

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

**October 2009
Overview of this Report**

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at San Diego State University. The report of the team presents findings based upon a thorough review of the Institutional Self-Study reports, supporting documentation, and interviews with representative constituencies. Based upon the findings of the team, an accreditation recommendation is made for this institution of **Accreditation**.

Common (NCATE Unit) Standards and Program Standard Decisions For all Programs offered by the Institution

| | Initial | Advanced |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions | M | M |
| 2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation | M | M |
| 3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice | M | M |
| 4) Diversity | M | M |
| 5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development | M | M |
| 6) Unit Governance and Resources | M | M |
| CTC Common Standard 1.1 Credential Recommendation Process | M | M |
| CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance | M | M |

Program Standards

| Programs | Total Standards | Program Standards | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| | | Met | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
| Multiple Subject, with Internship, w/BCLAD, Spanish | 19 | 19 | | |
| Single Subject, with Internship, w/BCLAD, Spanish | 19 | 19 | | |
| Education Specialist: MM Level I | 17 | 17 | | |
| Education Specialist: MM Level II | 12 | 12 | | |
| Education Specialist: MS Level I | 19 | 19 | | |
| Education Specialist: MS Level II | 11 | 11 | | |
| Education Specialist: Early Childhood Level I | 14 | 14 | | |
| Education Specialist: Early Childhood Level II | 3 | 3 | | |

| Programs | Total Standards | Program Standards | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | Met | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
| Early Childhood Special Education Certificate | 8 | 8 | | |
| Reading Certificate and Reading Language Arts Specialist | 20 | 20 | | |
| Multiple and Single Subject Clear | 4 | 4 | | |
| Bilingual Cross Cultural Specialist | 15 | 15 | | |
| Preliminary Administrative Services | 15 | 15 | | |
| Professional Administrative Services | 9 | 9 | | |
| Pupil Personnel Counseling: School Counseling | 32 | 32 | | |
| Pupil Personnel: School Psychology w/Intern | 27 | 27 | | |
| Pupil Personnel: School Social Work | 25 | 25 | | |
| Pupil Personnel: Child Welfare and Attendance | 9 | 9 | | |
| Health Services: School Nurse | 29 | 29 | | |
| Speech-Language Pathology | 16 | 16 | | |

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report**

Institution: San Diego State University

Dates of Visit: October 16-21, 2009

**Accreditation Team
Recommendation:** Accreditation

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards

The decision of the team regarding the six NCATE standards is that all standards are met. The decision of the team regarding the parts of California's two Common Standards that are required of NCATE accredited institutions is that both standards are met.

Program Standards

For all twenty credential programs, all program standards are met.

Overall Recommendation

Therefore the overall recommendation of the team is **Accreditation**.

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

Initial/Teaching Credentials

Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internships
Multiple Subject BCLAD (Spanish)

Single Subject
Single Subject
Single Subject Internships
Single Subject BCLAD (Spanish)

Advanced/Service Credentials

Administrative Services
Preliminary including Internship
Professional

Reading Certificate
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential
Bilingual/Crosscultural Specialist

Initial/Teaching Credentials

Clear Credential (SB 2042 Fifth Year)

Education Specialist Credentials

Preliminary Level I

Mild/Moderate Disabilities, including
Internship

Moderate/Severe Disabilities, including
Internship

Early Childhood, including Internship

Early Childhood Special Education
Certificate

Advanced/Service Credentials

Education Specialist Credentials

Professional Level II

Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Moderate/Severe Disabilities

Early Childhood Disabilities

Pupil Personnel Services

School Counseling including Internship

School Psychology including Internship

School Social Work

Child Welfare and Attendance

Health Services: School Nurse

Speech-Language Pathology

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- San Diego State University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- San Diego State University continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team
Joint NCATE-CTC Accreditation Team

NCATE Co-Chair

Doug Warring
St. Thomas University

California Co-Chair:

Mark Cary
Davis Unified School District, Retired

**NCATE/Common Standards
Cluster:**

Denise Fleming
CSU, East Bay

Lance Tomei
University of Central Florida

Jo Wanda Bozeman
Parkway School District of St. Louis County, Mo.

Patricia Elmore
Southern Illinois University

Patricia Hacker
South Dakota State University

Robert Perry
Los Angeles Unified School District

Programs Cluster:

KayDee Caywood
National University

Carrie Ann Blackaller
CSU, Dominguez Hills

Joanne Murphy
Long Beach Unified School District

Cynthia Fernandes
Acton Aqua-Dulce Unified School District

Staff to the Accreditation Team

Teri Clark, Administrator
Jan Jones Wadsworth, Consultant

Documents Reviewed

| | |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Institutional Self Study | Field Experience Notebooks |
| Course Syllabi and Guides | Advisement Documents |
| Candidate Files | Faculty Vitae |
| Program Handbooks | College Annual Reports |
| Survey Data | College Budget Plan |
| Candidate Performance Data | SDSU Website |
| Biennial Reports and CTC Feedback | Accreditation Website |
| Program Assessment Documentation | Program Evaluations |
| Program Assessment Preliminary Findings | Meeting Agendas and Minutes |
| Program Assessment Summaries | University Catalog |

Interviews Conducted

| | Team Lead/ NCATE Cluster | Basic/ Teaching Programs | Advanced/ Services Programs | TOTAL |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|
| Program Faculty | 29 | 41 | 44 | 116 |
| Institutional Administration | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Candidates | 2 | 13 | 27 | 42 |
| Graduates/Completers | 2 | 21 | 27 | 50 |
| Field Supervisors | 2 | 9 | 32 | 43 |
| Steering Committee | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Credential Analysts | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| Employers | 0 | 8 | 8 | 16 |
| | | | TOTAL | 284 |

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles.

NCATE STANDARDS/CCTC COMMON STANDARDS

STANDARD 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

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

Yes No

| Element | Unacceptable | Acceptable | Target | N/A |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|------------|--------|-----|
| 1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
| 1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation | | X | | |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:
 Initial licensure is provided primarily through fifth-year, post-baccalaureate programs for Single Subject (secondary), Multiple Subject (elementary), and Education Specialist (special education). All of these programs are state-accredited credentialing programs, and the state team has found that all programs meet all applicable state standards. Review of exhibits and interviews with candidates, graduates, and employers confirm that candidates in these programs know the content they plan to teach and can explain important principles and concepts delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. The review of exhibits included a review of assessment data maintained for all initial programs in Tableau, a data management system and a review of programs' Biennial Reports and Program Assessment Documents, both of which are state assessment reporting mechanisms.

ITP credential programs have admission requirements that ensure content knowledge. In the case of the Multiple Subject (MS) Program, candidates must pass California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET). In order to be recommended for the credential, candidates must also pass the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA). In the Single Subject Teaching Credential Program (SS), candidates may select one of two options: (a) completing a state-approved Subject Matter Preparation Program (SMPP) or (b) passing the CSET in their subject area. Occasionally, program applicants may be admitted prior to passing the CSET, but in these cases, candidates must pass the applicable CSET prior to student teaching. Since all candidates must pass the CSET prior to student teaching, the CSET pass rate for all program completers is 100 percent.

Education Specialist candidates who already possess an initial credential are deemed to possess the required content knowledge. Those who do not possess an initial credential must demonstrate subject matter competence in the same manner as their MS or SS counterparts.

In addition to test scores, candidates in the MS and SS ITP programs take the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), which includes the assessment of content knowledge. Candidates in MS programs also complete three PACT-associated Content Area Tasks (CTA). PACT assessments and rubrics are aligned to the six California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and 13 Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE). PACT assessment data show an aggregate first attempt unit mean score of 2.49 (2.0 is passing) for all candidates required to take this exam.

Review of exhibits and online data resources confirms that data are available for all of the above-cited key assessments and that data confirm candidates' mastery of content knowledge. These data demonstrate initial program candidates' virtually 100 percent pass rate on a variety of state examinations that measure content knowledge.

Data from exit surveys, one-year-out surveys, and employer surveys provide further evidence of program completers' content knowledge. For example, in the most recent survey data collected and provided by the California State University Center for Teacher Quality, employers rated program completers' preparedness on 34 different, specific content knowledge indicators. Data show that employers rated from 86 percent (lowest rating) to 100 percent of program completers were well or adequately prepared.

Overall, across all initial programs, candidates and program graduates demonstrate competence and confidence in their content knowledge as it relates to key principles and concepts delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

The unit offers several programs for advanced teacher preparation, including Reading Certificate, Reading Specialist Credential, Bilingual Cross-cultural Certificate, Education Specialist (Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe, and Early Childhood Special Education), Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction, and Clear Credential. Advanced candidates in all programs demonstrate content knowledge competence through a variety of key assessments including course embedded assessments, portfolios, action research projects, and comprehensive examinations. Data contained in Tableau, Task Stream, and other data applications consistently demonstrate candidates' strong content knowledge. During interviews, candidates and graduates of advanced programs express confidence in their advanced mastery of content knowledge. Data contained in the biennial reports and program assessment documents for advanced certification programs also confirmed that candidates in advanced programs have strong content knowledge.

Candidates in advanced programs demonstrate in-depth knowledge and understanding of state, professional, and programmatic standards and are able to translate this knowledge into practice in their specific fields. Possession of the preliminary credential as well as data gathered during the admission process indicate that candidates in advanced programs enter the program with a solid foundation of content knowledge upon which they can build during their advanced program. Advanced content knowledge objectives for candidates are identified in course syllabi and are assessed in embedded course assignments. Most advanced programs have very detailed and comprehensive curriculum and assessment maps that align advanced content knowledge objectives with applicable state and national standards. Assessment of candidates' acquisition of

advanced content knowledge is frequent and ongoing—far exceeding that which is collected and maintained for key assessments at major transition points. Interviews with faculty and candidates consistently confirm that faculty closely monitor individual candidates’ performance and progress and provide regular feedback to candidates to ensure their acquisition of advanced content knowledge.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|----------|--|--|
| 1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teachers – Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
| 1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teachers – Advanced Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
| <p><i>Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:</i> As indicated for element 1a above, all initial programs are state-accredited credentialing programs that, according to state team findings, meet all applicable state standards. Candidates in all initial programs demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge by successful completion of embedded signature assessments, and both formative and summative student teaching evaluations. Candidates in the SS and MS programs also demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge in the PACT teaching activity and PACT-associated CATS for MS candidates. A review of assessment data housed in Tableau for these key assessments, interviews with candidates and graduates, and survey data from exit, alumni, and employer surveys all confirm candidates’ mastery of pedagogical content knowledge and skills for teacher candidates, including their ability to use technology to facilitate student learning.</p> | | | | |
| <p><i>Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:</i> Candidates in advanced programs demonstrate in-depth knowledge of the content of their field and of the theories related to pedagogy and learning. Data from embedded assessments, portfolios, action research projects, and comprehensive exams indicate that candidates in advanced programs employ a broad range of instructional strategies, including technology, in their work with students.</p> | | | | |
| 1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teachers – Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
| 1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teachers – Advanced Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
| <p><i>Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:</i> As indicated for element 1a above, all initial programs are state-accredited credentialing programs that, according to state team findings, meet all applicable state standards. Candidates in all initial programs demonstrate competencies aligned with the Teaching Performance Expectations through successful completion of the PACT. PACT assessment data (MS and SS) as well as data from signature assignments, portfolios (SPED), and student teaching evaluations indicate that candidates in ITP programs demonstrate a command of and ability to apply professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills as set out in the state standards. Summative field evaluations from all ITP programs assess the range of state competencies, including</p> | | | | |

candidates' ability to take students' prior experiences and socio-familial contexts into account when planning, delivering, and reflecting on instruction. Data presented in the IR, electronic exhibits, and interviews, as well as the state team's finding of "standards met" for all initial programs, document candidate competencies in these areas.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Candidates in advanced programs demonstrate their understanding of research and best practices as these relate to teaching and learning, through signature (embedded) assessments, portfolios, action research, and comprehensive examinations. Candidates also have opportunities to demonstrate their understanding of socio-cultural factors and the role of students' prior knowledge through these assessments and through supervised field and clinical practice. In their action research project, they must translate theory into practice and show how this positively impacts student learning outcomes. Several programs require candidates to engage in research relative to their selected area of study. All programs require candidates to reflect on their practice and to use reflection to identify strengths and areas requiring improvement.

Although competence terminology differs from program to program, data from assessments across the unit indicate that the vast majority of candidates earn scores associated with high levels of competence in all areas assessed.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|----------|--|--|
| 1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
| 1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation | | X | | |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

As indicated for element 1a above, all initial programs are state-accredited credentialing programs that, according to state team findings, meet all applicable state standards. Candidates in initial programs demonstrate their positive impact on P-12 student learning through the PACT (MS and SS), signature assessments (SPED), and other student teaching evaluations (all initial candidates). Data collected from the PACT, signature assignments, and field evaluations provide strong evidence that candidates are able to assess and analyze student learning, monitor student progress, and appropriately modify instruction to meet the needs of California's diverse student population.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Candidates in advanced credentialing programs all demonstrate their ability to positively impact student learning outcomes during clinical/field experiences. Candidates in other advanced programs for teachers all complete action research projects that require the application of research-based intervention strategies and clear evidence of the candidates' ability to produce positive student learning outcomes. Aggregated data from these assessments are contained in a variety of data management tools including Tableau, Task Stream, and Excel. Reviews of these data show that all candidates in advanced programs demonstrate their positive impact on P-12 student learning. Additional assessments such as course-embedded assessments, portfolio projects, and comprehensive exams provide reinforcing evidence of advanced candidates' breadth and depth of knowledge that equips them to employ a wide variety of effective

instructional strategies to help all students learn. Longitudinal data supports the institution’s assertion that advanced candidates routinely and competently assess student learning and use assessment data to inform practice.

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|----------|--|--|
| 1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals | | X | | |
| <p><i>Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:</i> Like initial programs, all advanced programs for other school professionals in the unit are state-accredited credentialing programs and all have been found to meet all applicable state standards by the state team. These programs include Educational Leadership, School Counseling, School Psychology, and Speech-Language Pathology. The Speech-Language Pathology program is also nationally accredited by ASHA. A review of assessment data for key assessments in each of these programs confirms the state’s findings that candidates in all of these programs demonstrate the acquisition of knowledge and skills associated with applicable state standards. Pass rates on license exams, where required, were 100 percent for all advanced programs for other school professionals. Exhibits also included curriculum and assessment matrices for each of these programs. The matrices align course curriculum and assessments with applicable standards. Key assessments for these programs include portfolios, field work reports by supervisory personnel, standardized tests with national norms, comprehensive exams, thesis/project reports, course projects/assignments with scoring rubrics, internships, self assessment surveys, exit surveys, and employee surveys. Data for these assessments are primarily maintained in Tableau, and a review of those data confirmed high levels of candidate achievement on all key assessments in all programs.</p> | | | | |
| 1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals | | X | | |
| <p><i>Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:</i> The state team’s findings included confirmation that all candidates in all advanced programs for other school professionals demonstrate their ability to create positive environments for student learning. Assessment data indicating candidate competence in this area include embedded assessments, portfolios, comprehensive exams, theses/projects, fieldwork and clinical evaluations by supervisory personnel, standardized tests with national norms, course assignments with scoring rubrics, internships, self assessment surveys, exit surveys, and employee surveys. Where state licensure exams are used, pass rates are consistently 100 percent. Collectively, data reviewed for these measures confirm a high level of candidate competence in creating positive learning environments, building on students’ developmental levels, and making effective use of information regarding student, family, and community contexts. Data and interviews with graduates indicate that candidates have a strong understanding of policy and the socio-cultural contexts in which they work.</p> | | | | |
| 1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
| 1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Advanced Preparation | | X | | |
| 1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates- Other School Professionals | | X | | |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit's integrated approach to assessing candidates' professional dispositions begins with evaluating applicants' professional dispositions through the review of letters of recommendation and letters of intent/written narratives. Assessment of professional dispositions continues throughout the program via both formal (at transition points) and informal assessments. Interviews with candidates and graduates of initial and advanced programs provide convincing evidence that all candidates embrace and demonstrate the professional dispositions reflected in the unit's conceptual framework, which clearly incorporate NCATE's expectations pertaining to fairness and the belief that all children can learn. This integration of dispositional assessment with a variety of key assessments in all programs is reflected in program documents such as handbooks, field evaluation forms, and confirmed in interviews with program faculty and program coordinators. The central tenets of the conceptual framework related to professional dispositions are well reflected in the unit's assessments and are consistently evident in interactions with candidates and graduates who are able to well articulate their professional dispositions and provide numerous examples of how they put them into practice in deep and meaningful ways.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

The demonstration of advanced candidates' professional dispositions parallels that for initial candidates though advanced candidates do demonstrate a deeper understanding of and value for research-based interventions and are clearly transitioning to the status of teacher-scholar.

