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

Professional Services Division
June 2019

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 the findings based upon a thorough review of all available and relevant institutional and program documentation as well as all supporting evidence including interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation (with a 7th year report)** is made for the institution.

Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For All Commission Approved Programs Offered by the Institution

	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	X		
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	X		
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	X		
4) Continuous Improvement	X		
5) Program Impact	X		

Program Standards

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern	6	5	1	
Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern	6	5	1	
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities, with Intern	22	22		
Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Disabilities, with Intern	24	24		
Preliminary Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education	26	26		
Teacher Induction	6	6		
Preliminary Administrative Services	9	9		
Clear Administrative Services	5	5		
Bilingual Authorization	6	6		

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	5	**5**		
Reading Literacy and Leadership Specialist	5	**5**		
Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling	32	**32**		
Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology	27	**27**		
Pupil Personnel Services School Social Work	25	**25**		
Pupil Personnel Services Child Welfare and Attendance	8	**8**		
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 Documentation and Evidence
- 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: **February 24-27, 2019**

2017-18 Accreditation
Team Recommendation: **Accreditation (with a 7th year report)**

Previous History of Accreditation Status	
Date	**Accreditation Status**
10/17/2009	Accreditation

Rationale:
The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation (with a 7th Year Report)** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel. The team 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:

Program Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, completers, interns, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for all programs offered at San Diego State University, except for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject, with Intern Program Standard 2: Preparing Candidates toward Mastery of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), which was **Met with Concerns**.

Common Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, completers, interns, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for San Diego State University.

<u>Overall Recommendation</u>
Based on the fact that the team found all Common Standards to be **Met** and all standards for all programs with the exception of Program Standard 2 for the Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject credential programs to be **Met –** with Program Standard 2 for the Multiple and Single Subject Preliminary Credential **Met with Concerns** – the team recommends **Accreditation (with a 7th Year Report)**.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to offer the following credential programs and to recommend candidates for the appropriate and related credentials upon satisfactorily completing all requirements

Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern

Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern

Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, with Intern

Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe, with Intern

Preliminary Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education, with Intern

Teacher Induction

Bilingual Authorization

Preliminary Administrative Services
Clear Administrative Services

Reading and Literacy Added Authorization

Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist

Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling

Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology

Pupil Personnel Services School Social Work

Pupil Personnel Services Child Welfare and Attendance

Speech Language Pathology

The team recommends a 7th Year Report that the institution shall submit within one year of this site visit that demonstrates how the Multiple and Single Subject Preliminary Credential programs, including Intern, have organized coursework and clinical practice to provide multiple opportunities for all candidates to learn, apply, and reflect on all components of the Teaching Performance Expectations, specifically those related to digital literacy and the use of technology, and applying UDL, MTSS, and candidate knowledge of students' IEPs and 504s to planning instruction and assessment.

In addition, staff recommends that:
- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- San Diego State University be permitted to propose new educator preparation 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

Team Lead:	**Judy Sylva** California State University, San Bernardino
Common Standards:	**Michael Kotar** California State University, Chico
	June Hetzel Biola University
Programs Cluster:	**Lara Kassab** San Jose State University
	Lyn Scott California State University, East Bay
	Cean Colcord Whittier College
	Elizabeth Freer Alta Loma School District
	Thierry Kolpin Brandman University
	Antonia Issa Lahera California State University, Dominguez Hills
Staff to the Visit:	**Erin Sullivan** Commission on Teacher Credentialing
	Miranda Gutierrez Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission
Common Standards Addendum
Course Syllabi and Course of Study
Accreditation Website
Candidate Files
Candidate Handbooks
Survey Results
Precondition Responses
TPA Results and Analysis
Mentor Application Materials and Logs
Mentor and Advisor Handbooks
Candidate Application materials

Program Review Submission
Program Review Addendum
Candidate Advisement Materials
Faculty Vitae
Assessment Materials
Budget Reports
Performance Expectation Materials
Field Experience Materials
Unit Assessment System
Candidate IDPs
Data related to retention patters of candidates

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	192
Completers	106
Employers	73
Institutional Administration	29
Program Coordinators	38
Faculty	96
TPA Coordinator	6
Support Providers	8
Field Supervisors – Program	47
Field Supervisors – District	42
Field Placement Coordinator	7
Credential Analysts	8
Advisors	19
Advisory Board Members	43
Partners	9
Others	7
TOTAL	**722**

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

Background Information

Since its founding in 1897, San Diego State University (SDSU) has grown to become a leading public research university. Each year, SDSU provides more than 36,000 students with the opportunity to participate in an academic curriculum distinguished by direct contact with faculty and an international emphasis that prepares them for a global future. The university is home to graduate programs in business; engineering; public health; psychology; fine arts; biological sciences; public affairs; education; and speech, language, and hearing sciences. Undergraduate programs include business, engineering and international business. Overall, SDSU students can choose from 91 undergraduate majors, 76 master's programs and 23 doctoral degree programs.

Education Unit

The unit is comprised of sixteen programs which are housed in the College of Education and College of Health and Human Services and spread out over five departments, including the Imperial Valley Campus (IVC). In the 2017-18 year, the SDSU education unit had over 600 program completers. For the 2018-19 year, there are over 900 candidates enrolled across the unit's sixteen programs.

Table 1

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2017-18)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2018-19)
Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern	142	171
Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern	145	199
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, with Intern	24	19
Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe, with Intern	15	10
Preliminary Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education, with Intern	6	6
Teacher Induction	n/a	96
General Education Clear Induction	250	n/a
Education Specialist Clear Induction	35	n/a
Bilingual Authorization	33	61
Preliminary Administrative Services	68	51
Clear Administrative Services	37	44

Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	13	3
Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist	13	20
Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling	17	35
Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology	13	53
Pupil Personnel Services School Social Work	24	36
Pupil Personnel Services Child Welfare and Attendance	24	36
Speech Language Pathology	38	75

The Visit
The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

Program Reports
Preliminary Multiple Subject with Intern and Preliminary Single Subject with Intern

Program Design
The long, distinguished history of SDSU as the primary provider of new teachers to San Diego area school districts and beyond is clear when interacting with local district employers, mentor teachers, supervisors, and program coordinators. Both employers and candidates expressed feeling that the program recognizes, customizes, and is responsive to their individual needs. The mission of the School of Teacher Education (STE) to educate teachers who promote, support, and implement an inquiry-oriented approach to teaching and learning for student success and the mission of the Department of Dual Language and English Learner Education (DLE) to develop reflective and transformational practitioners in addressing the needs of ethnically and linguistically diverse learners through collaboration with schools, families, and community was present throughout all documents and in every interview. Candidates, both current and graduate, reflected the inquiry-focus of the program through critically reflective, evidence-based commentary about their own growth and the program's support of that growth.

The strong program focus on culturally sustaining, empowering, assessment-driven educational practices reflects the program, faculty, and staff valuing of the rich funds of knowledge candidates and TK-12 students bring to learning environments. The program not only "talks the talk" but provides candidates with the strategies and tools to enact student-centered, culturally and linguistically rich learning opportunities for all students. Partnerships with districts like Chula Vista Elementary and Sweetwater Union High School District illustrate the commitment to fostering new teachers who can teach across socio-economic contexts present in planning documents. Assignments across all courses and fieldwork require candidates to see and create partnerships with peers, mentors, administrators, families, communities, and students to create rich learning experiences in local classrooms.

There are a variety of options, from program focus to cohort selection to length of program, available to candidates. There are strong commonalities across and within these options, but all prepare candidates for success in the edTPA and to support culturally diverse students in a variety of contexts. The commitment to bridging the theory-to-practice gap is evident in the many of the assignments across the program. The system of social and emotional support for each student was obvious in every interview with candidates from every program. A regularly cited strength of the cohort model is the individual development and establishment of supportive communities in multiple and single subject programs, both in STE and DLE. Candidates feel their social-emotional and community needs are met very well in the program. Across the programs, SibMe is used as a formative assessment tool for reflecting on teaching practice. Field supervisors report that using SibMe in conjunction with face-to-face interactions helps ground candidate practice in evidence. They report the use of annotations as very powerful for helping candidates isolate instances of their practice, shape growth goals and

plans, and track their progress in learning to teach.

Course of Study
Candidates begin their teaching journey with taking prerequisite classes. All candidates take a course related to meeting the needs of students with IEPs and 504 plans, a multicultural education course, and a course in health education. Each program then has at least one additional course that supports students in developing a common body of prior knowledge for their program. Candidates take courses in subject-specific methodologies, a one- unit classroom management class (online), supporting language learners across the curriculum, and courses specific to their program option. Interviews with candidates and completers corroborate data from the completer surveys that the area of supporting students with special needs could be strengthened. Candidates and completers indicated that they feel prepared to identify and get to know students, however they expressed a desire to have continuing support (from the pre-requisite class) in how to learn how to read IEPs and plan instruction to more explicitly support this group of students. Candidates echoed the completer survey results in stating that they feel well prepared to support second-language learners and to address the needs of culturally, emotionally, socially diverse populations. Candidates in interviews and in survey data valued their experiences with cooperating teachers, the fostering of addressing individual students, and creating learning environments in their classrooms. Completer survey results indicated that a great strength of the multiple subject program is in the number of completers indicating confidence in mathematics methods.

