

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

Professional Services Division
January 2021

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **Sonoma State University**. The report of the team presents the findings based upon a thorough review of all available and relevant institutional and program documentation as well as all supporting evidence including interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation** 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 with Concerns
5) Program Impact	Met

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Multiple Subject	6	6	0	0
Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern	6	6	0	0
Preliminary Mild/Moderate Disabilities, with Intern	22	22	0	0
Preliminary Moderate/Severe Disabilities, with Intern	24	24	0	0
Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization	4	4	0	0
Bilingual Authorization (Spanish)	6	6	0	0
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	5	5	0	0
Preliminary Administrative Services, with Intern	9	8	1	0
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	32	32	0	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: Sonoma State University

Dates of Visit: October 24-28, 2020

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
April 2012	Accreditation

Rationale:

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

Preconditions

All preconditions have been determined to be **Met**.

Program Standards

All program standards have been determined to be met, with the exception of Preliminary Administrative Services Standard 2 (Collaboration, Communication, and Coordination) which was determined to be **Met with Concerns**.

Common Standards

All Common Standards have been determined to be met, with the exception of Common Standard 4 (Continuous Improvement) which was determined to be **Met with Concerns**.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the fact that the team found that all program standards were met with the exception of Preliminary Administrative Services Program Standard 2 which was Met with Concerns, and all Common Standards were determined to be met with the exception of Common Standard 4 which was Met with Concern, the team recommends **Accreditation**.

In addition, staff recommends that:

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

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
Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern
Preliminary Mild/Moderate Disabilities, with Intern
Preliminary Moderate/Severe Disabilities, with Intern
Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization
Bilingual Authorization (Spanish)
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization
Preliminary Administrative Services, with Intern
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Christine Zeppos
Education Consultant

Common Standards:

Marita Mahoney
California State University, San Bernardino

Nancy Paracini
University of California, Los Angeles

Program Reviewers

Robin Duncan
California Baptist University

Programs Reviewers:

Thierry Kolpin
Brandman University

Pamela LePage
San Francisco State University

Cristina Stephany
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Staff to the Visit:

Cheryl Hickey
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 Dashboard

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	98
Completers	56
Employers	11
Institutional Administration	19
Program Coordinators	14
Faculty	34
TPA/APA Coordinator	7
Field Supervisors – Program	30
Field Supervisors – District	24
Credential Analysts	1
Advisory Board Members	16
TOTAL	310

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

Sonoma State University (SSU) is one of 23 campuses in the California State University system. Sonoma State University is located approximately an hour north of San Francisco in Rohnert Park. As of fall 2019, the campus enrollment was comprised of over 8,000 undergraduate students and over 600 postbaccalaureate/graduate students. The ethnicity of the student body is as follows: 64.9 percent Caucasian, American Indian or Alaskan Native .3 percent, Asian 7.3 percent, African American 1.4 percent, Hispanic 7 percent, Unknown 16.9 percent and two or more 2.1 percent. Sixty three percent of the student body is male and 37 percent female.

The institution has 36 academic departments and degrees are offered in 46 majors. In addition to the nine credential programs and eight undergraduate and graduate certificate programs, SSU also is known for offering one of the only Wine Business programs in the country.

Education Unit

The School of Education at Sonoma State University serves as the unit. There are nine credential programs and all but one of them is operated out of the School of Education. The Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) School Counseling program is housed within the Department of Counseling within the School of Social Sciences. The unit head is the Dean of the School of Education who began her tenure with Sonoma State University in summer 2020 but served in the role at another California State University (CSU) campus previously. The Dean of the School of Social Sciences where the PPS program is located is also new and began her tenure with Sonoma State University in this role in summer 2020 as well.

Until recently, the two schools were housed in the same building, Stevenson Hall, providing easy collaboration between and among the credential programs. Major construction is currently taking place on campus and the building is in the process of being reconstructed. The two schools will reside together once again in Stevenson Hall beginning in Fall of 2022 once construction is complete. In addition to the credential programs, the School of Education also offers a bachelor's degree in Early Childhood Studies, a degree Minor in Early Childhood Studies, and a Master's in Education with concentrations in 1) Education Leadership, 2) Reading and Language, 3) Early Childhood 4) Special Education, and (5) Curriculum Teaching and Learning.

Table 1: Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2019-20)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2020-21)
Preliminary Multiple Subject	75	116
Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern	44	82
Preliminary Mild to Moderate Disabilities, with Intern	12	26
Preliminary Moderate to Severe Disabilities, with Intern	10	10
Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization	0	5
Bilingual Authorization	4	6
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	0	2
Preliminary Administrative Services	14	16
Pupil Personnel Services: Counseling	13	26

The Visit

As with all CSU campuses during the COVID-19 pandemic, Sonoma State University is conducting all of its coursework remotely for the entire 2020-2021 academic year. Due to the current situation, all Commission accreditation site visits, including to Sonoma State University, have taken place or will take place virtually in 2020-21. The team interviewed all 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 Subject Credential Program

Program Design

The Multiple Subject Credential Program (MSCP) is housed within the Department of Literacy Studies and Elementary Education (LSEE). The LSEE chair oversees the administration and operationalization of the program. Interviews confirm that leadership positions are shared among the four tenure-track professors, as well as full-time and part-time adjunct faculty, who may also serve as supervisors. In addition to teaching, faculty assume responsibilities for coordination and advising, California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA) support, securing field sites, and professional development training.

One placement coordinator (adjunct faculty) collaborates with specific principals in districts with an executed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Once a school site is secured, the supervisor assigned to the site places the candidates with a qualified mentor teacher. As faculty, candidates, and completers explained in interviews, the model of clinical experience is a community-based approach. Two faculty members also serve as CalTPA co-coordinators ensuring information regarding the teaching performance assessment is communicated to candidates, and that faculty, supervisors, and mentor teachers are trained. Interviews with faculty and supervisors confirm that CalTPA data is presented, shared, and discussed within faculty meetings to support program improvement. Analysis of accreditation CalTPA data indicated that SSU candidates met or exceeded state average scores per rubric, demonstrating the effectiveness of coordination and support. The department chair recognizes the need for shared CalTPA coordination and leadership to build capacity and ensure continuity of systems and candidate support. As confirmed by interviews, mentor teachers and faculty were encouraged to be trained by the Commission/Pearson as CalTPA assessors, when the program initially transitioned from PACT.

Communication between the MSCP and the broader School of Education occurs through the Council of Chairs meetings twice a month. The affairs of the department may escalate to the Council of Chairs, depending upon the need. Faculty, the chair, and the dean may have additional meetings before affairs are brought back to the Council of Chairs for decision. The MSCP faculty also attend School of Education meetings (once a month), and the Assessment and Graduate Studies Colloquium (once a semester) to engage in broader unit-wide discussions.

Prior to beginning the program all post-baccalaureate candidates complete prerequisite courses. The program is divided into two phases that build upon each other. Students must

successfully complete the Phase I coursework prior to beginning Phase II. Phase I contains most methods courses with student teaching/field experience limited to two days per week. Phase II contains fewer methods courses with full-time student teaching (4.5+ days per week). Most candidates opt to complete one phase per semester which is considered the “core” pathway, and thus complete the program in two semesters. Some candidates opt to spread Phase I coursework across two semesters, therefore completing the whole program in three semesters. These “flex” candidates begin their supervised student teaching/field experience in their second semester of the program and then complete their full-time student teaching in their third semester.

Newly hired tenure-track faculty, revised Commission standards, and other inputs have led to the revision and reinvigoration of program elements. Faculty advocated for literacy coursework during Phase 1 to better align with clinical placements. The course sequence has been modified to enable candidates to take either literacy methods course during Phase 1. The chair and faculty ensure that candidates enroll in the literacy methods course that corresponds with the grade level of their part-time student teaching placement. During Phase 2, candidates take the remaining literacy methods course based on the grade level of their full-time student teaching placement. The department chair verified that supervisors and she must ensure that each school site has mentor teachers with lower (TK-2) and upper grade level (3-6) assignments as a result of this shift. While more work is required administratively, as verified by interviews with candidates, this modification provides the opportunity for candidates to contextualize their coursework.

The department chair with the support of the faculty also continues to implement “First-hand” Fridays. These are special workshops scheduled throughout the semester to engage candidates in collective experiences to enrich their clinical practice. Candidates may visit places, such as the Green Music Center on campus, or a specific mentor teacher’s classroom to observe subject-specific pedagogy. During the interviews a completer confirmed that the “First-hand” Friday experience in a mentor teacher’s classroom boosted his self-efficacy in being able to teach math. These experiences have continued online, and the online format may allow for further cross-pollination and grounding of candidate clinical experiences beyond the practices and professional learning opportunities within their specific school sites.

