

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

California State University, Chico

Professional Services Division

May 2023

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **California State University, Chico**. 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
5) Program Impact	Met

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern	6	6	0	0
Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern	6	6	0	0
Bilingual Authorization	5	5	0	0
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, with Intern	6	6	0	0
Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs, with Intern	6	6	0	0
Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization	13	13	0	0
Preliminary Administrative Services, with Intern	9	9	0	0
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology, with Intern	5	5	0	0
Speech-Language Pathology	8	8	0	0
Agriculture Specialist	12	12	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: California State University, Chico

Dates of Visit: March 5-8, 2023

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
April 2015	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, completers, and local school personnel. The team obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit’s operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Preconditions

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

Program Standards

All program standards for all educator preparation programs offered by California State University, Chico (CSU Chico) were **met**.

Common Standards

All Common Standards were **met**.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the fact that the team found that all program standards were **met** and all Common Standards were **met**, the team unanimously recommends **Accreditation**.

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

Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern
Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern
Bilingual Authorization
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, with Intern
Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs, with Intern
Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization
Preliminary Administrative Services, with Intern
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology, with Intern
Speech-Language Pathology
Agriculture Specialist

In addition, staff recommends that:

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

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Edmundo Litton
Loyola Marymount University

Common Standards:

Keith Walters
California Baptist University

Tina Torres
California State University, Northridge

Staff to the Visit:

Hart Boyd
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Lynn Larsen
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Programs Reviewers:

Jill Anderson
Cal Poly Humboldt

Erin Biolchino
California State University, Long Beach

Grace Cho
California State University, Fullerton

Ann De Lay
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo

Grace Fantaroni
Point Loma Nazarene University

Lori Heisler
California State University, San Marcos

Veronica Escoffery Runnels
University of La Verne

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/APA Results and Analysis
Examination Results
Accreditation Data Dashboard
Program Planning Guides

Interviews Conducted

Constituencies	TOTAL
Candidates	188
Completers	70
Employers	46
Institutional Administration	5
Program/Pathway Coordinators	14
Faculty	39
APA/TPA Coordinators	2
Field Supervisors – Program	38
Field Supervisors – District	19
Credential Analysts and Staff	7
Advisory Board Members	32
Assessment Committee	3
Collaborative Partners	2
TOTAL	465

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

Originally established as the State Normal School at Chico in 1887, California State University Chico (CSU Chico) is one of the oldest California State University campuses and sixth oldest public college in the state. Located an hour and a half north of Sacramento, CSU Chico joined the California State University system in 1972. The community surrounding the campus is semi-rural and has a population of approximately 100,000 people. The university enrolled 12,885 undergraduate students and 955 postbaccalaureate students in the fall of 2022. CSU Chico is a Hispanic-Serving Institution and has a student body comprised of 36% Hispanic/Latino, 43.3% white, 5.6% Asian, 2.5% African American, .4% American Indian/Alaskan Native, and .2% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students who come from across California including 10.3% from the Sacramento area, 22.3% from the Bay Area, 20.9% from the Los Angeles area, and 17% from the rest of California. The remaining 3% of students come from out of state or are international students. There are 915 instructional faculty, with 56.4% full time and 43.6% part time.

Education Unit

CSU Chico offers 10 Commission-approved credential and authorization programs, and 515 candidates were enrolled across all programs in the 2021-22 academic year. The College of Communication and Education includes the School of Education (SOE), which houses the Preliminary Multiple Subject, Preliminary Single Subject, Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate and Extensive Support Needs, Bilingual Authorization, and Preliminary Administrative Services programs. Additionally, the College of Communication and Education includes the Department of Kinesiology which houses the Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization program and the Department of Communication Arts and Sciences which houses the Communication Sciences and Disorders program which offers a Master's of Science in Communication Sciences and Disorders and a Speech-Language Pathology program. In addition, the College of Agriculture houses the Agriculture Specialist program, and the Department of Psychology in the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences houses the Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology program.

The mission of the SOE is to support the development of effective, reflective, and engaged educators who value the identities of all students, their families, and the communities they serve. The vision of the SOE is to be a recognized leader in preparing educators to meet the needs of a diverse, democratic, and sustainable society through inquiry, collaboration, and service toward a socially and ecologically just world. The conceptual framework guiding the SOE's work is centered on social and ecological justice with inclusivity, democracy, sustainability, service, and inquiry. The goal for all CSU Chico educators is to be effective, reflective, and engaged, which is measured with eight candidate proficiencies using a continuous improvement system based on the plan, implement, assess, and reflect model. Field placements for these programs occur across 14 counties from near the Oregon border to San Diego.

Table 1: Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2021-22)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2022-23)
Preliminary Multiple Subject with Intern	130	129
Preliminary Single Subject with Intern	124	158
Bilingual Authorization	15	4
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs with Intern	31	46
Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs with Intern	8	13
Added Authorization: Adapted Physical Education	7	4
Preliminary Administrative Services	24	44
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology with Intern	6	16
Speech-Language Pathology	18	52
Agriculture Specialist	20	33

The Visit

This site visit was conducted virtually. The team and institutional constituents were interviewed via technology. The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

PRECONDITION FINDINGS

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

PROGRAM REPORTS

Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern

Program Design

CSU Chico's Preliminary Multiple Subject program, consisting of an undergraduate, graduate, and intern option, is housed within the School of Education (SOE) in the College of Communication and Education. A faculty member is assigned responsibility for program administration, program academic advising, and relevant accreditation tasks. The multiple subject program is supported by eight full-time faculty, six part-time faculty, and nineteen clinical supervisors.

Faculty, staff, and candidate interviews confirmed the accuracy of the multiple subject course sequence articulated in the program handbook and on the program website and advising forms. A block plan design provides for developmental sequencing of learning experiences along with the flexibility to meet some of the personal needs of candidates. Four courses and 45 hours of early fieldwork experience make up the prerequisite block. The second block is two semesters in length: the first semester consists of a 270 hour clinical experience and six methods courses (13 units); the second semester consists of a 450 hour clinical experience and four methods courses (7 units). The third block consists of five additional courses (13 units) that are often integrated into the candidate's block two course schedule. Intern candidates complete the same courses with an adjustment that increases the block two experience from two to three semesters. The Integrated Teacher Education Program (ITEP) provides undergraduates an opportunity to earn a Preliminary Multiple Subject credential. The ITEP program mirrors the graduate program with one modification: an increase in the number of CalTPA support classes from two (2 units) to three (7 units). Information for the concurrent multiple subject and education specialist pathway and the multiple subject with BILA pathway is described in the reports for the education specialist and BILA programs.

The multiple subject handbook notes that the program is rooted in a conceptual framework that emphasizes social and ecological justice as well as the SOE's mission of preparing candidates to be effective, reflective, and engaged and focuses on developing teachers who:

- Embrace core democratic values and strive to live and teach by them
- Know the content of the curriculum, including state-adopted standards, and are able to teach it to a diverse population of students
- Design learning experiences based on an understanding of students' physical, intellectual, emotional, social, cultural, and linguistic needs
- Utilize assessments to monitor student progress and modify instruction

- Create and maintain a democratic learning environment that supports all students' academic and personal success
- Develop as a reflective practitioner who exercises legal and ethical responsibility and engages in continuous professional renewal
- Understand the role of teachers as moral stewards of the school and community

Interviews with candidates, faculty, supervisors, and employers confirmed that the conceptual framework is transferred into practice. Coursework requires candidates to grapple with knowledge, power, and language with the intention of abolishing systems of oppression and dispossession. University supervisors use approved rubrics to assist practicum candidates in transferring the framework into action. Candidates repeatedly noted their appreciation for the faculty's ability to model the framework's emphasis on cultivating hope, healing, and care. One candidate shared an experience where a professor noted her body language and then responded by encouraging the candidate to step out and take time to re-center their thinking. The candidate noted that after class the professor followed up by listening and then directing the candidate to appropriate university resources.

Meeting agendas and minutes, confirmed through interviews, highlight a culture of gathering data, interpreting data, planning responses, implementing change, assessing change, and reflecting on the results. Monthly meetings of the multiple subject faculty and university supervisors provide an opportunity to share program updates, conduct training, secure input related to current initiatives, and share student concerns. A biweekly Pathway Committee meeting, consisting of all preliminary credential program coordinators, provides opportunities for open and transparent communication in areas such as program development, maintenance of program quality, program assessment, accreditation, candidate advising, and a review of communication with candidates and partners. The Governance Council is the coordinating and internal advisory committee for the SOE and ensures communication, consistency, collaboration, and oversight of the various SOE programs. The All-University Responsibility for Teacher Education Committee (AURTEC) provides curriculum, program, and policy oversight for both undergraduate subject matter preparation programs and educator preparation programs at the university level. The AURTEC is composed of the following:

- Vice Provost for Academic Programs (or designee)
- Dean of the College of Communication and Education
- Dean of the College of Humanities and Fine Arts
- Dean of the Graduate, International, and Interdisciplinary Programs
- Director of the School of Education
- Program Coordinator of the Liberal Studies Program
- Chair of the Educational Policies and Procedures Committee (EPPC) of the Academic Senate
- Faculty representing Arts and Sciences Subject Matter Programs
- Credential Analyst
- Program Candidate

- Community K-12 Representative

Several structures are in place to allow for input from various constituency groups. Candidates provide input through conversations with faculty as well as completing program developed surveys. Program completers provide feedback through completion of the CSU Exit Survey at the end of their program(s) and the CSU System-Wide Evaluation of First Year Teachers at the end of their first year of teaching. The SOE Advisory Board – consisting of CSU Chico faculty and administrators as well as various school site administrators, cooperating teachers, candidates, completers, and induction mentors – provides support, feedback, resources, and guidance to enhance the quality and development of the credential programs.

Interviews with faculty, supervisors, and advisory board members highlighted several recent program modifications. Concerns related to an intern’s ability to navigate the rigors of the program resulted in the intern pathway structure changing from a two to three semester plan. Awareness of the number of undergraduate students interested in pursuing a credential led to the creation of the ITEP pathway. Additionally, survey data, as well as comments from candidates, faculty, and supervisors, led to the development of support courses and the coordination of significant course assignment due dates with CalTPA submission dates.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Completing the block one prerequisite courses is required for admission into the multiple subject program. Interviews with staff and candidates confirmed a systematic process for determining equivalency for coursework not taken at CSU Chico. Prerequisite courses focus on developing foundational knowledge in the awareness of and strategies for meeting the needs of English learners and special populations. Additional in-depth content related to meeting the needs of English learners and special populations are threaded throughout the block two courses. Prior to the start of a candidate’s first block two experience, the multiple subject program coordinator holds an initial Credential Program Orientation (CPO). During the CPO, candidates are provided an overview of the SOE handbook, communication expectations, course schedule, and registration for the block two courses. At the beginning of block two, candidates attend a Program Preparation Meeting that is led by the SOE director and credential analyst. At this meeting, credential requirements are discussed and candidates are provided with information about their field placements, placement requirements, and supervision; additionally, candidates meet with their university supervisor for the first time to discuss the candidate’s placement in more detail.

Block two coursework occurs one or two days each week, with some evening and weekend options. Faculty shared that the course delivery format (i.e., in-person, synchronous, asynchronous, or weekend) is determined, in part, based on the needs of the candidates. Document review and interviews with faculty and candidates confirmed that consistency of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) focused content coverage occurs through the use of syllabi shells and common assessments. Faculty further noted that the collaborative spirit of the multiple subject faculty assists with coordinating a developmental scope and sequence amongst the various courses. During candidate interviews, individuals articulated awareness of

the faculty's efforts to match theory with practice and expressed appreciation for the clear links between the TPE-focused pedagogical content within the courses and their concurrent practicum experiences. Systematic reviews of files by the credentialing office assists candidates in identifying which block three courses are needed. Once again, the process for determining equivalency is used to identify which non-CSU Chico courses can be waived.

Candidates in all multiple subject pathways complete a 45-hour fieldwork experience as part of the block one prerequisites. This experience ensures that interns, who complete all block two practicum hours in their own classroom, are exposed to diverse grade levels. Graduate and ITEP candidates, during block two, complete two semester-long practicum experiences in different classroom levels. Combined, the fieldwork and practicum experiences help candidates experience all phases of a school year including the opening of the school year, staff development days, and parent conference days.

University supervisors confirmed that annual training and monthly meetings help support their efforts to guide candidates throughout the practicum experience. Additionally, interviews with university supervisors confirmed that evaluation of their effectiveness occurs within the established faculty handbook policies.

Candidate handbook content – coupled with university supervisor, district-employed supervisor, and candidate conversations – provide structure that helps candidates take increasing responsibility for instructional planning, differentiating instruction, assessing student learning, and reflecting on the results of assessments to inform future planning and teaching. Three sets of rubrics are used to assess candidate competence: Chico Observation Rubric for Educators (CORE), TPE domains, and dispositions. A mid and final-term university supervisor, district-employed supervisor, and candidate conference verifies that the candidate is making appropriate progress. Interviews with university and district-employed supervisors highlighted appreciation for the program coordinator's availability and positive support with situations that require mild, moderate, or intensive conflict resolution. A final Individual Development Plan (IDP) transfers the final rubric evaluations into a form that will guide the candidate during induction.

Per state program standards, district-employed supervisors are required to complete 10 hours of training. This requirement is monitored by the field placement coordinator. Approximately half of the training is videos produced by CSU Chico faculty to explain co-teaching expectations; the remaining portions of the training are met either through district professional development experiences or the Professional Development for Mentor Teachers (PD4MT) course provided through the California Council of Teacher Educators. Evaluation of district-employed supervisors is informal. University supervisors and candidates stated that the informal system is sufficient as both groups noted the power of continuous communication and proactive problem solving as the key for creating a positive experience. After a COVID hiatus, a spring 2022 gala re-established the formal recognition of all supervisors.

Candidates are formally observed six times per semester. Survey data, presented on the Commission on Teacher Credentialing's (Commission) data dashboard, indicates that 59.6% of candidates are being observed one or more times per week during each practicum semester (state average is 61.8%). University supervisors are provided the option of using GoReact video software for no more than two of the formal observations. This option allows supervisors to better meet the needs of their candidates. Each formal observation results in feedback, guidance, and support for improvement. Candidates and supervisors stated that post-observation conferences often make connections between pedagogy courses and field-based experiences. Survey data presented on the data dashboard shows that 92.3% of candidates believe the program effectively integrates course content with practicum experiences (state average is 91.8%). During interviews, faculty also highlighted intentionality in connecting the practicum experience with course assignments (e.g., candidates complete a literacy case study on a student from their field placement that includes the development of a student-centered instructional intervention plan).

During interviews, candidates shared that personal initiative in reviewing the CSU Chico, SOE, and multiple subject program materials allows one to navigate each step of the program with minimal interaction with CSU Chico staff. For candidates who prefer help navigating the material, advisors are tasked with sending regular emails and offering virtual or in-person advising meetings. Additionally, candidates noted that they often successfully leveraged faculty willingness to offer assistance as a means of securing critical information and/or gaining assistance in identifying the right CSU Chico office to contact. One faculty member stated that their willingness to provide support and assistance is rooted in a desire to model a "collective consciousness of goodness." Interviews with candidates, supervisors, and employers confirmed that this goal is being achieved.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidate progress is monitored through a variety of assessments, including observation rubrics, common course assessments, the Reading Instructional Competence Assessment (RICA), and the California Teacher Performance Assessment (CalTPA). These carefully designed tasks verify that candidates meet the TPEs for new teachers.

Multiple subject candidates in both the student teaching and intern pathways complete CalTPA Cycle 1 during Clinical Experience 1 and CalTPA Cycle 2 during Clinical Experience 2. All candidates receive information about the TPA in their coursework, program handbook, and the SOE website. Focused CalTPA support is provided through a course taught by a qualified instructor that addresses technical aspects of the CalTPA. During interviews, candidates expressed appreciation for expert assistance in helping them gain an understanding of prompt charts and task rubrics. Additionally, the course addresses technological topics such as formatting and uploading responses, scanning documents for submission, and understanding online evaluation systems. Candidates who need to resubmit their TPA enroll in a TPA remediation course. This course reviews the CalTPA scores, provides guidance for remediation as appropriate, and assigns a new due date for their CalTPA.

The CalTPA support class emerged as a result of the Annual Assessment Summit data evaluation activities. Three data sources were used during the summit:

1. Program specific surveys and anecdotal conversations that highlighted candidate struggles with completing the CalTPA in conjunction with all other program requirements
2. Candidate survey data presented on the Commission's data dashboard, such as the overall effectiveness of the program that was lower than state average (80% compared to 86.8% for the top two rankings)
3. CalTPA passing rates as reported on the dashboard:
 - **Math Cycle 1:** 58.6% compared to 62.9% for the state (2020-21)
 - **Math Cycle 1:** 52.8% compared to 59.8% for the state (2021-22)
 - **Literacy Cycle 2:** 63.8% compared to 71.2% for the state (2020-21)
 - **Literacy Cycle 2:** 60.8% compared to 69.8% for the state (2021-22)

Interviews with faculty and supervisors confirmed that continued efforts are being employed to further improve the candidate's CalTPA experience.