Candidates, mentors, supervisors, and faculty had differing ideas around the level of support for candidates to learn to use technology in classrooms. Candidates from all of the teacher preparation programs indicated that faculty utilized technology in their instructional practice, but that exploring pedagogies surrounding the use of technology was a professor-by-professor experience. Interviews with faculty revealed that they make specific efforts to incorporate technology into practice, and are interested in considering how they might think about supporting pedagogies for teaching in online environments moving forward. This interest would mirror the optional inclusion of technology mentioned in the fieldwork syllabus that specifically mentions iNACOL standards. Stronger integration of technology through coursework would bolster this new focus embedded in the 2016 TPEs. Single-subject candidates also indicated interest in learning more about, and the program supporting, attendance at local conferences.

Assessment of Candidates
Fieldwork and coursework syllabi describe a progressive series of formative and summative assessments of candidate learning. A clear system is in place, including "mock" edTPA experiences, theory-to-practice assignments, and a thread of self-reflection in the program that results in candidates who are confident in their skills. The culmination of the program in an Individual Development Plan that is completed during the last two weeks of the program creates a document that closes this experience and bridges to induction.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the Preliminary Multiple Subject with Intern and Preliminary Single Subject with Intern credential programs except the following:

Standard 2: Preparing Candidates toward Mastery of the Teaching Performance Expectations – Met with Concerns

Interviews revealed that coursework and clinical practice to provide multiple opportunities for all candidates to learn, apply, and reflect on all components of the Teaching Performance Expectations, specifically those related to digital literacy and the use of technology and applying UDL, MTSS, and candidate knowledge of students' IEPs and 504s to planning instruction and assessment were not evident in the program.

Bilingual Authorization

Program Design

SDSU's Bilingual Authorization has three main supports which include a thorough background on bilingual education, dual-language programs, and language policy; grounding in academic language use and instruction within the target language or in dual-language programs; and, attention to issues of social justice, history, culture, and equity as they affect language use, language minorities, and communities. Throughout candidates' program of study the attention to emergent bilinguals is embedded throughout the program and coursework. SDSU's program offers three pathways to the Bilingual Authorization, each with an emphasis in biliteracy for K-12 students.

In the first pathway, teacher candidates who are bilingual in Spanish and English can complete the Bilingual Authorization program concurrently with the Dual Language and English Learner Education (DLE) and Imperial Valley Campus (IVC) approved Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential programs. Teacher candidates have two options to meet the Bilingual Authorization program requirements. They may complete a full program of study to meet all standards for the Bilingual Authorization or they may complete corresponding CSET World Language exams, if for any reason they are not able to complete the coursework or if they have met the equivalency to the coursework via exam prior to entering the program. In the DLE department, where there is a dedicated concurrent bilingual Multiple Subject and Single Subject program, the courses are taught using both English and Spanish. At the IVC, where there is no separate bilingual program, candidates complete three courses in Spanish.

A second pathway for candidates concurrently pursuing the Bilingual Authorization in Arabic, Japanese, Mandarin, or Filpino with the Preliminary Multiple Subject Credential is to meet the requirements via a combination of coursework and corresponding CSET World Language exams.

For these language groups, coursework meeting the Bilingual Authorization standards is taught in English to the Context of Bilingual Education and Bilingual Methodology. For the Culture of Emphasis and Language Competence, candidates complete the corresponding CSET World Language exams.

The final pathway is for post-credential candidates who are Spanish/English bilingual to add a Bilingual Authorization via coursework. Teachers take four courses (13 units) to complete their Bilingual Added Authorization with an emphasis in biliteracy for K-12. The courses cover all of the Bilingual Authorization standards and nine of the units can be applied to the DLE Master in Education.

Course of Study
Concurrent Bilingual Authorization program coursework and fieldwork follow the same pattern and sequence as the Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs across departments with modifications included in required courses and fieldwork experiences. Candidates complete professional coursework and student teaching in two semesters and approximately 50% of the total program is devoted to student teaching.

In summer 2018, DLE added an online concurrent Multiple Subject credential and Bilingual Authorization, funded via the Classified Employee grant. It serves a four-county consortium comprised of Imperial, Orange, Butte, and San Diego County. The initial cohort included 310 classified employees at various stages in higher education, from 60 units to a completed BA. Of these, 49 qualified to start the credential program because they had their Bachelor's degree and had completed most prerequisites and a minimum of 300 hours of fieldwork. The online block follows much the same sequence as the other credential programs, but their student teaching is completed in one rather than two semesters.

A Single Subject credential with Bilingual Authorization is available for candidates interested in fieldwork and teaching in a bilingual Spanish middle or secondary school classroom in the candidates' subject major (Science, Math, Social Science, or World Languages-Spanish). This credential authorizes the holder to teach in any self-contained Spanish bilingual or regular classroom in which one teacher is responsible for teaching the given subject area. Because courses on methods of teaching subject areas are taught in Spanish as well as English, candidates must meet language of emphasis proficiency requirements. Candidates complete professional coursework and student teaching in two semesters and approximately 50% of the total program is devoted to student teaching.

Assessment of Candidate Competence
For the Bilingual Authorization, all DLE candidates are evaluated on their performance by faculty, district-employed cooperating teachers, and university supervisors. Evaluation of performance includes reflections on the part of the teacher candidate and fieldwork observations. Fieldwork observations include the classroom observation as well as a post-

observation conference where the candidate's performance is discussed and suggestions made. Faculty, supervisors, cooperating teachers, candidates, and program completers confirmed that the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher provide formative and summative feedback to DLE bilingual teacher candidates. At the end of the semester, the cooperating teacher and university supervisor confer to develop a written assessment of the candidate's performance. This summative evaluation incorporates elements from the DLE Bilingual Authorization Program.

DLE candidates pursuing the Bilingual Authorization in Asian/Middle Eastern languages in conjunction with the DLE approved Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential meet the requirements via a combination of coursework and CSET LOTE exams. For these language groups, coursework meeting the Bilingual Authorization Standards is taught in English to meet Standards 3 and 4 (Context of Bilingual Education and Bilingual Methodology). For Standards 5 and 6 (Culture of Emphasis & Language Competence) candidates complete the CSET LOTE exams III & V.

DLE candidates and credentialed teachers pursuing the Bilingual Authorization in Spanish add a Bilingual Authorization via coursework (4 courses) with an emphasis in biliteracy for K-12. These four courses (13 semester units) cover all of the Bilingual Authorization standards. Twelve of the units can be applied to the DLE MA in Education.

In addition to a clear process for assessing candidates, the Bilingual Authorization program also clearly delineates a process for support and, as appropriate, repercussion for candidates not making adequate progress. Based on document review and interviews, candidates are evaluated regarding their eligibility to be recommended for the bilingual authorization in the target language. To assess the effectiveness of the preparation program, program completers are surveyed one year after completion of their credential program in order to determine any changes to the existing program sequence and content. This data is shared with the DLE faculty and their stakeholders for discussion about possible next steps to improve the preparation of bilingual candidates.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

A highly collaborative culture exists within the College of Education as a result of the governance structure, vast partnerships, and commitment to equity. As recipients of a Wallace grant, the faculty, along with all of their partners, have embarked on a redesign quest that has led to the current Administrative Services program. This redesign mindset is now embedded in the culture, and as a collective, the program personnel are dedicated to a continuous improvement model. Using the monthly meetings with Wallace personnel and a large number of other collaborative meetings, programs collect data, elicit feedback, and study outcomes in real time for continuous data-informed program improvement.

Program Design

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential at SDSU is offered at the main campus in central San Diego, CA. The program resides within the College of Education under the direction of the dean. The chair of the Educational Leadership department is responsible for the Administrative Services Credential program. Through the integration of coursework and field experiences, candidates are provided multiple opportunities to practice and be assessed on the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs). The Educational Leadership (EDL) program prepares future leaders to make a powerful difference in the lives of students in education settings. The goal is to produce equity-driven leaders who fulfill the promise of engaging and inspiring learners. The EDL department is committed to developing the skills and dispositions of future leaders who desire focused preparation in how to respond to the emerging challenges and opportunities facing today's schools. In addition, SDSU faculty are committed to preparing candidates to lead and nurture the capacity of others toward a vision of excellence for all demographic groups of students thus transforming schools into dynamic, results-focused learning communities.

As a result of a variety of partnerships and grants, the most notable being the Wallace grant, the faculty and all partners have collaborated around a redesign of both the Preliminary and Clear Administrative Programs. EDL faculty and district partners are committed to creating fieldwork and clinical experiences for candidates that are aligned to the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE), California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA), and district needs. Faculty and partners also participated together in the redesign of the Clear Administrative Services Credential (CASC), resulting in seamless support for candidates moving into the two-year induction process. Program faculty and district partners commented on the highly collaborative community of practice that exists in these programs.

