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I. INTRODUCTION

1. Provide a brief overview of the institution and the unit.

California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) is one of 23 campuses in the California State University System (CSU). Serving inland Southern California, the public comprehensive institution was chartered in 1960 by the California Legislature and opened to students in 1965. Currently, CSUSB offers more than 70 traditional degree programs and a variety of education credential and certificate programs to over 17,000 students, and employs more than 2,000 faculty and staff (College Portrait, 2008-2009). With the mission of enhancing the intellectual, cultural and personal development of its students, CSUSB has worked collaboratively with local community and educational agencies in providing professional, occupational, and traditional academic programs and support services that meet the unique geographic and multicultural needs of the region and beyond.

The College of Education is recognized as the education unit at CSUSB, and houses four academic departments: Educational Leadership and Curriculum, Educational Psychology and Counseling, Language, Literacy and Culture, and Science, Mathematics and Technology Education. Among the current total enrollment of 1,888 candidates, 45 percent are enrolled in initial preparation programs, 33 percent are enrolled in advanced programs, and 22 percent are enrolled in programs for other education professionals. Tables 2 and 3 in the Institutional Report (IR) present summary information about the programs, award level, enrollment, and current status of state approval and national recognition through NCATE.

2. Describe the type of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?
The joint site visit was conducted following the California State and NCATE Protocol, with two teams working collaboratively. The State team consists of 15 state members. The NCATE/State team consists of five BOE members and two state members, sharing equal roles and responsibilities in all functions of the review. The State Team Report was produced by the State team, following the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) guidelines. The BOE report was produced by the NCATE/State team based on recommendations made collectively for each of the standards. The two state consultants, though not voting members, provided insights on state specific requirements and processes. There were no deviations from the protocol.

3. Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

In addition to programs offered at the CSUSB main campus, a collection of Teaching Credential Programs and M.A. programs in Education are offered at the Palm Desert Campus. Educational Administration Programs are offered off-campus at Hemet, Lake Elsinore, Ontario-West End of San Bernardino County school district facilities, and at the Palm Desert Campus. Interviews conducted at the Palm Desert Campus and review of exhibits confirmed that candidate performance and program quality are consistent with those offered at the main campus. With regards to distance learning, several programs are offered through blended deliveries using distance learning and other technologies. There are, however, no programs offered exclusively online.

4. Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

There were no unusual circumstances that affected the site visit.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit’s efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P–12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

1. Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The unit’s mission states its commitment to “prepare education and human service professionals for lives of leadership, service, and continual growth through the development of curriculum and programs that transform individuals and the community.” Fulfillment of this mission is supported by the unit’s conceptual framework (CF) guided by a set of core beliefs that lead to the development and support of “wise, reflective teachers and other education professionals.” The five characteristics of the wise professional educator are: (1) Possesses rich subject matter knowledge; (2) Applies sound judgment to professional practice and conduct; (3) Applies a practical knowledge of context; (4) Respects multiple viewpoints; and (5) Reflects on professional practices and follows up with appropriate action. These characteristics and expected proficiencies are aligned with state, national and professional standards, and are used for the development of program-specific outcomes and assessments.
Candidates’ knowledge, skills and professional dispositions are developed and assessed through a sequence of experiences involving course-embedded and field-based activities in which they have opportunities to develop, reflect and refine expected competencies. When applicable, state-specific tests, such as the Teacher Performance Assessments (TPAs), are used to assess candidates’ proficiencies. Outcome data are gathered through key assessments, which may include assessment of writing proficiency, proficiency in oral English, GPA requirements, field and clinical experiences, comprehensive exam and thesis/project, College of Education Candidate Survey and MA Core Sequence Survey, and Assessment of Dispositions. When needed, remedial actions are taken by the faculty, program leaders and/or unit administrators to help ensure that candidates develop appropriate competencies in meeting unit standards. Outcomes data are summarized in Annual Program Reports, Department Reports and Unit Assessment Reports for continual improvement.

The current conceptual framework reflects editorial revisions based upon suggestions made by external advisory committee members, candidates and faculty in 2004-2005. With additional support from the unit’s NCATE leadership team, the unit’s mission statement was re-articulated to address more directly the institutional standards as presented in its conceptual framework. The unit has also been engaged in a collection of professional development activities related to the conceptual framework, including the Annual Symposium Series titled “Wisdom in Education,” several editions of an E-journal, and retreats titled “Wisdom Talks.”

The conceptual framework is presented in the unit documents, including course syllabi, various assessment instruments, websites and other venues that are available to the public and candidates. Interviews with faculty and candidates confirmed that the five tenets and their guiding principles are included in both course activities and internship experiences for initial and advanced credential programs. Advanced M.A. programs are at different stages of documenting and assessing proficiencies and dispositions listed in the conceptual framework.

### III. STANDARDS

In its responses to each standard, the team should indicate when differences exist among the main campus, distance learning programs, and off-campus programs.

#### Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

1. Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 1 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

   Yes
   No

   If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.
1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation
Acceptable

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation
Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Initial licensure is provided primarily through Post Baccalaureate programs for Single Subject (SS), Multiple Subject (MS), and Education Specialist (ES). These credential programs have specific requirements that ensure content knowledge. Candidates must demonstrate subject matter competency by either completing a state-approved subject matter preparation program or passing the state exam. Multiple subject candidates must successfully complete the approved state exam for multiple subjects.

Information from the Institutional Report, the exhibit room, and interviews confirms that a variety of indicators are used to demonstrate that candidates in initial programs know the content they intend to teach. Data from the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) and from the California Subject Matter Exams for Teachers (CSET) indicate that candidates completing programs at CSUSB have a 100% percent pass rate. All candidates must also show proficiency in meeting the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) by successfully completing four different assessments called the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) that measure candidate performance on the 13 areas as they progress through the program. SS and MS candidates completing the program meet this requirement with a 100% passing rate as it is a requirement for program completion. Mean scores range from 2.94 to 3.44 on a four-point scale. The unit has volunteered to field test these assessments and have had faculty trained as assessors by the state. The unit has also recognized one area of concern having to do with adapting instruction for special needs learners and have taken steps to adjust their curriculum to address this concern.

Additional evidence of content knowledge was presented through data collected from school districts that reported data in a state conducted survey. The survey results indicated that employers of CSUSB graduates rated 83% to 95% of the graduates as adequately prepared in content knowledge.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Candidate’s mastery of content knowledge in advanced programs that lead to a credential is demonstrated through a collection key assessments, which may include signature assignments, clinical experiences, comprehensive exam and thesis/project, and state tests when applicable. The advanced programs for teachers listed below do not lead to licensure or a credential:

MA in Education, Bilingual/Cross Cultural; MA in Education, Curriculum and Instruction; MA in Education, Holistic and Integrative; MA in Education, Instructional Technology; MA in Education, Kinesiology; MA in Education, TESOL; MA in Education, Science; MA in Education, Special Education; MA in Education, Special Education; Educational Doctorate, Educational Leadership.

Content knowledge is measured in several ways, including GPA, completion of Writing Requirement Exemption Exam (WREE), completion of MA core courses and surveys, and completion of comprehensive exam and/or thesis/project. The annual MA Core Sequence Survey, for example, indicates a high level of satisfaction. Scores on a four-point scale ranged from 2.88 to 3.64. Of the 76 items scored, only two items were scored below three on a four-point scale on the two years of survey
Data and interviews indicate that candidates of credential programs meet and/or exceed state and institutional expectations on content knowledge. With regards to MA non-credential programs, the implementation of the unit assessment system is not as complete as it is in the credential programs. In particular, data collection and analysis of competencies related to institutional standards and conceptual framework is limited.