Other modifications include the migration of the calibration and scoring of mid-program portfolios to Watermark. During an interview, the department chair shared sample portfolios online. The faculty plan to score portfolios through the interface to anonymize the process and further standardize calibration efforts. Finally, faculty shared that there is a pilot to require candidates to submit the CalTPA Cycle 1 Mathematics during Phase 1. The shift may better align coursework to the CalTPA time of submission, yet completers indicated in interviews that adding the Cycle 1 submission to the load of coursework and demands of the Mid-Program Portfolio process during Phase 1 may cause cognitive overload.

In interviews, the chair and faculty verified that they engage stakeholders in local schools and school districts through the Collaboration for the Renewal of Education (CORE) Advisory Board. During spring semester, faculty and the chair indicated that principals, mentor teachers, and supervisors attend a meeting framed as a professional development opportunity. Within these meetings, the chair explained that focus areas arise for the MSCP to address within courses and their supervision model.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

As stated in the Program Handbook, candidates in the MSCP are supported to develop strategies for becoming life-long learners and agents of change within the school culture. As a whole the program aims to develop candidates' capacity to:

- appreciate the complexity of cultural influences in students' own lives and students' funds of knowledge;
- acquire knowledge related to the daily lives of children and adults in the family through inquiry and community studies;
- become aware of one's own biases and assumptions;
- question, evaluate, and critically analyze all aspects of schooling.

Program prerequisites build professional knowledge and skills and provide a foundational understanding of the diversity of students in U.S. schools, contexts of American schooling, and the role of professional educators. Analysis of syllabi and interviews with faculty confirmed that coursework is deliberately sequenced and interconnected with fieldwork.

During Phase 1, candidates are placed with a mentor teacher, complete four teaching methods courses, and the Phase 1 seminar. Candidates spend two days per week (approximately 200 hours) completing part-time student teaching. In interviews, candidates indicated that their mentor teachers are supportive and qualified. The four teaching methods courses and the Phase 1 seminar provide opportunities to study effective teaching practices, student learning and development, including curriculum and assessment in the areas of mathematics, science, the arts, literacy, physical education, and health. Candidates indicated that the grade level of their placement corresponded to the literacy methods course and shared that the department chair and supervisor had supported them with advising. In conjunction with fieldwork, candidates have opportunities to practice methods while instructing diverse learners in a general education classroom including English learners and students with special needs. The Phase 1 seminar bridges coursework and fieldwork and introduces lesson planning. Candidates confirmed that the seminar provides opportunities to reflect upon and synthesize their professional learning with an assigned university supervisor.

During Phase 2, candidates complete the remaining coursework, fieldwork, and seminar to deepen their understanding of teaching, learning, curriculum, and assessment. Candidates remain at the same school site yet change mentor teachers to ensure that their clinical experience includes both lower and upper grades. Candidates spend four and a half days per

week (approximately 420 hours) of full-time student teaching within this second placement and are assigned a university supervisor who conducts six observations as confirmed by candidate and supervisor interviews. The two remaining methods courses focus on teaching literacy and social studies. Candidates plan, implement, and assess learning for longer intervals of instruction including units, classroom routines, and long-range projects. The student teaching seminar occurs at the placement site and is led by university supervisors, who may engage mentor teachers to share their knowledge and skills during class. In interviews, mentor teachers shared that they had planned a presentation within a self-identified area of strength in collaboration with the supervisor. During seminar, candidates confirmed in interviews that there is an increased focus on inquiry, reflection, synthesis, and goal setting. In particular, candidates and completers indicated that goal setting is a focus of full-time student teaching and supported the improvement of their teaching practice.

As highlighted by candidates, faculty, supervisors, and mentor teachers during interviews, one of the main strengths of the program is the community-based approach to fieldwork. Candidates participate in two semesters of student teaching as a critical mass at the school site to form a professional learning community. In addition, whenever possible, a part-time student teacher and a full-time student teacher are placed with one mentor. This allows for the part-time student teacher to receive informal support from the full-time student teacher, while at the same time encouraging the full-time student teacher to engage in thoughtful dialogue with a more novice student teacher. While the department chair shared that the model has limitations, candidates indicated in interviews that the model does support their learning.

Through interviews, supervisors explained that the critical mass of student teachers affords them the opportunity to conduct a context-rich weekly seminar at the school site. Through interviews, the chair indicated that while the seminar syllabus is the same for all candidates, the enactment of the seminar takes into consideration the contextual specifics of the site, supporting a robust experience for the student teachers. Furthermore, having a critical mass of student teachers at a site also means having a critical mass of mentor teachers per site. University supervisors are then provided the opportunity to hold on-site mentor meetings to engage in both formal and informal professional development focused upon the specific mentorship needs of the student teachers. Throughout the interviews conducted, the word “community” continued to be used by faculty, supervisors, mentor teachers, candidates, and completers to describe the MSCP model of student teaching.

The chair confirmed that schools and mentors are selected based upon the needs of the candidates and program. The university supervisor observes each student teacher at least six times per semester, and all participants (student teachers, mentor teachers, and the university supervisors) meet at regular intervals throughout the student teaching experiences for feedback and debriefs. The mentor teachers and supervisors confirmed that they meet throughout the semesters to support candidates. Meeting frequency is somewhat organic, but also standardized through the set number of observations, and midterm and final evaluations.

The focus and foundation of the program is social justice as verified through candidate and faculty interviews. Throughout the program, candidates examine educational equity and access, prominent learning and pedagogical theory, instructional alternatives, approaches to classroom management, lesson and unit planning, differentiated instructional, educational technology resources, school health and safety, the state-adopted academic content standards, and the roles and functions of public schools in society. As a result, candidates develop the ability to effectively plan standards-based lessons, utilize a variety of teaching strategies, address needs and strengths of all learners, and organize instruction to ensure that all students can meet or exceed the state-adopted academic content standards for their grade level.

Assessment of Candidates

A review of syllabi, as well as interviews with the chair, faculty, and supervisors confirm that candidates are assessed in a variety of ways throughout the program. Assessment of candidates' teaching abilities also occurs throughout student teaching across both semesters. Following each formal observation, candidates participate in a lesson debrief and discussion in which they document strengths and next steps for planning, instruction, and/or assessment. More formal assessments and evaluations of student teachers are done around week six and week 14 of both part-time and full-time student teaching. A "midterm evaluation" is completed as a formative assessment and a "final evaluation", or summative assessment, is done around week fourteen. These evaluations include the triad (student teacher, mentor teacher, and supervisor) and provide feedback based on the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE)s.

At the end of Phase 1, candidates must receive a passing grade in all their courses as well as on the Mid-Program Portfolio (MPP) in order to proceed to Phase II coursework and full-time student teaching. The MPP includes artifacts and rationales that demonstrate candidates' growth and understanding of pedagogy, curriculum, and theory as they relate to the TPEs. Interviews with completers indicated that the MPP affords candidates the opportunity to choose artifacts. Completers identified the process as a rigorous, reflective experience to comprehensively review and analyze their work across the semester. Overall, part-time student teachers are required to demonstrate adequate progress towards meeting the TPEs in order to proceed to full-time student teaching.

During Phase 2 of the program, candidates must successfully pass CalTPA Cycles 1 and 2 in addition to the remainder of their coursework. Furthermore, prior to filing for the credential, candidates must pass the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA). At the culmination of full-time student teaching (around week 14-15), an induction growth plan called an Individual Learning Plan (ILP) is created. Changing the name of the ILP to Individual Development Plan (IDP) may support candidates in understanding the purpose of the document to inform their induction plan, rather than actually being their induction plan. In interviews, completers, supervisors, and mentor teachers, as well as an analysis of document samples, confirmed that the plan is constructed as a triad.

Completer survey data indicated that most candidates believe that the program is effective or very effective at developing the skills or tools that they needed to become a teacher. In addition, survey data confirmed that candidates believe their field experiences helped integrate and apply the major ideas developed through the program coursework. Completers and candidates indicated in interviews that they are supported by the community of faculty, supervisors, mentor teachers, and advisors within the MSCP.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, program coordinators, faculty, adjunct faculty, TPA coordinators, and field supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Multiple Subject Credential Program.

Preliminary Single Subject Credential with Intern

Program Design

Sonoma State University's Single Subject Credential Program is housed within the Curriculum Studies and Secondary Education (CSSE) Department, one of four departments in the School of Education. The program is led by the CSSE department chair and includes five tenured/tenure-track faculty members. The CSSE tenured/tenure-track faculty meet once a month to (1) communicate university, school, and program updates, (2) discuss specific ways to support individual students in the program, and (3) engage in assessment and accreditation related work. Retired and adjunct faculty members teaching during the semester are invited and frequently attend meetings. With the intention of including alternate perspectives within the department, the chair has hired and will continue to include adjunct faculty, who embody diverse backgrounds represented within the community.

