The UAC compiles information from the reports and

aggregates the admissions, program completion, demographic, and key assessment data to create the Unit Assessment Report. This report is then reviewed by the School of Education Executive Committee and reported to the faculty.

The Program Advisory Councils are comprised of key members of the Professional Community. The Councils are specific to each individual program, meet regularly and provides a vehicle for the systemic involvement of the P-12 community in program design and ongoing evaluation.

At the department level, faculty committees provide opportunities for shared governance and decision-making related to personnel issues and policies; program and curriculum design, implementation, evaluation; and fiscal management.

At the individual program level, coordinators provide leadership to their respective faculty, oversight of program delivery and evaluation, and coordination of admissions, orientation activities and advising of candidate, as well as training for part-time university and school-based faculty and field supervisors.

Faculty are key advisors for candidates and each faculty member holds five office hours per week. Candidates use departmental and program websites as supplemental to meeting with faculty advisors and staff. All unit recruiting and admissions policies are clearly described in handbooks and brochures provided by the unit. Each program also provides a variety of publications and services to students through the department offices. Informational meetings are also provided by the Educational Services Center, the University Advising Center, and the Graduate School.

The University Provost states that the unit is well-regarded within the campus community as leaders in teaching, research and service. Further, the dean, associate deans and department chairs all serve and/or chair campus committees and taskforces within the University community and assume leadership roles across campus.

B.   Unit Budget

The unit receives adequate budgetary allocations to support on campus programs and clinical work necessary for the preparation of its candidates to meet standards. Due to state reductions in revenues, budget cuts in 2002-2003 to the California State University system have at times reduced enrollment targets and resources. However, at this time budget resources are tied to enrollment growth and reliable state funding. Funding to the academic units is tied to enrollment targets measured by the number of Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES). Funding is allocated to each academic unit using a budget model that incorporates the following elements: Lecture FTES, Lab FTES, Lower Division FTES, Upper Division FTES, Graduate FTES, Administrative Support, Technology, Majors, and Special Needs. Using these factors, each unit receives funding to match performance in achieving full-time equivalent student enrollment and in other areas outlined by the model. Additionally, the Vice Provost for Planning, Resource Allocation and Evaluation awards performance funds to each college based on their achievement of university and college annual goals. The Vice Provost also reported that the unit's budget compares quite favorably to those of other units on campus and annually receives a high level of performance funds based on achievement of university and college annual goals. Figure 6.2.below shows the budget comparisons by college.

Figure 6.2 Budget Comparisons by College:

College	AGR	BSS	BUS	CME	ECT	HFA	NS	Total
2001-2002								
Budget	2,619,218	11,195,543	6,014,297	11,938,883	5,427,111	13,002,506	10,167,058	60,364,615
% of Budget	4%	19%	10%	20%	9%	22%	17%	
FTES	316	3,132	1,531	2,703	976	3,280	2,321	14,259
% of FTES	2%	22%	11%	19%	7%	23%	16%	
2002-2003								
Budget	2,464,418	11,048,911	5,844,310	11,400,803	5,604,190	12,741,041	9,843,255	58,946,928
% of Budget	4%	19%	10%	19%	10%	22%	17%	
FTES	294	3,092	1,516	2,593	927	3,119	2,188	13,729
% of FTES	2%	23%	11%	19%	7%	23%	16%	
2003-2004								
Budget	2,329,078	10,478,761	5,669,848	11,115,102	4,890,495	12,407,528	9,592,041	56,482,853
% of Budget	4%	19%	10%	20%	9%	22%	17%	
FTES	298	3,015	1,397	2,530	883	3,054	2,139	13,316
% of FTES	2%	23%	10%	19%	7%	23%	16%	

Academic Affairs has decentralized funding to each unit for academic priorities, unit operations and personnel. Salary savings are also retained by each unit allowing for flexibility and program enhancement. In addition to the base allocation, Academic Affairs also allocates funding for professional development as follows: $1,000 for each new tenure-track faculty, $600 for each tenured faculty, $600 for each probationary faculty, and $1,000 for each department chair. In addition to these funds, departments and the colleges provide additional support for faculty professional development, including attendance at professional meetings and training workshops, and support for high-cost international travel.

The system-wide budget cuts in 2002 also resulted in the elimination of funds used to compensate cooperating teachers. This did not impact negatively the quality of field experiences as the unit was able to recognize the contributions of the cooperating teachers in such ways as free workshops, seminars, and recognition and awards programs.