The faculty, in collaboration with district partners and program graduates, engaged in a comprehensive curriculum review in 2017 that resulted in a redesign. Data analysis and the adoption of the CalAPA performance tasks served as the springboard for this redesign. Faculty, executive leaders from local school districts, and graduates of the program came together to redefine core beliefs. What emerged were the five types of thinking a school leader employs: Culture and Climate Thinking, Data and Design Thinking, Leadership Thinking, Operational Thinking, and Systems Thinking.

The redesigned administrative services credential curriculum was implemented for the first time in the 2017-18 academic year. The program employs a hybrid delivery model with students spending approximately 75% of their time in face-to-face learning environments, and 25% of their credit hours engaging in online exercises and activities. Candidates engage in their coursework within cohorts which provides the opportunity to build relationships with peers that will provide a professional support network that long outlasts their time in the program. This was confirmed by completers who expressed a deep and abiding connection to the

program. District supervisors and employers highlighted the equity lens as a skillset candidates embrace in the program that serves them well as they promote into leadership positions. Candidates and completers reported that the program has intentional design and was seamless across professors. The accessibility and positive, strong relationships with professors was expressed in all groups interviewed. All stakeholders spoke of the program as well-coordinated and intentional.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience
The course of study is a balance between theory and practice. Coursework leverages the work of key scholars in the field including texts and studies by faculty members who teach the courses. Additionally, practices, simulations, and field experiences challenge candidates in their application of theory to school-focused problems of practice. Guided by the CAPE performance expectations, the performance tasks set forth in the CalAPA, and the five types of leadership thinking, each instructor presents a dynamic learning experience, scaffolded by defined goals and objectives, and involving a range of pedagogical approaches that are matched to the stated outcomes of each course.

All Preliminary Administrative Services credential candidates complete 140 hours of fieldwork as part of their program. Candidates are placed with practicing administrators in their districts, or a neighboring district. During the 2017-18 academic year, 36 credential candidates received field placements with practicing administrators. These practicing administrators are educational professionals serving as site leaders, district directors, and/or assistant superintendents who work with candidates as their assigned supervisors. These district-based supervisors have the responsibility for assessing candidates throughout their fieldwork experience. Candidates, completers, supervisors, and district personnel all spoke favorably about these experiences for candidates. The shadowing assignment was mentioned with frequency as being a pivotal learning experience.

Assessment of Candidates
Interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, and field supervisors confirmed the structure and alignment of assessments with standards (CPSELS) and CalAPA. Documented evidence including syllabi from classroom and fieldwork courses identifies the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs) to be addressed, and the type of learning to occur (introduction, practice and/or assessment) during the program. Competencies aligned to the CAPEs are assessed throughout the three-semester curriculum, which includes seven benchmark assignments.

Assessment also includes the new CalAPA, for which the program served as a pilot site. The three cycles of the CalAPA are integrated into curriculum-aligned courses and provide targeted assessment of credential candidates in the areas of data and gap analysis, facilitating professional learning, and coaching to improve teaching and learning. Feedback is elicited from

candidates after each course and contributes to the program's cycle of continuous improvement.

The program includes a comprehensive oral exam which is an opportunity for candidates to demonstrate mastery of the CAPEs – as required for credentialing – and to demonstrate that they have successfully led a target group improvement project. This oral exam occurs after candidates have completed all credential coursework. The exam is conducted by a panel of faculty members with each candidate individually. The exam has four components on which candidates must receive a rating of *Meets* or *Exceeds Standards* in order to be recommended for the Preliminary Administrative Services credential. Recommendation for the Preliminary Administrative Services credential is made after the university's credential analyst evaluates the participant's qualifications against a program checklist and accompanying program clearance form.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and coaches, the team determined that all program standards are **MET** for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program.

Clear Administrative Services Induction

Program Design
The Clear Administrative Services Credential at SDSU is offered through the main campus and at the school sites of the Preliminary Administrative Services credential holders. The program resides within the College of Education under the direction of the chair of the Educational Leadership department. The department is responsible for overseeing the Administrative Services Credential program, including coursework for the preliminary credential, as well as the induction program that leads to a Clear Administrative Services Credential.

The program builds upon a framework that ensures program components train novice administrators to develop and deepen their expertise of instructional pedagogy for equity and provide growth-producing feedback to teachers. Training also provides the skills to navigate and support organizational stability by recognizing school structures and systems critical for all students to achieve and thrive at high levels. Candidates expand and refine knowledge and skills to promote more effective teaching and learning through cognitive coaching. Additionally, candidates engage in authentic leadership experiences through a systematic structure of support that helps them experience first-hand issues administrators face, refine their practice, and better understand their professional responsibilities.

There are four components to earning the Clear Administrative Services credential, along with a required minimum of 80 hours for the inductee over the course of two years. The bulk of the

program is devoted to one-on-one coaching and network coaching triads. Each inductee is required to attend a mandatory orientation at the commencement of the program. The program is divided into four distinct components: clinics, one-on-one coaching, networking coaching triads, and the creation of an Individualized Induction Plan (IIP).

One-on-one coaching and clinical experiences were recently modified in the following ways: the coaching component now allows for district leaders in five participating San Diego County districts to provide coaching and support from within their own organizations through partnerships. Participation occurs under an agreed upon Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which outlines the expectations the responsibilities of the university, the responsibilities of the respective district, articulation of resources, inductee responsibilities, and shared responsibilities of SDSU and districts. Once these program elements are met, each district may tailor a portion of the program to specific needs and focus areas of the district. The clinical component provides clinical experiences relevant to each administrator's newly acquired role in a timely manner, such as learning about instructional pedagogy as a support for supervising and evaluating teachers' performance while on the job. Interviews with faculty, district partners, and candidates confirmed these positive improvement modifications.

The program encourages stakeholder input. With the support of the Wallace Foundation, SDSU was offered a grant to redesign the Clear Administrative Services Credentialing program. This resulted in the development of partnerships with local school districts to collaborate, co-plan, and co-design current program elements. As a result, there have been significant improvements to the program. Examples include monthly advisory meetings, full-day *Think Tanks* with Wallace partner districts, joint professional development sessions, end-of-course focus groups to evaluate for areas of program improvement, two way collaboration/communication between SDSU faculty and district partners, exit interview debriefing sessions with graduating candidates to understand their experience and needs for future support and growth as they remain in the pipeline, and consultation with the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and program survey administration and analysis.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)
Each Administrative Services credential inductee develops an Individual Induction Plan (IIP) with his/her coach specific to identify the areas of greatest need or growth for the novice administrator. These IIPs typically include overarching themes related to instruction, coaching, school structures, and systems. Inductees then participate in yearly clinics designed to reflect both the themes inherent in their IIP and the current work the novice administrator may encounter throughout the two-year program.

SDSU inductees and their coaches receive guidance on the requirements for successful completion of earning the Clear Administrative Services Credential. Each coach helps craft a rigorous, relevant IIP aligned to the demands of the novice principal's desired goals. Frequent

discussion and interaction between the coaches and program faculty provides opportunities for professional growth for all participants.

As many as 100 inductees may participate each year in the clear induction program. The design of the program allows for enrollment within 120 days of starting an initial administrative position. It is designed to be a two-year experience. There is an opportunity for inductees to begin their program immediately upon accepting a leadership position.

All of the induction experiences take place at school sites. Quarterly clinics provide the formal professional learning around specific topics essential to moving novice administrators toward becoming sustainable and effective practitioners. The topics of the clinics are designed to connect to the field work by utilizing a series of structured activities following each clinic. For example, upon engaging in professional learning on Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR), inductees participate in planning and delivering a lesson utilizing GRR, shadowing and debriefing a lesson using GRR, and engage in instructional rounds with his/her coach to observe GRR practices.

Coaches, which include SDSU Administrative Services program alumni, are assigned to work with inductees based upon the best fit between the coach's experience and the needs of the novice administrator. A maximum of three inductees may be assigned to a given coach. This model allows the coach to facilitate the network coaching triads with his/her inductees. All coaches are supported through professional development and it is expected that the coach supervise the field work associated with the IIP not less than once per month. The frequency may increase in response to the IIP or issues that may arise while implementing the IIP. The coaches use all program assessments to support and guide the inductee's growth in the CPSEL leadership competencies.

The program coordinators host monthly meetings with the coaches to check in on inductees' progress and how the IIPs are developing, and identify roadblocks that need to be addressed, all with the goal of improving coaching skills and deepening their understanding of the process of coaching novice administrators.
Faculty, candidates, district employed and completers verified the power of the coaching experience.

Assessment of Candidates
Interviews with candidates, completers, district partners, and coaches corroborated the program structure and assessment evidence that was presented to the Commission during Program Review. The program implements individualized, job-embedded support and guidance through a blended model of one-on-one expert coaching, quarterly network meetings, and rich professional learning opportunities. Program participants target specific learning goals with the support of an experienced leader, and have opportunities to engage in collaborative learning

with peers who are facing similar work situations. The foundation for the program is clearly based on the CPSELs.

Novice administrators complete a pre-, mid-, and post-program self-assessment aligned with the CPSELs and focused on an effective instructional system. The assessments not only enable the novice to assess personal leadership growth with respect to the CPSELs, but also enable each novice to monitor progress in moving his/her school toward high-performance and, in particular, high-achievement for all students.