All program requirements must be met by candidates prior to being recommended to the Commission for a Preliminary Multiple Subject credential. CSU Chico's credential office routinely monitors candidate files and typically contacts candidates through email if there are any missing program requirements. In the semester when it appears that the candidate will be finishing all program requirements, the credential analyst will offer workshops to help candidates complete necessary forms. Prior to submitting a recommendation, the credential analyst verifies the candidate's file. Accuracy is further verified with a systematic verification of the awarded credentials list sent by the state to CSU Chico.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Preliminary Multiple Subject program with Intern pathway.

Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern

Program Design

CSU Chico's Preliminary Single Subject program is also housed within the School of Education (SOE) in the College of Communication and Education. The single subject program offers thirteen content areas and has an intern option, a concurrent single subject and education specialist pathway, and a residency program. The 13 approved content areas are as follows:

- Agriculture

- Art
- Business
- English
- Health Science
- Home Economics
- Industrial and Technology Education
- Mathematics
- Music
- Physical Education
- Science
- Social Science
- World Languages

The single subject program coordinator noted in interviews that there have been no candidates in the business and home economics content areas since the last site visit. Information for the concurrent single subject and education specialist pathway and the single subject with BILA pathway is described in the reports for the education specialist and BILA programs.

The single subject program is led by a program coordinator and pathway coordinators who are supported by seven tenured/tenure-track faculty, eight adjunct faculty, and fourteen clinical supervisors. The single subject program coordinator is responsible for the program's administration and communication about the program. The program coordinator also acts as the liaison with accreditation and other agencies and individuals related to the program. The program coordinator, pathway coordinators, faculty members, and SOE staff serve on the Governance Council that facilitates communication, consistency, and collaboration among programs of the SOE and deals with SOE and program operations, credentialing, and accreditation. The Governance Council makes recommendations to the faculty of the SOE. Additionally, the program coordinator and all pathway coordinators attend the Pathway Committee, which was established to encourage open and transparent communication among the faculty of pathways and to meet pathway responsibilities, including pathway development, maintenance of program quality, assessment, selection and advising of candidates, and communication with candidates and school partners. The committee also oversees coursework and field experiences and ensures that all aspects of the program meet accreditation standards. As with the multiple subject program, the AURTEC provides curriculum, program, and policy oversight for both undergraduate subject matter preparation programs and educator preparation programs at the university level.

The available pathway options for the single subject program are as follows:

- Concurrent: Preliminary Single Subject and Preliminary Education Specialist
- Intern
- Residency

The concurrent pathway is designed to prepare future teachers to meet the diverse needs of K-12 students. Two semesters of full-time student teaching are required for this intensive pathway. Concurrent candidates are placed in a general education setting for one semester and a special education setting for another semester. Further details for the concurrent pathway are provided in the Preliminary Education Specialist program report.

Single subject candidates have an option of earning a credential through an internship pathway, which allows candidates to find paid teaching positions and combine supervised teaching and completion of the teacher preparation courses with employment in a school district. Qualified individuals are authorized to teach with a Preliminary Single Subject Intern credential for up to two years of classroom teaching. All intern candidates must meet all program requirements prior to admission. During interviews, several intern candidates noted the value of the “boot camp” program event which orients candidates to the program and also provided opportunities to connect and bond with other interns.

Additionally, CSU Chico offers a teacher residency pathway called the Computational Literacy Across Secondary Settings (CLASS) program. A review of program documents shows that CLASS is an accelerated, innovative, and blended pathway that is based on the social and ecological justice conceptual framework of honoring inclusivity, democracy, and sustainability with service. CLASS candidates work full time (four days a week) at a school site in one of CSU Chico’s diverse and/or high-need partner districts for an entire academic year. Candidates assume responsibility for co-planning and co-teaching with their dedicated mentors from day one and participate with their mentors and supervisors in a variety of classroom, school, and district-related activities. Candidates are, in effect, additional faculty members in the classrooms and at the schools where they are assigned. During interviews, candidates, district-employed supervisors, university supervisors, and employers attested to the quality of the CLASS residency program and highlighted the successful teaching careers of candidates who completed the program.

A review of documentation and interviews with the single subject program coordinator confirmed that incoming single subject candidates participate in a program orientation and receive the following:

- Co-teaching and cooperating teacher letter
- Cooperating teacher information
- MySOE Instructions
- Membership Forms

Financial aid opportunities for candidates are also shared. Additionally, the pathway coordinators meet with all candidates again at the beginning of each semester at the Practicum Preparation Meeting to prepare candidates for the semester. During this meeting, the pathway coordinators discuss the following: SOE handbook, field placement requirements, CalTPA, and credential requirements. This meeting is followed by a time for each candidate to meet with their supervisors to discuss their field placement in more detail. Cooperating teachers or

district-employed supervisors expressed the value of “co-teaching” in the practicum settings and also highlighted an appreciation of CLASS candidates who are “motivated, eager, and enthusiastic about teaching.”

Faculty, staff, and candidate interviews confirmed the accuracy and consistency of the single subject course sequence articulated on the program website, program handbook, and program advising forms. Candidates in single subject and single subject intern pathways experience preparation through the single subject block plan that provides for developmental sequencing of learning experiences along with the flexibility to meet some candidate personal needs.

As with the multiple subject program, the single subject handbook notes that the program is rooted in a conceptual framework that emphasizes social and ecological justice as well as the SOE’s mission of preparing candidates to be effective, reflective, and engaged. Document review and interviews confirmed that coursework and fieldwork in the single subject program are aligned to focus on developing teachers who:

- Embrace core democratic values and strive to live and teach by them
- Know the content of the curriculum, including state-adopted standards, and are able to teach it to a diverse population of students
- Design learning experiences based on an understanding of students' physical, intellectual, emotional, social, cultural, and linguistic needs
- Utilize assessments to monitor student progress and modify instruction
- Create and maintain a democratic learning environment that supports all students’ academic and personal success
- Develop as a reflective practitioner who exercises legal and ethical responsibility and engages in continuous professional renewal
- Understand the role of teachers as moral stewards of the school and community

Interviews with candidates, faculty, supervisors, employers, and cooperating teachers confirmed that the conceptual framework is transferred into practice. Candidates repeatedly noted their appreciation for the faculty for preparing them to be effective, reflective, and engaged. During interviews, a program completer shared about her “habit of mind” that was formed during the practicum courses; additionally, she shared about how her daily habit of reflecting and examining her teaching helped her to grow and continue improving her teaching practice. A group of supervisors echoed this sentiment, praising the reflective practitioner's habit of mind that CSU Chico candidates bring to the practicum and its positive impact on teaching.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Document review and interviews with candidates confirmed that the program has a minimum of 600 hours of required clinical practice across the arc of the program. The prerequisite block consists of four courses and 45 hours of early fieldwork experience in their subject matter preparation program prior to admission to the program. The initial student teaching, called Practicum I, consists of 20 hours a week for 16 weeks (four hours per day, five days per week)

of observing and co-teaching experience in a single classroom. To experience all phases of a school on site, candidates are encouraged to start and end following the grade 7-12 school schedule. The final student teaching semester, called Practicum II, consists of 25 hours a week for 16 weeks of full-time experience in a grade 7-12 school, teaching two courses at two different levels.

Interviews with candidates confirmed that, during the practicum, they have numerous opportunities to plan and practice multiple strategies for managing and delivering instruction. Candidates expressed satisfaction with witnessing close connections between pedagogy courses and field-based experiences. As such, candidates apply what they are learning about planning, instruction, and assessment in their practicum settings.

An interview with field placement coordinator confirmed that the coordinator assigns all clinical practice field placements. Candidates are assigned an interview with a designated district-employed supervisor or, in some instances, with a site administrator. Candidates conditionally accepted into the program will not be assigned a field placement interview until all requirements have been met to start the program. Field placements are confirmed when the cooperating teacher invites the candidate to co-teach with them. If a candidate is assigned to a second interview and is still not offered a field placement, the candidate will need to meet with the program coordinator to determine if a third interview will be assigned. If a candidate is not offered a field placement after three interviews, the SOE director will review the candidate's status. The field placement coordinator monitors the completion of the 10 hours of training that are required from the district-employed supervisors. Document review and interviews confirmed the existence of a solid fieldwork placement protocol.

Assessment of Candidates

A review of documentation confirmed that the TPEs are evident and embedded into the curriculum of the single subject program in order to effectively support beginning-level practitioners to educate all students in meeting state-adopted academic standards. Program coursework and field experiences provide opportunities for candidates to learn and apply the TPEs, including continuous reflection from the beginning to the end of the program, as corroborated through candidate and completer interviews. Supervisors and cooperating teachers confirmed that candidates acquire adequate skills to serve diverse students across a range of ages and grade levels. Examples of fieldwork performance evaluations include reflective journal entries, unit and lesson plans, standardized observations, and pre-and post-observation conferencing, in which supervisors and faculty assess candidates.

According to the program coordinator, starting in the 2022-23 academic year, a three-unit CalTPA course was added to support single subject candidates. Concerns related to limited classroom practice to complete the CalTPA and the need for continuous support to successfully complete the CalTPA were the rationale behind this program modification. However, candidates and cooperating teachers expressed during interviews that taking both CalTPA Cycles 1 and 2 in the same semester, during Practicum II, can be stressful. To mitigate this, completers and candidates near completion suggested that the program consider providing an

early introduction or overview of the CalTPA in the prerequisite courses. Additionally, they suggested a scaling back of the number of course assignments and flexibility with the assignment deadlines in Practicum II courses. The TPA coordinator teaches the CalTPA course, oversees CalTPA related issues, provides continuous support as needed, maintains currency in all CalTPA tasks, aggregates CalTPA data, and coordinates retakes. The CalTPA course addresses technical aspects of the CalTPA, including technological topics such as formatting and uploading responses. If the CalTPA scores are below the passing score, candidates sign up for a focused CalTPA support in a one-unit, non-matriculated course, which is provided in a TPA remediation course. This course reviews for the CalTPA scores and provides one-to-one guidance for remediation as appropriate.

Candidates are informally observed and evaluated daily by their district-employed supervisor. Additionally, the university supervisor conducts a minimum of six formal observations. At specific points in teaching practica, formal three-way conferences are held among the candidate, district-employed supervisor, and university supervisor to discuss the candidate's progress, identify challenges, and plan for improvement while reviewing the candidate's effectiveness in applying teaching strategies in relation to California's academic content standards and curriculum frameworks, student needs, interests, and accomplishments.

Candidates also self-evaluate their progress at the end of each teaching practicum using a self-evaluation form, culminating conference form, exit interview, and Induction Individual Development Plan (IDP). Additionally, cooperating teachers and university supervisors evaluate candidate performance using the practicum and disposition midterm/final evaluation form, which is guided by the TPEs and dispositions rubrics.

University supervisors expressed their appreciation to the SOE for providing resources and continuous support. They also shared how they have benefited from the university supervisor monthly meetings, pairing up with experienced supervisors to help one another, and ongoing professional development workshops/training to learn about new trends and updates from the education field and across the pathways. University supervisors also confirmed that the supervisors' toolbox, candidate handbook, and sharing of CalTPA data helped them better understand their responsibilities as supervisors in assessing candidates (e.g., midterm/final evaluations and conferencing with candidates) and also provided them a "scaffold" to support candidates to be ready for instructional planning, differentiating instruction, assessing student learning, and reflecting on the results of assessment to inform future planning and teaching.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, and the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Preliminary Single Subject program with Intern pathway.

Bilingual Authorization

Program Design

Candidates for the Bilingual Authorization (BILA) are typically candidates who completed their Bachelor's degree at CSU Chico and who are concurrent multiple or single subject candidates. The BILA can only be completed through a traditional credential pathway culminating in student teaching – there are no BILA interns. CSU Chico's BILA program is approved to offer authorizations in Spanish, Hmong, and Punjabi; however, program staff who were interviewed stated that there have been no candidates in Hmong or Punjabi in the last three academic years prior to the site visit. Candidates and completers who were interviewed stated they learned about the BILA through their undergraduate advisors or credential program staff when they applied for admission.

The BILA program is located in the SOE under the leadership of the SOE director and BILA program coordinator. When candidates are admitted to the multiple or single subject pathway, program administrators state that these candidates have to be admitted to the BILA pathway at the same time. Candidates cannot be admitted to the BILA pathway post-credential. Candidates and completers who were interviewed confirmed that they were also enrolled in a multiple or single subject program while completing coursework for the BILA.

The BILA pathway offers a combination of specialized language and culture coursework and general initial credential (multiple subject or single subject) coursework that emphasizes culturally sustaining pedagogy, thus creating a unifying thread between the bilingual prerequisites and the professional education coursework. In an interview, candidates confirmed that they learn various strategies for emergent bilinguals in the program. Furthermore, they stated that their classes focus on diversity, inclusivity, and language diversity. Completers confirmed they were taught strategies about how to develop relationships with families of diverse backgrounds, and this was one of the most important lessons from their credential program. Completers also stated that they learned about how to use student data in their program, and they were given an opportunity to complete observations in a variety of schools.

The BILA pathway is organized into a two-semester plan consisting of professional education courses along with field experiences in the K-12 classroom. BILA candidates begin the program in the fall and finish in the spring, although candidates may take some coursework related to the culture of emphasis in their undergraduate program. Content knowledge is developed throughout the candidate's undergraduate major. At the core of the BILA is the development of a knowledge base on issues related to content knowledge, language acquisition and development, culturally sustaining pedagogy, reflective practice, in addition to language development and culture for the language of emphasis (i.e., Spanish, Hmong, or Punjabi).

Both the SOE director and the BILA program coordinator serve on the Governance Council, which is the coordinating and internal advisory committee for the SOE. This council facilitates communication, consistency and collaboration among programs of the SOE in regard to school and program operation, credentialing, and accreditation. The program coordinator chairs meetings of the BILA program faculty and supervisors and is a member of the advisory board that meets at least once per month to share information about the credential programs,

changes in admission requirements, and updates from the Commission. Interviews with program administrators confirmed the distinct roles that the SOE director and BILA program coordinator serve in the BILA program.

As with the multiple and single subject programs, the AURTEC provides curriculum, program, and policy oversight for both undergraduate subject matter preparation programs and educator preparation programs at the university level.

Interviews with committee members confirmed that the changes to the BILA program, in light of new standards, were presented to the AURTEC – the new program will be implemented starting in July 2023.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Candidates in the BILA program experience their preparation through a developmental sequencing of learning experiences. Although field experience is not required by the BILA standards, candidates in the BILA pathway complete clinical field experiences to demonstrate candidate competency. Candidates stated they are placed in dual-language immersion schools (multiple subject) or English Language Development (ELD) classrooms (single subject).

Before admission to the BILA program, bilingual candidates fluent in Spanish must complete a series of Spanish courses leading up to a course in grammar and composition. Candidates and completers in the Spanish authorization confirmed they take Spanish courses and they also have to pass a Spanish language proficiency exam to demonstrate speaking and writing proficiency – these same potential candidates take a course where they learn mathematics, science, and social science academic vocabulary.

For BILA candidates fluent in Hmong, there are no Hmong language classes currently offered at CSU Chico; therefore, students must take the Hmong Language California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET) to satisfy the language requirement for the Hmong BILA. Candidates in the Punjabi authorization must also take the appropriate CSET exams.

Culture is a central construct of the BILA program curriculum design. BILA candidates fluent in Spanish have two courses on Latino cultural information, as well as insight into sociocultural issues between the mainstream society and the Latino. Candidates must also choose between an Introduction to Latin American Studies and a Culture and Civilization course – both courses are taught in Spanish. BILA candidates fluent in Hmong must take and pass a course on Hmong cultural roots and contemporary issues. It is in this course that students study Hmong American roots, including geographic, demographic, sociocultural, economic, political, religious, and historical elements from the countries of origin. The main emphasis is on how Hmong roots influence contemporary lives of Hmong Americans, starting with their immigration/migration and settlement/resettlement patterns and continuing on to the present day. Students explore the complex patterns of Hmong American acculturation and identity, especially with respect to elements of gender, socio-economic class, ethnicity, age and education. All potential BILA candidates are required to take the prerequisite course, EDTE 302: Access and Equity, which

frames the experiences of linguistically and culturally minoritized populations in the context of educational policy, school law, program options, and the social purposes of education. This course introduces the context of bilingual education, which is further discussed in the program. In addition, potential BILA candidates complete EDTE 570: Establishing a Supportive Learning Environment in Bilingual and/or General Education Classrooms, where they are introduced to culturally sustaining pedagogy.

In the program, candidates are provided with a framework to infuse multicultural education in the curriculum, develop instructional units, and implement strategies that enable emergent bilinguals to access academic content and promote language development. Knowledge about students' cultures, and the development and implementation of multicultural curricula and foundational knowledge for culturally sustaining pedagogy is further developed and reinforced. Faculty members guide students through the process of understanding and learning to implement this theoretical model that not only addresses student achievement but also helps candidates to support their students in accepting and affirming their own cultural identity while developing critical perspectives that challenge inequalities perpetuated by schools.

Throughout the courses, candidates are provided with opportunities to share their own cultural and linguistic experiences in schools, and how those experiences have affected their academic opportunities. Furthermore, candidates are asked to reflect on their first recollection of how they learned to read and write in their primary and secondary language. This activity builds the foundation for understanding the importance of taking into consideration students' cultural and linguistic background when planning and delivering content. Candidates read pieces that explore in detail what happens when students from a culture different from the dominant culture participate in activities that validate only the dominant culture.