C. Personnel

University workload policies require that tenured/tenure-track teaching undergraduate and/or graduate courses, teach 12 weighted teaching units (WTUs) per semester and additionally perform the equivalent of 3 WTUs of work in student advising, governance, committee work, university and community service and scholarly activity. WTUs are used for teaching courses and/or supervision of student teachers, interns, or school administration candidates. The supervision of six student teachers and/or practicum candidates is the equivalent of 3 WTUs. A review of faculty workloads and interviews with faculty, department chairs and coordinators confirm that faculty are actually only teaching a maximum of 12 credit hours per semester.

Faculty may receive assigned time for temporary tasks or projects or for long-term assignments in lieu of part of their teaching assignment. This assigned time exists for a variety of reasons for either short-term—e.g. one semester—or for long-term work. For example, all of department chairs, program coordinators, and directors of field placements earn assigned time that releases them from teaching.

Discussions with the dean, associate deans, department chairs and faculty members, as well as a review of faculty vitae, indicate that the unit annually meets their scholarly productions targets as set by the Office of Academic Affairs. However, faculty workload policies have significantly impacted some faculty member's abilities to effectively engage in scholarship activities.

The unit incorporates the use of temporary or adjunct faculty who bring the immediacy of the work place to the instructional setting. Adjunct faculty are included in orientation sessions and professional development opportunities provided by the individual departments and/or programs and undergo annual evaluations as well.

The unit provides adequate support staff to work directly with faculty and candidates. There are currently 16 support staff positions in the unit. Support staff assists with clerical tasks, communication, processing of candidate files, advisement referrals and general record keeping. Support staff is assigned based on FTES. Unit support staff is as follows:

Office of the Dean - 3
Office of Credentials and Student Services -1
Department of Education – 2.5
Department of Professional Studies in Education -1
Program of Communicative Disorders and Sciences -2
Program of Agriculture- 1
Department of Kinesiology - 2

Additionally, the unit employs two full-time computer technicians as well as student assistants to assist faculty, install new equipment, and maintain faculty and staff computer software and hardware.

D. Unit facilities

The primary home for College of Communication and Education is Tehama Hall, a 90,157 square foot facility completed in 1992. Other components of the unit are housed in several other buildings on campus. Most faculty offices are in Tehama Hall. Tenured and tenure-track faculty offices are single occupancy. Part-time faculty share a two-person office. Each office is equipped with desks, individual phone lines, a computer with high-speed internet access, and a printer. Additionally, copy, fax and storage are located and accessible to faculty and candidates in all unit facilities.

Unit facilities include technology-enhanced classrooms. Classroom facilities and computer labs are located in Tehama Hall, Modoc, A. J. Hamilton, and Siskiyou. Facilities range from an old elementary school building (AJH) to Yolo Hall (Kinesiology), which was built in 2002. The Department of Education currently has four 'smart' (technology rich) classrooms for which it has priority access; each classroom is equipped with a large-screen projector, instructor computer, DVD, CD, video player, and a cart with 15 laptops available for student use in the rooms. All rooms have wireless access to the Internet. In addition to the open technology labs in Tehama

Hall and other unit facilities on campus, laptops are made available for candidates use in partner school settings with their students.

Several other resources are available to faculty and students. The Instructional Media Center (IMC), located in the basement of the library, provides support for the production of posters and brochures as well as assistance with websites. The Resources in International Education (RISE) library, located in AJH, provides students with books and artifacts for enrichment of the curriculum. The Meriam Library has a dedicated K-12 curriculum section on the third floor.

E.   Unit resources including technology

The unit provides adequate funding across programs to support candidate learning. Unit budgets are decentralized. The unit head allocates funds to the various departments and programs based on needs within programs. Salary savings and external funding through grants have provided significant opportunities for flexibility in funding.   In 2005 – 2006, the unit received $3,434,460.00 in external grants and contracts.

The University has made a considerable commitment to technology resources and faculty training and development to technology. Technology-equipped rooms are available to faculty generally whenever they are needed. Further, the unit has developed an ongoing partnership with the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT) and the Technology and Learning Program (TLP). Two specific areas of collaboration are the Learning Productivity Grants and the Exemplary Online Instruction Awards. The Learning Productivity Grant program and other CELT grant programs are designed to provide faculty with the resources to try out new and innovative approaches to teaching. The grants are competitive and reviewed by the CELT director, Technology and Learning Program staff, and several faculty members. Another key partnership is the Exemplary Online Instruction Awards that are given each year at the CELT conference. Conversations with the dean, department chairs and faculty confirm that unit faculty have consistently taken advantage of these opportunities.