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

| Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The California Standards for the Teaching Profession are based on research and expert advice pertaining to best practice. The standards are organized around six interrelated categories of teaching practice with 13 Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). They are:

A. Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students
TPE 1 – Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction
B. Assessing Student Learning
TPE 2 – Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction
TPE 3 – Interpretation and Use of Assessments
C. Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning
TPE 4 – Making Content Accessible
TPE 5 – Student Engagement
TPE 6 - Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices
TPE 7 – Teaching English Learners
D. Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students
TPE 8 – Learning about Students
TPE 9 – Instructional Planning
E. Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning
TPE 10 – Instructional Time
TPE 11 – Social Environment
F. Developing as a Professional Educator
TPE 12 – Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations
TPE 13 – Professional Growth

Review of documents and interviews of faculty and candidates confirmed that program, curriculum and assessments are aligned with the state standards. Candidates in the credential programs focus on the 13 TPEs through their coursework in the program. In order to complete the credential program, they are required to pass the TPA established by the state. This is a four-part assessment administered as candidates progress through the program. Data found in the IR and in the program assessment reports showed that candidates meet and/or exceed state and institutional expectations on pedagogical content knowledge. Data from the TPA did not specifically address the skills of using technology in instruction, but the unit did supply data from state conducted surveys of alumni, indicating that 90.9 percent of the program graduates felt they had “effective” or “very effective” preparation for using technology.
Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Candidates in advanced programs leading to credentials have the opportunities to develop, reflect and refine expected pedagogical content knowledge through a sequence of experiences involving course-embedded and field-based activities. Candidates in non-credential advanced programs are also provided with a series of learning and assessment opportunities to enhance and improve their content and pedagogical content knowledge.

All MA in Education programs identified concepts in their unique programs that related to content and pedagogical content knowledge through a crosswalk of six principles that were addressed and assessed in required courses. Mean GPAs were summarized for courses identified as contributing to pedagogical knowledge, which ranged from 3.47 to 3.84 on a four point scale.

1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

| Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Data from exhibits and interviews confirmed that candidates can apply pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills to create supportive learning environments, and facilitate student learning. As stated in standard 1b, candidates in the credential programs are required to demonstrate their competencies in meeting the 13 TPEs through coursework and field and clinical experiences which are aligned to state and NCATE standards. As a program exit requirement, candidates are further required to successfully pass the state TPA. Candidates’ competencies are reflected in the 100 percent pass rates for SS, MS, and ES programs.

Data from field supervisors who rated candidates on professional and pedagogical knowledge ranged from 3.8 to 4.0 on a four point scale. In addition, candidates are required to demonstrate reading competency and the unit provided data from a state exam called the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) with pass rates from 94 to 100 percent over the years 2005 to 2007 for the MS and ES programs. The unit also provided survey data from the candidates themselves and they rated this area of their preparation highly as well, with scores ranging from 3.6 to 4.4 on a five point scale for the years 2005 to 2007.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Similar to initial programs, candidates in advanced programs have the opportunities to develop, reflect and refine expected professional and pedagogical content knowledge and skills through a sequence of experiences. Candidates demonstrate competencies through successful completion of coursework and key assessments, successful completion of a thesis/project or passing a comprehensive exam, and maintaining the minimum required GPA.

Courses and their alignment to elements of NCATE standard 1 were presented. GPAs for courses aligned with professional and pedagogical skills showed that GPAs are above the acceptable minimum.
Summarized data from MA core courses, comprehensive exam and thesis/project further support that candidates can apply pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills to create supportive learning environments, and facilitate student learning. Limited outcomes data are provided on courses beyond MA Core for non-credential master’s programs.

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Preparing wise, reflective teachers and other education professionals who support and promote positive learning outcomes for all students is central to the unit’s conceptual framework. Review of syllabi, key assessments, and interviews with faculty indicated that candidates in the initial teacher preparation programs learn to plan, deliver, and assess instruction; collect, analyze and interpret data; and modify strategies as needed, in order to increase student learning and performance.

The unit’s program, curriculum and assessments are closely aligned with TPEs. GPAs and results of key assessments, thus, provide keen insights on candidates’ knowledge and abilities. Through successful completion of coursework, assignments, and clinical practice, candidates demonstrate their proficiencies in assessing and analyzing student learning, in monitoring student learning, and in developing and implementing meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn. The 100 percent pass rates on TPAs for MS, SS and ES programs demonstrate candidates’ abilities to have a positive impact on student learning. Data from the exhibits and from candidate interviews, further confirm that candidates are successful in fostering student learning.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Advanced candidates have a variety of opportunities to demonstrate their impact on student/client learning. As discussed earlier, courses and their alignment to elements of NCATE standard 1 and TPEs were presented. GPAs derived from these courses and results from comprehensive exams and thesis/projects were used to demonstrate that candidates meet the state, national and institutional expectations. In 2008, Candidate Survey was revised to include an item inquiring about assessing students/clients. Though limited in scope, the results showed that advanced candidates rated their coursework and program experiences as effective to very effective in assisting them to assess students and clients.

1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

| Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Candidates in programs for other school professionals develop and expand their professional and
pedagogical knowledge and skills through a variety of learning and assessments activities, which may include portfolios, field work reports by supervisory personnel, standardized tests, comprehensive exams, thesis/project reports, course projects/assignments with scoring rubrics, internships, self-assessment surveys, exit surveys, and employee surveys. GPAs and assessment data provide multiple measures at key transition points on candidates’ performance and program quality. The data are compiled into annual reports and shared with department chairs and with the Dean’s Council.

All programs for other school professionals have a requirement of a 3.0 GPA for admission to the program. A GPA exception policy is in place to ensure that candidates admitted through the policy demonstrate a high level of knowledge and skills. All candidates are required to meet the University Graduate Writing requirement, typically through course completion. In addition, all courses must be completed with a GPA of 3.0 or higher, and with no grade lower than a B/B-. Field and clinical experiences are closely supervised and assessed. Assessment results from Educational Administration, Counseling and Guidance, and School Psychology indicate that candidates meet developmental and competency expectations. The Council of Learned Societies in Education (CLS) standards are being incorporated into MA core courses. Assessment data indicate that the bulk of the scores on the 76 measures were at or above three on a four-point scale. Survey data showed that candidates rated program experiences as effective to very effective in content, pedagogical content, and professional and pedagogical skills and knowledge.

The Ed. D. program in Educational Leadership is new and focuses on improving leadership skills and the ability to conduct research that will help candidates solve leadership issues. This new program requires a dissertation that faculty expressly hopes will improve their professional skills and contribute to the literature in educational leadership. As a part of the unit assessment system, the program has developed assessment processes and procedures, and is in the process of implementation. The program has yet to graduate its first cohort and thus has limited outcomes data.

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

Student Learning for Other School Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

As indicated in the previous section, candidates’ competencies in meeting institutional and state performance expectations are measured in a variety of ways. Activities and assessments related to candidates’ understanding of and abilities to have a positive impact on student/client learning focus on a) creation of positive learning environments b) building success on students’ developmental levels c) understanding of student, family, and community diversity, and d) understanding of policy context in which they work. Data from thesis/project, comprehensive exam, standardized test, field/clinical experience evaluation, and MA Core Sequence survey support that candidates meet state and institutional expectations.