The professional preparation coursework systematically delivers content across a series of courses to ensure competency in meeting the educational needs of the diverse California student population. In the courses, candidates are asked to make the connections between the principles associated with equitable educational opportunities for all students. These connections are facilitated through the systematic implementation of culturally sustaining/responsive strategies and the use of culturally sustaining materials. Close connections occur between the guiding constructs, pedagogy courses, and field-based experiences. For example, BILA candidates complete a literacy case study of an emergent bilingual student from his or her field placement and develop an instructional intervention plan. Courses linked with field placements are a forum for collectively discussing and reflecting upon the effectiveness of strategies learned.

Candidates in the BILA program complete supervised field placements throughout an entire academic year and experience all phases of a school year on-site, including the opening of the school year, staff development days, and parent conference days. Candidates who are in the multiple subject program confirmed that they are placed in dual-language immersion programs. Candidates in the single subject program are required to have an ELD placement. Field experiences gradually increase from three days in their first field placements to five days a

week during the second semester. Multiple subject BILA candidates are required to take over classroom responsibilities for three days towards the end of the semester. Single subject BILA candidates are required to take over classroom responsibilities for two periods of the day, one in their specific discipline and the other in the ELD field placement, and also at the end of the semester.

Assessment of Candidates

Since candidates in the BILA program complete either a multiple subjects or single subject program concurrently, BILA program candidates complete the CalTPA for their credential program. Faculty stated that the BILA candidates typically complete their CalTPA in English although they have to demonstrate through the assessment that they can effectively work with English learners and emergent bilingual students.

For Spanish speaking candidates, the BILA program uses a combination of measures to assess language proficiency in Spanish. Spanish language courses, the applicant interview process, and the Center for Bilingual/Multicultural Studies (CBMS) Spanish language exam are all considered in order to meet this standard and identify the candidate's level of language proficiency. Prior to admission, prospective Spanish speaking candidates are assessed to meet the appropriate levels of proficiency before advancing through the BILA pathway series. They must take the CBMS language exam and BLMC 399, which uses an additional language exam designed specifically for use as an instrument to determine the language abilities of preservice bilingual teachers. Candidates are assessed across the four language domains through the use of corresponding rubrics. At this time, the BILA program does not have a set of courses or a campus-based examination to verify Hmong or Punjabi.

Candidates who are bilingual in Hmong must complete the California Subject Examination for Teachers: Languages Other Than English (CSET: LOTE) in Hmong. The Punjabi candidates also complete the appropriate CSET examinations.

In field experiences, candidates are evaluated daily by their cooperating teachers. In addition, candidates are visited and observed a minimum of six times by their university supervisor who holds a Bilingual Authorization. For each formally observed lesson, BILA candidates are required to submit a lesson plan 48 hours in advance of teaching that is written in the language of instruction. Through this early submission of the lesson plan, candidates are able to receive feedback from their supervisor prior to teaching on key areas of their lesson plan such as the selection of appropriate ELD and content standards, content and language objectives, as well as strategies to support student access to and engagement with the lesson content. During the observation, candidates are observed with the SOE's TPE-aligned CORE rubric, with special attention to what students are doing in the lesson. The post-lesson debrief between BILA candidates and their supervisors takes place directly after the lesson or soon thereafter, with special attention to addressing how the CORE rubric criteria/TPEs were met. Within two days after teaching the lesson, the BILA candidate is required to submit a written reflection on their lesson's strengths and areas for growth.

At specific points in the teaching practica, formal three-way conferences are held among the candidate, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor to discuss and identify challenges, plan for improvement, and review candidate effectiveness in applying teaching strategies in relation to California academic content standards, curriculum frameworks, and student needs, interests and accomplishments. Supervisors record evaluations of a candidate's progress using the practicum and disposition midterm/final evaluation form, which is guided by the TPEs and dispositions rubrics. At the end of each semester, candidates also self-evaluate their progress, identifying strengths and areas for growth within their practice. Candidates discuss these strengths and areas for growth in their three-way meetings but also with the Bilingual Center faculty at the end-of-semester and in BILA program exit interviews where feedback is given in support of the candidate's future success. Additionally, the combination of course-embedded assessments and the CalTPA provides both formative and comprehensive summative assessment data aligned to the TPEs. The multiple measures allow for triangulation of data in the aggregate and by individual residents. Data for these assessments are included in the annual reports.

BILA candidates receive advice and assistance from their program faculty and staff. Completers and candidates stated that they felt they had the necessary support to ensure they completed their program requirements. Several completers shared that they felt their program faculty and staff went the extra mile to support them, and they credit these program personnel for their success as bilingual teachers.

Findings on Standards

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

Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate and Extensive Support Needs, with Intern

Program Design

CSU Chico's education specialist programs are housed within the SOE in the College of Communication and Education, under the supervision of the SOE director. The SOE is part of the Education Preparation Providers Unit and houses six Commission-approved credential programs, including Preliminary Education: Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs programs. A concurrent credential program is offered where candidates earn both a Preliminary Education Specialist credential and a Preliminary Multiple Subject or Preliminary Single Subject credential. Within these credential programs, three pathways to the preliminary credentials exist: traditional, intern, or residency. Undergraduates interested in pursuing a career in teaching have the option of beginning coursework for their credential with a Liberal Arts bachelor's degree.

Each credential program is led by a pathway (i.e., program) coordinator, as defined in the SOE Constitution. For the education specialist programs, there is an education specialist program

coordinator and a program coordinator for the concurrent pathway. Credential pathway coordinators are responsible for the administration of the pathway, communication about the pathway, and acting as the liaison with accreditation and other agencies and individuals related to the pathway. Pathway coordinators for the education specialist program serve on the Governance Council, which is the coordinating and internal advisory committee for the SOE.

All education specialist program coordinators attend biweekly Pathway Committee meetings, and supervisors, district leaders and mentor teachers confirmed they are asked to attend these meetings and appreciate the open dialogue for support, concerns, and requests provided.

As mentioned in previous reports, curriculum oversight at the university level is provided by the AURTEC. The AURTEC provides program and policy oversight for all programs of teacher preparation, including both undergraduate subject matter preparation programs and teacher credentialing programs. Significant changes to credential and subject matter programs are communicated to the provost by AURTEC.

There are multiple points of entry to the education specialist programs, as students often come with undergraduate degrees in liberal studies (often with a special education major), child development, psychology, and/or subject specific majors (e.g., English, mathematics, science, etc.). As long as students complete their prerequisite courses, basic skills requirement, and subject matter competence, they can be considered for admission to the program. Many course equivalencies are accepted from other universities or community colleges, allowing for flexible entry points. In the three education specialist pathways, candidates share common courses, with the exception of curriculum courses and field placements in identified areas of specialization that focus on mild to moderate support needs or extensive support needs, which meet the Commission standard requirements for content and number of clinical hours.

All education specialist programs and pathways require five prerequisite courses and 13 program courses concurrent with fieldwork placements. Additionally, there are four courses required for a CSU Chico recommendation for a credential. This coursework can be completed at any time but is recommended before starting the credential program.

Candidates can earn an education specialist credential by taking two semesters of coursework with student teaching placements during each semester. The internship pathway allows interns to obtain a preliminary credential in the desired specialization over four semesters, while being employed as the instructor of record in a special education classroom appropriate to the specialization being earned. Intern candidates are supported through additional intern seminar courses each semester. There is also a one semester “add-on” option where candidates who have obtained a preliminary or clear credential in one specialization and wish to obtain a secondary specialization may do so upon pathway completion. The admission cycle for these programs are opened twice a year, for fall and spring starts.

In the concurrent pathway, over the course of the two semesters, candidates are placed in public school general education and mild to moderate special education classroom settings that

model competent teaching and effective learning experiences for students. The admission cycle for this program has only a fall start to match the school year of the surrounding districts.

The CLASS residency program is an 18-month post-baccalaureate program leading to Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate and Extensive Support Needs credentials as well as a master's degree in teaching. Central to the program is an 18-month, full-time, co-teaching teaching residency with carefully selected mentors in high-need rural schools and across mild moderate and extensive support needs. Interviews with program leadership confirmed that districts' need for highly qualified special education teachers was a catalyst for this pathway to be developed.

District interviews confirmed that the traditional, intern, and residency pathways were developed to include co-teaching models alongside mentors, as well as triad and ongoing meetings for support.

Over the past two years, CSU Chico has aligned all courses to reflect the new Universal, Mild to Moderate Support Needs, and Extensive Support Needs TPEs. This included developing a new course for all education specialist candidates that provides students with content and experiences related to transition planning, collaboration with families, and services including occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech-language services, nursing, orientation and mobility, and school psychology. In this course, students participate in Individualized Education Plan (IEP) team demo days that provide opportunities to engage with readings and interviews related to home instruction and educational settings in hospitals/rehabilitation facilities and treatment centers. While placements are more difficult to find in all of these settings, the course includes guest speakers such as school nurses and psychologists and uses modules such as the Open Hands Open Access modules that provide strategies for supporting students with deaf-blindness. Additionally, another course was developed to provide 45 hours of high quality teaching videos and experiences in various settings relating to the care and education of students with disabilities. To deepen candidates' knowledge of general education and provide engagement with the Universal TPEs, CSU Chico added the course, SPED 562: Methods for Science/Social Science/Arts: General and Special Education to all education specialist course sequences. There is also an added requirement for candidates to participate in instructional activities within a general education setting for at least 15 hours per semester. Lastly, CSU Chico integrated the new Literacy Standards and the California Dyslexia Guidelines into their foundational literacy course which also serves as support for RICA preparation.

Several structures are put in place to allow for constituent input, which was confirmed in interviews. The SOE's advisory board shared that they meet twice a year to provide support, feedback, resources, and guidance to enhance the quality and development of credential programs. Prior to their meeting, a survey is sent out to gather staffing needs and other current topics. The advisory board represents constituents from a variety of school levels and geographic regions in the service area. This board is composed of the director, assistant director, pathway coordinators, and various stakeholders including school site administrators, cooperating teachers, credential candidates, completers, and an induction representative. The

advisory board shared their appreciation of CSU Chico candidates in bringing knowledge of co-teaching, equity, diversity, and social justice to their schools. Interviews confirmed these constituencies have opportunities to provide program feedback on needs in the field. One such result from these discussions arose the need for training interns, so CSU Chico responded by creating an “intern boot camp.” During this designated time prior to the beginning of the school year, university supervisors, district support, and interns were brought together to set the interns up for success. Another example districts shared was the employment opportunity fair CSU Chico hosts that allows for hiring educators. The need for quality candidates in more rural school districts contributed to CSU Chico creating residency grant opportunities. Invitations to training and professional development opportunities from both districts and CSU Chico are shared. Meeting minutes are disseminated through email to ensure that all constituencies receive updates. Since COVID, meetings have moved to an online platform, and this assists with travel limitations so more representatives (anywhere between 12-25) are able to attend.

Additionally, the special education team invites administrators, Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) directors, and educators from the region twice per year to participate in meetings of the Northeastern California Special Education Advisory Board, where CSU Chico solicits feedback to inform their programs. To gather feedback from credential candidates, candidates take an exit survey at the end of their programs. Additionally, candidates and their supervisors provide responses to the CSU system-wide evaluation of first year teachers.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Candidates in all education specialist pathways experience their preparation through a course sequence that provides for developmental sequencing of learning. The course sequence begins with essential prerequisite or related knowledge and understandings. They complete program courses and teaching practica during the two semesters that follow. Course seminars introduce key topics including differentiating curriculum and instruction for students with disabilities, advanced assessment and evaluation, IEP writing, transition plan development, instructional and assistive technology, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), advanced reading diagnosis and interventions, home/family/school collaboration and communication, and special education laws.

Documentation and interviews confirmed that candidates in all education specialist pathways experience over 600 hours of student teaching or intern teaching. Candidates in the concurrent program experience over 750 hours of student teaching in both general and special education settings. Coursework occurs on evenings and weekends and is provided in face-to-face, hybrid, or fully online mediums to accommodate both traditional and intern candidates. Placements for clinical practice for traditional programs, internships, and the residency pathway are arranged with districts through various communications with mentor teachers and district support. Cooperating teachers shared that they appreciated the meet and greet opportunities outside of the classroom provided through the CLASS residency pathway in order to build collaborative working relationships.

In addition to the 45-hour field experience that candidates complete prior to admission to the program, candidates in an education specialist program pathway complete supervised placements throughout the program and experience all phases of a school year on-site, including the opening of the school year, staff development days, and parent conference days.

Opportunities to observe, acquire, and utilize professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions are provided through the field experience as candidates take increasing responsibility for instructional planning, differentiating instruction, assessing student learning, and reflecting on the results of assessment to inform future planning and teaching. The education specialist TPEs and related candidate proficiencies (i.e., CORE and SOE dispositions rubric) of the conceptual framework are specifically addressed and assessed throughout the program in both coursework and fieldwork.

Knowledge about language acquisition is a primary focus in a prerequisite course while Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) strategies and content about additional supports for English learners are threaded throughout the programs and in a literacy development course. Additionally, the education specialist faculty collaborate with the BILA program to provide an annual mandatory emergent bilingual/special education workshop.

Education specialist candidates observe teaching and participate in structured field experiences in a wide variety of K-12 general and special education classrooms during prerequisite courses. Placement staff at CSU Chico and districts report several factors are involved in matching candidates with cooperating teachers, depending upon the policies of distinct districts and/or SELPAs, subject, area of need, and region. For structured student teaching, candidates are provided with two experiences in special education settings, either in mild to moderate placements or four extensive support placements. At least one placement is made at a hard-to-staff or under-performing school, often within a rural district within their service area. The public and charter school placements vary along the continuum of support from itinerant support, co-teaching, collaboration within general education classrooms, response to intervention (RTI)/multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) intervention classes, resource support programs, and self-contained special day classes, depending on the programs in place within schools and the credential type being pursued. Candidates often have opportunities to observe or student teach in a variety of settings and are required to spend 15 hours per semester participating in instructional activities within a general education classroom. In the concurrent pathway, candidates confirmed that they spend one semester in a general education setting and one semester in a mild/moderate special education setting. Candidates shared that site mentors encourage opportunities to observe various types of settings and students, while others are able to substitute across different schools and placements.

In the CLASS residency program, candidates participate in a semester-long placement within an extensive support needs setting and then a year-long co-teaching residency in a mild to moderate support needs setting in a district serving a high-need student population. University faculty and districts report a very purposeful matching process for this residency grant.

During field placements, candidates have numerous opportunities to apply strategies taught in coursework. For example, in SPED 672: Curriculum and Instruction - Mild/Moderate Support Needs and SPED 639: Curriculum and Instruction - Extensive Support Needs, candidates implement an evidence-based practice with students, collect data, monitor student learning, and consider next instructional steps. Candidates confirmed that courses linked with field placements are a forum for collectively discussing and reflecting upon the effectiveness of strategies learned.

During interviews, candidates shared that they are observed and supported daily by their district-employed supervisor for a total of at least 5 hours per week, as well as visited and observed a minimum of twelve times by their university supervisor over the course of a school year. District-employed supervisors receive 10 hours of training and are invited to attend other workshops and professional development opportunities, although these were sometimes held outside of their contracted working hours and were not able to attend. They shared that they enjoy having candidates in their classrooms and in co-teaching environments as candidates bring a lot of new knowledge and energy to the district-employed supervisor.

During interviews, cooperating teachers and district personnel report that support from their university peers is readily available and they are responsive to candidate and district needs. During interviews, university supervisors noted that they attend monthly supervisor meetings, attend pathway coordination meetings, and receive weekly emailed newsletters from CSU Chico that provides different tips and resources. University supervisors also have a shared calendar so candidates can see where they may visit any particular day. Many candidates reported feeling very supported by their university supervisors.

At specific points in teaching practica, formal three-way conferences are held among the candidate, district-employed supervisor, and university supervisor to discuss candidate progress, identify challenges, and plan for improvement. The team also reviews candidate effectiveness in applying teaching strategies in relation to California academic content standards, curriculum frameworks, and student needs, interests, and accomplishments. Candidates confirmed that they also self-evaluate their progress at the end of each teaching practicum. Additionally, cooperating teachers and university supervisors evaluate candidate performance using the CORE, TPE, and SOE disposition midterm/final evaluation, which are guided by the CORE, TPE, and dispositions rubrics. District site mentors are evaluated through a classroom environment form from the assessment office. University supervisors are reviewed yearly by pathway coordinators.

Current completers from the CLASS program felt well prepared for their position. The three completers who were interviewed completed their education specialist credentials from the CLASS residency program and two of them are working in the schools where they completed their field experience. They shared their greatest takeaways from the program included how to be organized, time management, being a lifelong learner, and it was shared that “(They) can do hard things.” Their own action research projects allowed them to become “experts” in social emotional learning, assistive technology, and UDL at their sites.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidate progress is monitored through a variety of assessments, including the supervision and mentoring process, and the newly designed education specialist CalTPA. These tasks verify that candidates meet the TPEs for new teachers. Successful completion of courses, clinical practice, and the CalTPA, along with verification of passing the RICA result in a recommendation to the Commission for a Preliminary Education Specialist teaching credential.

