

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

Professional Services Division
January 2021

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **California State University, Dominguez Hills**. 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 Stipulations** is made for the institution.

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

Common Standards	Status
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Met
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	Met
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met
4) Continuous Improvement	Met
5) Program Impact	Met

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject, with Intern	6	6	0	0
Bilingual Authorization: Spanish	6	6	0	0
Preliminary Education Specialist:				
Mild/Moderate	22	22	0	0
Moderate/Severe	24	24	0	0
Early Childhood Special Education	26	26	0	0
Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization	4	4	0	0
Preliminary Administrative Services, with Intern	9	9	0	0
Clear Administrative Services Induction	5	5	0	0
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling, with Intern	32	32	0	0

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Child Welfare and Attendance	8	8	0	0
Teacher Induction	6	5	1	0

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: California State University, Dominguez Hills

Dates of Visit: October 11-14, 2020

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
November 06, 2011 Report of the Accreditation Site Visit	Accreditation with Stipulations
October 22, 2013 Report of the Accreditation Revisit	Accreditation

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** 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 recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** for the institution was based upon the following:

Preconditions

After review of all preconditions for this institution, all preconditions have been found to be aligned for California State University, Dominguez Hills.

Program Standards

After review of the institution's Program Review submission, reviewer feedback, and addenda with additional supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, completers, mentors, faculty, unit staff, and employers, the team made the following standards determinations for the programs offered at California State University, Dominguez Hills:

All program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject programs, including Intern.

All program standards are **met** for the Bilingual Authorization program.

All program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Administrative Services program, including Intern.

All program standards are **met** for the Clear Administrative Services Induction program.

All program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Education Specialist programs, including Intern, for Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe, and Early Childhood Special Education.

All program standards are **met** for the Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization program.

All program standards are **met** for the Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance programs, including Intern.

All program standards are met for the Teacher Induction program except for Program Standard 4, which was **met with concerns**.

Common Standards

After review of the institution's Common Standards Review submission, reviewer feedback, and addenda with additional supporting documentation, interviews with unit and program leadership, assessment coordinators, evaluation committee, faculty, unit staff, employers, advisory committees, the team determined that for the programs offered at California State University, Dominguez Hills all Common Standards are **met**.

Overall Recommendation

Given the above findings on Preconditions, Program Standards, and Common Standards, the review team recommends an accreditation status of **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

The team recommends the following stipulations:

- 1) That within one year the institution provide evidence that it is facilitating ongoing training and support for Teacher Induction program site-based mentors that includes, but is not limited to: coaching and mentoring, goal setting, use of appropriate mentoring instruments, best practices in adult learning, support for individual mentoring challenges, reflection on mentoring practice, opportunities to engage with mentoring peers in professional learning networks, and program processes designed to support candidate growth and effectiveness.

In addition, staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- California State University, Dominguez Hills be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

- California State University, Dominguez Hills 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.

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

Bilingual Authorization: Spanish

Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe, and Early Childhood, with Intern

Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization

Preliminary Administrative Services, with Intern

Clear Administrative Services Induction

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling, with Intern

Child Welfare and Attendance

Teacher Induction

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Judith Sylva
CSU San Bernardino

Common Standards:

Rebekah Harris
Azusa Pacific University

Sandra Fenderson
University of San Francisco

Programs Reviewers:

Rhianna Casesa
Sonoma State University

Doreen Ferko
California Baptist University

Tracy Robinson
Association of California School
Administrators

ShaKenya Edison
Victor Valley Union High School District

Staff to the Visit:

Erin Sullivan
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission
Program Review Submission
Common Standards Addendum
Program Review Addendum
Course Syllabi and Course of Study
Candidate Advisement Materials
Accreditation Website
Faculty Vitae
Candidate Files

Assessment Materials
Candidate Handbooks
Survey Results
Performance Expectation Materials
Precondition Responses
TPA Results and Analysis
Examination Results
Accreditation Data Dashboards

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	136
Completers	144
Employers	30
College of Education Partners (LEAs)	9
Institutional Administration	3
Program Coordinators	8
Assessment Coordinator/Staff	2
Evaluation Committee Members	9
Faculty	35
Recruitment Coordinators	10
TPA/APA Coordinators	3
Intern Support Providers	7
Field Supervisors – Program	14
Field Supervisors – District	5
Credential Analysts and Staff	2
Induction Mentors	18
TOTAL	435

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed more than once due to multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background Information

California State University, Dominguez Hills (CSUDH) sits on the historic Rancho San Pedro, the oldest land grant in the Los Angeles area. The land was in the continuous possession of the Dominguez family through seven generations - from its concession to Juan Jose Dominguez in 1784 to its acquisition by the people of the state of California for the university. The campus is located in the South bay of Los Angeles at the intersection of the coastal towns in the South Bay and the urban communities of South L.A., the institution epitomizes the modern urban university.

CSUDH is a Hispanic serving institution situated in the Southern geographical region of Los Angeles and Orange Counties. The P-12 student population CSUDH graduates serve is ethnically, linguistically, and economically diverse. Hence, courses are developed according to a culturally and linguistically responsive framework (Hamayan, Marler, Sanchez-Lopez & Domico, 2013). CSUDH is one of the most ethnically and economically diverse universities in the western United States. In 2019 the institution had 15,873 undergraduate students and 1890 graduate students enrolled. Of those, 55% of students are first generation and 86% are students of color. It enrolls the largest number and percentage of African American students of any CSU campus. CSUDH is ranked first among public universities in California in awarding bachelor's degrees to African Americans and consistently ranked nationally as a top degree producer for minority students. CSUDH offers 47 undergraduate majors and 23 graduate programs in addition the educator credentials under review.

Education Unit

The College of Education includes a Student Service Center and is divided into two divisions as well as one department and an Evaluation Center. The Teacher Education Division includes the Teacher Education programs and the Special Education programs, The Graduate Education Division includes the Counseling Pupil Personnel Services programs and the School Leadership programs, and the Department of Liberal Studies includes the integrated bachelor degree programs for the multiple subject and education specialist credentials. The Dean, as the unit head, with assistance of the Associate Dean provide oversight to all of the education preparation programs and meets regularly with the Chairs and Program Directors through Dean's Cabinet meetings, Evaluation Committee Meetings, and through individual meetings.

Table 1: Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2019-20)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2020-21)
Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern	141	248
Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern	100	243
Bilingual Authorization	45	73

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2019-20)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2020-21)
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe, with Intern	38	90
Preliminary Early Childhood Special Education, with Intern	27	50
Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization	0	0
Preliminary Administrative Services, with Intern	115	104
Clear Administrative Services Induction	52	109
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling, with Intern	37	42
Child Welfare and Attendance	31	21
Teacher Induction	26	60

The Visit

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this site visit was conducted virtually. The team interviewed institutional stakeholders via technology.

PRECONDITION FINDINGS

After review of all relevant preconditions for this institution, all have been determined to be met.

PROGRAM REPORTS

Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject, with Intern

Program Design

The CSU Dominguez Hills (CSUDH) Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Programs are housed within the College of Education (COE), Teacher Education Division (TED). The COE dean is responsible for ongoing oversight of the TED, which includes the Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs. As confirmed by the interview with the TED Chair, a high level of engagement from the dean plays a central role in supporting faculty and the TED Chair, addressing any needs or concerns brought forth by departmental meetings and conversations, and providing processes by which to address issues. As a member of the unit's leadership team, the dean meets monthly with the TED Chair providing a level of institutional transparency. The TED Chair works collaboratively with Multiple Subject and Single Subject Program faculty (including full-time and part-time faculty), Multiple Subject Clinical Coordinator, a Single Subject Program Clinical Coordinator, and university supervisors. The TED Chair coordinates communication between the TED program and the COE and university, including attending monthly meetings of the COE Evaluation Committee in order to collaborate on program assessment requirements. As verified by interviews with the TED Chair and faculty, ongoing communication and collaboration (both formal and informal) amongst faculty, advisors, and the TED Chair is a program strength.

Formalized communication occurs during departmental meetings of faculty members, as well as cross-collaborative meetings between full-time and part-time faculty that occur at the beginning of each semester. The TED Chair reports calling additional meetings when necessary. Informal communication within and across the programs occurs in a variety of ways. Part-time faculty and district employed supervisors report being available to students and each other through e-mail, text message, phone calls, and on-site and virtual office hours; candidates report the use of Instagram and Facebook as an additional means to receive programmatic communication. These multiple means of communication support the sharing of information regarding credential specific requirements, program announcements, upcoming workshops, and meetings which support candidates' abilities to meet program and credential requirements.

The Multiple and Single Subject credential programs have a variety of pathway options for the candidates, including an intern program, adding bilingual authorization, accelerated options for Liberal Studies (LBS) majors including an Integrated Teacher Education Program (ITEP) and post-baccalaureate options, residency models of student teaching through the California STEM

Institute for Innovation and Improvement (CSI3), and a concurrent credential/Master's degree program.