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Evaluation of dispositions for other school professionals is deeply embedded throughout course assignments, assessments, and field and clinical experiences. Checklists are used in many programs at the entry transition point and during faculty meetings for the purpose of candidate evaluation. Assessment of dispositions also occurs as an integral part of evaluation of field, clinical, practicum, and internship experiences. Each program has evaluation instruments, and data from these assessments shows strong evidence of candidate dispositions.

Overall Assessment of the Standard:

All initial programs and the majority of advanced programs, including all programs for other school professionals, are state-accredited credentialing programs. During this visit, the state team has determined that all programs meet all applicable state standards, which collectively and comprehensively address all elements of NCATE Standard 1.

Initial candidates consistently demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical and professional knowledge, and associated skills required for teachers to ensure that all students can learn and to foster equity and fairness in their lessons and learning environments. Candidates effectively use assessment data and other resources to monitor student learning and learning styles, determine students' needs, and use the results of such evaluations to differentiate instruction appropriately. Initial candidates are deeply committed to the values of the unit and demonstrate these values in their practice through their work with students.

In summary, candidates in advanced programs for teachers and other school professionals know

and demonstrate high levels of content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, and pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, as well as the professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Candidates at these levels demonstrate strong understanding, respect, and commitment to working with students, families and communities. They emulate the teacher-scholar model so valued by this unit, consistently employing research-based best practices to create responsive and meaningful learning experiences for all students.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- AFIs corrected from last visit –

AFI Number & Text: 1.1

For the initial and advanced programs, there is unevenness in their assessment of candidate dispositions.

AFI Rationale: Both initial and advanced programs assess candidate professional dispositions related to the ideals of fairness and the belief that all students can learn at each transition point. Professional dispositions are aligned with state standards and the unit’s conceptual framework.

AFI Number & Text: 1.2

In the initial programs, there is unevenness among the multiple and single subject cohorts in their delivery of curriculum and instruction essential to development of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

AFI Rationale: In addition to administration of the PACT in the MS and SS programs, each ITP program has developed embedded signature assessments (ESAs) with agreed upon rubrics for all instructors to ensure continuity in delivery of curriculum and instruction.

AFI Number & Text: 1.3

In the initial and advanced programs, the availability of aggregated candidate performance data is limited, especially beyond the admissions level.

AFI Rationale: For both initial and advanced programs, aggregated candidate performance data for all transition points are available in Tableau (the institution’s data management system) and in program biennial reports and program assessment documents (state assessment reporting mechanisms).

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

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 1 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 1 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 1: Met

STANDARD 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

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

Yes No

| Element | Unacceptable | Acceptable | Target | N/A |
|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|------------|--------|-----|
| 2a. Assessment System – Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
| 2a. Assessment System – Advanced Preparation | | X | | |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit’s assessment system and assessment practices and priorities clearly reflect the eight basic tenets of the conceptual framework. Key features of the assessment system include: 1) identification of applicable state and national standards by each program, 2) the identification of key assessments at four transition points (program entry, en route, program completion, and in practice) to measure candidate learning outcomes aligned with those standards, 3) the aggregation and analysis of learning outcomes data, 4) including stakeholders in the application of assessment data to inform quality improvement, 5) evaluating the impact of implemented program changes on candidate learning outcomes, 6) assessing unit operations as well as program effectiveness, and 7) using information technologies to facilitate recording, access, analyzing, and presenting candidate learning outcome data. The assessment system also defines key types of data to be collected, analyzed, and applied for the improvement of programs and unit operations in each of three specific domains: candidate and graduate performance, faculty performance and productivity, and unit operations.

The unit fully engages the professional community in its ongoing assessment activities. In support of the state’s Learning to Teach Continuum (LTC), initial programs in partnership with the local school district have an outstanding, collaborative induction and mentoring structure in place for their graduates. An LTC standing committee includes unit and district representatives. Interviews with LTC members confirm that this committee is actively engaged in assessing the qualifications of program graduates, providing induction support for program graduates, and assisting the unit in identifying opportunities for program quality improvement. Based on new teacher performance, unit faculty members provide targeted professional development opportunities for the district. Similarly, district personnel and program graduates also support the preparation of candidates. For example, when the district identified a need for more expertise in a specific technology application, the unit invited a graduate highly skilled in that application to conduct an on campus training session for current candidates. Program graduates confirm and highly praise unit faculty engagement in this process.

At the program level, each initial program has identified key assessments at the four identified

transition points. Multiple assessments are used at each point. These key assessments are carefully aligned with applicable state and unit standards, including professional dispositions. Multiple and single subject credentialing programs have identified embedded signature assessments aligned with the state’s Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE), California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), and California Program Standards. All initial programs conduct student teaching observations (STO) and student teaching evaluations (STE) also aligned with these standards. Candidates in multiple and single subject credentialing programs must also pass state’s Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT).

A formal process is in place to ensure the accuracy and consistency of PACT assessments in the unit. Faculty members are trained to conduct this evaluation, multiple scoring is required on a sampling basis, and there is a formal process for recalibration training if needed. Rubrics are in place for the grading of other key assessments to help ensure accuracy and consistency in grading. Some of those rubrics consist only of criteria to be assessed and a Likert scale rating system without performance descriptors for the criteria at each level. Multiple raters are used for some key assessments (e.g., student teaching evaluations), but the unit is not able to provide any evidence of consistency or accuracy in the use of such rubrics for some key assessments tools.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Overall, the unit’s assessment system reflects the same features and functions for advanced/OSP programs as for initial programs. A number of the unit’s advanced programs are also state accredited credentialing programs. Key assessments in these programs are typically aligned with CSTP and applicable California Program Standards. Basic tenets of the conceptual framework and candidates’ professional dispositions are incorporated into key assessments. Advanced programs for teachers that are not state accredited are aligned with CSTP. Programs for other school professionals also incorporate national specialized professional association standards into their curriculum and assessments. Multiple assessments are used at key transition points. Many rubrics for key assessments are well designed with clear performance descriptors for every criterion at each performance level. As in the case of initial programs, however, some rubrics consist only of the criteria to be assessed and a Likert scale rating system without performance descriptors for the criteria at each level. The unit is not able to provide any evidence of consistency or accuracy in the use of these assessment tools.

Some advanced programs are relatively new and do not yet have any program completers. These programs have established appropriate program exit assessments and have plans in place to collect alumni and employer data for program graduates.

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

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit uses a variety of tools to ensure that initial programs admit qualified applicants. These include GPA in undergraduate programs, passing the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) passing the applicable California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET) or

completion of state-approved content programs, letters of recommendation, completion of early field experiences, and letters of intent/written narratives by applicants. The letters of intent and letters of recommendation are reviewed by program faculty and are used, in part, to conduct an evaluation of applicants' professional dispositions. Program entry data such as CBEST, CSET, and GPA data are maintained in Tableau. Letters of recommendation and written narratives are maintained by programs.

Key assessments have been identified by all programs for en route and program exit transition points. These include embedded signature assessments (ESA), formative and summative student teaching assessments, applicable state certification examinations, the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), and PACT-associated Content Area Tasks (CAT) for multiple subject programs. Data for these key assessments are regularly collected and maintained in the unit's data warehouse using Tableau.

Statewide surveys are conducted by the California State University system to collect data on graduates' competence. The state provides the unit with its disaggregated data, and these data are maintained in Tableau. The unit also conducts one-year-out surveys of program graduates. Additionally, the unit has a formal, collaborative induction and mentoring program in place with the local school district based on the state's Learning to Teach Continuum (LTC). This system supports graduates from multiple and single subject programs and provides direct feedback to the unit on graduates' performance during their first two years of teaching. Although this formal induction system does not yet include graduates from special education credentialing programs, interviews with special education faculty and graduates from these programs confirm that equally effective induction and mentoring support is provided for these graduates, and that feedback to the unit from this informal system is equally effective in helping to inform program quality improvement initiatives.

The unit produces a variety of periodic reports based on candidate assessment data. The state requires program assessment documents and biennial reports from all state-accredited programs, which includes all initial programs in the unit. In addition, the university requires every department to compile and submit an annual assessment report based on student (candidate) learning outcomes correlated to national or state standards. These university reports are reviewed at multiple levels, and this process is designed expressly to support the continuous quality improvement of academic programs. Exhibits included applicable reports for all initial programs. Additionally, all faculty and administrators have direct access to Tableau and are able to request and receive tailored assessment data reports in real time.

Tableau, the unit's primary data system, can disaggregate data based on a wide variety of variables including department, program, location, timeframe, gender, and ethnicity. All users have the ability to generate such disaggregated data. Interviews with administrators and faculty members reveal that the extent to which these abilities to disaggregate data are utilized varies by program.

Data on formal candidate complaints are maintained in several formats. Statistical data regarding the number of complaints by academic year and category (advising, facilities, grades, etc.) are maintained in Tableau. For privacy purposes, more detailed information regarding the

specifics of each complaint and its resolution are maintained by the Assistant Dean of Student Affairs and in a protected Access database.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Advanced/OSP programs also use a variety of tools to ensure the qualifications of admitted candidates. These include GRE scores, undergraduate GPA, letters of recommendation, employer recommendations, professional experience, and letters of intent/written narratives from applicants. Program faculty reviews letters of intent and letters of recommendation in the same manner as for initial programs.

Key assessments have been identified by all programs for their en route and program exit transition points. Key course-based en route assessments in advanced programs are analogous to the embedded signature assessments (ESA) in initial programs. A variety of assessments are also used at program exit. While these vary by program, all programs use multiple assessments at all transition points, including program exit. Commonly used assessments at program exit include program portfolios, research projects/reports, and comprehensive exams. Some, but not all advanced programs maintain their assessment data in Tableau. Exceptions are: data for the M.A. in Education (concentration in special education) are partially housed in Tableau; data for the M.A. programs in Math Education K-8, Reading, and Curriculum & Instruction are maintained in Task Stream(a commercially available, Web based e-portfolio, assessment, and reporting software application); Educational Leadership program data are maintained in Tableau and Task Stream; and School Psychology and Speech-Language Pathology programs maintain their data in Excel spreadsheets. Finally, data for the relatively new M.A. in Teaching (all concentrations) are still being manually maintained.

Exit surveys are administered to all advanced program completers. The unit also recently piloted one-year-out surveys of advanced program graduates. Interviews with graduates of advanced credentialing programs confirm an active and effective albeit informal mentoring and induction program similar to that identified by graduates of initial programs in special education.

All advanced programs produce one or more of the same reports cited for initial programs. State-approved credentialing programs produce assessment documents and biennial reports. All advanced programs produce annual university assessment reports. These reports are reviewed and utilized in the same manner as for initial programs. Exhibits include applicable reports for all advanced programs. For programs fully or partially utilizing Tableau, faculty and administrators have direct access to Tableau and are able to request and receive tailored assessment data reports for available data in real time. As in the case of initial programs, interviews with administrators and faculty members reveal that the utilization of Tableau reporting and data display capabilities varies by program. Maintenance of data on formal candidate complaints is identical to the process reported for initial programs.

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|----------|--|--|
| 2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement – Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
| 2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement – Advanced Preparation | | X | | |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Interviews and informal discussions with administrators at all levels, program faculty, staff, advisory groups that include district personnel, candidates, graduates, and employers consistently confirm a culture of assessment and commitment to continuous improvement that prevails throughout the unit and extends into the local school district through collaborative partnerships. Numerous examples strongly affirmed the unit's commitment to quality improvement. Stakeholder involvement in evaluating current candidates and program graduates and in helping to identify opportunities for improving courses, programs, and clinical experiences is also clearly evident. One example for initial programs is the use of triad meetings of clinical faculty, supervising teachers, and principals to evaluate student teachers' performance and progress.

A wide variety of structures and processes are in place to review and analyze assessment data and identify opportunities for program and unit quality improvement. Annual assessment reports are prepared by all programs. These reports, which provide summary assessment data and describe program level quality improvement initiatives, are reviewed by department heads, the director of assessment, associate deans, the dean, and a university wide assessment committee. Program assessment documents and biennial reports for all initial programs also reflect assessment data and implemented or planned program quality improvements. Department chairs meet twice monthly. Meeting minutes and interviews with department chairs confirm that these meetings routinely include discussions about candidate assessment data and collaborative planning for quality improvement. The dean's leadership team also meets twice monthly with a similar agenda. This group also looks at a wide variety of unit level data including aggregated candidate assessment data, faculty productivity data, budget issues, etc., and identifies potential improvements to unit operations. Evidence also includes records from a variety of ad hoc meetings focusing specifically on assessment or including assessment topics in their agendas. Examples include a department chairs' mini-retreat held in November 2006 and a department chairs' assessment workshop held in May 2007. Records from the mini-retreat show data analysis used to evaluate the efficacy of programs and refine department and college goals and priorities. Records from the May 2007 meeting reveal an agenda totally devoted to refining the units assessment activities, objectives, and outcomes at all levels. There is also ample evidence of the dean's commitment to and active engagement in assessment for continuous quality improvement. Examples include analytical records from a 2007 dean's accountability survey and the recent (Jan 2009) publication of an improvement and accountability plan for the entire unit.

As previously discussed, faculty have ample access to candidate assessment data. Candidates and graduates also consistently report that they receive regular and rich feedback, which significantly enhances their professional growth during their programs.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The use of data to improve programs and unit operations for advanced program is virtually identical to that for initial programs. One noteworthy example of stakeholder involvement in evaluating current advanced program candidates is the inclusion of district administrators on the grading panels for comprehensive examinations in educational leadership programs. Another noteworthy example of faculty members' commitment to continuous improvement was the observation by recent graduates of several advanced programs who were convinced they

experienced improvements in faculty instruction during their programs that were directly related to comments and suggestions they had made in their end-of-course evaluations of instruction submitted earlier in their programs.

Overall Assessment of the Standard:

The unit has an assessment system in place that reflects their conceptual framework; applicable institutional, state, and national standards; and professional dispositions. Multiple key assessments have been identified for program entry, mid-program, program exit, and post-graduation transition points for all programs. These key assessments provide a comprehensive and effective means to monitor and support candidates' progress through their programs and to ensure that they achieve all target learning outcomes aligned with applicable standards. The professional community is highly engaged with the unit's assessment activities through collaborative partnerships including an outstanding jointly managed induction and mentoring system for new teachers during their first two years of practice. A variety of systems and processes are also in place to ensure that assessment data are regularly collected, reviewed, analyzed, and used to help identify opportunities to improve programs and unit operations. Numerous exhibits and interviews with administrators, program coordinators, program faculty, candidates, graduates, community partners, and advisory groups all provided compelling evidence that the unit embraces assessment and continuous quality improvement. During interviews, candidates expressed high praise for individualized support they receive from faculty during their program. Graduates echo this feedback and further state that support from faculty continues after graduation even in programs where formal induction systems are not in place. Assessment data are maintained and managed using a variety of technologies including Tableau, Task Stream, Excel, and Access. Faculty and administrators have easy access to candidate assessment data. A culture of assessment is evident throughout the unit. Faculty and administrators embrace the use of assessment data to improve candidate learning outcomes, program quality, and unit operations. Candidates clearly see and appreciate this culture and feel that they, too, play an active role in this process. The end result of the unit's commitment to assessment and continuous improvement is the unit's ability to consistently produce highly qualified professional educators while continuing to raise the bar to even greater heights.