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:
The unit has developed a set of dispositions derived from the five tenets and their guiding principles as articulated in the conceptual framework, and has developed assessment instruments with scoring rubrics for assessing proficiencies of candidates. Interviews and review of exhibits confirmed that candidates in credential programs at initial level were provided with multiple opportunities to develop and improve, if deemed necessary, expected professional dispositions.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:
The advanced programs have adopted a set of dispositions derived from the five tenets and their guiding principles as articulated in the conceptual framework, and has adopted the assessment instruments with scoring rubrics for assessing proficiencies of candidates. Though summarized data presented at the visit were limited, interviews and review of exhibits confirmed that candidates in credential programs at advanced level were provided with multiple opportunities to develop and improve expected professional dispositions. Non-credential advanced master’s programs are at different stages of documenting and assessing proficiencies and dispositions as articulated in the conceptual framework.

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:
Credential programs for other school professionals in the unit were jointly reviewed by the state and the NCATE teams. Interviews and review of exhibits confirmed that candidates in these programs were provided with opportunities to develop and improve expected professional dispositions through a variety of course-embedded assignments and/or field based assessments. In addition, the unit has taken the initiative to develop a unit-wide dispositions assessment encompassing five areas: Rich Content Knowledge; Sound Professional Judgment and Conduct; Practical Knowledge of Context; Respect for Multiple Viewpoints; and, Self-reflection and Personal Growth. Though limited, aggregate and summarized data derived from the unit-wide dispositions assessment were provided.

Overall Assessment of Standard
Programs leading to credentials at both initial and advanced levels for teachers and other school professionals were reviewed independently and collaboratively by the State and the NCATE teams. Interviews and review of a variety of program documents, assessment reports and state-specific test requirements confirmed that candidates have the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions delineated by institutional, state, and professional standards. The State team, with the support of the NCATE team, will recommend met for credential programs at both initial and advanced levels to CCTC.

Non-credential Master of Arts in Education programs were not reviewed by the State team and were reviewed by the NCATE team. The unit has provided evidence through the IR, exhibits, and on-site interviews, that candidates in these programs have the knowledge and skills to help all children learn. However, limit aggregated and summarized data on proficiencies and dispositions as articulated in the conceptual framework were provided from these non-credential programs.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]
Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The conceptual framework is not clearly aligned or infused throughout some programs (ITP and ADV).</td>
<td>Interviews and review of program documents such as course syllabi, signature assignments and dispositions assessments confirmed that conceptual framework has been aligned with state and national standards, and are presented in curriculum and assessments within the unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not all candidates can articulate the conceptual framework (ITP and ADV).</td>
<td>Interviews conducted by the various BOE members collectively suggested that candidates, graduates and some faculty were unable to articulate the proficiencies and dispositions as stated in the conceptual framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New AFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-credential master's programs are at different stages of documenting, assessing and summarizing proficiencies and dispositions as articulated in the conceptual framework (ADV).</td>
<td>The unit has developed unit-wide assessments on proficiencies and dispositions as articulated in the conceptual framework. However, limited aggregated and summarized data from non-credential master's programs were provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation for Standard 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

The unit and the NCATE team agreed to remove “Nationally Recognized” under the column of “Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE” as presented in IR Table 2.

The unit and the NCATE team also agreed to remove “WASC” under the column of “Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents) for programs labeled in IR Table 3, with the exception of the Educational Leadership (Ed.D.).

IR page 7 listed the three MA core courses as EDUC 663, EDUC 695, and EDUC 603. The correct numbers for the three MA core courses should be EDUC 603, EDUC 605 and EDUC 607.
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 2 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes  No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

2a. Assessment System

| Assessment System – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Assessment System – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The five candidate outcomes outlined in the conceptual framework are reflected in the assessment system in all programs as evidenced by syllabi, alignment charts, posters and logos displayed reinforce its tenets. The assessment system includes an integrated set of evaluation measures that are used to monitor candidate performance and manage and improve unit operations and programs.

The unit’s assessment system has been developed and refined since the last accreditation visit through participation in the Program Leaders’ Committee, Cabinet, the Unit Assessment Committee and the Division of Teacher Education Executive Committee and unit faculty. The Unit Assessment report serves as the vehicle to document the results of the prior year’s outcomes – in candidate performance, program operation and unit operations. Programs conduct a yearly review of candidate performance data, dispositions surveys, candidate surveys, alumni surveys, employer surveys, and advisory group feedback, which is then summarized in an Annual Program Report. Documents and interviews with faculty and program chairs provided evidence of regular evaluation by the professional community of faculty and stakeholders. The annual two-day Dean’s Cabinet retreat consisting of associate deans, department chairs and faculty representatives and unit’s assessment coordinator review Annual Reports and make recommendations. Recommendations are then shared with faculty so program decisions can be made about programs, candidates, and unit operations. The assessment system is based on professional, state, and institutional standards and all programs are guided by the tenets of the conceptual framework which align with program state and/or national standards.

The Office of Curriculum and Archives in conjunction with the Office of Assessment and Research maintain program and unit databases of candidate evaluation, dispositions, and unit surveys and report results. Evidence from interviews and documents confirm that evaluation measures assess performance data and unit operation through a series of multiple assessments that are charted by program at transition points and courses where the assessment resides. The unit works to eliminates bias and tests for fairness,
accuracy, and consistency through training for faculty in the procedures for the scoring of the Teacher Performance Assessments (TPAs). The TPA’s are a series of four teacher performance assessments completed during interval times during the teacher candidates’ initial preparation. Scoring of the TPA is conducted by trained teacher education faculty at the university who score each candidates performance data in a blind evaluation format. This helps to ensure that all candidates receive a fair evaluation. Data from this evaluation are disaggregated and reported by Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) of which there are 13 along with some additional topics. This is the first year that the State of California has required the TPA, however the teacher education unit has been piloting it for over four years. Programs also have procedures in place to assure that assessment of candidate performance within clinical practice is fair and accurate. Supervisors and field site support people are oriented to the clinical experience and assessment procedures and tools. An online intern coach training module has been developed so that the evaluation of teacher performance in the classroom can be completed more accurately.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:
The five candidate outcomes outlined in the conceptual framework are reflected in the assessment system in all programs including the advanced programs: Advanced Credential Masters, the non-credential Masters, Other School Personnel and the Educational Leadership Doctorate (Ed.D.). The Advanced Programs, much like the Initial Programs have an integrated set of evaluation measures that are used to monitor candidate performance and manage and improve unit operations and programs. Like the Initial Programs the Advanced Programs have designated a set of evaluation measures that are used to monitor candidate performance and manage and improve unit operations and programs. Advanced Programs go through the Annual Report process and participate in the Dean’s Cabinet Retreat in the same way that the Initial Program functions. Candidates in the Masters Advanced Programs all participate in the MA Core, a series of three courses that prepare candidate for their graduate program. An MA core survey is completed by all candidates during one of these courses, additionally; most of the masters program have or are planning to have a comprehensive examination, major project, or thesis/dissertation completed by all students. Coupled with the disposition survey which is being integrated into all programs and the exit survey advanced program assessment system collects data using the same process that the initial program use. The Advanced Programs have established procedures for proctoring and scoring comprehensive examinations. All candidates who are ready to take the comprehensive exam each quarter report to the same area for the exam. Final projects, thesis or dissertations are read by a minimum of two readers to ensure that there is no bias and that fairness is maintained.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

| Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:
The Assessment System for the School of Education is maintained by two offices; the Office of Curriculum and Archives and the Office of Assessment and Research. The Office of Curriculum and Archives (OCA) is responsible for the collection of electronic syllabi, reports, vitae, curriculum changes, committee summaries, and accreditation evidence. The unit’s documents including the conceptual framework and its history, curriculum changes, and communications from accrediting bodies are housed
in the office. The office provides clerical support for the Unit Assessment Report, Biennial Reports to the state, accreditation documents, the Executive Unit Assessment Committee, the Curriculum Committee, and the Program Leaders’ Group. It also has responsibility for follow up calls to employers and graduates completing the CSU Follow-up Survey, resulting in one of the highest response rates in the CSU. Finally, this office posts documents on the web for communication and accreditation purposes. Candidate assessment data are systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized and analyzed.