Over the past two years, the programs have been modified in a number of ways. Unit-wide, the mission and vision of the COE was updated in 2019 with a guiding principle being strong relationships between the community, the students, and the faculty. Programmatic changes reflect this update of the mission and vision. For example, Phase 2 Funds of Knowledge projects have been adjusted to better support candidates' fieldwork and center the candidates' experiences within the lives of students' personal experiences. Additionally, the Single Subject credential program is currently creating new partnerships with schools that demonstrate aligned values and interests to the TED to place candidates at these missionally aligned sites for field experiences. Finally, the TED has modified its approach to and support of CalTPA. There are new CalTPA Coordinators who are facilitating more faculty meetings about CalTPA to ensure consistent conversations informing this assessment. Additionally, the TED Chair reports a new intentionality of embedding CalTPA-like tasks into the continuum of learning earlier so that candidates are better prepared for this assessment in Phase 3.

Stakeholders have a variety of ways to provide input to the programs. For example, the TED Chair reports reviewing the CSU Chancellor's Office Employers Survey and facilitating small group conversations based upon these data. Furthermore, as verified by interviews, stakeholder input is generally provided as part of a continuous feedback loop with many school site administrators serving as part-time instructional faculty who also host student teachers at their respective campuses.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The course of study includes a developmental progression of coursework and clinical practice experiences that prepare candidates to teach in urban settings with a diverse student population. Coursework and clinical practice experiences are linked throughout the program to provide candidates the opportunity to study and apply the California K-12 academic standards, use state-adopted instructional materials, practice a variety of assessment techniques to monitor student learning, and provide appropriate instruction to diverse learners. Candidates complete their coursework in a planned, sequential order. At CSUDH, Multiple Subject and Single Subject program courses are arranged into three phases (or semesters) beginning with Phase 1: Purpose, Phase 2: Practice, and ending with Phase 3: Praxis. In each of the three phases of the program, as confirmed in interviews with faculty, candidates, and completers, coursework and field experiences are tied together, blending theory and practice, in order to support candidates as they develop their skills.

There are two broad pathways for completing the multiple subject and single subject credential programs: a student teaching (traditional) option and an intern option. All candidates begin the program in the student teaching option; those who obtain a position as teacher-of-record at a local public school may transition into the intern option after Phase 1. All candidates, regardless

of pathway, take the same courses with the exception of the Phase 2 and Phase 3 fieldwork courses. Candidates in the student teacher pathway conduct their field experiences in classrooms with host teachers whereas interns carry out their field work in their own classrooms with support from the district-provided mentors and university-based supervisors.

Multiple Subject credential candidates also have an opportunity to complete their program as undergraduates in an Integrated Teacher Education Program (ITEP) through the Liberal Studies department. These candidates complete all of their multiple subject coursework and fieldwork as undergraduates and enroll in the same courses as non-ITEP candidates, with two exceptions: 1) a blended science content/science methods course in lieu of the TED 416 Multiple Subject science methods course, and 2) a senior seminar in place of the TED 448 multiple subject teaching event course.

Both student teaching and intern candidates in the Multiple and Single Subject programs have the opportunity to earn an added Bilingual authorization at the same time as their preliminary credential. Candidates pursuing this option enroll in the same courses as the other candidates in the program but, where applicable, take the bilingual sections of courses and, where available, participate in bilingual, dual-language, or newcomer contexts for fieldwork.

During Phase 1, candidates focus on the theoretical underpinnings to teaching and learning in diverse classrooms, are introduced to lesson planning and instruction, and study the California State content standards. They participate in 60 hours of early fieldwork. This phase lays the foundation for later methods courses and allows candidates to examine human development, classroom management, language acquisition, multicultural perspectives, educational equity and access, and health and safety. In interviews, candidates report that they begin learning about the TPEs at this point as concepts.

During Phase 2, candidates begin teaching methods that support their instruction in the content areas, as well as theory and methods for supporting students with special needs in inclusive settings. In interviews, candidates report that they dig deeper into the TPEs during this phase and have opportunities to plan and develop lessons in courses that they implement in the field. In this phase, candidates begin their teaching practicum (approximately 90 hours in a K-12 classroom) or their internship (over 525 hours in a K-12 classroom).

During Phase 3, candidates take their final courses, engage in full-time student teaching (approximately 450-525 hours) or internship (over 525 hours) assignments, and complete their CalTPA. This phase of the program is where candidates put the TPEs into practice. Additionally, candidates take a class focused on CalTPA. In interviews, completers reported an inconsistency in course quality and success, but the Multiple and Single Subject programs seemed to have addressed this issue as current candidates in the course confirmed in interviews that it is “very helpful.”

Related to program coursework, candidates report a strong presence of an asset-based perspective of students throughout, and strong connections between their coursework and their fieldwork. Additionally, candidates report a social justice orientation from the beginning of the program. For instance, they begin a Funds of Knowledge assignment in a Phase 1 course that is based upon their Phase 1 field experience; this Funds of Knowledge assignment ultimately supports candidates' completion of CalTPA Cycle 1 in Phase 3. Throughout the program candidates are encouraged to engage in reflective practice regarding their growth as developing teachers in the form of lesson plans, reflections, and journal entries. Signature assignments designed to assess progress toward the TPEs are required in each course throughout the program.

The TED Chair reported that about 60% of coursework is taught by part-time faculty. In interviews candidates reported inconsistency in course quality depending upon the professor. However, the TED Chair and faculty report this issue is currently being addressed in a variety of ways. Each course taught in the program now has a full-time course chair who is ultimately responsible for the content of their course, including the "non-negotiable" signature assignments which assess the TPEs and are housed in TaskStream. Course chairs report spending a lot of time communicating with part-time faculty primarily through phone but also via email to share pertinent course information and resources.

Related to field experience, each phase provides candidates with the opportunity to participate in experiences in diverse settings and apply child/adolescent development theory, instructional planning, assessment skills, and knowledge of differentiating instruction for diverse students through observations and teaching. Candidates are required to find their own school site for the Phase 1 field experience but the site must be approved by their course instructor. The program places candidates for the Phase 2 and Phase 3 clinical experiences. As indicated in Program Review and confirmed during interviews, to meet the Commission requirement for 600 hours of clinical practice, candidates in student teaching pathways complete at least 60 hours of early fieldwork in Phase 1, 90 hours of practicum in Phase 2, and at least 450 hours of full-time student teaching in Phase 3. Candidates in intern pathways complete at least 60 hours of early fieldwork in Phase 1. In Phase 2 and Phase 3, the interns complete a minimum of 525 hours each semester in their own classroom as the teacher of record with the support of a district mentor and a university supervisor.

In interviews, many completers and current candidates reported student teaching or internship to be the highlight of their experience at CSUDH, mentioning "amazing" master/mentor teachers, supervisors, and school sites. During full-time student teaching, candidates engage with their district employed supervisors (mentor/master teachers) and university supervisors to demonstrate application of pedagogy and content knowledge, impact on student learning, and reflection for improvement. While completers and candidates report a positive student teaching and internship experience, they reported inconsistency regarding timeliness and organization of field experience placements. Interviews with fieldwork coordinators indicated

that this issue is currently being addressed with most placements now happening at least two weeks in advance of the semester.

Interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, supervisors, mentor/master teachers, and program leaders confirmed that Phase 2 and Phase 3 placements meet the Commission's requirements for diverse placements and are completed in an appropriate grade level and content area classroom under the supervision of a qualified and trained district-employed supervisor and university supervisor. Also confirmed by candidates, completers, district employed supervisors, and university supervisors, candidates meet with their university supervisor at least six times during their student teaching placement or internship to receive feedback related to planning, teaching, and assessment of students as well as progress towards mastery of the TPEs. Additionally, there are midpoint and final evaluation meetings. Interviews with university supervisors and program coordinators indicate that during the final evaluation meeting, candidates, the district-employed supervisors, and the program supervisors collaborate on an individual development plan that consists of recommendation for professional development and growth as the candidate progresses into a Teacher Induction program. However, interviews with candidates and district-employed supervisors suggest inconsistency regarding the use of this document. A subsequent interview with program coordinators confirmed this lack of clarity, and program coordinators articulated ways in which they are remediating these issues.

University supervisors shared that recent modifications to the program such as the improvement of syllabi and documents, online office hours with program coordinators, ongoing and increased training and support, the development of an improvement plan for candidates who are struggling, regular email communications, and a student teaching orientation at the beginning of each semester demonstrates increasing support by TED for their role. District-employed supervisors (mentor/master teachers) who received Phase 3 student teaching candidates overwhelmingly report that it is a positive experience. They report that candidates are prepared for student teaching; but, in the event that there is a struggling student, there is a clear process by which to provide the candidate with support. There is a variety of training offered to district employed supervisors, including online training, ongoing support, quarterly meetups, and weekly "mentor/master teacher office hours" with the clinical coordinators. Mentor/master teachers reported that the program coordinators are very accessible and provide one-on-one support if necessary.

Candidates, completers, and faculty indicate that student advising and communication can be inconsistent, incorrect, or incomplete at times, resulting in confusion regarding coursework, forms, deadlines, and/or procedures. The program coordinators and the TED Chair have reported several new initiatives intended to improve advising. These initiatives include intentional student advising with dedicated advisors assigned by candidate last name beginning in Phase 1 and lasting through Phase 3; Phase 1 and Phase 2 classroom visits by program coordinators; and consistent and continuous open lines of communication triangulated by the

student, the program coordinator, and the faculty advisor.