Candidates confirmed that they receive information about the CalTPA in the program handbook, on the SOE website, and in their courses. Specifically, they receive CalTPA support in their SPED 501: Seminar for Field Placement course. All education specialist candidates are enrolled in this course, which addresses technical aspects of the TPA required by the Commission as part of the requirements for earning a preliminary teaching credential. Candidates learn how TPAs are evaluated and scoring tools such as rubrics are explored. Technological topics include formatting and uploading responses, scanning documents for submission, and understanding online evaluation systems. Different groups of candidates have reported different levels of support as the education specialist CalTPA is new; however, those in the intern and CLASS residency programs shared that they had a knowledgeable faculty member who met with them weekly to keep them on track and provided checklists and feedback on their submissions.

Candidates who need additional support for the education specialist CalTPA have access to their EDUC 501 instructor, supervisors, and other faculty members. Candidates who need to resubmit their education specialist CalTPA are enrolled in a TPA remediation course. This course addresses technical aspects of the education specialist CalTPA remediation required by the Commission as part of the requirements for earning a preliminary teaching credential. This course will review education specialist CalTPA scores, provide guidance for remediation as appropriate, and assign a new due date for their education specialist CalTPA.

The pathway coordinator meets with incoming candidates and provides an orientation to the program at the Credential Program Orientation (CPO) and the Practicum Preparation Meeting to prepare candidates for the semester. During these meetings, the pathway coordinator discusses the SOE handbook, field placement requirements, education specialist CalTPA, and supervision requirements. This is followed by a meeting with their supervisor to discuss their field placement in more detail and requires observations, paperwork, and assessments. Information about and support for the education specialist CalTPA is provided within the SPED 501 courses.

If there are concerns about a placement or candidate, university and site supervisors contact their pathway coordinator first to problem solve. If an issue arises regarding a candidate's ability to meet the TPEs and/or disposition requirements, a meeting is held with the pathway coordinator, university supervisor, and sometimes the district-employed supervisor and goals are created in a two week improvement plan. The team then meets again after two weeks and decides on next steps.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the CSU Chico education specialist credentials for Preliminary: Mild to Moderate Support Need program with Intern pathway and Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs program with Intern pathway.

Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization

Program Design

The Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization (APEAA) at CSU Chico is offered through the Department of Kinesiology within the College of Communication and Education. This small program is coordinated by one tenured faculty who is currently in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) in the kinesiology department and is supported by one additional full-time faculty and three part-time faculty. Together, the full and part-time faculty are responsible for advising the APEAA candidates, teaching program coursework, and supervising fieldwork. There are no units assigned to support program coordination work for the APEAA program. A fieldwork placement coordinator in the SOE is responsible for the identification and coordination of candidate site placements in K-12 settings, with this one position serving multiple programs. A credential analyst provides support by verifying that candidates meet all requirements, making the formal credential recommendation to the Commission, as well as providing direct support to candidates on completing the application process for their credential. The APEAA program communicates with the unit through participation in the professional education unit group, which meets multiple times a semester. The APEAA program is additionally supported by the chair of the kinesiology department and the dean of the College of Communication and Education. This year, a change to the program personnel was the hiring of a university-employed supervisor with expertise in adapted physical education to complete fieldwork observations in the general physical education setting as well as the adapted physical education setting. This hire will support the implementation of consistent observation and feedback to candidates in their K-12 placements from an adapted physical education expert.

The APEAA program can be entered through four pathways:

1. Candidates who completed their bachelor's in kinesiology with an option in physical education teacher education (PETE)
2. Candidates who completed their bachelor's in a subject other than PETE
3. Candidates who hold an education specialist credential
4. Candidates who hold a single subject credential in physical education

All candidates complete 21 units of coursework in adapted physical education content. Candidates who have not completed a bachelor's in kinesiology in PETE or a single subject

physical education credential must also complete additional requirements in coursework and competency exams. Candidates coming in with an education specialist credential or a single subject credential in physical education must complete only the APEAA coursework and fieldwork, all other candidates must complete the single subject credential in physical education concurrently with the APEAA coursework and fieldwork.

The APEAA program engages in continuous improvement through the collection of formative and summative feedback from university-employed supervisors and through surveys and exit interviews with candidates. Interviews with the program coordinator detailed the process for identifying the needs reported by both candidates and district-employed supervisors and integrating changes into the program to address those needs. Recently, this process included integrating more opportunities to address transition planning through seminars and coursework. A self-identified area for improvement was to implement a more formalized process for collecting and storing feedback from district-employed supervisors. Interviews with the program coordinator confirmed that the APEAA program engages in continuous improvement efforts at the unit level, with data collected each semester and professional education unit group meetings dedicated to discussing the data and identifying strategies to implement changes based on this data.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

All APEAA candidates complete 21 units of adapted physical education-focused coursework. The curriculum in the APEAA program at CSU Chico incorporates critical content in adapted physical education across multiple courses and fieldwork experiences. Document review and interviews with candidates confirmed that content focuses on assessment, use of technology, goal development and collaboration on IEPs, IEP/504 plans/Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSP)/Individual Transition Plans (ITP), transition planning, motor development, principles of human behavior, and understanding and ability to work with students from diverse backgrounds across all age groups. These topics are included across curriculum and applied in fieldwork experiences that provide candidates an opportunity to apply knowledge and skills to generalize them to a variety of settings. Evidence supporting course sequencing, connection of courses to fieldwork placements, and integration of fieldwork through the entire program was provided through program materials and was confirmed in interviews with completers, employers, and district-employed supervisors.

All candidates complete the fieldwork components of the APEAA program at CSU Chico, which include 130 hours over six early field experiences and additional hours in K-12 settings. Candidates completing a single subject credential in physical education concurrently with the APEAA complete a total of 600 hours of fieldwork in K-12 placements that is spread across general physical education and adapted physical education placements. Candidates who are completing only the APEAA and who already hold an education specialist or single subject in physical education credential complete the equivalent of one class period in general physical education and one class period in adapted physical education per day for one semester for their K-12 placements.

Candidates in the APEAA program who earned their bachelor's in kinesiology with an option in PETE complete all the required APEAA coursework and fieldwork concurrently with the single subject credential program in physical education.

Candidates in the program who enrolled with a bachelor's in a subject other than PETE must complete subject matter competency via an approved PETE program or by completion of the CSET in physical education. Candidates then complete the single subject credential in physical education concurrently with the APEAA required coursework and fieldwork.

Candidates in the program who come in with an education specialist credential must complete either 12 units in kinesiology content or pass the CSET in physical education. The 12 units include required coursework in motor development and biomechanics and additional classes that candidates select from a list focusing on assessment, motor learning, and/or pedagogy. These candidates must then complete the required APEAA coursework and fieldwork only.

Candidates who enter the APEAA program with a single subject credential in physical education must complete only the required APEAA coursework and fieldwork.

Document review and interviews with candidates, completers, and coordinators confirmed that candidates complete placements in a variety of settings across all age groups that represent all aspects of adapted physical education with a range of diversity. According to program documentation and confirmed through interviews with candidates, completers, district-employed supervisors, and administrators, the fieldwork experience is directly and explicitly connected to course content, and candidates are well-prepared by coursework to be successful in each placement. Additionally, document review and interviews with candidates and university-employed supervisors revealed strong interconnectivity between coursework and fieldwork with continuous reflections and signature assignments where candidates collect evidence in fieldwork that connects back to course content.

According to interviews with district-employed supervisors, university-employed supervisors, candidates, and the program coordinator, there have been challenges in finding placements for some candidates in K-12 settings in the last couple of years. This has resulted in some candidates not receiving placements until multiple weeks into the semester.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates in the APEAA program, who are also completing the single subject credential in physical education, must complete the CalTPA for that program. All APEAA candidates are assessed throughout the APEAA program via formative and summative assessments including five key assignments across the curriculum. Students must complete the first three assessments before being cleared to move on to the field experiences classes. According to interviews with candidates, they are well-informed of the requirements to complete the program and milestones needed to apply for their credential and the APEAA and are provided with detailed feedback and support by the APEAA faculty.

Document review as well as interviews conducted with candidates and university-employed supervisors indicated that assessment and evaluation in field placements are conducted on an ongoing basis through reflections by candidates as well as through supervisor review using an adapted physical education competency assessment form four times a semester and the evaluation of student teacher competencies in adapted physical education form at the end of the program. Additionally, candidates and district-employed supervisors discuss progress and work before and after each class. Throughout their time in the program, candidates compile evidence in a portfolio that demonstrates how they have completed all requirements and met all standards. This portfolio is assessed by APEAA faculty using established rubrics.

Candidates who are in need of additional assistance are advised by APEAA faculty who work with them to develop a continuous improvement plan that includes goals for improvement and a plan of action. Interviews with candidates, university-employed supervisors, and the program coordinator confirmed that students using continuous improvement plans meet regularly with faculty and supervisors to monitor progress and any newly developing or ongoing support needs.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization program.

Preliminary Administrative Services, with Intern

Program Design

CSU Chico's Preliminary Administrative Services program is located in the SOE under the leadership of the SOE director and the administrative services program coordinator. The program coordinator, who is the only full-time faculty member in the program, oversees all of the operations of the program. The program coordinator and one part-time faculty member co-teach the four program courses and provide support to candidates. Both a traditional and intern pathway are offered for the administrative services program. The program is currently offered in a fully online format that utilizes a mix of synchronous and asynchronous class sessions. The administrative services program handbook indicates the alignment of the program with the mission and vision of the SOE as well as the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs). Further, the program handbook identifies six core principles for adult learners and how these principles apply to the program, noting that program instructors design learning opportunities to increase candidates' leadership capacity by emphasizing real-world application of theory to practice. Candidates emphasized the program's focus on the adult learning principle that learning must be practical and applicable to the learner's context. During interviews, one candidate shared that the faculty are always "adding material that's happening right now in real time, or scenarios happening in our district or on the news and they ask, 'What would you do?'" Interviews with all constituent groups – but especially faculty and university supervisors – confirmed that the administrative services

program emphasizes supporting candidates as they complete meaningful, CAPE-aligned, practice-based assignments and reflect on their leadership growth during those assignments.

The program coordinator serves on the SOE Governance Council which facilitates communication, consistency, and collaboration among programs of the school in regard to school and program operation, credentialing, and accreditation. The program coordinator also attends bi-weekly meetings in which all coordinators meet with the SOE director and assistant director to discuss SOE issues, align best practices within the programs, and provide program updates. All pathway coordinators communicate with each other on a regular basis to share information, provide resources, and collaborate on current issues in education. Although the program is part of the SOE, the program course scheduling and logistical structure is done by the program coordinator through Regional and Continuing Education (RCE) with the dean of RCE who partners with the SOE director and College of Communication and Education dean on all budgetary and operational aspects of the program. By running the program through RCE, the administrative services program has more flexibility with its schedule, and tuition is less costly for candidates. The Preliminary Administrative Services program connection with the SOE and RCE begins with the program coordinator communicating and meeting regularly with the SOE director and RCE dean, providing consistent updates on candidates, budget, curriculum, and assessment.

The program coordinator chairs meetings of the administrative services program faculty and university supervisors who meet at least once per month to share information about the credential program, curriculum decisions, student issues, and updates from the Commission. During interviews, faculty and university supervisors all shared that they have frequent communication with the program coordinator.

Over the course of the past two years, several modifications have been made to the administrative services program. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, coursework shifted from face-to-face instruction to virtual instruction with synchronous and asynchronous components. Class sessions moved to live virtual Zoom classes, and online modules were completed asynchronously. Due to the success of these shifts, the online class meetings and modules have remained post-pandemic. Program courses meet on Saturdays during the fall and spring semesters and on weekdays during the summer. The Saturday sessions typically occur twice per month, and they are a mix of synchronous online coursework in the morning and asynchronous work on modules or group collaboration on projects in the afternoons. Many candidates and completers shared that the program's online classes, class schedule, and flexibility with asynchronous learning modules support them as professionals. During interviews, candidates, completers, and faculty also noted that the program's shift to a fully online program has meant that each cohort is comprised of candidates from a wide geographic area, which adds to the diversity of the cohort. Several candidates, completers, and faculty shared their appreciation for the diversity of perspectives within a cohort.

Coursework and assignments in the administrative services program have also been recently modified to integrate and prepare candidates more effectively for the California Administrative Performance Assessment (CalAPA), including building structures to enable candidates to

successfully complete the assessment by participating in collaborative coaching sessions, one-on-one support from CalAPA coaches, and mentoring through the field experience component. Many current candidates and program completers emphasized that they were supported in their CalAPA cycles through the coursework and assignments in the program. One candidate stated, “The faculty understand the value of the CalAPA, and it’s woven into the assignments.” Similarly, another candidate shared, “Everything I did in my assignments I could use on my CalAPA.” Another candidate shared that assignments, fieldwork, and the CalAPA are coordinated, providing an example of how the problem of practice she chose for the transformational change project served as a starting point for Cycles 1 and 2 of the CalAPA: “Instead of doing extra work we were encouraged to use the work you’re already doing.” Candidates, completers, and faculty also emphasized the immense support they receive from the CalAPA coaches, both via in-class workshops and individual follow-up coaching sessions. The program utilizes two CalAPA coaches who are program completers who successfully completed the CalAPA in the recent past. During interviews, all faculty and university supervisors could describe how they supported candidates with the CalAPA during coursework and fieldwork. Some district-employed supervisors mentioned that they also supported candidates in completing their CalAPA cycles.

Another recent modification to the administrative services program has been to make adjustments to curricula that focus on equity-driven practices such as multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS), restorative practices, and an emphasis on social-emotional learning (SEL). Several district-employed supervisors, candidates, completers, and faculty shared specific examples of candidate topics for their transformational change project that connected to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). Many candidates and completers also discussed specific assignments or projects, including CalAPA cycles, that connected to equity-driven practices in schools. Interview data from faculty, candidates, and completers emphasized that all coursework and assignments use an equity lens when approaching leadership topics in K-12 schools. Further, faculty shared that candidates are prompted to reflect on personal and institutional biases throughout coursework, especially discussions, and that there is a newly added spring curriculum module that contains resources for candidates related to implicit bias.

A number of structures are put in place to allow for constituent input to the administrative services program. Feedback from SOE faculty and administrators is solicited through biweekly pathway coordinator meetings, monthly SOE meetings, and individual communication. Frequent communication with RCE staff and administrators also results in continuous program feedback. Program mentors (district-employed supervisors) consist of current administrators in K-12 educational settings, and these district-employed supervisors have an opportunity to provide their input at five specific times during each year during the three triad meetings and the two mentor workshops. Program faculty have also established many relationships with K-12 practitioners throughout the region, so they seek input informally from their regional partners. Faculty and university supervisors shared during the interviews that they perceive the program to be a “living program,” and they strive to “keep it fresh” by continuously making adjustments to the curriculum based on the feedback from candidates and K-12 partners.

During interviews, school district representatives – including employers, district-employed supervisors, and university supervisors – shared that there is a good working relationship between their organizations and CSU Chico, including the administrative services program. While there is not an advisory board specific to the administrative services program, some school district representatives shared that they had participated in a broader SOE advisory board in the past. School district representatives also shared that they have had opportunities to provide feedback to the administrative services program about some curriculum topics that they would like to see emphasized in the program even more heavily than they already are. Additionally, these representatives stated that the lines of communication between their K-12 organization and CSU Chico are open. During interviews with employers, participants shared specific examples of feedback about curriculum they have provided to the administrative services program, including an increased coverage of fiscal knowledge for principals as well as providing more training for candidates about tools to support student behavior in K-12 schools. School district representatives also shared that they had opportunities to provide their expertise as guest speakers during class sessions in the administrative services program. This was confirmed in documents where guest speakers with K-12 expertise in specific areas are part of many class sessions. Further, K-12 representatives often provide input and feedback on candidates’ transformational change projects at several stages in the project’s development. According to documents and interviews, the transformational change project addresses a real, practical need in a K-12 school setting, so the district-employed supervisors and university supervisors often support candidates in selecting their project topic, working toward completion of the project, and providing feedback on the project. District-employed supervisors also have an opportunity to provide their input at five specific times during each year during the three triad meetings and the two mentor workshops.

Candidates and completers are given opportunities to provide input throughout the program, and they also complete an end-of-program survey – the data from this survey is available on the Commission’s data dashboard. Candidate feedback is taken from surveys conducted at the end of each course as well as live, in-class feedback sessions at the end of each term. Many of the existing program structures, especially the mentor workshops, provide specific opportunities for candidates to provide feedback. Candidates, completers, faculty, and university supervisors all shared that faculty are open to receiving feedback, including constructive feedback, about the program. Candidate interviews confirmed that faculty are open to feedback at any time during the program, with one candidate sharing, “They have created a culture where they always ask for feedback.” 2020-21 survey data shows that 100% of the 15 candidates, who took the survey, selected a response of “effective (4)” or “highly effective (5)” when responding to Question 2 about how effective the program was at helping them develop the tools and skills they need to be a school leader. Survey data from 2020-21 also showed 93.3% of the 15 candidates, who responded to Question 1, selected the highest value (3), indicating that they perceived that the program prepared them “very well” to become school leaders.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Candidates in the program complete the requirements for the Preliminary Administrative Services credential by participating in a one-year cohort program that tracks them through the developmental sequence of learning and structured field experiences designed to provide them with the skills and knowledge to perform the duties of a K-12 administrator while also building their leadership and interpersonal skills. Candidates complete four, six-unit classes over the course of one calendar year beginning in July of each year. Each class is built upon the foundation of the CAPEs, which also aligns to the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL) and California Administrator Content Expectations (CACE). Rather than having many separate courses that focus on a single topic or CAPE, the six CAPE domains are presented in an integrated way that builds as candidates progress through the four-course sequence. CalAPA work is embedded in the coursework as candidates are expected to complete Cycles 1 and 2 in the fall and Cycle 3 in the spring. As one candidate shared, “The classes and assignments flow and build on top of one another.”