In addition to these formal assessments program participants have a variety of other opportunities to demonstrate growth in all six CPSELs, including one-on-one coaching sessions, network coaching triads, maintaining an interactive journal, and development of the IIP and portfolio (reflecting progress toward achieving problem-solving goals).

Program participants are advised about assessment criteria upon entering the program during a mandatory orientation that occurs two weeks before the start of the program. The IIP is the primary vehicle through which professional learning is personalized and growth is measured for participants. Professional learning opportunities are based on the participant's self-assessment of current strengths and areas for growth. The participant is advised that informal and ongoing assessments occur through feedback, based on the program coordinator's observations of the network coaching triads and on the coaches' reports of progress in one-on-one coaching sessions. Participants are also advised that participation in all aspects of the program components is assessed.

Recommendation for the Clear Administrative Services credential is made after the university's credential analyst evaluates the participant's qualifications against a program checklist and accompanying program clearance form.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and coaches, the team determined that all program standards are **MET** for the Clear Administrative Services Induction program.

Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate with Intern, Moderate to Severe with Intern, and Early Childhood Special Education with Intern

Program Design
The SDSU Department of Special Education has three Preliminary Education Specialist programs: Mild to Moderate Disabilities, Moderate to Severe Disabilities, and Early Childhood Special Education. Candidates have the option to complete either a student teaching or Intern program pathway in each of these areas. The program offers candidates an interdisciplinary

experience in which they complete most of their courses together with peers from one or two other program areas, with the exception of courses that focus on assessment and instructional methods.

SDSU leadership in the Education Specialist credential programs includes program coordinators who report to the department chair and collaborate with all colleagues in the department. Each program has its own program coordinator. Faculty members collaborate to make decisions as a group during monthly faculty meetings the attended by all tenured and tenure-track faculty. The department chair also holds meetings with all faculty, including all course instructors and adjuncts for credential program courses; issues related to program development and course content changes are discussed.

All candidates are required to take prerequisite courses including a course from the Department of Dual Language and English Learner Education that focuses on strategies for working with English learners. They enter the program as a cohort and complete the remaining required courses in either one year or two years, depending on the pathway they have chosen.

The field experiences, practicum, and clinical practice hours are scaffolded throughout the credential programs. One course provides 12 hours of observation in the field in a variety of educational settings for individuals with disabilities across ages and includes general education environments. The Mild to Moderate and Moderate to Severe programs require two additional practicum experiences which include student teaching.

The Education Specialist Intern program was modified at the beginning of Fall 2016 based on feedback from Education Specialist Intern program completers. The department hired a new full-time intern coordinator to oversee the Intern program and to develop a support system for current and future interns. The coordinator hired two additional people to fill the role of a university intern support person. The intern coordinator also created an intern handbook that outlined the responsibilities of the intern, the university, and the school district in supporting Education Specialist Mild to Moderate and Moderate to Severe Interns. The Intern program relies on a continuous improvement model that uses feedback from intern completers, university intern support personnel, districts, and school support personnel (teachers and administrators) to identify ways to support interns as they transition into full-time special education teachers.

It was clear after interviewing current candidates, program completers, teachers, district level administrators, university supervisors, and faculty that each of the preliminary pathways encourages stakeholder input. Furthermore, the program's procurement of federal and state grant dollars has facilitated the strengthening of current partnerships and the development of new partnerships with local school districts to better collaborate, co-plan, and co-design program elements.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)
The Preliminary Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, and Early Childhood Special Education credential programs provide candidates with field experience opportunities at three different points in the program that are connected to coursework. During completion of the prerequisite courses, candidates enroll in a field experiences course. This course requires candidates to complete 30 hours of in-class observations. After candidates have been admitted to the program and during the first semester, candidates complete 90 to 120 practicum hours in a general education, Mild to Moderate, or Moderate to Severe classroom. Early Childhood Special Education candidates complete 300 hours working with infants and toddlers. During the second and final semester, candidates take an advanced practicum in which they complete 14 weeks of student teaching with 35 hours a week of in-class time for a total of 598 fieldwork hours minimum. Early Childhood Special Education candidates take an advanced practicum in which they complete 14 weeks teaching 35 hours a week in the preschool setting.

The program has two courses that focus on instructing candidates in the methods of teaching English language acquisition and development and teaching reading and language arts.

All candidates, university supervisors for the program, and master/mentor teachers receive a practicum handbook during the initial practicum experience and prior to beginning the student teaching experience. This handbook outlines the field experience sequence, describes the timeline for assuming responsibilities during student teaching, and lists the responsibilities for the candidate, the university supervisor, and the mentor teacher separately. It describes the role and responsibilities of the program coordinator as the person who oversees the practicum and who addresses issues that may arise. The handbook also informs the candidates about the process of applying for their preliminary credential through the College of Education at SDSU.

Assessment of Candidates
Candidate competencies are assessed in multiple ways throughout the credential program. Key courses include signature assignments that require the practice and demonstration of meeting the Commission's adopted standards. Candidates collect these assignments (e.g., lesson plans, assessments, parent interviews, sample IEP goals, etc.) and upload them to a portfolio in their Taskstream account. The portfolio is shared at a culminating Portfolio Fair Activity and reviewed by one of the key tenure track faculty in the candidate's program area at the end of the credential program. The quality of the portfolio and the assignments is rated on a Portfolio Evaluation Rubric during this event.

All candidates are rated by university supervisors and master/mentor teachers during practicum and student teaching using the Competency Rating Form for their credential program. Candidates receive feedback on their performance on these competencies throughout their student teaching experience and understand that they are aiming to achieve a rating of 4 or 5 for each of the competencies by the end of their program. The program instructs candidates about the Signature Assignments, Portfolio, and Candidate Rating forms

during the mandatory orientation meeting, the initial practicum experience, and during their technology course.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Disabilities with Intern, Education Specialist: Moderate to Severe Disabilities with Intern, and Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education Credential Programs.

<div align="center">

Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling

</div>

Program Design
The Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) School Counseling program is located within the College of Education (COE) and overseen by a dean who reports to the provost. Within the COE, the School Counseling program is housed in the Department of Counseling and School Psychology and led by a department chair. The PPS School Counseling program co-directors report to the department chair. There are a total of three full-time faculty and two full-time lecturers supporting the program, with approximately nine part-time lecturers.

The Department of Counseling and School Psychology holds monthly meetings for all faculty. The department chair works together with the faculty to support the program, ensure alignment of standards, and promote program coherence. The School Counseling program faculty meet every term to review candidate progress and evaluate any program changes. The program is designed to work in a collaborative model, and as such, all full-time faculty and lecturers participate in policy decisions, student admissions activities, and ongoing advising of students.

Each candidate is assigned to a faculty advisor when entering the program. The faculty advisor provides mentoring and support for program planning, fieldwork, and any concerns that may arise, and conducts an exit interview upon program completion. The advising capacity was noted as a program strength in interviews with both candidates and faculty, with many candidates and completers making comments such as, "The program cares about us as a whole person."
The program co-directors maintain and have access to all program documents, resources, and assessments, and are able to share those with other faculty, staff, and students, as merited and/or needed. All syllabi templates include standards and policies and are available to all faculty to ensure program fidelity. Through the syllabi, candidates are informed about the standards, assignments, assessments, and requirements for each course, along with the expectations and process for evaluating candidate skills, knowledge, and dispositions.

The program requires candidates to complete 62 units with a Master's degree in Counseling. Candidates are expected to complete all program requirements through a two-year process, which includes regular coursework and supervisory meetings. The course sequence is designed to build on each previous course and integrates practicum and fieldwork experiences. In the first year, candidates complete their first 200 hours of fieldwork, which the program calls practicum. All candidates are also required to complete an additional 100 hours of practicum as defined by the Commission's program standards. In the second year, candidates complete the remaining 400 hours of fieldwork. Candidates may select a field placement site based on their needs (i.e. career goals, logistical preference, and/or level of education) or the program can provide referrals to specific sites; regardless, every site must be approved by the program director and have an appropriate MOU between the program and the site. Throughout the coursework and fieldwork experiences, candidates are assessed on their knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Every SDSU candidate works with a site supervisor and a university supervisor throughout their field experiences.

The program regularly solicits feedback about candidate progress and overall program effectiveness through meetings held every term with faculty, alumni, and candidates. Additionally, data is collected on candidate and program processes more intently during the program's annual research symposium. Over the past two years, and based on key stakeholder input, the program added a lab course to the curriculum that focuses on college and career readiness from a multicultural/social justice perspective and initiated a more comprehensive selection process for recommending and approving fieldwork placement sites to better ensure that candidates have a training experience that is more closely aligned with the American School Counseling Association (ASCA) National Model. Current candidates expressed that the program's alignment and commitment to the ASCA National Model is a key strength of the program with one candidate stating, "We are able to get fieldwork sites that allow us to work with what our professional association expects of us as professional school counselors."

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)
The program's course sequence is designed in a scaffolded manner with courses building on content from previous courses. Candidates in the first year take courses primarily focused on the foundational and introductory school counseling skills and knowledge, including theories, groups, ethics, and multicultural counseling. In the second year, and during their more intensive fieldwork experience, the courses focus on advanced skill development, policy, and the ASCA National Model. Program documents thoroughly cover all Commission-adopted standards as well as the ASCA domains for school counseling.