Two placement coordinators (adjunct faculty) collaborate with partner school districts to place candidates with qualified mentor teachers at diverse school sites. Placements are communicated to candidates, and the department chair assigns candidates a university supervisor. A faculty member also serves as the edTPA coordinator ensuring information regarding the teaching performance assessment is communicated to candidates, and that faculty, supervisors, and mentor teachers are trained. Interviews with faculty and supervisors confirm that edTPA data is presented, shared, and discussed within faculty meetings to support program improvement.

Communication between the Single Subject program and broader School of Education occurs through the Council of Chairs meetings twice a month. The affairs of the department may rise to the Council of Chairs, depending upon the need. Faculty, the chair and the dean may have additional meetings before the issue is brought back to the Council of Chairs for decision. The

program faculty also attend School of Education meetings (once a month), and the Assessment and Graduate Studies Colloquium (once a semester) to engage in broader unit-wide discussions.

Evidence reviewed and interviews confirmed that the Single Subject program is aligned with the School of Education's social justice framework. Faculty, current candidates, and completers confirm that the Single Subject program supports candidates in developing the dispositions, professional understandings, and practices needed to (1) be an effective teacher in a single subject assignment in culturally, linguistically, and socioeconomically diverse classrooms and (2) continuously reflect and grow as a social justice educator.

The program is structured over the course of two semesters and aligned with one academic year. After completing two prerequisite courses, candidates are admitted during fall semester and complete the program at the end of spring. Phase 1 (fall semester) consists of academic coursework with 190 hours of observation/participation and linked course assignments. In Phase 2 (spring semester), candidates engage in intensive student teaching consisting of 415 hours of fieldwork with linked course assignments. In special circumstances, such as work or family obligations, candidates may develop a plan to be enrolled part time and extend the program beyond the two semesters.

The Single Subject program faculty have redesigned program elements in response to revised Commission standards, transition from PACT to edTPA, adoption of new content standards (e.g., NGSS), expertise from recently hired tenure-track faculty, and new grants, initiatives, and school partnerships. The number of required hours for the fall and spring clinical experience was increased to meet the 600-hour requirement. Candidates engage in more course assignments during Phase 1 that integrate field components, increase coherence across coursework, and provide a fall semester check point. As a result, candidates now have an assigned university supervisor during Phase 1 in addition to Phase 2. Courses have also undergone a name and course catalog description change to emphasize program focus areas: Equity and Agency (EDSS 442), Language and Literacy (EDSS 446), Curriculum Instruction and Assessment (EDSS 444), and Creating Effective Learning Communities (EDSS 443B).

The program has also had success securing funding (e.g., National Science Foundation, Department of Education, CTC Residency Grant) and partnerships (e.g., Trellis Education) to support candidates financially and in professional growth as social justice educators. The Single Subject program has been involved in recruitment initiatives to address teacher shortage and increase the diversity of candidates. The *Preparing Underrepresented Educators to Realize their Teaching Ambitions* (PUERTA) Project is a U.S. Department of Education, Title V Individual Development Grant-funded project designed to increase the number of Hispanic and Latino students qualified to teach in public schools. PUERTA is a campus-wide approach that recruits teacher education candidates, provides supportive advising, offers Summer Bridge and a Freshman Year Experience, and provides CSET tutoring to remove barriers that prevent students from earning a teaching credential.

The department chair indicated that PUERTA was a pivot from the Accelerating Academic Achievement for English Learners (AAAEL) Project, which focused on providing sustained, collaborative professional development experience for preservice and in-service teachers to improve classroom instruction and accelerate academic achievement of English learners in mathematics, science, and English language arts. By leveraging funds from the PUERTA Project the department chair has been able to continue to provide additional, targeted professional development opportunities for mentor teachers. Each initiative and partnership within the program has had a particular focus on language and literacy development and/or STEM education.

In the spring, the Single Subject credential program holds a Community Advisory Board meeting to (1) update stakeholders on program goals, activities, and changes and (2) engage stakeholders in dialogue and feedback around the program. In the last several years, two tenure-track faculty members have engaged with district leaders from Santa Rosa City Schools, Sonoma Valley School District, and Napa Unified School District for stakeholder feedback through partnerships that aim to increase the number of qualified math, science, and computer science teachers. The two faculty members indicated the desire to build deeper relationships with targeted partners rather than inviting all stakeholders to meetings. As the chair confirmed, consolidating the advisory board enables the targeting of different affiliations. The intention of this shift is to yield richer conversations, critical voices, and more directive feedback to address current focus areas of the program.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Candidates expressed that they chose Sonoma State University because of the renowned faculty and innovative practices reflected within the program design and coursework. Courses have been designed and refined to form a cohesive experience for candidates. Interviews with candidates, faculty, and supervisors confirm that coursework assignments are interconnected and infused within field experiences.

Within Phase 1, EDSS 442: Equity and Agency in Teaching and Learning, focuses on issues of social justice and ways to implement equitable practices within teaching and the institution of education as a whole (building from experiences during the prerequisite course EDUC 417: School and Society). EDSS 446: Language and Literacy Development in Secondary Classrooms supports candidates in disciplinary and digital literacy in secondary classroom settings, including reading/language pedagogy for first and second language learners. In EDSS 444: Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment, candidates learn to organize curriculum, plan instruction, and engage in formative assessment using appropriate content and language/literacy standards, culminating in a 3-5 hour learning segment planned by candidates across courses to integrate language and literacy development in their content area. Topics and assignments in EDSS 444 are strategically connected to what they learn in EDSS 442 and EDSS 446. Finally, in EDSS 443B: Creating Effective Learning Communities: Seminar, candidates discuss what they are learning

through systematic observations in the field experience as related to creating an effective learning community, particularly through restorative justice (building from experiences during the prerequisite course EDSS 418: Adolescent Development). EDSS 443B culminates in a Classroom Management Plan which, combined with the Learning Segments, prepares candidates for student teaching during Phase 2.

During the Phase 1 field experience (EDSS 443A: Creating Effective Learning Communities: Field Settings), candidates are placed with a qualified and trained mentor teacher in their subject area. They remain with this mentor for the entire school year. Candidates first observe targeted components of their mentor's teaching (guided through assignments in EDSS 443B) and then gradually increase responsibility as they assist students and teach more classes. Candidates and completers indicated that their mentor teachers were supportive and knowledgeable and that this played an important role in their development. Completers emphasized that the quality of the mentor was central to candidates' satisfaction with the program as well as their development as a teacher. They believed being placed with a highly qualified mentor teacher was a key component of the success of the program.

Candidates are assigned a university supervisor who (1) serves as a liaison between the university setting to the field placement site, (2) orients the mentor and candidate toward field experience expectations, and (3) conducts 1-2 formal observations. Candidates complete several assignments in their Phase I courses to guide co-planning and/or co-teaching with their mentor and self-analysis of their teaching. Candidates and completers also indicated in interviews that supervisors provide concrete, practical, yet comprehensive support within the program.

For Phase 2, candidates take EDSP 430: Special Education for Teachers, in which they are introduced to and practice evidence-based practices for supporting students with special needs (e.g., Universal Design for Learning, Multi-tiered systems of support, assistive technology). In EDSS 459 Seminar: Student Teaching in Multicultural Settings, candidates are supported through field-based planning and reflection activities to complete the edTPA and then are supported in developing as a professional as they apply for jobs and transition to becoming a beginning teacher.

Within the semester-long student teaching assignment (EDSS 458: Student Teaching in Multicultural Settings), candidates have complete responsibility for two classes and assist for two more. Between January and March, candidates also complete the edTPA during student teaching. After the edTPA, candidates engage in a four-week immersion where they participate in an additional class to experience the full day. Throughout Phase 2, candidates continue to be supported by a university supervisor who completes 6-8 observations with attention to targeted TPEs and subject-matter pedagogy.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates and completers confirmed that they are assessed for program competencies throughout the academic year in ways that connect coursework to clinical experience. In Phase 1, candidates complete two Teacher Learning Cycles (or TLCs) that apprentice candidates into the professional life of a teacher through 1) *planning*, 2) *instructing*, 3) *analyzing* teaching and student learning and 4) *responding* to their analysis. Each TLC has a different teaching focus (TLC #1 - Eliciting Student Ideas; TLC #2 - Subject Specific Pedagogy and Technology Integration) that aligns with targeted TPEs and edTPA tasks. Thus, TLCs function as program checkpoints to ensure adequate progress is being made during Phase 1.

As confirmed through interviews, the TLCs are program-wide assessments that are supported by multiple course instructors, the university supervisor, and the mentor teacher. Candidates identify the TLCs as concrete examples of how assessment within the program is streamlined and infused within the classroom context.