The Meriam Library supports the mission and strategic priorities of the unit and the University. Services are available in 24 hours 7 days a week via online references, email references and traditional face-to-face references. The Library ReSEARCH Station forms the gateway to information and guides, online tutorials, image collections, interlibrary loan services and the Internet in addition to books, journals and other information resources. Library collections are increasingly electronic while still supporting text-based materials that are not available or easy to use electronically. The full-text electronic journals and databases are the most utilized library resource. A major electronic resource initiative is to make our research collections accessible via the Internet. The Library has an active digitizing program to convert historic maps, text and photographs so that these resources may be used by students, researchers and others.

The university also assisted the School of Education by selecting and purchasing a content management system that provided the structure to create the electronic exhibit room for accreditation. Faculty leadership has recommended sustaining this system to assist with storing important data and supporting the unit assessment system (AIMS).

Overall Assessment of Standard

A review of documents, interviews with unit administrators, faculty and candidates confirm that the unit has clear leadership and authority for the operation of teacher preparation programs with sufficient budget, facilities, and resources, including technology resources, for the preparation of

candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. The faculty is dedicated and committed to producing high quality candidates.

NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Areas for Improvement:
None

State Team Decision: Standard Met

INTERNSHIP ISSUES FOR STATE REPORT

Common Standards 1 and 2 – Leadership and Resources
The School of Education has official agreements with each school district in which an intern is employed. Each district provides each intern with a support provider, and when needed, additional support.

Common Standard 4 – Evaluation
The Credential Programs Committee oversees and coordinates teacher education programs for the School 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 board serves as the primary liaison between the departments and the school districts that participate in internship programs.

Common Standard 5 – Admission
Admission of intern candidates is coordinated by the Credential Analyst's Office and with 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 site and the university program coordinator 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

Findings on Standards:
Based upon 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 (offered through the options listed above) to be fully met. Candidates, graduates, faculty, field personnel, and employers uniformly judge that the program—offered through an impressive variety of options—prepares educators who are well prepared to meet a variety of student needs in California's classrooms today; candidates are indeed effective, reflective, and engaged.

Strengths:
Of the many strengths of the Multiple Subject program, three are noted here.

First, the program is offered in a variety of formats to address a range of candidate preferences and needs. For early identifiers, the Integrated Teaching Core offers a systematic and extended program that spans candidates' undergraduate experience. The Internship experience allows candidates to maintain employment as classroom teachers as they complete the credential. The "basic" multiple subject program offers a model for candidates who need some flexibility in the time to completion of their program. Finally, the concurrent program allows candidates to complete the Multiple Subject and Education Specialist credentials simultaneously.

Second, it is clear that the program has a built a long history of serving the region's educational community. Relationships among constituents are long term and serve the program well for effective implementation and continued development. For instance, many practitioners serving as cooperating teachers are program graduates, and many constituents serve in multiple roles (such as school principal and council member).

Third, constituents uniformly noted that program personnel are dedicated individuals who are committed to the success of candidates and to continued efforts to sustain the quality of their programs.

Concerns:
None noted.

Multiple Subject Credential Tri-Placement
Single Subject Credential Tri-Placement

Findings on Standards:
Based upon review of the response to Program Standards, documents such as course materials and assessments, and based on interviews with program constituents and stakeholders, the team finds all program standards in the Tri-placement Program for multiple subject and single subject credentials to be fully met. Candidates, graduates, faculty, field personnel, and employers consistently report that the program prepares educators who are committed to the learning and development of all students, whose rigorous coursework is carried forward into fieldwork, and

who are ready to take on their own classrooms. Participants also expressed strong appreciation for the leadership team, and for the network of support they have built around their cohort of candidates.

Strengths:
Of the many strengths of the Tri-Placement Program, three are noted here.

First, the design of the program as a cohort fosters earnest collaboration among candidates, faculty, and cooperating teachers. Over the course of the program, candidates form a closely-knit group that supports academic, professional, and personal growth.

Second, the three program coordinators also serve as instructors and field supervisors, which allows them to link theory and practice across coursework and fieldwork in unique ways. Candidates could clearly see how topics that were raised in courses were immediately addressed in classrooms, and they regularly drew connections across their experiences.

Third, the program coordinators model the reflective practice they expect of their students, by implementing regular assessments, reflecting on their findings, and using them to make changes to the program.

These strong components of the program, together with the long-term relationships developed by the coordinators among schools, districts, and BTSA, combine to form an exemplary program.

Concerns:
None noted.