Assessment of Candidates

Throughout the program's three phases, candidates complete signature assignments that are aligned to the TPEs. Faculty report an intentionality and collaboration in determining which course(s) would assess which TPEs through the signature assignments. Interviews with candidates and faculty confirmed that signature assignments are tied to common rubrics. Candidates must earn passing scores for each signature assignment in one phase before moving on to the next phase of the program. By the end of Phase 3, all candidates have been assessed on all TPEs either through coursework or through field experience (student teaching or internship) or both. During Phase 3, candidates' progress towards meeting field based TPEs is assessed through the Midpoint Evaluation Summary and the Final Evaluation Summary in student teaching or intern settings. To successfully complete the student teaching or internship seminar, candidates must receive a score of "3-Competent" for each TPE.

Candidates are informed of assessment requirements in a number of ways: course syllabi include rubrics and descriptions of assignments; the TED handbook has a brief introduction to the TED Performance Assessment System; CalTPA communication and requirements are disseminated in the CalTPA course. Signature assignments submitted by candidates along with the scores earned via faculty assessed rubrics are housed in TaskStream. Candidates receive feedback on assessment results from faculty and university supervisors.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and district employed and university employed supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject, with intern credentials.

Bilingual Authorization Program

Program Design

The Bilingual Authorization program is housed within the College of Education (COE), Teacher Education Division (TED). It is dedicated to preparing dual-language and bilingual teachers to serve in the greater Los Angeles region, focusing upon linguistically, racially, and culturally diverse/minoritized populations. The Bilingual Authorization Program offers five pathways for candidates to earn the added Bilingual Authorization in Spanish.

The College of Education Dean is responsible for ongoing oversight of the Teacher Education Division, which includes the Bilingual Authorization program. As confirmed by the interview with the TED Chair, a high level of engagement from the Dean plays a central role in supporting the program. As a member of the unit's leadership team, the Dean meets monthly with the TED Chair providing a level of institutional transparency. The Associate Dean is primarily responsible

for programmatic support and curricular design. The Chair of TED works collaboratively with the Bilingual Authorization Coordinator who works closely with the clinical coordinators for multiple and single subjects. As verified by interviews with the Department Chair and faculty, on-going communication and collaboration (both formal and informal) between and amongst the coordinators and the Department Chair is a program strength. As confirmed by the TED chair, there is a Dual-Language Curriculum Committee who oversees the bilingual authorization program curriculum.

There are five pathways for candidates to earn their bilingual authorization at CSUDH: (1) ITEP (undergraduate pathway); (2) with multiple or single subjects credential (post-baccalaureate credential program); (3) with educational specialist (post-baccalaureate credential program); (4) dual-language certificate (graduate level coursework); (5) Master's degree in Education: Dual language option (advanced degree).

Regardless of the pathway for completion, the three main pillars of the CSUDH Bilingual Authorization program are: (1) a grounding in academic language use and instruction in both Spanish and English; (2) a situating within bilingual, biliterate, and translanguaging pedagogies as praxis; and (3) an attention to historic and contemporary issues of justice, equity, and systems of power and privilege among minoritized linguistic communities.

The main difference between the credential programs (including ITEP) and the graduate level coursework (certificate and MA) is field experience. In the ITEP/credential programs, candidates have supervised field experience in dual-language classrooms whereas there is no supervised field experience in the certificate/MA programs. As confirmed by interviews, many of the candidates pursuing certificate/MA are classroom teachers in bilingual/dual-language classrooms (though this is not a requirement).

Over the past two years, there have been some changes to the bilingual authorization program. According to the TED Chair, coursework has been significantly modified to focus on bilingual competencies that align more closely to the candidates' lived experiences as bilinguals and an explicit inclusion of translanguaging as a pedagogy and an asset.

There are multiple opportunities for stakeholder input and community collaboration/ involvement in the bilingual authorization program. For instance, as described by the TED Chair, dual-language principals who host field experience through the residency option meet and look at data to share what is working. There is an annual summer institute called "El Pregonero" and fall bilingual conference. In both of these interactive workshops/conferences, current and former CSUDH bilingual authorization candidates and community stakeholders engage around a common theme related to dual language/bilingual education.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

As confirmed during program review and verified by candidates' and completers' interviews,

the course of study includes a developmental progression of coursework, beginning with language and competency requirements and culminating with a performance based bilingual assessment--differentiated for candidates based upon their stage in the educational career (credential versus graduate-level).

Clinical practice experiences in dual-language schools are embedded into the credential candidates' coursework [and therefore have three phases of field work: Phase 1 (initial field experience); Phase 2 (practicum); Phase 3 (student teaching)], whereas graduate/certificate candidates are generally already credentialed teachers and are therefore already in the field as teachers in a variety of contexts. Multiple subjects credential candidates report their field experiences to be of a high-quality, with multiple opportunities to teach in both Spanish and English in all content areas; single subjects credential candidates report less opportunities to teach in Spanish in the content areas of math and science. They also report fewer opportunities to receive feedback related to teaching in Spanish. Furthermore, while multiple subject candidates pursuing added bilingual authorization report to having cohort classes in which Spanish is the language of instruction, single subjects candidates do not have these same experiences. The Dual Language Coordinator confirmed that this was a challenge but that due to smaller numbers of single subject candidates pursuing added bilingual authorization, it was impossible to provide them with content area courses in Spanish. Certificate/graduate candidates and completers report that all their coursework is in Spanish.

The Program Chair reported that most of the bilingual authorization coursework is taught by part-time/adjunct faculty. There is a Dual-language curriculum committee that ensures consistency in coursework across the program. Candidates and completers report that courses are clearly connected with each other, making it easy to recall and apply concepts.

Candidates and completers of all pathways overwhelmingly report having a positive experience in the program, with completers indicating that the program has enhanced their ability to teach emergent bilinguals in a variety of contexts. Throughout all program pathways, candidates develop knowledge and skills related to pedagogical competencies related to bilingual authorization program standards, including Spanish language competence, cultural competencies, and bilingual/dual-language methods and pedagogies. These competencies are embedded throughout the coursework and aligned to course topics and objectives.

Candidates, completers, and faculty indicate that student advising and communication regarding the bilingual authorization program to be informative and consistent with ongoing support and advising from the Bilingual Authorization Program Coordinator. The Program Coordinator describes this as "High Touch Advising" that often begins prior to formal program admittance, and candidates/completers report that it was overall a very clear process. Candidates and completers agree that the Coordinator is "indispensable" and very clearly communicates deadlines. Advising announcements were made in a variety of ways, including in courses and through emails and social media. Completers reported receiving a folder with a list

of the required courses related to their individual pathways. As verified by completers and candidates, professors made themselves available for issues related to the course or the program.

As verified by interviews with TED Chair and Bilingual Authorization Coordinator, while structurally there is a lot of “moral support” for the program, there is a need for more resources/support/course releases/funding to meet the needs of this program as it continues to grow.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed in a variety of ways throughout the program for bilingual authorization competencies, including through coursework, through Spanish-language CSET examinations, or through a combination of the two. For the most part, as confirmed by interviews with the Bilingual Authorization Coordinator and candidates/completers, multiple subjects candidates and certificate/graduate candidates are assessed primarily through coursework (and, for multiple subjects candidates, practicum/student teaching) in all competencies, including Spanish language proficiency. Candidates are required to receive a B minimum in all Spanish courses. The Spanish language proficiency of single subject candidates, as verified by completers and the Program Coordinator, is often assessed through a passing score on the CSET Spanish III exam as there are limited (if any) opportunities to take courses in Spanish. Candidates and completers confirmed that course assignments are tied to standardized rubrics.

All credential candidates are required to complete one signature assignment in Spanish, and multiple subjects credential candidates complete the CalTPA: Math assessment in Spanish. Multiple subject candidates also complete signature assignments in literacy, math, and science in Spanish. Certificate/graduate candidates and completers report a variety of assessments and projects relating standards-aligned content in English and Spanish.

Candidates are informed of assessment requirements through course syllabi (which included rubrics and descriptions of assignments) and professors/faculty. Candidates receive feedback on assessment results from faculty.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and district employed and university employed supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Bilingual Authorization.

**Preliminary Education Specialist, with Intern
Preliminary Mild-Moderate, Preliminary Moderate-Severe,
and Early Childhood Special Education (Preliminary and Added Authorization)**

According to the clinical supervision data for 2019, 84% of the Education Specialist credential candidates at CSUDH are interns. Subsequently, special education faculty collaborate closely with school districts within the CSUDH service area to meet the needs of teacher candidates as well as the P-12 students and their families. This collaboration is evidenced by the 99 school partnerships CSUDH had within the area it serves.

Program Design

The overall design of the Education Specialist programs and the Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization (ECSEAA) program at CSUDH is predicated on inclusive and culturally responsive practices within an equity focused framework. This is the foundation underlying all three of the Education Specialist credential programs and the ECSEAA. Evidence of this is exemplified by the scope and sequence of course content for each program. CSUDH Department of Special Education offers two pathways to obtain an Education Specialist Credential that best meets the needs of the candidates. The Intern pathway provides candidates a 3- or 4-semester pathway toward completion. The Student Teaching pathway is a 4-semester program inclusive of student teaching. Additionally, those who hold a Level I Preliminary, Level II Clear, or Life Special Education Teaching Credential may pursue the ECSEAA.