The Office of Assessment and Research (OAR) processes and houses admissions, and exit surveys as well as the unit data bases of candidate evaluation and unit surveys. Recently this office assumed responsibility for the TPA data from teacher education. Counseling candidates who have taken the national Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE) are sent to this office and then distributed appropriately. The unit is in the process of implementing a new Candidate Management Database that will follow candidates’ performance as well as program and unit data that will be easily accessed by faculty and staff. The director of assessment and research and her staff (80%-time AAS support, two graduate assistants and part-time clerical help) are critical to the logistics of unit-wide assessments. This office acts as a funnel in which much data are generated or collected and then transformed into graphs, tables, and reports that make sense of the great amount of data the unit and its programs have available.

As stated earlier, data on dispositions, clinical practice, and TPAs come into this office for analysis and reporting by program and in the aggregate when appropriate. The Unit’s Current Student Survey is generated, analyzed, and reported from this office. The office takes in survey data from the university and system (CSU Follow-Up Survey, CSU Exit Survey, CSUSB Alumni Survey) and generates tables and reports for program and unit use. The office also monitors admission GPA, GPA of certain courses, and program completion numbers. Candidate assessment data are disaggregated for Credential and non-Credential programs, off-campus programs, and Advanced Programs. In some cases data are requested in charts and graphs as well.

The unit maintains records of formal complaints; resolutions are documented. The university has procedures in place to facilitate candidates’ filing of formal complaints. The Student Non-academic Grievance Policy (http://policies.csusb.edu/studgriev.htm) responds to candidate concerns regarding injustice caused by practices of the university. The Procedure for Discrimination Complaint (http://policies.csusb.edu/discrcompl.htm) allows candidates to file formal complaints about alleged discrimination by a faculty or staff member. Academic Grievance Procedures (http://academic-affairs.csusb.edu/progs/grade_policy/) allow students to file formal complaints regarding evaluation by faculty, admissions, dishonesty issues, suspension, probation, and dismissal. All of these procedures are linked to the university website. Program faculty are responsible for ensuring student know these procedures are available. Candidates pursuing grievances start the process within the Dean’s Office, which monitors annual grievances (Candidate Grievances 00-08). Data are regularly compiled, summarized, and analyzed. Each year, progress on past goals is noted in the Annual Unit Assessment Report along with any newly developed goals. Responsibility for this resides with the associate deans. The data management systems are maintained using information technology and several databases. As mentioned before the new Candidate Management System (CMS) will allow all data to be housed in one system and provide ready access to faculty and staff.

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

The advanced program assessment system operates in the same way as the initial programs with the exception of the non credentialed masters programs where the unit assessment system is in different stages of development and implementation resulting in inconsistency in data processing interpretation and decisions for program improvement. The absence of systemic performance based summary data at
the non credentialed masters level due primarily to differences in system implementation limits the potential impact of data driven changes among non credentials masters programs.

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

| Use of Data for Program Improvement – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Use of Data for Program Improvement – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data. The data are used to improve candidate performance, programs and unit operations. Data-driven improvements are listed on a summary chart with a description of the action taken. Data are regularly and systematically used to evaluate courses, programs, and clinical experiences. For example the TPA data from teacher credentials programs suggest that teacher candidates from both campus and off campus do not appear to differ significantly in performance demonstration on the TPA. Unit initiates changes based on data. One specific example discussed by faculty was a particular result on the TPA that indicated that teacher candidates were not as well prepared to meet the needs of English Language Learners or Special Needs students at the same level that they performed other tasks. To address this issue changes were made to courses in the programs to ensure that teacher candidates received specific training that dealt with this issue. Through the annual reports data and program information are shared with the faculty. These reports are also available electronically. Assessment data are shared with advisory groups including a Unit wide Student Advisory Groups and input is solicited.

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

The Advanced Teacher Preparation and the Preparation of Other School Professionals operates in the same way as the initial programs.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data. The data are used to improve candidate performance, programs and unit operations. Data-driven improvements are listed on a summary chart with a description of the action taken. Data are regularly and systematically used to evaluate courses, programs, and clinical experiences. For example the TPA data from teacher credentials programs suggests that teacher candidates from both campus and off campus do not appear to differ significantly in performance demonstration on the TPA. Unit initiates changes based on data. One specific example discussed by faculty was a particular result on the TPA that indicated that teacher candidates were not as well prepared to meet the needs of English Language Learners or Special Needs students at the same level that they performed other tasks. To address this issue changes were made to courses in the programs to ensure that teacher candidates received specific training that dealt with this issue. Through the annual reports data and program information are shared with the faculty. These reports are also available electronically. Assessment data is shared with advisory groups including a Unit wide Student Advisory Groups and input is solicited.

The non credentialed masters program are in different stages of development and implementation the unit assessment system, resulting in inconsistency in data processing interpretation and decisions for program improvement.
Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

New AFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. Inconsistencies exist in data collection, analysis, and evaluation among the non credentialed masters program | The unit assessment system is in different stages of development and implementation resulting in inconsistency in data processing, interpretation and decisions for improvement. |
2. Inconsistency exist in reporting and utilizing data for improvement among non-credential master's programs | Absence of systemic performance based summary data at the non credential master level, due primarily to differences in system implementation, limits the potential impact of data driven changes among non credentialed masters programs. |

Recommendation for Standard 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 3 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)
If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

| Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit's geographical coverage area necessitates partnerships with a variety of constituencies to accommodate the candidates’ needs. Those partnered include the county education offices of San Bernardino and Riverside, school districts where candidates are placed, as well as internal campus partnerships with the administration and the arts/science faculty. These partnerships are strengthened through advisory groups for specific programs, such as MA Program Advisory and Reading Advisory. Each of these advisory groups consists of members, both internal and external to the unit, representing the constituencies of the counties, district and the unit. Each of these groups has regularly scheduled meetings to discuss all facets of the programs including the field and clinical experiences as applicable. The districts participate in quarterly district liaison meetings which serve as an additional source of feedback for teacher education. A portion of this feedback deals with the potential placement of candidates in both field and student teaching situations. Larger districts utilize a school support position to place potential candidates, while in other districts, a principal or designated teacher fills that role. Once placement occurs, the resident teacher collaborates with the university supervisor to provide appropriate feedback to further enhance the candidate’s experience and expertise, as well as an assessment of the experience. Programs have established protocol for ensuring constant communication between the unit and the school based personnel, with programs requiring on-site visits four to six times each quarter. School principals verified that they were informed of all unit placements, and instructed in a process should an intern or a candidate experience a difficulty with the placement.