Interviews with site supervisors and other community stakeholders confirm that the SDSU candidates are well prepared with one interviewee stating, "Candidates are very well prepared and I always look for SDSU grads if I need to hire a PPS graduate." Additionally, completers and current candidates confirm the relevance of coursework to the realities of school experiences and work needed in the schools. One interviewee stated, "I really appreciated the social justice

and community-based focus." This viewpoint was shared by many other interviewees who indicated that social justice, multicultural, and community-focused course content was emphasized throughout the program and during fieldwork.

All candidates are supported in finding their own fieldwork placement site; SDSU makes the final determination regarding whether a specific site is acceptable. Candidates reported that selecting a site was advantageous to them because it allowed them to choose a location that was most conducive to helping them meet their career and personal goals. All candidates are required to have a minimum of 200 hours of experience at two different levels (elementary, middle, and/or high school), and the site supervisors pointed out that the SDSU program made sure that the sites promote "self-care" as an important part of their training.

The candidates are evaluated four times a year - twice each term - by their on-site supervisor and also at least once each term by their university supervisor. A standard rubric is used for the evaluation. Candidates are also evaluated on a final project that they develop for a site and present at the program's annual research symposium.

Assessment of Candidates
Candidates are assessed throughout their courses and fieldwork process. Grading rubrics are developed for each course and used by all faculty and supervisors. Candidates also complete a self-assessment on dispositions at the beginning of the program and are given feedback on their dispositions from both university and on-site supervisors. Candidates reported through interviews that they felt supported throughout the whole program evaluation process and felt comfortable approaching any faculty with any concerns or difficulties they might be experiencing. When asked how they would address a concern that might come up in a course or during fieldwork, candidates responded that they felt there was "plenty" of support, with one candidate stating, "I always know there are at least a few people I can talk to, including my advisor and/or course faculty."

Candidates are assessed at the end of their program with a final evaluation from the site and university supervisor, as well as on their presentation at the research symposium. Candidates are also required to complete an online portfolio in which they showcase their best work and use the material for future employment possibilities. All candidates are required to pass the PRAXIS exam for school counselors, a nationally recognized comprehensive exam used by several institutions for summative assessment purposes.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the PPS School Counseling Program.

Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology

Program Design

The Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) School Psychology program is located within the College of Education (COE) and overseen by a dean who reports to the provost. Within the COE, the School Psychology program is housed in the Department of Counseling and School Psychology and led by a department chair. The PPS School Psychology program director reports to the department chair. There are four full-time faculty and full-time emeritus faculty along with over 12 adjunct faculty supporting the program. The full-time emeritus faculty oversees a grant program that provides funding for multicultural, social justice, and cross professional collaboration for school psychologists. The department chair works together with the faculty to support the program, ensure alignment of standards, and promote program coherence.

The School Psychology program faculty meet every month to review candidate progress and to evaluate any changes to the program and/or profession. The program is designed to work in a collaborative model, and all full-time and adjunct faculty participate in policy decisions, student admissions activities, and ongoing advising of students.

Each candidate is assigned to a faculty advisor when entering the program. The faculty advisor provides mentoring and support for program planning, implementation, fieldwork, and completion. The advising capacity was noted as a program strength in interviews with both candidates, faculty, supervisors, and employers. One of the employers noted that candidates come into the field with a good sense of "self-care".

The program director maintains and has access to all program documents, resources, and assessments and is able to share those with other faculty, staff, and students, as merited and/or needed. All syllabi templates include standards and policies and are available to all faculty to ensure program fidelity. Through the syllabi, candidates are informed about the standards, assignments, assessments, and requirements for each course, along with the expectations and processes for evaluating candidate skills, knowledge, and dispositions.

The program requires all candidates to complete a 46-unit Master of Science (M.S.) degree followed by a 47-unit Education Specialist (Ed.S.) for a total of 93 units to meet their PPS requirements. Candidates participate through the program in a cohort model and are expected to complete program requirements through a four-year process, which includes regular coursework, practicum and fieldwork, and supervisory meetings. The course sequence is designed to build on each previous course and is integrated with the practicum and fieldwork experiences. The program places candidates in a practicum site during their first year but afterwards candidates are allowed to select from a list of approved sites.

For their final fieldwork placement, candidates may select a site based on their needs (i.e. career goals, logistical preference, and/or level of education) or the program can provide

referrals to specific sites; regardless, every site must be approved by the program director and have an appropriate MOU between the program and the site.

Throughout the course and fieldwork experiences, candidates are assessed on their knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Every candidate works with a site supervisor and a university supervisor throughout their field experiences. One of the field site supervisors indicated that they are always happy to take on more SDSU candidates because they truly believe that "the candidates benefit from the experience, but more importantly the students in the school benefit from the candidates."

The program regularly solicits feedback about candidate progress and on overall program effectiveness through monthly meetings faculty and supervisors. Additionally, data is solicited every year from either an advisory group meeting or a functional faculty retreat meeting that is held on alternating years. Over the past three years, and based on key stakeholder input, the program made some revisions to the curriculum. They added a stand-alone ethics class and a school-based mental health class so that the program would be better aligned with the National Association of School Psychologist (NASP) domains. Current candidates expressed the program's alignment and commitment to the NASP domains as a key strength of the program, with one candidate stating "we are better able to work in any state if we choose because of the NASP alignment."

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)
The program course sequence is designed with courses building on content from previous courses and each year has its own theme. In year 1, the focus is on systemic thinking and data-based decision making. In year 2, the focus is on groups, consultation, intervention, and evaluation. In year 3, the focus is on advanced individual- and systems-level interventions, and in year 4 the focus is on integration of multicultural school psychology. Additionally, each year there is a full-time faculty member that oversees the practicum/fieldwork requirements for that year.

Interviews with site supervisors and other community stakeholders confirm that SDSU candidates are well prepared, with one interviewee stating, "I wish we could get more SDSU candidates at our site." Another employer shared their appreciation for the "academic rigor" that the program provides to all candidates. Both completers and candidates confirm the relevance of coursework to the realities of their school experiences and work required in the school settings. Many of the interviewees stated an appreciation for the multicultural and social justice emphasis throughout the program, while one candidate specifically highlighted the benefit of producing so many candidates that are bilingual in Spanish.

Many of the key constituents indicated that they appreciated the practical experience the candidates receive over the 4-year period. In all, candidates exceed the number of

practicum/fieldwork hours required by state or NASP standards, with all candidates graduating with more than 2,000 hours of experience.

Candidates are evaluated a minimum of 2 times a year by their onsite supervisor and university supervisor. A standard rubric is used for the evaluation. Candidates are also evaluated on assignments that are related to course content and field experience.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed throughout the course and fieldwork process. Grading rubrics are developed for each course and used by all faculty and supervisors. All candidates are assessed a minimum of once per term at their field site with an Evaluation of Competency Development (ECD) assessment. The ECD assesses candidates based on the NASP domains and the Commission's PPS standards. Candidates also complete a self-assessment on dispositions at the beginning of the program and are given feedback on their dispositions from both university and on-site supervisors throughout their academic tenure. Candidates reported through interviews that they felt supported throughout the whole program evaluation process and felt comfortable approaching any faculty with any concerns or difficulties they may be experiencing. One candidate stated that they "appreciate the emphasis on introspection" that was emphasized in their first year. When asked how they would address a concern that might come up in a course or fieldwork, candidates responded that they felt comfortable approaching any faculty or supervisor. One candidate specifically stated that they appreciated the "multi-level yearly support" provided by the program.

Candidates are assessed at the end of the Master of Science portion of their program with a Master's project. At the end of the Ed.S., candidates are required to successfully pass the School Psychology PRAXIS exam, a nationally recognized comprehensive exam used by several institutions for summative assessment purposes. Candidates are also required to complete an online portfolio in which they showcase their best work and use the material for future employment possibilities.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the PPS School Psychology Program.

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

Program Design
The Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) School Social Work (SSW) and Child Welfare and Attendance (CWA) program are located within the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) and overseen by a dean who reports to the provost. Within the CHHS, the School Social Work and Child Welfare and Attendance program coordinator reports to the Director of Social Work who reports to the Dean. Candidates are exposed to any number of faculty in the Social Work program, which includes 17 full-time faculty, 3 full-time lecturers, and over 38 adjunct faculty. The SSW/CWA program emphasizes a multicultural, social justice, and cross professional collaboration approach for all their SSW/CWA credential candidates, and all candidates that go through the program must meet all the criteria required by the Commission for both the SSW and CWA credentials.

The SSW/CWA program faculty meet every month to review candidate progress and to evaluate any changes to the program and/or profession. The program is designed to work in a collaborative model, and all full-time and adjunct faculty participate in policy decisions, candidate admissions activities, and ongoing advising of candidates. Each candidate is assigned a faculty advisor when entering the program. The faculty advisor provides mentoring and support for program planning, implementation, fieldwork, and completion and also reports to the director. The faculty advising capacity was noted as a program strength in interviews with both candidates, faculty, supervisors, and employers. One employer noted during interviews that candidates come into the field with a good sense of "self-care".