Mild/Moderate (M/M), Moderate/Severe (M/S) Education Specialist Credential

Specific to the M/M and M/S programs is the provision of services for individuals with disabilities and their families from TK to age 22 within the context of a Multitiered System of Support (MTSS) framework for students with M/M and M/S needs focusing on inclusive and individualized supports to ensure the success of students, family, and staff.

Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) and Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization (ECSEAA)

Specific to the ECSE and ECSEAA programs is the provision of services for children and their families from birth to age 5. The ECSE program has a significant focus on preparing pre-professionals to work collaboratively with families to provide developmentally appropriate and individualized instruction for young children who are at-risk for developmental delays or who have been diagnosed with disabilities. This form of instruction lays the foundation for young children to participate meaningfully in routine daily activities and pre-academic learning activities (Division for Early Childhood, 2014).

The leadership of the Education Specialist credential programs includes a tenured department chair who reports directly to the associate dean and dean of the College of Education. In

addition, faculty are active researchers who hold leadership roles in professional organizations (e.g., Council for Exceptional Children) closely aligned with their area of expertise thus providing leadership outside the College of Education.

Communication within the department is generally facilitated by the department chair. The department chair facilitates bi-monthly department meetings that focus primarily on curricular content and program-related issues. The Special Education Department chair holds annual meetings with part-time faculty as well. These meetings are provided to support and train part-time faculty as well as to ensure that they are provided any updates or information related to their roles and responsibilities. Additionally, program faculty and clinical coordinators review assessment reports generated from multiple sources (e.g., candidate perceptions, P-12 administrator perspectives) at least biannually. These data are used to inform programmatic and curricular decisions. Communication between the Department of Special Education and the institution occurs first within the chain of command that is, through the Special Education Department chair, associate dean, and then dean. The dean and associate dean participate in and represent the College of Education on the provost's council.

Building upon information received four years ago by an outside reviewer, CSUDH revised its Introduction to Special Education course and included more content related to instructional strategies. As new faculty have been hired, they have shared their own expertise such as the increased focus on social-emotional learning to course content. Lastly, the Special Education Department, as a whole, has addressed the changes resulting from the transition from university held intern programs to district held intern programs.

It is evident that the CSUDH faculty have a close-knit relationship with stakeholder partners in its surrounding districts which has contributed to the rich and free flow of information between the two groups. This free flow of communication provides constant information to the CSUDH faculty for the purposes of monitoring candidate preparedness, program evaluation and program improvement.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Candidates across all Education Specialist credential programs (Mild/Moderate (M/M), Moderate/Severe (M/S), Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE)) complete a common set of courses. This provides candidates with opportunities to collaborate across programs and solidify the foundational philosophies of inclusion and culturally relevant practices. Although there is a common set of courses, the sequence of those courses is dictated by the credential program the candidate is pursuing. Program specific coursework is subsequently provided in the areas of assessment, pedagogy, and methodology. All programs require candidates to have 45 pre-service hours as well as two fieldwork courses.

Student Teaching Pathway

For all Education Specialist programs, early fieldwork requires 100 supervised hours divided evenly between general and special education settings focusing on classroom interactions and teaching responsibilities for students requiring mild/moderate or moderate/severe needs from infant to adult populations. Candidates pursuing the ECSEAA are required to complete 80 hours of early fieldwork specifically in early intervention. During the early field experience, candidates gradually take on more teaching responsibilities. The final fieldwork experience for candidates in M/M, M/S, ECSE, and ECSEAA consists of 15 weeks of supervised teaching practice. In each semester of fieldwork candidates receive with individual observations and feedback provided by the university supervisor 6 times over the course of each semester. In the final fieldwork experience, candidates are simultaneously enrolled in a seminar with eight class sessions taught by the university fieldwork supervisor. Candidates pursuing the ECSEAA have only seven required class sessions taught by the university fieldwork supervisor. In the student teaching pathway, all candidates are paired with a master teacher who is intentionally selected to match each candidate for the purposes of maximizing the learning experience.

Intern Pathway

For all Education Specialist programs and the ECSEAA program, candidates are required to complete three additional semesters of fieldwork subsequent to early fieldwork ranging from 1470 to 1960 hours. Candidates are provided a school-based mentor as outlined in Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) between the university and partner districts.

One particularly unique element related to fieldwork is the method by which university supervisors are selected. Prospective supervisors are subject to a rigorous vetting process. For example, one criterion for the position is that the applicant has demonstrated exemplary leadership. The clinical coordinator reviews all submitted applications, interviews all applicants, and provides some of the initial training and support for new university supervisors. In addition, the new supervisor is assigned a veteran supervisor mentor for two semesters. This not only provides the new supervisor with immediate access to guidance, feedback, and support, it also promotes familiarity with other supervisors.

Assessment of Candidates

Data specific to candidates' ability to meet the Commission standards is assessed in a variety of ways throughout the program. TaskStream archival data for projects and fieldwork evaluations are primary data sources for ongoing program evaluation. Candidates complete disposition surveys at program entry and exit. These data are reviewed at the program level during faculty meetings and discussed with the College Evaluation Committee. Ratings regarding perceived teaching competency are collected from candidates, supervisors and school-based administrators during each fieldwork class. Candidates receive a fieldwork handbook during their first semester of fieldwork. The handbook includes information on the preliminary, and clear credential programs as well as the Master's degree program in Special Education. During fieldwork seminars, candidates review the Commission's adopted competencies and Teaching

Performance Expectations and assessment processes. In addition, candidates are able to download a checklist allowing them to independently monitor progress toward certification. Finally, faculty provide ongoing candidate support.

Candidates receive ongoing support from faculty throughout the program. Program acceptance letters explicitly state that candidates must meet with their advisor to complete a program plan. Faculty advisors are assigned to candidates based on the candidate last name. Candidates develop advisement forms with their assigned advisor. The advisement forms are reviewed at three critical points during the candidate's program: (1) program acceptance, (2) application for an intern credential, and (3) acceptance to final fieldwork. Furthermore, ongoing timely communication with candidates occurs through the Blackboard Special Education Learning Community as well as during class meetings and office hours.

In situations where candidates are struggling, the candidate can receive support from the candidate's faculty advisor as well as other identified faculty members. If a university supervisor as well as the master teacher and/or intern mentor has concerns about a candidate, the clinical coordinator will visit the site and assess the situation. If there are concerns subsequent to the visit from the clinical coordinator, the Special Education Department chair visits the site and assesses the situation. If it is confirmed that a student is significantly struggling, a meeting with the onsite support provider, the university supervisor and the candidate are called and an improvement plan is developed. There are a number of options that can be provided to promote the candidate's success such as retaking early fieldwork (if the candidate is in good academic standing), being provided more time to complete fieldwork, or providing the candidate more visits from the University Supervisor. Once the improvement plan is created, the candidate signs it indicating agreement and confirmation of the plan.

Finally, candidate support is one of the outstanding strengths of the program as revealed by both Education Specialist Credential completers and current candidates. Faculty were overwhelmingly characterized as kind, encouraging, caring, flexible, available, accessible, and as going above and beyond. One student commented that he always wanted to be a teacher but was not financially able to stop working in order to complete all the hours required to complete student teaching. CSUDH worked with him to find a solution regarding student teaching and he is now fulfilling his dream of being a teacher.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervision practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe, and Early Childhood Special Education programs with Intern and the Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization program.

Pupil Personnel Service Credential Program: School Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance

Program Design

The Pupil Personnel Services credential programs in School Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance are designed to prepare candidates for careers in a variety of educational counseling settings. Candidates choose to specialize in either P-12 school or college and are able to concurrently pursue a Certificate in College Counseling, a Pupil Personnel Services (PPS-C) credential – which is required to function as a School Counselor in public schools – or, for candidates who already hold a PPS credential, a Child Welfare and Attendance (PPS-CWA) authorization, which is an optional specialization that authorizes counseling services specifically related to student attendance and truancy prevention and remediation. The program is designed to provide candidates with a broad conceptual knowledge base and the development of specific counseling skills applicable to diverse populations and counseling needs. The program stresses the importance of self-awareness, reflective examination, and interpersonal and professional growth in order to provide a comprehensive preparation in educational counseling.

The PPS-C and PPS-CWA programs are led by the division chair and program coordinator and are under the leadership of the Division of Graduate Education within the College of Education (COE) on the organizational chart. The division chair stated her role is to support the program coordinator and faculty to ensure the success and quality of both programs, and to communicate program-specific information and/or requests at the COE leadership level. At this time, with many transitions occurring, COE leadership meets at least twice a month. The program coordinator has authority to and makes all program decisions that do not require a formal approval from the division chair and/or COE leadership. The division chair and program coordinator meet and communicate regularly, both informally and formally, about program updates. The program coordinator also meets once a month with the faculty. To be inclusive of and accommodate part-time faculty, both the division chair and program coordinator also conduct informal one-on-one sessions to share information, garner feedback, and build relationships.