Further evidence of collaboration is evident with unit faculty supporting local schools through in-service presentations. As a result of this activity in one school, four resident teachers are now participating in a class at the university on differentiating instruction. Members of all of the represented collaborative groups identified through interviews that they felt that input from them was beneficial to the unit and pointed to things that had developed or changed as a result of their input such as the elimination of day classes to better accommodate candidate needs. The Literacy Center was a direct outgrowth of the perception of a community need and has continued to expand with no advertising, only through word-of-mouth, as an additional example of positive collaboration. Schools send children in need of literacy support to the Center where the candidates engage in both field and clinical experiences as they work with k-12 students.

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

The advisory boards for the Advanced Programs as well as the other school professionals operate in the
same way as the boards for the Initial Teacher Preparation as substantiated through interviews with those boards' members.

### 3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

| Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

#### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Field experiences and clinical practice are a cornerstone in the initial and advanced credential programs. The unit’s conceptual framework of developing wise professionals mandates that candidates both observe and apply learning in a field setting. Initial programs include several field–based experiences. Exploratory field experiences are pre-requisites for each program. Candidates must meet the entry requirement that has been established for their program to be eligible for formal clinical practice. MS and SS candidates must teach at least a portion of their experience in a classroom in which the ethnicity of at least 25 percent of the students is different from the candidate’s, and in settings that include English Learners and students with special needs. The Supervision Office coordinates teacher education placements for clinical work with the districts. Each district has a field coordinator who collaborates with the Supervision Office Director and program directors in making appropriate field assignments. Field work in the Instructional Technology program has embedded course work that details outside projects.

Some of the smaller programs are supervised by unit members only. When the need for supervisors exceeds the unit personnel, outside supervisors are hired by the university to fulfill that role. This additional supervisor pool consists of retired educators who possess the credential and/or have had experience with the area they are supervising. New supervisors are trained prior to the first experience, while existing supervisors are offered opportunities for professional development related to candidate expectations and experiences each quarter. Candidates complete a review of the university supervisor at the end of the placement. This information is used when determining future assignments for the supervisor.

Resident teachers are selected on the basis of certification, quality of instruction, and willingness to serve the profession. Many of the selected resident teachers received certification through the unit and are thoroughly familiar with the requirements of the program(s). MS, SE, and SS directors and the director of supervision inform the district administrators of the requirements through the use of the Resident Teacher Brochure, that details the specific requirements for this task. selection is confirmed by the university after visiting the site. Placement quality is monitored by the university supervisors. Additional information is obtained by the use of the Resident Teacher Evaluation Form which is completed by the candidate and the supervisor. Future placement decisions are made after reviewing these evaluations. Interns serve in districts with a memorandum of understanding (MOU). The Supervision Office serves as support for this process. Field support teachers (coaches) are assigned with input from intern directors and staff. All parties acknowledge that the opportunity for internships has been reduced dramatically recently due to the shifting demographics of the unit’s service area, as well as the current economic situation.
Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Advanced credential programs require additional field work with identified hours that are monitored through faculty and site supervision utilizing competency-aligned rating sheets. The advanced programs have a somewhat different system of placement for their clinical and/or field placements. Program coordinators, staff and department chairs are responsible for the coordinating these experiences. Although determined jointly, since most of the candidates work full-time, they are typically assigned to the same site where they are employed. All plans are individualized with the general expectations of the program stipulated in the Field Experience Evaluation form, a document that outlines the expectation for the placement. Candidates desiring a certificate in an area not under their current placement will spend time in other classrooms or in a different setting such as the Literacy Center to complete the required hours for the clinical experience. Technology has been infused throughout the curriculum of all programs, largely through the use of a grant, Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers for Technology (PT3). The faculty was mentored in the use of technology enabling the infusion of technology into their lessons. The candidates have at least one assignment in each course that is technology based as observed in the syllabi. School district personnel report that the candidates are the ones who assist in the instruction of technology in the classroom where they are assigned, increasing the technological expertise of the resident teacher or coach. Advanced candidates utilize technology with assignments in data collection in programs where data is a key component such as Educational Administration, School Psychology, and School Counseling.

3c. Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Candidates have multiple opportunities to demonstrate the acquisition of knowledge and skills during field placements and clinical practice. They are formally assessed by the site personnel, as well as the university supervisors. Completion of lesson plans as well as reflections enables a supervisor to utilize multiple methods of assessment that is delivered at predetermined checkpoints, affirming candidate strengths and/or weaknesses. The conceptual framework is present on clipboards given to the supervisors as a reference, with the rubrics for measuring field placements reflecting these same principles, continuing the threads of the framework that have been infused in each course through the use of a standardized course template. Candidates are assessed both formally and informally. Each formal observation produces a document that has been crafted by the observer. It is reflected upon by the candidate and discussed with both the supervisor and the resident teacher or the field support personnel. The candidate provides a formal reflection for the experience, and indicates personal areas of growth as a result of the experience

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

Candidates are assessed both formally and informally on a regular basis as determined by the certificate desired. Each formal observation produces a document that has been crafted by the observer. It is
reflected upon by the candidate and discussed with both the supervisor and the resident teacher or the field support personnel. The candidate provides a formal reflection for the experience, and indicates personal areas of growth as a result of the experience.

**Overall Assessment of Standard**

The unit has provided a variety of field and clinical experiences for programs at both initial and advanced levels. The candidates are able to work with a diverse population, utilizing the principles of the conceptual framework, under the trained eyes of carefully selected professionals at the site and university level. There is a process in place for evaluation of all elements of the experience, to ensure that quality is maintained. Whether the candidate is seeking an initial or advanced credential, the training is solid, leading to a large number of graduates being placed in educational positions in the area. The unit has a large number of graduates who are willing to give back to the unit by serving as resident teachers and/or field support personnel. This is a testament to the unit’s mission for developing wise educators.

**Strengths** [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

**Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**AFIs from last visit: Corrected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Some unit supervisors lack expertise in area(s) in which they are supervising (ITP) (ADV).</td>
<td>Interviews and reviews of documents affirmed that supervisor credentials are aligned with areas in which they are supervising.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFIs from last visit: Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New AFIs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation for Standard 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 4: Diversity

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

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 4 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

| Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Candidates in the initial programs participate in specific activities and experiences that prepare them to work with diverse student populations. The unit articulates unit-wide and program-specific proficiencies related to diversity based on the Conceptual Framework. Interviews and documents confirm that coursework and field experiences in the initial programs provide the candidates with multiple opportunities to demonstrate understanding, sensitivity and abilities to adapt instruction based on the students’ learning styles, culture, gender, linguistic and special needs. Strategies for communicating with students and their families are shared and discussed in various courses.

Diversity proficiencies are embedded in coursework and assessed in culminating projects, portfolios, examinations, and the TPAs. Teacher Performance Assessments include four distinct tasks which include collection of personal and assessment data for students, instructional planning that demonstrates the candidate's ability to adapt instruction to meet student needs, analysis of student work and reflections on the teaching experiences. Assignments and tasks completed by candidates indicate that lessons are developed and taught, allowing students to demonstrate their ability to plan appropriate instruction that
connects curriculum with the students’ past experiences and culture.