The program coordinator maintains and has access to all program documents, resources, and assessments and are able to share those with other faculty, staff, and students, as merited and/or needed. All syllabi templates include standards and policies and are available to all faculty to ensure program fidelity. Through the syllabi, candidates are informed about the standards, assignments, assessments, and requirements for each course.

The program requires candidates to complete a 2 year 60-unit Master of Social Work (M.S.W.) degree in order to obtain the PPS SSW/CWA credentials. The program allows some candidates to enroll under an advanced standing process which allots credit for previous course work; however, all candidates, regardless of previous course status, are required to complete the minimum of 1,000 hours of fieldwork with a minimum of 450 hours in a K-12 school setting and an additional 150 hours, as required by the Commission's standards for SSW and CWA credentials. The program ensures this process through close monitoring of candidates by university supervisors and site supervisors. All candidates selected for participation in the PPS credential program must be approved to perform in a school social work practicum site.

Candidates participate in regular coursework, fieldwork, and supervisory meetings on a regular basis. The course sequence is designed to build on each previous course and is integrated with the practicum and fieldwork experiences. Candidates are allowed to complete their fieldwork in one of eight districts where there is an existing service learning agreement with the district. Throughout the courses and fieldwork experiences, candidates are assessed on their knowledge and skills. One of the field site supervisors indicated that they primarily take on SDSU PPS SSW/CWA candidates and graduates and noted that "more than 70% of the 23 school social work personnel in the district are graduates from the SDSU PPS SSW program."

The program regularly solicits feedback about candidate progress and overall program effectiveness through meetings held every term with faculty and supervisors. Additionally, data is solicited annually from key stakeholders, advisory groups, professional association meetings, and the school of social work. Over the past two years, and based on key stakeholder input, the program made some revisions to the curriculum, specifically with the addition of a self-study course where candidates self-rate their work against the Commission's standards. This coincides with feedback from candidates, completers, and mentors who complimented the programs emphasis on self-reflection and self-care. One mentor specifically stated that they had to tell a candidate to "take some time off" in order to highlight the importance of self-care, because the candidate wanted to continue to work on a site even though the university was on a break.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)
The School of Social Work Master of Social Work degree requires candidates interested in the Pupil Personnel Services credential in SSW/CWA to take courses in the Advanced Direct Practice Concentration. This includes a two semester field practicum and two advanced practice classes focusing on individuals and families. In addition, the PPS candidates must complete an advanced human behavior course, policy course, research course, and a school social work and child welfare and attendance course. There is also the recent addition of a self-study course where candidates evaluate their work against the Commission's standards for SSW/CWA. Some of the candidates in the program stated that the course content on diversity and multicultural support directly helped with "working with children in different cultural groups."

University supervisors are required to complete two of four trainings offered throughout the year. All candidates are paired with supervisors that are well versed with the program requirements, professional obligations, and remediation processes. For example, one supervisor indicated that "there are specific systems in place to provide every candidate added support if there are any difficulties encounter at a school site." Candidates are evaluated a minimum of two times a year by their onsite supervisor and university supervisor. A standard 5-point rubric is used for the evaluation. Candidates are also evaluated on assignments that are related to course content and field experience.

Assessment of Candidates

In addition to the course assessments, and the fieldwork evaluations that candidates receive throughout their fieldwork and practicum experiences, candidates must demonstrate competency in all areas of the PPS standards, as evidenced by participation in learning activities in all areas. Candidates are required to list specific learning activities in 11 PPS competency areas including Child Welfare and Attendance competencies that are performed in the field experience. Candidates are made aware of the assessment process through course material, faculty advising, and regular supervision. During interviews with candidates and completers, no one indicated difficulties with the assessments. One candidate specifically stated that the program provided "flexibility" around the manner in which candidates could show their competencies, while at the same time feeling that the program was "rigorous in its expectations." All candidates must pass a qualifying exam to advance to the second year of the program. At the end of the program, all candidates must complete a thesis or a comprehensive examination before graduation.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the Pupil Personnel Services School Social Work and Pupil Personnel Services Child Welfare and Attendance Programs.

Speech-Language Pathology

Program Design

The Speech-Language Pathology Program at SDSU is housed in the College of Health and Human Sciences. The program provides multifaceted preparation for a career in speech-language pathology, with a strong commitment to both theoretical and research components. The program provides supervised clinical experiences that prepare graduates to be highly competent and manage a variety of speech and language disorders across the lifespan and from culturally and linguistically diverse populations. The academic and clinical preparation ensures that graduates of the program have the competencies to excel as independent clinicians and as members of collaborative clinical teams. The Master of Arts (M.A.) education program in Speech-Language Pathology at SDSU is accredited by the Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. The leadership in the Speech-Language Pathology program includes a director, associate director, program coordinator, and clinic director.

Faculty and staff communication is reportedly regular and takes the form of conversations, emails, monthly department meetings, and yearly retreats. Additional meetings are held between clinical supervisors and program leadership. There is an advisory committee that meets 1-2 times yearly and includes members of the community, alumni, and retired faculty

members. Information from the advisory committee is brought back to the faculty for further discussion.

Candidates are provided with an advisor and paired with a "buddy" (first year candidate paired with a second year candidate buddy), as well as being supported by class/cohort representatives. Candidates can also be part of a mentor/mentee program. Interviews with both candidates and completers indicated a high level of support for candidates throughout the program. There was unanimous appreciation of the faculty's approachable and supportive nature, as well as their open door policy. During interviews, many candidates and completers shared that the sense of being "part of the San Diego State University SLP family" had much to do with their success in the program. Candidates and completers felt a sense of belonging through the program.

During interviews, employers shared that they seek out SDSU Speech-Language Pathology program graduates because they know that SDSU graduates are "sharp, they question, they seek new ideas - the rigor is huge at SDSU." Employers appreciate the critical thinking that is infused throughout the program. Candidates are prepared for graduation with portfolio preparation and seminars on resume writing and interview tips.

Course of Study

The SLP program is structured so that graduating candidates receive a Master of Arts in Speech-Language Pathology and are eligible to apply for a Preliminary Speech-Language Pathology credential. The Program admits 38 Speech-Language Pathology M.A. candidates (from a pool of approximately 400) in the fall term of each year. The program is five semesters in length, comprised of two academic years and the intervening summer. Undergraduate preparation in speech, language, and hearing sciences is required in order to be eligible for admission to the M.A. program. Candidates advance through the program with their cohort. Candidates must complete a minimum of 45 academic units and a minimum of 19 clinical practicum units, with additional clinic hours that are required. Additionally, it is school policy that all credential candidates maintain a 3.0 grade point average in all 600-level and above credential courses.

Candidates accrue a minimum of 375 hours of clinical and fieldwork experience throughout their program. The average number of hours accrued by the 2017 cohort was 428. Each candidate begins their clinical work in the fall of Year 1 with two courses – one selected from Pediatric SLP, Neurogenic Speech-Language Intervention, or Voice/Fluency/Dysphagia Clinical Intervention, and one selected from Diagnostic Practicum in Speech-Language Pathology: Pediatrics, or Diagnostic Practicum in Speech-Language Pathology: Adults, or Multidisciplinary Diagnostic Practicum in Speech-Language Pathology. Over the course of the three semesters, candidates participate in on-campus clinical practica, gaining experience with pediatric and adult diagnostics and intervention. In the fall of Year 2, approximately half the class is enrolled in an advanced clinical practicum, which may include an externship in a medically-based program or placement in a middle or high school. The other half of the cohort is placed in a

public school practicum. The following semester candidates enroll in advanced clinical practice or clinical practicum in public schools, depending on their placement in the previous semester. All candidates are required to complete a student teaching experience during their program.

Coursework includes seminars specifically designed around cultural and linguistic knowledge (Seminar in Communicative Disorders in Bilingual Adults, and Seminar in Communicative Disorders in Bilingual Spanish-English Children). This cultural and linguistic knowledge is also embedded throughout all courses. Additionally, all faculty members have done research in the area of bilingualism, which adds an additional layer of knowledge to their teaching. Faculty also bring in guest speakers, often after gaining input from the candidates about additional information they were seeking. Coursework that encompasses the lifespan enables candidates to be "pushed outside our comfort zones," in the words of one candidate, which enables them to become more well-rounded and experienced.

Assessment of Candidates
The program provides continual monitoring and assessment to ensure candidate success, and that candidates remain on track throughout the program. Candidates are regularly assessed throughout the program. They are assigned supervisors for clinic/therapy experiences and meet with them regularly to discuss and review sessions. Clinic/therapy experiences are viewed by clinic supervisors for immediate feedback following the therapy session, and are also videotaped to allow for candidates to review afterwards for reflection. During fieldwork experiences, candidates receive ongoing feedback from mentor teachers and supervisors, as well as through two formal assessment periods (mid-year and end of year). Feedback from interviews at the site visit indicated that candidates believed they were "being assessed constantly," and they appreciated that information.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the Speech Language Pathology program.