After the TLCs, candidates are assessed on their planning through a detailed learning segment (3-5 hours of instruction) that includes how (1) learning will progress, (2) language demands will be supported, (3) English learners of varying proficiencies (e.g., bridging, emerging) will be supported, and (4) student learning will be assessed formally and informally. Candidates are also expected to select, analyze, and use a central text as part of this learning segment (supported in EDSS 446) to align with the program's focus on language and literacy development in the content areas. The faculty describe that this planned learning segment may become the learning segment taught during spring student teaching for the edTPA.

For assessment of competencies during the clinical experience, the mentor teacher completes a formative assessment of subject-matter pedagogy during one observed lesson and an evaluation at the end of Phase 1 that focuses on the candidate dispositions, professionalism, and interaction with students. Candidates must be "recommended" by the mentor through the Phase I evaluation, submit a signed log verifying the required clinical hours, and complete all Phase 1 courses with a "C" or better to move onto Phase 2.

During Phase 2, candidates are formally assessed on teaching competencies through the edTPA, a final assessment of subject matter pedagogy, and a final evaluation by the mentor teacher (in consultation with the university supervisor). Throughout the semester, a university supervisor completes 6-8 observations of teaching, each targeting different TPEs. The supervisor debriefs with candidates after each observation using evidence from the completed form. During the middle of the semester, the university supervisor, mentor teacher, and candidate meet to complete a midterm evaluation (aligned with TPEs). Evidence reviewed and interviews confirmed that the supervisor, mentor teacher, and candidate meet again at the end of the semester and use the same form to reach consensus on a final evaluation, which is submitted by the mentor teacher along with an Individual Learning Plan/Individual Development Plan (ILP/IDP) for the candidate's induction support provider. While completers could recall the SSU

ILP/IDP as connected to the CSTPs, explicitly articulating the role of this document may support the candidates' transition to induction.

Interviews with candidates and completers confirm that they are advised and made aware of assessment expectations in multiple ways. The university supervisor serves as an initial advisor for clinical practice related expectations and support. This includes an initial triad meeting with the candidate, supervisor, and mentor teacher at the onset of Phase 1 and Phase 2 to discuss clinical practice expectations and assessment. The department chair serves as the program advisor and communicates with supervisors, course instructors, mentor teachers, and candidates. The EDSS 444: Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment instructor provides specific instructions regarding the TLC and Learning Segment assessments. An edTPA coordinator, who may also teach the student teaching seminar (EDSS 458) supports candidates and the program in navigating the edTPA. The edTPA coordinator also provides appropriate feedback to candidates to interpret the edTPA results and develop a plan to successfully pass the edTPA.

Completers and candidates recognize the culture of collaboration among program faculty and staff to support their development as individuals, beginning teachers, and social justice educators. Candidates indicate that the level of support and feedback provided collectively by faculty, supervisors, and mentor teachers through the completion of the deliberately coordinated coursework and field experiences is invaluable. Review of data from program completer surveys and interviews confirm that completers believe that they are well or very well prepared to meet the Teaching Performance Expectations.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, program coordinators, faculty, adjunct faculty, TPA coordinators, and field supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Single Subject credential program.

Preliminary Mild to Moderate and Moderate to Severe Educational Specialist with Intern

Program Design

The Preliminary Educational Specialist Credentials (SPED) in Mild to Moderate and Moderate to Severe are offered by the Department of Educational Leadership and Special Education (Department) in the School of Education. Traditional candidates take approximately three semesters to complete the programs. Candidates may take longer, however, if they choose to earn a Master's degree, a dual credential, or are interns. The Department also offers a new added authorization in Early Childhood Special Education and a Bachelor of Arts degree in Special education.

According to the organization chart, the credential programs are led under the direction of the Chair in Special Education and Educational Leadership. The chair works with the dean and the Associate Dean of Education to administer the program. Within her department, the chair also works with the intern coordinator, the Master's degree coordinator and the credential advisor. The intern coordinator works with candidates who are teachers of record and working in schools. The credential advisor works with the undergraduate programs and with the full-time traditional credential candidates and is responsible for choosing appropriate school placements.

Review of documents confirmed that a majority of candidates start in the spring semester and finish at the end of the following spring. The candidates are then prepared to take a job in the fall when school begins. A majority of the candidates are interns who work full time while they finish their credential programs. These candidates start working full time as teachers during their second semester. During their first semester, they are required to observe in different teaching venues at a number of different sites, so they have access to children of different ages with different types of disabilities. This is true of both candidates who are interns and those who are traditionally mentored full-time student teacher candidates.

Interviews with the department chair and faculty confirmed that the chair meets with faculty at least twice a month in regularly scheduled faculty meetings. She also meets with faculty in small groups and one on one. The chair meets with the Community Advisory Council (CAC) to discuss the needs of the community. Recently, the department began offering an Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization based on feedback from the CAC. The faculty also meets with the dean and the other faculty from the School of Education in the fall and the spring.

In interviews, the faculty stated the program has a developmental approach. Interviews confirmed that faculty develop trust with SPED candidates so they can provide critical instruction and feedback. The program is dedicated to social justice and faculty members shared ideas through interviews about how they want to fulfill that mission. There is an atmosphere of open and honest dialog, which has laid the groundwork for continuous improvement. The faculty members conveyed passion about serving special needs children and discussed the importance of a culture of support and care when working with teacher candidates.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experiences)

Faculty confirmed that courses are organized such that candidates in both the Mild to Moderate (M/M) and Moderate to Severe (M/S) programs take most of their courses together for the first two semesters. For example, all candidates take common introductory classes in the first semester and more advanced classes later. In the final semester, the two groups split off and candidates in both programs take courses focused on content more relevant for M/M or M/S.

Although the content for M/M and M/S was integrated in many courses in the program, during interviews, many of the faculty members stated that they had degrees that were interdisciplinary with regard to M/M and M/S and felt comfortable teaching and supervising in both areas. Candidates mentioned in their interviews that they believed SPED content was covered well in both M/M and M/S, even though the courses were integrated. They appreciated hearing about both populations and learning about the needs of diverse students.

According to supervisors, a clinical seminar course is offered every semester to bridge the gap for candidates between the content they are learning in the program and what they are learning in their clinical experiences. The candidates attend this seminar once a month. It is organized with a developmental consistency, aimed at helping candidates grow throughout the program. In an interview, the intern coordinator explained that, for example, faculty will teach behavior management in the first semester and then candidates are asked to produce a teaching event assignment during their final semester, where lessons, behavior management, assessment, etc., must come together. This event accompanies the candidates' teaching evaluations and is part of their evaluation process.

According to the credential advisor and the intern coordinator, during fieldwork, candidates are mentored by both university supervisors and mentor teachers from the schools. University supervisors are required to observe interns five times over the year. Supervisors are asked to observe traditional student teachers five times during their final student teaching semester. After they observe the candidates, college faculty discuss their observations with the candidates. School mentors also observe candidates over the course of a semester and provide guidance and feedback. Both supervisors and mentor teachers provide input into the candidates' evaluations. These processes were confirmed by completers.

According to the supervisors, after the candidates' first semester, where they are exposed to several different teaching venues, the intern candidates work full time as teachers of record during the second and third semesters of their program. The traditional student teacher candidates also participate in student teaching experiences during their second and third semesters. They start working with a mentor teacher for a full day per week during their second semester. During their third semester, they are asked to work with a teacher every day and are expected to take over much of the class. This sequence of clinical experiences was confirmed by completers.

Candidates also mentioned that the culture of the program was supportive. Candidates and especially completers, felt comfortable asking questions and seeking feedback from faculty and other candidates while in the program, particularly when seeking feedback on their teaching. The candidates who started recently, during the pandemic, however, thought that some of the close contact with faculty and classmates was obviously missing and stated disappointment about that. They were also nervous that their online student teaching experiences might not prepare them appropriately for in-person classroom teaching.

As far as program improvement, the faculty said in an interview that they talked with stakeholders in advisory meetings and informally. They noted that this input was one reason they started the Early Childhood Added Authorization program and the ITEP program (an early childhood and special education bachelor's degree combination). Faculty also stated that they used data and feedback to make hiring decisions. The SPED faculty indicated that they met twice a month and talked about improving literacy classes and content for emerging bilingual students. They also mentioned an interest in improving technology training, which was an area that was shown to need improvement based on their candidate exit surveys. They did use data such as exit surveys for program improvement, but had not, so far, been tracking changes in exit survey data over time.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are required to complete what the faculty call a "teaching event" during the last semester of their program. This event is organized around the TPEs and it includes assessment, behavior, context, cultural and IEP, task analysis, lesson and instructional planning, reflection, and final curriculum assessment. Their work is evaluated by college supervisors, mentor teachers, and student teaching seminar instructors.