Interviews of candidates reveal that they are encouraged to develop classroom climates that value the diversity of the students and incorporate multiple perspectives in the subject matter being taught. All initial programs prepare candidates to teach English learners within the context of the general or special education classroom, as well as specific strategies on how to modify instruction for students with exceptionalities.

During the clinical practice in initial programs, observations and final evaluations are aligned to the proficiencies and feedback is provided by the supervisor and resident teacher. Initial program candidates receive feedback on assignments and observations that promote improvement in their knowledge and skills for helping diverse students learn.

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

Candidates in the advanced programs and programs for other professionals participate in coursework, discussions, and assignments that demonstrate the unit-wide and program-specific proficiencies developed by the unit based on the Conceptual Framework.

Proficiencies are assessed in culminating experiences including comprehensive examinations and theses. Advanced candidates receive feedback on assignments and observations that promote improvement in their knowledge and skills for helping diverse students learn. Interviews and documentation indicate that the belief that all students can learn and a focus on adaptation of instruction or services based on individual student needs is emphasized in the advanced programs. The experiences vary depending on the context of the work including the classroom, counseling sessions, supervision by site administrators or other support services. Sensitivity to the culture and experiences of students and their families are considered as professionals in the advanced programs strive to understand the unique needs of the students.

### 4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

#### Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Advanced Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation

Candidates in initial programs have the opportunity to interact with unit faculty, faculty from other units, and school faculty from at least two ethnic/racial groups. Data provided from the unit demonstrate that the percentage of male and female faculty as well as ethnicity mirrors the faculty demographics in the university as a whole. Female faculty members who work with initial program candidates are 52 percent of the unit faculty as compared to the university at large which has more men than women. The ethnic diversity of the unit faculty shows 73 percent White, non Hispanic and the remainder is representative of Hispanic, Black and Asian ethnic groups. Interviews and documents demonstrate that when openings exist, the unit, with the support of the university, actively recruit faculty from the larger educational community to provide a diverse group of qualified applicants. A survey to gather data about the demographics of the school-based faculty has been developed and distributed, limited results were provided at the visit. Faculty vitae and data collected by the unit indicate that faculty members with whom initial candidates work have knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work
with diverse student populations, including English learners and students with exceptionalities. Supervisors participate in professional development that prepares them to support candidates in the areas of differentiated instruction and successfully working with students that have special learning needs.

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

Candidates in advanced programs have the opportunity to interact with unit faculty, faculty from other units, and school faculty from at least two ethnic/racial groups. Demographic information provided by the unit indicates that the unit faculty that interacts with the advanced candidates is 51 percent male and 49 percent female. No distinct differences were noted between programs offered at the main campus and those that meet in other geographic locations. Documents and interviews of faculty, candidates and graduates indicate that faculty who prepare educators for leadership roles have appropriate professional experience in the relevant roles of the candidates. Interviews and documents indicate that the unit is involved in many recruitment efforts that will continue to provide a pool of qualified applicants that represent a range of ethnic groups, multiple perspectives and experiences.

**4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates**

| Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

The demographics of the candidates in the initial programs are similar to the demographics represented by the student populations in the geographic areas served by the university. Table 9, which was cited as supporting evidence in the Institutional Report, indicates that the ethnicity of local student populations are 49 percent Caucasian, 39 percent Hispanic, 7 percent Black, 4.5 percent Asian/Pacific Islander and .5 percent Native American or Alaskan Native is similar to the demographics of the current candidate groups in the initial programs. There are approximately two times as many female candidates as males which is similar to the university student population. (65.02 percent female / 34.98 percent male) Candidates from diverse groups have the opportunities to work together on assignments, projects and committees as discussed in interviews and through examination of evidence provided by the unit. With the recent hire of three recruiters/advisors, the unit continues to increase or maintain a pool of candidates, both male and female, from diverse socio-economic and ethnic/racial groups. Recruitment efforts include outreach to local high schools and community colleges, attendance at career and job fairs, visits to undergraduate classes, as well as organization and presentation of quarterly informational meetings.

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

The demographics of the candidates in advanced programs are similar to the demographics of the university and school districts in the university service area. Percentages of ethnic groups are similar to the demographics listed for the initial programs. Recruitment efforts for candidates are similar to the efforts listed above.

**4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools**
Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

A review of demographic data from schools and districts within the geographic service area of the university indicate that candidates in the initial programs are given opportunities to work with students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and economic groups. The unit currently has agreements with 55 districts which are prepared to offer appropriate placements for field experiences or clinical practice. Many of these districts have over 50 percent of the students who receive free and reduced lunch as well as demographics that meet the program requirements for diversity. Efforts continue to expand these agreements to additional districts in response to the geographic needs of the candidates. The unit is currently in negotiations with a high school district that would provide numerous, appropriate placements for the growing numbers of single subject candidates. Early field experiences for the initial programs include assignments related to pupil diversity including ethnicity, race, religion, socio-economic status, gender and language. The Supervision Office facilitates and retains records of the candidates’ field experience and clinical practice placements. These placements provide the candidates opportunities to practice and demonstrate their abilities to plan and adapt instruction that meets the needs of all students, including English learners and students with disabilities. Candidates in both the initial programs receive feedback about their progress using multiple methods. The unit dispositions rubric is used as one tool for assessing a candidate’s progress in responding to diversity competencies. Documentation and interviews confirm that reports and resulting discussions by the university supervisor and resident teachers provide feedback to the candidate regarding their continued growth in this area. Candidates in the initial programs receive feedback from their peers on lessons they develop as well as from opportunities to observe each other in teaching situations.

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

Communities and schools in the geographic service area of the university provide candidates in the advanced programs opportunities to work with diverse students and clients including those from different socioeconomic groups and at least two ethnic/racial groups. English learners and students with disabilities are part of the field experiences and/or clinical practice which will give the candidates opportunities to develop and practice their knowledge, skills and professional dispositions. Most candidates in advanced programs are teachers or other professionals who are currently employed in the schools. If the location does not have a diverse student population, then the candidate would need to complete the program in another setting in order to satisfy program requirements. Candidates receive feedback about their progress using the unit dispositions rubric as well as program specific indicators.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit demonstrates commitment to preparing candidates to work successfully with diverse students. Candidates in both the initial and advanced programs interact with faculty, other candidates, students or clients that represent a wide variety of diverse groups. Diversity is incorporated and assessed through courses, field experiences and clinical practice. Candidates learn how to meet the individual needs of students/clients and how to adapt instruction and support to promote success.
Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New AFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation for Standard 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

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

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 5 was validated in the exhibits
and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

---

5a. Qualified Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualified Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The unit consists of 224 faculty with 90 full-time faculty. As documented, all faculty have earned master’s and/or doctorate degrees. Tenure track faculty at both the initial and advanced teaching levels are well qualified in their respective fields. A review of the faculty Qualifications Summary shows that most faculty have previous teaching or clinical experience in their field prior to assuming their positions and hold terminal degrees in their respective disciplines. Lecturers hold advanced degrees and/or are licensed or certified in their respective specialty areas. The longevity of the part time faculty is evidenced by the fact that almost 40 percent have been with the unit for more than five years. Interviews with tenure track faculty and lecturers, as well as review of the qualifications summary and examples of professional development activities provide evidence of the depth and breadth of faculty educational experience, scholarship, and leadership.