Teacher Induction

Program Design
Interviews and document reviews strongly support the assessment-driven approach to the design and delivery of the SDSU Teacher Induction Program. Policies and procedures foster the authentic, job-embedded development of clear credential candidates through individualized, CSTP-grounded Individual Learning Plans (ILPs). Data collected during the site visit supports the program's reported use of past assessment data to improve and ensure candidate growth and competence.

Mentors are key in the design of the program. As such, the program recruits, trains, has a plan for remediation as, necessary, and retains only highly qualified mentors. Mentors (and candidates) emphasized the quality of preparation and training of mentors, as well as the immediately available email support ("usually within an hour!") of program personnel. Mentors go through their interview process through Zoom to be able to determine if mentoring online is the right fit for their mentoring approach. Training in both hard skills (technological) and soft skills (interpersonal/CSTP/guiding candidates) is provided to mentors. Mentoring is embedded throughout the program and there are clear expectations that candidates must receive at least an hour of support per week from their mentors.

The program has implemented a key assessment structure, based in research and supported with strong relationship-driven mentoring practices, as identified in their planning documents. One of the greatest strengths identified by candidates, mentors, and program leadership is the specific, job-embedded nature of the program design.

Program leadership has multiple instruments for gathering feedback in place. Many of the program design choices were driven by feedback provided from candidates and mentors who took part in previous iterations of the program. The program's innovative approach honors the previous experiences of the candidate. It guides professional growth through supportive, caring, rigorous mentoring and ILP processes and strives to ensure the work being done in the program remains relevant to participating candidates.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Fieldwork)
A review of program documents as well as interviews with program coordinators, mentors, and candidates confirm that the sequence of the curriculum and fieldwork is based on the self-identified needs in the CSTPs and addresses the needs of developing educators through observation, cycles of inquiry, and weekly Zoom conversations with mentor teachers. Regular reflection on CSTPs runs throughout the program, beginning with an in-depth self-reflection. Program coordinators noted that this is extremely helpful, as not all candidates are coming in with induction plans from their preliminary programs. The initial and following self-reflections are the core of the program design. Candidates select focus CSTPs and complete multiple cycles of inquiry-embedded learning in their current work.

Candidates meet with mentors by Zoom at least one time per week. This mentoring process provides just-in-time support to mentees, as well as long-term support. Program coordinator consultation with site administrators has been challenging due to the wide range of time zones, but coordinators are proactive in communicating with all stakeholders to ensure the program and ILPs are meeting state, candidate, and site needs for developing the induction candidates' progress in the learning-to-teach continuum.

Candidates complete a specified number of ILP cycles that are reviewed by program personnel and by the credential analyst to ensure all CSTPs are included. Due to the individualized and

flex-to-fit nature of the program, some candidates (early completion option) may be allowed to complete more cycles in a given semester to honor their depth of experience.

A clear, logical progression of observations, planned and recorded lessons, and support conversations enhance the candidate goal-driven work of the program. ILP goals are directed by the candidate in consultation with the mentor and may change from cycle to cycle, based upon the candidate's development. Candidates report the work being embedded and authentic. For example, one candidate stated, "The ILP and mentoring process supported my growth and development as a professional and was embedded in my specific context and assignments."

The candidate's work culminates in a final reflection screencast that allows candidates to share an overall reflection on the development of their teaching practice and student learning in the context of their own classrooms.

Assessment of Candidates
A clear, progressive system of formative and summative assessments is the core of the program design. Candidates self-assess, develop learning goals, and work with mentors to hone their practice. Candidates create Individual Learning Plans (ILPs) that are grounded in the CSTPs and reflect their developing practice. Mentors are also evaluated through candidate feedback collected by the program. Mentors are required to utilize this data in a continuous self-evaluation improvement process. Mentors participating in site visit interviews reported the mentoring process as valuable professional development in their own practice.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data, including assessment and survey results, and the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, mentors, and faculty, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the Teacher Induction program.

Reading and Literacy Added Authorization
Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential

Program Design
The SDSU Reading and Literacy Added Authorization and Reading and Literacy and Leadership Specialist Credential programs reflect a comprehensive and balanced approach to literacy and a developmental perspective on literacy acquisition and growth from emergent through adolescent and adult literacy. The design of the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA) and Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential (RLLSC) programs provides a progressive sequence of study that prepares teachers to assess and teach reading, writing, listening, speaking, viewing, and visually representing of a range of texts (literature, information, visual in media forms old and new) through direct instruction and specific skills

and strategies. The programs are based on a sound rationale informed by current, confirmed, replicable and reliable research in literacy as referenced in the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts. RLAA and RLLSC teachers reflect on their professional advancements as they develop clearly defined competencies throughout their coursework, clinical work, and field experiences which are distributed across four strands: curriculum and instruction, assessment, research, and leadership.

Candidate learning outcomes for program teachers have been developed by the tenure-line faculty in coordination with colleagues and field practitioners. Outcomes include that completers of the RLAA and RLLSC programs 1) demonstrate the belief in the potential of all students and build upon the cultural and linguistic assets available in their specific community, 2) frame teaching and learning within an inquiry-oriented approach to foster critical and innovative thinking, 3) are able to effectively assess students, create and design instruction that matches assessment outcomes (intervention), and provide differentiated support for all students to maximize engagement and ensure equity through a range of scaffolds in meeting the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts, and 4) provide instructional support and resources for teachers through professional development, reflective feedback, individual reinforcement, and team collaboration within the school community context.

Teachers in the RLAA and RLLSC programs learn in cohorts designed so that they move through the coursework together and have structured opportunities to collaborate, model best practices, and coach each other.

Stakeholders to the RLAA and RLLSC program include the literacy faculty, College of Education faculty colleagues, students, program completers, and local school district educators and administrators. The reading faculty meet to collaborate on program effectiveness, goals, and improvement and are recruiting area teachers and stakeholders for their Advisory Board. The program coordinator confirmed that the development, implementation, and evaluation of the RLAA and RLLSC programs are collaborative enterprises between the faculty in the College of Education and reading faculty.

Course of Study
The 13-unit Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA) program is designed to provide additional expertise in literacy instruction for pre-Kindergarten to adult students beyond the teacher's basic teaching credential, and authorizes the holder to teach students at one or more school sites. Candidates in the RLAA program are prepared to build upon students' strengths to help all of California's diverse students meet their literacy potential. The program is currently offered in a face-to-face program completed over one academic year (fall and spring semesters) with a new cohort of teachers admitted on alternating years. The program offers three 3-unit courses and one 4-unit course (which includes one unit of fieldwork in the literacy center). All RLAA completers have the option to continue on to the RLLSC as all of the programs are nested and offered in sequence.

An online RLAA option offered through extended education is offered over two summer semesters. The graduate division gave special permission for graduates of the RLAA online program offered through extended education to continue to the RLLSC face-to-face program and transfer all 13 units (typically no more than nine units are permitted) so that teachers may apply all of their coursework into developing their next level of literacy expertise.

The Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential (RLLSC) Program is a 25-unit program (an additional 12 units in addition to the RLAA) designed to extend candidates' knowledge beyond the basic teaching credential and Reading and Literacy Added Authorization to provide services at one or more school sites at the school, district, or county level. Advanced coursework guides candidates through a deep exploration of research and leadership experiences that will enable them to provide specialized skills needed to support and advocate for all of California's diverse PK-12 students. Document review and interviews with the program coordinator confirm that candidates also can earn the 31-unit Masters of Arts in Reading degree with the successful completion of two additional 3-unit graduate courses beyond the RLLS credential program in a face-to-face and hybrid format. In the past year five candidates have completed the RLAA online program, 13 candidates have completed the nested RLAA/RLLSC/M.A. in Reading, with eight candidates currently enrolled in the face-to-face RLLSC program.

Interviews with recent completers, a current candidate, and program faculty and a review of program documents confirmed that the progression of coursework includes a community reading clinic which allows candidates to have hands-on experiences working with diverse students and an opportunity to implement current strategies. The program integrates all components of reading. Extensive review of the syllabi confirm that all courses are designed to provide candidates with multiple opportunities to apply the knowledge and skills acquired in their coursework. Interviews with recent completers and a current candidate and a review of the syllabi verify that candidates develop knowledge and skills and gain new understandings of the developmental process of reading as well as the specific components of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency and comprehension.

Because candidates in the program are employed as full-time K-12 teachers, there are no traditional field placements. However, a review of course syllabi, and interviews with recent completers and a current candidate confirm that course fieldwork assignments are designed to provide candidates with opportunities to work with students of different age and grade levels. The face-to-face coursework of RLAA and RLLSC candidates includes experiences working in the field at their school sites and structured opportunities to support students at the SDSU Literacy Center where they receive immediate feedback from behind-the-glass observations. For example, coursework includes field experiences coaching teachers and providing on-site professional development experiences that are analyzed through video. The courses meet in the SDSU Community Reading Clinic, housed in the SDSU Literacy Center in the City Heights community. City Heights is a low-income, culturally and linguistically diverse area of San Diego.

The center consists of a 6,000 sq. ft. space containing a smart-classroom, parent waiting room, 15 one-way glass cubicles on an observation hallway, library of children's books, and a graduate student lending library. In the past year, 100 students from local schools have received tutoring through the clinic. This is a significant increase from 30 students who were served the prior year. The program is now installing cameras to record literacy practices for further evaluation and analysis. Online students are required to work in the field and provide video clips using SIBME, a digital tool that allows for real time and time stamped explicit and detailed feedback.