The program has just shifted to the cohort model in preparation for the new PPS standards, to streamline course schedules, and in response to looming budgetary challenges. With the cohort model, candidates are only admitted in the fall. Additionally, in preparation for the new standards, the program has made recent changes to the curriculum, adding a course on Leadership and Counseling, and modifying the Principles of Education and Psychological Assessments. Leadership and Counseling will now be the first course in the sequence for all new candidates. In preparation for this change, the program leadership began the approval process for the course a year ago and are now ready to implement Leadership and Counseling for Fall 2021 and Program Development and Evaluation for Fall 2022. Also, the Human Diversity course has been updated by the full-time faculty and is currently being offered.

The program coordinator also reported there has been fluctuation in part-time faculty over the past two years, but this has been a welcomed opportunity to ensure program faculty are the best fit, are current in their field, and have expertise in best practices and special populations.

Faculty, candidates, and community partners have a continuous, open line of communication to provide feedback, suggestions, and opportunities to the program. The program coordinator reported that faculty have a formal monthly meeting, but also meet and communicate informally almost daily. The program coordinator further stated that in addition to communicating with program leadership and faculty, candidates may share feedback through the Graduate Counseling Association, which is a chartered organization on campus that provides professional development 2-3 times a month, as well as networking and social gatherings that connect faculty, candidates and partners in the college community.

Course of Study

Course sequencing is tradition in design with candidates taking foundational courses in the beginning of the program, introduction to practicum in the middle, and candidates begin to build and apply counseling competencies in the middle-to-end of the program through fieldwork.

Site supervisors reported candidates completing fieldwork were adequately prepared and ready to assume counselor responsibilities when placed at their sites. Completers reported that coursework was relevant and effectively prepared them for successful transition to employment as a counselor. More specifically, at the completion of the program, completers reported feeling prepared and confident in their counseling skills and ability to respond to crisis situations. PPS-CWA completers and faculty report coursework and the fieldwork experiences were aligned and relevant to address all issues of attendance, special populations (foster, homeless, juvenile justice involved), and resource gaps.

Completers and candidates report being confident and prepared to address critical areas, in diverse communities with complex needs. In addition to the coursework, completers attribute their preparedness to the quality and availability of the faculty in the program. Program leadership stated that faculty, who are also practitioners, are an added value to the program providing candidates knowledge and skills through relevant (location, time, population) case studies, best practices, and presenters, as a complement to the coursework. Completers report the importance of collaboration with families, colleagues and community is embedded in all coursework, as a vital means to meet the complex needs of families.

Candidates research and find their own field placements that are then approved by the program. Candidates report faculty are available to assist them in finding a field placement. If candidates experience complications identifying an appropriate field placement, faculty offer a list of potential fieldwork supervisors who have long standing relationships with the program,

including colleagues of faculty and completers. University and fieldwork supervisors report open and frequent communications to ensure the candidate is progressing towards competency. Alumni often return as fieldwork supervisors and are familiar with the program and necessary competencies. The university supervisor meets with field supervisors one-on-one prior to supervising candidates to ensure they are familiar with the programs and to review the fieldwork supervisor manual. As a check and balance, candidates are also informed about expectations for field supervisors, what to do if an issue arises at the placement, and to maintain open lines of communication with the university supervisor. The university supervisor states the role of the university supervisors is to assess placements, advise candidates about placements, approve placements, and advocate for candidates during placements. Candidates also complete surveys at the end of each placement to inform the university supervisors and faculty about their experience and bring to surface concerns regarding placements and field supervisors.

Fieldwork supervisors report clear understanding of their roles and a shared understanding with the university supervisor and candidate regarding the required competencies and goals for the candidate. Candidates report meaningful reflection with both supervisors; feeling their strengths and areas of growth are both acknowledged and supported. One candidate shared an experience where she desired to work in the district near her home but the district did not have a Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with the university. She reached out to the program coordinator who offered to serve in this role for this candidate.

Candidate Competence

Candidates are assessed by various formal and informal methods to ensure standards competencies. The first assessment happens during the admissions process. It is reported the program coordinator reviews applicants to ensure they are good fits for the program and the counseling profession as a whole. Candidates must be and/or desire to be holistic, reflective, and introspective practitioners. Once in the program, faculty report candidates are consistently assessed by the faculty on coursework performance, knowledge, and application of theory to timely, relevant case studies, feedback from site supervisors during fieldwork, and candidates' self-reflections throughout the program. The culminating assessment is the multifaceted capstone project that is a comprehensive and critical examination of applied counseling content and skills. Candidates are required to demonstrate competency through oral and written capstone examinations for fulfillment of the degree. While candidates' progress toward credential recommendation is monitored throughout the program, it is within the fieldwork courses and placements where candidates are more closely assessed and monitored to ensure they have met all the requirements to be recommended. In addition to ensuring that candidates have met the competencies necessary for credential recommendation, candidates' dispositions are also monitored throughout the program to confirm that they are personally and professionally adept to be recommended for school counseling work.

Faculty further reported that candidates have a dispositional assessment upon entry to the program, a competency evaluation through practicum after completion of the foundational coursework, and at the end of the program through an evaluation of the candidates application of knowledge, skills and abilities developed during the entirety of the program.

Candidates report being informed verbally and in writing by faculty at the beginning of each course on the method of assessment. Additionally, candidates also reported being continuously and timely informed of their performance on assessments, both informally and formally. Candidates report faculty provides lengthy, meaningful feedback in the reflective journals. Furthermore, candidates stated that not only did faculty provide feedback in a caring and compassionate manner, but they also often solicited feedback.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all standards are **met** for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance programs.

Preliminary Administrative Services, with Intern

Program Design

The CSUDH Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) program is housed in the Graduate Education Department in the College of Education. The program is coordinated by four full time faculty and nineteen part time faculty. The program is known as the School Leadership Program (SLP) and is founded by the mission to develop leaders with an adaptive mindset who use their heart and minds to engage courageously and humanistically create excellent learning environments.

The SLP admits credentialed teachers with at least four years of full-time teaching experience. Candidates become part of a cohort, taking 13 units in fall and 13 units in spring to complete the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential requirements. Candidates wishing to earn a Master's degrees are required to complete two additional classes.

The program receives support and guidance from the interim dean, department chair, newly appointed program coordinator, part time faculty and credential analyst. Full time and part time faculty meet three times a year to review data and revise curriculum. Master syllabi are used in all cohorts to provide consistency in content and assignments. Candidates, mentors, employers and stakeholders confirmed that leadership frequently asks for input regarding program design. CSUDH has long established partnerships with Los Angeles Unified School District, neighboring school districts and charter organizations. Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), handbooks, and feedback surveys are used as tools for communication. Course lead instructors meet weekly with other instructors to calibrate content and discuss strengths and

opportunities for improvement. Full time and part time faculty meet three times a year to review data and revise curriculum.

Over the course of two years several changes have been made to the program including the hiring of new faculty as well as modifications to course work to highlight summative and formative assessment criteria that aligns with the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA). Revisions were made to coursework and fieldwork and implemented in the 2018-19 academic year and as part of an ongoing system of assessment faculty continue to meet to review data, surveys, and feedback. Faculty reported they revised course content to include additional practices with reflective practice as it was noted on assessments as an opportunity for growth.

Course of Study

An extensive review of the PASC program's course matrix and syllabi confirmed the design, instruction and assessment in all courses are based on the California's Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE), the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs) and prepare candidates to be successful on the CalAPA. The two-semester cohort program is an accelerated model with pathways using both a hybrid and an online delivery model that prepares candidates through coursework, fieldwork, and clinical practice. The six core classes are instructed in five-week modules with each course meeting formally one evening a week for 5.5 hours in the hybrid pathway while the online pathway meets weekly for synchronous and asynchronous instruction. Another twenty-five percent of the course work is devoted to online and distance learning options. Web-based discussion, self-reflection and research activities support the face-to-face and fieldwork components of the program. The technology skills required for course work support candidate learning and preparation for the CalAPA. These skills also develop instructional leaders to be more proficient with technology. The remaining twenty five percent of the program is dedicated to field work in which candidates are focused on a field-based project that integrates the traditional classroom components and on-line components of the program. The culminating activity is a multimedia presentation.

Four critical components are integrated into the SLP program to enhance the College of Education's mission and goals. These four components are 1) Urban and Diversity: School leaders work in urban settings with culturally and linguistically diverse learners; 2) Theory into Practice: Course assignments, projects and the field-based assignment blend theory and practice in school districts and community agencies; 3) Standards Based: Candidates are provided a range of opportunities to demonstrate competencies and meet standards; and, 4) Performance Based: Leadership systematically evaluates the effectiveness of course assessments, course surveys and informal and formal assessment to address emerging developments in education.

Upon entry, candidates are divided into cohorts and assigned a cohort leader. The cohort leader serves as instructor, mentor and coach throughout the entire program working with candidates in both clinical and field experiences. Within each cohort a smaller professional learning community is formed where candidates practice and develop leadership skills. Candidates take two courses each semester with their cohort leaders. One course focuses on the development of the candidate's personal leadership and the other is designed to assist candidates in their field experiences through their field-based project. Candidates complete three standards-based content courses each semester that build on the candidates' skills to work with diverse communities in urban settings. Interviews with candidates, part-time faculty and completers verified that the cohort model is well received and the relationships established in the cohorts last for many years after program completion.

Focus is placed on case study and fieldwork simulations, the application of theory, and school focused challenges and problems of practice. Each course has clear goals and objectives, are CAPE focused and have clearly defined demonstrations of knowledge embedded in the activities. Candidates indicated that the practice of case studies provided them with the opportunity to apply the theory the studied to real world situations. Completers shared that they felt prepared to take on a leadership role that focused on challenging situations.

The program refers to supervisors as mentors in their documents. Mentors work with candidates and support candidates by providing feedback in the middle of the course and at the end point assessment. Each semester candidates submit mentor logs to detail their interactions with their mentor. The mentor handbook clearly outlines the responsibilities and roles of the mentor. There is a strong relationship with mentors and candidates often return to the program once they have cleared their credential to serve as a mentor for a candidate.

Assessment

Candidate competence is assessed throughout the year. Assignments built into the course work are designed for mastery learning and all candidates have the opportunity to resubmit assignments to ensure passage of the course. Cohort leaders provide support to candidates and candidates reported that their small learning communities are also a great opportunity for collaborative work networking and support. One candidate with a learning disability stated that she has attended two other institutions and that this institution provided the most support she has ever received.

Candidates are informed of the CalAPA during an initial orientation and during each course. Candidates reported receiving support and encouragement throughout the program in formal means such as assignment feedback as well as informal means such as texts, phone calls and emails. The culminating project is a field-based project that provides the foundation for the learning experiences and captures changes in leadership dispositions, knowledge, and skills. The field-based project allows the candidate to put into practice theory from the coursework by simulating the role of the administrator to affect adult behavior to improve student outcomes.

Candidates collect and analyze data to identify an equity gap at their school site and create a theory of action, set measurable outcomes, facilitate learning and implementation for the adults, and collect data to capture change in adult learning and practice as well as in student achievement. Candidates reflect on personal areas of growth and practice behaviors consistent with the leadership dispositions of successful school leaders. The field-based project is essential in the attainment of the CAPE because the skills required to complete the field-based project are the same skills required for passage of the CalAPA. During interviews, candidates stated that although the field-based project was time consuming and rigorous it was instrumental in creating change in school resulting in a positive impact for student achievement. Candidates reported that faculty, curriculum, and the practice of theories equipped them to confront challenging situations, engage in difficult conversations, and lead with intention.

Findings on standards

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

Clear Administrative Credential Program

Program Design

CSUDH provides an Clear Administrative Services Induction program designed for administrators who hold a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. Candidates may enter the two-year program in Fall, Spring, or Summer. Documents, interviews, and leadership confirm CSUDH's Clear Administrative Services Induction program is a hybrid, individualized, job-embedded, two-year coaching program. The design of the program is centered around the CSUDH Leading for Equity Framework which is informed by principles of various learning theories and research aligned to the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL). All stakeholders reported the program design provides extensive opportunities for candidates to learn and apply those theories and includes both formative and summative assessments. Completers stated they felt empowered to lead communities to fulfill their potential.

Program leadership designed the program to meet the specific needs of urban schools in the greater Los Angeles area. Many candidates reported to be CSUDH alumni or they learned about the program from a colleague. One candidate explained that he selected CSUDH to clear his credential after he interviewed administrators in his district that he considered successful, exceptional leaders and found they were CSUDH alumni.

Recent retirements have resulted in the promotion of faculty who have personal and professional connections to the program resulting in a smooth transition. Three full time faculty and three part time faculty provide leadership to six cohorts of induction candidates. University

faculty serve as cohort leads and previously served in district level positions prior to working at the university. These relationships with districts have been maintained. The faculty reported they meet weekly to discuss candidate progress and needs.

Due to increases in candidate enrollment and recent retirements the coaching model has been modified to provide candidates with the flexibility of selecting a site coach who meets established criteria. Candidates have the option of selecting a site coach or having a university coach. Three university coaches are a constant in the CSUDH program and provide coaching, communication, and collaboration. University coaches are trained in California Association of Professors of Educational Administration (CAPEA) coaching and Coaching for Instructional Equity. Candidate site-elected coaches are interviewed by university faculty, meet established criteria, submit proof of previous coach training, sign an MOU and participate in program orientation. Candidates stated they felt supported by the university coaches because those individuals are themselves recent practitioners, knowledgeable about educational trends, policy and research. University leadership shared plans to provide ongoing training for coaches to refine coaching skills, engage in ongoing professional learning and support for individual coaching challenges.

Stakeholder feedback is provided through surveys, coaching logs and other program documents. The university was the recipient of many grant funded programs advised by formal advisory team and is in the process of reestablishing an advisory team of employers and stakeholders since the grants have expired. University faculty meet weekly to plan, collaborate and discuss how to support candidates and coaches. Weekly program emails about assignments, resources, upcoming events, and announcements keep candidates informed and connected, and ensure progress is monitored in an efficient manner. Faculty described CSUDH as a “high touch” program.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Stakeholders and documents confirmed the two-year induction program focuses on three overlapping components: coaching, professional development, and assessment. It was reported by program leaders and candidates that candidates engage in reflection and goal setting as they write an individual induction plan based on an assessment of their administrative needs.

Coaching

The majority of candidates utilize a site coach as they feel that is the most beneficial match for their growth and development. Program leadership ensures coaches are qualified, trained and an appropriate match for the candidates. The forty hours of job-embedded coaching activities take place in a variety of ways including site visits, face-to-face meetings and electronic conversations. It was reported through interviews that site selected coaches provide onsite job embedded coaching. Candidates also participate in coaching activities during seminars, monthly electronic meetings, and individualized coaching sessions.

Professional learning is intentionally designed around the CSUDH Leading for Equity Framework which includes the following eight elements: Adaptive Leadership, Collaborative Cultures, Communicative Intelligence, Immunity to Change, Dilemma Framework, Hacking, Stand for School, and Community Healing and Care. Each element is explored through literature, protocols, and self-reflection. A crosswalk of the Leading for Equity Framework and the CPSEL is referred to during face to face meetings, electronic meetings and coaching sessions. The five themes of building relationships, leading adaptively, developing human potential, managing resources, and self-actualization align to the CPSEL and are intentionally presented as the foundation for effective leadership. Candidates may attend seminars focused on these foundations or they may propose the selection of non-university professional development activities such as district or county seminars, workshops, or conferences to become part of their Individual Induction Plan. CSUDH professional development is offered during workshops and electronic meetings. Candidates spoke highly of the professional development opportunities because they provided them with the tools and resources needed to make transformational change in urban schools. Many candidates referred to the Adaptive Schools Tools and Restorative Practices as effective. Candidates provide feedback on professional learning through a structured protocol and candidates reported their suggestions were always welcome.

Assessment

In addition to document review, interviews with candidates, completers, faculty and coaches confirmed that informal and formal assessments are a part of the two-year program. Candidates take a Target Success Assessment three times during the program to inform them of their leadership dispositions, share results with coaches and use the results to develop the Individual Induction plan. Candidates also receive feedback from others through a 360 assessment twice during the program. The individualized learning plan is updated three times during the program as candidates modify and revise the plan alongside their coaches and instructors. Coaching logs serve as an informal assessment tool.

Candidate Competence

The program assesses candidates using a variety of tools taken at the beginning, mid-point and end of the program. These assessments are designed to measure skills, attitudes, and behaviors and provide data to inform the candidate and coaches on the candidates' skills and experience in each of the six CPSELS. The results of these assessments are reviewed and evaluated by the candidate, coach and the university instructor. The candidates' supervisors also provide feedback.

Candidates maintain an electronic portfolio and reflect on their learning about long-term policy issues related to school leadership in each of the six CPSEL and document their competency. Candidates construct a reflective essay when they determine they have accomplished the activities as described in their individual induction plan and after they have determined mastery. The reflective essays and associated artifacts become integral data for candidates' portfolios. Candidates complete a final presentation as the culminating project and present it at

a culminating event. The final presentation is presented using a reflective protocol and scored by a rubric. During interviews candidates stated the work leading up to the final presentation resulted in transformational change in their schools.

Findings on standards

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

Teacher Induction

Program Design

The CSUDH Teacher Induction Program is designed for multiple subject, single subject, and education specialist teachers in the Los Angeles/Orange County region who wish to earn their Clear Teaching Credential in a university setting. The CSUDH Induction Program grew out of the Special Education Clear Credential Program. The program was modified to align its structure and requirements with Commission standards in the fall of 2018 and was broadened to serve both general and special education teachers.

The two-year, four semester mentoring program builds on the knowledge and skills that candidates developed in their preliminary preparation program. With mentor support, candidates develop and implement Individual Learning Plans (ILP) with professional goals that are based within the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and that support their immediate needs or long-term goals in teaching. Candidates reflect on their progress and completion of their professional goals at the end of each semester. Candidates enroll in a course on Individual Learning Plan Development – which is a repeatable course – for the first three semesters. Then in the last semester, candidates enroll in a course on Individual Learning Plan Completion.

A one year, two semester Early Completion Option (ECO) is available for those candidates who are experienced and exceptional. Eligible candidates may petition for this option at the conclusion of their first semester. Petitions are reviewed by a small committee of experienced mentors; the committee recommends candidates to the department chairs who make the final determination on candidate fitness for the ECO.