Strengths: The unit systematically analyzes candidate assessment data and data from graduates, faculty, and members of the professional community; identifies opportunities for program quality improvements based on that analysis, implements changes in response to those perceived opportunities, and collects follow-up data to evaluate the efficacy of implemented changes thus "closing the loop" of their continuous quality improvement cycle. The formal induction and mentoring program conducted in a collaborative partnership with the local school district extends this continuous improvement cycle into the first two years of program completers' practice. This expands the unit's ability to monitor the effectiveness of implemented changes thus strengthening the relationship of performance assessments to candidate success during their time in the program and during their early years of practice.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- AFIs corrected from last visit –

AFI Number & Text: 2.1

Program assessment systems are not aligned with the unit's conceptual framework.

AFI Rationale: The unit now has a single, unit-wide conceptual framework. The basic tenets of this conceptual framework, which define unit standards and the professional dispositions valued by the unit are consistently and effectively integrated into curriculum, instruction, and assessment in all programs in the unit. Interviews with candidates and graduates show that they understand and highly value the basic tenets of the unit's conceptual framework including diversity, social justice, and research-based effective practice.

- AFIs continued from last visit – None

- New AFIs –

AFI Number & Text: 2.1. The unit has not implemented procedures to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency in the assessment of candidate performance for all key assessments.

AFI Rationale: For many key assessments, rubrics consist solely of a list of criteria to be evaluated using a four or five level Likert-type scale without descriptors for each designation, and no processes are in place to check accuracy, consistency, and fairness in the use of these rubrics.

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 2 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 2 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 2: 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 professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

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

Yes No

| Element | Unacceptable | Acceptable | Target | N/A |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|------------|--------|-----|
| 3a. Collaboration between Unit & School Partners – Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
| 3a. Collaboration between Unit & School Partners – Advanced Preparation | | X | | |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The programs in the unit have strong partnerships with school districts in the region served by the university. One partnership in the School of Teacher Education uses a site-based model of teacher preparation involving blocks where cohorts of candidates work with a block leader who partners with one or more school districts. The unit has established a structure of advisory committees within each program to offer feedback and suggestions to the unit and holds regular meetings to assist with the design, delivery, and evaluation of field and clinical experiences. Membership on the committees includes representation from all programs as well as candidates and school partners. Evidence and interviews indicate that these relationships continue as the unit works to implement the conceptual framework into all program areas.

Field supervisors work with school partners to coordinate field placements and internships for candidates in initial programs. Each program has specific requirements, some of which include working with diverse students and working with qualified cooperating teachers or other school professionals. Faculty also work with districts on committees, in evaluation and research, curriculum development, and professional development to provide additional learning experiences for candidates and other professionals.

A review of program handbooks and interviews verified that candidates are placed in field experience and clinical practice according to the selection criteria and qualifications for cooperating teachers. Candidates indicate that they are supervised daily by the cooperating teacher, receive at least five visits from the university supervisor, receive both formal and informal feedback and have many opportunities to engage in self-reflection and self-evaluation activities.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Advanced program practicum and clinical experiences are designed and coordinated by each graduate program area in collaboration with leaders from school partners and the site supervisors. Supervisors monitor field experiences in order to ensure that candidates develop

and demonstrate skills, knowledge, and dispositions in each program. Masters candidates who are practicing teachers in local districts work with graduate faculty in the college to design and implement action research projects that best align with field experiences. In some programs, the clinical experience, supervision and evaluation can vary according to the specifics of placement and activity. Most graduates complete the clinical experience in the district of their employment. Course syllabi and portfolios indicate that evaluation is reflective and ongoing.

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

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:
 Candidates are required to complete early field experiences before entering credential programs. Prior to student teaching (clinical practice), initial candidates are evaluated on the entry level requirements of the unit. Clinical practice feedback and evaluations are ongoing and the exit criteria are completed by the site supervisor/cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. The team confirmed that transition points exist for both initial and advanced programs; and that they vary based on professional and state standards.

Review of handbooks and interviews with candidates and cooperating teachers confirm that field experiences for initial candidates are developmental. The unit provides criteria and responsibilities in handbooks that address the stages of field experience so that the goals and outcomes are understood by all partners. Documentation provided by the unit confirmed that field experience and clinical practice are aligned with the unit’s conceptual framework, state and professional standards. All programs meet unit and state requirements for field and clinical experiences. Interviews confirmed that candidates use a variety of technologies throughout their programs along with modeling by faculty in their coursework.

The university supervisors work with district leaders to ensure that criteria for selecting cooperating teachers are followed. Expectations for supervisors at both the initial and advanced level are clearly delineated in the faculty handbook. Criteria for selecting cooperating teachers are consistently reviewed and monitored by district and university personnel. The Student Teaching Handbook includes guidelines and information for the cooperating teachers, unit supervisors and principals. Based on interviews, cooperating teachers indicate adherence to unit guidelines.

The unit uses trainings or orientations, email and direct contact to ensure cooperating teachers are aware of changes to the assessment system as well as any adjustments to program expectations. Interviews and data verified that communication is regular and continuous. Candidates related numerous instances of faculty support with issues and challenges that they face in the field. In some cases, this communication is still taking place after graduation.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Candidates in advanced programs and programs for other school professionals demonstrate a deeper understanding of the competencies required for initial candidates through coursework and cumulative portfolios. The use of technology as an instructional and assessment tool, as well as research and communication are demonstrated throughout the field experience and clinical practice in a variety of ways based on the requirements of the program. Candidates also show a commitment to working with students, families and communities from diverse backgrounds.

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

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:
 By the time initial general education candidates enter the student teaching experience, they have been assessed on the conceptual framework, state, professional Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) and program standards through coursework, field experiences, lesson plans, and a professional portfolio. The portfolio includes embedded signature assessments (ESA) reflecting multiple experiences in personal and professional growth and development. Ongoing classroom observations from university supervisors with opportunity for a post reflective conference provide support for candidates during their student teaching. Informal and formal student teacher evaluations are completed by cooperating teachers and university supervisors. At least twice a semester formative evaluations are shared in a three-way conference that involves the university supervisor, the cooperating teacher and the candidate. A district administrator is sometimes involved in summative evaluations. The current evaluation form is aligned with the conceptual framework and TPEs. Program areas provide their own requirements to this basic evaluation form.

Opportunities for reflection and feedback are provided throughout the clinical experience for candidates in the initial teaching programs. Midpoint and final evaluation reports help student teachers to reflect on their progress in areas of competency as assessed by the program.

Across programs candidates indicate being well prepared to meet the needs of their students and comfortable with students and parents in diverse settings. Placement in field experiences involves collaboration between the unit coordinators and the school partners to ensure that all candidates have experience working with students from diverse settings.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:
 In advanced programs, candidates are assessed on all the standards for knowledge, skills and dispositions. They are given feedback and support by university supervisors to increase proficiency. For example, support is provided to keep an ongoing log of interactions with a

student and to complete a case study and an academic history for the assigned child. Candidates use reflective journals, daily logs and observation instruments to document opportunities and experiences. Programs center on conducting research and curriculum projects that focus on improving candidate practices and student learning, including students from diverse backgrounds.

Overall Assessment of the Standard:

The unit and education partners have actively collaborated to design, implement, and evaluate field experience and clinical practice for initial and advanced candidates. With dedication and commitment the unit and its P-12 partners have focused on desired outcomes to prepare initial and advanced candidates to engage all students in meaningful learning experiences. Field experiences and clinical practices are supervised by qualified educators and university supervisors, take place in a variety of diverse settings, and produce proficient candidates who can reach and teach all students in the classroom setting.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- AFIs corrected from last visit –
The unit has developed and implemented specific criteria for cooperating teachers. Based on the IR, interviews with district principals and site supervisors and faculty, the criteria is continually monitored throughout the field experience by district and university personnel who work with candidates to ensure that they are receiving quality support and mentoring to meet the needs of students.

- AFIs continued from last visit – None

- New AFIs - None

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 3 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 3 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 3: Met

STANDARD 4. Diversity

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

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

Yes No

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

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

As guided by the unit’s mission and beliefs, each program articulates its own specific mission statement and desired proficiencies both with elements addressing issues of diversity. Individual program areas are designed with curricula, field experiences, and assessments aligned to these proficiencies. In the School of Teacher Education, candidates are trained in a model of culturally responsive teaching which “values and integrates the language, culture, and social context of the students into the school curricula giving equal status to the home, community, and school experiences.” Initial credential candidates are expected to successfully complete a course in multiculturalism as a prerequisite to entering any of the Unit’s programs of study. Based on a review of the syllabi, there are required courses with embedded signature assessments (ESA) and other assessments carefully integrated into each program which afford candidates an opportunity to explore such topics as: communicating in ways that demonstrate sensitivity and respect to students and their families from different ethnic, sexual orientation, religious, and linguistic groups; exploring one’s own culture as a framework for understanding other cultures; and adapting instruction for English learners in special education classrooms. A cohort model based on partnerships at school districts with a high degree of diversity is used in multiple subject (MS) and single subject (SS) credential programs for in-depth field experience in learning to develop, adapt, and evaluate lessons connected with students’ experiences and cultures. In the cohort model candidates have the opportunity to regularly interact with families representing a diverse demographic and to work with experienced guide-teachers to set up classrooms that value fairness and the belief in the potential for all students to be successful. Special education candidates experience a supervised practicum every semester focused on teaching students who have an area of exceptionality and who are from diverse backgrounds (particularly English learners). Policy Studies in Language and Cross-Cultural Education (PLC) [BCLAD] candidates have in-depth culture study integrated into their entire program. Data from ESA and course

performance, post-graduation evaluations and candidate portfolios are used to provide initial candidates regular feedback on improving their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The advanced credential programs use the same mission statement, philosophy, and dispositions as the initial credential programs, but expect the candidates to have deeper and broader knowledge bases and experiences. Some of these programs articulate proficiencies related to diversity very specifically. Examples include Reading, (training “reflective practitioners capable of working collaboratively in diverse P-12 multicultural and multilingual settings”), Educational Leadership (the belief that “administrators must be prepared to work with diverse students, staff, parents, and communities”), and School Counseling (train graduate students “who are capable of assessing, developing, implementing, and sustaining programs for youth from diverse backgrounds...”). A survey of course syllabi for advanced and other school professional candidates revealed designs to require a more in-depth investigation of teaching and learning practices situated in a strong philosophical base that is proven to effectively benefit diverse learners. SPED 600 requires candidates to analyze a classroom for special needs adaptations and modification. In TE639 candidates learn and apply research and theories of literacy, instructional methods, and assessment for all learners. TE 677 leads the candidates through an action research project in topics connected to diverse learners. The Educational Leadership Ed.D. P-12 program in has course ED 840 which is a seminar in Leadership for a Diverse Society. The syllabus for School Counseling course CSP 622 has candidates analyzing data and conducting a fieldwork case study on students from diverse backgrounds. In interviews with advanced and other school professional candidates the graduates confirmed that they felt well-prepared to look at curriculum from many different perspectives; to incorporate into a school’s climate the dispositions of fairness, equity, and social justice: and to promote an all encompassing valuing of diversity. Faculty and staff have analyzed the data from one-year-post graduates concerning topics of diversity and found, for example, that candidates from MS/SS programs felt less prepared to support students with special needs while candidates from special education felt less prepared to work with English learners. The unit has collaborated to develop an Improvement and Accountability Plan in which there are delineated incremental action steps (including changes to specific courses) to address these concerns of graduates.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|----------|--|--|
| 4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
| 4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Advanced Preparation | | X | | |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Candidates in departments that offer initial and advanced credentials as well as departments offering credentials for other school professionals have opportunity to interact with professional education faculty both within and across units who exemplify a rich and wide diversity. A comparison of the institutional, unit, and community demographics showed that the unit’s faculty was more diverse than the Institution and community. Candidates have opportunity to interact with professional faculty who are diverse in age, cultural heritage, ability, gender, sexual orientation, and language. They are also able to interact with a diverse P-12 faculty as they do their field experiences and internships. Although this P-12 faculty is predominantly white or

Latino and female, various other ethnic groups are represented.

To bring additional experiences with diversity to their candidates, departments host guest speakers from groups such as: Gay, Bisexual, Lesbian, Transgendered (GBLT) campus organization, speakers of various languages, and persons with various types of disability. Several of the departments offer opportunities to work, serve, or study internationally. The Department of Counseling and School Psychology has offered opportunities to work in Mexico; the Special Education Department sponsors exchange programs in Australia; and BCLAD candidates in the Department of Policy Studies in Language and Cross Cultural Studies can take classes in Mexico or Spain. Faculty vitae, syllabi, publications, grants, presentations, and projects demonstrate the exceptional knowledge about and sensitivity to issues of diversity that they can share with candidates. Recent publications by the faculty include: *New Horizons in Multicultural Counseling, Language Learners in the English Classroom*. Research by the unit's faculty has been included in *Journal of Adolescent Literacy, the Reading Teacher, TESOL Quarterly, and Multicultural Education*. There is a conscious effort by the unit to recruit and retain a diverse faculty. The various departments recruit by posting in a wide variety of publications, explicitly specifying multicultural criteria on job notices, browsing websites and publications, and using the wide range of contacts throughout the P-12 system.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

While the advanced candidates have a more diverse faculty (49 percent other than White non-Hispanic), the initial candidates have 30 percent of their faculty from diverse categories other than White, non-Hispanic. The initial candidates have faculty who are 79 percent female and 21 percent male while the advanced candidates have faculty who are 60 percent female and 40 percent male.

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

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Candidates from across the unit regularly engage in professional activities with a widely diverse peer group in classes, small group projects, cohort work in local school districts, service projects, conference presentations, and seminars. In interviews with both initial and advanced candidates the mention of diversity and its place in the institution, and specifically the unit, brought a wave of positive response. Candidates feel that they are encouraged to explore their own place on the diversity continuum, and then to celebrate that unique place while using it to bring perspective to their class work, discussions, assessments, and field work. Candidates are especially encouraged to use their knowledge of their own cultural heritage to develop plans for responding to students and their families in ways that display the dispositions of fairness and sensitivity. According to unit demographic data, most of the candidates as of fall 2008 were either White (48.9 percent initial and 44.9 percent advanced) or Hispanic (26 percent for both initial and advanced). There are also American Indian, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander. Candidates who work within cohort models do most of their course and field work in groups and on-site in schools where there is diverse P-12 population. Candidates who engage in clinical practice

models for their credential bring their own culture and the cultural understandings gleaned from their faculty and peers to the clinical setting as they work in diverse communities with clients who have a wide range of languages, religions, ethnicities, cultures, and values. According to graduates, the faculty work to make assignments in clinical experiences related to the candidate's needs in professional growth. Candidates across all programs complete reflective activities that focus on some aspect of their program and how diversity impacts what they do as professionals. Candidates are assessed both formatively and summatively and the results used to strengthen the academic rigor of the courses.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Because the diversity of the candidate population is represented nearly equally at the initial and advanced level, candidates' opportunity to work with a diverse peer group is the same for initial and advanced levels. See the detailed response in the *Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation*.