Assessment of Candidate Competence
The program's comprehensive assessment processes require that candidates are both formatively and summatively assessed on all competencies throughout coursework and in clinical and fieldwork assignments. A review of program documents and interview with the program coordinator confirmed the key assessments used to monitor candidates' progress toward the desired outcomes in the four assessments for both programs. Faculty have extended the program outcome data and have three formalized assessments for each program.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization and Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential programs.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation			
Components	**Consistently**	**Inconsistently**	**Not Evidenced**
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:			
● The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among, and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California's adopted standards and curricular frameworks	X		
● The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	X		
● The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation.	X		
● The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development/instruction, field based supervision and clinical experiences.	X		
● The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.	X		
● Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	X		

● The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. Qualifications of faculty and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service.	X		
● The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	X		
Finding on Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	**Met**		

Brief summary of information applicable to the standard

The common thread in the missions and/or stated central tenets is a commitment to the connection between professional practice and research, and strategic partnerships with the community in promoting equity and social justice. These priorities align with the university strategic plan goals of student success, research and creative endeavors, and community and communication. The missions, processes and procedures, and stated goals and objectives of the programs are aligned with effective implementation of teaching and services in California public schools. Faculty, staff, candidates, and stakeholders have involvement and input in decision making at all levels from the unit through individual programs. The unit supports faculty in collaboration across programs, including community partners in developing funded projects to meet the needs of candidates, students in P-12 public schools, and identified community needs related to education. Policies and procedures for faculty recruitment, retention, tenure, and promotion are clearly aligned with the values of the unit as reflected in the missions and central tenets. There is support at the institutional level for promoting diversity among faculty and supporting the needs of each program. The unit supports the Office of Student Services (OSS) in the College of Education that provides training and support to IVC and serves students seeking admissions and credential recommendations in SDSU's programs.

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support			
Components	**Consistently**	**Inconsistently**	**Not Evidenced**
● Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	X		
● The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	X		
● The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.	X		
● Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements.	X		
● Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies	X		
Finding on Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	**Met**		

Brief summary of information applicable to the standard
Stakeholder interviews and evidence indicate that the unit recruits and supports candidates in all programs ensuring their success. Criteria for admission to each program is based on multiple measures, communicated through websites, unit staff, and at education job fairs. The unit engages in significant efforts to admit candidates to diversify the population of educators. Staff reach potential candidates by providing information sessions in subject matter classes, undergraduate and graduate classes, and the community. Office of Student Services (OSS) staff guide candidates, including those from underrepresented groups, through application processes. In interviews, employers appreciated being able to hire educators from SDSU who reflect the diversity of students in their classrooms. Faculty, supervisors, and department staff reported on steps they take to ensure that candidates are guided to success. Candidates confirmed that they

are well supported and cared for by faculty and staff. It was common for interviewees from all groups to talk about the community nature of their program.

Systematic processes monitor candidate progress through each program. Databases are maintained for monitoring candidate progress. OSS tracks successful completion of requirements in courses and field experiences. Faculty and supervisors monitor candidates and provide assistance for success. For candidates who experience difficulties, program-based remediation and improvement processes are available. For example, edTPA coordinators described formal processes for remediation of candidates who do not pass the assessment on their first attempt. For students needing to resolve more difficult situations, the assistant dean for Student Affairs is available.

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice

Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
• The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards.	X		
• The unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.	X		
• The unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites, as appropriate to the program	X		
• Through site-based work and clinical experiences, programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-	X		

based strategies for improving teaching and student learning.			
• Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	**X**		
• The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	**X**		
• Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	**X**		
• All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	**X**		
• For each program the unit offers, candidates have significant experience in school settings where the curriculum aligns with California's adopted content standards and frameworks, and the school reflects the diversity of California's student and the opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards.	**X**		
Finding on Common Standard 3: **Fieldwork and Clinical Practice**	**Met**		

Brief summary of information applicable to the standard

SDSU programs demonstrate well-designed coursework sequences with purposefully integrated fieldwork activities, systematically supporting candidate success and ensuring acquisition of essential professional competencies that meet program standards. Program partners provide carefully selected, highly qualified, certified site-based supervisors who offer candidates opportunities to experience diversity in curriculum and field experiences, effectively mentoring candidates in their implementation of research-based strategies to improve P-12 teaching and learning. Programs designate criteria for site-based supervisors who are certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by each certification. SDSU systematically trains site-based supervisors, orients them to the supervisory role, evaluates, and recognizes supervisors. Supervisors demonstrate ongoing ability to effectively and knowledgeably support candidate growth and there is close communication between faculty, staff, partners, and candidates to ensure candidate success. Program faculty, staff, and partners effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice in the context of data-driven decision-making with key stakeholder input. Program and unit data is systematically collected, evaluated, and utilized for continuous program improvement. For each

program in the unit, candidates have significant experience in P-12 settings where the curriculum aligns with California's adopted content standards and frameworks, and the school population reflects the diversity of California's students and the opportunity to work with a wide range of students identified in the program standards.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement

Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
• The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.	X		
• The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.	X		
• Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data.	X		
• The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from key stakeholders such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation	X		
Finding on Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	**Met**		

Brief summary of information applicable to the standard
Review of documents and interviews of staff, faculty, and candidates, indicated that the unit has implemented a continuous improvement process. The Assessment System flowchart identifies personnel responsible at stages of the cycle, the sequence of activities, and shows how data collected at program relates to unit operations. The Assessment System Data Collection table shows that the system has a primarily annual cycle of data collection, analysis, and dissemination events that generate results leading to understanding effectiveness of programs and operations. Candidate performance data, exit survey data, and stakeholder responses to follow-up surveys are entered into a Tableau (software) server. Different analyses and displays are possible, allowing areas for potential improvements to emerge. The director of assessment is responsible

for monitoring all aspects of the system across programs. Further, the director of assessment is responsible for analyzing data, providing reports, and attending program, department, and college meetings to assist faculty and staff in interpreting results so that evidence-based decisions can be made. Follow-up surveys of program completers, guide teachers, and supervisors such as, data from CTC Program Completer Surveys, and unit designed exit surveys are analyzed. Interviews indicated these data help the unit identify areas for improvements. Examples of program improvements enacted were listed and explained in documents and reported by faculty and staff in interviews. Staff and faculty recognize the necessity of fostering a culture of continuous improvement and maintaining structures and supports for systematic collection and use of data.

Common Standard 5: Program Impact

Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
• The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.	X		
• The unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California's students	X		

Finding on Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Met

Brief summary of information applicable to the standard

SDSU candidates know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to effectively educate and support all P-12 students in meeting state-adopted academic standards. Partners, professors, directors/Chairs/administrators, credential analysts, and formative and summative data indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements. The unit, its programs, and partners evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence, and on teaching and learning in P-12 students in California schools. Exemplars that demonstrate SDSU program impact include school district partners like Chula Vista Elementary School District; the Community Literacy Program; Projects BEAMS, PUEDE!, TLC, MAINSAIL, PIPELINES, and Garden Plot; Native American and Indigenous Scholars Collaborative; Local Solutions Grant for Special Education; Teacher Residency Grants; National Science Foundation Grants; the University Principal Preparation Initiative; the Gates Foundation

Grant; CAPTAIN with the Marin County SELPA; and four integrated Teacher Preparation Grants from CTC to name a few examples of SDSU's many community impact programs and partnerships. In interviews with faculty, students, alumni, and partners, the review team consistently heard narrative affirming the close working relationships between the unit's and the programs' faculty and staff with students and local partners, in relationship to candidate growth and demonstration of a positive impact on P-12 student learning in California's schools.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY
The strength of the unit resides with the strong partnerships between the faculty and the education community in San Diego County and the Imperial Valley. The institution supports faculty in scholarly pursuits and community partnerships, resulting in well over 20 million dollars in grant funding from federal, state, and local agencies. Each funded project involves collaboration among the programs in the unit as well as among local education agencies, community colleges, tribal communities, and academic departments across SDSU.

Institutional support has been consistent throughout the cycle of review and the commitment to maintain this support is evident based on interviews with institutional leadership and deans. This commitment has resulted in continuous funding to sustain the current initiatives and create opportunities for expanding and creating new initiatives with successful grant writing.

Upon review of the CTC Program Completer Surveys, SDSU multiple subject and single subject credential completers respond at a rate at or above the statewide average. In addition, these completers gave their programs at SDSU effectiveness ratings at or above the statewide average with the majority of their ratings being a four or five on a five-point scale. The area where completers in the multiple subject credential program rated as less effective corresponds with the preparation to use technology to support instruction and student learning. Overall, the strength of the programs in terms of their effectiveness is supported by the interviews with multiple stakeholders as well as the completer survey responses. Areas of weakness have been identified in the same ways. SDSU is clearly responsive to feedback as they have been in the process of transitioning the multiple and single subject programs to the latest standards and TPEs. It is expected that they will respond to this feedback with their focus on their values of collaboration, community partnerships, and the connections between research and practice.