The first course offered in the summer focuses on the theory and foundations of transformational educational leadership and administration. The role and expectations of the school administrator as a change agent are explored including promotion of democratic education, development of professional relationships, instructional leadership, and assessment of student learning for continuous improvement. The second course is held in the fall and has candidates learn and apply analytical processes across the six CAPE domains to identify current school conditions and needed changes – on-site administrative field experiences are incorporated. The third course is held in the spring and has candidates learn to design, analyze, prioritize, and support school change for the improvement of student learning across the six CAPEs – on-site administrative field experiences are incorporated. The fourth course is held in the second summer and prepares candidates to become effective school leaders by integrating knowledge, interpersonal, and technical skills. This course focuses on planning the processes and steps for the first 100 days of educational leadership to maximize long-term positive impact, especially on improved student learning. The interview data and documents show how the CAPE domains are woven throughout the four courses and provide candidates opportunities to be introduced, practice, and be assessed in all CAPE areas during all four courses which is an effective method for building candidates’ knowledge and a point of pride for the program.

The CAPEs address critical areas within each domain, including developing a shared vision, instructional leadership, restorative practices, MTSS, family and community engagement, and facilities management, and coursework is aligned to these critical topics in the CAPEs. During the interviews, faculty, university supervisors, candidates, and completers shared several examples of how critical topics and equity show up in the coursework. These interviews also emphasized that current K-12 practitioners serve as guest speakers and share their expertise on a specific topic during class time. Examples of topics mentioned in the interviews included trauma-informed practices, UDL, restorative practices, SEL, and MTSS. Faculty emphasized that K-12 practitioners are valued guest speakers/experts who come to class sessions to share their

knowledge and experiences related to the intersection of theory and practice in these critical areas.

The administrative services program aligns site-based field experiences, including the CalAPA, with learning experiences. In the words of the program faculty, “Everything we do is based on praxis.” Fieldwork takes place in both the fall and spring semesters. Candidates also complete the field-based CalAPA Cycles 1 and 2 in the fall and CalAPA Cycle 3 in the spring. Fieldwork is supported and guided by district-employed supervisors and overseen by a university supervisor. Candidates select their fieldwork site and district-employed supervisor so that they can complete fieldwork projects that align with their current work setting. During interviews, district-employed supervisors shared that they began working with their candidates in the summer months (July and August). Candidates are expected to meet with district-employed supervisors at least five times during the program, during EDAD 632 and EDAD 633, for support on completing all tasks and projects related to fieldwork. Interviews with candidates and district-employed supervisors showed that the frequency of these meetings varied by candidate and, in many cases, occurred much more frequently. During interviews with candidates, completers, district-employed supervisors, and university supervisors, participants frequently mentioned the significant role that program faculty play in supporting the fieldwork experience due to their availability and willingness to collaborate. University supervisors, completers, and candidates were especially vocal about praising the faculty for their support during fieldwork and coursework.

Candidates are assigned a university supervisor early in the program, typically in the summer months. Candidates and university supervisors are matched based on their roles, the candidate’s desired administrative position, and the supervisor’s expertise. The number varies by cohort, but approximately 6-9 candidates are assigned to each university supervisor each year, and these groups are known as cadres. During interviews, candidates and faculty shared that these cadres provide significant support for candidates during the program – candidates receive support from their peers in the cadre as well as from their university supervisor. Candidates meet with university supervisors at least once a month to discuss coursework and field experience in all courses, including the CalAPA. Candidates and completers reported that the university supervisors and program faculty are always available for additional support or more frequent meetings via email or text.

For fieldwork evaluation purposes, district-employed supervisors, university supervisors, and candidates meet in collaborative sessions (triads) to evaluate progress on coursework three times over the course of the year. These triad sessions serve as a significant way that district-employed supervisors, university supervisors, and candidates can connect and provide updates to one another about a candidate’s progress. The initial triad meeting is also an opportunity for the university supervisor to share fieldwork expectations with the candidate and with the district-employed supervisor.

Curriculum for each course builds learning activities, leadership development, and assessments that require a component of fieldwork and reflection. The embedding of fieldwork in all

assignments allows for the practical application of leadership theory at a K-12 educational setting. During interviews, candidates and completers shared their appreciation for the alignment of coursework and fieldwork. As one candidate shared, “As I’m navigating the fieldwork situations in real time, in class I’m learning the laws I’ll need to handle those scenarios in real time, and then I can talk to my cohort about it during class.” The interviews with faculty and university supervisors also highlighted that the fieldwork experiences embedded in the coursework provide candidates with opportunities to experience real-world K-12 leadership situations, practice their developing leadership skills, and be guided by supervisors/faculty through a process of self-reflection that deepens the learning. For example, candidates write entries in an ongoing reflective journal throughout the program where faculty can comment and provide insights, and candidates meet regularly for reflective conversations with their supervisors. As one candidate stated, “They [faculty] don’t give us answers. They sit with us and work with us and ask questions. They provide a mirror for us to look at ourselves. Because that’s the role we’re signing up for as administrators.”

Document review and interviews yielded many examples of specific assignments, most of them field-based, that supported candidates’ and completers’ application of theory to practical, real-world situations. Two projects – the transformational change project and the diversity project – emerged as particularly meaningful according to the emphasis that district-employed supervisors, university supervisors, faculty, candidates, and completers placed on these projects during interviews. The transformational change project came up in all focus group interviews, and participants emphasized over and over that this project provides candidates with an opportunity to use their coursework and fieldwork in the program to select an equity-related topic that is an area of real need for a K-12 school or district and work toward enacting lasting change in their organization. Several completers shared that the work they completed in their transformational change project is still being implemented in their organizations; these candidates were proud that their work had affected ongoing change. The diversity project is another significant, field-based assignment. Documents and interviews revealed that candidates are also required to complete a diversity project in which they visit two additional field sites to compare and contrast the diverse populations and cultures they experience. The candidates and completers consistently shared information related to the diversity project and explained the valuable leadership learning that resulted from visiting two sites that were different from their own work site. Completers shared many specific examples of how the diversity between sites (e.g., diverse grade spans, diverse socioeconomic levels, varied English learner populations, or specialized programs for students with disabilities) contributed to their learning.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed in each of the four courses throughout the program. Documents showed that assessments are all aligned to the CAPEs. Candidates are assessed through the completion of nine ePortfolio tasks connected to each of the six CAPE domains spread throughout the four courses. Several other assessments aligned to the CAPEs were mentioned in interviews and program documentation. The transformational change project is evaluated twice by faculty and university supervisors using two rubrics, one at the proposal stage and one

for the final product. The CalAPA is required for all candidates, with Cycles 1-2 completed in fall and Cycle 3 in the spring. Document review and interviews confirmed that candidates are also assessed by completing a Professional Growth Plan (PGP) where they share strengths and next steps aligned to the six CAPE domains; the PGP is submitted three times throughout the arc of the program. Candidates discuss their PGP with their district-employed supervisor and university supervisor during the triad meetings. Both supervisors assess candidate growth on their PGP by conducting a mid-year evaluation, using the mid-program review evaluation form from the handbook, and a final evaluation, using the field-experience exit evaluation form from the handbook. Candidates also complete a leadership disposition self-assessment as part of their PGP. At the end of the program, university supervisors also evaluate candidates using the supervisor check sheet from the handbook. The final assessments consist of the creation of a “first 100 days” project and final demonstration of growth presentation – this presentation is a chance for candidates to present their ePortfolios, and it is also assessed by university supervisors and faculty using a rubric. The final ePortfolio is submitted at the end of the program and is evaluated using the ePortfolio evaluation form contained in the program handbook.

Candidates are provided with information on when they will be assessed and given results during a program overview at the beginning of the cohort (during the summer) and during a course orientation at the beginning of each term. They are also provided with reminders throughout each term during class sessions and using the online learning management system. Candidates and completers shared during interviews that they appreciated the clarity of the online learning modules and course materials – including timelines and calendars – that showed them precisely what is expected of them during every step of the program. Candidates and completers also confirmed that program faculty provide timely feedback on assignments and that faculty are always accessible and quick to respond to questions. Candidates and completers also confirmed that faculty provide them with feedback, especially in areas where a candidate may have missed the mark on an assignment or where additional growth is needed. During interviews, several candidates shared that the faculty feedback on their ongoing reflective journals is especially helpful because it serves as a running communication log between candidates and faculty.

Interviews with candidates, completers, district-employed supervisors, and faculty all confirmed common themes of communication and relationships as a central part of candidates’ experience in the program and specifically about how candidates receive feedback on assessments throughout the program. Many current candidates emphasized their positive relationships with faculty and supervisors as contributing to their learning. One candidate noted that the faculty “respect me as a professional,” while another shared that the faculty “are actively working with us toward our growth.” Document review and interviews confirmed multiple opportunities for candidates to check in with faculty and supervisors so that there are many opportunities for candidates to review assessment results. Two examples came up multiple times during interviews: the Professional Growth Plan and the triad meetings, both of which required ongoing communication and meetings between candidates, district-employed supervisors, and university supervisors.

The CalAPA is another way that candidates are assessed. The program coordinator also serves as the CalAPA coordinator. All CalAPA data management is supported by the college assessment analyst. Candidate fieldwork sites also serve as the site for their CalAPA fieldwork. The CalAPA data from the Commission's data dashboard for 2021-22 (the most recent year for which data is available) shows a Cycle 1 pass rate of 95.5%, Cycle 2 pass rate of 91.3%, and a Cycle 3 pass rate of 100%.

Candidates are made aware of the CalAPA requirements, appropriate use of materials, the appeal policy, and the remediation policy through the program handbook. During candidate, completer, and faculty interviews, participants noted that the faculty provide an overview of the CalAPA in the first course during the summer. Interviews also confirmed that CalAPA coaches visit a couple of the first program class sessions in fall to introduce the CalAPA requirements and logistics to candidates, including the assessment guides and rubrics. These CalAPA coaches also provide ongoing workshops and 1:1 coaching related to the CalAPA throughout the fall and spring semesters of the program. The program faculty also provide background on the skills required for the CalAPA during class sessions and support candidates in coursework in tasks related to the CalAPA. During candidate interviews, one candidate stated, "Nothing is a surprise" when describing how the program informs them of CalAPA requirements. After this remark, many additional candidates shared similar sentiments, stating that the CalAPA was explained as early as program information sessions that occurred prior to their enrollment in the program.

During interviews, program faculty and university supervisors noted that there are several ways that they identify and support candidates who may need additional help with the CalAPA. First, many course assignments are scaffolded steps toward completion of the full cycle, so the faculty can see candidate progress as they submit these smaller benchmarks. Also, candidates complete an ongoing reflective journal where they can self-report any challenges they are having, including challenges with the CalAPA. Faculty read and comment on these journals, so if a candidate chooses to self-report, then the faculty are immediately made aware of the need for extra help. Furthermore, as part of their coursework, candidates are required to submit a screenshot of evidence that they submitted their CalAPA cycle – the deadline for Cycle 1 is halfway through the fall semester, and the deadline for Cycle 2 is the end of the fall semester – so if a candidate fails to submit that evidence, then the faculty become aware that the candidate has fallen behind. Faculty, university supervisors, candidates, and completers shared during interviews that any problem with the CalAPA is typically due to busyness or other personal factors; it is more common that a candidate will fall behind and fail to submit rather than not knowing how to complete the cycle or not passing the cycle. Candidates and faculty shared that the CalAPA coaches and their in-class workshops play a vital role in encouraging students to complete the CalAPA on time.

If a candidate does not pass a CalAPA cycle, the program coordinator reaches out to the candidate via email to set up an individual support session. The candidate also has the option of

meeting with one of the CalAPA coaches for a coaching session if they need additional support prior to resubmission of the cycle.

Interviews with candidates and completers confirmed that candidates feel very supported in their CalAPA work in the program by program faculty, supervisors, and the CalAPA coaches. Candidates and completers shared that they could schedule 1:1 appointments with CalAPA coaches or faculty if they needed additional support.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, program coordinator/CalAPA coordinator, employers, district-employed supervisors, and university supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Preliminary Administrative Services program with Intern pathway.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology, with Intern

Program Design

CSU Chico's Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology program is housed within the Department of Psychology in the College of Behavior and Social Sciences. As a credential granting program, it is associated with the College of Communication and Education which houses the SOE in addition to a number of the other Commission-approved educator preparation programs.

Although the school psychology program is located outside of the College of Communication and Education, it is an active participant in CSU Chico's Education Preparation Providers Unit. The unit includes initial and advanced credential programs that are housed in the College of Communication and Education and those educator preparation programs, like school psychology, that are housed in other colleges.

All approved programs in the unit share the common purpose of developing effective, reflective, and engaged educators. Participation in the unit helps the program to optimize the diverse expertise needed to provide the best possible training to its candidates and reflects the dual areas of school psychologists' expertise: psychology and education.

The school psychology program is certified by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and offers rigorous studies toward a master's degree in applied/school psychology inclusive of professional training toward the school psychology credential. It is a three year, full-time, 67-hour graduate program designed specifically to meet NASP accreditation standards. This program also meets the California requirements for credentialing as a school psychologist as defined by the Commission.

Leadership of the program consists of two program co-coordinators, the Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) committee, which is composed of program faculty and is a subcommittee of the Graduate Committee, and an advisory committee. The PPS committee is responsible for all aspects of the school psychology program. The committee is chaired by a coordinator, who is responsible for organizing the work of the committee. Following all California, university, college, and departmental policies and regulations regarding graduate education, the faculty members of this committee make all decisions regarding curriculum, fieldwork, and assessment of candidate progress. Additionally, the committee routinely and regularly discusses program direction and development, program needs, curriculum design, and candidate progress.

The school psychology program also maintains an advisory committee which consists of individuals representing the broader educational community being served by the program. This includes local administrators, school psychologists, and other educational professionals. The advisory committee allows constituents to provide input into the program impact, curriculum, and district needs. Interviews with full-time faculty, adjunct instructors, coordinators, and advisory committee members confirmed that this administrative model has proven beneficial to the program. It has supported collaborative ventures and communication to assist in the continued growth and refinement of the program to meet the education needs of the surrounding community.

The school psychology program admits one cohort of candidates each year. A limited number of candidates are admitted to the program each year due to the cost of program implementation and the difficulty of securing appropriate field placements for candidates – it was noted in interviews that the actual number of candidates admitted each year varies based on faculty, department resources, and other criteria existing at the time of the admissions period.

Communication between the program and candidates is facilitated through the university's email and the course management system, BlackBoard. Information regarding program requirements, professional placements (such as district field placements/internships), and credentialing occur via those channels. An open advisement system is utilized where full-time faculty serve as advisors and mentors for candidates as they progress through the program. Candidates reported that they are advised in group settings within practicum and supervision courses. Additionally, candidates shared that faculty were accessible to them through office hours or direct requests for appointments, when needed.

Within the program, the coordinators meet regularly with other program faculty (tenured, tenure-track, and adjunct) to discuss candidate progress, curricular concerns, and planning issues. Communication with other programs on campus takes place at regularly scheduled department and education unit meetings. Interviews with coordinators and a review of provided documentation confirmed that these meetings are instrumental in making decisions to meet the needs of candidates.

Within the school psychology program, candidates are initially admitted to the psychology department's master's program, which is 30 units. These units are included within the 67 units

required by the school psychology program. Once matriculated as a master's candidate, they progress through the master's program and only enter the credential program after having successfully completed the initial master's coursework in preparation for the school psychology program courses. Candidates receive the school psychology credential at the conclusion of the three-year program – one year in the master's program, two in the credential program.

The school psychology program is composed of a logical sequence of coursework and field experiences that are closely supervised by a combination of full-time faculty and adjunct instructors whose primary professional identification and training is in the field of school psychology. The first year of coursework provides an orientation to the profession of school psychology, as well as the foundations for professional practice. In the second year, coursework focuses attention on the development of professional competencies, as well as an integration of knowledge and skills necessary for professional practice. During this second year, candidates also complete a two day per week, 600-hour practicum in the schools.

The third year culminates with a supervised, full-time school-based internship (1,200 hours) that serves as a capstone activity. During the internship, all candidates must practice and integrate a comprehensive range of services under the supervision of credentialed faculty and field supervisors. The degree is awarded and the candidate is recommended for the full school psychology credential upon successful completion of all required courses – including the internship experience – and demonstration of advanced competency in professional skills. Upon graduation, candidates are also eligible to become Nationally Certified School Psychologists (NCSP).