Candidates are also evaluated on their teaching. They are expected to successfully prepare and present lesson plans to the students in their classrooms. Supervisors and master teachers score the lessons based on the TPEs. Candidates who were interviewed during the site visit confirmed that they presented multiple lessons to K-12 students during their field experience placements and that they were observed five times during their final semester if they were traditionally mentored candidates. They were observed five times over the course of the year if they were interns. Furthermore, they confirmed that teaching event assignments were reviewed to confirm that candidates could assess their students, create lesson plans, and write IEPs.

A number of assessment instruments were also noted, often presented in the handbook so candidates could see how they would be evaluated before entering the program. These assessment tools were often check-off tools organized around the TPEs and were presented to candidates by supervisors, mentor teachers, or faculty in clinical seminar courses throughout the program – not just the end. The assessment instruments provided feedback on skills, knowledge, and dispositions, and provided space for comments as well as numeric scores.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, coordinators and administrators, the team determined that these standards are fully **met** for the Mild to Moderate and Moderate to Severe Educational Specialist Programs, including Intern, at Sonoma State University.

Reading and Literacy Added Authorization Program

Program Design

The Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA) at Sonoma State University is led by four tenure-track faculty with one faculty member acting as the program advisor. The faculty redesigned the program within the last year in response to revised standards, faculty retirements, a desire to regrow the program, and a focus on social justice. The reading advisor, who also serves as the bilingual authorization coordinator, deliberately framed courses to ground the program within a social justice framework and support the view that biliteracy is an asset, and that students have the right to develop literacy in their home languages as well as English, regardless of their schooling context.

Candidates require a preliminary teaching credential for admission to pursue the added authorization. Candidates are admitted to the RLAA program every fall and spring. The reading advisor indicated that the program is designed with intentional flexibility so that candidates may begin coursework in either fall or spring semesters and proceed through the program at their own pace. Most students take courses for the RLAA as part of a master's degree in education, completing both an RLAA and master's degree in 2.5 years. The coursework requires that students work in the field at their school sites as well as engage in clinical practice under the supervision of a literacy expert during the Summer Reading and Writing Academy.

Document analysis and faculty interviews confirm that the RLAA program reflects a comprehensive and balanced approach to literacy and a developmental perspective on literacy acquisition and growth from emergent through adolescent and adult literacy. Confirmed by completers and faculty in interviews, the program provides a course of study that prepares teachers to assess and teach reading, writing, listening, speaking, and viewing of a range of texts through direct instruction and specific skills and strategies that address the California Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and the ELA/ELD Framework. Each candidate in the RLAA program has a specific course of study monitored and supported by the reading advisor, who also oversees the master's program in reading.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Document analysis indicates that the program requires candidates to reflect on their professional advancements toward defined competencies throughout their coursework and clinical practice, with experiences distributed across four strands: curriculum and instruction, assessment, research, and language development. Faculty indicated in interviews that the following critical outcomes for RLAA graduates were developed with the support of the advisory board:

- Sonoma State University RLAA graduates demonstrate the belief in the potential of all students and build upon the cultural and linguistic assets available in their specific communities.

- SSU RLAA graduates must be able to effectively assess students, create and design instruction that matches assessment outcomes (intervention), and provide differentiated support for all students to maximize engagement and ensure equity.
- SSU RLAA Graduates must ensure equity and access through a range of scaffolds in meeting the California Common Core State Standards.

Courses offered in the fall include EDCT 552: Educational Technology Praxis and EDRL 524: Literature and Literacy. Analysis of syllabi and completer interviews confirm that candidates develop strategies for promoting fluent reading and comprehension, planning and delivery of literature-based reading curriculum, and assessment-based intervention and instruction. Candidates also explore the research and practice in multi-modal literacies. Completers indicated that the Educational Technology Praxis course enabled them to understand that technology should enhance learning rather than provide alternative ways for students to complete rote tasks.

Courses offered in the spring include EDRL 521A: Language Development in First and Second Languages and EDRL 522: Assessment and Teaching in Reading and Language Arts. Analysis of syllabi and completer interviews confirm that candidates investigate literacy research, theories, beliefs, and/or practices through case studies of emergent bilinguals, struggling readers and writers. Candidates examine the nature of fluent reading and comprehension, assessment approaches, planning and delivery of reading intervention and instruction, and best practices. Field experiences and assessments occur within candidates own classroom contexts and are intended to lead to purposeful reading instruction.

Faculty indicated in interviews that the summer course synthesizes the content and understandings built within the coursework of the program. EDRL: 527A: The Summer Reading and Writing Academy – Clinical Field Experience in Reading and Language Arts provides the opportunity for candidates to implement theory and research learned in the fall and spring courses. Candidates serve as teachers in the Academy that consists of TK-6 students from the Roseland School District. Candidates focus on practicing and improving learner-centered reading and writing instruction. According to review of the syllabus, candidates assess students, deliver standards-based instruction, collaborate with colleagues, and reflect upon their teaching practice. Completers who recently engaged in the summer academy indicated in interviews that the course was informative, tailored to a case study student, and useful. One completer explained that the course enabled her to explore graphic novels. The knowledge she gleaned from her experiences in the course was then applied within her own classroom.

Assessment of Candidates

Assessment of candidates is based on signature assignments for each RLAA course. Each signature course assignment meets competencies for the authorization. Candidates must successfully pass the signature assignment with a grade of B or better to enroll in the next RLAA course. Syllabus review and faculty interviews confirm that signature assignments are housed in

Canvas and periodically reviewed by program faculty to facilitate the continuous review the progress of individual candidates as well as the RLAA program as a whole. In order to be ultimately recommended for the RLAA, candidates must have a minimum GPA of 3.0.

Signature assignments include the Culture of (Bi)Literacy Investigation and Action Plan, Multimodal Literacy Project, Classroom Action Research Project, School Site Plan for Professional Development, the Assessment Case Study, and the Practicum Portfolio. Faculty confirmed in interviews that signature assignments were deliberately designed to address competencies, while providing opportunities for candidates to explore the intersection between social justice, reading and literacy. Completers indicated in interviews that the Culture of Bi(Literacy) Investigation and Action Plan signature assignment supported their exploration of representation in children’s literature. They discovered that they can support engagement by ensuring that children of color and with different backgrounds were represented in their classroom libraries. This led to the act of constructing a Donor’s Choose Project to fund children’s books that would be carefully chosen to address inequities in representation. Overall, completers expressed that the RLAA has supported their growth as an educator and that teachers need this information to teach their students.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with completers, faculty, and the advisor, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization.

Bilingual Added Authorization

Program Design

Sonoma State University offers a Bilingual Added Authorization (BILA) in Spanish for multiple subject, single subject, and educational specialist teacher candidates. Two pathways are offered to obtain the bilingual authorization. Candidates may complete the bilingual authorization while pursuing a teaching credential or the requirements may be completed in a post credential program.

The Bilingual Added Authorization is a collaboration among faculty in the School of Education (SOE) and the School of Arts and Humanities (A&H) and concentrates on three areas of study: Literacy Studies and Elementary Education in the SOE, Chicano and Latinx Studies in A&H, and Spanish Linguistics in A&H. There are four primary BILA faculty members—three tenured professors and one full-time adjunct professor. A SOE faculty member serves as the BILA coordinator and advisor.

The BILA program was approved by the Commission in August 2018 and currently has 18 part-time and full-time students enrolled in the Multiple Subject Credential program where

candidates complete the program in two to three semesters. BILA is recruiting and is prepared to accept candidates for the single subject program and education specialist candidates.

No major modifications have been made since its initial approval, however, due to COVID 19 and the shelter-in-place guidelines implemented in spring of 2020, classes shifted from in-person to online.

Interviews and a review of documents confirmed that program faculty, university supervisors, and mentor teachers meet regularly and contribute to the development and continuous improvement of the BILA program. Advisory board members meet once or twice annually to discuss critical issues related to preparing teacher candidates to serve students in dual immersion classrooms across the service area. Decisions about the program design, coursework, and fieldwork placements are informed by informal and formal feedback processes. Information from student exit surveys, course evaluations, and capstone assignments is used to make adjustments to support candidate success. The university site supervisors meet with mentors every other week and observe student teachers usually on a weekly basis. Mentor teachers, university field supervisors, and the program director develop personalized, relational support systems for candidates. Although there are various processes for informal feedback for mentor development and improvement, a formal feedback process to enhance professional growth is not currently in place.

University site supervisors informally coach mentors to improve practice and mentors participate in university-based or residency teacher program professional learning sessions on a regular basis.