Multiple Subject Credential Bilingual Emphasis (Spanish)
Single Subject Credential Bilingual Emphasis (Spanish)

Findings on Standards:
Based upon review of the response to Program Standards, documents such as course materials, and based on interviews with program constituents and stakeholders, the team finds all program standards in the BCLAD program for multiple and single subject credentials to be fully met. Candidates, graduates, faculty, field personnel, and employers are unanimous in their judgment that the program prepares educators who are committed to the learning and development of all students, who embrace multiple perspectives, and who value bilingualism as an asset that contributes both to the richness of life of individuals and to fabric of U.S. society. Participants also uniformly note that program personnel model the passion for education that they intend candidates to display throughout their career.

Strengths:
Of the many strengths of the BCLAD program, three are noted here.

First, the program is especially strong in the development of professional perspectives toward student learning and the teaching profession.   Candidates uniformly express and display dispositions that ground their practice in an understanding of who their students are, in the

setting of high expectations for their students, and in a sense of commitment to fulfilling their responsibilities to their learners.

Second, the program is to be commended for its systematic, structured, and regular opportunities for candidates to conduct self-evaluation of their learning (including significant learning resulting from field experiences) and to set goals based upon their evaluations.

Third, program constituents roundly praised the quality of communication among students and all personnel, including faculty, supervisors, administrators, and coordinators. Candidates and graduates report appreciating deeply the high levels of cohesion and support they receive throughout the program and beyond.

Concerns:
None noted.

Single Subject Credential
Single Subject Internship Credential
Single Subject Credential – Blended Physical Education

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 Department of Education, in partnership with faculty from the academic departments and K-12 practitioners, provide a sequenced professional program that effectively prepares candidates to meet the needs of diverse learners in secondary schools. Guided by the conceptual framework, the Single Subject program provides opportunities for candidates to develop professional dispositions that will prepare them to make a significant contribution to their students, schools, communities and profession.

Strengths:
CSU Chico's Department of Education enjoys widespread respect among K-12 practitioners and administrators in their service area. Candidates and graduates also expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the preparation program and the supportive, invested and engaged faculty.

Candidates are placed for their student teaching assignments at schools whose students reflect the diversity of the region and whose teachers model effective teaching practices in meeting the needs of all learners. The university supervisors are well qualified to support student teachers. All candidates and graduates interviewed indicated satisfaction with the guidance and feedback they received from both their cooperating teachers and university supervisors.

The overall Single Subject program gains from two related programs which model "best practices" exceeding expectations for two general single subject standards. Adapted PE faculty are to be commended for their work in meeting Standard 14. Faculty in Agricultural Education take Standard 10 to an exemplary level through home visits.

Concerns:
None noted

Reading Certificate
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards were met for the Reading and Language Arts Credential Program, with exception of standard #7 for the Reading Certificate and standard #16 for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist which were met with concerns.

Standard # 7 Field Experience and Standard #16 Advanced Clinical Experiences require that candidates complete extensive clinical experiences to include a variety of students and a variety of settings to enable the candidate to demonstrate proficiency. Candidates reported that they identify and select struggling readers from their own classrooms for field and clinical experiences and provide interventions for them at their assigned work sites.

Candidates are provided with current research-based methodology for developing fluent reading and comprehension strategies for English Language Learners and struggling readers. Candidates are prepared to select, administer, and analyze a variety of assessments and intervention strategies. In addition they learn to critically examine current research on reading. Through case studies/classroom clinical practice candidates are able to provide reading/language arts interventions to students at their own elementary, middle or Community College/schools.

Strengths:
Candidates praised the faculty members for their accessibility, support and the wealth of knowledge provided. Specifically the candidates reported that ongoing support, monitoring, conferencing and continued scaffolding were provided for writing projects. As result candidates report they have enhanced professional writing abilities.

Candidates report they learned to use a critical inquiry approach to analyze reading research, strategies, programs, and initiatives challenging their current personal instructional practices as well as decisions they might meet in the future. As a result they have become better teachers of reading and instructional leaders at their schools and in their districts.

Concerns:
None noted

Adapted Physical Education Specialist Credential

Findings on the Standards:
Based on the review of the instructional report and supporting documents, as well as interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team has determined that all standards are met. The Adapted Physical Education Program was developed being mindful of the skills and dispositions required by the state standards for motor skills deficient individuals. As candidates move forward towards achieving their specialization in Adapted Physical Education, there is careful advising and coordination to ensure the candidates are enrolled in courses and are assigned tasks that fulfill the credential requirements. The program is recognized as a vital service "for the lowest able persons with motor skills deficiency." The program is carefully monitored to ensure quality control and effective implementation in the field. The variety of assessment procedures also ensure that quality is maintained. Revisions to the program are made based on feedback from candidates, faculty and the advisory committee.

Strengths:
The Kinesiology Department is a resource for handicapped children and adults in the local community as well as the community beyond the geographical confines of the university.