Clinical faculty are qualified to support and assist candidates. A review of the Qualifications Summary and interviews confirm that clinical and field supervisors are certified in their content area, and most have completed the course for supervision of student teachers.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

A review of syllabi reveals instruction is aligned with state and professional standards, theories, and current developments within the field. The review of course content and resources provides evidence that faculty are knowledgeable in the content areas and select current and relevant materials to support instruction and learning. Generally, course objectives show a relationship to tenets of the conceptual framework. Most syllabi include a statement of the CF.

The review of curriculum and course requirements and interviews with faculty indicate technology is infused into instruction at the initial and advanced levels. Examples of technology use include pod...
casting, information search, PowerPoint, interaction using Moodle technology, and Blackboard. Almost all faculty have training and experience in the use of the Smart Classroom equipment.

All courses address the diverse needs of students, learners, and clients and multicultural content is infused throughout the program. A review of faculty scholarship and professional development further illustrates the emphasis on understanding and meeting the needs of the populations being served.

The review of evidence indicates faculty understand and model best practices such as differentiated learning styles, varied instructional strategies, and multiple forms of assessments including performance assessment. Faculty encourage use of reflection, critical thinking, and problem solving skills with candidates by assigning case studies, action research, metacognitive review, review and analysis of research, and developing research design. The review of syllabi, candidate portfolios, student opinion of teaching survey results, and interviews with students and faculty confirm these skills are part of the instructional program. Courses and field experiences include discussion of professional dispositions. For example, credential candidates self-reflect on professional dispositions by completing a disposition rubric several times in the program; field supervisors complete professional dispositions rubrics for individuals completing field experiences.

Faculty reflect and self assess to ensure best practices in teaching. Faculty periodically complete a Faculty Activities Report which includes a section requiring self assessment based on a variety of sources including student and peer evaluations. Additionally, faculty may arrange to video tape class sessions. Faculty participate in follow-up conferences with department chairs; assistance is provided for improving or adjusting teaching as needed. Some faculty create questionnaires to elicit additional student feedback on specific course elements.

### 5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

| Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

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

All tenure track faculty and many lecturers are actively engaged in scholarship and professional development through publishing, grant writing, attending workshops, presenting at conferences, and collaborative and joint projects in the community. A review of faculty participating in campus-supported professional development shows that unit faculty take advantage of the numerous opportunities for support via Teaching Resource Center grants and workshops, collaboration and team teaching grants, teaching skills study awards, Faculty Research Leaves, CSU research grants, and unit-supported professional development activities.

The examination of professional journal articles, co-authored book chapters, books, textbooks, and project summaries confirm scholarship and professional development activities; activities are aligned with the tenets of the CF the and unit mission, and many address the needs of the local community. Additionally, a review of grant topics and research projects indicate faculty collaborate with other professionals to improve candidate learning and teacher preparation through their writings and presentations.
All faculty have membership with one or more professional educational organizations. Faculty participate in professional associations and activities at the international, national, regional, state, and local levels.

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

| Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

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

As stated in the institution guidelines for promotion and tenure, faculty are expected to serve the college, university, their profession, and the local community. Information presented in the faculty handbook confirms faculty service is one of three areas considered in retention, promotion, and tenure decisions. A review of the Qualifications Summary and interviews with faculty confirm they engage in department, college, and university committee activities, serve in leadership roles in professional organizations at all levels, participate on education boards and advisory councils, collaborate with school and agency practitioners, and participate in community activities and events.

Unit faculty collaborate with faculty and staff in P-12 schools, assisting with mentoring, grant writing, and service activities. Faculty collaborate with public school colleagues to present at professional meetings and conferences. Faculty have been awarded grants such as the federal Gear Up grant to encourage at risk students to think about attending college. Faculty regularly present workshops and services for and with public school colleagues: for example, weekly literacy tutoring to incarcerated high school students. Mentoring: Family to family – a training model for San Bernardino County Department of Children’s Services and work with the San Bernardino School District to develop and teach a class to high school students who aspire to become teachers.

Faculty serve as leaders in professional organizations as well as consultants to school districts and governmental agencies. Numerous roles include Founder of AERA Sig (special interest group) in Spirituality in Education, Gubernatorial Appointee to California Student Aid Commission, and International Advisory Board of the British Journal of Guidance and Counseling.

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

| Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

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

Tenure track faculty at the initial and advanced levels are evaluated annually in the categories of teaching, scholarship/professional development, and service. Annual evaluations of faculty conform to promotion and tenure guidelines established by the Academic Senate with relevant provisions of the California State University (CSU) collective bargaining MOU (memorandum of understanding), and are
aligned with policies stated in the faculty handbook. The process includes independent review made by department committee, chair, unit committee, dean, and university committee. Tenured full professors are reviewed every five years. The provost makes the final decision in retention, promotion, and tenure decisions.

Lecturers are reviewed in a similar manner, but only at the department level. Part time supervisors and clinical faculty are reviewed by program directors, the associate director of teacher education, and CSUSB Palm Desert director of post graduate programs in education, as appropriate.

Teaching is evaluated using multiple sources including university-wide student evaluations, peer evaluations from classroom visits, syllabi and other course materials. Supervisors are evaluated based on a form specifically designed for field experience evaluation. Informal types of evaluation, like team teaching or peer sharing, are also used to improve teaching.

Results from the student evaluations in recent years indicate that faculty in unit are consistently high — 3.66-3.85 on a 4 point scale. In recent quarter evaluations, supervisors were rated 3.7 and 3.6 on a 4 point scale.

Faculty use results from university student opinion surveys, self-designed course evaluation tools, the Teaching Performance Assessment, the CSU exit and other survey results, and the annual faculty review as part of the self-assessment process that informs course design and modification. When appropriate, a faculty member may develop a support team of colleagues or select a faculty mentor to support improved classroom instruction. A more senior faculty member may be selected to serve as a mentor in the areas of scholarship or faculty development.

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Faculty professional development at CSU San Bernardino and the College of Education, is a priority as identified by the university president, provost, and dean of the college. Numerous opportunities are made available to faculty through the Teaching Resource Center (TRC). Professional development is offered through the TRC in various forms such as workshops, presentations, information sessions, and grants. Many unit faculty participated in technology workshops including making course material accessible, pod casting for instruction, and enhancing teaching with video clips. Several faculty were awarded grants for improving teaching skills and team teaching. All faculty were given opportunities to participate in activities to facilitate infusion of the CF through college meetings and collegial conversations.

New faculty receive induction orientation in their first year and attend workshops and lectures offered through the TRC during the first three years of their employment as well as release time in their first year to support scholarship/professional development. All full time faculty are given $1,000.00 in travel money for professional development/service annually. Additional financial support is available for individuals presenting at national and international conferences.
Overall Assessment of Standard

Faculty at CSUSB are provided significant support for scholarly activities and professional development. Faculty engage in research, professional development, and community activities that reflect the tenets of the CF. The university and the unit are recognized for collaborative efforts with local districts, agencies, and communities. Faculty serve their professional organizations at the local, state, national, and international levels. Faculty engage in self-reflection to improve instruction and service to students.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

New AFIs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Recommendation for Standard 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources
The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including
information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 6 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes       No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Leadership and Authority – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Leadership and Authority – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The College of Education (COE) is one of six colleges in the Division of Academic Affairs at CSUSB plus one satellite campus. The unit is administered by a dean, two associate deans and four department chairs. In addition, the Palm Desert Campus is administered by a dean, an associate dean and a director of post graduate education programs. The Division of Teacher Education, including the Student Services Office (SSO), is led by the associate dean and the directors of the Single Subject (SS), Education Specialist (ES) and Multiple Subject (MS) Credential Programs. The advisory body to the Dean of the College of Education is the Cabinet.