Course of Study and Fieldwork/Student Teaching

The BILA pathways are based on an integrated, interdisciplinary approach introducing theory and methods in the coursework and implementing those practices in student teaching placements. Program standards for the preparation of bilingual teachers draw upon foundational and current research in three areas, in this case: the historical context for Spanish bilingual education and bilingualism, Spanish bilingual methodology, and the cultural emphasis—Chicano/Latinx. Through a review of the BILA program handbook, course syllabi, and interviews with faculty, current students and completers, the curriculum meets the requirements emphasizing a culturally relevant and academically robust capstone assignment. Literacy methods are highlighted as fitting for dual immersion K-12 students and math content teaching is a focus area for continued improvement in dual immersion classrooms.

The BILA handbook, candidates, completers, and university supervisors indicated that two student teaching placements are required, usually in the same school. Candidates typically select the schools where they would like to complete their fieldwork.

Applicants may select one of two pathways to obtain the BILA: 1) post-baccalaureate or 2) the

undergraduate integrated teacher education program. Multiple subject candidates pursuing a bilingual authorization complete their student teaching in dual-immersion classrooms. Education specialist candidates and single subject candidates, once these candidates come into the program, will complete their student teaching in classrooms with high numbers of emergent bilingual students. Candidates will complete 600+ hours of fieldwork/student teaching over the course of two semesters which may extend to a third semester.

Interviews with mentor teachers and candidates highlight the opportunity to complete student teaching through a teacher residency model of fieldwork and supervision. Candidates are eligible to receive up to \$18,000/annually to complete their fieldwork as a “residency program” with Napa Valley Unified School District or Santa Rosa City Schools. Current candidates and completers commented on the advantage of participating in this model where the student teachers begin the school year from the first day of class, are involved in the school site’s professional learning, and serve as co-teachers in the classroom.

Assessment of Candidates

Assessments are described in the BILA handbook and there is documentation of candidate data indicating the assessments are taken and passed. The candidates and completers indicated they are well supported to pass the required assessments. Candidates are assessed throughout the program through several signature assignments aligned to the program standards. Each signature assignment is due at the end of the specific course, e.g., parent interview assignment or culturally relevant literacy assignment. Candidates plan and execute lessons usually twice weekly and receive informal and formal feedback indicating specific goals for improvement.

Candidates must pass the language requirements for the Bilingual Additional Authorization: CSET Spanish Subtest III, CSET LOTE World Languages Subtest IV, and CSET Spanish Subtest V. BILA candidates complete coursework, student teaching, and CalTPA performance assessments as required in their respective pathways: Multiple Subject, Single Subject, or Education Specialist.

As the Bilingual Added Authorization becomes increasingly necessary to serve the Spanish speaking populations in California, all stakeholders expressed the importance of expanding the reach of BILA. Not only does it serve the Spanish speaking population, but it gives a dual immersion option to access to non-Spanish speaking students. The program director, who initiated the BILA program, wishes to increase candidate enrollment by offering the authorization along with a master’s degree to prepare teachers to meet the burgeoning needs of the state’s Spanish speaking population. The program is intended to address a bilingual teacher shortage as well as an ever-increasing demand for teachers who are qualified to teach in dual language settings.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Bilingual Added Authorization.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

Program Design

Sonoma State University's program for Administrative Services Credential is well organized. The School of Education houses the program with one program director/full-time faculty and several part-time/adjunct faculty. The credential process is held by the School of Education who verifies the program standards have been met. The program utilizes the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA) to meet accreditation requirements with Pearson as the direct assessors.

Leadership within the credential program and department leadership are strong. However, based on interviews it was acknowledged both roles are newly held by these particular individuals. Both leaders indicated a desire for further collaboration. Evidence from these interviews further suggests a need for development of shared responsibility between the department chair and program leadership. Collaboration on shared content, site mentor training and evaluation, and unit wide assessment are areas considered in discussion and could be areas for growth. Some beginning sharing has occurred, like the mock interviews, but this was not systematic.

The program director conducts advisory board meetings once per year. Additional meetings were held for the redesign process for the new standards as confirmed by the advisory board members. Means for stakeholder input includes the advisory board members and intensive work with San Diego State University in designing and meeting the new administrative credential standards. Substantive input and additional meetings were held in Spring 2019 for development of the new program.

Completers reported that the credential team serves the program by conducting informational sessions with candidates in the spring semester. This was consistent with the report from the program. The credential staff gives detailed information about the forms and documentation necessary to apply for the Certificate of Eligibility. The unit has a tracking system in place to verify their progress.

Structure of coursework and field experiences in the credential program is established such that in the two-semester program the fieldwork and coursework are closely aligned. The site supervisors and faculty lead work together to ensure connection is authentic and appropriate between fieldwork and coursework. Faculty and supervisors both reported in interviews that

they meet regularly to ensure consistency in fieldwork and coursework as well as provide necessary support for candidates.

Program modifications over the last two years have been significant. The program is being delivered in the revised version beginning in the fall of 2020. Over the last three years, the Administrative Services Credential (ASC) program has revised several program elements in direct response to new program and teaching standards from the Commission and the adoption of the CalAPA. To meet the new requirements and fully integrate them into the ASC program, all courses were redesigned (new names and course catalogue descriptions) to emphasize the six domains of the California Administrative Performance Expectations (CAPEs) and include embedded support for the CalAPA. Candidates now engage in more course assignments that directly integrate field components, which were also developed to increase coherence across coursework and the teaching of the standards. Throughout the program, candidates have an assigned university supervisor to support them with their fieldwork and Cycle 2 of the CalAPA. This design was confirmed in interviews with candidates, supervisors, and faculty.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Throughout all courses, participants progress from theory and reflection to concrete applications and practice of what is being studied. They are called upon for the critique and redefinition of one's knowledge, beliefs, and assumptions about learning and leadership. Multiple learning opportunities are provided to candidates, which emphasize the acquisition of personal awareness and personal reflection. The curriculum focuses on building a knowledge base to enhance understanding of complex educational issues and the development of process skills. The courses are structured so that the fall provides a macro vision of leadership during which leadership theory, equity, data, and culturally sustaining practices are explored and emphasized. The spring is a more micro approach, providing candidates the opportunity to move to practice and direct application of what they are learning, exploring such topics as co-facilitating communities of practice, conducting teacher observations, coaching, managing, learning about operations, law, and personnel, and working with and directly supporting school communities and students.

Faculty and supervisors reported the authentic connection between the vision of the unit for social justice and the work of the program and its candidates. Advisory board members and supervisors affirmed the positive impact of the candidates on the community and schools.

Fieldwork site selection is based on student need and opportunity. The expectation for site mentors and site supervisors is well outlined. Selection and evaluation of site mentors is an area the program recognizes as an opportunity for growth. Evaluation and feedback of both the site mentor and supervisor would be a way to strengthen the overall fieldwork experience. Faculty reported that the program will consider a move to all principal site mentors due to the nature of the CalAPA and its focus on the principalship.

Site supervisors are selected based on their application and experience. The supervisors reported in interviews that they lead candidates in their area of expertise – elementary, secondary, or alternative settings. This is a strength of the program. The communication between supervisors and the faculty lead is strong.

CalAPA results are limited due to the single year of consequential assessment being the same year as COVID shut down. Three out of fourteen candidates passed all sections of the assessment and four out of fourteen have yet to submit any portion of the assessment. The faculty lead reported, and it is reflected in the syllabus, that candidates are required to submit at least the first two cycles as part of the assignments in their fieldwork courses.

Students are in a two-semester cohort advised by the lead faculty member. Students complete their coursework and fieldwork in the fall/spring semesters.

Assessment of Candidates

The Educational Leadership Program embraces the yearlong development of candidates by assessing program competencies throughout the academic year in ways that connect coursework to clinical experience. Throughout the year, candidates are assessed in a variety of ways, including submitting signature assignments in each class, completing artifacts that demonstrate understanding of leadership theory, instructional oversight, professional growth, educational law and finance, and culturally sustaining approaches to leadership, participating in classroom discussions, and developing and executing a fieldwork project that encompasses lessons and objectives covered in the coursework.

For assessment of competencies during the fieldwork experience, the site mentor and the university supervisor complete an assessment of the fieldwork project, dispositions, and professionalism. Throughout the year, the university supervisor completes six meetings to support and guide the candidate throughout the fieldwork experience and project.

Candidates must receive a passing grade in all their courses as well as pass all three cycles of the CalAPA in order to qualify for the administrative credential.