Induction candidates must hold a current California preliminary teaching credential, be employed in a teaching position that requires their respective credential and meet university admission requirements. Prospective candidates, during the application process, submit an Employer Support Form indicating that the employer agrees to provide the candidate with a site/organizational mentor who holds alike credentials to the candidate. In addition, the employer agrees to provide release time for the mentor to observe the candidate. Candidates enter the Induction Program by applying to the university and the program. The unit's Program

Admissions Unit reviews the applications to ensure that all admission requirements are met and then forwarded to the Induction Coordinator for admission approval or denial.

The Induction Coordinator, a part-time faculty member, has primary responsibility for leadership of the program and works in collaboration with the dean and department chairs of Teacher Education and Special Education to implement the program. Regular weekly communication between the department chairs and the Induction Coordinator includes in-person meetings, phone calls, virtual online meetings, and emails. The Induction Coordinator attends staff/faculty meetings, as needed, to present updates to staff/faculty regarding the Induction Program. Faculty has also been invited to attend mentor professional development when it is offered.

The program utilizes a hybrid mentoring system in which candidates receive mentoring support across each month from both their site-based mentor and their course instructor mentor (course mentor), collectively totaling at least 4 hours per month. The site-based mentor meets with their candidates for at least three hours per month and provides support for ILP development and implementation, subject matter, and “just in time” issues that may arise in daily teaching. The course instructor meets with each candidate at least one hour per month to provide support in the development and implementation of the ILP, as well as ongoing deeper reflection on ILP progress.

Selection of site-based mentors is a collaborative process involving the candidate, the employer, and the Induction Coordinator. Qualified mentors have a minimum of three successful years of teaching, a clear credential in the same area as their candidate, and receive the endorsement of the candidate’s site administrator. Course mentors are experienced induction mentors prior to teaching courses. In 2018-19 the induction program worked in partnership with New Teacher Center (NTC). NTC provided all mentor training during that calendar year, including 4 full days of in-person training and 3 online mentor forums. In 2019-20 the induction program transitioned away from NTC and began to develop its own online mentor training. Currently, guided professional development is not offered to site-based mentors. Course mentoring instruments are made available at the course Google Classroom site and on the candidates’ Blackboard site and mentors are informed of and agree to this when completing the mentor application form. Interviews with the Induction Program Coordinators informed the team that some participating districts internet firewall blocks the Google Classroom sites so candidates are, at times, responsible for printing and sharing the mentoring instruments with their mentors. Candidates are also responsible for submitting completed mentoring instruments to the course Taskstream site. It was the expectation of the Induction Coordinator that the program’s previous structure in which both site-based and course mentors engaged in initial and ongoing CSUDH Induction program-sponsored online learning modules would resume in the current academic year but that was not able to be implemented. Interviews with mentors confirmed that regular formal training is not being provided to them.

The Induction program assesses the quality of mentor services (site and course instructors) through candidate and mentor surveys, as well as through assessing candidate portfolios at the conclusion of each semester. If the match between mentor and candidate is unsuccessful, then the Induction Coordinator will contact the employer about the need to place the candidate with a different site mentor. Mentors and candidates both stated in interviews that they were happy with their matches. Many mentors are also completers of CSUDH's educator preparation programs.

Some candidates and completers indicated they chose CSUDH's Induction program because they had heard about its excellence. Many candidates and completers described the program's focus on social justice, strong family engagement, and preparing them to be leaders in the community. One candidate commented that he felt bad for teachers in other induction programs who were not receiving the same quality of induction and made an effort to share his knowledge and experiences with those individuals.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

There are two courses in the Teacher Induction program. *Individual Learning Plan Development* is a repeatable course and *Individual Learning Plan Completion* is taken in the final semester of the program. Induction candidates take *Individual Learning Plan Development* for the first three semesters of the four-semester program and complete the induction program in the fourth semester with *Individual Learning Plan Completion*. The program focuses on the teacher's needs to expand and deepen knowledge, skills and abilities targeted to the teacher's employment and career goals in their development as a teacher. Candidates who hold a Preliminary Teaching Credential may complete the Teacher Induction Program through the development of an ILP. The ILP includes an individualized plan for completing appropriate professional development and/or coursework designed to expand and apply the candidate's particular skills and knowledge base on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. The ILP identifies the coursework, experiences, and/or tasks that must be completed and assessed while guiding the activities to support growth and improvement of professional practice.

Mentor assignments are completed within the first 30 days of the semester. During the application process, candidates upload an employer support agreement in which the school administrator agrees to provide a site-based mentor. Candidates ask their mentors to fill out a mentor application and the site mentor roles and responsibilities agreement. The clinical coordinator reviews the applications to ensure that the mentors meet all of the qualifications. In each year of the two-year program, candidates spend 57 hours with their course mentors in class or in small groups and 4 hours online, plus 21 or more hours with their site mentor either online or in-person at their school site for a total of 82 hours of mentoring support. In-class mentoring activities include guiding candidates through a reflection on their current teaching levels and practice through the lens of the CSTPs. Candidates initially draft their ILP in class with coaching from the course instructor and then further refine their ILP professional goals in consultation with their site administrator and site mentor. Candidates reflect on progress on ILP

goals twice a semester in class with a group and receive instructor as well as peer feedback. In addition, candidates present a short video clip of their teaching in class each semester and receive feedback from the instructor and their peers.

Site mentors guide and support candidates with ILP implementation and reflection on progress towards meeting professional goals. Site mentors are intended to use mentoring instruments such as Class & Focus Student Analysis, Observations, and Lesson Planning. These are made available to them through a Google Classroom site that few are currently able to access. Candidates are currently responsible for documenting their meetings with their mentors on mentor logs and ensuring these are submitted through Taskstream to the program coordinators at the institution.

Assessment of Candidates

The *Individual Learning Plan Development* course is designed as a small seminar with a cap of 16 candidates. The small class size allows the instructor to interact with all of the candidates and provide them with step-by-step information about the requirements of the program. The syllabus for the course is quite detailed and provides candidates with information about all of the assignments including the development of the ILP. In addition to devoting class time to developing the ILP, there are a number of points in which induction candidates turn in assignments and are provided with timely feedback to ensure their success. Course instructors use Blackboard to make all of the course documents and assignment information easily accessible. The course syllabus, class discussions, and documents and materials on Blackboard provide candidates with guidance regarding program information, expectations, and their progress in the program.

Candidates are assessed for competency at the end of each semester. Competency is defined as the demonstrated advancement of teaching practice through the ILP process, including successfully working on and/or completing the ILP as demonstrated through their submitted portfolio and presentation of the work to colleagues and the class instructor during the last class of each semester. In addition to the ILP, there are a number of assignments including lesson plans, mentor meetings, mentor logs which are completed and uploaded by candidates onto Taskstream. Candidates are given feedback and are scored on rubrics in Taskstream by the induction instructors/mentors.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including survey results, the completion of interviews with program participants, completers, mentors, faculty, employers, and university supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Teacher Induction program except for the following:

Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors – Met with Concerns

During interviews with candidates, completers, and mentors, and in reviewing the mentor agreement document, it was clear that mentors are not receiving the training and support from

the program that is required in the standards. Specifically, the program must provide ongoing training and support for mentors that includes, but is not limited to, coaching and mentoring, goal setting, use of appropriate mentoring instruments, best practices in adult learning, support for individual mentoring challenges, reflection on mentoring practice, and opportunities to engage with mentoring peers in professional learning networks, and program processes designed to support candidate growth and effectiveness. In fact, evidence suggests that candidates are currently being made responsible for ensuring mentors receive the training and supports materials they need from the program and are responsible for uploading the mentoring logs to Taskstream.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

Strategically located in the dynamic South Bay of Los Angeles, California State University Dominguez Hills (CSUDH) epitomizes the modern urban university. The College of Education (COE) at CSUDH prepares teachers, counselors, and school leaders who are committed to equity and racial justice. The faculty, staff, and leadership of the COE are committed to preparing candidates to become effective, impassioned collaborators in ensuring that every child has every opportunity to learn, to grow and to thrive. The commitment to diversity is reflected in the fact that the full-time faculty is majority-minority, and more than 70 percent of graduate students are people of color who reflect the diversity of Los Angeles. In each of these programs, students encounter individualized academic advising and step-by-step guidance to program completion or degree, low faculty-to-student ratios, and dedicated, mentoring faculty with real-world experiences. Highly respected among school districts across the region, the COE at CSUDH prepares educators to join and lead teams dedicated to improving the communities' diverse urban public schools. Led by experienced faculty passionate about building better schools and stronger students, COE programs are designed for individuals committed to making a real and lasting difference in the classroom, in our schools and in children's lives.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:	<i>No response needed</i>

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
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.	Consistently
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 1: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The College of Education (COE) at CSU Dominguez Hills (CSUDH) is in the midst of a transition of leadership with an interim dean and three department chairs who have assumed their positions in the last two years. The CSUDH president, provost, and former dean are clearly supportive of the interim dean and the unit as a whole. The profile and experiences of faculty are also in transition with several successful faculty searches in the last five years that have brought a renewed vitality to the College of Education.

The unit has convened a working group of faculty to develop and maintain a focus for the unit to inform their vision: *Grounded in principles of justice, equity, and critical consciousness, we are committed to reflective, responsive, and purposeful praxis in teaching, scholarship, and leadership. Alongside the communities we serve, we prepare critical educators to co-create and enact transformative change.* This vision is aligned with the university president’s vision for the institution as a whole to be recognized as a top-performing Comprehensive Model Urban University in America.

The unit has promoted the practice of being both in and of the communities that they serve through faculty scholarship and service by engagement in local school districts and communities. This is manifest in the range of grant funded programs to prepare and retain educators to serve in their own urban communities which include various opportunities for collaboration and stakeholder feedback. These grant-funded programs support faculty scholarship; recruitment of diverse, committed, and qualified students, faculty, and staff; and, retention of qualified full-time and part-time faculty.

The unit leadership is supported by the institution leadership in ensuring that resources are available to support the operation of each educator preparation program as well supporting faculty in the pursuit of grants and funding sources for programs and initiatives that are relevant and sustainable.

The unit vision drives recruitment, hiring, and retention of a diverse faculty that more closely reflects the diversity of the community and the candidates at CSUDH. The strong collaboration of faculty and staff in the process for the recommendation of candidates for California teaching, administrative, and professional credentials is evident.

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Team Finding
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	No response needed
The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	Consistently

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Team Finding
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.	Consistently
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements.	Consistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 2: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Evidence presented in the university catalog and on the College of Education (COE) website shows that application to programs is based on clear criteria and multiple measures of qualifications. Interviews with candidates and completers confirm that admission processes were followed and information around expectations were clearly communicated via information sessions and other information flyers.

The COE has engaged in recruitment and program development activities to support the admission, promotion to the profession, and retention in the profession of individuals to diversify the educator pool in California. First, evidence was presented that demonstrates ongoing outreach activities such as EduCorps events, Future Teacher Outreaches, Men Teach Recruitment events, to name a few. Second, interviews with P-12 partners, division chairs, program coordinators, and current candidates also spoke to the pathways to the profession that have been developed through grants by the COE (e.g., STAR, CSI3) to support diverse candidates and first generation students into the profession. In interviews, diverse and first-generation candidates shared that they most likely would not have been able to consider completing a credential program without the opportunity presented through the COE’s different grant-funded pathways.

Related to candidate advising and assistance, there are a number of programs available at the university level with an emphasis on supporting all candidates, including first generation students, students of color and underrepresented minority groups, and students with diverse needs. These programs include, but are not limited to, the Toro Dreamer Success Center, the Women’s Resource Center, a food pantry, and the Career Center. Additionally, within the COE,

candidates in credential programs have access to program coordinators, faculty, and staff who provide advising and information around program requirements. In interviews, candidates and completers of Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs spoke to occasional issues in advising (e.g., advisors being unavailable, uncertainty of where to go with certain questions, differences in information from different individuals). The department chair and the academic advisor shared in interviews that consistency of advising and communication around program updates has been a recent priority. The department has been working to identify issues and exceptions to work to reduce such occurrences. Interviews with candidates and completers in other credential programs revealed strong advising and ready access to clear information from faculty or staff when questions did arise. Finally, interviews with Program coordinators confirmed processes of tracking and reviewing candidate information to appropriately direct reminders or supports should additional supports be needed to meet program requirements or specific competencies.

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
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-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	Consistently
The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	Inconsistently

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	Consistently
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	Consistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 3: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Candidates develop and demonstrate knowledge and skills to work with P-12 students through a sequence of coursework integrated with fieldwork and clinical experiences to provide a comprehensive learning experience. Through a review of documentation and interviews held with faculty, candidates, supervisors, completers and coordinators, there is ample evidence the unit offers robust and rigorous clinical programs.

Programs are grounded in theory to practice approaches where candidates connect content learned in courses to application in fieldwork placements. Review of program documents as well as interviews with employers, completers, candidates, program coordinators, faculty and site-based supervisors corroborate ongoing collaboration with school site and community-based partners. These field placements give candidates the opportunities to meet the needs of the communities while fulfilling program requirements. Employers specifically cited the positive impact the unit’s diverse candidates bring to their sites.

Review of program documents coupled with interviews of supervisors, cooperating teachers, candidates, and administrators indicate the unit has formed a collaborative community of professionals that include, program coordinators, supervisors, school-site administrators, to ensure the development of a system of support for candidates completing their fieldwork and clinical experiences. Candidates in the School Leadership Programs (SLP) (administrative services credential programs) are actively engaged in action research in their practicum and fieldwork/internship experiences with program faculty and site-based supervisors to address local student and community needs

Program documents indicate site supervisors are subject to a rigorous application and interview process which validates licensing and experience requirements. From there, they are trained in cognitive supervision and complete the required 10 hours of training. Supervisors demonstrate

ongoing ability to effectively and knowledgeably support candidate growth per candidate statements and there is close communication between faculty, staff, school partners, and candidates to ensure candidate success. Intern candidate interviews confirm the appreciation of off-hour availability and support of both university and site-based supervisors. End of academic year recognition ceremonies honor the work of district supervisors in the Multiple and Single Subject credential programs where supervisors receive a certificate and are treated to a buffet. Interviews with current candidates, completers, and employers indicated the process of securing site-based supervisors for some candidates was inconsistently employed by program coordinators.

Program faculty, staff, and school partners implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice in the context of data-driven decision-making with key stakeholder input. Program data are systematically collected, evaluated, and utilized for ongoing program improvement.

The geographic location of the institution in southern California allows for all candidates to be placed in diverse settings where the curriculum aligns with the California adopted content standards. Candidates in all credential programs described opportunities to work with diverse students, to serve their communities, and to develop relationships with families and other educators during their clinical experiences.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.	Inconsistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 4: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Key components of the continuous improvement process within the College of Education (COE) are program assessment plans, the COE Evaluation Center, the COE Evaluation Committee, and the Data Reflection and Program Improvement Action Plan and Accountability Forms (DRPI+). Each credential program has a program assessment plan. The assessment plan is organized in stages along the pathway of the program (e.g., admission, mid-way, program completion). Each stage contains the different course assignments that are being assessed during that stage. Additionally, non-course-based assessments are also included in some stages (e.g., completer surveys, performance assessments). The COE Evaluation Center is led by the Director of Assessment and comprises one full-time staff member and one part-time staff member. This center is responsible for providing data reports that feed into the program assessment plans. The COE Evaluation Committee is led by the Director of Assessment and is comprised of division chairs, program coordinators, Evaluation Center staff, and the interim dean. This committee meets monthly to analyze and discuss data and evaluation within the COE. The COE uses the DRPI+ forms for programs to reflect on the data, share analysis and discussion of the data, provide a program improvement action plan, project a timeline for improvement, indicate parties responsible, and provide updates on implementation and completion of the program change.

A new Director of Assessment was appointed in 2019. After a time of listening and learning the director worked with the COE Evaluation Committee to review and reflect upon the evaluation processes within the COE. The DRPI+ process was paused during the 2019-2020 academic year for some programs to enable the COE to examine and plan for improvement around the evaluation process. Interviews with program coordinators and Evaluation Center staff indicate that the DRPI+ pause did not pause data collection on program assessments. However, the analysis and use of candidate and completer data and data reflecting the effectiveness of COE operations to improve programs and services was not clearly continuing across all areas during this time. Additionally, during this time the COE received feedback on Common Standards which confirmed to the COE Evaluation Committee that the COE had clear program assessment plans but did not have a clear unit assessment plan. As a result of the reflective work and the feedback received, the COE Evaluation Committee created a unit assessment timeline and a plan to transition to an updated assessment system. In 2020-21, the unit and programs are engaged in developing guiding questions, identifying program level outcomes, and examining current data sources and determining whether these sources adequately answer the guiding questions. In 2021-22, the unit and programs will continue to examine current data sources and determine whether the sources adequately answer the guiding questions along with progressing to piloting rubric development and revision and holding faculty scoring sessions. The 2022-23 through 2025-26 academic years will continue to be a time for rubric development and revision. In 2026-27 the COE will arrive at a final revised assessment system. The program assessment plans, COE Evaluation Center, COE Evaluation Committee, DRPI+ process, and development of a unit assessment timeline are important pieces that position the COE well related to implementing the revised assessment system and ensuring it will be a comprehensive continuous improvement process.

Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Team Finding
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 5: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard.

Interviews with school principals, employers, program completers and program leaders validated the positive impact on teaching and learning of credential candidates have had in schools that serve California’s students in meeting state adopted academic standards. School principals shared about the large number of candidates they hired from the CSUDH programs while another principal stated their school site implemented the work of candidate’s field-based projects. Site based personnel interviewed also indicated they were grateful for the service and rapport built with the unit’s program staff, faculty and leadership. Numerous employers, principals and program level stakeholders identified the importance of the diversity CSUDH candidates bring to their schools and the positive impact on their school communities.

Candidates in all credential programs are assessed regularly to ensure they are meeting the Commission-adopted requirements and program standards. Education Specialist and School Leadership program candidates indicate that they receive formative and summative feedback from coursework and clinical experiences. Faculty, coordinators, university- and site-based supervisors collaborate regularly to ensure candidate competency in the Multiple and Single Subject credential programs.

The unit systematically collects and reviews data to analyze program impact. The Evaluation Committee is formalizing how the unit collects, processes, and interprets feedback from stakeholders to drive program improvement. Site visit program reviewers noted feedback from P-12 partners represented a limited number of partners who are external to the CSUDH community.