The unit’s policies regarding recruiting and admissions are clear and consistent across publications and catalogs. All information is very easily accessible on the university web site and in print form. Accurate and up to date academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading policies, and advertising are easily available as well.

The unit ensures that all candidates have access to student services through the Student Services Office and through a Community Counseling Center. Every candidate who enrolls in a unit program is assigned a faculty advisor who helps the candidate map out a course of study. Policies for each credential and degree program are reviewed each year to address system, campus or unit changes.

A wide range of unit-wide advisory committees and program advisory committees with membership from inside the unit as well as from across the university provide the unit with program design, implementation, feedback, and evaluation.

Of special note is that the associate provost for academic programs chairs the SS Advisory Committee that meets on a quarterly basis and provides systematic collaboration among SS providers. Documents of those meetings show, among other things, increasing movement toward integrated SS credentialing that requires collaboration between the unit and the SS departments. The functions of the SS Advisory Committee are: communication and program articulation and recruitment; and collaborative
development of teacher education subject matter programs. Interviews with unit and SS faculty and deans elicited evidence of ongoing communication about programs and credentialing even outside the committee meetings.

6b. Unit Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Budget – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

For 2007-2008, the unit budget was $7,508,787 which is the same amount as the prior fiscal year. The amount does not include benefits (38% of salary) or trust or foundation accounts. The college generated an additional $4 million in federal and state grants during the fiscal year (2007-2008) and during the 2008-2009 fiscal year the grant total had reached $2.3 by March 2009. For 2007-2008, baseline funding for the unit was the second highest among the colleges per FTE faculty equivalent at $98,804. Supervision costs raise the FTE student cost for the unit to $5,556, highest in the institution.

The opening of the new building in the fall 2008 led to enhancement of all unit programs with new equipment, facilities, and space as well as expanded help with recruitment of students. For the fiscal year (7/1/08 – 6/30/09) vacant faculty lines total $699,588, and as of 1/30/09, approximately $311,000 was subtracted as part of overall budget reductions. Hiring of Single Subject and secondary reading faculty has been halted as a result, and searches remain open for two leadership positions in the unit.

6c. Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The unit maintains policies that provide for the standard workload for full-time tenure-track faculty at 45 weighted teaching units per academic year (three courses per quarter). Full time lecturers (non tenure track) teach 11 classes per year or a combination of courses and clinical supervision.

Some part of a faculty member’s workload (up to 100%) may be “bought out” by a grant requiring part time faculty replacement for the duration of the grant. Documents show that during the 2006-2007 academic year, total reassigned time for research, outreach, grant-funded activities and program coordination equaled 856 weighted teaching units. The unit makes appropriate use of full time and part time faculty so that the unit programs can be delivered with integrity and coherence. A university-wide Tenure Track Committee report has established a goal to reach an FTE faculty to part time faculty ratio
of 75 percent by 2011. Achieving that goal will help to reduce the number of part time faculty and adjuncts that now stands at 134. The number of part time faculty is a direct result of the number of supervisors needed to support the credentialing of candidates. Those supervisors are screened and supported in their work.

Support personnel are sufficient to assist in preparing candidates to meet appropriate standards.

Full time faculty and full time lecturers each have $1000 available for professional development per year. Additional funding is available to assist faculty in travel to conferences where they are presenters both nationally and internationally. Some departments provide funds to faculty for professional materials. Budgets are decentralized across campus. Each new faculty member is provided with a $5,000 technology package. Faculty members are encouraged to be fully engaged as professionals.

6d. Unit Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The new $51 million 128,000 square foot building was opened in the fall of 2008 and houses programs that had been spread across campus. Of the total amount, $2.3 was allocated for furniture, telecommunication equipment and wiring, and other movable accoutrements. Other features of the facility include an office for each full time faculty member, five computer labs, seven conference rooms equipped with CISCO voice conferencing equipment and 28 wireless access points providing 100% wireless network coverage of the building. The Tools for Education Campaign raised $3 million from the community at large. In order to provide maintenance and upgrades for the new facility, the state has allocated $1.2 million annually.

The unit facility supports faculty and candidate use of information technology through $300,000 of technology equipment and software included in the original cost of the facility, and through training for faculty and staff provided by a unit-based IT department. A unit Technology Committee meets monthly to address issues and needs related to technology and technology issues. The Palm Desert facility also has its own IT department.

6e. Unit Resources including Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Resources including Technology – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Resources including Technology – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The university is decentralized and, as a result, the unit is able to allocate resources across programs so that all aspects of the preparation of candidates can be supported and so that the unit’s assessment plan can be carried out.
Each new faculty member receives a $5,000 allocation for technology purchases, and a regular replacement schedule is maintained in the unit.

Candidates have ready access to technology and technology support as they go through their preparation programs. All students have 24 hour access to computer labs throughout the campus.

The College of Education building has classrooms with smart technology including “Polyvision” interactive boards. The unit operates five computer labs with 150+ computer workstations each. All labs are fully equipped with a wide variety of software.

The university geographic coverage area is 27,000 square miles. As a result, there is increasing attention being paid to the delivery of programs through online courses. The university Instructional Technology department plan is that the unit will be the next in line to receive support in expanding its offerings in the area of online resources. The infrastructure in place is sufficient to provide the needed reliability, speed and confidentiality to provide delivery of the system. Documents show that unit use of instruction sessions by the university library provide candidates with information and training in new database systems and other technology in classroom visits as well as in the library itself. Librarians are also available to assist faculty in integrating information literacy skills into their syllabi.

Since the last accreditation, the University has hired an associate vice president for assessment and planning and dean of graduate studies who works closely with unit programs in outcomes assessment. The unit has created an Office of Assessment and Research and hired a senior director and an administrative analyst/specialist who collect and interpret data to meet program and unit needs and respond to various national, state and system requirements.

**Overall Assessment of Standard**

The unit provides the leadership and resources that are necessary to prepare candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. The budget reflects a commitment to the unit’s mission and demonstrates a support structure for faculty involvement in scholarship and professional development opportunities. The unit is the highest funded college out of six in the university with regard to full time student equivalency as a result of supervisor ratios for credentialing. The new facility and the level of technology use are further evidence of commitment to producing a quality product.

**Strengths** [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

**Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**AFIs from last visit: Corrected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Associate Provost for Academic Programs chairs the Single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Collaboration among the colleges, especially in the area of single subject credentialing, is not systematic.

Subject Advisory Committee that meets on a quarterly basis and provides systematic collaboration among Single Subject providers. The functions of the advisory committee are: communication and program articulation and recruitment; and collaborative development of teacher education subject matter programs. Documents show a focus on the functions of the committee.

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

New AFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Recommendation for Standard 6

| Initial Teacher Preparation | Met |
| Advanced Preparation | Met |

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

You may either type the sources of evidence and persons interviewed in the text boxes below or upload files using the prompt at the end of the page.

Documents Reviewed

Please see attached for Document Reviewed.

Persons Interviewed

Please see attached document for Persons Interviewed.

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.
See **Attachments** panel below.

**(Optional) State Addendum:**