Over the past two years, the school psychology program has made modifications to the curriculum and the overall program structure. Program coordinators noted that they analyzed data collected from completer surveys, feedback from NASP program reviewers, as well as data from employer surveys. This data identified that social justice as an area which required additional emphasis within the curriculum. As a result, a new introductory course was developed to address the foundations of diversity, equity, and social justice in the school setting. Additionally, the PPS committee infused diversity across all program courses – candidates are now required to demonstrate cultural competence in all standards.

A second curricular modification was the addition of a consultation class for first year candidates in order to support their knowledge and growth in the foundational concepts and skills necessary for effective consultation. This course ensures that pre-service candidates understand the increased role of school psychologists' participation in academic and behavioral intervention within the PK-12 setting.

Site supervisor feedback, alumni statements, and commentary from advisory members confirmed the value of the final curricular modification that was made by the program. This modification involved the revision of counseling courses. Although CSU Chico no longer offers a school counseling credential program, the two counseling course sequences remained the same. The courses were clinical in nature and focused primarily on adult clients at the exclusion

of child, school-based clients. The PPS committee replaced these two courses with a single course which teaches the fundamental principles of counseling in the school setting. This change supported an emphasis to include the planning, management, and evaluation of comprehensive counseling services to children within the PK-12 school environment.

External constituency groups such as school site administrators, directors, site supervisors, coordinators of student services, teachers, school psychologists, and alumni provide continuous feedback to the program in multiple ways. One way is through participation on the advisory committee. The advisory committee meets bi-annually and provides feedback, support, and commentary regarding the impact of candidate preparation and performance while also providing suggestions on school district needs. Interviews with these constituency groups confirmed their ability to provide the program with valuable feedback that could be applied at both the program level and within their respective regions. An example of this was an “intern boot camp” that was developed to orient interns to the school district. Initially this bootcamp was aimed at teacher education candidates but has also been extended to other education professionals. Commendable is the fact that the advisory committee is well representative of multiple constituencies and geographic regions in the surrounding area – the committee meets online, which has increased member participation.

School psychology candidates provide input on coursework, university supervision, and training support for each course, via Student Evaluations of Teaching. Practicum students and interns also provide feedback regarding their placement through an evaluation of internship supervisor and site survey. Feedback on candidate performance during fieldwork is gathered from field-based supervisors. These supervisors provide feedback through regular conversations with the university supervisor and through the evaluation of the school psychology practicum students and interns. During interviews, field-based supervisors confirmed that in addition to completion of surveys, open lines of communication with coordinators are present for informal feedback regarding programmatic suggestions as well as for support when issues with candidates or interns arise.

At the conclusion of the program, all program completers receive an anonymous exit survey, via email or BlackBoard, to provide the program with direct feedback regarding their experiences as candidates. Overall, advisory committee members, alumni, and candidates unanimously conveyed a belief in the program providing them with ample opportunities to give feedback regarding all aspects of the program.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The school psychology program offers a master’s degree in applied/school psychology plus a school psychology credential that is certified by NASP and approved by the Commission. It is a 67-unit program that encompasses 23 classes and requires a minimum of three years to complete.

The program operates on a cohort model and requires full-time attendance. Courses are only offered once per year. The emphasis is on instruction that forms a cohesive program rather

than a collection of individual courses. Consequently, the program's curriculum is sequenced so that candidates will matriculate effectively from one experience to another and receive intensive supervision and feedback in all applied work. All coursework is designed to meet all standards from the Commission and NASP.

First year candidates receive foundational knowledge about delivering school psychological services from a consultation framework to prevent and remediate learning and adjustment problems experienced by children and adolescents. Candidates continue into their second year of coursework by applying this consultation framework, which views problems from a systems/ecological perspective and uses a problem-solving approach, across their practica. Interviews with candidates confirmed the value of the courses they took in order to prepare them for their site-based experiences in schools. Candidates expressed confidence in their readiness to address issues and acknowledged that the theoretical coursework, coupled with site-based practica, supported their skills growth.

The second-year coursework also highlights the links from assessment to the development and progress monitoring of evidence-based interventions. In the third year, candidates continue to apply their coursework knowledge within their school placements as interns. Additionally, candidates practice and polish their range of skills as they work toward independent practice as school psychologists after graduation. Respect for human diversity and demonstration of culturally competent practice are woven into each practice domain area (e.g., consultation, intervention, counseling, assessment, program planning, and evaluation) throughout the three-year training.

Across the first two years of the school psychology program, academic courses are coordinated with field placements. Candidates are expected to use information from readings, lectures, and discussions of specific areas of knowledge to complete related projects and practice learned skills in their fieldwork settings. Document review and interviews with candidates substantiated the execution of projects within the site-based setting – this is demonstrated in the consultation course sequence offered within the program.

When candidates take the first consultation course, they read about and discuss theory and models of consultation. They also practice consultation skills through role-play. During the second year of practica experiences, candidates directly apply their consultation skills by working with school personnel to solve real-world academic and behavioral problems. Candidates' completion of foundational courses within the first two years supports their practice of consultation, counseling, intervention, and assessment skills under the supervision of university and site-based supervisors. The final year of the program encompasses a 1,200-hour fieldwork/internship where candidates apply the full spectrum of training they have received in preparation for independent practice after graduation. Candidates are evaluated on their competence in service delivery by university and site-based supervisors.

All candidates are introduced to diversity and social justice in the first semester in an introductory school psychology course as well as in a cultural considerations for service delivery

course where candidates develop knowledge, leadership skills, and attitudes necessary to act as social change agents when engaging with California's ethnically and linguistically diverse PK-12 population. The impetus for these changes was based upon completer input via surveys and discussions within the education unit. Discussions with coordinators and review of program documentation substantiated this information.

Additionally, program coordinators confirmed that related diversity, equity, and inclusion content is interwoven in the coursework throughout the three-year program. The coursework, in combination with fieldwork placements, expands candidate ability to apply theory, their lived experiences, and knowledge to engage with families they serve. Furthermore, it supports candidates in learning how to plan, organize, and implement culturally appropriate interventions and conduct psychoeducational assessments that are responsive to the needs of the ethnically and culturally diverse populations they will serve.

Candidates engage in two major field experiences in the school psychology program: the practicum and internship. In the second year, candidates participate in supervised school psychology practica over two semesters and must accrue a minimum of 600 hours. The practica affords candidates sufficient supervised experiences to allow early exposure to and identification with the practice of school psychology prior to the internship.

The internship experience is offered to students in the third year after they have successfully completed the second-year practicum. Interns function as practicing school psychologists in a K-12 school environment under the close supervision of credentialed and experienced school psychologists onsite and on campus. Interns complete 1,200 hours of supervised field experience and provide school psychology services in the areas of consultation, counseling, assessment, intervention development and evaluation, assessment, and program evaluation.

The program has a pre-approved list of placements that involve an average of 8 to 10 different school districts. Practicum and internship placements are made by the school psychology program coordinators in collaboration with school districts. The placements are completed in Northern California, typically within a 75-mile radius from the CSU Chico campus. During interviews, candidates expressed an appreciation for the fieldwork placement process. Program completers and current candidates stated that their needs were taken into consideration when the program placed them at their respective fieldwork sites. Candidates shared that the intention that went into placing them at different school sites was appreciated and supported their learning during the internship year. Additionally, a number of candidates noted that they are still in touch with their prior supervisor as a result of the "good match" they had with their site based supervisor.

Candidate field experiences are directly connected to professional skills, dispositions, and expectations that are first introduced and supported in coursework. The program coursework sequence provides a set of graduated assignments and related skill experiences to introduce and teach competencies that are required in the field. Candidates engage in field-based activities in all areas of professional training throughout their tenure in the program and

complete a total of approximately 600 hours of supervised field experience (practicum) within the second year of the program and 1,200 hours of supervised internship in the third year.

The various structured activities experienced during fieldwork and the internship are designed to provide opportunities to apply skills in assessment linked to intervention, consultation and collaboration with families and school personnel, prevention and intervention, and professional and ethical practice. Included across the assignments are various self-reflections on their practice.

The program coordinators and candidates ensure that district sites are well-informed to support coursework and program goals by providing site supervisors with handbooks that include program specific competencies which candidates must address from their coursework. Completers and candidates confirmed that the combination of theoretical knowledge and practical application in fieldwork settings supported their learning and helped to build confidence in their growing skills, especially during the internship year.

Interviews with fieldwork supervisors confirmed receipt of handbooks from program coordinators and validated that program candidates arrive at school sites ready to apply what they have learned in the program. During interviews, field-based supervisors noted that fieldwork supervision is further enhanced because many of the current site supervisors are program completers who have three or more years of experience in the field and wanted to “give back” to their alma mater.

Within the school psychology program, oversight of fieldwork is structured and organized by the program coordinators and fieldwork course instructors. Candidates are provided with orientation, course syllabi, advising handouts, and standardized forms to guide them through their fieldwork experiences. During interviews, candidates expressed a positive level of appreciation for the fieldwork placement process. Candidates and interns indicated that the process was smooth and that they felt they were matched well with the supervisor and sites they were assigned to by the program coordinators.

Supervision for candidates within both the practicum and internship is provided by both university and school-based site supervisors who are credentialed school psychologists. Practicum and internship candidates have a weekly seminar on campus throughout the year. In the spring semester, practicum candidates and interns meet together which provides an opportunity for peer-to-peer supervision.

As part of their seminar, candidates submit a weekly log and have individual conferences with their university supervisor three times across the semester. Also required is that school psychology practicum candidates and interns meet at least one and two hours per week, respectively, with their field-based site supervisors. University supervisors consult by telephone with field supervisors monthly. At the end of each semester, formal summative evaluations of candidates by their site supervisors are collected. Collectively, these documents are reviewed and discussed with candidates. In sum, candidates in the program receive highly guided

experiences under close supervision. Document review and interviews with candidates confirmed that candidates are closely mentored throughout the program.

During interviews, adjunct instructors and field-based supervisors noted that communication with the program coordinators is positive. They respectively discussed and confirmed that, when necessary, remediation plans could be developed with guidance from the university supervisor, field site supervisor, and/or the program coordinator to assist candidates who experience difficulty with dispositions, coursework, practicum, or fieldwork.

Candidates are required to demonstrate specific competencies in all classes as well as in their practica and internship experiences. Program candidates are evaluated on a continuous basis by four major groups: course instructors, designated school psychology program faculty, the PPS committee, and fieldwork supervisors. Course instructors evaluate student performance via standard procedures of coursework grading, consisting of the evaluation of designated performance measures in class.

Assessment of Candidates

Admission to the school psychology program is a two-step process, which ensures adequate screening of all candidates. Candidates initially enter the master's portion of the program first and then after the master's candidates have neared completion of the first year, they formally apply to the PPS committee to be admitted to the school psychology credential portion of the program. This allows the committee to evaluate each candidate's skills and readiness for applied fieldwork. Once admitted into the credential program, candidates are officially known as school psychology practicum students.

During their first year, candidates are assessed at the end of each semester while serving in field placements. This was confirmed through document review and interviews with current candidates. Candidates expressed knowledge about this process in readiness for the evaluation of their first year within the program.

Candidates in their second and third year in the program are required to compile and submit a portfolio of various projects, papers, case studies, and other assignments to the PPS committee. Once candidates are part of the school psychology program, their performance in general and progress on competencies is evaluated by the PPS committee following feedback from field supervisors and instructors. At the end of each semester, any concerns are conveyed to candidates and conditions may be imposed for their continuance in the program.

Designated program faculty also evaluate student performance during the school psychology practicum and internship in monthly, individualized face-to-face meetings with candidates following a telephone consultation with a field site supervisor. Strengths and weaknesses of student performance and targeted objectives for desired change are clarified and then discussed with the candidate. If candidates do not make adequate progress toward the satisfaction of these objectives, regular matriculation through the program is stopped or modified. At the end of the fall semester of the second year, the PPS committee discusses each

candidate's progress and informs the candidate in writing of any concerns. At the end of the internship experience, the evaluations are summative. The PPS committee aggregates all information from fieldwork supervisors, program faculty and course instructors, as well as grades, candidate portfolios, and uses the information to make final decisions about recommendations for the school psychology credential.

Candidates must earn a passing score on the Praxis II exam at or above the national score to demonstrate their competence in school psychology prior to completion of the program. Upon passing the Praxis II, the candidate is eligible to apply to become an NCSP. As a culminating activity to their program, candidates have the option of taking and passing a comprehensive exam (written and oral) or completing and defending a thesis. The comprehensive exam has both written and oral components. The written exam is administered twice each spring and is composed of five integrative essay questions. The thesis option allows candidates to explore a topic of interest to them – approved by a thesis chair – and conduct a research study of this area. Candidates will then collect data and present their findings in a written paper and will provide an oral defense. Additionally, candidates receive exit surveys to evaluate their experience in the program.

During interviews, candidates and completers reported understanding the assessment requirements and expectations. Both constituency groups indicated that both faculty and the program handbook prepared them at each level of the assessment process. Additionally, both groups reported that they felt confident in their understanding of program requirements for matriculation and completion of the program.

The program hosts an orientation meeting for all incoming students prior to the beginning of the first semester. During orientation, candidates receive pertinent program information related to course sequence, assessment information, and a fieldwork overview. Additionally, candidates receive a copy of the student program handbook, which introduces all candidates to program expectations and program evaluations. Discussions with first year candidates as well as interns confirmed consistent communication regarding assessments and evaluations via meetings and timely email notifications.

Currently within the program, faculty provide open advisement and support in monitoring and encouraging preparation for assessments. University and site supervisors provide summative evaluations at the end of each semester of the fieldwork placement, and these are shared with the candidate. During interviews, fieldwork supervisors confirmed receipt and completion of evaluations for candidates with opportunities to engage program coordinators if questions arose regarding their evaluation of interns they worked with.

Interviews with candidates and completers confirmed that there is a clear understanding of the assessment requirements and expectations within the program. Review of program documentation substantiated the presence of necessary program information. Candidates also shared that emails are sent out in advance to notify them of upcoming assessment requirements. Additionally, interns shared an appreciation for the increased level of

advisement received in the third year advanced supervision course. Overall, each group interviewed reported confidence in their understanding of program requirements for both matriculation and completion of the program.

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, interns, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology program.

Speech-Language Pathology

Program Design

The Communication Sciences and Disorders program (CMSD) at CSU Chico offers a Master of Science and a Bachelor of Science in Speech-Language Pathology (SLP). The master's degree leads to fulfillment of the academic requirements for certification as a speech-language pathologist by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA), state licensure, and preliminary certification from the Commission for a SLP credential for professional practice in California public schools. The program is housed within the Department of Communication Arts in Sciences with the Communication Studies program in the College of Communication and Education. The SLP credential program is an active participant in the Education Preparation Providers Unit. The unit provides initial and advanced credential programs across the university a way to interact and communicate with each other to assure alignment on important issues.

Program leadership consists of a program director, graduate coordinator, clinic director, and internship coordinator. The program director plays a central role in program management of both bachelor's and master's programs and candidates, with duties including:

- Overseeing curriculum and program development
- Enrollment management
- Recruiting and onboarding of new faculty
- Overseeing advising
- Managing graduate assistants
- Obtaining candidate feedback and managing candidate concerns
- Reviewing and approving verification of all licensing standards for every candidate
- Candidate recruitment and retention, including coordinating remediation and improvement plans
- Leading and managing all ongoing accreditation efforts for the Council of Academic Accreditation (CAA), ASHA, and Commission
- Organizing and leading all faculty meetings
- Representing the program at various professional meetings

The CMSD program is coupled with a non-accredited, professional Communication Studies (CMST) program, therefore, the CMSD program director is also responsible for creating and managing the department schedule and coordinating hiring of lecturer faculty. The graduate coordinator is responsible for advising and communicating with candidates to ensure that they meet the requirements of the office of graduate studies. The clinic director manages the on-site clinic, and the internship coordinator manages contracts and placement of candidates to school-based, medical, and private practice sites. Although there is a small faculty, they work together very closely and exemplify a collaborative team approach to supporting the program and their candidates. A theme that emerged from interviews with all constituent groups is the supportive and collaborative nature of the program leadership and faculty.

The master's program admits one cohort of approximately 26-28 candidates each year. One pathway is offered for the group. Candidates take the same course sequence over the two year period covering all content areas to meet standards. All candidates are placed in the on-site clinic for the first year and see three individuals who require SLP services, including a mix of adults and children. In the second year of the program, all candidates receive a school placement and either a private practice or medical placement. All candidates in the pathway meet the requirements for the preliminary SLP credential. At program completion, candidates have acquired at least 400 total clinical education hours, with at least 375 of those supervised, direct client contact hours in a minimum of three distinct settings. All candidates participate in at least one school placement.

Program leadership communicates regularly with faculty through faculty meetings and email communication. This was confirmed from interviews with faculty and department leadership. Candidates reported receiving information about the credential program through a handbook and regular email communication from program leadership as well as during cohort meetings throughout the semester. Candidates participate in group advising on an ad hoc basis throughout the program, as needed. The graduate coordinator is responsible for advising all graduate students, but candidates noted that they feel comfortable going to all faculty members with issues. Interviews with candidates confirmed that the graduate coordinator and faculty are easily accessible, and candidates are provided with clear, ongoing communication. The internship coordinator and the faculty internship supervisors communicate regularly via email with district-employed clinical supervisors who supervise current candidates. Employers and supervisors all reported that the communication was clear and effective.