The relatively new Kinesiology building with its array of facilities includes state-of–the-art equipment and ample space. This allows for adapted P.E. candidates to receive training that is current in the field of motor skills deficiency.

The Department of Physical Education and Exercise Science has a comprehensive competency sign-off for exiting candidates from the Adapted Physical Education program.

Feedback and comments from graduates and candidates indicated support by the university faculty and their practicum supervisors.

Another area of strength was the Autism Clinic jointly operated by the Adapted Physical Education Program, the School Psychology program, and the Communication Sciences and Disorders program.

Concerns:
None noted

Agricultural Specialist Credential

Findings on Standards:
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team has determined that all program standards are met for the Agriculture Specialist Credential.

Faculty in the College of Agriculture responsible for teaching and coordinating the agricultural education program in partnership with secondary school practitioners, California Department of

Education (CDE) staff, and industry representatives, provide a sequenced professional program that prepares candidates to meet the needs of diverse learners in California's agricultural education programs.

Strengths:
Faculty are to be commended for their continued professional relationships with practitioners, colleagues in sister universities, CDE Agriculture Education Unit staff, and for their active participation in the California Agriculture Teachers' Association and related national professional associations. Their modeling of professionalism carries over to their undergraduate students and candidates who have 100% membership in the American Association of Agricultural Educators.

Cooperating teachers expressed appreciation for the opportunity to develop and strengthen their supervisory knowledge and skills through state wide Cooperating Teacher Conclaves.

Faculty have an "open door" policy, and candidates feel very comfortable coming to them with questions and concerns. Candidates and graduates report that the level of teaching in the program is high and that faculty foster a "family," yet professional, atmosphere throughout the credential process.

Concerns:
None noted

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

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 the following:

> All standards are met for both the Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate and the Moderate/Severe Level I programs including Internship
> All standards are met for both the Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate and the Moderate Severe Level II credential programs

After reviewing documents, sets of data collected, teacher observations and conducting numerous interviews with employers, supervisors, site administrators, directors, graduates and program faculty, the team determined that the Education Specialist credential candidates are well prepared for their role in special education teaching positions. Faculty are highly qualified and accessible to teach and model best practices for in teacher education and special education. Grants secured by faculty support candidates in the program and provide funds for the development of materials and instruction in the areas of emotional and behavioral disturbance and autism.

The broad knowledge base of candidates is well developed and practical applications of content and process are provided for immediate use in diverse teaching situations. Program graduates comment that they are well prepared to teach, having both a breadth of knowledge in special education and specific skills in their specialization area. Furthermore, evidence indicated that program graduates are prepared to assume the roles and carry out the duties of a special education teacher including assessment, data collection, 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.

The program faculty collaborate with colleagues across disciplines, school-based field administrators and supervisors and cooperating teachers to provide well-coordinated, high quality education specialist programs. The faculty have excellent relationships with school districts, and graduates are highly regarded by employers. The program faculty collect evaluation data from candidates, supervisors, cooperating teachers and employers on an ongoing basis, with findings informing program content and process.

Strengths:
Special education faculty are committed to preparing highly qualified candidates to instruct students with disabilities. They have high expectations for teacher candidates and have developed a well- coordinated, sequential and well-articulated program of study. The program of study is rigorous and demanding, focused on research-based literature which links theory with practice. They are reflective about their practices and facilitate the development of special educators who are effective practitioners. The candidates and graduates interviewed consistently expressed appreciation for the accessibility of faculty, their high level of professionalism, and the personalized nature of the program. They stated the program prepared them well as special educators who constantly reflect on their instructional practices. Employers and field supervisors were pleased with the close partnerships with the university and the quality of the credential candidates. Employers state that graduates of the program are among the most successful teachers in their service area. Specific program strengths include:

- The faculty is recognized for their efforts to be in the field supporting candidates in their initial teaching experience. There is significant support provided to students through ongoing visitations, modeling lessons and meetings with supervisors and support providers. Candidates reflected on how the regular visitations of support providers and corresponding feedback has served them well in their growth and affecting positive changes in their instruction. The special education faculty are consistently responsive to the needs of candidates in the Concurrent, Intern, Level I, and Level II programs. The faculty provides a strong advisement system, with expectations and requirements clear in course work and fieldwork for all program pathways. Part-time faculty are included in all aspects of the program and highly qualified in the field of special education. Level II candidates articulated the value of the program emphasis on research, critical thinking, best practices and the linkages to practical application

- Effective partnerships have been developed with local school districts, county offices of education and SELPA's to support the special education program. Partnerships and the community are encouraged to share information to strengthen the special education program with specific focus on communication and parent involvement. The Advisory Board is well attended, meets twice a year and provides a forum to discuss constituent

needs. Web casts of advisory board meetings enable all members, regardless of geographic location, to participate.

- The Intern Program is well coordinated across geographic regions that range from Yuba City to the Oregon border and from the Pacific Coast to Nevada. Special education faculty collaborate with school site-based, district, county and other university professionals to deliver program content in alternative formats including day-long institutes, interactive video, evening and weekend as well web-based classes. These formats enable candidates to receive the same content that is delivered on the Chico campus and to complete the program in a timely manner. These alternative formats are essential to the preparation of special education teacher for remote and rural schools.

- The Concurrent Program adds another pathway for student to be credentialed simultaneously in two areas (Multiple Subject and Education Specialist). This unique program has resulted in an increase in student enrollment in the special education program to take advantage of this opportunity provided by the Multiple Subject Credential faculty. The program effectively blends the general multiple subject curriculum with the special education curriculum. Students have the opportunity to meet the competencies in both programs by accessing a well-designed course of study.

Concerns:
None noted

Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, 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 track their progress through the program via a portfolio that contains all important documents related to their coursework, clinical assignments, the diversity of the populations served, and evaluations from supervisors. The portfolios also contain papers evaluated with rubrics, clinical hour logs, tracking of the requirements for the credential, as well as diagnostic, therapy, and exit reports.

The program offers an undergraduate and a graduate degree in Communication Sciences and Disorders; all students in the graduate program complete the requirements for the Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential. The faculty has developed an intensive program that allows the students to complete the degree in two years. Issues on diversity are incorporated throughout the academic coursework and all clinical placements. Credential candidates have an opportunity to work with students who have a variety of disabilities in the on -campus clinic and the public school practicum. Students are trained in ways to work collaboratively in school settings and to communicate effectively with school personnel and the families of children with disabilities. They are also trained to participate in transition planning across the lifespan for all learners.

Members of the faculty participate with the students in community service projects such as the annual Speech and Hearing Fair where members of the community receive free speech and hearing screenings. The faculty engage in an ongoing assessment of the curriculum, classroom teaching strategies and methods, and hands-on experience with state-of-the-art equipment. The program has an exceptionally active Advisory Board that meets at least two times a semester. Members of the Board noted that when they make recommendations, the faculty implements the suggestions immediately. In turn, faculty members frequently support programs directed by members of the Advisory Board. An example is ongoing support of the Brain Injury Coalition at Butte College.

Strengths
The faculty and supervisors on and off campus provide immediate feedback to students in clinical placements. Students conduct frequent self evaluations for their therapy sessions on campus. Principals and supervisors note that students from Chico State University are the most professional and reflective beginning practitioners that they employ. Students are employed before they graduate and school administrators noted that there is a higher than average retention rate with Chico speech pathologists. Graduates of the program praise the faculty for their consistent guidance through the program and continued advice and counsel after graduation.

Another area of strength is the Autism Clinic collaboratively operated by the Communication Sciences and Disorders program, the Adapted P.E. program and the Pupil Personnel Services program. This clinic is funded by an internal grant and the team members are applying for an external grant to expand the program. This program affords students the opportunity of working collaboratively with faculty and students from other credential programs.

Concerns:
None noted.

Pupil Personnel Services Credential: School Psychology with Internship

Findings on Standards:
After review of the response to the program standards, document reviews, and interviews of candidates, faculty, graduates, employers, supervisors and members of the advisory committee, the team determined that all standards were met.

Strengths:
The program in Pupil Personnel Services – School Psychology including Internship, was especially strong in both the quality of the faculty and the candidates. Employers and supervisors all spoke with great respect about the professionalism of the faculty members and the quality of the graduates of the program. The team found that Standards **7 Family-School Collaboration, 10 Consultation,** and **14 Human Relations** were especially strong components of the program.

Another area of strength was the Autism clinic jointly operated by the School Psychology program, the Adapted P.E. program, and Communication Sciences and Disorders. This program, funded by a grant, is a strength of Standard **21 Wellness Promotion, Crisis Intervention, and Counseling.**

Concerns:
None noted.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

CSU Chico's document, *The Preliminary Administrative Program*, which responds to the CCTC Standards adopted in 2003 is under review at this time. The program must complete that review process and be approved in order for the program to continue to admit candidates.

This current site-based review provides feedback for revision of the institution's program document. Three overarching areas emerged during the review: program design, leadership and coordination, and assessment of candidate competencies on CCTC standards.

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:

Standards Two and Seven are met.

Standard One is met with concerns because the evidence available did not demonstrate a well-designed rationale, articulated clearly, evident in the program (1a). Use of multi-media technologies (1c) and opportunities to learn about and manage the use of technology were not evident (1d). Evidence of an organizational structure that provides coordination of administrative components of the program on a consistent and on-going basis was not evident (1e). No evidence was found to show how the program makes allowance for the fact that interns do not have all "theoretical" background necessary at the beginning of the program (1g). It was not clear how each candidate is assessed on all competencies (1h).

Standard Three is met with concerns because it was not evident how the program builds on candidates' understanding of student content standards for students (3a). Data was not available for how the program ensures that before the intern assignment, the intern has a basis understanding of administrative practice and an understanding of their specific job responsibilities (3d).

Standard Four is met with concerns because evidence was not available for elements f and h.

Standard Five is met with concerns because evidence was not available for elements f and g.

Standard Six is met with concerns because evidence was not available for elements: 6c1,7, 8,9; 6d1,2,3,5; 6e3,

Standard Eight is met with concerns because evidence was not available for elements: 8a & d. There was no evidence of the participation by supervising administrators in the final field experience evaluation.

Standard Nine is met with concerns because evidence was not available for elements a, c, d, f, g, i.

Standards 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 are met with concerns. The syllabi and assignments touch on the standards, but is it difficult to determine how they address specifics of each of the elements. For example, there is a "vision" assignment, but it is not clear how it meets 10a, which requires that the candidate is able to <u>facilitate</u> development of a shared vision. Similarly, it is not clear how under 11g the candidate is able to provide opportunities for parents to develop and use skills in collaboration and shared responsibility. The connection between course assignments and these outcome standards which require that students are able to do specific things in school settings is not always clear. For example, students may know about equitable distribution of resources (15e), but can they influence and support policies that ensure equitable distribution of resources (15e)?

Strengths
It appears that faculty and administrators involved in the program are committed to the long-term viability of this program which has existed at Chico for many decades. There has been a recent effort by leadership at Chico to support the needs of candidates across the widely dispersed service area with the start of the new cohort at Yuba County Office of Education.

Another strength of the program is the arrangement for administrator shadowing opportunities for students in their fieldwork. The department has a list of cooperating administrators that students can contact.

Graduates come back to Chico to make presentations in classes which helps students to build local connections.

Concerns
No additional concerns noted.

Library Media Teacher Credential

Findings on Standards
After a review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards were met with the exception of Standard # 26 for the Library Media Teacher Credential, which was met with concerns. Standard # 26 Determination of Candidate Competence requires that evaluation of candidate competency include thorough documentation and written verification. While a final portfolio is created by candidates and reviewed prior to exiting the program, unified interim formative assessments, tasks, checklists, and rubrics were not found nor is the portfolio actually used as a summative assessment of candidate competence or program improvement.

Strengths
Administrators, teachers, and employers in the field report satisfaction with the services provided to their school libraries through the graduates from this program.

Concerns
None noted

Professional Comments

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

Multiple Subject

In the spirit of continued program development, the team offers three professional comments. First, the team received uneven reports on the quality of candidates' preparation for technology within the Multiple Subject program. The team finds plentiful evidence of the integration of technology within courses and field experience, and some candidates give positive reports on their technology class. However, other candidates and graduates note a lack of connection between CTAP experiences and (a) the technology course and (b) their field experiences.

Second, some candidates and cooperating teachers expressed a desire for more frequent opportunities to formally review the effectiveness of cooperating teachers in the Multiple Subject program. On a related note, some cooperating teachers expressed desire to learn more about the program so that they can even more effectively support candidates throughout the program.

Third, in order to address all aspects of TPE 4 (mathematics) and Program Standard 8A(a--mathematics), the team is concerned that course experiences in the Multiple Subject (Department of Education) program are light. Interviews with candidates and graduates, and review of course documents, suggests that a total of 1.5 units may not be adequate to fully prepare candidates to provide effective instruction in mathematics.

Single Subject

Candidates and recent graduates whom we interviewed were unanimous in their concern that there was little connection between two courses taken concurrently with their Practicum I observations and teaching experiences. They were concerned that faculty teaching classes were not supervising student teachers, thus not connecting curriculum with their daily challenges in the classrooms.

Faculty and administration may consider TPA options that provide tasks or assignments that are reinforcing and sequential in meeting summative evaluation requirements. Candidates and recent graduates viewed many assignments as redundant and as not scaffolding or reinforcing others.

As faculty consider reasonable workloads for the Practicum I student teaching experience, a balance of units assigned to EDTE 535 should more closely match the actual expectations of the cooperating teachers and the "unofficial" workload reported by candidates interviewed. Units should reflect seat time as well as assigned experiences. Attention should also be paid to the total number of courses in the program.

Regular and systematic workshops for Cooperating Teachers may be considered as all Cooperating teachers interviewed indicated that they have received no formal preparation in clinical supervision skills.

Multiple and Single Subject Bilingual Emphasis

The team makes two comments here, in the spirit of continued program development. First, the team finds plentiful verbal evidence that candidates experience appropriate fieldwork settings, including work with English learners and students with identified special needs. However, the team encourages program personnel to consider an explicit mechanism to track candidates' placements across their program in relation to English learners, appropriate cooperating teacher certification, and students with special needs. For example, a simple form in the candidates' file that notes the completion of EL placements would help audiences such as external reviewers—in addition to program faculty—track appropriate placements quickly. Second, the team notes the uniformly high quality of cooperating teachers who are carefully selected according to explicit criteria. However, the team found limited evidence that the cooperating teachers themselves understood the criteria by which they were selected. Future program development efforts might include consideration of documents and orientation efforts that make criteria explicit to all program constituents.

Adapted Physical Education

As the program is certain to grow, it will need additional resources to meet the demands and to maintain the positive view held by the students, practitioners and employers.

Agricultural Specialist

The program is unique in that there is additional coordination required to accommodate placement for both practicum sites. Also, there is an additional level of site review by CDE staff to be considered and addressed prior to student teacher placement.

Faculty in the Agricultural Education program are encouraged to actively participate in Department of Education discussions concerning total program units and candidate work load balance.

Reading and Language Arts Specialist

Candidates would benefit from more in-depth and hands-on experiences with formal reading assessment tools. This would enable them to build a stronger knowledge base of both formal and informal assessment measures and their appropriate uses.

Education Specialist

Faculty may want to consider the following program suggestions:

Candidates and graduates were concerned that many general education candidates had limited information regarding students with special needs and collaborative practices. The candidates recommended that content regarding students with special needs and collaborative practices be addressed throughout the general education program.

The program is in the emerging stages of utilizing an electronic portfolio for candidate assessment and collecting data. In order to complete the electronic portfolio efficiently, candidates will need greater technical support in terms of equipment (scanners) and technical assistants who are familiar with the construction of the portfolio. In addition, faculty are encouraged to refine the scoring rubrics and continue with the calibration of individuals who will evaluate the portfolios. As a result, faculty will be able to utilize the data collected towards strengthening the content of the program.

Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential

Students and public school employers noted that information regarding RtI (Response to Intervention), emergent literacy, and behavior management should be considered for inclusion in the curriculum prior to the public school practicum.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology

This is a lengthy program for students to complete, with extensive course work and an intensive Internship program. Additional course work, such as Reading instructional skills and strategies currently used in schools for behavioral plans were areas mentioned by candidates as being of interest.

Preliminary Administrative Services

Comments from a variety of sources touched upon the issue of institutional capacity for the program. It was reported that students often take upwards of five classes from the same instructor, which makes the program less attractive to potential students. Others commended that the amount and type of work required in the program depresses the number of applicants. Students reported that the classes are "disjointed" and some said that they contain so much "busywork" that students feel overwhelmed. Lack of consistency in the quality of the courses was noted in all discussions with students. One student said that this was discussed with the department chair; others expressed some frustration that the institution did not seem to be aware of the issues.

Some students said that the syllabus for EDCI601 did not take into account that they already had extensive experience in C&I and lacked "administrator" focus.

Review of the program according to the CCTC Standards would be facilitated if the program used a standard format for all syllabi. These need to indicate how the course content addresses the input standards (Standard 6a-f). The products produced by students in courses, fieldwork or their professional activities which show what students know, are able to do, can identify, utilize, coordinates, understands, demonstrates, and engages in (Standards 10-15). The relationship between the items on the syllabus and the standard has to be specific and obvious to reviewers. The majority of candidate files reviewed did not contain evidence of assessment on standards by the institution prior to making credential recommendations.

The program faculty and candidates need to be able to have a common understanding of the rationale for the design of the program which is clearly evident to reviewers in the design of courses and fieldwork experiences.

For the classes offered with 40% on-line the syllabi needs to indicate how instruction is taking place for this portion of the class such as participation in chat rooms, stipulated times when students need to log-on, responses to posted assignments, on-line lectures, and guided web research, etc.

Library Media Teacher

The creation and implementation of additional assessment tools could assist the program in the collection and analysis of data to strategically assess, monitor and improve the program.

Although enrollment in the program is limited, the program serves an important community need.