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|----------|--|
| 4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools | | | X | |
| 4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Advanced Preparation | | | X | |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Teacher education and special education candidates are required to teach at culturally diverse schools a minimum of one semester. Many of the programs use the cohort model with one of the exceptions being Special Education since there is not a high enough concentration of students with special needs in any one particular area to accommodate a cohort of candidates who need field experience. Policy Studies (BCLAD) candidates do their assigned field experience in school with a high concentration of students who speak Spanish, but who are from widely diverse cultural backgrounds. Many of the cohorts are designed to function with diversity as a focus. Candidates for the initial credential typically use this model as most advanced credential candidates are already employed. Multiple Subject and Single Subject candidates use the PACT assessment system which contains a component in which candidates prepare a lesson for all students including English language learners and students with special needs. They implement the lesson, record it on camera and reflect on the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that were used in the teaching event. Special Education uses a similar system for its candidates. Mild to moderate candidates have one semester of Response to Intervention model field work in a middle school that is widely diverse in terms of culture and language. Pupil Personnel Services, Reading, School Counseling, School Psychology, and Educational Leadership all require very definite field experiences in settings with a high degree of diversity. In all of the programs there are specific reflection criteria for candidates after supervisors have given feedback as indicated in the syllabi. Some of the unit's candidates serve as advisors in Compact for Success, a college preparatory program mentoring students in partnership with a local high school district with a large Latino population (over 70 percent). Compact for Success provides a gateway to admission into the Institution for students going through its program. There is counseling, advisement, tutoring, for students and connection with resources, informational seminars, and advisement for families throughout the middle school and high school years. Recently the

program has started in the sixth grade. A summer bridge program was offered in 2009 to assist candidates with the transition from High school into the university. In the Department of Educational Leadership, students, faculty, doctoral candidates, and credential candidates participate in a privately endowed national research and development program called the National Center for Urban School Transformation. This program studies, analyzes, celebrates and disseminates information about best practices for serving students in specifically underachieving groups in urban school districts.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Candidates from all programs—initial and advanced teaching and other school professionals—work with highly diverse P-12 student populations in both the San Diego and Imperial Valley areas. See the detailed response in the *Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation*.

Overall Assessment of the Standard:

The unit’s conceptual framework provides a clearly articulated structure of proficiencies that place a high value on diversity and that are anchored in a solid theoretical and practical knowledge base - from the foundation of the institution’s mission to “impart an appreciation and broad understanding of human experience extending to diverse cultural legacies,” to the unit’s beliefs that include “respect for individual uniqueness, ability to learn, and effective practices for all learners.” Two of the unit’s six key knowledge and skill proficiencies (providing effective services and collaborating in culturally sensitive ways) directly address diversity along with the corresponding candidate dispositions (fairness, caring, belief that all individuals can learn, as well as collaboration, partnering, and forming effective relationships across diverse individuals). Across all programs both curriculum and experiences are designed, implemented and evaluated based on concepts of diversity in ethnicity, race, gender, socioeconomic status, exceptionalities, language, religion, and sexual orientation. During the last six years the aggregate assessment outcomes across various programs indicate that candidates can consistently demonstrate and apply these proficiencies. A review of the syllabi, feedback data, portfolios, and face-to-face interviews revealed that candidates for initial, advanced, and other school professional credentials are provided purposefully crafted and regularly evaluated experiences in working with diverse populations in institutional and P-12 school faculty, other credential candidates, and students in P-12 schools.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

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

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 4 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 4 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 4: Met

STANDARD 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

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

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

Yes No

| Element | Unacceptable | Acceptable | Target | N/A |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|------------|--------|-----|
| 5a. Qualified Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
| 5a. Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation | | X | | |
| <p><i>Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):</i></p> <p>All tenured and tenure-track faculty members holding the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, as well as faculty who have retired and are still teaching part-time in the College of Education, have doctoral degrees. In addition, 29 percent of adjunct faculty members holding the rank of lecturer have doctoral degrees. The remaining lecturers are respected practitioners who hold an M.S. or Ed.S. degree and have considerable experience in P-12 schools. Faculty qualifications reported in the IR are based on a survey of faculty conducted in the fall of 2008 with a 98 percent return rate for tenured and tenure-track faculty and 90 percent return rate for lecturers. These data were confirmed by a review of curriculum vitae of professional education faculty and interviews with both college administrators and faculty.</p> <p>According to California state law, all teachers and related school personnel must be licensed in the P-12 field in which they teach or supervise. Therefore, all school faculty are licensed in the fields that they teach or supervise.</p> <p>Interviews with college level administrators verify the credentialed preparedness of faculty appointed in their colleges at the initial and advanced levels. Review of faculty curriculum vitae and interviews with program candidates and graduates indicate that all tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty have contemporary, relevant experience in their areas of expertise including work in public schools, community programs, as well as other professional settings.</p> | | | | |
| 5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
| 5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation | | X | | |
| <p><i>Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):</i></p> <p>Professional education faculty members have a thorough understanding of the content they teach</p> | | | | |

(100% with doctorates in the field) and integrate current knowledge in their instructional practice based on their scholarship and professional experience. Course syllabi are aligned with California Standards for the Teaching Profession and California Program Standards, consistent with national professional standards (i.e., NCTE, NCTM, NCSS, NASPE, NSTA, ASHA, CACREP, and NASP).

Faculty mentor candidates to apply research, theories, and current developments in their fields through action research and other scholarly activities that incorporate decisions on research methodology to answer relevant questions grounded in theory. Candidates are mentored through the entire process from theoretical framework, literature review, research design, data collection and analysis, presentation of results, and implications for future research.

San Diego State University was founded as a normal school over 100 years ago. The university’s original mission to prepare elementary teachers resonates in the unit’s vision and mission to prepare effective professionals. Two of the eight central tenets are beliefs in “access to a quality public education for all” and in the “central role that excellence in teaching plays.” Confirmation of these beliefs was expressed in interviews with faculty, candidates, graduates, and administrators who embrace the teacher-scholar model.

Faculty indicated multiple ways that candidates develop reflection (discussion boards, blogs, embedded signature assignments, auto-ethnography, and portfolios), critical thinking (analysis of video examples of classroom practice and teaching observations to examine instructional practices), problem solving (through action research and case studies), and professional dispositions (all children can learn, perspective of life-long learning, and modeling the use of democratic and cooperative classrooms).

A review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty, department chairs, and program coordinators revealed that numerous instructional strategies (problem-based learning and cooperative learning) are used with traditional and online classroom delivery (Blackboard and innovative podcasting assignments), while accommodating different learning styles and special needs of candidates.

From candidate evaluations of teaching effectiveness conducted during the fall semester of 2008, faculty received a mean score above 4.25 (rated on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being high) in each of the departments in the College of Education on items related to course organization, course value, and instructor characteristics. Faculty in the Division of Education at the Imperial Valley Campus received a mean score above 4 on the same items. Each year, through a competitive process, a number of faculty are provided stipends for course redesign based on candidate learning outcomes and teaching evaluations. Data are also used for program improvement.

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

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

San Diego State University is classified by the Carnegie Foundation as a Research University with high research activity. Tenured and tenure-track faculty throughout the university are expected to demonstrate a serious commitment to scholarship through refereed publications, paper presentations at meetings of learned societies, funded grants, awards, and honors. The College of Education’s vision and mission are to produce new knowledge and contribute to the knowledge base. One of the eight central tenets of the unit’s conceptual framework, a belief that “thoughtful scholarship is an efficient method for identifying effective practice,” guides the scholarly inquiry and products of the professional education faculty.

The proportion of tenured and tenure-track faculty demonstrating scholarly work between 2006 and 2009 follows: presentations at state, national, and international meetings (91%); presentations to local partners and organizations (69%); peer-reviewed publications including refereed journal articles, book chapters, and books (96%).

The proportion of lecturers demonstrating scholarly work between 2006 and 2009 follows: presentations at state and national meetings (23%); presentations to local partners and organizations (37%); professional publications (21%).

Seventy-five percent of tenured and tenure-track faculty and 22 percent of lecturers report that they worked on externally funded grants and contracts during the three academic years 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009 totaling almost \$33 million.

Consistent with the unit’s vision and mission to produce new knowledge and contribute to the knowledge base, the faculty fulfill another one of the eight central tenets, a belief that “the field of practice can be improved through the development and application of knowledge and use of strategic partnerships to facilitate positive change.” This belief guides the engagement of 33 percent of the tenured and tenure-track faculty and 7 percent of lecturers when they collaborate in research and practice with partners in the community. Particularly noteworthy programs highlighted by college and university level administrators include the City Heights Educational Collaborative, the National Center for Urban School Transformation, the SDSU Reading Clinic and Literacy Center, the Center for Community Counseling, and the Center for Research in Math and Science Education.

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

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):
 Consistent with the service mission expected of tenured and tenure-track faculty at San Diego State University, the unit’s vision and mission stress partnering with the field of practice to improve client outcomes and promote social justice. Two of the eight central tenets, a belief that “the diversity of San Diego/Imperial County region ... provides a rich venue for scholarship and reflective practice from which findings of state and national, if not international importance can be developed” and “the field of practice can be improved through ... the use of strategic partnerships to facilitate positive change” guide the service mission of the college, university,

and broader community.

At a major research university, scholarship informs service and the College of Education at San Diego State University demonstrates this in their service to schools and communities throughout the region. Strategic partnerships that are particularly noteworthy for their service component include the City Heights Educational Collaborative, the National Center for Urban School Transformation, the SDSU Reading Clinic and Literacy Center, the Center for Community Counseling, and the Center for Research in Math and Science Education.

A review of curriculum vitae of tenured and tenure-track faculty and lecturers indicates that the unit's professional faculty serve in elected positions representing constituents for the purpose of faculty governance and as appointed representatives on committees and councils at the college and university levels. The faculty also serve in elected and appointed positions with professional associations to ensure that teaching and research programs are cutting edge and innovative in the College of Education. Editorships and appointments to editorial boards reflect positively on the excellent reputation of the professional education faculty.

During interviews and informal discussions, candidates and graduates focused on the importance of continuing collaborations among the school-based fields of special education, school counseling, school psychology, and educational leadership in the College of Education and speech and language pathology, school nursing, and social work in the College of Health and Human Services. Candidates and graduates stress the importance and relevance of the international component of their programs and that support for these activities is often available through departmental externally funded grant activity in the College of Education.

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

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

A comprehensive evaluation system, specified by the California State University System, San Diego State University, and the College of Education, is functioning effectively to provide evaluations annually for tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty. Tenured professors are reviewed at least every five years. Tenure and promotion criteria state “excellence in teaching is the primary qualification for reappointment, tenure, and promotion; that continuous growth in research and scholarship is essential to teaching effectiveness; and participation in service is essential and expected of faculty.” For reappointment, tenure and promotion consideration, there are six levels of review including department faculty committee, department chair, college faculty committee, college dean, university faculty committee, and the provost for the president. The expectations and process are equivalent for the Imperial Valley Campus. For tenured faculty the college requires comprehensive review of teaching, research and service no less than once every five years by the department faculty committee and chair. Between 2007 and 2009 all faculty promotions or reappointments under consideration were approved with the exception of

one faculty member not appointed to Professor in 2008.

The College of Education requires candidate evaluations of teaching for every course taught during the probationary years prior to promotion and tenure for inclusion in the annual performance review process. For tenured faculty’s fifth year review, every course evaluation is submitted. Candidate evaluations are administered using an online instrument assuring candidate anonymity. In addition, other informal course evaluations may be used.

A faculty peer-review committee and the department chair review the teaching effectiveness of lecturers hired for more than one semester per year at least annually. Candidate evaluations of teaching effectiveness are included as well as other relevant course materials such as in-class observations and syllabi.

From candidate evaluations of teaching effectiveness conducted during the fall semester of 2008, faculty received a mean grand total score (averaged across all items) between 4.27 and 4.46 (rated on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being high) in the departments in the College of Education. Faculty on the Imperial Valley Campus received a mean grand score of 4.25 on the same items. Data are used for program improvement, course improvement, and faculty professional development.

Peer review of documents in the Performance Review provides input to modify teaching, to better meet candidate needs, and to gain insights on areas that may need improvement. Faculty members meet with department chairs to develop a plan to improve teaching, scholarship, or service as appropriate. When requested, either the dean or associate dean provides assistance in professional writing, research, and/or teaching.

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

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The College of Education created a new position, Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Research, to organize faculty professional development activities and to provide individual input regarding any aspect of the faculty member’s Performance Review. Following the retirement of the person in the newly created position, the dean and associate dean have assumed the responsibilities.

Due to the “central role that excellence in teaching plays” in the beliefs derived from the mission and vision of the unit, an instructional designer has been hired by the college to support faculty in development and implementation of hybrid and online courses. Since January 2007 she has worked with 60 faculty members.

Research is a high priority in the unit. To support newly appointed tenure-track faculty during their probationary period, they are provided with three units of research assigned time each semester through their fifth year or until they receive tenure. Tenured faculty may submit

proposals for competitive review by a college committee for three units of research assigned time for an academic year. The provost has committed permanent funding of \$200,000 for the allocation of research assigned time to enhance the research productivity of tenured faculty.

Numerous professional development opportunities and workshops are provided at the college level and at the university level. The University's Center for Teaching and Learning and other campus offices provide professional development opportunities related to teaching, scholarship, and technology. Proposals for internal research funding are competitively evaluated at the university level. In addition, a number of faculty members are provided stipends for course redesign based on candidate learning outcome assessment data and candidate evaluations of teaching effectiveness through a competitive process. Over 95 percent of tenured and tenure-track faculty and 57.5 percent of lecturers have participated in professional development at the college or university level. Off-campus professional development activities including conference participation are supported by college travel funds.

Professional development activities on and off campus have provided opportunities for faculty to develop their knowledge and skills consonant with the conceptual framework and commitment to social justice while incorporating emerging technologies to make a difference in the lives of the clients and communities they serve.

Overall Assessment of the Standard:

Professional education faculty in the unit have doctorates or exceptional expertise and considerable experience in P-12 schools. By California law, all teachers and related school personnel must be licensed in the field they teach or supervise. Higher education clinical faculty are, or have been, licensed classroom teachers, administrators, school psychologists, or school counselors who continue their work in schools supervising student teachers and interns and providing professional development activities for school personnel.

Professional education faculty have a thorough understanding of the content they teach and integrate current knowledge in their instructional practice. Course syllabi are aligned with California Standards for the Teaching Profession, California Program Standards, and professional standards. Faculty mentor candidates to apply research, theories, and current developments in their fields through action research and other scholarly activities. Faculty provide numerous experiences for candidates to develop reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions. Faculty use traditional classroom techniques and online instruction to accommodate different learning styles and special needs of candidates. Candidate evaluations of teaching effectiveness are very positive.

Most professional education faculty demonstrate scholarly work in their fields. Between 2006 and 2008, tenured and tenure-track faculty presented papers at professional meetings (91%) and published refereed journal articles, books, and book chapters (96%). Lecturers presented papers at professional meetings (23%) and prepared professional publications (21%). Tenured and tenure-track faculty (75%) and lecturers (22%) worked on externally funded grants and contracts.

The unit has strategic partnerships with the City Heights Educational Collaborative, the National Center for Urban School Transformation, and the Center for Research in Math and Science Education to improve client outcomes and promote social justice. Faculty provide service to the college, university, community, region, and profession through committee memberships and journal editorial boards.

The college has a comprehensive evaluation system specified by the California State University System, San Diego State University, and college policy. Candidate evaluations of teaching are required for every course taught during the probationary years for tenure-track faculty. In the last four years, all tenure-track faculty submitting dossiers have been promoted and tenured. Evaluations of professional education faculty are used to improve teaching, scholarship and service. On and off campus opportunities are available at the university and college levels for faculty professional development in teaching, scholarship, and service.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

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

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 5 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 5 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 5: Met

STANDARD 6: Unit Governance and Resources

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

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

Yes No

| Element | Unacceptable | Acceptable | Target | N/A |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|------------|--------|-----|
| 6a. Unit Leadership & Authority – Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
| 6a. Unit Leadership & Authority – Advanced Preparation | | X | | |
| <p><i>Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):</i></p> <p>Under the direction of the dean, the unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources to support preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards within the conceptual framework of effective practice, at both the initial and advanced levels.</p> <p>The dean has responsibility for and authority over initial and advanced programs for teachers, programs for other school professionals in education (School Counseling and Psychology, Educational Leadership), and online programs (Educational Technology) offered by the college on the San Diego campus. The dean also has responsibility and authority over credential programs at IVC. The Dean of the College of Health and Human Services (HHS) has responsibility and authority over credential programs offered by schools in that college. The provost oversees the academic interests of both colleges.</p> <p>While primary responsibility resides in these two colleges, undergraduate preparation aligned to P-12 content standards and the integrated teacher credential program require participation and collaboration of departments and colleges across the university. Two university wide teacher preparation committees ensure communication and coordination.</p> <p>The college leadership team consists of the dean, associate dean, assistant dean, directors of Teacher Education (SDSU main and IVC campuses), department chairs, the doctoral program directors; director of assessment; and student services, budget, and data management staff. The leadership team meets twice monthly to manage and coordinate activities of the college.</p> <p>The Imperial Valley Campus is a branch campus of SDSU, with its own dean who oversees all programs at that campus. The chair of the Division of Education serves on the unit's leadership team in the same capacity as department chairs. A memorandum of understanding between the two campus deans supports systematic communication and collaboration of professional education faculty. Faculty members from both campuses collaboratively prepare credential</p> | | | | |

program documents for review and approval by the state, noting any differences between the San Diego and Imperial Valley campuses in implementation.

The Office of Student Services Coordinator, dean, associate dean, assistant dean, teacher education directors (SDSU main and IVC campuses), Special Education chair, Policy Studies chair, and Liberal Studies coordinator meet periodically to share information concerning recruitment strategies and basic programs, discuss program changes, determine strategies for disseminating information to prospective and current candidates, and review credential data. All college information for the university bulletin, as well as materials used for public information about programs is coordinated through these people for dissemination to potential candidates and other constituents.

The college Office of Student Services, department advisors, and university centers ensure access to advising and counseling. The staff in student services ensures that when candidates have grievances they are handled quickly and efficiently so that the grievance can be resolved to each party's satisfaction.

Consistent with the conceptual framework's emphasis on engagement with community partners, faculty members collaborate with P-12 practitioners and members of the broader community in program design, delivery, and evaluation through advisory committees, formal agreements, and cooperative activities. Advisory committees comprised of faculty, public school personnel, community leaders, alumni, and parents meet regularly to advise on curriculum issues, program quality, and cooperative arrangements. Policy File section V-B states that every degree or credential program "establish and regularly use an advisory committee composed of representatives of all significant client and professional communities with which program faculty must interact." The Dean's Advisory Board membership includes leaders of school, business, and community organizations and emeritus faculty. The dean consults on a regular basis with board members, who advise and confer regarding pertinent issues and strategies for promoting academic excellence and effective practice. The Governance Committee in Educational Leadership includes three P-12 superintendents and three community college administrators and meets three times per year on recruitment, admissions, learning outcomes, and evaluation.

The unit provides co-leadership to several strategic partnerships central to its conceptual framework. One example is the City Heights Educational Collaborative, a unique partnership between San Diego State University, San Diego Unified School District, San Diego Education Association, and Price Charities. SDSU assumed administrative and operational responsibility for the three schools that form the core of the collaborative—Rosa Parks Elementary, Monroe Clark Middle and Hoover High School—serving 5,000 students. The City Heights credential blocks (multiple and single subject) and school counseling program focus on multicultural awareness and involvement with parents and community.

The Teacher Preparation Program Advisors group meets twice yearly to share ongoing activities, discuss changes in credential requirements, review subject matter test results, exchange ideas about recruitment, and identify support needs. The dean takes to the Advisory Council any arising issues that require addressing at the dean's level. In addition, the director of the School of Teacher Education (or her designee) serves as a member of the advisory committee for Liberal

Studies.

The Colleges of Education and Science partner in supporting the Center for Research in Mathematics and Science Education, which facilitates collaboration between the two faculties on projects, colloquia, and programs related to learning mathematics and science. The College of Education provides six units of assigned time and a small budget each semester to support the center’s associate director and activities. Collaborative projects and programs associated with the center include a joint Ph.D. program with the University of California, San Diego in Mathematics and Science Education, Mathematics education courses, and the Professional Development Collaborative offer a Mathematics Specialist certificate to practicing teachers.

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------|--|----------|--|--|
| 6b. Unit Budget – Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
|------------------------------------------------------|--|----------|--|--|

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|--|----------|--|--|
| 6b. Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation | | X | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|--|----------|--|--|

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

California has experienced several budget declines in recent years, resulting in significant general fund reductions for all state institutions during these periods. The unit has experienced reductions, and expenditures and allocations have been adjusted to reflect the change in budget allocations. The 2008-09 allocation for the unit was \$16,285,130, down from the previous year, but in line with the budget of other units that require field experiences. Changes have been made in the number of students in classes (raised class enrollment) as well as in the number of students per faculty member for supervision purposes (however, this increase has not gone higher than the NCATE recommendation of 18:1).

Beginning with the 2007-08 fiscal year, the CSU began differentiating funding for candidates enrolled in graduate programs. A full time equivalent (FTE) graduate student is defined as enrolled in 12 units; for all other candidates, it is 15 units. Because colleges receive budget adjustments based on FTEs growth and decline, the redefining of FTES for graduate enrollment will benefit the College as masters and doctoral program enrollments increase.

Continuing the priority identified by faculty for research assigned time to support faculty scholarship, the unit used one-time funds to support assigned time for two years. In fall 2008, the provost approved \$200,000 in permanent funds to support faculty research assigned time.

Unit faculty continue to have discussions focused on how best to meet the challenges presented in tighter budget times, as they see programs downsized and enrollment capped. They continue to think creatively about how best to keep the quality of the services they provide to candidates as the financial and human resources decline.

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|--|----------|--|--|
| 6c. Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|--|----------|--|--|

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|--|----------|--|--|
| 6c. Personnel – Advanced Preparation | | X | | |
|---------------------------------------------|--|----------|--|--|

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

An area for improvement from the 2003 report stated “faculty loads and lack of unit resources limit the time available for research and professional development.” The college dean and

university provost have committed resources to balance faculty workloads to better support the unit's threefold mission. In addition to workload data reviewed as part of the visit, the quantity and quality of scholarly activities described in Standard 5 provide support for an adequate, though not ideal, level of unit resources. The current state fiscal crisis does threaten the availability of these resources.

Faculty workload in the CSU system is the negotiated outcome of the California Faculty Association and the system. By policy, full-time tenured and tenure track faculty members carry a workload of 15 weighted teaching units (WTUs) per semester. (WTUs are a function of course classification and enrollment). In the CSU system, 12 WTUs for instruction and 3 for instructionally related responsibilities (advising, curriculum development, and committee assignments) constitute this workload. Workload for full-time lecturers is 15 units of instruction. For tenured/tenure track faculty and lecturers, teaching, supervising student teachers, and supervising independent studies constitute instructional workload. The load assignment is sufficient to meet contract requirements as well as to allow time for teaching scholarship, and other requirements as indicated by NCATE.

The unit compensates high advising loads, dissertation advising, and research through units of assigned time, which count in the 12 remaining units of workload. Tenure track faculty members currently can receive three units of assigned time for research until the year of tenure application. Tenured faculty members may apply for research assigned time awarded competitively based on proposal quality. Faculty who supervise student teachers receive one unit of instruction for every two or three candidates supervised (depending on the program and not to exceed 18 candidates). Dissertation chairs receive three units of assigned time once for each doctoral candidate supervised. Committee members receive either a smaller number of units or stipends, depending on the program. Full time faculty teaching in the new independent Ed.D. program receive one unit of assigned time for professional development when teaching a three-unit doctoral course.

While the CSU system workload is determined by contract as 15 WTUs, tenured and tenure-track faculty members typically teach five to six units, including supervision. The remainder of their workload consists of assigned time for excess course enrollment, scholarship, involvement in schools, program coordination, candidate admissions and advising, demanding service activities, and instructional design and evaluation. Faculty teaching load also is reduced by buyout from externally funded projects and administrative assignments.

University curriculum policy recommends class size based on level and primary instructional strategies used (lecture, seminar, activity, lab). Class size ranges from 350 students for a large general education lecture course (supported by instructor assigned time for large enrollment and/or student assistants) to eight students for a doctoral seminar in the unit. Typically, face-to-face and online courses in the unit range from 20 to 40 students. Increases in minimum class size enrollments are occurring as the budget situation worsens.

Hiring of part-time faculty is very limited, but is purposeful, and the specializations of potential lecturers are matched to the department's instructional needs. Part-time faculty members serve or have served as master teachers or administrators for P-12 schools and are assigned by departments to teach specific clinical courses in their areas of specialization. Temporary faculty

are hired for the specific class or field experience using a specified hiring protocol and must meet the standards established by the department and by the university for their teaching positions. A permanent faculty member often receives units to coordinate and oversee lecturers teaching multiple-section courses required for basic credential courses.

Despite the fact that several positions have been eliminated or subsumed by other staff due to budget cuts, the unit has sufficient administrative staff to support programs offered. Additionally, the unit supports specific personnel whose roles enhance the effectiveness of faculty in their teaching and mentoring of candidates.

The university offers resources for faculty development including the Center for Teaching and Learning and Instructional Technology Services, both of which support teaching and learning, and the SDSU Research Foundation, which supports submission of proposals for external funding and post-award administration. The awarding of college travel funds is done through the Faculty Resource Allocation Committee, course redesign stipends and sabbaticals through the Professional Leave Committee, and small grants through the university Research Committee.

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--|----------|--|--|
| 6d. Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation | | X | | |
| 6d. Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation | | X | | |

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The 2003 report cited “lack of adequate office and work space” as an area for improvement. Since that report, several changes have taken place that address that issue.

The Business Administration and Mathematics building, now Education and Business Administration (EBA), was remodeled to accommodate the move of several groups from the Education Building. This included the Office of the Dean, School of Teacher Education, Department of Policy Studies in Language and Cross-Cultural Education, joint doctoral programs, and Office of Student Services. In preparing for the move, Academic Affairs applied a formula to determine the number of faculty offices to which the unit was entitled. As a result, the unit now has adequate office space, with faculty in office areas with their peers. Full time tenured and tenure-track faculty and lecturers occupy individual offices unless they requested to share offices with colleagues. The unit is housed primarily in EBA, North Education, and Education. The Department of Administration, Rehabilitation, and Post Secondary Education has its offices and classroom facilities in Mission Valley with the department’s Interwork Institute providing rehabilitation research and personnel preparation. Faculty and staff now both feel that there is adequate professional space provided for meeting, advising and professional work.

The unit's technology facilities permit faculty to model use of technology and candidates to practice its use for instructional purposes, with only scheduling as an issue. The majority of education classes are taught during the evening to accommodate teachers and other working candidates, placing pressure on the facilities during the evening hours. In June 2008, the university approved the addition of a new computer lab for the unit to address the specific need of research courses required by advanced programs. The unit now houses seven computer labs, which has eased the issue of limited computer lab space for students and classes. Unit faculty

teach in 32 classrooms of which 13 percent are “semi-smart” (laptop not included) and 78 percent are “fully smart.” At the Imperial Valley campus, both smart classrooms and smart carts are available to instructors who request their use. Candidates as well as faculty feel that both the space designated as technology space and the tech support provided by staff more than meet their ongoing needs.

Some cooperating public schools designate one classroom for use by SDSU teacher education programs. Because some of these rooms are solely for SDSU use, it has been possible to dedicate rooms to ongoing displays, curriculum materials, manipulatives, and reference resources for faculty based in these schools. Several on-site credential programs have access to computer facilities provided by the host school or by the host school in collaboration with SDSU. Because of strong collaborations with school district partners, the preliminary administrative services credential programs hold classes on site at district boardroom facilities. These facilities include technology support, kitchens, and executive conference tables and chairs. The Imperial County Office of Education also serves as a site for off-campus courses. For example, IVC uses the county office for EDTEC 470, Technologies for Teaching, because of the site’s technology resources. P-12 school classrooms in the Valley provide Internet access and projectors.

The City Heights Community Center, an 84,000 square-foot facility in the inner city, was purchased by the SDSU Research Foundation. It houses the City Heights project offices and innovative community programs including the National Center for Urban School Transformation, the Center for Community Counseling, and the Literacy Center. The latter supports the Community Reading Clinic, M.A. in Reading courses, and Reading Recovery courses.

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

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The College of Education now has what faculty consider a transparent budget process with each department’s and the dean’s office instructional and non-instructional budget targets provided to all chairs, directors, and to the Policy Council in advance of the fiscal year. The expectation is that all involved in the process manage their budgets within their budget targets. The goal is to ensure an adequate base for each department’s core programs and faculty, and then adjust for retirements and resignations, grants and contracts, new hires, sabbaticals, leaves, and special projects within the limits provided while looking forward to additional budget decreases. Data are increasingly available to all involved in the budget process. The dean, associate dean, and budget manager meet individually with each chair and doctoral program director several times a year to ensure that budget targets support candidates meeting standards in their fields of study. When necessary, the dean in collaboration with the provost, support significant changes in standards that require additional resources.

In fall 2009 the dean organized a faculty/staff “Futures Planning” process to engage the COE in proposing how each program can take the next step in implementing the conceptual framework’s focus on making a difference through evidence-based practice. The current fiscal crisis, while

unwelcome and uncomfortable, provides faculty the opportunity to rethink the college's structure, policies, processes, and programs to be proactive in making change.

The unit changed the part-time assessment coordinator position to a full-time director of assessment with management status, with a half-time student assistant. The unit also has a full-time programmer/analyst with a half-time student assistant who manages the unit's databases and data warehouse (Tableau). Additional support is provided in the form of assigned time or stipends to faculty members at the San Diego and IVC responsible for preparing program and assessment documents. The college and departments support assigned time for faculty members responsible for establishing electronic portfolios and data bases as methods for collecting assessment data.

The importance of using technology to improve learning environments is a major strand in the unit's conceptual framework. Advancing faculty and candidate use of technology is a major goal in allocating the unit's technology resources. Logs recording usage of technology labs support the claim that there is substantial availability for both students and faculty use. The unit now has three full-time technology consultants, a new 0.5 web designer, a data systems analyst, and an instructional designer, labs, and smart classrooms to support faculty and candidates. The unit collaborates with the university to provide a week-long summer workshop on course redesign (Course Re-Design Institute) with follow-up services over the summer.

The university provides a desktop or laptop to every new tenure-track or tenured faculty member and replaces computers on a rotating basis every three to four years. Each year the university solicits requests for instructional and non-instructional equipment and allocates resources for approved purchases. The college purchases equipment for faculty and staff off-cycle as needed, as well as licensing agreements allowing faculty free access to critical programs such as SPSS and Survey Monkey.

Library resources are also deemed sufficient and current for needs. Resources include over seven million books, over 700 public access computers, a 24-hour study area, and media center with multimedia computer workstations. It has received significant monies from the college or acquisition of materials (print, electronic, etc.) to support the new doctoral program; these acquisitions have also improved access for other programs supported by the college. The college and library collaborate to ensure that education collections are sufficient and current through close working relationships with the education librarian and other education staff. In 2002, the library added the first education librarian position to support reference, library instruction, and web resource development services for education.

At IVC, database access is exactly the same as for the SDSU main campus. Books are accessible through the Circuit, LINK+, and courier service to IVC for all items in the SDSU collection. The IVC librarian provides instructional and reference support for all disciplines.

Other technology resources are completely accessible to candidates on and off-campus and in distance learning programs. The college uses the university-provided Blackboard course management system that is supported 24/7 with a help line. Some college faculty also use an Adobe Connect system that is moving to 24/7 administration. Access to both the Blackboard and Connect systems are password protected to ensure candidate confidentiality and have adequate bandwidth for speed. Other resources used in distance education programs are also password protected, and use individual candidate accounts to access grades and other confidential

information. Additionally, teacher education faculty who are engaged in supervision of teacher candidates in field experiences are now able to use a program called eSupervision, developed by an education faculty member, to allow access to student teachers and others engaged in the supervision of teacher candidates out in the field. This program is housed on a dedicated server that allows both SDSU and site supervisors access to candidate work, discussions, lectures, etc., to alleviate some of the restrictions on time that have occurred as a result in changes of load for supervision.

Overall Assessment of the Standard:

Regardless of the fiscal climate, faculty, staff and administration are committed to ensuring that the educational experience of candidates is not compromised, and that all involved hold to the tenets put forth in the conceptual framework. The unit has provided for a clear system of governance that serves faculty, candidates and administrators well. It is this system that has aided faculty in meeting the challenges presented by the budget crisis, and has allowed them to feel some control in meeting the demands presented by budget cuts. The system also allows for good collaboration across disciplines, including those outside the college that contribute to the programs the unit delivers. This includes other SDSU units as well as those in the communities in which the unit works.

The structure and process in place for planning, delivering and evaluating programs is one of the strengths of this unit. Faculty speak very highly of the process through which curriculum changes are made, noting that it has become a process few faculty complain about because of the openness and support provided when proposing change or evaluating programs/curriculum. They also speak favorably of the assessment system; it still has kinks, but they feel confident that it will be a smooth process once everything is in place.

The climate that currently exists does promote a sense of professionalism and collegiality. The reconfiguration of office spaces as well as the location of faculty in like groups has promoted a better sense of belonging as well as a relationship with candidates that promotes the idea of teacher scholar as faculty now have better spaces in which to interact with teacher candidates and other program candidates. Load has been negotiated, and within the requirements of the contract (and as much as possible), faculty have been provided opportunities for load reassignment or changes in assignment as determined by course load, scholarship/research activity and supervisory responsibilities. Although the university has clear issues to resolve with enrollment related to budget, faculty have the ability to work within the governance structure to determine how best to deal with those issues as they present themselves. This includes time spent on-site working with professionals in the field as well as collaborations across campus.

Unit resources are also deemed adequate for faculty needs. New possibilities with technology and all that represents are presented in a way that faculty are able to use to their best potential, and this impacts how candidates perceive the use of technology in their programs and its potential in the field. Library resources have been well developed, with several programs benefiting from the acquisitions for the new doctoral program. Resources for those faculty based on-site are also adequate in terms of support from the university as well as the school site.

Strengths:

A particular strength of element 6a is that through the Policy Council the unit has created a governance structure that has become widely recognized throughout the unit as a very strong advocate for all faculty, students, and processes that are part of the unit. The council has taken on the role of helping guide the unit through the tasks associated with budget cuts, and has taken the lead on working creatively to develop solutions that will keep the conceptual framework intact while meeting the needs of a quickly declining budget. The rigor with which the members go about their business of governance as well as the respect they have for each other and that faculty throughout the unit have for those who are on the council is very apparent through conversations with faculty and others in the unit. This is supported by the fact that the dean has provided faculty with the opportunity to be a part of the process from the beginning, and has made the task of dealing with the budget a very transparent process.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- AFI corrected from last visit –
 - *Lack of coherence between the conceptual framework for each program and the unit's conceptual framework limits the ability of the unit to plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs of study.*
 - All conversations with those engaged in the process of provided coursework for teacher candidates, advanced program candidates and other school personnel program candidates were very clear in their articulation of the unit's conceptual framework and its relationship to their own program framework. Comments were made about how the framework reiterated what their own beliefs were and how they conducted their professional practice. All members of the unit (as well as in supporting programs) articulated well how they used the framework to guide their practice and how it supported the work they do in and out of classrooms. One group made very clear that the framework represented the best of what they all had as supporting tenets in their own programs; the unit framework had merely pulled it all together into a single identifiable concept that they all agreed represented their program philosophies.
 - *The College of Education lacks adequate office and work space and funds for supplies, materials, and software.*
 - Budget allocations have been made available that supported changes in office space and work space (remodeling building space), as well as creation of computer labs and software programs for compiling data and supporting coursework. Faculty indicated that they have no requests that have not been funded in terms of supplies, materials and software; in fact, they were clear that this support was very good.
 - *Faculty loads and lack of resources limit the time available for faculty research and limit professional development opportunities for faculty and staff.*
 - At both the initial and advanced level, faculty loads have been set based on contractual agreement as well as unit policy, as delineated by the policy council. This allows for faculty to have release time for research (3 units per semester when working toward tenure and promotion, applied for each year; 3 units of competitive time for tenured faculty). Other release time is available for working on grants. Faculty apply for the release as needed, and as possible are granted release time.

There is a commitment on the part of the Provost to provide funding for faculty release and faculty development. A Center for Teaching and Learning has been established that provides multiple opportunities for faculty to engage in activities to promote better teaching as well as scholarship. There is a full complement of opportunities available across the university that faculty can take part in if they choose. There are also funds for travel; faculty indicated that these funds were available on a competitive basis but few had been refused or not fully funded. The dean has also made the commitment to furthering faculty opportunity for research and scholarship through funds available from his office.

- AFI's continued from last visit – None
- New AFI's – None

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 6 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 6 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision for Standard 6: Met

CTC COMMON STANDARDS NOT ADDRESSED BY NCATE UNIT STANDARDS

CTC Common Standard 1.1

Met

The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Findings:

SDSU has procedures in place for each credential program where the program leadership verifies that all credential requirements have been met by each candidate. Once the verification has been completed within the program, a program completion notification is provided to the credential analyst. The credential analyst verifies the transcript and completion documentation that all requirements have been completed and then submits the electronic recommendation to the Commission. SDSU has also implemented a process to monitor credential recommendations by reviewing a percentage of the recommendation tracking documents.

CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Met

Qualified members of the Unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist in their professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The Unit provides support to candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.

Findings:

Program coordinators and faculty provide information to candidates on the requirements for the credential and monitor candidate progress towards the completion of the credential requirements. Across all credential programs, candidates and program completers report that the individuals who provide advice and assistance are knowledgeable and accessible to the credential candidates. Additional assistance is available to candidates when necessary. Examples of additional assistance in courses and during field work were shared. If a candidate does not make progress after receiving the additional assistance, the candidate is counseled out of the program.

IV. PROGRAM REPORTS

Teaching Credential Programs

Multiple Subject/Single Subject Multiple Subject with BCLAD/Single Subject with BCLAD

Program Design

San Diego State University offers Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs through the School of Teacher Education (STE) and Multiple Subject with BCLAD and Single Subject with BCLAD programs through the Department of Policy Studies in Language and Cross-Cultural Education. Both STE and PLC offer these programs at the main campus in San Diego. In addition, the Imperial Valley Campus (IVC) offers multiple and single subject preparation programs. The credential programs are based on the recognition that all new teachers must develop the skills and reflective practice to teach effectively in linguistically and culturally diverse settings. SDSU has adopted a cohort model for delivery of the credential program content and for organizing student teaching assignments. Currently, SDSU operates eight multiple subject cohorts and six single subject cohorts. The cohort model allows the program to facilitate instruction, and it provides flexibility in scheduling and a high level of connection between theory and practice in field experiences.

The preliminary credential program is guided by five organizing principles:

1. All teacher candidates must possess a core of knowledge and skills. Together these comprise a pedagogical competence for teaching academic content. Teacher candidates demonstrate these competencies through multiple forms of assessment in their courses and student teaching assignments.
2. Teacher preparation requires an integrated program of study through the first years in the profession, with collaboration between and among subject matter specialists, teacher educators and public school practitioners. Through these University-public school partnerships, candidates acquire the requisite knowledge and skills to teach state adopted K-12 academic content standards as they move through the teacher education program.
3. Organization of faculty and students into cohort blocks facilitates the acquisition of professional knowledge since this organization acknowledges the social nature of learning and provides opportunities to build coherent models of teaching and learning that embody shared values of the group and reflective practice;
4. Teacher candidates must develop a thorough knowledge and understanding of schools as structured social and educational units, which is enhanced by university and public school collaboration and cooperative field-based programs.
5. Teacher preparation must provide knowledge and skills and experiences in teaching learners of diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds and this content is both specific and technically focused in designated courses and infused throughout the curriculum.

Interviews with candidates, faculty and advisory board members stressed the effectiveness of the cohort model in supporting candidates' progress through both coursework and field practice. The high level of support and personal attention that candidates receive from faculty and peers within cohorts is seen as a significant factor in the success of the program.

Curriculum

Preparation to teach reading and language arts is central to teacher preparation efforts in the Multiple Subjects program. Throughout their credential work, teacher candidates consider literacy issues across disciplines, languages, cultures, and ethnic groups. In concert with California standards, the goal of reading instruction is to develop competent, thoughtful readers who are able to use, interpret and appreciate all types of texts. Because beginning teachers need to be able to deliver effective reading instruction that is based on the results of ongoing assessment, reading/language arts methods courses are designed to reflect knowledge of state and local reading standards for different grade levels and present a comprehensive reading curriculum that is sensitive to the needs of all students. The program places a particular emphasis on preparing teachers for literacy instruction with linguistically and culturally diverse learners, including English language learners (ELL) who are acquiring literacy skills in English as their second language or who are developing bi-literacy skills.

In addition to coursework on teaching reading in the secondary school, the Single Subject Credential Program emphasizes literacy by focusing on teaching strategies and techniques for use in content area instruction. These enable candidates to provide student access to subject matter content and to promote students' understanding of concepts. In addition, each candidate completes a methods course in the specific subject area of the credential he or she is seeking. The knowledge and skills the candidates acquire in these courses are immediately applicable in their student teaching assignments. Interviews with candidates and site supervisors confirmed that candidates are well prepared to teach subject matter content to diverse student populations.

Differentiating instruction to meet diverse learning needs within the classroom is a basic principle that is stressed throughout the MS/SS and MS/SS/BCLAD credential programs. In prerequisite coursework, candidates learn to identify students' specific learning and behavior needs and develop these skills throughout their field experiences. Candidates learn how to use positive behavior supports for students with and without disabilities as part of effective classroom management.

Interview evidence from candidates and practitioners who work with them indicates that program coursework provides a strong theoretical background that translates effectively into practice. Supervising teachers report that candidates are well-prepared to provide differentiated instruction as they enter student teaching.

Field Experience

Candidates in the MS/SS and MS/SS/BCLAD programs complete two field experiences during which candidates work gradually toward assuming full planning and teaching responsibilities for their assigned classrooms. Each student teaching block within a cohort provides guidelines for the gradual assumption of duties across the two semesters of fieldwork. During field experience, candidates are expected to demonstrate progress in meeting Teacher Performance Expectations. Candidates are formally evaluated each semester by the university and site supervisors and receive regular feedback from supervisors observing candidates' teaching.

Throughout field experience candidates receive support and interventions as needed from university and site supervisors and other program faculty. Candidates and program completers

report that advice and assistance is readily available and that problems that occur during field experience are resolved in a timely and effective manner. In the event that more serious intervention is needed, the Block Leader will observe the candidates' teaching and assists the site and university supervisor in developing a remediation plan. In the event that changes in assignment are necessary during field experience, the Block Leader serves to facilitate these. Candidates who are not able to successfully complete a remediation plan, or whose continued performance does not meet the criteria for effective practice are counseled out of the program

Assessment of Candidate Competence

Formative assessment is provided throughout coursework in the form of "embedded signature assignments" (ESAs). These are particular tasks that have been designed by program faculty to provide evidence of candidates' acquisition of critical knowledge and skills. Each ESA is scored on a rubric related to one of more of the TPEs. Additional formative assessment is provided by fieldwork evaluations.

Summative assessment of candidate competencies is provided by the Teaching Performance Assessment. The MS/SS and MS/SS/BCLAD programs use the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) for assessing candidate competency. Results from both 2007-08 (the pilot year) and from 2008-09 indicate that candidates score significantly above passing in most areas in both general teaching and content area teaching.

Interviews with program completers and employers provided consistent evidence that SDSU does an exceptional job of preparing candidates to assume teaching responsibilities in multicultural, urban schools.

Standard Finding: After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Education Specialist Credential Programs Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, and Early Childhood Special Education Early Childhood Special Education Certificate

Program Design

The mission of the Department of Special Education is to develop the untapped potential of individuals with disabilities, talents, and diverse backgrounds and to make a significant positive impact on the learning and life environments of people with exceptionalities. This department philosophy targets the attainment of enhanced academic, social, personal, and vocational outcomes, both during the school years and adult life, for individuals with exceptionalities. In response to its mission, the Departmental has articulated three overriding academic purposes/goals for the Department. These are:

- Offer graduate credential and degree programs that link research to practice;
- Conduct research on effective practices for diverse learners;
- Change societal structures to support new paradigms on disability and differences.

Department faculty are recruited from respected institutions, bringing their expertise and infusing their scholarly work into each of the emphasis areas of Early Childhood, Mild/Moderate disabilities and Moderate/Severe disabilities. The Department's commitment to student diversity is also embodied in the faculty within the department, which includes a faculty member with a disability and other faculty of diverse genders, ethnicities, and cultures.

The Department of Special Education is organized to ensure effective and efficient program management and responsiveness. The Department is also involved in several collaborative efforts with local districts and agencies, bringing best practices to the field in each of the emphasis areas. Such examples include: 1) Project Achieve, which prepares candidates with an interest in literacy to serve students with mild to moderate disabilities, 2) University/District and agency collaborations around Transition issues for students with moderate to severe disabilities, and 3) the So Cal Bridge Collaborative, which was a conference focused on early childhood/family-based interventions and included a presentation from a program graduate. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) and Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards and candidate competency ratings data guide program development, key assignments and program modifications. In addition, recommendations from an Advisory Board comprised of district personnel, parents, and program graduates ensure program modifications meet identified needs within the field.

Curriculum

Core Courses: Candidates in all credential areas meet common standards that are the focus of core courses. The standards that these courses address are considered essential to all special educators. Before enrolling in core courses, all candidates first complete the prerequisite courses and one of the characteristics courses in an emphasis area (e.g. Early Childhood, Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Moderate/Severe Disabilities). Core courses prepare candidates to: (a) adapt instruction, (b) provide behavioral and academic interventions with intensity, (c) utilize assistive technology to support students with disabilities both with instruction and communication, and (d) implement Individualized Education Program (IEP) Plans. Candidates also complete core courses in reading and mathematics methods, which are taught by general education faculty, and learn about collaboration with general education teachers, service providers, parents, and agencies. Common themes infused throughout all programs are data-based decision-making, early intervention, research-based pedagogy, advocacy and collaboration. Faculty, candidate and program completer interview data supported this finding.

Technology is integrated into courses as candidates use a computer-based learning interface to varying degrees and participate in hybrid courses that blend distance/online and face-to-face learning. Several course assignments and projects require immediate application of research and best practices as candidates observe and reflect about classroom experiences, model strategies with students, and collaborate with families and agencies. Moreover, a certificate is embedded within coursework of the Level II credential program for Early Childhood. Beginning in Spring, 2009, SPED 530: Issues in Autism will be taken by all candidates ensuring all candidates are adequately prepared to teach individuals with autism.

Courses Specific to the Mild/Moderate Disabilities Credential: The major goal of the program in Mild/Moderate Disabilities is the preparation of effective entry-level special education professionals for teaching positions with students identified as having learning disabilities, mental retardation, emotional disturbance and/or behavior disorders. With this credential, candidates may be employed in a variety of settings, work in a full range of service delivery models, and teach students from kindergarten through age 22. Courses specific to their program of study include a course on assessment, advanced curricular adaptations and a practicum course.

Courses Specific to the Moderate/Severe Disabilities Credential: The major goal of the credential program in Moderate/Severe Disabilities is the preparation of effective entry-level special education professionals for teaching positions with students identified as having moderate to severe disabilities. Candidates are authorized to teach in programs that serve students from kindergarten through age 22 and service delivery options may range from special day classes to full inclusion. Courses specific to the program of study in Moderate/Severe Disabilities include coursework in assessment, curricular adaptations and instructional strategies specific to the moderate/severe student population and inclusion.

Courses Specific to Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Credential: The primary goal of the ECSE program is to prepare effective, entry-level early interventionists and early childhood special educators to work with young children and their families. Candidates are authorized to serve children with disabilities from birth through pre-kindergarten. Services may be provided in natural environments such as the child's home, the home of a family child care provider, or a community-based preschool program. A primary emphasis of this credential area is the ability to work with the child in the context of the family. Because this is not considered to be a "teaching credential," the general education curriculum (reading, writing, mathematics) is not a part of the course of studies. Because of the differences in legislation and implementation of infant/toddler programs versus preschool programs, candidates must demonstrate skills in both areas.

Courses comprising the ECSE credential address service collaboration and coordination of services with multiple agencies, assessment practices, and program planning for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers. A central requirement of the ECSE coursework is to learn about and complete an Individualized Family Services Plan (IFSP).

Field Experience

The credential program provides a sequence of three field experiences. These build on the 30 hours of observation in a variety of general and special education classrooms that are required for all undergraduate pre-education students, as a part of the Liberal Studies major. Students who do not complete the Liberal Studies major but choose to enter special education teacher preparation from other fields are required to complete comparable observations prior to acceptance into the special education program of teacher preparation.

The department-specific field experience sequence begins with the prerequisite undergraduate concentration in special education and continues through both semesters of the Level I course of study. It is designed to provide candidates opportunities to observe and participate in educational settings that model effective practice and serve a diversity of students. All practica

occur in school sites where at least 25% of the students are from ethnolinguistically diverse backgrounds.

Various instructional delivery models (e.g. co-teaching and small group) are also explored through field experience. The culminating practicum extends this opportunity, intensifies the involvement and responsibility of the candidate, and requires demonstration of the competencies required for recommendation for the Education Specialist Credential.

All candidates and program completers interviewed remarked on feeling adequately prepared, supported and mentored throughout the program. Mentor teachers attend a two-day training, must hold the same credential the candidate holds, and must obtain a formal recommendation from their principal. Field supervisors meet specific criteria as set forth and agreed upon by the university faculty. Nearly all field supervisors interviewed (including one who was also a mentor teacher) were graduates of one of the programs, indicating a strong sense of community and continued partnership between SDSU and program completers. Moreover, candidates and completers commented on both feeling “ready to work” upon program completion and enjoying their program experiences. Interview responses by both candidates and completers also echoed themes of the department goals.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

All credential program candidates must be formally recommended by the SDSU College of Education Credentials Office. Before recommendation, however, the candidate for certification has passed several checkpoints monitored by faculty and advisors to assure competencies and performance criteria have been met, as outlined below.

First, satisfactory completion of coursework (i.e. maintain a GPA of 3.0 or greater) assures that the standards associated with each course have been met. Second, performance criteria in practica provide a means of ascertaining that candidates have demonstrated competence in applying the knowledge and skills associated with each of the standards to actual instructional situations. Another layer of assessment is data obtained from employer surveys regarding completer performance within the classroom. Finally, candidates seeking a Level II Education Specialist Credential complete a Professional Credential Induction Plan, which is used to set candidate goals and monitor candidate progress toward satisfactory completion of the Level II credential requirements.

At the point of program completion, the Practica Coordinator reviews candidate performance with the university supervisors. SDSU Credentials Office reviews the student's approved program plan against transcripts of completed coursework. If the student has satisfactorily met all Department requirements, the Credentials Office forwards a formal recommendation for the appropriate credential.

Additional formative assessment of candidate competencies occurs through faculty and field supervisor observations and feedback and self-assessments via video-taped lesson reflection and analysis with faculty. Current plans exist to add evaluations of videotaped lessons to an electronic data system (TASKSTREAM). Summative assessment occurs through signature assignments and a portfolio for all three credential programs. Portfolio requirements are clearly

delineated by an evaluation rubric. The portfolio assessment is an ongoing process which begins in the first semester and continues through student teaching. Evidence and artifacts are collected, included and reviewed at specific checkpoints.

Candidates struggling to meet competencies are given multiple chances to succeed. They are provided with advisement and coaching by faculty, field supervisors and mentor teachers or district support providers. Candidate and program completer interviews corroborated this safeguard. Dispositions data of candidates is also assessed and monitored throughout Level I and Level II programs to ensure candidates are suitable matches for the field of special education.

Findings on standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Bilingual Cross Cultural Specialist Program

Program Design

The Bilingual Cross Cultural Specialist Program enables candidates to earn the Bilingual Cross Cultural Specialist Credential and a Master of Arts degree. The program has an optional international experience open to candidates. This option utilizes a program already in place in Queretaro, Mexico that prepares CSU preservice teachers for the BCLAD credential.

Curriculum and Field Experience

Each candidate in the program has field experiences in a variety of settings that relate to the candidate's professional goals and abilities in relation to the adopted standards. All courses in the Bilingual Specialist program include significant fieldwork components. While candidates usually utilize their school site for fieldwork, each site itself reflects a diverse cultural and linguistic population.

Sites for field experiences are already in place both in public and private schools in Queretaro and in an indigenous area as well. For the Bilingual Specialist these experiences are two-four weeks in length and include observations and co-teaching in public and private schools. Spanish language proficiency is required for this experience (i.e. BCLAD certification). Course instructors, and/or the CSU Resident Director monitor all field experiences.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

Candidate competence is determined through a variety of means. Each semester the candidate is assessed and graded by each instructor using multiple measures, such as classroom assignments, examinations and field based projects. The program advisor monitors the grades each candidate receives throughout the program. At the end of the Specialist Credential coursework, candidates further demonstrate their competence in the designated areas through an electronic comprehensive portfolio evaluation. The portfolio was implemented in 2004 to replace the former exit requirement of a written comprehensive examination. The capstone assessment evaluates not only a candidate's knowledge of content and material, but also his or her ability to synthesize and discuss theory, research practice and to illustrate how he or she has

begun to implement in their practice the knowledge and skills gained throughout the program. Of the seven core standards assessed at the end of the Master of Arts degree program, five are directly aligned to the Bilingual Specialist Standards.

Standard Finding:

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation and interviews with stakeholders, the team has determined that all program standards for the current Bilingual Cross Cultural Specialist Program are met.

Clear Credential Program

Program Design

San Diego State University offers the four courses of advanced study required for obtaining a Clear Credential, previously known as the Fifth Year of Study Program. During the site visit the team was able to have a formative discussion with the institution about the development of its revised Clear Credential program. SDSU has been working collaboratively with San Diego Unified School District to plan its proposal for the revised Clear Credential program (standards adopted June 2009) and plans to submit the program proposal in January 2010. The final cohort of candidates for the current program was accepted in fall 2009.

Curriculum

Currently students complete four courses in the Clear Credential program:

- *Schools and the Pedagogy of Health Education*
- *Advanced Classroom Adaptations for Special Populations*
- *Advanced Teaching with Technologies*
- *English Language Development/SDAIE: Curriculum, Teaching & Assessment in Diverse Settings*

The revised Clear Credential program is planned to be similar to an induction program in that candidates develop a growth plan within the context of their teaching assignment. Candidates continue to complete work in the area of English language development, making adaptations for students with special needs, and using technology in teaching. The major change from the current program is that each candidate will focus his or her coursework in each of these areas based on an individual growth plan

Field Experience

The current Clear Credential program allows candidates to demonstrate the knowledge and skills required by the standard through the major assignments in each course. The proposed Clear Credential program is designed to have classroom visits or video review by the program personnel for each candidate, discussion boards the candidates will participate in and peer assessments. For each assignment, candidates will organize their work based on elements of the teaching cycle: planning, instruction, assessment, reflection, and application.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

Each of the four courses has major assignments and rubrics. The major assignments comprise the course grade for the candidate. Each candidate recommended for the Clear general education teaching credential must pass each of the four courses. Within the revised Clear Credential

program, the candidates will build upon the activities from the preliminary credential program. It is planned that candidates will formatively assess themselves, be assessed by peers, and be summatively assessed by university support providers.

Standard Finding:

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation and interviews with stakeholders, the team has determined that all program standards for the current Clear Credential Program are met.

Reading Certificate and Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential Programs

Program Design

The Reading/Language Arts Graduate Certificate and Credential Programs are designed primarily for teachers who want to improve their classroom practices in reading, writing, and language development through coursework and field experiences. The Reading Certificate Program is “nested” within the Reading/Language Arts Credential Program. The certificate and credential programs build expertise in reading/language arts on a continuum from emergent reading and writing development through adult literacy. Inherent in the program design are the following: 1) the development of increasing levels of proficiency in emerging literacy, 2) the designing and implementation of intervention plans, 3) opportunities for collaboration among colleagues, and 4) competence related to the Reading Certificate and/or Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential program standards. Theory and research is emphasized in all coursework and put into practice in K-12 field experiences.

Curriculum

The Reading/Language Arts Credential Program has four major strands: (1) curricular/instructional; (2) assessment; (3) research and (4) leadership. The curriculum addressing theoretical tenets includes a study of language acquisition and development for native English speakers and English language learners, developmental reading at elementary and secondary levels, the selection and organization of appropriate materials for instruction, and the integration of language arts and a literature-based program across the curriculum. Candidates acquire an assessment and intervention repertoire through coursework and field experiences. These experiences develop competence in the diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties and reading disabilities.

Coursework for the program is research based. The discussion of research findings is to help candidates develop as informed practitioners and consumers. Compendiums of research articles are attached to course readers and some course assignments relate specifically to the program’s emphasis on research (e.g., Mini Research Study and Annotated Bibliography and Research Proposal). Candidate dispositions are related to a critical analysis of programs in relation to effectiveness, research, and the knowledge to locate materials and instructional methods based upon a student’s specific literacy strengths and needs.

The Reading faculty stated that they enjoy collaborating with their colleagues and appreciate their differing areas of expertise. This collaboration is echoed in cooperative assignments at the

Community Reading Clinic where students work in pairs or triads as primary and secondary evaluators.

Field Experience

In a supervised clinical practicum conducted at the Community Reading Clinic, certificate candidates develop an individual instructional plan for a struggling reader/writer drawn from research-based instructional strategies in order to help the student achieve higher levels of reading and writing proficiency. Candidates also work in small groups and learn to adapt strategies from the one-to-one setting to the classroom environment. The capstone tutoring experience for credential candidates provides additional work with diagnostically based interventions planned with and approved by the course instructor. Strategies learned for both assessment and instruction in courses are demonstrated and practiced in fieldwork. The ratio of supervision for this course is three graduate students per one unit of credit for faculty's workload. This supervision ratio enables close contact between candidates and supervisors.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

Assessment of standard-related competences is embedded throughout program courses in both programs. Signature assignments for credential candidates related to collection of data on candidate competence are: Professional Assessment Report, Mini Research Study, Annotated Bibliography and Research Proposal, Capstone "Noticing" Requirement, and a Professional Development Workshop. Faculty developed and utilize a five point Likert scale for each assessment.

The Capstone Notice Requirement is a significant, multi-semester assessment where candidates work under supervision in the Community Reading Clinic for the duration of the program. At the beginning of the program candidates develop a written proposal for their intervention, during the program deliver instruction, write a summative case report, and near the completion of the program compile an individual student portfolio. Feedback is given to the candidate from classmates and the supervisor who have observed the lesson. Candidates are videotaped and privately review their performance to complete the capstone competency-embedded assessment.

Standard Finding:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, and administrators, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Services Credential Programs

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program Professional Administrative Services Credential Program*

Program Design

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program is housed in the San Diego State University's College of Education. The central theme and shared vision of all of the programs in the School of Education is to develop teachers and leaders who will be committed to narrowing the achievement gap among student groups. The program is grounded in adult learning theory, which focuses on the development of strong instructional leaders capable of utilizing resources to improve learning for all students. The content of all courses is aligned with the California Professional Standards for School Leaders (CPSELs) that are aligned with the standards of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). The program has been designed and is executed in a manner which is consistent with the high standards set forth by the College of Education.

Curriculum

San Diego State University credential candidates move through a rigorous three semester program which includes ongoing review, discussion, and analysis of multiple leadership issues through their coursework, their work and regular meetings with the supervising principal, as well as the university supervisor's regular visits. Candidates become familiar with a variety of leadership models and are able to demonstrate appropriate leadership skills in specific situations. Candidates also learn how to share and foster leadership skills in others. This includes how to manage conflict, build consensus, and effectively communicate orally and in writing. Throughout the program, the emphasis is on student learning and each individual's responsibility to ensure achievement of students. The curriculum displays rigor in content coursework and exhibits integration of shared vision. Candidates and completers report the cohort model provides strong support and assistance for all candidates throughout the tenure of the program.

Field Experience

Fieldwork candidates experience a comprehensive, integrated and authentic field experience with instructional leadership at its core. Candidates work closely with site supervisors in examining data, assisting with instructional tasks, working with student populations, meeting with the public, assessing student performance, supervising personnel and planning day to day school operations. Meeting specific standards, working with a supervising principal and a university supervisor, and gaining varied experience in school leadership make up an important part of the preparation experience. Technology is incorporated throughout the field experience through Task Stream, an electronic portfolio learning management system. Candidates assess data, create presentations and generate research through the use of technology. Reflection assignments related to the field experience are also incorporated into each of the six core leadership courses.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

Assessment is evident throughout the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program. Candidates are assessed in a variety of ways. Formative and summative assessment is evident throughout coursework and fieldwork experiences. Faculty utilize and model assessment as an

instructional tool in the delivery of each course. Rubrics are evident in the evaluation of competencies; portfolios and self-assessment are utilized. Candidates attend regular assessment meetings during fieldwork which provide an opportunity for the supervising principal and university supervisor to guide and coach the candidate on his/her performance. In addition, at monthly department faculty meetings, faculty meet to discuss candidate growth and competency.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

***Note on the Professional Administrative Services Credential Program:** The Professional Administrative Services Program (Tier II Program) no longer exists at SDSU. The last candidate exited the program in Fall 2008. As of Fall 2008 the only route to a Professional Administrative Services Credential offered at SDSU is through the Ed.D in Educational Leadership Program, which began admitting candidates in Fall 2008. This program has yet to recommend any candidates for a credential. As a result, there is no report included on this program.

**Pupil Personnel Services
School Counseling Services Credential Program**

Program Design

The School Counseling Service Credential Program at San Diego State University is a graduate level professional preparation program which promotes critical inquiry, reflection, self-development and social action within its candidate ranks. The faculty reflects the department's commitment to the integration of diversity and social justice.

The program consists of two years of full time graduate study. The program is designed to provide a cohesive sequence of learning experiences and is based on a core of skills and knowledge prerequisite to entry as a practicing school counselor. Program design has been influenced by state and national professional preparation standards for school counselors.

Curriculum

The School Counseling Service Credential Program offers a rigorous curriculum steeped in the ecosystemic approach to intervention and assessment. Courses are partnered with technology in the form of data assessment, research and program presentation. Students work with American School Counseling Association (ASCA) model programs and design, implement and create advocacy tools which help to promote their school sites and their profession. Inclusion of grant writing skills, personal/social data analysis and crises intervention are hallmarks of this program. Candidates complete over 500 hours of fieldwork at the conclusion of the second year. The strong program reflects the faculty's commitment to professional and ethical behaviors within the scope of school counseling.

Fieldwork

Counseling candidates are exposed to an array of professional models through their interaction with field supervisors, faculty, university supervisors and collaborating practitioners. Field supervision models include clinical, administrative and collaborative approaches to supervision. Faculty members do a fine job in pairing candidates with school sites which will be receptive and supportive of candidates' talents. Collaborative endeavors are strengths of these partnerships. Effective communication exists between the candidate in the field and university faculty in the form of personal visits, e-mail and phone conversations. Field candidates serve to create, deliver and evaluate standards based on Guidance Curriculum and data driven interventions. They are also encouraged to utilize a peer supervision model when targeting strengths and addressing needs in field experiences.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

Assessment occurs within the scope of coursework in a variety of ways: formative and summative evaluations; mock interviews; assessment portfolios and self-reflection. There is evidence of rubrics within the scope of assessment.

During fieldwork, candidates are assessed on the standards identified in the Evaluation of Competency Development Form using a four point rating scale. This scale assists instructors and field supervisors to determine the level of knowledge, practice and skills necessary for professional competence which are based on the School Counseling Specialization Standards.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and other supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards have been met.

Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology Services Credential Program

Program Design

The School Psychology Program is a four year graduate level preparation program which culminates in the Educational Specialist degree in School Psychology (Ed.S) and the California Pupil Personnel Services Credential in School Psychology.

The program prepares candidates to offer comprehensive assessment and intervention strategies in culturally and linguistically diverse schools. The program addresses both National Association of School Psychologists and California Commission on Teacher Credentialing accreditation standards and receives input from stakeholders in the form of candidates, faculty, field supervisors, employers and community advisory board. Great emphasis is placed upon multicultural content, issues, perspectives and processes which are integrated throughout the curriculum. Research proven approaches within the delivery of assessment and intervention are particular strengths of this program.

Curriculum

The curriculum places a great emphasis on intervention and assessment strategies within the scope of service. It provides candidates with the competence and confidence to be able to promote self-efficacy among the students they serve. Candidates are able to recognize the interrelationships among the school, family and community to promote academic success and social and emotional well being. The curriculum contains a strong cross cultural component and an emphasis on a full range of intervention strategies from prevention to crisis intervention. This scope of counseling competencies is integrated in four years of fieldwork, which is comprised of over 2000 hours of collaborative field based learning.

Fieldwork

Fieldwork is a four year model of professional collaboration and field experiences. Faculty does an admirable job in pairing the candidate with school sites throughout the four year program. Emphasis is given to finding placements consistent with the program's philosophy of ecosystems and research supported success of diverse students. Much effort is made by the university to monitor and support field efforts of candidates, and assistance is offered through face to face meeting, e-mail and phone contact. It is reported that faculty offers assistance through direct supervision of candidates on site in the public schools as well as through university placement. Program completers are praised by employers and candidates by site supervisors as being extremely well prepared with "hands on" practical experience and a clear knowledge of how to react in any school site situation.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

The inclusion of four years of fieldwork ensures continuous evaluations and review of all School Psychology Program candidates. Students are encouraged and expected to provide self-reflection through assignments, as well as use of portfolios which demonstrate mastery of school psychology competencies. Use of rubrics is evident throughout the program. Formative and summative assessments are embedded in the curriculum. A particular strength of the assessment system is the *Evaluation of Competency Development*, which is a systematic evaluation of candidate integration of the domains of knowledge and application of professional skills in delivering a comprehensive range of services. Field supervisors utilize this rubric each semester of fieldwork.

Report on Findings:

After a review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all standards have been met.

Pupil Personnel Services School Social Work Program Child Welfare and Attendance Services Program

Program Design

The Pupil Personnel Services School Social Work/Child Welfare and Attendance Services Credential Program is a specialization in Advanced Direct Practice concentration of the Master of Social Work Program at San Diego State University. During the 60-unit course of study,

candidates for the PPS Credential in School Social Work and Child Welfare and Attendance Services simultaneously complete course work and field work requirements for the PPS credential and the MSW degree. Candidates who already possess a Master of Education degree may enter the program for the PPS credential only. The program was developed in response to the increasing need within the San Diego region to prepare California's school children with skills to function in complex, global and multicultural communities. The program seeks to develop professional social workers who can bring assessment, intervention and organizational skills to interdisciplinary educational teams for the purpose of providing coordinated and comprehensive services to all school children and their families.

The two-year program sequence begins with a year of foundation coursework and field practice in social work. At the end of that year, candidates wishing to obtain the credential in school social work and child welfare and attendance credential apply for admission to the credential program. Potential candidates are required to be accepted as interns at a participating school, are interviewed by program faculty, and must pass a qualifying exam in order to be admitted.

Interviews with current candidates and with program completers indicate that the program is rigorous and demanding, but that the combination of coursework and field practice result in graduates who are able to work effectively and collaboratively in a wide range of school settings.

Curriculum

The curriculum of the PPS credential program has been developed in a rigorous manner to meet standards of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) as well as CTC standards. The curriculum includes both foundation and specialization coursework introduced throughout the period of study.

Foundation content is introduced in eight generic courses during the first academic year. These courses offer a conceptual foundation in generalist social work practice from a cross-cultural perspective. The program includes major sequence areas in social work education (Practice, Human Behavior and the Social Environment, Policy, Research and Field Work). This foundation content is expanded upon in advanced concentration courses for the Direct Practice and Children, Youth, and Families concentrations, which are offered in subsequent semesters. PPS students must also take a two-semester course in school social work.

Candidates and program completers reported that course instructors were well-prepared and knowledgeable, and that course content is well-integrated with field practice. A number of candidates mentioned the course, *Psychological Development of Vulnerable Children*, as being particularly valuable in the development of their perspectives as school social workers.

Field Experience

Candidates in the MSW program take 15 credit hours of field practicum, beginning with seven credit hours of generalist social work practice during their first year. At the end of the first year of study, candidates develop a learning plan for credential fieldwork. The second year field placement consists of eight credit-hours of field work in a school setting under the supervision of a qualified field instructor. This field instructor is experienced in school social work practice and/or child welfare and attendance services, and is informed of all PPS credential requirements

in order to assure that candidates receive appropriate learning experiences in the fieldwork portion of the program. Each candidate has a primary placement at one school level (elementary, middle, or high school), with a secondary placement at a level above or below that of the primary placement.

All candidates in fieldwork participate in a bi-monthly field seminar offered concurrently with their fieldwork semesters. The fieldwork seminar is an integral component of the fieldwork experience and is the primary vehicle for the integration of classroom and fieldwork learning, including the integration of social work values and ethics. The seminar provides an opportunity for candidates to examine and understand their professional roles, assists them in understanding the dynamics of personal change, and helps them in the examination and integration of personal and professional values. The seminars focus on developing an understanding of the social work role and practice issues, integration of professional and personal values and concepts, practice research policy issues, and preparing the student to enter the professional social work arena. Additionally, PPS candidates are expected to demonstrate an understanding of their professional responsibilities within the context of the school setting and the relevant student population served.

Candidates who require extra support and intervention during fieldwork are assisted by fieldwork instructors, course instructors, and the director of field experience. Candidates who do not make adequate progress are required to enter into a “performance contract” that specifies the performance criteria they must meet and the timeline for meeting them. Candidates who are not able to fulfill the terms of a performance contract are dropped from the program.

In interviews, employers consistently cited the depth of field experience that program completers bring to schools as something that sets SDSU graduates apart from graduates of other programs. In addition, employers described graduates as being very knowledgeable about the needs of urban, multicultural students and families and well prepared to work effectively with them from their first day of employment. Candidates and program completers also reported feeling very well prepared to meet the challenges that face urban schools.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

Credential candidates are assessed with both formative and summative assessments. During fieldwork, candidates receive regular formative feedback through informal observation and conversation with field instructors. In addition, candidates are formally assessed by their field instructors at both the primary and secondary sites once each semester as well as completing self assessments of their progress. At the end of the fieldwork sequence, candidates take a comprehensive exam covering all aspects of school social work. This serves as a summative assessment of candidate competence. In the event a candidate is not able to pass the comprehensive exam he/she is given an opportunity to retake it. If the candidate does not pass the second time, he/she must meet with program faculty to develop a plan for remediation. Should a candidate complete a remediation plan and still not pass the comprehensive exam, the candidate is not recommended for a credential.

Standard Finding: After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

School Nursing Services Program

Program Design

The School Nurse Services Credential program at San Diego State University (SDSU) is administered through the School of Nursing, College of Health and Human Services. The University classifies students enrolled in the School Nurse Services Credential program as graduate students.

A hybrid-teaching model has been adopted for all credential courses offered by the School of Nursing. Although for a time there was strong pressure from the school nurse community for an entirely online curriculum, enhanced student satisfaction was achieved by incorporating an online component to courses that are taught primarily on campus. Prospective school nurses complete both coursework and fieldwork under the direction of the program coordinator, instructors, and preceptors. Two of the courses are special education courses taught by faculty in the School of Education. The SDSU School Nurse Services Credential program is a 28-unit program and individuals may earn a MSN with the completion of 12 additional units.

Graduates verified that they found value in coming on campus for courses and not having all classes on-line. They have obtained grants in their school districts and credit the SDSU School Nurse Services Credential Program for exposing them to external funding possibilities.

Curriculum

The School Nurse Services Credential program curriculum was designed using a multi-disciplinary approach. The objectives for the program are to prepare each graduate so that he/she will have:

Knowledge of health and developmental patterns of school-aged children and adolescents.

The ability to identify and detect by health assessment, the health and developmental deviations of the school-aged child and adolescent and report findings to school and medical personnel and to parents.

The ability to interpret health information and provide counseling and education to individuals and groups of students, parent, and school personnel.

Knowledge and understanding of the functions of community agencies that work with children and their families and the ability to access their services effectively.

Knowledge and understanding of professional, ethical and legal influences on practice as they apply to health services for the school-aged child and adolescent.

The ability to assist school personnel in recognizing environmental health and safety factors which impact families, students and other school personnel.

The ability to organize and administer a health service program which meets the needs of its clientele in the school setting.

The ability to function in the professional role of a school nurse.

Knowledge and understanding of various cultural/ethnic groups and sensitivity to varying health practices and beliefs.

The ability to evaluate and incorporate relevant research findings in the health service program; participate in research in the school setting.

Both didactic content and clinical experiences are provided to students that enable them to better integrate and implement the role of school nurse. Currency of the program is maintained through continual communication and input from within the school nurse community and San Diego Unified School District. Feedback is provided by students who are currently employed as school nurses by way of class discussion and course evaluations. School district leaders assist in providing students with optimal clinical placements that will offer broad learning opportunities and exposure to the current school nurse role and responsibilities. An Introduction to Counseling course was recently added to the curriculum as a result of student and community input.

Field Experience

Each candidate admitted to the credential program completes Nursing 631 Practicum. Candidates enroll in the practicum toward the end of their program of study so that they enter the course fully vested in the knowledge gained in prior classes. The field work involves a minimum of 16 hours in each of the following areas of focus: elementary, middle school, high school, and special education settings.

The practicum course consists of 120 hours of field experience. Students are assigned to a primary preceptor who is a credentialed school nurse and who agrees to help guide the clinical experience. Investigating areas of school nursing planned to broaden the student's clinical experience such as working with Special Education Itinerant Nurses, Pediatric Nurse Practitioners or a School Nurse Practitioner in a school-based clinic is also encouraged for students completing fieldwork. Students use a reflective thinking process to journal their encounters and submit a weekly log to the Nursing 631 clinical instructor who continually monitors their progress.

Graduates stated that professors were working as school nurses. Due to these shared experiences they found their professors' and field supervisors' advice and knowledge to be especially relevant to their practice.

Several course assignments are completed that involve interaction with individuals in the home, school and other community settings. A critical thinking exercise is completed where each student spends time with a client who lives a life very different from theirs (e.g. ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and/or lifestyle) and with whom they are able to experience life from a new perspective. A cultural assessment is completed on family using a cultural assessment tool. In the companion Nursing 630 Community Health course, the students carry out a targeted community assessment and an evaluation of a community-based program. A part of the 120 hours of field experience is credited for the completion of these assignments as they all contain a field work component and involve interaction with school-age students and their families.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

Course examinations and satisfactory practicum performance evaluations assess candidate success at key points of the program. The credential advisor is able to track the student's acceptable and timely progress throughout the program via the university's Webportal software. Periodic advisement sessions provide the candidate with feedback and input regarding course sequence and field work planning.

Final evaluation occurs upon completion of all required course work. At that time, the candidate makes an appointment with the Credential Advisor for the purpose of a joint review to determine whether all course work and practicum objectives have been satisfactorily met. Upon reviewing transcripts and evaluations of practicum accomplishments, the advisor makes the final determination and completes a Program Clearance form. The candidate is then directed to the Credential Office to initiate an application for the issuance of the clear credential certificate.

Standard Finding:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, administrators, employers, and preceptors, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Speech-Language Pathology Services Program

Program Design

In reviewing the American Speech-Language Hearing Association (ASHA) Accreditation document it is noted that the Council on Academic Accreditation (CAA) division of ASHA approved the program in 2004. The focus of this review is to verify that the standards related to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Speech-Language Pathology credential are being met.

The California standards relate to children and youth in schools from the ages of preschool to K-12 or in classes organized primarily for adults. Although the Program Assessment Document responding to the CTC standards on salient program features was not submitted, the team was able to glean a picture of the Speech-Language, and Hearing Sciences Program (SPHS) through a review of the program submission to CAA, the Biennial Report, and interviews with the program administrators, faculty, candidates and graduates. Candidates were positive about the advisement received from the faculty and of the collaborative practice of have second year candidates mentor first year candidates.

Curriculum

Graduates expressed that they were well prepared to meet the needs of their clients through coursework and the clinical experiences offered in the program. A strong point of the program is its involvement with issues related to primary and secondary language learners who do not speak or are not literate in English. Candidates spoke of their rich experiences in working with Native American and Spanish speaking students due to opportunities provided by grants received by program faculty. Graduates and candidates spoke of the training that they received in working with individuals with autism and the needs of Response to Intervention initiatives.

Field Experience

SLHS 933, Clinical Practice in Public Schools, is a fieldwork experience where the candidate is evaluated by their supervising speech-language pathologist and the SLHS Credential Coordinator. The content related to the California Services Credential appears to reside in one course. The assessment of candidates to insure that each candidate has the knowledge and skills required by the Speech-Language Pathology Credential standards was not clearly evidenced in the documents. However, in conversation with the program administrators, faculty, candidates and graduates, the team learned that the program provides experiences in the training and education of candidates to work as speech and language pathologists with students as required by the CTC standards.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

Assessments used to evaluate candidates are: 1) overall grade point average, 2) the clinical remediation program, 3) the academic remediation program, and 4) the Praxis exam in Speech-Language Pathology.

Candidates are evaluated each semester in terms of academic and clinical coursework. The faculty discusses student progress with appropriate remediation recommendations for individual candidates. The candidate in need of remediation is given a review form and both the student and advisor discuss a course of action and both individuals sign the form.

Standard Finding:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, and faculty the team determined that all program standards are met.