Current candidates provide input related to the academic program via course evaluations at the end of each semester. Candidates provide input regarding their clinical experiences via an evaluation of their clinical supervisor at the end of the clinical experiences. Interviews with candidates indicate that program leadership and advisors are accessible if concerns arise. District-employed supervisors can provide feedback to the program through informal communication with the internship coordinator and faculty supervisors. The supervisors also complete evaluations at the end of each semester that provide information about candidate preparedness.

Over the past two years, the CMSD program has made improvements to the academic program and clinical program. For example, the faculty have made extensive revisions to the strategic plan, gradually increased the number of graduate students accepted each year (up to 26 for fall 2020), revised the graduate academic and clinic handbook, and adopted a new web-based data management system to efficiently record, organize, and store pertinent student and program data. Clinic-related changes have focused around improving opportunities for candidates to work with diverse disorders. To improve the candidate's learning experience, the program has standardized several supervisory processes, continued to require evidence-based practice activities associated with each candidate's client, and added several planned specialized clinic groups: Parkinson's Voice Project, Adult Neurogenic Group, and a Dynamic Assessment Specialty Clinic (DASC). Additionally, the program maintains valuable community connections with the Brain Injury Coalition.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Prerequisite knowledge is attained through two years of sequenced coursework at the undergraduate level. Graduate-level courses are also sequenced to provide a strong theoretical and practical framework and are taught with a clinical emphasis. Many courses have clinically focused assignments, involve clinical problem-solving skills, and some include community service and/or service-learning activities. Document review and interviews with candidates, faculty, district-employed supervisors, and employers indicate that content focuses on the following:

- Assessment
- Evidence-based practice
- Use of technology
- Goal development and collaboration on Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), 504 Plans, Individualized Family Service Plans, Individualized Transition Plans
- Transition planning
- Language and literacy development
- Understanding and ability to work with students from diverse backgrounds across all age groups

These topics are included across curriculum and applied in fieldwork experiences, providing candidates an opportunity to apply knowledge and skills to generalize them to a variety of settings. Review of the program curriculum shows that there are no specific courses in the critical area of English language learners. As indicated by the curriculum matrix, this is embedded across multiple courses within the curriculum. Program faculty, current candidates, as well as district-employed supervisors confirmed this structure and candidates were able to report specific courses where they learned this content. Evidence supporting course sequencing, connection of courses to fieldwork placements, and integration of fieldwork through the entire program was provided through program materials and was confirmed in interviews with candidates, completers, and district-employed supervisors.

The program has contracts with over 70 internship sites in local and extended areas that include private and public school sites, private practice, acute care, skilled nursing, and rehabilitation facilities. Interviews with completers and current candidates near completion confirmed that candidates receive a variety of experiences with diverse learners.

Assessment of Candidates

Faculty and candidates reported that a mandatory candidate orientation takes place during the first semester in the graduate program. Candidates receive information about how they are assessed and how they will be informed of their progress toward standards during this meeting. Candidates also receive a candidate handbook that documents all of the policies and procedures. Additionally, cohort meetings are conducted by the program director and/or graduate coordinator, which focus on portfolios, what to expect with performance reviews, comprehensive examinations processes and procedures, training on the data management system, and group advising.

Candidates are assessed both with formative and summative measures on knowledge and skills acquisition throughout the program. Methods used to measure candidate performance include performance evaluations of clinical placements, content area assessments within courses, portfolio review, a comprehensive examination, exit review, and the PRAXIS exam.

Interviews with candidates and district-employed supervisors confirmed that performance evaluations are completed for all clinical experiences each semester. Candidates obtain performance evaluations from the district-employed supervisors as they acquire skills across the nine disorder areas. A candidate is considered competent when they receive an average score of 2.5 (out of 4) on all areas of evaluation.

A review of syllabi shows assessments within each course associated with specific learning outcomes and Commission SLP standards. Portfolios provide additional evidence of formative and summative learning at the programmatic level. Candidates submit portfolios in March during their first graduate year and in November of the second year. A progress report is provided to the candidate to indicate their performance to date and suggestions for improvement. Comprehensive examinations are completed in the spring semester of the second year and comprise six hours of writing across two days with questions addressing the nine major SLP content areas. Additionally, candidates are required to pass the national PRAXIS exam before graduating. The exit review assesses each of the candidate's materials, test results, and academic and clinical performance across the two year program. Once the program director determines and documents full compliance to all program, CAA-ASHA, Commission, and licensing standards, the final paperwork is signed. At this point, candidates are given the opportunity to provide programmatic feedback on their academic and clinical experiences through an online exit survey.

Findings on Standards

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

Agriculture Specialist

Program Design

CSU Chico's Agriculture Specialist program is housed in the College of Agriculture and linked with the single subject program in agriculture, which is part of the Educational Preparation Providers Unit of the SOE. The Agriculture Specialist program receives regular feedback on course offerings and programmatic experiences from the Agricultural Education advisory committee, the College of Agriculture advisory committee (Superior Ag), and the SOE advisory committee. The program coordinator manages the agriculture specialist program and is one of four faculty members supporting the undergraduate program in agricultural science. As part of the agricultural science program, prospective candidates may complete options in agricultural education and agricultural communication and leadership, as well as credential-related coursework. The program coordinator receives three weighted teaching units per year to fulfill a number of responsibilities, including teaching coursework, managing all program coordination tasks (i.e., site selection, candidate placement, and candidate evaluation), and the hiring and training of candidate supervisors for the field experience and clinical practice pieces (practicum one during fall semester, practicum two during spring semester) for the single subject in agriculture and Agriculture Specialist credentials. Additionally, the program coordinator acts as a liaison among the constituents – program candidates, College of Agriculture administration and faculty, SOE and education unit, credential office, graduate admissions, candidate supervisors, clinical practice sites, and the California Department of Education Agricultural Education Unit (CDE-AEU). The program coordinator attends all single subject program meetings. The coordinator then disseminates information from SOE to the Agriculture Specialist faculty, supervisors, and candidates and often shares information supervisors glean from placement sites with the SOE and faculty since many of the faculty do not maintain supervisory responsibilities. This is of great importance, as the coordinator often leads the faculty in addressing issues observed during the clinical practice. Finally, candidate completion of clinical practice hours and expectations is verified by memo and provided to the credential analyst.

The program coordinator connects with Agriculture Specialist program coordinators from the four other Commission-approved programs through monthly Zoom meetings, as well as at quarterly meetings held in combination with representatives of the CDE-AEU. The program coordinator is an active member of the California Agricultural Teachers Association (CATA) and the CDE-AEU state staff group. The coordinator, along with the other Agriculture Specialist program coordinators, the CDE-AEU program director, and the state supervisors from all six state agriculture education regions, meet multiple times a year. All members of this state team collaborate to approve candidate placement sites, local, regional, and state projects, and grants. The program coordinator presents updates about the CSU Chico agriculture education

credential program – which includes both the single subject in agriculture and Agriculture Specialist credentials – and solicits feedback for improvement three times each year at CATA meetings. Additionally, the coordinator attends an annual weeklong CATA summer conference to collaborate with CDE-AEU staff, current and new secondary teachers, deans from other universities, and community college leaders across the state that house agriculturally based programs. Furthermore, annual participation in facilitating leadership workshops at the California State Future Farmers of America (FFA) Leadership Conference, while not a requirement of the program, is a highlight for current and future credential candidates. The event helps them to engage with FFA on a bigger stage and refine their instructional planning and presentation skills. It also helps candidates gain experience in working with diverse student populations.

Candidates seeking the Agriculture Specialist credential are expected to complete nine units of specialization in one of four technical agriculture areas during their undergraduate degree program – animal science, plant science, agricultural engineering technology, or agricultural business. Candidates are also required to complete a minimum of 2,000 hours of either paid or voluntary experience – the entirety of which must be completed after graduation from high school – or a minimum of 3,000 hours of either paid or voluntary experience of which a maximum of 1,500 hours may be accrued prior to graduation from high school. Over the 57 units of coursework required for the single subject in agriculture and Agriculture Specialist credentials combined, candidates log over 645 hours associated with classroom observation and fieldwork, with the early field experience requiring 45 hours. During the first clinical practicum, candidates complete approximately 300 hours by reporting to their assigned school sites daily for one semester, with Fridays off for completion of other course assignments. During the second practicum, candidates report to their school sites daily and are expected to complete approximately 300 hours of clinical practice fieldwork. These hours not only address candidates’ time in the classroom but also account for their responsibilities working with secondary learners after school and on weekends. This work is associated with the FFA and supervised agricultural experience (SAE) portions of the program, which could include field days, school farm work days, fair preparation and facilitation, conferences, and career development event and/or leadership development event preparation. Upon successful completion of the program, Agricultural education candidates receive two credentials: a Preliminary Single Subject Agriculture credential and the Agriculture Specialist credential via concurrent coursework offered by the SOE and the College of Agriculture.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Candidate advising begins as soon as candidates express a desire to teach agriculture. While candidates can complete the Agriculture Specialist courses during the credential program, candidates are encouraged to begin completing Agriculture Specialist coursework during their undergraduate programs, including early field experience. The course sequence establishes a foundation and readies candidates for engaging at a high level prior to entering the clinical experience. Candidates enroll in the remaining SOE coursework during clinical practice. During interviews, current candidates and program completers all stated the coursework prepared them well for entering the clinical practice phase of the program.

Candidate placement occurs by first applying to the program and completing an interview with the SOE. Candidates must also complete an interview with the program coordinator to discuss current expertise relative to agriculture, personal needs relative to free or reduced housing as candidates are often placed great distances from the university, and professional goals for development. The interview is also used as a check to ensure candidates have completed all program prerequisites. The program coordinator works collaboratively with the CDE-AEU regional representative to identify acceptable programs which effectively fulfill Agriculture Specialist standards specifically related to the FFA, supervised agricultural experience, and instruction in the Career and Technical Education (CTE) setting. The SOE also works with the program coordinator to secure memorandums of understanding (MOUs) with the district offices for placement sites, and the coordinator then presents candidates with their placement offers – no candidates are placed without a signed MOU.

During first and second clinical practice practicums, candidates report to their assigned sites to experience a full program (i.e., classroom, laboratory, FFA, and supervised agricultural experience) under the direction of a designated cooperating teacher. Candidates are placed at different sites for each phase and are visited using both virtual and in-person modalities by the nine clinical supervisors, no fewer than six times during the placement. These visits are spaced equidistantly across the semester and are guided by the CORE observation record. At these visits, candidates and the supervisor discuss progress, next steps, and address any additional needs for support. Additionally, the cooperating teacher at the school site provides daily/weekly feedback through one-on-one conversations with the candidate, as well as regular feedback to the university through the CORE competency/disposition evaluations, and teaching self-evaluation. The program coordinator offers regular communication via email and Zoom to guide the supervisors and cooperating teachers through the advising and evaluation process. Regular check-ins with candidates also ensure candidates are progressing through their assignments. At the final supervision meeting, supervisors work with candidates to complete their induction Individual Development Plans (IDPs).

Given the large size of the Agriculture Specialist program at CSU Chico, the program utilizes nine experts outside of the university as supervisors, with two of the faculty supervising in a limited capacity as they have other on-campus responsibilities. Supervisors are identified by the program coordinator, in consultation with the CDE-AEU and teacher educators from the four other Commission-approved Agriculture Specialist programs. Supervisors must be experienced agricultural education professionals. Some are retired university agriculture education faculty, some are retired agriculture teachers, and some provide support to California agricultural education in some other capacity. All supervisors have a record of exemplary teaching in agricultural education. Candidates conveyed great satisfaction with their supervisors, citing the depth and breadth of their supervisor's teaching experience as being critical to their credibility and to the advancement of candidate development. The program coordinator does not serve as a university field supervisor; however, the faculty unanimously expressed a need to the person in this role to supervise in the future as it allows them to witness firsthand their candidates'

strengths and needs, which in turn allows them to make better decisions about program revisions and refinement.

The program coordinator oversees the agricultural education credential program which includes both the single subject in agriculture and Agriculture Specialist credentials and is therefore aware of all expectations for the full spectrum of teacher preparation. Additionally, the program coordinator monitors candidate progress through evaluations and communication with candidates and supervisors. Should the need for reassignment of candidate supervision or placement site arise, the program coordinator would work with the CDE-AEU and the SOE to support the student and program in doing whatever is necessary.

The selection of cooperating teachers involves coordination among the SOE, the program coordinator, and the CDE-AEU regional supervisor for the Superior region. The cooperating teacher must be fully credentialed (both single subject in agriculture and Agriculture Specialist) and represent programs that can provide the ideal environment to immerse candidates in CTE instructional learning, Future Farmers of America, and supervised agricultural experience. A representative from each cooperating district must sign a MOU which outlines the general terms and provisions. Cooperating teachers supervising for the Agriculture Specialist program complete a 10-hour, online co-teaching training offered by the SOE and have access to a variety of other online resources. They also attend a two-day cooperating teacher conference sponsored by the CDE-AEU. Cooperating teachers also meet with the program coordinator at the agricultural education cooperating teacher conference to discuss individual needs as well.

The Agriculture Specialist program uses a series of surveys to solicit candidate feedback including: course evaluation surveys, clinical practice evaluation surveys, Commission master teacher survey, a Commission exit survey, and a one-year out survey. The program coordinator reviews the survey results and considers the feedback when providing needed support for current candidates, as well as when planning program revisions and offerings for future candidates. The candidates, cooperating teachers, site administrators, and supervisors all indicated a high level of satisfaction with the program. Current candidates also shared they often discuss program feedback with the program coordinator, more often than what a survey affords them, given the close working relationship they have developed over time with their program and the fact that the program coordinator does not supervise and can be objective. Furthermore, candidates across the program mentioned that they connect with those candidates a step ahead of them and behind them in order to share information and guide candidates toward successful planning and outcomes. A common comment among candidates in every interview session involved their programmatic mantra to get to know their peers and take care of them since they comprise their professional network.

Assessment of Candidates

Monitoring and support of candidates begins while they are still completing courses in their undergraduate program. Candidates complete a series of reflection assignments related to coursework and early field experience which provides benchmark feedback to the program coordinator and university supervisors. As outlined in the program's planning guide and the

handbook, candidates receive an overview of evaluation and assessment activities. Candidates also participate in SOE coursework during the practicum phases of clinical practice which helps to impart awareness. Current candidates shared that additional workshops and supports regarding CalTPA are also offered to respond to candidate questions.

During clinical practice, there are several measures to monitor and support candidate performance. Throughout their clinical practice, candidates meet with their supervisors during visits to discuss teaching experiences and hours logged, as well as the Future Farmers of America, supervised agricultural experience, and other CTE-related activities they have completed. At the end of the semester, candidates submit a self-evaluation that addresses their development according to the CORE competencies, SOE dispositions, and TPEs.

Also during clinical practice, Agriculture Specialist candidates have a number of opportunities to prepare for the performance assessment tasks/activities. They are enrolled in SOE coursework that will address the different components of the TPA. There, the candidates engage in discussions with their peers and instructors surrounding CalTPA tasks/activities. Candidates were also complimentary of their agriculture education faculty who provide ongoing support regarding their completion of CalTPA, including setting benchmark dates for completing pieces of the assessment in a timely manner.

Candidates are expected to engage in the co-teaching model with their cooperating teachers. Through co-teaching, candidates receive close monitoring by their cooperating teachers. Candidates are also visited by their supervisor no less than six times during their clinical practice placement. Each visit requires completion of the CORE observation record and the clinical practice task checklist. Reports are reviewed by the program coordinator. During visits, the supervisor observes the lesson, sits with the candidate to reflect on the experience, then files their report. Given the high level of direct contact and the frequency of clinical practice visitations, the program coordinator is often the first to identify issues and work directly with the candidate, supervisor, and, when necessary, the cooperating teacher. In the event an issue arises while at the cooperating site, the cooperating teacher will often connect with the supervisor and program coordinator to share the need and co-develop a plan of support. Should needs continue, and depending on the level of concern, compliance and dismissal policies are outlined in the single subject program handbook.

The Agriculture Specialist program has cooperating teachers complete midterm and final evaluations which assess candidate progress of the TPEs. Candidates sit with their cooperating teachers and discuss their performance relative to the TPEs several times during clinical practice, informally at the start and more formally at the mid-point and end. During their interview, cooperating teachers shared that they go over the midterm and final evaluations – featuring the TPEs – with their candidates at the beginning of clinical practice to ensure they understand how they will be evaluated as well as during the evaluations at the mid and final phases to be sure candidates understand how the assessments are conducted. One supervisor added the conversations they have with their candidates are often richer since they share common language and understanding of each TPE. Finally, candidates work with the program

coordinator to develop an Individual Development Plan (IDP) during the final visit, which is shared with their induction programs upon accepting a teaching position.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Agriculture Specialist program.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

CSU Chico has a long history of preparing educators. CSU Chico was established in 1887 as the State Normal School at Chico. The College of Communication and Education, together with the College of Behavioral and Social Science and the College of Agriculture, continue to serve the educational needs of the North State region of California. All of the colleges and departments that have a credential program are brought together as the Education Preparation Providers Unit. Administrators, faculty, and staff collaborate on a regular basis to ensure that the programs continue to prepare candidates who are equity-minded and committed to working in diverse rural communities.