The program assessment plan is communicated to the candidates through their courses and fieldwork supervisors. There was a concern expressed from the 2019-20 cohort of completers that there was an unexpected shift to CalAPA, but that year was a non-consequential year. Current candidates reported in interviews that they understand that the CalAPA is required to receive recommendation for their Certificate of Eligibility. Current candidates commented that while the program offers CalAPA support, faculty approachability in providing such support is an area for improvement.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Administrative Services Credential except for the following:

Standard 2: Collaboration, Communication, and Coordination – Met with Concerns

There is little evidence of shared responsibility between the faculty and unit. Specifically, within the department there appears to be positive collegiality, but evidence was not seen in how the programs within the department collaborate. Inconsistent evidence is found that the faculty have collaboration with other faculty in the unit. For example, shared responsibility in establishing systems for selection and evaluation of site mentors was not evident.

Pupil Personnel Services - School Counseling

Program Design

The Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) School Counseling Credential program is offered in the Department of Counseling, which is part of the School of Social Sciences at Sonoma State University. The credential is granted as part of a 60-unit Master's in Counseling degree. Candidates with a previous Master's degree in Counseling that required some field experience can apply to the "credential only" program which requires less units, but still includes the 600 hours of field experience as stated in the Commission's standards. The School Counseling program averages about 12-14 new candidates a year.

The PPS School Counseling program has two full time faculty that oversee and administer the program which is officially housed under the School of Social Sciences. The Dean of the Social Sciences coordinates with the Dean of the School of Education in department oversight, including resource allocation. The Counseling Department Chair reports to the Dean of Social Sciences and oversees the PPS School Counseling program faculty. In addition to the two full time faculty members in the School Counseling program, there are four additional tenure track faculty in the counseling department, and over 10 adjunct faculty that are regularly involved with delivering course content and providing support to candidates. One adjunct faculty indicated that there are "always several other adjuncts when I attend these meetings." This correlated with program faculty stating that their faculty meetings always include adjuncts.

The program has been going through a recent revision to incorporate the new Commission PPS School Counseling standards and performance expectations. All courses include language reflecting the new performance expectations and the fieldwork/practicum component data reveals those changes. The program has an advisory board meeting twice a year and obtains input on program changes in addition to providing input on other factors that are program relevant. For example, the advisory group indicated that the program was needing more course content on 504 education plans, and all members agreed that "the program made the

necessary changes.” Additionally, the advisory board reported that they felt their input was taken seriously.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experiences)

The program is generally a two-year program but has flexibility for candidates to take an extra year if needed. All candidates must receive a B- or better in every class to continue on to the next classes. During the first semester, candidates are introduced to the School Counseling foundation courses so that by the second semester they are ready to start their practicum experience. The program places candidates into either a middle or elementary school (both are partnered with the program for this purpose) for their practicum and to prepare them for their 600 hours of fieldwork experience. Several of the candidates noted that they appreciated the experience of the practicum, one specifically stating, “I had no experience in the education field, and the practicum really got me into the system, so I felt a lot better about starting fieldwork.” After candidates have completed their practicum experience, they can then choose a school to complete their fieldwork hours. If the school the candidates chooses does not have a Memorandum of Understanding with the program, the program chair coordinates the development of and drafts a new one, ensuring that the candidate has a better chance of obtaining the placement of their choice.

While candidates are in their practicum and fieldwork placements, they are also taking all the program courses that cover all the Commission standards. Courses are laid out in a manner to best match candidates experiences in the field, with more advanced courses left towards the end of their fieldwork experience. All candidates are required to complete hours at two different levels, as required in the Commission standards. At all sites, candidates are supervised by a site supervisor and also have a university supervisor that meets with candidates weekly. The site supervisors for the candidates felt that the candidates from SSU were well prepared and especially skilled at the social/emotional learning component of the profession. This proved to be of added significance for this geographical area due to the number of traumatic events experienced from mass wildfires. In fact, one site supervisor stated that, “I don’t know what we would have done without the fieldwork students, their experience with trauma focused counseling was exactly what was needed.”

Assessment of Candidates

The program has four transition points where candidates are evaluated. These points correspond with specific courses and assignments. Program leadership indicated that once every term the faculty review all the candidates to see that they are meeting Program Learning Objectives. These candidate reviews include the candidate’s academic performance, their developing competence in becoming effective school counselors, and an evaluation of whether their progress toward meeting professional and department objectives require more support. Candidates are not allowed to continue to the next level without meeting each transition point successfully. If a candidate needs more support from the program, program faculty meet individually with the candidate to develop a learning plan that details how the candidate can succeed.

Towards the end of the candidate's field experience they are required to demonstrate proficiency through their culminating experience, a portfolio exam as well as a written/oral case study presentation.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling Program.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The education programs at Sonoma State University are housed in both the School of Education (SOE) and the School of Social Sciences (SOSS). The unit head is the Dean of the SOE with strong collaboration with the Dean of SOSS for the oversight and management of the School Counseling program. While both deans are new to the institution, both have experience from institutions with strong programs and were able to communicate a clear shared vision as to how to increase the academic quality, service to the community, and dedication to social justice. The deans are supported by a University President and Interim Provost who also strongly communicated a commitment to the education programs and the community as well. Faculty and staff are well qualified and are committed to following articulated processes to ensure that student outcomes are achieved and evaluated appropriately.

The relationships that each individual program has with their candidates, completers, and community is impressive. There is an opportunity with new dean leadership to improve the unit-wide relationships between programs to ensure consistency in the collection and use of data for continuous improvement as well as to ensure that each program has a voice in the unit operations to confirm consistency and quality of programs. In addition, there is an opportunity for the Dean of the SOE to formalize community relationships and activities unit-wide, ensuring that they are regular and systematic for unit and program improvement as well. While the university is currently operating remotely during the Covid-19 pandemic, construction is in progress for the unit to move into a newly renovated building with state-of-the-art classrooms and facilities soon after the return to campus.

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>
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.	Inconsistently
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.	Inconsistently
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

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
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 programs at Sonoma State University School of Education (SOE) are grounded by a mission and vision which are well aligned with California’s adopted standards and curricular frameworks. The vision articulates a commitment to advancing social justice in schools and communities through excellence in education. The mission is to provide transformative educational experiences through teaching, research, and key initiatives by preparing undergraduates, graduate students, and credential candidates to advocate for social justice in their learning and throughout their careers so that students, schools, and communities flourish. Both the vision and mission are infused throughout the preparation programs. Stakeholders who were interviewed (employers, administration, faculty, candidates, and completers) were able to articulate the importance of the unit vision and mission in guiding their work and personalized their commitment in many ways.

Document review and interviews with the administration, employers, and faculty confirmed the unit involves faculty and relevant stakeholders in coordination and the decision making for all educator preparation programs; however, the involvement is not regular or systematic, and is often informal. Throughout leadership changes during the past few years, advisory boards have met less regularly and with varying degrees of documented feedback and program/unit changes as a result of that feedback; however, evidence provided in document review, interviews with employers and department chairs confirmed frequent informal communication in each program along with subsequent recommendations for program improvement. A best unit-wide practice is the new president’s Commission of Teacher Education forum which garners specific feedback from stakeholders for improvement and action. Interviews and document review confirm that the Council of Chairs discuss the review of data and necessary action taken in improving education. However, these meetings include the unit head, credential and budget staff, and regular representation from SOE Department Chairs, but infrequent representation from PPS School Counseling credential or Administrative Services credential representatives.

Document review and interviews with the president, interim provost, deans, and faculty confirmed there are sufficient resources to administer the programs in the unit. Interviews with the president confirmed a strong commitment to supporting educator preparation programs

both through resources and with her personal time. The interim provost and senior associate vice president confirmed budget support by protecting the unit from permanent cuts so the unit would not feel the effect of the 12% COVID-19 budget cuts.

The unit is led by the SOE dean; however, the PPS School Counseling credential program is housed outside of the SOE in the School of Social Sciences (SOSS). It was confirmed in interviews with the interim provost, the SOSS dean, and the SOE dean, that the SOE dean is the unit head for all Commission approved programs and influences the hiring, budget, and curriculum as needed to ensure adherence to Commission standards. All three individuals highlighted the positive collaboration, trust, and respect for each other which ensures successful collaboration in this organizational structure.

The recruitment of diverse faculty and the faculty development support of them are best practices at Sonoma State University. Document review and president, interim provost, dean, and faculty interviews confirmed a true commitment to diversity and professional development support and an evaluation system which ensures only qualified personnel are retained.

Document review and interviews with administration and staff confirmed the Student Services office staff have the responsibility for maintaining records for all programs in the unit. The credential analyst and coordinator are the authorized representatives to recommend candidates for the credential by following a clear process (admission through recommendation) to ensure candidates have met all the requirements for the credential which is tracked by using FileMaker Pro system. At the conclusion of the program, the credential analyst reviews each candidate file and recommends qualified candidates.

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

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Team Finding
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

Interviews with staff, faculty, and candidates, and review of documents indicate the unit recruits and supports candidates in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success. Clear criteria for admission to each program based on multiple measures of candidate qualifications are communicated through application materials, information meetings held during each open application period, and on unit and program websites. Informational materials explaining programs, admission criteria, and the application process and forms are provided through the Student Services office.

The interim provost, senior associate vice president, SOE dean, and SOSS dean all articulated a strong desire to develop a strategic plan focused on recruiting and admitting candidates to diversify the educators prepared by Sonoma State University. The SOE dean also articulated a desire to intentionally recruit African American men to the teaching profession. The PUERTA program is an example of such coordinated efforts to increase diversity of candidates.

In interviews, employers reported appreciation at being able to hire teachers from Sonoma State University who reflect the diversity of candidates in their classrooms and are already community members, stating that these teachers are key to the success of their schools.

Policies and requirements communicated through program personnel, handbooks, and websites, as well as clearly identified support personnel that include department chairs, program coordinators, faculty, supervisors, staff, and department and unit administrators are available to ensure candidates are guided to success. Program personnel reported on the steps they take to ensure success; candidates, in interviews, confirmed they are well supported by program personnel.

Systematic processes for monitoring candidate progress through each professional preparation program are in place. The Director of Student Services and credential analyst maintain databases for monitoring candidate progress, tracking completion of requirements and success in courses and field experiences. Department chairs, program coordinators, faculty, and university-based supervisors also monitor candidate progress and provide assistance to ensure

success. For candidates who need additional assistance in successfully meeting program and credential requirements, an improvement plan process is available to help candidates focus on areas for improvement and support candidates. Interviews with department chairs revealed detailed steps to ensure not only candidate success, but steps to counsel out of educator preparation should the candidate not achieve important benchmarks and standards.

Staff stated during interviews that they are provided with what they need to be able to advise and support candidates. Candidates confirmed the process for the credential recommendation and also stated the credential analyst is easily accessible to provide advice and assistance. Across programs, candidates confirmed that they are receiving the necessary support to complete the program.

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.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	Inconsistently

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	Inconsistently
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

Through a review of documentation and interviews held with faculty, candidates, university supervisors, district-employed mentors, principals and advisory board members, there is ample evidence the unit offers robust and rigorous clinical programs. Programs are grounded in social justice principles and engage candidates in theory to practice approaches where candidates apply course content knowledge to pedagogical practices in fieldwork placements.

After an extensive review of credential program documents and confirmations through interviews, it is evident that the existing credential programs in the School of Education and the Department of Counseling are all in alignment with the current California’s adopted content standards and frameworks.

Course content for Multiple and Single Subject credential candidates is grounded in culturally responsive pedagogy. Course content and fieldwork assignments support the needs and inclusion of diverse student populations is reflected throughout the curriculum (e.g., how to effectively serve students with special needs and how do candidates meet the literacy needs of emergent bilinguals). The School of Education and the Department of Counseling are dedicated to recruiting a diverse population of candidates to reflect the communities they serve. Interviews with multiple stakeholder groups commented on the commitment to serving the needs of the TK-12 diverse student populations, specifically Latinx, across the region.

MOUs from each program indicate that site supervisors hold the required credentials to serve as mentors for the board range of credential candidates. Candidates complete their clinical practice in school settings supervised by university supervisors and district-employed supervisors (mentors). The university supervisors regularly visit and observe credential candidates and meet with the mentor teachers and candidates to review progress and design next steps. In interview discussions, it was noted that many of the district employed supervisors and course instructors are alumni of the SSU credential programs and have long-standing relationships with the directors and university supervisors. The district mentors/supervisors are

recommended by the principals of the school sites and go through a local district vetting process. While there is some evidence that the site supervisors have professional learning opportunities to grow and develop their expertise, there is no systematic process in place to ensure that district-employed supervisors are receiving the required hours of professional learning across all programs. University supervisors and district and school administrators confirmed there is a collaborative effort to select and match site-supervisors with candidates. The majority of site supervisors are evaluated by candidates at the end of the program. However, there is inconsistent evaluation and feedback processes in place to give periodic formal feedback to district site supervisors/mentors. There is evidence of an informational feedback process held through conversations and coaching that takes place on a consistent basis.

The PPS program in School of Counseling is aligned with the Counseling Department’s mission of seeking to educate candidates to provide students with the knowledge, attitudes, and skills to promote the health and development of students and their families through a culturally relevant and responsive approach. There is an emphasis on self-care and trauma informed practice, which is especially significant during this pandemic period. PPS credential candidates are systematically observed and given feedback for improvement. Site supervisors participate in regularly in professional learning and district site supervisors/mentors are evaluated on a regular basis.

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.	Inconsistently
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completion 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 with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Based on thorough document review and verified by interviews with program leadership, coordinators, faculty, candidates, advisory board partners and supervisors, it was apparent the credential programs at SSU use multiple forms of assessment to engage in a continuous cycle of program improvement. Input from candidates is sought through self-reflection, program portfolios, surveys and informal check-ins. Strong evidence was available for the collection, analysis, and use of data obtained from faculty, supervisors, cooperating teachers, candidates and completers/alumni by the initial teacher education programs (Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, Bilingual, and Reading Language Arts) program faculty, departments, Assessment and Accreditation Committee, and the Council of Chairs. There was inconsistent evidence the School of Education unit regularly assesses their effectiveness in relation to course work, and fieldwork and clinical practice, and inconsistent evidence the School of Education unit regularly analyzes and uses candidate and program completer data, especially for the Administrative Services credential and PPS School Counseling credential. There was clear evidence the School of Social Sciences unit which houses the PPS credential program regularly assesses their effectiveness and analyzes and uses their candidate and program completer data.

All credential programs collect signature assignment data and portfolios, licensure test data, fieldwork supervisor and cooperating teacher survey data, and exit and completer survey data from graduates. Multiple examples of data use were readily provided such as revision of course sequence in Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs as a result of student and faculty feedback. Creation of new courses across the Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist programs resulted from candidate and completer data. Feedback from candidates, program completers, advisory board members, and community stakeholders resulted in collaborative learning spaces (e.g., Teaching Learning Communities, Collaborative Learning Events).

Interviews with external stakeholders (e.g., advisory board members, residency programs) indicated they were regularly consulted regarding candidate preparation, and their input was used in making program revisions and initiating new programs to meet community needs, such as the residency programs.

The School of Education unit recently completed strategic planning and established goals for the recent academic year. These were iterative processes which included unit-wide collaboration with faculty and staff, and included focus groups with breakout sessions, input and feedback opportunities, and revisions by the dean, Council of Chairs, and departments. Examples of unit-level assessment of effectiveness and candidate and completer data provided by the Council of Chairs and the Assessment and Accreditation Committee focused only on program-level changes (e.g., syllabi revision, collaborative instruction across programs) across most unit credential programs. There was no evidence program effectiveness, candidate, and completer data from Administrative Services credential and PPS School Counseling programs were analyzed and used at the School of Education unit level. Discussions with the School of

Education dean and the School of Social Sciences dean indicated they were aware of these issues and acknowledged the importance they be addressed.

Rationale for the Finding

Although there was ample evidence that all credential programs were collecting, analyzing, and using data for program improvement, there was inconsistent evidence the School of Education unit regularly assesses their effectiveness in relation to course work, and fieldwork and clinical practice candidate, and inconsistent evidence the School of Education unit regularly analyzes and uses candidate and program completer data, especially for the Administrative Services Credential and PPS School Counseling Credential.

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

In discussions with advisory board members, school site administrators, mentor teachers, faculty, and candidates and completers about the impact that SSU candidates and program completers have on the educational community, all spoke highly of the impact in local schools and communities. Community stakeholders stated their preference for student teachers and interns from SSU programs, along with hiring SSU program completers across all credential programs. They stated SSU candidates and program completers are better prepared to meet the challenges of the community schools (e.g., bilingual needs, literacy needs, financial poverty, migrant families, etc.) than candidates or graduates of other programs. They praised how the SSU candidates and program completers reflected the demographics of local schools and communities, noting that most were from the area and wanted to give back.

Candidates and program completers described collaborating and planning with their school and school district colleagues, receiving feedback with a growth mind-set and social justice lens. They also described how SSU university supervisors fostered their capacity to self-assess and

reflect on their practices. Community stakeholders and mentor teachers were impressed with the quality and expertise of alumni qualified to teach students with disabilities.

Community stakeholders and mentor teachers frequently described how candidates and program completers embedded themselves in their schools and communities. Examples were provided on regular out-reach to parents in English and Spanish, active participation in school program and department meetings, participation in school and community events, and involvement in school extra-curricular activities. They also described that K-12 students often described candidates and program completers as role models and as members of their support system.

Many of the faculty, program coordinators, site supervisors, mentor teachers, and school site administrators commented on the high level of expertise that SSU alumni possess which makes them ideally suited to serve as district-employed supervisors and lecturers for SSU.