The College of Communication and Education has a dedicated office to support external funding. The Office of Outreach, Research, and Grants has assisted faculty and staff to secure close to \$30,000,000 in external grants. Some of the innovative programs funded by grants include Biliteracy as a Resource: Investing in Literacy Across Languages for All (BRILLA), a program designed to increase the number of qualified bilingual teachers. The Computational Literacy Across Secondary Settings (CLASS) program is a \$6,900,000 residency program that engages candidates in a co-teaching model at one of five local, high-need, rural partner districts. The Northern California Education Leadership Consortium (NorCAL ELC) is a \$3,500,000 project that provides high-quality professional learning opportunities for teacher leaders and administrators in the 11 northernmost counties of California.

Members of the education unit are considered experts by colleagues across the university and communities in the North State. They have been called upon to lead events on anti-racism, teaching with technology, and universal design for learning. All members of the education unit also contribute to community service. The Clinic for Communication Disorders provides free speech and hearing-related services to the community. The adapted physical education program sponsors a sports day for students with special needs in the community. Furthermore, CSU Chico has an autism clinic which allows candidates to engage in activities in the pedagogy lab which is equipped with two-way mirrors for candidate learning. The Agriculture Specialist program organized its annual Future Farmers of America Field Day which attracted more than 1,000 PK-12 students from the region.

Over the last three years, the CSU Chico community has experienced multiple natural disasters including devastating fires and a global pandemic. Through all of these events, the CSU Chico

community has remained committed to preparing the best educators to serve the rural areas of California.

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 constituencies in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	Consistently
The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation.	Consistently
The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development/instruction, field-based supervision and clinical experiences.	Consistently
The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.	Consistently
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	Consistently
The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. Qualifications of faculty and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service.	Consistently

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 Education Preparation Providers Unit of CSU Chico is responsible for all Commission-approved credential programs. Most of the credential programs are housed in the College of Communication and Education; however, there are also programs housed in the College of Behavior and Social Science (school psychology) and College of Agriculture (agriculture specialist). The education unit is a structure that allows all the programs to work collaboratively and share a common purpose and vision for education preparation. Interviews with administrators and staff confirmed that the Dean of the College of Communication and Education serves as the unit head, and she meets regularly with the other deans to ensure credential programs are consistently meeting standards.

While each college may have their own vision statement, the education unit is guided by the vision of CSU Chico to become the preeminent university to solve the challenges of the twenty-first century. The education unit aims to prepare educators who are lifelong learners and change agents. The unit is further committed to educating the whole person, enabling access of equity, building community through collaboration, and crafting meaningful, responsible, and responsive narratives. Candidates who were interviewed stated their coursework prepares them to promote equity and culturally responsive pedagogy. Administrators confirmed their commitment to ensuring that CSU Chico remains responsive to serving rural communities. University supervisors address social justice, anti-racism, and valuing the funds of knowledge of their students through conversations and lesson plans with teacher candidates.

Faculty, staff, and various constituencies participate in important decisions of the credential programs. There are various campus wide committees that ensure that various stakeholders are involved in the credential programs. The All University Responsibility for Teacher Education Committee (AURTEC) provides program and policy oversight of the teacher credentialing programs at CSU Chico. Through AURTEC, the preparation of teachers becomes an all-university responsibility. AURTEC is composed of administrators and staff of CSU Chico (including the Vice Provost for Academic Programs) and representatives from K-12 schools. AURTEC supported the development of the Computer Science Supplementary Authorization, and it also played a key role in the development of the Integrated Teacher Education Program (ITEP). The ITEP is a four-year program which allows a candidate to study for a bachelor’s degree in liberal studies and be recommended for a teaching credential. During interviews, AURTEC members stated that they

play a role in any curriculum changes in the credential programs. Collaboration is also done through the education unit meetings. Program personnel from all three colleges meet to discuss shared interests including the allocation of resources. For example, faculty from other colleges serve as subject matter coordinators and play a key role in evaluating courses for candidates to meet the subject matter competence requirements.

Personnel from CSU Chico also collaborate with PK-12 personnel through meetings including cooperating teacher workshops and events where candidates meet prospective employers. Partners from induction programs stated that they speak to candidates before they complete their respective programs. As a result of this collaboration, CSU Chico candidates come to the induction programs with a positive view of the induction program and they have completed IDPs.

Resources are allocated to the needs of the credential programs. Interviews with various constituencies confirmed the process for allocating resources to the programs. Administrators stated one source of funding for the credential programs comes from the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. These funds (also referred to as “general funds”) are based on enrollment in the programs. Each dean then works with the department chairs and SOE director to allocate funding to the programs. In addition to the general funds, the College of Communication and Education has access to endowments such as the Whaelan Endowment. Funds from endowments are used for operations and student scholarships. The education unit recently hired a grants director to support the programs with securing external funding. In the last three years, the education unit secured about \$29,000,000 in external funding for program development and to provide candidates with financial support. As programs are developed through grants, administrators who were interviewed stated intentional efforts are taken to create a sustainability plan that will maintain the program should grant funding cease to exist. Administrators stated that program coordinators are compensated through course remissions or credit towards the three credits of service.

Faculty are recruited who support diversity and equity initiatives of CSU Chico. Procedures are clearly outlined in a hiring manual for tenure track positions. Administrators confirmed that faculty are hired for their content expertise, experience, and knowledge of PK-12 context, content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems. Faculty and other instructional personnel are evaluated using various methods. Candidates confirmed that they complete teaching evaluations at the end of each course.

Documents for the credential recommendation process are stored in a management system called Perceptive Content. The system is used for archiving documents. The credential office has a staff of four, and candidates interact with one of these staff members from the time they express an interest in the credential programs. These staff members also work with faculty in the credential programs that are housed outside of the College of Communications and Education. Credential office staff stated they conduct coursework and degree evaluations for basic skills and subject matter. Furthermore, interviews showed these staff members share a web-based checklist of all credential requirements and coursework. In some cases, a credential

staff is asked to speak to a class of completers, as in the case of the school psychology credential program housed in the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences. Most follow-up information is shared through email. Candidates confirmed that they receive email communications from the credential office, and information is also available on the CSU Chico website.

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
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 faculty, staff, and candidates highlighted a multistep admission process that often begins with the prospective candidate exploring a credential specific website. All credential programs use an approved website shell to share program features, videos related to program distinctives, scholarship/grant opportunities, and admission requirements. A link to an FAQ page provides clarifying information with additional embedded links that direct the prospective candidate to appropriate personnel, forms, and support videos. Programs also provide a checklist to help applicants independently track the process.

Program admission is a three-step process. Prior to formal credential program approval, admittance to CSU Chico’s graduate school must occur. Relevant program requirements (such as basic skills, a Certificate of Clearance, minimum GPA, letters of recommendation, disposition forms, and potential variances for prerequisites) ensure multiple measures are being used to verify candidate qualifications. The relevant information is submitted to the credentials office. Data is recorded and approval forms for viable variances are completed and processed. Once all information is verified, an email is sent to the candidate and program coordinator. Program

coordinators now complete any program specific admission requirements and contact the candidate with an outcome decision. During interviews, candidates noted that the website, links, and videos allow one to independently complete the process. Candidates needing personalized support also expressed appreciation for the positive and prompt responses of CSU Chico personnel.

Once admitted, CSU Chico provides multiple venues to support, advise, and promote successful retention. The College Advisor and Retention Specialist (CARS) is responsible for candidate academic advising needs. Interviews with CARS personnel highlighted that the program began in 2016 with the vision of improving advising equity. CARS currently uses e-advising tools, advising best practices, and acts as a single point of contact and support for advising-related policies and procedures. Additionally, CARS generates reports for advisors, chairs, and/or deans to guide retention and student success efforts.

Credential-specific advising focuses on tracking the candidate's ability to meet performance and competency expectations and is provided by program coordinators, faculty, and the credentials office. Informative program-specific websites include links/videos, web-based interactive e-advising tools, and program handbooks. Interviews with candidates consistently included words of appreciation for the accuracy of information and the support provided throughout the program. Finally, the College of Communication and Education Success Team monitors the process and provides additional support and/or training as needed.

As a designated Hispanic Serving Institution, CSU Chico has implemented several strategies to diversify California's educator pool. Beyond traditional practices such as preview days and college-career fairs, interviews with faculty and staff highlighted four targeted strategies. The first is the development and implementation of formal programs such as Adelente that prepares CSU Chico's Latinx and low-income undergraduate students for postbaccalaureate opportunities. The second is video testimonies posted on the various credential-specific websites that share success stories from graduates from diverse backgrounds. The third is the program faculty's commitment to increase preparation program exposure across the CSU Chico campus by teaching undergraduate courses and guest speaking in relevant non-school of education courses. The final is the SOE's commitment to secure grants and scholarship funds. Interviews with the grants office coordinator and faculty grant researchers highlighted intentional efforts to identify and apply for grants that advance the unit's mission and vision. Recent grant awards include CSU Chico's Center for Bilingual/Multicultural Studies' \$2,952,133 five-year grant to expanding English learners' opportunities and the Computational Literacy Across Secondary Settings (CLASS) program's \$6,150,839 five-year grant to create residency programs for credential candidates seeking a single subject math, science, or special education credential.

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.	Consistently
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	Consistently
For each <i>program</i> the <i>unit</i> offers, candidates have significant experience in <i>California public schools</i> with diverse <i>student</i> populations and the opportunity to work with the range of <i>students</i> identified in the <i>program</i> standards.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 3: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Document review and interviews confirmed that all credential programs use Commission program standards to create a developmental sequence of supervised field experiences. Central to each program’s clinical practice experience is a praxis–based pedagogical vision that promotes achievement of program-specific learning expectations, provides opportunities to implement research-based learning strategies, encourages continuous professional growth, and

fosters advocacy for students, families, schools, communities, as well as the education professions.

All programs have created rubrics and checklists that measure candidate dispositions and performance. The data gathered from the evaluation tools is used to verify that each candidate recommended for a credential meets Commission program-specific outcomes.

Interviews with program coordinators, faculty, and field-placement personnel highlighted a systematic process that ensures candidates experience “diverse school setting(s)” that reflect California’s public schools. The field placement coordinator is tasked with verifying and documenting site demographics using tools such as EdData.

Signed MOUs ensure that districts are involved in site and district-employed supervisor selections. The MOU process is managed centrally by CSU Chico’s Risk Management Office. District-employed supervisor qualifications noted in the MOUs are also stated in the various clinical practice handbooks, posted on the SOE website, and shared broadly with participating partners. The field placement coordinator evaluates all district-employed supervisor qualifications to ensure that Commission requirements, such as appropriate credentials and years of experience, are met. Only district-employed supervisors whose qualifications are verified are selected to serve. Multiple comments during candidate interviews highlighted respect and admiration for the district-employed supervisors’ mentoring effectiveness and knowledge.

Once an appropriate district-employed supervisor is identified, the field placement coordinator is tasked with assigning candidates to a district-employed supervisor. Diverse protocols across the various partner districts – as well as diverse program size and practices (programs such as Speech-Language Pathology self-place candidates) – increases placement complexity. Interviews with program faculty, university supervisors, the field placement coordinator’s staff, and candidates revealed that personnel issues during the 2022-23 academic year also compounded the process. The result was an inconsistent implementation of fieldwork and clinical practice protocols, especially for candidates in the non-grant funded preliminary credential programs and the adapted physical education program.

University supervisors are employed by CSU Chico as part-time lecturers. Published university supervisor job descriptions include the responsibility to observe, debrief, evaluate, and coach candidates as they learn to transfer theory into practice. The university supervisor is also responsible for nurturing the relationship between candidates and district-employed supervisors. The CSU Chico faculty handbook confirmed that university supervisor decisions related to hiring, training, evaluating, and retaining are guided by established university policies.

An orientation meeting, handbooks, supervisor toolbox website, and monthly meetings orient and maintain currency for the university supervisor related to their roles and responsibilities. Interviews with university supervisor personnel included repeated comments of appreciation

for the supervision toolbox website that includes links to items such as transition pacing guides, coaching explanations, forms, and training videos. The district-employed supervisor is typically oriented to their role through a variety of methods including a university supervisor/district-employed supervisor orientation meeting, online training modules, and SOE training events. Recent training events included the following topics:

- Disposition Rubrics
- Literacy, Language, and Culture
- Empower At-Risk Youth Strategies

Interviews with district-employed supervisors confirmed that the orientation and training programs are occurring.

Clinical practice data is collected, analyzed, and interpreted by program faculty and supervisors during the annual assessment summit. During the summit event, program faculty are provided time to synthesize program data with relative program goals and program improvement initiatives. Data sources include the CalTPA/APA, completer survey, Year 1 teacher survey, employer survey, and other program-specific data such as the classroom environment survey that offers insight into candidate perception of their field placements and supervisors.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.	Consistently
The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.	Consistently
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.	Consistently
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 constituencies such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 4: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Documents review and interviews with staff, faculty, partners, candidates, and other constituencies indicate that the education unit has a comprehensive assessment plan in place

to address continuous improvement. The unit has a graphic depiction of their assessment system and includes an annotated list of assessment roles and responsibilities for the unit. The annotated list of data identifies the type of data collected, data sources, purpose, and shows how data is used at the program level for continuous improvement. The unit's data and reporting calendar identifies the cycle of data collection, analysis, and discussions with the unit and programs.

The continuous improvement system guides assessment for all educator preparation programs, and the system serves three purposes:

1. To collect and analyze data on applicant qualifications
2. To assess a candidate's development of proficiencies based on the unit's conceptual framework and professional and state program standards
3. To provide data on candidates, resources, and operations to improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs

Following analysis of identified candidate proficiencies, the unit shares outcomes and sets goals annually as a part of their regular and ongoing education unit meetings, as well as within their individual programs. The unit primarily employs the continuous improvement system to assess proficiencies in the programs. This year the unit has selected two measures of effective practice as their data-driven focus:

1. **Subject Matter Knowledge:** To evaluate the extent to which candidates demonstrate solid knowledge of and currency in their subject matter/academic discipline and a commitment to continue to expand their depth and range of understandings
2. **Diversity:** To determine a candidate's knowledge about and responsiveness to the needs of all learners, including linguistically and culturally diverse learners and special populations

Data from a variety of sources will be used to analyze the identified candidate proficiencies in these focus areas. One example of this is the culture competency survey, which will be administered to all teacher candidates – it is a self-assessment tool designed to help candidates explore their cultural competence.

The assessment analyst supports the SOE and the education unit and oversees data collection processes, contributes to data analysis discussions, and supplies TPA and other assessment data for analysis, use, and reporting. The assessment coordinator is responsible for reviewing the data and overseeing the process of presenting the data and facilitating discussions during different meetings including the annual assessment summit. Data is shared with faculty, staff and stakeholders including the assessment committee for discussion. Elected members of the assessment committee include two faculty elected at-large. Position-based members include the assessment coordinator, an assessment staff member, and four faculty representatives representing the following credential areas: multiple subject, single subject, education specialist, and bilingual.

The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice and feedback from key constituencies such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation. Interviews with external constituents (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 CLASS residency program. The CLASS program is an accelerated and supportive master’s degree pathway for earning a single subject credential in English, mathematics, science, or an education specialist credential that partners with schools in high-need and diverse rural districts in one of the following locations: Gridley, Live Oak, Oroville, Red Bluff, or Willows.

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.

Based on data from multiple measures, the education 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. According to the Commission’s employer survey and in terms of overall effectiveness to teach, a majority of employers found program completers to be well or very well prepared after their first year of teaching. This was also evident during interviews with site administrators who praised candidates and program completers from CSU Chico, stating they preferred hiring interns and program completers from CSU Chico because they are better prepared to meet the challenges of community schools. Additionally, district partners expressed similar sentiments when speaking of services and specialist candidates they hired after being prepared by CSU Chico.

The unit manages multiple grant-funded projects and other ongoing efforts that support district partner’s professional development interests and needs throughout the region including the CLASS program. This program is an accelerated and supportive master’s degree residency pathway for earning a single subject credential in English, mathematics, science, or an education specialist credential. The program prepares highly qualified candidates to teach in

high-need schools in the region and beyond. Additionally, the Training in Interdisciplinary Education and Research (TIER) grant is a federally funded scholarship program focused on training preservice professionals in interdisciplinary collaboration to work with children with significant disabilities.

Some highlights of the impact that CSU Chico's education unit and its programs are having are listed below:

- The administrative services program created the Northern California Educational Leadership Consortium (NorCal ELC) that offers high-quality professional learning and support for school and teacher leaders in the eleven northernmost counties of California. The program and NorCal ELC sponsor a series of webinars about increasing equity in education and social and emotional learning for school leaders in the region.
- The Community and Instruction for Expanding English Learners' Opportunities (CIELO) project improves instructional practice and educational outcomes for English learners within dual language immersion programs. The education unit partners with the Orland Unified School District in order to increase the pool of bilingual educators.
- The Triad Project engages three-person teams or "triads" (i.e., a university-based science education faculty, a teacher candidate, and a mentor teacher from Chico Unified School District) in the creation of an instructional unit that is aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS).