INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
SAN BERNARDINO
5500 University Parkway
San Bernardino, CA 92407
5/2/2009-5/6/2009

Type of Visit:
Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation
**OVERVIEW**

This section sets the context for the visit. It should clearly state the mission of the institution. It should also describe the characteristics of the unit and identify and describe any branch campuses, off-campus sites, alternate route programs, and distance learning programs for professional school personnel.

A. Institution

1. What is the institution’s historical context?

Chartered in 1960 by the California Legislature and opened to students in 1965, California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) is one of 23 campuses in the California State University System (CSU), a public, comprehensive university governed by a single Board of Trustees (most are gubernatorial appointments) and serving over 405,000 students supported by 45,000 faculty and staff. It is the second largest public university system in the world. CSUSB’s fall 2007 enrollment was 14176 FTES on the main campus and 629 FTES on the Palm Desert campus. Approximately 25 percent of the enrollment is post baccalaureate.

2. What is the institution’s mission?

Summary
The mission of California State University, San Bernardino is to enhance the intellectual, cultural and personal development of its students. Serving inland Southern California, in one of the fastest growing regions in the nation, the University seeks to serve the educational needs of the region and the state by offering a wide range of academic programs and support services.

California State University, San Bernardino recognizes that one of its strengths is the diversity of the university community. As a result, the University has developed curricula and services that affirm the multiculturalism of this region and show the dignity and values that unite all people.

Faculty, administrators, and staff know, too, that the University serves not just traditional full-time students but others who attend part-time because of responsibilities at home and at work. In fact, because many students begin their higher education elsewhere, the University continually updates its transfer agreements with surrounding colleges and universities. (Complete Text) [http://csusb.edu/president/Vision.html](http://csusb.edu/president/Vision.html)

3. What are the institution’s characteristics [e.g., control and type of institution such as private, land grant, or HBI; location (e.g., urban, rural, or suburban area)]?

Located in Inland Southern California, about 70 miles east of Los Angeles, San Bernardino and the surrounding region including Riverside County, are among the fastest growing areas of the United States. The population of over 4 million includes 86,660 residents added from July 2006 – July 2007. The 27,400 square mile, two-county service area is the largest area served by any of the CSU campuses. Figures from 2005 indicate that the median household income in Riverside County was $52,029 and in San Bernardino County it was $48,761, compared to the state median income of $49,894 (2004 figure). A broad range of socioeconomic and cultural profiles contribute to the diversity of the region and is reflected in the make-up of its school districts, many of them with Latino populations in excess of 50 percent, with a majority of these students being English Learners. The residents of the region are distributed across urban, suburban, rural and isolated desert and mountain communities. San Bernardino County’s Hispanic population size is ranked among the top five in the state. The county is among the leaders in population growth of African Americans among counties with at least 50,000 African Americans. There is a significant and rapidly growing Asian immigrant population.

California Post Secondary Education Commission (CPEC) from 2005 indicate a decline in the college going rate in both San Bernardino and Riverside Counties in the prior two years with both counties falling considerably below the state average of 43.4% and being part of the lower 30 percent of California’s 68 counties. (Data retrieved from CPEC Website, California Context) The region has an ever-increasing population of site-and time-bound students.

4. (Optional) Links and key exhibits related to the institutional context could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members can access other exhibits in the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

B. The unit

1. How many candidates are enrolled in programs preparing them to work in P-12 schools at the following levels: initial teacher preparation, advanced teacher preparation, and other school professionals?

Currently, we have a total enrollment of 1,888 candidates. Eight hundred fifty-three (853) of these are enrolled in initial preparation programs, which is 45% of the total enrollment. Six hundred twenty-five (625) are enrolled in advanced preparation programs for teachers, representing 33% of the total. The programs for other education professionals enroll 410 candidates, which is 22% of the total, with 12 of those in the education doctoral program. The historical information on programs [http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COEProgramHistory.pdf](http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COEProgramHistory.pdf), with dates of implementation, is attached. Further details regarding programs are in tables 2 and 3 referenced below.

1a. (Optional) A table with these data could be attached here. A summary of what the data tell the unit about its candidates should be included in the response to B1a above.

2. Please complete the following table (Table 1) to indicate the size of the professional education faculty.

| Table 1 Professional Education Faculty and Graduate Teaching Assistants |  |  |
2. (Substitute Table 1) If the titles for academic ranks at your institution do not match the table above, a substitute table reflecting your titles could be attached here.

Table 1

See Attachments panel below.

3. What do the data in above table (Table 1) tell the unit about its faculty?

The data in Table 1 indicate that the full time faculty in the unit are primarily at the senior level, most of them tenured. They also indicate that we have a sizable cadre of full time and part time non-tenure track faculty. Of the 82 full time faculty in the COE, 57% are full professors; if the faculty who are fulltime in the institution but part time in the unit are considered, the figure is 54%. Eighteen percent (18%) are fulltime lecturers who are not on the tenure track. The 134 part time faculty include clinical supervisors, a number of whom may supervise only two or three candidates in any given quarter due to the large geographical spread of our field sites. Many part time faculty, as noted in Table 11 [http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Table11_001.pdf], are clinical faculty with workloads that equate to less than one course each. The need for such a large cadre stems in part from the reassigned time used by full time faculty to carry out leadership, service or grant-funded activities. Graduate assistants do not have any teaching or supervisory responsibilities in the unit. The College has been able to hire a number of faculty in recent years at the associate or full professor levels, so rank does not indicate in all cases longevity. Nevertheless, some retirements will occur over a relatively brief time span or a number of faculty may opt for the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) if it continues to be offered by The CSU.

4. Please complete the following table (Table 2) to indicate the programs offered at your institution at the initial teacher preparation level.

Table 2

Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and Their Review Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Award Level (e.g., Bachelor's or Master's)</th>
<th>Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted</th>
<th>Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents)</th>
<th>Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)</th>
<th>State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)</th>
<th>Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Subject</td>
<td>Credential</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Yes/Approved</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Nationally Recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Subject</td>
<td>Credential</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Yes/Approved</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Nationally Recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Credential</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Yes/Approved</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Nationally Recognized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What do the data in above table (Table 2) tell the unit about its initial teacher preparation programs?

We offer the Multiple Subjects (MS), Single Subjects (SS) and Education Specialist (ES) Credentials for the first license to teach. From the data in Table 2, we observe the following about our three initial programs: The comparative sizes of the programs have not changed recently with multiple subjects having the largest enrollment of the three programs and ES the smallest. The numbers in the MS and SS programs have declined, however, and ES numbers have increased. This is due in part to the changing population statistics as well as the decision in California not to continue with the class size reduction program. The ES Program, on the other hand, has grown as new approaches to teaching learners with exceptionalities are developed and districts provide more resources for special needs students. The three programs are approved by the State and were recognized by NCATE in 2002, the first time that we sought NCATE review.

6. Please complete the following table (Table 3) to indicate the advanced programs offered at your institution for the advanced preparation of licensed teachers and other school professionals.

Table 3

Advanced Preparation Programs and Their Review Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Award Level (e.g., Master's or Doctorate)</th>
<th>Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted</th>
<th>Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents)</th>
<th>Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)</th>
<th>State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)</th>
<th>Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credential Only Adapted P.E.</td>
<td>Credential</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Yes/Approved</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Edu Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual/Cross Cultural Education</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career &amp; Technical</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional &amp; Alternative</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>State WASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic &amp; Integrative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>State WASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Technology Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>State WASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESOL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>State WASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>State WASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>State WASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>MA in Teaching (Math)</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>State WASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Language Arts Credential/MA in Education: Reading/Language Arts</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>State WASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other School Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>State WASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Administrative Services Credential (Tier 1) MA, Educational Administration</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>State WASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Administrative Services Credential (Tier 2)</td>
<td>Credential</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>State WASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology PPS Credential</td>
<td></td>
<td>Credential</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>State WASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School counseling PPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Credential/Advanced</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>State WASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership (Ed.D.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>WASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What do the data in above table (Table 3) tell the unit about its advanced programs?
The unit offers one advanced program for licensed teachers which is a credential only (Adapted Physical Education), nine options within the M.A. in Education, one M.A.T. (math), and a combination M.A. option and credential in reading/language arts. Programs for other school professionals include two master’s degree/credential combinations (MA in Ed. Admin/Admin. Services) and MS in Counseling and Guidance/School Counseling); the School Psychology Credential and the Educational Leadership Programs (Ed.D.) with a total enrollment of 410 which is 29% of enrollment in the unit. Most candidates who have the option to do so pursue the MA/ or MS/credential combination. This history of our programs, referenced above, is indicative of the changing legislative landscape in California that has required adjustments to credential programs over the years. It also reflects the responsiveness of the Unit faculty in meeting identified educational needs in the region. The continuing expansion and fine-tuning of M.A. degree options is a clear example of the latter. We are proud to have been in the first group of CSU campuses authorized to offer the doctorate in educational leadership and to have received approval from WASC to do so. This is yet another example of our ability to respond to educational needs in the region.

8. What programs are offered off-campus or via distance learning technologies? What alternate route programs are offered?
The College of Education and the university as a whole are committed to serving the needs of site-and time-bound students. To serve our population effectively, all programs in the Unit are available after 4:00 in the afternoon to full- and part-time students, and at various times over the years, programs have been available at off-campus sites provided at the College of Education (Instructional Technology, Career and Technical Education, Reading/Language Arts) and the Level II Education Specialist Programs were approved by WASC to offer the programs with more than 50% on-line. Most notable among the off-site offerings are the programs at CSUSB’s Palm Desert Campus. Established 19 years ago to serve upper division, post baccalaureate and master’s students, the campus is now in the process of acquiring permanent, privately funded facilities. The Campus currently serves 127.8 full-time equivalent students (FTES) in professional education programs. In 1999, a second center opened to serve the High Desert communities. Housed on the campus of Victor Valley College, the program received initial multiple- year funding through a U. S. Department of Education Title V grant for Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs). Until this year when low enrollments caused them to go on hiatus, the Multiple Subjects Credential and Administrative Services credential programs were offered at the site. We do not offer any alternate route programs.

9. (Continuing Visit Only) What substantive changes have taken place in the unit since the last visit (e.g., added/dropped programs/degrees; significant increase/decrease in enrollment; major reorganization of the unit, etc.)? (These change could be compiled from those reported in Part C of the AACTE/NCATE annual reports since the last visit.)
As outlined in the attached table, a number of important programmatic and organizational changes have taken place in the unit since the last accreditation. In the College of Education, the Education Specialist Department was dissolved and the Education Specialist credential coordinator position became a director position in the Division of Teacher Education. An Office of Research and Assessment was created and staff hired, and the student services functions of advising, recruiting and credential processing were merged to create a new Student Services Office within the Teacher Education Division. New programs include those in Educational Leadership (Ed.D.) and the M.A.in Education Option in Correctional and Alternative Education. Enhanced programs include the M.A. Core which now has a director, the M.S. in Counseling and Guidance and the M.A...
Option in Instructional Technology. Four advanced programs for teachers received WASC authorization to offer the programs 50% on line. In the Multiple (MS) and Single Subjects (SS) Programs, candidates now have the option to attend school fulltime and complete a degree and a credential in four years. Finally, in several programs through the entire unit, there has been an increased emphasis on assessment and on adapting instruction to meet the needs of all students. This has taken place in a variety of ways: with specific changes/additions to courses, with modifications at the program level, through faculty research and grants and via professional development opportunities for faculty.

Changing staff needs and student populations in the region’s school districts, an increase in the number of institutions offering weekend and “fast track” programs for credential candidates, class size reduction policies and changes at the state level offering alternative pathways to some credentials have affected enrollment patterns in the College of Education during the past decade. These changes have included major spurts in enrollment growth as well as significant downturns in some programs. The enrollment in the College of Education nearly doubled between academic years 1995-1996 and 2000-2001 with the highest percentage of growth occurring in Educational Administration, Elementary Education, Reading Education, and Secondary Education. In the same period, the percent of FTES in the University represented by Education enrollments climbed from 11.7% in 1995-96 to 16.1% in 2000-2001. Since the peak year of 2002-03 with 2,209 annualized FTES, full-time equivalent enrollment declined slightly in 2003-04 by 5% but most sharply in 2004-05 by 24% from the previous year (due in part to a lack of state supported summer session that year). Since that time, the decline has been about 2% per year with a leveling off to where between 2006-07 and 2007-08 FTES was essentially unchanged. The COE hired a full time recruiter to address the need for more science, math and Education Specialist teachers. Individual programs have developed systematic recruitment efforts. Increased communication between COE faculty and academic departments with Commission approved programs should result in more graduates remaining at CSUSB to pursue a credential.

The table provides evidence that faculty and staff in the unit are attuned to the needs of the region that we serve, that we consider feedback from the field when making programmatic decisions, and that we heed the changes envisioned and recommended by our various accrediting bodies to enhance the quality of our programs.

10. (Optional) Links and key exhibits related to the unit context could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members can access other exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This section provides an overview of the unit's conceptual framework(s). The overview should include a brief description of the framework(s) and its development.

1. Briefly summarize the following elements of the unit's conceptual framework:
   - the vision and mission of the unit
   - philosophy, purposes, goals, and institutional standards of the unit
   - knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit
   - candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology, that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards
   - summarized description of the unit's assessment system

a. the vision and mission of the unit

The College of Education at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB), is dedicated to the development and support of wise, reflective teachers and other education professionals with substantial knowledge of their disciplines and dedicated to educating students who will work toward a just and diverse society that embraces democratic principles. Possessing powerful pedagogical, procedural and practical knowledge, these educators respect a variety of viewpoints and exhibit an ethic of care and concern for their students and professional colleagues. Community members, students and all educators are engaged in a reciprocal learning process. They are, in effect, learners working collaboratively to make sense of the world that surrounds them.

The Mission of the College of Education at California State University, San Bernardino is to prepare education and human service professionals for lives of leadership, service and continual growth through the development of programs and courses that transform individuals and the community. Our core beliefs in:
• the dignity and inherent worth of all people,
• diversity and multiple perspectives as essential, treasured assets,
• a collaborative teaching/learning community,
• the crucial leadership role of education professionals in promoting positive social change, fostering human development, achieving social justice, and promoting human rights
form the foundation for our work. In collaboration with university and P-12 colleagues, clients, students, alumni and the community-at-large, we apply our values and beliefs in responding to evolving needs and priorities in the schools, agencies and communities of the region we serve.

Adopted by the College faculty and staff and approved by Dean Patricia Arlin, April 22, 2008 (Complete text of Mission Statement http://csusb.edu/coe/mission_statement.htm)

b. philosophy, purposes, goals, and institutional standards of the unit

The Conceptual Framework http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Conceptual_Framework_001.pdf describes our commitment to a definition of education as an ongoing developmental process that embraces a core set of principles based on studies of wisdom and exemplary teaching that incorporate, but are not limited to,
• national, state and discipline-based educational standards.
• A commitment to diversity and to preparing professional educators to work with diverse populations are at the heart of the Institutional Standards, the University Mission and the College of Education Mission as noted throughout our response to each NCATE and CCTC Common Standard.

The five characteristics of the wise professional educator outlined below serve as our institutional standards.
Wise educators possess rich subject matter knowledge. They have a structural understanding of their discipline’s concepts, procedural knowledge and skills, and understand the interactions and place of their discipline within the context of other disciplines and society.
Wise educators apply sound judgment to professional practice and conduct. Within their discipline they are able to integrate theory and practice and know how to represent and explain their discipline in ways that make that subject matter understandable to students, clients, or other adults. Additionally, their actions demonstrate a strong commitment to ethical, responsible, and professional behavior.
Wise educators apply a practical knowledge of context. They know, understand, and act appropriately related to the specific contexts that result in the implicit
understandings brought to the educational setting by the learner/recipient. Wise educators respect multiple viewpoints and priorities of their peers, students, clients and communities. They strive to understand the values of the various individuals and groups with whom they interact and make a concerted effort to incorporate knowledge of and sensitivity to those values into all professional decisions.

Wise educators reflect on their professional practices and follow up with appropriate action. They are comfortable and flexible when making professional decisions, drawing on their experiences and knowledge of their students/clients. Using reflective strategies and formal and informal assessments of their work, wise educators make necessary adaptations to meet the needs of students/clients.

c. knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit

Certain developmental and learning theories inform the shared vision of the College and its various departments and programs. These theories support the view that learners, through experience and interaction with others across time, actively construct and reconstruct knowledge in order to create meaning. At the heart of the College’s shared vision is the belief that teaching, learning and development are intimately integrated and that university faculty are themselves active learners alongside students. Developing as a wise professional educator implies a lifelong commitment to continual engagement in the process of teacher/leader as learner. The description of the wise professional educator is grounded in the developmental psychology of wisdom studies; (Baltes and Smith, 1990; Staudinger, Maciel, Smith and Baltes 1998; Baltes and Staudinger, 2000; Baltes and Kunzmann, 2004; GIA1/4ck and Baltes, 2006). The application of these studies contributes to the concept of the wise teacher (Arlin 1990, 1999) and exemplary teachers (Collison 1996). Recently the discussion has turned to the relationship between intelligence and wisdom (Sternberg and Jordan, 2006). Brown and Green (2006) describe five key categories in their analysis and one crucial “core” category they name the “learning from life” process. They define this process as “self-knowledge, understanding of others, judgment, knowledge, life skills and willingness to learn.” In this tradition the College of Education faculty strive to prepare professional educators who are life-long learners who are constantly engaged in “learning from life”, learning from their teaching and from their students and who become wise in the process.

d. candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology, that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards

The alignment table [http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/MasterComposite-AlignmentTable_000.pdf] provides the standards alignment for all programs with proficiencies in diversity and technology. The diversity proficiencies [http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/ProficienciesRelatedtoDiversity4a_1_001.pdf] are also listed by program in Standard Four. At the time of the initial NCATE accreditation, the Conceptual Framework was relatively new and not sufficiently infused into courses and programs. The Institutional Standards drawn from the Framework are now evident in course and program design and clearly tied to NCATE standards. Candidate proficiencies are linked to state, NCATE and institutional standards as well as to professional association standards where applicable. We can claim that we prepare “wise professional educators” only when our candidates embody the characteristics described in the five tenets of the Framework and demonstrate successfully the proficiencies described in the alignment table and in Standards One and Four.

e. summarized description of the unit’s assessment system

The Unit Assessment System [http://www.csusb.edu/coe/ncate/documents/unitassessments TIMELINE09.pdf] is designed around three components: the Conceptual Framework, including institutional standards; program evaluation; and a program reporting and documentation process. The latter incorporates program evaluations which summarize program strengths, areas of need, and use of data for program improvement in Annual Program Reports. All programs are guided by the institutional standards which align with program, state and/or national standards. Program faculty review candidate performance data, candidate, alumni and employer surveys, and advisory group feedback, all of which is summarized in an annual program report. In the annual reports, the specific use and/or implementation of the data and feedback are explained. Following review of each annual program report by the appropriate associate dean or chair, the associate deans draft a Unit Assessment Report for review by the Unit Assessment Committee which makes recommendations to be considered at the annual Cabinet Retreat. This facilitates the development of unit goals and informs the allocation of financial and human resources. Program faculty review program reports and unit goals to establish individual program goals for the ensuing year. The Director of the Office of Research and Assessment also provides trend analysis and other support to programs. A major strength of the assessment system lies in the involvement of individual faculty members as well as those in leadership positions. By following a carefully constructed calendar and step-by-step process, program and unit improvements are ongoing throughout each academic year.

The California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) [http://www.ctc.ca.gov/ctcprep/TPA-files/TPEs-ETS-salient.pdf] are the core elements of the College’s clinical assessment of candidate performance in initial programs. The Standards are also addressed within other programs for professional educators as appropriate. They are in a sense precursors to the five dimensions of the wise professional educator and our Conceptual Framework. Organized around six interrelated categories of teaching practice, these standards can be readily mapped onto institutional standards, NCATE Standards, and the Interstate New Teacher/education professional Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards.

A. Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students
B. Assessing Student Learning
C. Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning
D. Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students
E. Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning
F. Developing as a Professional Educator

The Teacher Performance Expectations, stemming from the CSTP, were developed as part of California legislation (SB 2042) [http://info.sen.ca.gov/pub/97- 98/bill/sen/sb_2001-2050/sb_2042_cfa_19980707_113958_asm_comm.html] and they are directly linked to the Teacher Performance Assessments (TPAs) [http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/TPA-files/CalTPA-general-info.pdf] described in Standard 2. Candidate progress with respect to the institutional standards is assessed at each level of the individual’s professional development. During the supervised portion of initial programs, candidates must complete successfully the TPAs in order to earn the credential. Coursework and field experience, evaluation of performance during clinical practice, as well as support and assessment as a new teacher or other education professional are grounded in the TPAs or in comparable program, state and/or professional association standards for those in advanced programs and programs for other professionals. This completes the assessment loop by making sure that candidate, program and unit progress are considered simultaneously and are mutually influential.

1a. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to the conceptual framework could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

2. (Continuing Visits Only) What changes have been made to the conceptual framework since the previous visit?

Faculty, external constituents and students have had ongoing opportunities to review and comment as the College collects information to be used in the unit evaluation and to revise the Framework as needed. Although there have been no substantive changes to the Framework, the tenets (institutional standards) contained therein were clarified by changing some of the language based upon suggestions from external advisory committee members, candidates and faculty in 2004-2005. New references have been incorporated to reflect more recent relevant scholarship, and the NCATE leadership team has provided additional examples of how the Conceptual Framework relates not only to classroom teachers but to all education professionals. We also re-wrote the Mission Statement of the College...
to address more directly the institutional standards.

3. (First Visits Only) How was the conceptual framework developed and who was involved in its development?

STANDARDS

This section is the focus of the institutional report. A description of how the unit meets each standard element must be presented. Significant differences among programs should be described as the response is written for each element under subheadings of initial teacher preparation, advanced teacher preparation, and other school professionals. Links to key exhibits to support the descriptions may be included in the text for each standard.

STANDARD 1: CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical content knowledge, 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. What content knowledge tests are used for the purpose of state licensure and/or program completion? If the state has a licensure test for content, what is the overall pass rate? What programs do have an 80% or above pass rate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>% of Test Takers</th>
<th>Overall Pass Rate for the Unit (across all initial teacher preparation programs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CSET and CBEST: Title II Results: Passage of the California Subject Matter Exams for Teachers (CSET) is required for all Multiple Subject (MS) program applicants. Single Subject (SS) and Special Education (ES) candidates may demonstrate subject matter expertise either through passage of the appropriate CSET or through completion of a state-approved undergraduate subject matter degree for teachers. Teacher candidates are also required to pass the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) prior to admission to the supervision phases of their experience. Recently, due to redundancy of the two exams, the state waived this requirement if the candidates have taken and passed the writing section of the CSET. Pass rates for both the CSET and the CBEST are 100% for all candidates, indicating initial teacher candidates have mastered the content knowledge required for state licensure and/or program completion. (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Table4ContentLicensurePassRates.pdf)

Teacher Performance Assessment/Teacher Performance Expectations: As of July 1, 2008, state law required passage of the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) for all MS and SS teacher credential candidates. This four-task assessment assesses all Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) required by the state. The TPA is administered over the course of the program and while the purpose of the tasks is not to directly assess content knowledge, content knowledge does serve as a knowledge foundation of the areas related to pedagogical content; as such, we reference it here. CSUSB has several years of data from three of the four TPA tasks due to our piloting of the assessments prior to the state law requirement. A state-wide pass rate has not yet been established; however, the state requires a score of 12 out of 16 for passage with no task score lower than two. Our campus requires a passing score of three out of four on all tasks; results reveal candidates score three or greater on all tasks thus indicating initial teacher candidates have mastered the content knowledge required for state licensure and/or program completion (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Table4ContentLicensurePassRates.pdf).

2. Please complete the following table (Table 4) to indicate pass rates on content licensure tests program by program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate). (This information could be compiled from Title II data submitted to the state or program reports prepared for national review.)

**Table 4**

Pass Rates on Content Licensure Tests for Initial Teacher Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th># of Test Takers</th>
<th>% Passing at State Cut Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Pass Rate for the Unit (across all initial teacher preparation programs)</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Subject</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Subject</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What do the data in the above table (Table 4) tell the unit about the content knowledge of initial teacher candidates?

Pass Rates on Content Licensure Tests (CSET & CBEST) for initial teacher candidates reveals 100% of our candidates have mastered the content knowledge required for state licensure and/or program completion (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Table4ContentLicensurePassRates.pdf).

Teacher candidates meet subject matter requirements prior to admission to the program due to CSU policy (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Table4ContentLicensurePassRates.pdf). This assures admitted candidates truly have the required subject matter knowledge prior to in-depth study of pedagogy. In the past, some candidates completed credential courses only to find themselves stalled by the subject matter exams. The CSU’s policy prevents candidates from loss of tuition and time by requiring they meet the subject matter requirement before entering credential coursework. We make CSET preparation workshops (http://rimspi.csusb.edu/ss_schedule.htm) available to applicants, and we also have an Exceptional Admit Process (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/ExceptionalAdmits.pdf) for candidates who have taken the CSET and are close to a passing score. Candidates who graduate from our undergraduate subject matter programs complete coursework aligned with the standards assessed by CSET. Applicants within undergraduate integrated programs must complete subject matter requirements prior to admission to the supervision phase of their programs as required by CSU policy for integrated programs.

4. What data from other key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? (Institutions that have submitted programs for national review or a similar state review are
required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed.)

Admission GPA. All candidates seeking admission to the University must have maintained a 2.5 undergraduate GPA or seek special permission and have a GPA of 2.67 (overall) or 2.75 (last 60 semester units) for admission to post-baccalaureate credential programs. Our candidates meet this requirement (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdmitGPAInitialCred06-08.pdf), thus demonstrating the ability to learn content knowledge. Applicants with low admission GPA consult with program directors and are typically admitted if they met the subject matter requirement through examination. The program director completes a Graduate Decision Form (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/GradDecisionForm.pdf) identifying additional requirements.

Writing Proficiency: Initial teacher candidates present evidence of writing proficiency by passing the writing portion of either the CBEST or CSET. This is verified by Student Services’ admissions staff, and there is no exception.

Proficiency in Oral English: MS, SS, and ES Mild/Moderate candidates complete a faculty-conducted admission interview for admission during which candidates’ proficiency in oral language is assessed. If concerns are noted, the candidate may be advised to seek assistance and the potential issue is recorded. Concerns for proficiency in oral language have been almost non-existent.

Supervision: Initial teacher candidates are evaluated by their university supervisors and field teachers. During supervision phases, candidates are evaluated on their classroom teaching performance (Evaluation Instruments: Exhibit 1a4.1). University supervisors and resident teachers formatively and summatively assess candidates’ professional and pedagogical content knowledge as they review written lesson plans, observe implementation of lessons over time, and conference with the students. Candidates cannot complete their program or attain a credential without a passing rating in supervision.

Content knowledge is a foundation of the content pedagogy assessed. Analysis of candidate performance in clinical experience (making subject matter comprehensible) reveals candidates in MS and SS intern programs clearly demonstrate content knowledge (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldworkMSandSS07-08.pdf). Clinical experience results for ES candidates indicate no areas of concern (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldworkESResults.pdf).

CSU Exit Survey Data: All MS, SS, and ES candidates complete this survey during their last quarter. It is an online survey maintained by the CSU. Unfortunately, results are not aggregated across programs or CSU campuses to allow for comparisons. During our test piloting, we have noted some methodological concerns with administration and results reporting; and although data is available in the exhibit room, we will not include it here as we do not have complete confidence in the results. Beginning Fall 2009, the CSU will no longer maintain this survey; however, our campus will revise this survey and with resources and support provided by our dean, we will continue to administer this survey as we believe the feedback from candidates will assist in program improvement and development.

CSU Follow-up Survey Data: Due to the unique quality of this survey, it is included here, rather than within 1a6. The CSU conducts an annual survey, matching results for employing supervisors and initial teacher candidates at the end of their first year of teaching. Thus, the department chair or administrator responds to questions of preparation regarding actual named teacher(s) he or she has observed during the first year of teaching. We have ten years worth of data available in the exhibit room. All initial teacher candidates are requested to participate; our response rate across years ranges from 31% to 53% (at or above the CSU average). A CSU committee aligned survey items to all NCATE Standard 1 components, including content knowledge. Aligned results are available for three years (2005-07). The data is combined across all three years and disaggregated to allow for comparison of CSUSB student teacher, intern, and SS graduates. Results reveal our graduates and their employers rate our candidates adequately to well prepared in their subject areas thus demonstrating content knowledge (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CSUFollowUpSurveyAlignedContent.pdf). A content knowledge related improvement area of focus has been teaching reading across the curriculum (included under pedagogical content knowledge).

COE Candidate Survey: Candidates enrolled in COE programs are surveyed biennially (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COECandidateSurvey06_08.pdf). Items include a review of subject matter preparation. Results indicate initial teaching candidates rate their programs effective to very effective in addressing content knowledge (subject matter knowledge, writing well, critical thinking and problem solving) (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COECandidateSurveyContent06-08.pdf). No discrepancies found across programs or the SB campus and PDC.

In conclusion, data from key assessments indicates initial teacher candidates demonstrate content knowledge as required by professional, state, and institutional standards. Admission requirements provide rigor in assuring candidates are able to learn and understand content knowledge. The writing and oral English proficiency requirements provide additional verification of ability. Coursework, clinical practice, and minimum GPA requirements ensures candidates learn content knowledge. Follow-up feedback rates our candidates as demonstrating content knowledge. Additionally, candidates believe their coursework advances their content knowledge and prepares them to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

4a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to content knowledge of initial teacher candidates could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about content knowledge should be discussed in the response to 1a4 above.

5. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teaching candidates demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? (Institutions that have submitted advanced teaching programs for national review or a similar state review are required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed.)

Writing Requirement: According to CSUSB policy, all graduate candidates must comply with the (http://gradstudies.csusb.edu/writingreq.html). This may be accomplished by earning a B or better in an expository writing course at CSUSB, passing the Writing Requirement Examination (WREE) or presenting evidence of graduate level writing proficiency. The majority of candidates elect to meet this requirement via coursework (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdvancedProgramGraduateWriting2006-08_000.pdf). This demonstrates candidates will be able to succeed in courses designed to promote in-depth content knowledge.

GPA Requirements: Advanced programs require demonstration of subject matter competency through attainment of a basic credential and in some cases, teaching experience. Three MA programs (no credential) are an exception due to the nature of those programs, which prepare candidates for positions other than within schools (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdvancedProgramAdmissionRequirements.pdf). Admission requirements include an undergraduate GPA of 2.5 within the last 90 quarter units and a cumulative GPA of 3.0 in all education courses.

GPA for NCATE Aligned Content: All courses must be completed with a minimum GPA of 3.0 (B) or better with no grade lower than a C in most courses and a B in designated subjects. GPA’s from courses aligned with content knowledge (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/NCATEAlignedCoursesStd1_000.pdf) reveals the minimum requirement is exceeded, thus candidates demonstrate content knowledge (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdvancedProgGPAforContent2006-08_000.pdf). No discrepancies were found across programs. Course syllabi, assignment descriptions, scoring guides and key assignment work samples will be in each program’s exhibit files.

MA Core Sequence Survey: Candidates complete common core courses in Research and Educational Foundations designed to develop knowledge and skills in research (EDUC 663), foundations of American education (EDUC 695), and thinking, writing, and speaking skills (EDUC 603). Candidates complete a comprehensive review of their preparation. The annual MA Core Sequence survey indicates candidates believe their involvement in the MA Core Sequence courses has led to their learning of content knowledge (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/MACoreNCATEAligned200508.pdf). Candidates in the
2005-06 survey identified difficulty learning to write abstracts and executive summaries. This feedback led to specifically addressing this issue and ratings improved in 2007-08.

Comprehensive Exam and Thesis/Project: Several programs include a comprehensive exam option (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/NCATEMapThesisorComp_000.pdf). While content knowledge may not be the emphasis, it is foundational to instruction, assessment and is required for synthesis and integration. Results of pass rates indicate the majority of candidates successfully pass, indicating these candidates demonstrate content knowledge; however, pass rates for ES are of concern.

(http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdvProgramCompPassRate2006-08.pdf). Analysis of item responses identifies content weaknesses to be addressed. If a candidate does not pass an exam question(s), there is some variation in program remediation. However, in general, the candidate meets with the program coordinator. Upon a first failure, the program coordinator approves a retake; approval after a second failure requires the dean of Graduate Studies' approval.

Thesis/project results have led to program changes (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/MAThesisProjectResults06-08.pdf). Many candidates were changing the exam or had lengthy completion times. For example, the Holistic and Integrative program incorporated literature reviews to an earlier class so candidates were better prepared. This aided candidates to complete the thesis/project in less time and resulted in fewer students switching to the exam option.

COE Candidate Survey: Advanced program candidates consistently rated their coursework and program as effective to very effective in preparing them in the area of content knowledge (subject matter knowledge, writing well and critical thinking and problem solving) in our biennial candidate survey (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COECandidateSurveyContent06-08.pdf). No discrepancies in ratings were found across programs or the SB campus and PDC.

In conclusion, key assessments indicate advanced teaching candidates demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the content required by professional, state, and institutional standards. Admission requirements provide rigor in assuring candidates hold content knowledge. Content knowledge is the foundation for further study; coursework addresses instructional strategies, monitor content knowledge in the context of instruction. The minimum GPA requirement, comprehensive exams and thesis/projects provide another assessment. Additionally, candidates rate their coursework as advancing content knowledge.

5a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to content knowledge of advanced teacher candidates could be attached here. What was the response rate?

6. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in the content area? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

CSU Follow-up Survey Data: Results reported in Section 1a-4 due to strength of this survey.

Program Advisory Boards/Follow-up Studies: Results of follow-up studies and meetings with advisory boards/groups for advanced program candidates are reported within program annual reports. No concerns related to content knowledge have been reported, with the exception of writing ability which has been an improvement goal for several advanced programs, especially in the area of professional writing.

CSUSB Five-year Alumni Survey: The overall response rate for all programs on campus was 22%. The majority of advanced program graduates rated their coursework and program at CSUSB effective to very effective in preparing them in content knowledge (writing well, speaking effectively, critical thinking and problem solving skills, and using mathematical tools), thus indicating our graduates are satisfied with their preparation in the area of content knowledge (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CSUSBAlumniSurveyContent07.pdf).

7. A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to content knowledge could be attached here.

8. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to the content knowledge of teacher candidates could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

Subject Matter Workshops

See Attachments panel below.

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

Note: In this section, institutions must address both (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.

1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the pedagogical content knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? (Institutions that have submitted programs for national review or a similar state review are required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed.)

GPA for NCATE Aligned Pedagogy Content: Initial teacher preparation programs include courses which build upon undergraduate content coursework and relate content knowledge with pedagogy. Methods courses relate content to specific instructional methods. During methods courses, candidates write lesson plans, do presentations, and complete field and/or clinical practice assignments to demonstrate their ability to plan instruction which reflects accurate content and appropriate pedagogy. Candidates must maintain a B average in all credential coursework and can receive no individual course grade less than a B-. This provides one indicator of appropriate attainment of pedagogical content knowledge and skills as assessed within classes. GPAs from initial courses aligned with pedagogy content (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/NCATEAlignedCourseInitialPrograms_000.pdf) reveal initial teacher candidates exceed the minimum accepted GPA, thus indicating initial candidates demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge required by professional, state, and institutional standards (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/InitialProgramGPAPedagogyContent2006-08.pdf). Course syllabi, assignment descriptions, scoring guides and work samples on key assignments can be found in each program's exhibit files.

Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA): MS and ES candidates are required to pass the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) before they can be recommended for licensure. Candidates are encouraged to take the exam toward the end of their program, after completing preparatory coursework. Our pass rate as reported in Title II is 97-100% which demonstrates CSUSB initial teacher candidates are well prepared to teach reading (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/RICAPassRatesfor200507.pdf). ES candidates have a 100% pass rate with the exception of one quarter at PDC in which the intern pass rate was 95%. MS candidates exhibit more variability in their pass rate, but through the years, overall pass rate has continued to range from 97-100%.
Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE): Three TPEs specifically capture pedagogical content knowledge and skills for MS and SS candidates: TPE 1: Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction; TPE 4: Making Content Accessible; and TPE 9: Instructional Planning. Candidates develop knowledge and skills in these areas throughout course and clinical practice as indicated in the MS program, for example, in the TPE by Coursework Chart (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/TPEbyCourse.pdf).

We are very proud of our analysis of the TPE has garnered the attention of both the CSU and the state. Presently the CSU and state require only a total score for reporting TPE results; however, we have found providing scores for each TPE to be more informative and psychometrically sound. By providing individual TPE scores, we more accurately assess candidates’ strengths and weaknesses on each task, and develop appropriate plans for improvement where necessary. This option is lost when reporting only a total score to represent performance on each TPA task.

We report results by both the related TPEs and also “Performance Dimensions” as measured by the TPA (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/TPAEIAlignedvNCATEFall200807.pdf). Our exploratory study has revealed the performance dimensions are more trustworthy measures. Pass rates for the TPA are excellent, and no pedagogical content areas of concern have been noted, indicating our initial teaching candidates demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge required by professional, state, and institutional standards.

Supervised Clinical Practices: Similar to the TPA, clinical supervision assesses MS and SS candidates across state-mandated TPEs. A supervision evaluation instrument with TPEs aligned with NCATE Pedagogy Content (making subject matter comprehensible, engaging and supporting students) was piloted in 2006-07 for MS and SS candidates (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldworkMSandSSPedContent0607.pdf). Although results revealed MS and SS intern initial teacher candidates clearly demonstrated pedagogical content required by professional, state, and institutional standards, the evaluation instrument was modified for use based on feedback received from the program directors and to ease implementation and data interpretation. Results based on the revised evaluation form continued to reveal MS and SS candidates are well prepared in pedagogical content knowledge and skills, with no areas of concern noted (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldworkMSandSSPedContent07-08.pdf). Similarly, supervision results for ES candidates indicate no areas of concern and (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldworkESResults.pdf).

COE Candidate Survey: Initial teacher candidates have consistently rated their coursework and program as effective to very effective in preparing them to meet pedagogical content expectations (pedagogical skills and judgment, practical knowledge of context/culture, and developing sensitivity to peers, students, and clients), thus demonstrating acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge and skills required by professional, state, and institutional standards (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COECandidateSurveyPedagogyContent06-08.pdf). No discrepancies in candidate ratings were found across programs or the San Bernardino campus and the Palm Desert campus.

In conclusion, data from key assessments indicates initial teacher candidates demonstrate the pedagogical content knowledge and skills as required by professional, state, and institutional standards. Maintaining the minimum required GPA, successfully completing coursework, passing RICA, and passing the TPA ensure candidates learn pedagogical content knowledge and skills. Supervised field assessments reveal candidates are using these skills in their classrooms. Additionally, candidates themselves believe their coursework advances their level of pedagogical content knowledge and skills and prepares them to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills of initial teacher candidates could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about pedagogical content knowledge and skills should be discussed in the response to 1b1 above.

2. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teaching candidates know and apply theories related to pedagogy and learning, including the use of a range of instructional strategies and the ability to explain the choices they make in their practice. (Institutions that have submitted advanced teaching programs for national review or a similar state review are required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed.)

GPA for NCATE Aligned Pedagogical Content: GPAs from courses aligned to the preparation of pedagogical content knowledge and skills (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/NCATEAlignedCoursesStd1_000.pdf) is well above the required overall 3.0 GPA, thus demonstrating advanced program candidates successfully know and apply theories related to pedagogy and learning (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdvancedPrepGPAPedContent2006-08_001.pdf). No discrepancies were found across programs. Course syllabi, assignment descriptions, scoring guides and work samples on key assignments can be found in each program’s exhibit files (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CoursesandAssignmentsNCATEAlignedStandard1_000.pdf).

Comprehensive Exam and Thesis/Project: Advanced program comprehensive exam pass rates indicate the majority of advanced program candidates do not show weakness related to knowing and applying theories related to pedagogy and learning; however, pass rates for ES candidates are of concern (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdvProgramCompPassRate2006-08.pdf). Several advanced programs include a comprehensive exam option (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/NCATEMAProgThesisComp000.pdf). Successfully completing an MA thesis/project ensures advanced program candidates know and are able to apply theories related to pedagogy and learning (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/MAThesisProjectResults06-08.pdf). Through successful completion of either the comprehensive exam or a thesis/project, advanced program candidates have demonstrated an awareness of various instructional strategies, the ability to choose the most appropriate strategies given the context, and the ability to defend their decision based on supporting research and literature.

COE Candidate Survey: Advanced program candidates have consistently rated their coursework and program as effective to very effective in preparing them to attain pedagogical content knowledge and skills (pedagogical skills and judgment, practical knowledge of context/culture, and developing sensitivity to peers, students, and clients), thus demonstrating they have learned and are able to apply theories related to pedagogy and learning, and are able to do so in consideration of the context (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COECandidateSurveyPedagogyContent06-08.pdf). No discrepancies in candidate ratings were found across programs or the San Bernardino campus and the Palm Desert campus.

In conclusion, data from key assessments indicates advanced teaching candidates have learned and are able to apply theories related to pedagogy and learning, while being aware of instructional strategies and being able to provide support for their choice of strategy given the context. Maintaining the minimum required GPA, successfully completing coursework, and either successfully completing a thesis/project or passing a comprehensive exam ensures candidates have learned pedagogical content knowledge and skills, are able to apply pedagogical theories, are able to select the most appropriate instructional strategy within the given context, and are able to provide research support for their choice. Additionally, candidates themselves believe their coursework advances their level of pedagogical content knowledge and skills and that they are able to apply these theories appropriately and in consideration of the context.

2a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills of advanced teacher candidates could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about pedagogical content knowledge and skills should be discussed in the response to 1b2 above.

3. What data indicate that candidates can integrate technology in their teaching?

Technology Competence: MS and SS candidates must complete an online technology assessment or have passed an approved basic computer class as part of the application process. 100% of MS and SS applicants meet this requirement. State-designated technology competencies (Program Standard 9) are integrated into
coursework. Additionally, evidence of competence with technology use includes performance data from the clinical experience based on evaluations of student teaching, specifically ratings on TPE 4: Making Content Accessible, which includes the ability to use technology as an instructional tool (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/TPEAlignedvNCATEFall2008.pdf). Candidates plan and implement technology supported lessons as demonstrated within samples within individual program exhibits.

The advanced programs, although distinct in focus, each require candidates to use technology in their own learning. Advanced programs often include a distance learning component which promotes mastery of technology for learning. Some advanced programs, such as Instructional Technology and Career and Technical Education, directly teach candidates to use technology in teaching and instruction. Examples of technology-related assignments are within the Instructional Technology Table (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/InstructionalTechnologyTable.pdf).

COE Candidate Survey: Candidates, in both initial teacher programs and advanced programs, have indicated that technology is well integrated into their program, while suggesting an improvement in computer lab and facilities would be welcomed (https://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COECandidateSurveyTech06-08_000.pdf). In September 2008, the COE moved into a new building with state of the art Smart Classrooms and candidate computer labs and facilities. We expect our candidates will find these new labs and facilities more than adequate in future surveys.

CSU Follow-up Survey: A CSU committee aligned survey items to all NCATE Standard 1 components, including use of technology. Aligned results are available for three years (2005-07); our response rate across years ranges from 31% to 53% (at or above the CSU average). The data is combined across all three years and disaggregated to allow for comparison of CSUSB student teachers, interns, and CSU graduates. Initial teacher candidates at one-year follow-up, rate their area lower than others for the entire CSU (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CSUSurveyTechResponses.pdf). There is consistent feedback that preparation in the use of instructional technology is one of the weaker areas of preparation. This result is consistent with results for the entire CSU. Although CSUSB ratings are somewhat higher than that of the CSU, and may relate to new state standards placing differentiated emphasis on instructional technology between the preliminary credential and induction, which does not reside with universities. Within this accreditation review period, the Unit has benefitted from a Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers for Technology (PT3) grant which included individual mentoring of faculty, professional development workshops, and partnerships with local schools with emphasis on technology. We expect that with the move into our new building with state of the art Smart Classrooms and computer labs and facilities, these ratings will improve in future surveys.

CSUSB Five-year Alumni Survey: The overall response rate for all programs on campus was 22%. The majority of advanced program alumni rated their CSUSB experience as effective to very effective in preparing them to use technology in their workplace and educational experiences (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CSUSBAlumniSurveyTech07.pdf). In conclusion, our candidates integrate technology in their own learning and in their teaching. Candidates must demonstrate technology competence and initial teaching candidates are directly assessed on their use of technology in teaching. Candidates have previously identified a need for improved computer labs and facilities, which has now been addressed with new computer labs and facilities. Based on follow-up feedback from initial teacher candidate graduates, programs continue to revise program and course content to assist candidates in learning to use and to integrate technology into their teaching.

3a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to candidates’ ability to integrate technology in their teaching could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about candidates’ technology skills should be discussed in the response to 1b3 above.

4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in pedagogical content knowledge and skills? If survey data are not available, what was the response rate?

CSU Follow-up Survey: A CSU committee aligned survey items to all NCATE Standard 1 components, including pedagogical content knowledge and skills. Aligned results are available for three years (2005-07). We have ten years worth of data available in the exhibit room. All initial teacher graduates are requested to participate; our response rate across years ranges from 31% to 53% (at or above the CSU average). The data is combined across all three years and disaggregated to allow for comparison of CSUSB student teachers, interns, and CSU graduates. An area of focus identified relates to teaching reading across the content areas. One year after program completion, initial teacher graduates and their employers view content pedagogy as an area of strength, thus demonstrating our initial candidates are well prepared in pedagogical content knowledge and skills (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CSUFollowUpSurveyAlignedPedContent.pdf). The CSU System also has identified this as an emphasis area for CSU campuses and offered related workshops which were attended by representatives from our faculty. Additionally, our implementation of the TPA provides for candidate focus on development of language, no matter what content area is being taught.

CSUSB Five-year Alumni Survey: The overall response rate for all programs on campus was 22%. Advanced teacher program graduates rated their CSUSB coursework and program experience as effectively preparing their pedagogical content skills and reported satisfaction their level of preparedness (course instruction, practical training for work) (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CSUSBAlumniSurveyPedagogyContent07.pdf). No areas of concern are noted; thus indicating advanced program graduates were adequately prepared in pedagogical content knowledge and skills.

5. A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills could be attached here.

6. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to the pedagogical content knowledge of teacher candidates could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

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

Note: In this section, institutions must address both (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.

1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills related to foundations of education; the ways children and adolescents develop and the relationship to learning; professional ethics, laws, and policies; the use of research in teaching; the roles and responsibilities of the professional communities; diversity of student populations, families and communities (this one may be addressed in the first element of Standard 4); and the consideration of school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students? If a licensure test is required in this area, how are candidates performing on it?

GPA for NCATE Aligned Professional Pedagogy: All initial teacher candidates must maintain a B average with no grade lower than a B- in all credential coursework. This is one means of maintaining knowledge of candidates’ progress throughout the program and their demonstration of the related skills and knowledge. GPAs in initial courses aligned with professional and pedagogical knowledge (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/NCATEAlignedCourseInitialPrograms_000.pdf) are well above the acceptable program minimum, thus indicating our initial teacher candidates demonstrate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/InitialProgramGPAPrelPed2006-08.pdf). Course syllabi, assignment descriptions, scoring guides and work
samples on key assignments can be found in each program’s exhibit files.

Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA)/Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE): In the MS and SS programs, the TPA assesses TPE5: Student Engagement; TPE6: Developmentally-appropriate Teaching Practices; TPE7: Teaching English Learners; TPE9: Instructional Planning; TPE10: Instructional Time; and, TPE11: Social Environment. MS and SS candidates progress in gaining knowledge and skills within foundations of education, child and adolescent development, professional ethics and laws/policies, use of research in teaching, roles of professional communities, diversity of students and families/communities, and context and prior experiences of students are monitored through the assessment of TPE5: Student Engagement; TPE6: Developmentally-appropriate Teaching Practices; TPE7: Teaching English Learners; TPE8: Learning about Students; TPE9: Instructional Planning; TPE10: Instructional Time; TPE11: Social Environment; and, TPE12: Professional, Legal and Ethical Obligations. Candidates develop knowledge and skills in these TPE areas throughout course and fieldwork/supervision as indicated in the TPE and Coursework Matrix (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/TPEbyCourse.pdf). The TPE pass rate is excellent and is a good indication of candidate performance (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/TPEAlignedwNCATEFall2008.pdf). One area of concern has been noted for both MS and SS candidates, adaptation of instruction. This finding is also supported by the CSU Follow-up Survey and supervised field assessments. Program faculty have continually worked in this area through additional training in the TPA, study of the TPA prompts and benchmarks, and review of course work for emphases on adaptations. This area has been an annual goal as documented within program annual reports and the annual unit assessment report.

Supervised Field Assessments: Clinical practice includes assessment of initial candidates across the state mandated TPEs. A supervision evaluation instrument with the TPEs aligned with NCATE Professional Pedagogy (engaging and supporting students, planning instruction/designing learning experiences, and creating/maintaining effective environments for student learning) was piloted in 2006-07 for MS and SS candidates (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldworkMSandSSProfPed06-07.pdf). Although results revealed MS and SS interns demonstrated professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, the evaluation instrument was revised for future implementation based on feedback received from program directors and to ease implementation and data interpretation. Results based on the revised evaluation form continued to reveal MS and SS interns were well prepared in professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldworkESResults.pdf). MS and SS supervised field assessments have indicated adaptation of instruction as an area of concern; this finding is consistent with the TPE/TPE results and the CSU Follow-up Survey. Clinical practice results for ES candidates indicated no areas of concern and candidates clearly demonstrate professional and pedagogical content knowledge and skills (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldworkESResults.pdf).

Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA): MS and ES candidates are required to pass the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) before they can be recommended for licensure. Candidates are encouraged to take the exam toward the end of their program, after completing preparatory coursework. This assessment includes professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills components related to how to teach reading. Our initial teacher candidate pass rate is 97-100% which demonstrates CSUSB’s initial teacher candidates are well prepared to teach reading (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/RICAPassRatesfor200507.pdf).

COE Candidate Survey: Typically, initial teacher candidates, rated their coursework and program experiences as effective to very effective in assisting them to learn how to conduct library research and how to synthesize and integrate information (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COECandidateSurveyProPed06.pdf). Based on feedback from program leaders, these items were revised in 2008. Initial teacher candidates rated their coursework and program experiences as effective to very effective in assisting them to develop skills necessary for practical training for work and career advancement, conducting research, and organization and planning skills (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldworkESResults.pdf). One area of concern has been noted for MS and SS candidates, adaptation of instruction. This finding is also supported by the CSU Follow-up Survey and supervised field assessments. Program faculty have continually worked in this area through additional training in the TPA, study of the TPA prompts and benchmarks, and review of course work for emphases on adaptations. This area has been an annual goal as documented within program annual reports and the annual unit assessment report.

In conclusion, data from key assessment indicates initial candidates have attained professional and pedagogical content knowledge and skills. Maintaining the minimum required GPA, successfully completing coursework, and passing RICA, candidates learn professional and pedagogical content knowledge and skills. Candidates themselves believe their coursework and program has improved their professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Although, initial teacher candidates typically do very well on the TPA and in supervised clinical practice, these assessments have identified candidates weak in adaptation of instruction. This finding is consistent with the CSU Follow-up Survey. Program leaders are using this feedback to implement coursework and program changes to address this weakness.

1a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of initial teacher candidates could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills should be discussed in the response to 1c1 above.

2. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teaching candidates demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills such as those delineated in the core propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards?

GPA for NCATE Aligned Professional Pedagogy: Advanced programs for licensed teachers require a valid teaching credential for admission which demonstrates professional and pedagogical skills at a beginning level. The primary indicator of professional and pedagogical knowledge for credentialed teachers completing advanced programs is their completion of requisite courses with a grade point average of 3.0 or higher. GPAs for courses aligned with professional and pedagogical skills (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/NCATEAlignedCoursesStd1_000.pdf) reveal all GPAs are well above the acceptable minimum, thus indicating advanced program candidates demonstrated professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills as described in the core proposition of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/NCATEAlignedCoursesStd1_000.pdf). No discrepancies were found across programs. Course syllabi, assignment descriptions, scoring guides and work samples on key assignments can be found in each program’s exhibit files (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CoursesandAssignmentsNCATEAlignedStandard1_000.pdf).

Comprehensive Exam and Thesis/Project: Advanced program comprehensive exam pass rates indicate the majority of advanced program candidates demonstrate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills; however, pass rates for ES candidates are of concern (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdvProgramCompPassRate2006-08.pdf). Several advanced programs include a comprehensive exam option (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/MAThesisorCompOption.pdf). Successfully completing an MA thesis/project ensures advanced program candidates know professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/MAThesisProjectResults2006-08.pdf).

MA Core Sequence Survey: The MA Core Sequence survey indicated advanced program candidates rated their involvement in the MA Core Sequence of classes as aiding their learning of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills (e.g., completing a literature review, communicate complex educational ideas, comment meaningfully on the underlying assumptions of education) (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/MACoreNCATEAligned200508.pdf). Candidates in the 2005-06 survey identified difficulty learning to write abstracts and executive summaries. This feedback to program leaders led to specifically addressing this issue in the MA Core Sequence courses and these ratings improved in 2007-08.

COE Candidate Survey: Typically, advanced teacher candidates, rated their coursework and program experiences as effective to very effective in assisting them to learn how to conduct library research and how to synthesize and integrate information (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COECandidateSurveyProPed06.pdf). Based on feedback from program leaders, these items were revised in 2008. Advanced teacher candidates rated their coursework and program experiences as effective to very effective in assisting them to develop skills necessary for practical training for work and career advancement, conducting research, and organization and planning skills (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COECandidateSurveyProPed06.pdf). Based on feedback from program leaders, these items were revised in 2008. Advanced teacher candidates rated their coursework and program experiences as effective to very effective in assisting them to develop skills necessary for practical training for work and career advancement, conducting research, and organization and planning skills.
In conclusion, data from key assessments indicates advanced teaching candidates demonstrate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Maintaining the minimum required GPA, successfully completing coursework, and either successfully completing a thesis/project or passing a comprehensive exam ensures candidates have learned pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills as described in the core proposition of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Additionally, advanced teacher candidates themselves rated their coursework and program experiences as aiding in developing their professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

2a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of advanced teacher candidates could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills should be discussed in the response to 1e2 above.

3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

CSU Follow-up Survey: A CSU committee aligned survey items to all NCATE Standard 1 components, including professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Aligned results are available for three years (2005-07). We have ten years of data available in the exhibit room. All initial teacher graduates are requested to participate; our response rate across years ranges from 31% to 53% (at or above the CSU average). The data is combined across all three years and disaggregated to allow for comparison of CSUSB student teachers, interns, and CSU graduates. One year after program completion, initial teacher graduates and their employers indicate initial teacher candidates’ level of preparation related to professional and pedagogical skills to be more than appropriate (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CSUFollowUpAlignedProfessionalPedagogy.pdf). As stated previously, and consistent with TPE assessments and supervised field assessments, adaptation of instruction has been a consistent area cited for improvement for MS and SS programs.

CSUSB Five-year Alumni Survey: The overall response rate for all programs on campus was 22%. Typically, advanced teacher program graduates rated their CSUSB coursework and program experience as effective to very effective in developing professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills (synthesizing and integrating information, enhancing general intellectual abilities, and obtaining knowledge and skills needed for employment) (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CSUSBAlumniSurveyProfessionalPedagogy07.pdf). However, two areas of weakness were noted: conducting library research and enhancing interpersonal and social abilities.

4. A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills could be attached here.

5. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of teacher candidates could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here.)

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

Note: In this section, institutions must address both (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.

1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn? (Institutions that have submitted programs for national review or a similar state review are required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed.)

Analysis of Student Learning: Initial teacher candidates learn and are evaluated on a variety of student learning techniques (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AnalysisOfStudentLearningDescription.pdf).

Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA): Emphasis on student learning within course and field work prepares candidates for the TPA tasks which include focus on analysis of student learning within the clinical setting. Candidates must include planning, instruction, and assessment of student learning, with specific justifications for adaptations made for English language learners and students with special needs. Candidates in clinical experiences assess students in their field classroom. Two of the TPA tasks are completed during supervised clinical practice and require candidates to collect P-12 work from an English Learner and a Special Needs Student. Candidates’ ability to assess is evaluated by TPA in TPE2: Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction; TPE3: Interpretation and Use of Assessments; and, TPE8: Learning about Students. MS candidates also collect and analyze student work samples from observed lessons. Results reveal good evaluations for assessment (monitoring student learning during instruction and interpretation of use of assessments), with the exception of adaptations for instruction (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/TPAAlignedwNCATEFall2008.pdf). While programs work toward improvement, we and our advisory groups recognize the rigor of the TPA and are pleased with candidates’ progress. In fact, our campus provided the state with new benchmarks from our candidates’ work as the quality of our candidates’ performance surpassed the state’s original benchmarks.

Supervised Clinical Experience: Supervisors assess candidates across the state mandated TPEs. A supervision evaluation instrument with the TPEs aligned with NCAE Assessing Student Learning (making subject matter comprehensible, planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students) was piloted in 2006-07 for MS and SS candidates (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldworkMSandSSStudentLearning06-07.pdf). Although results revealed MS and SS intern candidates proficient in assessing student learning, implementing meaningful learning experiences, and making subject matter comprehensible for all students, the evaluation instrument was revised based on feedback received from program directors and to ease implementation and data interpretation. Results based on the revised evaluation form continued to reveal MS and SS interns were proficient in assessing student learning, implementing meaningful learning experiences, and making subject matter comprehensible for all students, with no areas of concern identified (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldworkMSandSSStudentLearning07-08.pdf). Supervision results for ES candidates indicated no areas of concern and candidates were assessed as proficient in assessing student learning (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldworkESResults.pdf).

COE Candidate Survey: The 2006 COE Candidate Survey did not have items assessing student learning. An item inquiring about assessing students/clients was added when the survey was revised in 2008. Typically, initial candidates rated their coursework and program experiences as effective to very effective in assisting them to assess students/clients (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COECandidateSurveyAssessStudent2008.pdf). No discrepancies in candidate ratings were found across program or the San Bernardino campus or Palm Desert campus.

In conclusion, assessments indicate initial teacher candidates are proficient in assessing and analyzing student learning, monitoring student learning, and in the development and implementation of meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn. Through successful completion of coursework and assignments, passing the TPA, and completing clinical practice, candidates demonstrate student learning. Candidates believe their coursework and program is effective in assisting them to learn to assess students/clients. Although, candidates typically do very well on the TPA and clinical practice, these assessments have identified...
weaknesses in adaptation of instruction. This finding is consistent with the CSU Follow-up Survey. Program leaders are using this feedback to guide program change.

1a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to student learning for initial teacher candidates could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about student learning should be discussed in the response to 1d1 above.

2. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teaching candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning and regularly apply them in their practice? (Institutions that have submitted advanced teaching programs for national review or a similar state review are required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed.)

GPA for NCATE Aligned Courses: The advanced teacher programs include courses which address student learning. GPA’s from these courses aligned with assessing student learning (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/NCATEAlignedCoursesStd1_000.pdf) reveal typically all advanced teacher candidates demonstrate an understanding of the concepts and theories of student learning (assessment, knowing student, families and communities, and using research) and are able to apply these skills as the course GPA’s meet the minimum requirement of 3.0 (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdvancePrgrmGPAforAssesStudent2006-08_003.pdf). One minor exception is that the overall course GPA for the 2006-07 year for the Adapted Physical Education program fell below 3.0; however, this was remedied in the 2007-08 year. Course syllabi, assignment descriptions, scoring guides and work samples on key assignments can be found in each program’s exhibit files (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CoursesandAssignmentsNCATEAlignedStandard1_000.pdf).

Comprehensive Exam and Thesis/Project: Several advanced programs include a comprehensive exam option (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/ComprehensiveExamGPAforAssesStudent2006-08.pdf). Advanced program comprehensive exam pass rates indicate the majority of advanced program candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts of student learning; however, pass rates for ES are of concern (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdvProgramCompPassRate2006-08.pdf). Comprehensive exams contain questions related to the ‘assessment of students.’ Successfully completing an MA thesis/project ensures advanced program candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning and are able to apply them in practice (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdvanceProgramCompPassRate2006-08.pdf). Many projects involved assessing a specific instructional strategy.

COE Candidate Survey: The 2006 COE Candidate Survey did not have any items assessing student learning. An item inquiring about assessing students/clients was added when the survey was revised in 2008. Typically, advanced teacher candidates rated their coursework and program experiences as effective to very effective in assisting them to assess students and clients (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COECandidateSurveyAssessStudent2008.pdf). No discrepancies in candidate ratings were found across program or the CSUSB San Bernardino campus or Palm Desert campus.

In conclusion, data from key assessments indicates advanced teaching candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning and are able to apply these concepts in their practice. Through successful completion of coursework and assignments, and successfully passing the comprehensive exam or the thesis/project, advanced teacher candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories of student learning and how to apply these in practice. Candidates themselves believe their coursework and program experience is effective in assisting them to learn to assess students/clients.

2a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to student learning for advanced teacher candidates could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about student learning should be discussed in the response to 1d2 above.

3. What do follow-up studies of employers and graduates indicate about graduates' ability to help all students learn? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

CSU Follow-up Survey: A CSU committee aligned survey items to all NCATE Standard 1 components, including ability to help all students learn. Aligned results are available for three years (2005-07). We have ten years worth of data available in the exhibit room. All initial teacher graduates are requested to participate; our response rate across years ranges from 31% to 53% (at or above the CSU average). The data is combined across all three years and disaggregated to allow for comparison of CSUSB student teachers, interns, and CSU graduates. One year after program completion, initial teacher graduates and their employers indicate candidates are strong in their ability to assess student learning (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CSUFollowUpSurveyAlignedStandard1.pdf). However, as discussed previously, the CSU Follow up survey data has consistently indicated MS and SS candidates are weaker in adaptation of instruction for English Language learners and Special Needs students.

4. A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to student learning could be attached here.

5. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to student learning for teacher candidates could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

1. What content knowledge tests are used for the purpose of state licensure and/or program completion? If the state has a licensure test for content, what is the unit’s overall pass rate across all programs for other school professionals? What programs do not have an 80 percent or above pass rate?

Content Knowledge Tests: The Counseling and Guidance program is the only program to use a national standardized test conducted by the National Board of Certified Counselors, the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE). Successful completion of this exam is required for program completion and licensure. The program sets its own passing score in relation to the national mean and the overall pass rate for 2007-08 was 89% (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CounselingandGuidanceCPCEScores06-08.pdf; http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CounselingandGuidanceCPCEPassRate06-08.pdf). Results indicate counseling and guidance candidates meet or exceed the national mean at the time of testing; although not all candidates pass on their first attempt.

2. Please complete the following table to indicate pass rates on content licensure tests for other school professionals program by program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Pass Rates on Content Licensure Tests for Other School Professionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Period:</td>
<td>Winter 2007 - Spring 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Knowledge Tests</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and Guidance</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. What do the data in the above table (Table 5) tell the unit about the content knowledge of other school professionals?

As stated above, the Counseling and Guidance program is the only other school professional program to use a national standardized test run by the National Board of Certified Counselors. The program sets its own pass score in relation to the national mean. The overall 2007-08 pass rate was 89%.

Counseling and Guidance candidates perform in line with the national mean for the CPCE exam, although not all candidates pass the exam on their first attempt. Areas perhaps needing improvement are “helping relationships” and “group work.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th># of Test Takers</th>
<th>% Passing at State Cut Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Pass Rate for the Unit (across all programs for the preparation of other school professionals)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and Guidance</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. What data from other key assessments indicate that these candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? (Institutions that have submitted programs for national review or a similar state review are required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed.)

Admission Requirements: Admission requirements ensure candidates have an acceptable level of knowledge and skills (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdmitRequirementSchoolProfs.pdf). Admission GPA to the Administrative Services credential reveals some concerns, as not all candidates meet the minimum 3.0 GPA (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdminGPAAdminCert2006-08.pdf). In such cases, candidates meet with the program leader to request an exceptional admit status. 100% of candidates meet the University Graduate Writing policy, typically through course completion (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/GradWritingReqResultsOtherSchoolProfs06-08.pdf).

GPA: Courses are designed to meet state standards; as such GPA is an indicator of professional skills and knowledge. All courses must be completed with a GPA of 3.0 or higher, with no grade lower than a B/B-. GPAs from courses aligned with NCATE (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/NCATEAlignedCoursesStd1_000.pdf) are well above the accepted minimum, thus candidates demonstrate professional knowledge and skills (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/OtherSchoolProfsGPAforStdLearn06-08.pdf). Course syllabi, assignment descriptions, scoring guides and work samples on key assignments can be found in each program’s exhibit files (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CoursesandAssignmentsNCATEAlignedStandard1_000.pdf).

Fieldwork and/or Clinical Practice: Educational Administration (EdAdmin), Counseling and Guidance (C&G), and School Psychology (SP) include fieldwork and/or clinical practice. EdAdmin candidates performed weakest on CTCC Standards 13 and 15 (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/EdAdminFieldwork2007-08.pdf). Results (counseling, group counseling, consultation, guidance lesson) for the C&G program (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CounselingandGuidanceFieldExp2008.pdf) and SP results (legal issues/compliance, ethical performance) (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/SchoolPsychologyFieldExp2008.pdf) reveal no deficiencies. Candidates were highly competent and experienced growth.

Thesis/Project and Comprehensive Exam Option: EdAdmin, Counseling and Guidance have a comprehensive exam option, representing summative assessment of professional knowledge and skills, reflecting successful synthesis of program content knowledge as well as master level writing and understanding (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/OtherSchoolProfsCompPaceRate2006-08.pdf; http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/OtherSchoolProfsThesisPaceRate07-08.pdf).

As discussed in section 1e1, Counseling and Guidance candidates meet or exceed the national mean on the CPCE; although not all pass on their first attempt.

Educational Leadership (EdD) candidates complete a qualifying exam and dissertation. To date, two candidates have completed the qualifying exam and none have completed the dissertation.

MA Core Sequence: The Council of Learned Societies in Education (CLS) standards are being incorporated into MA core courses. The CLS recommends case analyses of events with reflections on sociopolitical contexts, participation in and reflection on school leadership, and the use of theory and knowledge base in formulating teaching practice. Results of the annual MA Core Sequence survey (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/MAcoreNCATEAligned200508.pdf) indicate candidates believe the MA Core classes has led to their learning of content knowledge. Candidates in the 2005-06 survey identified difficulty learning to write abstracts and executive summaries. This feedback led to addressing this issue in the MA Core Sequence courses and these ratings improved in 2007-08.

COE Current Candidate Survey: Candidates rated program experiences as effective to very effective in content (subject matter knowledge, writing well, critical thinking and problem solving), pedagogical content (pedagogical skills and judgment, practical knowledge of context/culture, developing sensitivity to peers, students, clients), and professional and pedagogical skills and knowledge (conduct research, synthesizing and integrating information) (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COECandidateSurveyOtherSchoolProfs2006-08.pdf). Assistance in improving research skills was noted. No discrepancies in ratings were found across program or the SB campus and PDC.

In conclusion, key assessments reveal candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills required by professional, state, and institutional standards. Through coursework, fieldwork assessments, a thesis/project or comprehensive exam, candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills to be professionals. Candidates rated program experiences as developing their professional knowledge and skills.

4a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to the knowledge and skills for other school professionals could be attached here.

What the data tell the unit about content knowledge should be discussed in the response to the new 1e4 above.

### 5. What data from key assessments indicate that these candidates know their students, families, and communities; use data and current research to inform practices; and use technology in their practices?

GPA for NCATE Aligned Knowledge and Skills: Courses are carefully designed to prepare professionals to meet professional, state, and institutional standards, and therefore course grades are a valid indicator of candidates’ ability to know their students, families, and communities, use current research to inform practice, and use technology in their practices. All program courses must be completed with a GPA of 3.0 or higher, with no grade lower than a B/B-. Results of GPAs from courses aligned with NCATE standards (assess student learning, know students, families, and communities, and use current research to inform practice) (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/OtherSchoolProfsGPAforStdLearn06-08.pdf). Course syllabi, assignment descriptions, scoring guides and work samples on key assignments can be found in each program’s exhibit files (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CoursesandAssignmentsNCATEAlignedStandard1_000.pdf).
Thesis/Project and Comprehensive Exam Option: EdAdmin and Counseling and Guidance have a comprehensive exam option, representing summative assessment candidates’ ability to know their students, families and communities and use of data to inform practice. Results, presented in section 1e4, indicate candidates demonstrate knowing their students, families, and communities, and the ability to use current research to inform practice.

The Counseling and Guidance program uses the CPCE exam, a national standardized test conducted by the National Board of Certified Counselors, in lieu of a comprehensive exam. Successful completion of the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE) is required for program completion and licensure. As discussed in section 1e1, Counseling and Guidance candidates meet or exceed the national mean on the CPCE; although not all pass on their first attempt.

Educational Leadership (EdD) candidates complete a qualifying exam and dissertation. To date, two candidates have completed the qualifying exam and none have completed the dissertation.

Fieldwork and/or Clinical Practice: Educational Administration (EdAdmin), Counseling and Guidance (C&G), and School Psychology (SP) include fieldwork and/or clinical practice. These experiences ensure candidates know their students, families, and communities, use current research to inform practice, and use technology in their practices. Fieldwork results for the Educational Administration program revealed candidates performed weakest on CTCC Standards 13 and 15, while the Moreno Valley cohort was the weakest overall (results presented in 1e4). Fieldwork/supervision results (counseling, group counseling, consultation, and guidance lesson) for candidates in the Counseling and Guidance program revealed no deficiencies (results presented in 1e4). Fieldwork/supervision results (e.g., assessment, consultation, group assessment, community referral, evidence-based treatment, peer relations, client relations) for candidates in the School Psychology program revealed no deficiencies (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/SchoolPsychologyFieldExp200809.pdf). Results for candidates in the school psychology program revealed candidates were highly competent and experience growth from the time of the first assessment to the last assessment.

MA Core Sequence: The Council of Learned Societies in Education (CLS) standards are currently being incorporated into performance indicators for Master’s core courses. The CLS recommends as evidence case analyses of events with reflections on sociopolitical contexts, participation in and reflection on school leadership activities, and demonstration of the use of theory and knowledge base in formulating teaching practice. Candidates in these courses complete a review of their preparation. The MA Core Sequence conducts an annual survey of candidates (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/MACoreNCATEAligned200508.pdf). Results from this survey (e.g., advocate infusion of multicultural curricular content, write a literature review, locate resources to prepare a research design, write a product and disseminate the findings) indicate candidates believe their involvement in the MA Core Sequence of classes has led to their knowing their students, families, and communities, and use current research to inform practice.

COE Student Research Symposium: A COE Research Symposium has been held annually for seven years during which advanced candidates present and hear each others’ research. It is expected that candidates in the new CSUSB EdD in Educational Leadership program will provide a leading role in the Research Symposium in 2009, which will increase the quality of the activity.

COE Current Candidate Survey: Candidates in other school professional programs rate their coursework and program experiences as effective to very effective in preparing them to know their students, families, and communities, and to use research to inform practice (practical knowledge of context/culture, developing sensitivity to peers, clients, students, synthesizing and integrating information, and conducting research) (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COECandidateSurveyOtherSchoolProf0606-08.pdf). Candidates did identify they would like to see their program assist them in improving their research skills. No discrepancies in candidate ratings were found across program or the San Bernardino campus and the Palm Desert campus.

Candidates in other school professional programs have indicated that technology is typically well integrated into their program, while suggesting an improvement in computer lab and facilities would be welcomed (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COECandidateSurveyTechOtherSchoolProf06-08.pdf). In September 2008, the COE moved into a new building with state of the art Smart Classrooms and candidate computer labs and facilities. We expect our candidates will find these new labs and facilities more than adequate in future surveys.

CSUSB Five-year Alumni Survey: Although alumni data (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CSUSBAlumniOtherSchoolProf07.pdf) indicates other school professional candidates were mostly satisfied with the integration of technology in coursework (using computers to prepare projects/reports, using computers for information searches), it is evident programs need to provide more assistance to candidates conducting electronic research and in using technology in report preparation.

In conclusion, data from key assessments reveal candidates in programs for other school professionals successfully demonstrate they know their students, families and communities, use research to inform practice and use technology in their practice. Through coursework and assignments, fieldwork/supervision assessments, completion of a thesis/project or comprehensive exam, these candidates consistently demonstrate they have grasped the knowledge and skills to be professionals in their fields. Additionally, the candidates themselves believe their coursework and program experiences have assisted in developing skills to know their students, families, and communities, while indicating they would like to see a greater emphasis on developing research skills and using technology in report preparation.

5a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to the knowledge and skills outlined in the 1e5 could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about content knowledge should be discussed in the response to 1e5 above.

6. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation related to knowledge and skills for their field? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

CSUSB Five-year Alumni Survey: The overall response rate for all programs on campus was 22%. Alumni of the other school professional programs rated their CSUSB coursework and program experiences as more than adequately prepared them in the areas of content (writing well, speaking effectively, critical thinking and problem solving, using mathematical tools), pedagogy content (course instruction, practical training for work), and professional and pedagogical skills and knowledge (conducting research, synthesizing and integrating information, enhancing general intellectual ability, obtaining employment skills), and they are satisfied with faculty interactions (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CSUSBAlumniOtherSchoolProf07.pdf). Of note, is that these candidates would have liked improved career advising from faculty and improved enhancement of their interpersonal and social abilities.

7. A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to knowledge and skills for other school professionals could be attached here.

8. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to the knowledge and skills of other school professionals could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

If. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates can create positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental levels of students; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work? (Institutions that
have submitted programs for national review or a similar state review are required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis/Project and Comprehensive Exam: EdAdmin and Counseling and Guidance have a comprehensive exam option. Examinations often inquire on practical applications of student/client problems. Results, presented in section 1e4, indicate candidates create positive student learning environments, consider the diversity of students, families, and communities, and are aware of appropriate policies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Counseling and Guidance program uses the CPCE exam, in lieu of a comprehensive exam. Passing of the CPCE is required for program completion and licensure. As discussed in section 1e1, candidates meet or exceed the national mean on the CPCE; although not all pass on their first attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership (EdD) candidates complete a qualifying exam and dissertation. To date, two candidates have completed the qualifying exam and none have completed the dissertation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fieldwork and/or Clinical Practice: EdAdmin, C&G, and SP programs include fieldwork and/or clinical practice. These experiences ensure candidates know their students, families, and communities, can create positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental levels of students, consider the diversity of students, families, and communities, and are aware of policies in the workplace. Fieldwork results for the Educational Administration program revealed candidates performed weakest on CTCC Standards 13 and 15 (results presented in 1e4). Results (counseling, group counseling, consultation, and guidance lesson) for candidates in the Counseling and Guidance program revealed no deficiencies (results presented in 1e4). Fieldwork/supervision results (e.g., conceptualization, assessment, interpretation, evaluating effectiveness, consultation, group assessment, community referral, evidence-based treatment, legal issues/compliance, peer relations, client relations) for candidates in the School Psychology program revealed no deficiencies (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/SchoolPsychologyFieldExpo200809.pdf). Candidates are viewed as competent and experienced growth.

MA Core Sequence: CLS standards recommend case analyses of events with reflections on sociopolitical contexts, participation in and reflection on school leadership, and the use of theory and knowledge base in formulating teaching practice. Results (e.g., advocate infusion of multicultural curricular content, communicate complex ideas effectively in educational organizations, comment meaningfully on the underlying assumptions of education, contextualize education change (reform) in the classroom and school system) of the annual MA Core Sequence survey (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/MAcoreNCATEAligned200508.pdf) reveal candidates successfully demonstrate the ability to create positive student learning environments, consider the diversity of students, families, and communities, and are aware of appropriate policies in their work.

COE Current Candidate Survey: Candidates rated program experiences as effective to very effective in preparing them to create positive student learning environments, to be aware of developmental levels of students, and to consider the diversity of students, families, and communities (practical knowledge of context/culture, developing sensitivity to peers, clients, and students, and ability to work with people of diversity) (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COECandidateSurveyKnowandDiversityOtherSchoolProfs2006-08_000.pdf). Candidates did identify they would like to see their program assist them in improving their research skills. No discrepancies in candidate ratings were found across program or the SB campus and PDC.

1a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to other school professionals’ support of student learning could be attached here.

What the data tell the unit about student learning should be discussed in the response to 1f1 above.

2. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates’ ability to create positive environments for student learning? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

CSUSB Five-year Alumni Survey: The overall response rate for all programs on campus was 22%. Alumni of the other school professional programs rated their CSUSB coursework and program experiences as more than adequately prepared them in practical training for work and obtaining the knowledge and/or skills needed for employment (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CSUSBAumniOtherSchoolProfs07.pdf). Of note, is that these candidates would have liked improved career advising from faulty and improved enhancement of enhancing their interpersonal and social abilities.

Advisory Boards: All other school professional programs received feedback from their respective Advisory Boards. Advisory Board members include CSUSB faculty, school districts, field/site supervisors, and employers. Feedback encompasses community and university needs, candidate and program development, and success of graduates.

3. A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to support for student learning could be attached here.

4. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to other school professionals’ support of student learning could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

Note: Indicate where the responses refer to initial teacher preparation, advanced preparation of teachers, or other school professionals, noting differences when appropriate.

1. What professional dispositions are candidates expected to demonstrate by completion of programs?

Initial teacher, advanced program and other school professional candidates reflect the dispositions expected of professional educators. All initial programs have professional dispositions (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COEUnit-wideDispositions.pdf). Additionally, each program has identified professional dispositions in their syllabi. All candidates reflect on the dispositions expected of professional educators. Candidates participate in development of a plan to explore their dispositions when needed.

All candidates must demonstrate the highest level of commitment to their profession and their students. To achieve this, course content includes professional standards and methods to adopt those standards into one’s personal belief system.

Unit-wide Process for Disposition Assessment: The Unit has developed Unit-wide dispositions aligned with our Conceptual Framework’s institutional standards. This process engaged program leaders, and more indirectly, program faculty, in an energetic review of the Conceptual Framework’s tenets. The tenets’ were slightly revised for clarity and to accurately reflect all unit programs. These were adapted into a rubric (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/UnitDispositionRubric.pdf), 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. Candidates’ dispositions are self-assessed and assessed by faculty.
Disposition Monitoring. All unit courses, except for the Educational Leadership (EdD) program, have identified specific dispositions (within Course Objective sections of syllabi) related to their content and to development of professional educators. Course grades reflect candidates’ level of implementation with regard to dispositions. Course instructors and/or supervisors typically counsel candidates who have difficulty demonstrating professional dispositions, and most programs have a method to address any noted deficiencies. For example, the Counseling and Guidance program and the Correctional and Alternative Education program have formal processes whereby candidates identified as deficient develop, along with a faculty member, an action plan, a copy of which is sent to the program director/coordinator. The plan is monitored by the instructor and/or program director/coordinator and remains in effect, if necessary, once the candidate enters the supervision field experience. The Office of the Graduate Dean manages a handbook of information which includes dispositions for graduate candidates.

All initial teacher programs have a similar formal system to address any noted disposition deficiencies (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Professional-Growth-Plan.pdf). This procedure is in the Student Handbook and provides a clearly defined process. Faculty and/or supervisors utilize the process to identify dispositional areas of concern, meet with the candidate to develop a plan of action, and document the Professional Growth Plan. The faculty member or program director monitors successful completion of the plan. This procedure is similar to the Individual Induction Plan utilized in the state’s induction programs.

The Educational Leadership (EdD) program currently uses Student Learning Outcomes in program and course materials, including each course syllabi, as required by WASC. The NCATE accreditation review has led to the decision to align Student Learning Outcomes and the Unit Dispositions based on the Unit’s Conceptual Framework. Student Learning Outcomes and Dispositions will be included in the EdD course syllabi and EdD candidates will be assessed according to the Unit-wide Process for Disposition Assessment outlined above.

Professional Behaviors. During clinical experience, supervisors assess MS and SS candidates regarding TPE 13 Professional Growth. This TPE requires candidates evaluate their own teaching practices and subject matter knowledge in light of information about the state-adopted academic content standards for students and student learning. Candidates improve their teaching practices by soliciting feedback and engaging in cycles of planning, teaching, reflecting, discerning problems, and applying new strategies. Candidates use reflection and feedback to formulate and prioritize goals for increasing their subject matter knowledge and teaching effectiveness.

MS and SS intern candidates are assessed on professional behaviors for 30 weeks (longer for ES) by their university supervisor. Professional behaviors and dispositions are indicated through behaviors such as punctuality, attendance at required meetings, notice of absence, appropriate dress, completion of required duties, quality of lesson plans and assessments, appropriate response to professional feedback, collegial interactions, and professional speech. Supervisors and resident teachers regularly observe instruction, confer with candidates and provide written feedback. Performance is documented in a consistent manner as described in the NCATE Standard 3 response.

Candidates who show deficits are counseled by mid-quarter; deficiencies are noted and a plan for adjustment is developed, using the Professional Growth Plan. Improvement must be demonstrated for candidates to receive field experience credit. Each program’s contract with employing school districts allows school personnel to release candidates whose professional behaviors and/or disposition are unacceptable.

2. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates demonstrate appropriate professional dispositions?

Admission: MS and SS programs, in addition to ES intern programs interview candidates which serves as initial assessment of candidates’ personal qualities and pre-professional qualifications. The MS and ES programs also require applicants bring a written statement which explains his or her philosophy, goals, and experience.

The Educational Leadership (EdD) program’s Recruitment and Selection committee reviews application materials and interviews applicants which serve an initial assessment of professional dispositions, beliefs and behaviors. Application materials include a statement of purpose describing the applicant’s educational philosophy, awareness of educational reform needs, and goals to effect educational reform. Key interview questions related to professional dispositions include: Throughout life, we face situations new to us. Think of the most recent time when you found yourself in an unfamiliar situation, one in which you had never been before. Describe the situation and tell us how you handled yourself in this situation; and, Describe a situation in which you provided leadership for a group of teachers, staff or other coworkers on a joint project (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/EdDCandidateInterviewTemplate.pdf).

Fieldwork/Clinical Practice: Results for MS and SS intern candidates’ clinical practice evaluations aligned with TPE 12 and 13 (developing as a professional educator) reveal no areas of concern (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/DispositionsMSandSSFieldwork06-08.pdf). Results for ES candidates are assessed on a number of professional behaviors and dispositions (e.g., treats students and professionals with respect, ethically handles information about students, peers, colleagues, and supervisors, systematically evaluates own teaching performance, attempts to improve teaching performance) reveal no areas of concern (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldworkESResults.pdf).

The ES Program identified belief statements and dispositions to foster in their candidates. The most pivotal statement is, “all students can benefit from a public school education,” which is assessed through coursework, examination questions, curriculum projects and fieldwork. In particular, candidates who teach students with severe disabilities are expected to engage all students in learning. The collection of instructional data by candidates on their students implies students will benefit from education.

Advanced credential and other school professional candidates are required to complete a professional level clinical experience which involves supervised interaction in an appropriate setting (e.g., an administrative role for educational administrators, classroom role for teachers, etc). All graduate programs include an internship, capstone experience, or dissertation and thesis/project which allows faculty to assess candidates’ professional dispositions. Theses/projects reveal candidates’ commitment to inquiry, as well as their ability to conceive and complete an assignment. No dissertations have been completed at this time.

Unit-wide Dispositions: During 2007-08, programs implemented the unit-wide disposition rubric, and the College’s Assessment Director collected and analyzed data (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/ProgramDispositionResults07-08.pdf). Results are preliminary as this is a newly adopted rubric, and programs are working to implement the rubric into their candidate assessment system. Results indicate candidates’ dispositions in the five assessed areas do improve during program involvement. Initial teacher candidates tend to utilize their dispositions lower than either advanced or other school professional candidates. Given initial teachers’ level of experience, this result is expected. Results also indicate dispositions for initial teacher candidates improve in all dispositional areas throughout program and course involvement. Disposition self-evaluations for advanced candidates and other school professionals demonstrate candidates successfully exhibit all dispositions. What is unexpected, is for advanced candidates to be rated at or below an expected basic level at the initial evaluation. It is unclear if this is an artifact of candidates not clearly understanding the dispositions they are rating or if it is an accurate reflection of their dispositions despite a history of holding a teaching credential.

MA Core Sequence Survey: Results (e.g., read and write research articles and reports, critically evaluate educational research articles, ensure the protection of human subjects in research, engaging in graduate-level classroom dialogue, advocate the infusion of multicultural curricular content) from the annual MA Core Sequence survey indicate advanced candidates believe their involvement in the core sequence of classes has led to dispositions which value research, respect human subjects, and advocate infusion of multicultural curriculum (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/MAcoreNCATEAligned200508.pdf).

COE Current Candidate Survey: Dispositions (ability to work as a member of a team, using reflective practices and their impact on decisions, commitment to...
2a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to professional dispositions could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about professional dispositions should be discussed in the response to 2g2 above.

3. In what ways do candidates demonstrate that they are developing professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn?

Unit-wide Dispositions: Each of these five unit dispositions assessed (Rich Content Knowledge; Sound Professional Judgment and Conduct; Practical Knowledge of Context; Respect for Multiple Viewpoints; and, Self-reflection and Personal Growth) relate to fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Candidates’ dispositions do improve during program involvement (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/ProgramDispositionResults07-08.pdf). Initial teacher candidates tend to self-evaluate their dispositions lower than either advanced or other school professional candidates. Given initial teachers’ level of experience, this result is expected. Results also indicate dispositions for initial teacher candidates improve in all dispositional areas throughout program involvement. Disposition self-evaluations for advanced and other school professionals candidates reveal disposition acquisition. What is unexpected, is for advanced candidates to be rated at or below an expected basic level at the initial evaluation. It is unclear if candidates not clearly understanding the dispositions they are rating or if it is an accurate reflection of their dispositions at the time of evaluation.

Fieldwork/Clinical Practice: MS and SS intern candidates are assessed on professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn (engaging and supporting students, creating and maintaining an effective environment, make subject matter comprehensible, assessing student learning, and developing as a professional) (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldworkMSandSS07-08.pdf). These candidates demonstrate they are developing professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn. No differences were noted across programs or campuses.

ES candidates are assessed on a number of professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn (e.g., uses a variety of multicultural resources for instructional learning, prepares materials which are age and language appropriate and accommodate for individual differences, demonstrates knowledge and understanding of individuals with disabilities and second language learners, uses effective questioning techniques with all students to ensure understanding, uses appropriate measures in evaluating the progress of students from diverse backgrounds) (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldworkESResults.pdf). No areas of concern were noted, thus these candidates are developing professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn.

Professional Behaviors: Other school professional candidates are also assessed on professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Clinical practice results (e.g., knowledge of NASP/CASP ethical principles and IDEA, ethical performance, legal issues/compliance, evaluating effectiveness, work efficiency, working with IEP teams and school system) for candidates in the School Psychology program revealed no deficiencies (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/SchoolPsychologyFieldwork07.pdf). Results for candidates in the School Psychology program revealed candidates were highly competent and experience growth from the time of the first assessment to the last assessment.

The Educational Leadership (EdD) program’s Recruitment and Selection committee reviews application materials and interviews applicants which serve an initial assessment of professional dispositions, beliefs and behaviors. Application materials include a statement of purpose describing the applicant’s educational philosophy, awareness of educational reform needs, and goals to effect educational reform. Key interview questions related to student learning include: As an administrator, how would you work with your employees to raise student achievement and establish a climate of learning?; and, The legislation that was responsible for the creation of this doctoral program requires that the research of the doctoral candidates addresses the challenge in the public schools. What is your current research interest, one that could be developed into a doctoral dissertation? (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/EdDCandidateInterviewTemplate.pdf).

In conclusion, initial teacher, advanced, and other school professional candidates demonstrate they are developing professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Dispositions of candidates are assessed through unit-wide disposition assessment, fieldwork/clinical practice, and professional behaviors, allowing for a multi-faceted approach. In follow-up surveys, initial teacher graduates rate themselves below the CSU average in working in diverse situations and learning ethical standards in working with special need students, while their employers rate them above the CSU average in education equality for all students. Initial teacher graduates may be rating themselves low in relation to the CSU average as they are keenly aware of the numerous and varied needs of students in CSUSB’s diverse service region.

4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates’ demonstration of professional dispositions? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

CSU Follow-up Survey: All initial teacher graduates are requested to participate. A CSU committee aligned survey items to all NCATE Standard 1 components, including professional dispositions. Aligned results are available for three years (2005-07). We have ten years worth of data available in the exhibit room. All initial teacher graduates are requested to participate; our response rate across years ranges from 31% to 53% (at or above the CSU average). The data is combined across all three years and disaggregated to allow for comparison of CSUSB student teachers, interns, and CSUSB graduates. We have ten years worth of data available in the exhibit room. Results indicate MS and SS candidates rated themselves below the CSU average in being prepared to work with other teachers and families, while rating themselves at or above the CSU average in working in diverse situations and learning ethical standards in working with special needs students (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CSUFollowUpAlignedDispositions.pdf). Of note, student teacher candidates were both below the CSU and CSUSB average in learning ethical standards in working with special needs students. Employers of CSUSB MS and SS candidates one year following program completion reveal employers rate CSUSB graduates at or the above CSU average in education equality for all students. Given the diversity of the service region of CSUSB, this finding is especially important, but also one we would like to see above the CSU average.

5. A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional dispositions could be attached here.

6. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to professional dispositions could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 1?

In October 2006, we established the COE Office of Assessment and Research. To our knowledge, we are the first CSU campus to establish such an office in a...
college. In fact, we have received numerous inquiries from other campuses as to how to set up a similar office on their campuses, in an effort to make the assessment coordination role the full-time role of one office instead of a task added to a dean, associate dean, or multiple faculty. Although, the function of this office continues to develop, we now have a central unit location through which most program evaluations, data input, database maintenance, and report preparation across all programs and the unit is collated. We have found the majority of our programs have elected to use the data services provided by this office, and the office works to aggregate data from programs that choose to also conduct independent and/or course specific evaluations.

All programs strive to assess candidates at admission, during program involvement, at exit and follow-up. This allows us to see growth in our candidates and to assist candidates who may have deficiencies in a timely manner.

All programs have very active community Advisory Boards which provide current and follow-up feedback to program leaders on a regular basis.

There are number of new assessment and reporting processes which will assist the unit in monitoring candidate progress and the feedback will allow for program development and improvement:

-- The merging of Annual Program Reports with the state Biennial Reports for all programs – this will allow program leaders to review candidate and program data and to implement any necessary changes while addressing both NCATE and state standards.

-- Newly established unit-wide dispositions based on the unit’s Conceptual Framework and institutional standards – all program leaders participated in the development and adopting of the unit-wide dispositions. This process allows us to monitor candidate development and to provide assistance to any candidates experiencing deficiencies in a timely manner. As this is a new unit-wide process, we are evaluating this process to ensure it meets the needs of candidates, program leaders and the unit.

-- The implementation of clinical practices assessment for initial program candidates – this allows program leaders receive feedback from site supervisors and resident teachers as to the strengths and weaknesses of our candidates in the context of their placements. As this is a newly implemented process, we are evaluating this process to ensure it meets the needs of candidates, program leaders, and site supervisors and resident teachers.

-- Standardizing MA comprehensive examination and thesis/project rubrics based on the Ed.D. qualifying examination and dissertation rubrics approved by WASC. This will ensure all advanced and other school professional candidates will at least meet the minimum standard of expertise and mastery as set by the unit.

2. What research related to Standard 1 is being conducted by the unit?

We have engaged in several research studies related to Standard 1:


-- Analysis of the impact of training on TPA scorer reliability (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/TeachingPerformanceCalibrationFall07-Fall08.pdf).


-- TPA report to Cal Poly SLO, March 2007 (We were asked to share our system and study of our implementation of the TPA, including factor analysis with other campuses (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/TPAReportsSLO.pdf).

-- An Exploratory Analysis of California Teaching Performance Assessment Task 3: An Application of the Rasch Measurement Model (Dr. Joseph Jesunathadas, accepted for AERA 2009)

-- After a pilot of disposition rubric implementation, Dr. Sue Spitzer conducted a survey of (29) university supervisors (for MS and SS) to determine their use of the rubric (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/DispositionSurveyReportFall07.pdf). Responses were used during 07-08 to clarify program expectations for the Disposition Rubric and to ensure the assessment was implemented consistently across supervisors.

-- MS and SS Fieldwork/Supervision evaluation form was piloted in 2006-2007. These findings led to a revision of the form for 2007-2008 (and future) which provides both program leaders and the unit with meaningful and useful data.

-- The COE Candidate Survey is reviewed and revised to ensure it evaluates areas informative to program leaders and the unit.

-- In the fall of 2009, the CSU will be turning the CSU Exit Survey over to each campus. As we do not want to lose the information learned from this survey, we are in the process of incorporating it into our annual assessment plan.

STANDARD 2. ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

[Note: Include programs for teachers, including graduate programs for licensed teachers, and other school professionals, noting differences when appropriate.]

2a. Assessment System

1. How is the unit assessment system evaluated and continuously improved? Who is involved and how?

The unit’s system of assessment was approved at our last accreditation visit, and has evolved greatly since that time. Our comprehensive system includes a decentralized approach to individual program improvement which allows program leadership and faculty to make decisions regarding assessment and program changes with input from school partners, while an annual reporting process connects all programs to unit governance and resources.
The system incorporates program evaluations in a process in which programs summarize program strengths, areas of need, and use of data for program improvement in Annual Program Reports (http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/exhibits-reports.html#ProgramReports). These reports are reviewed at both the Department and Unit level to guide decisions about resource allocation, program initiation, program support, and program dissolution. Additionally, each department prepares an Annual Department Report for the unit (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/exhibits-reports.html#DeptReports). An Annual Unit Report summarizes and makes recommendations based on trends from the program and department annual reports.

The system’s basic design consists of three components: the conceptual framework and standards; program evaluation; and, a systemic reporting and documentation process. All programs are guided by the tenets of the conceptual framework which align with program state and/or national standards. Programs do extensive review of candidate performance data, candidate surveys, alumni surveys, employer surveys, and advisory group feedback, which is summarized in an Annual Program Report. Annual Program Reports are submitted to Department Chairs of the department in which each program lives and to the Unit. The Department Chair then reviews each Annual Program Report in their department and summarizes patterns and trends in preparation for the annual Dean’s Cabinet retreat. The Associate Dean for Teacher Education serves as the reviewer of initial teacher credential program reports. Additionally, the two Associate Deans review all Program and Department Annual Reports and draft the Annual Unit Report in preparation for the annual Dean’s Cabinet retreat. The Annual Unit Report also contains unit wide data including enrollment statistics, Title II results, Annual AACTE reports, exam results, GPA information, employer and alumni survey data from across the unit, graduation day surveys, comprehensive exam pass rates, theses/project production, grievance statistics, unit-wide disposition results, and grant awards. These data sources and the report process are defined in the Unit Assessment System Document (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/UnitAssessmentsTimeline09_001.pdf).

Prior to the annual two-day Dean’s Cabinet retreat, a draft Annual Unit Report is reviewed by the Unit Assessment Committee (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/UnitAssessmentCommittee.pdf). This committee includes the associate deans, department chair representatives, faculty representatives, and the unit’s assessment coordinator. All review the draft and collaboratively make tentative recommendations for goals. The Dean’s Cabinet then reviews the draft Annual Unit Report which results in the establishment of Annual Unit Goals, some of which often relate to refinement of the assessment system. For example, the Annual Program Report templates have been refined several times. Additionally, the unit is able to assess each program’s utilization of advisory groups and candidate performance data, thus assuring continued growth and usefulness of the assessment system. The Annual Unit Report is shared with unit faculty, staff, and program and department leaders. Annual Department Reports are also shared with program and department faculty.

Refinement of the unit assessment system has continued since the last accreditation visit through participation of the Program Leaders’ Committee, Cabinet, the Unit Assessment Committee, the Division of Teacher Education Executive Committee, and unit faculty. Our goal has been to integrate assessment within the everyday activities of the unit, and thus, the organizational structure of the unit has become the means for unit assessment development and improvement. A Unit Assessment Graphic (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/UnitAssessmentgraphic.pdf) captures the assessment system and its connection to the day-to-day workings of the unit.

Each year, the Unit Assessment Report serves as the vehicle to document the results of the prior year’s outcomes—in candidate performance, program operations, and unit operations. We consider the unit assessment system to be a part of unit operations and as such, its annual evaluation is included within the annual Unit Assessment Report. Due to the nature of the report process, program leaders and department chairs are instrumental in the review and improvement of the program. These leaders have intimate knowledge of the assessment procedures and results. Each year, their input is provided through the reports themselves and chair’s contribute input at cabinet meetings. The associate deans read all reports and draft the unit goals, some of which always relate to the unit assessment system. As documented within NCATE Part C reports, improvement of various aspects of the unit assessment system have included revision of report templates, development of a unit-wide disposition rubric, collection of clinical practice outcomes data, and emphasis on program use of candidate performance data, to name a few.

Initial Programs’ Entrance Assessments (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/InitialProgramAssessments.pdf)

Advanced Credential and Masters Programs Assessments (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdvancedCredentialandMastersProgramsAssessmentSystem.000.pdf)

2. Please complete the following table (Table 6) to indicate the key assessments used by the unit and its programs to monitor candidate performance at transition points such as those listed in Table 6?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6 Unit Assessment System: Transition Point Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table uploaded in Attachments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How does the unit ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit’s conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards?

Because our Unit Assessment System is based upon a decentralized approach which flows from program assessment to unit assessment, the unit is able to assess candidate proficiencies outlined in state and professional standards and our unit’s conceptual framework. Programs are founded on state standards and the conceptual framework. Programs have identified standards as noted in the Alignment Table (http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/MasterCompositeAlignmentTable.000.pdf). Annual Program Reports identify candidate assessments utilized for program improvement, fully describe the assessments used, and report assessment results and resulting actions. The Annual Unit Assessment Report (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/unitassessmentreport06-07.pdf) describes trends in candidate assessment and program evaluation results, which led to unit goals for all programs or for types of programs (initial or advanced). In addition to tracking trends, the unit incorporates unit-wide assessment related to the Conceptual Framework through the development and implementation of a Unit-wide Disposition Rubric (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/UnitDispositionRubric.000.pdf) which evolved from our Conceptual Framework.

California’s new accreditation system has supported our own unit assessment system through its implementation of a biennial report process. We refined our annual program report template to align more fully with the state’s. The template requires that programs identify candidate assessments used at transition points, provide assessment descriptions, report performance outcomes, identify strengths and weaknesses for candidate performance and program operations, and finally, document actions based upon data-based findings. We have incorporated this report process, not only for our licensure programs but also for our MA programs. This assures that the system collects information on candidate performance on a continual basis.

Our Unit Assessment System (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/UnitAssessmentsTimeline09_001.pdf) is clearly documented and includes a schedule of assessments, responsible parties, and the full description of the annual reporting process. This document, along with adequate personnel to implement the plan, assures our unit consistently collects information on candidate proficiencies as outlined in our Conceptual Framework, state standards, and professional standards.
The unit has invested a great deal of funding into personnel who have responsibility for unit and/or program assessments, including an Office of Assessment and Research with overall research and assessment responsibility for the unit, an Office of Curriculum and Archives whose staff member organizes and maintains unit assessments and reports, a TPA Coordinator (faculty with release), and a TPA staff support person, in addition to Program Leaders and Chairs and two Associate Deans with responsibility for assessment. These roles are further described in section 2b below.

4. How does the unit ensure its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias?

A critical goal in candidate assessment is fair, accurate, consistent, and bias-free procedures. A major effort in this area is the procedure for the scoring of the TPA. The state has established standards for implementation, including efforts toward establishment of reliability and validity. The unit’s plan for addressing the standards was approved in early 2008 for implementation in July 2008. However, the unit has been striving toward this goal for several years. TPA scorers are trained and calibrated. Those candidates receiving a failing score receive a second scoring to verify reliability. Scorers are retrained to maintain accuracy after not scoring for a time. Candidates must follow the Appeals Process if they disagree with the evaluators.

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. Whenever possible, candidates in danger of not passing the experience are notified in writing by mid-quarter, with specific needs to be addressed identified. In some programs, this takes the form of a Professional Growth Plan. Typically, in these cases, another supervisor or the program coordinator or director conducts an additional visit to provide a second opinion and additional collection of evidence regarding performance. Field site support personnel also have input into the assessment of the candidate. As in the case of any course, candidates have the right to appeal grades received for clinical practice through the grade grievance policy of the university.

Advanced programs have established procedures for proctoring and scoring of comprehensive exams. The comprehensive examination is offered every quarter of the year, including the summer. The exam is administered to all programs in the same area, with staff members preparing numbered packets with exam content. Faculty representatives from different programs proctor the exam on a rotating basis. Each program has established rubric for scoring each question on the exam. The comprehensive exam is scored by at least two program faculty members. If there is a disagreement regarding the passage of a question, a third reader reviews the question to determine passage.

In the case of the thesis/project, the candidate selects the readers who will participate in supervising the thesis/project. There must be two readers at minimum. The candidate has the ability to change readers if needed. All these or projects conform to the University standards for graduate work and are approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies.

The EdD program has established scoring rubrics for annual portfolios, literature review, qualifying exam, dissertation proposal, and dissertation defense. In concert with their Dissertation Chair, candidates establish a Qualifying Examination Committee (a minimum of three members), and the candidates can choose to keep this committee to be members of their Dissertation Committee or they can elect to establish a new committee. Candidates may also change Chairs and/or committee members if necessary. All dissertations conform to university standards for graduate work and are approved by the Dissertation Committee and the Dean of Graduate Studies.

University policies support all programs in establishing procedures for fair and accurate assessments. The Academic Grievance Policy (http://academic-affairs.csusb.edu/progs/grade_policy/), the Non-Academic Grievance Policy (http://policies.csusb.edu/studgriev.htm), and the Procedures for Discrimination Complaints (http://policies.csusb.edu/discrecompl.htm) provide candidates with the opportunity to appeal both grades and discriminatory practices.

5. What assessments and evaluations are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit?

As stated previously, the entire unit assessment system incorporates individual program assessments and feedback into an annual reporting process that identifies goals for program and unit improvement. Each program identifies data-driven goals for candidate performance improvement and also operational improvement within report template tables. Annual Program Reports, especially the tables identifying strengths and areas for growth related to candidate performance and program operations, are reviewed for trends and unit-wide goals are identified. Additionally, TPA, clinical practice, the CSU Exit Survey, the CSU Follow-up Survey of graduates and their supervisors, the Current Student Survey (http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COECandidateSurvey06.pdf), the Alumni Survey, and Unit-wide Disposition results (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/UnitDispositionResults2007-08.pdf) are reviewed and used to make judgments which lead to goals for improvement of both operations and programs. Unit goals include operational-related goals and are included for review here (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Goal08-09.pdf).

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the unit assessment system could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 2a. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit or Document Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU Follow-up Survey NCAE Unit Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE Candidate Survey NCAE Unit Responses 2006-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUSB Alumni Survey Unit Responses 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Comp and Thesis/Project Pass Rates 2006-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Disposition Results 2007-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Point Assessments Table 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

1. What are the processes and timelines used by the unit to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data on candidate performance, unit operations, and program quality?
The Unit Assessment Timeline outlines the unit’s assessments and reports, responsible parties, and timeline. The Unit Assessment System was designed to complement already existing organizational structures of the unit. Cabinet is the unit decision-making, and therefore, it is critical that results of assessments and program-identified areas of growth Cabinet as decisions regarding resources and support are made annually. The system assures faculty and program leaders are actively involved throughout the process. Roles of those with responsibility for the system are defined below.

RESPONSIBLE PARTY ROLE
Dean - Oversight of Unit and decision-making
Cabinet - decision-making in collaboration with Dean
Unit Assess. Comm. - Oversight: system implementation & its improvement
Program Leaders - Oversight: candidate performance assessment & faculty evaluation
Department Chairs - Oversight: department programs & creation of department reports
Assoc. Dean, Admin. - Oversight: advanced programs, comp exams, review of annual reports
Assoc. Dean, Teach. Ed. - Oversight: initial programs, review of annual reports, draft unit report
Office of Assessment & Research - Oversight: FilemkerPro, unit-wide assessments, program level assessments (TPA, clinical results…)& federal & system reports
Office of Curr & Archives - Archival of curriculum & accreditation documents, preparation of reports, communication w/ accrediting bodies, coordination of follow-up calls for CSU Survey
TPA Coordinator Implementation, training of scorers, secondary scoring of failing candidates, qualitative analysis
Deans’ Assistant Coordination and management of candidate grievances

The Office of Curriculum & Archives (OCA) electronically collects reports, syllabi, and vitae. An electronic database, managed by the Director of Assessment & Research, houses admission and exit outcomes. Unit-wide assessments are housed in the same office, and this employee collaborates with CSUSB’s Office of Institutional Research on enrollment and completion statistics. Program leaders manage candidate assessments, advisory feedback, and survey data, although the Office of Assessment and Research (OAR) maintains program and unit databases of candidate evaluation and unit surveys and reports results to the program leaders and the unit. Annual Program Reports summarize data and feedback and are submitted to the OCA and department chairs. Candidates’ formal complaints are logged in the Dean’s Office.

CSUSB recently implemented a campus-wide PeopleSoft Student Records System. The unit is presently updating our electronic Candidate Management Database (CMD) system, maintained by the COE’s OAR. The university’s records system does not allow for inclusion of candidate assessments and does not provide for adequate tracking of program progress. Our goal is to further centralize data management. The CMD is available to all faculty and necessary staff. Full implementation of the system will occur in two phases. Phase I (beta testing is scheduled for May ‘09) follows candidate recruitment, applications, admission requirements and decisions, program and course enrollment, faculty advising, course substitutions, program progress, supervision placements and results, comprehensive exam results, thesis/project results, and culminates in credential analysts review of and recommendation for credentials. Data is used to prepare Title II Reports, AACTE reports, CTC reports, CSU reporting, and answer inquiries regarding candidate performance and program completion which will be used at the program, department, and unit levels for decision-making. Phase 2, tentatively scheduled for winter ‘10, will track candidate assessments, dispositions, TPA, clinical practice assessments, and program-specific assessments and surveys. Phase 2 will allow anonymous candidate responses to the Current Student Survey and the CSU Exit Survey.

We are very excited about our new Candidate Management Database and its potential to allow us to follow candidate performance, and program and unit performance. A centralized management system will facilitate ease of use for faculty and staff. This system will allow us to accurately track all candidates at every stage of their program involvement, and assist in coordination with the university system so data is complete for all candidates. Efforts are underway to link the Candidate Management Database with the university-wide student records system, which may incorporate importing university-tracked candidate data into the COE Candidate Management Database to ensure all essential data is accurate and current. Logistics on present collection and analysis of data are listed below:

Initial Program Logistics
Application Process Assessments
The Student Services Office (SSO) inputs admissions information into the Candidate Management Database, which all Program Leaders access. Program Admission Coordinators review completed applications and candidates who have met all requirements are admitted. Applications of candidates applying for special admission are forwarded to Program Leaders for decision.

Course Assignments and Grades
The PeopleSoft system monitors candidates’ grades and notifies the SSO when candidates do not maintain the required GPA. All candidates’ grades are available through accessing the university-wide PeopleSoft student records system; however, we have planned to import student course grades into the COE Candidate Management Database to aid faculty and staff.

Fieldwork and Student Teaching Evaluations
As of Fall ’06, fieldwork/supervision data was collected and recorded by the SSO, and entered into an electronic database by the OAR, which analyzes the data and submits program specific reports to Program Leaders and the Unit Assessment Committee. Aggregate data is also produced. All fieldwork evaluation data is maintained and stored in this same office.

Teacher Performance Assessments
TPAs are scored electronically in a web-based platform maintained by the College’s web manager. The assessments are electronically analyzed and submitted to the TPA faculty coordinator who completes qualitative analysis and the OAR (as of Fall ’08) which completes quantitative analysis. The TPA Coordinator subsequently authors a TPA Report ([http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/TPAReporttoDean.pdf](http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/TPAReporttoDean.pdf)) of quantitative and qualitative results by program and in the aggregate. Program Directors, the Dean, and the Associate Dean of Teacher Education receive the report.

CSU Follow-up Survey
The Dean’s Office receives annual CSU Follow-up Survey results, which are analyzed by the Dean, Associate Dean, and Program Leaders. The OCA manages follow-up calls to encourage survey completion and the OAR maintains the information on complters for submission to the CSU. This office is currently piloting a new report format created by the Dean, Associate Deans, and Program Leaders to facilitate ease of use and interpretation.
incorporated new state requirements into our process to reduce redundancy of reporting. We will also be moving to biennial reporting (with two years of data)

Advanced Programs Logistics

Application and Beginning Assessments

CSUSB applications are submitted to the Graduate Studies Office along with transcripts, recommendation letters, and program specific documents. Program coordinators review applications. Applicants can be admitted fully, conditionally, or provisionally. Application status is reviewed and maintained by program coordinators, program advisors, or appointed faculty and/or staff. The SSO and program coordinators maintain records for advanced applicants. Some programs operate on a cohort model, in which new groups start and complete the program in tandem. New cohorts may begin each quarter, once a year, or every two years.

The doctoral program requires completion of the GRE, application, and interview for review by the faculty committee.

Midterm Assessments, Grades and GPA

All candidates’ grades are available from the Office of Admissions and Records through the student information portion of the PeopleSoft system. GPA is monitored by the Graduate Studies Office and reported to program coordinators, including identification and notification of candidates to be placed on academic probation, or if necessary, dismissed. Candidates must maintain a 3.0 GPA to remain in the program; probation is assigned if the GPA falls below that level. After two quarters below 3.0, the candidate may be dismissed from the program and the university. For master’s program candidates, a Graduate Approved Program Plan is documented prior to completion of 20 units. This is the formal “map” or “contract” for the completion of program requirements, including a schedule for completion of the program. At this time, decisions are made regarding which culminating event, of either the comprehensive exam or project/thesis, the candidate will pursue. If the program includes clinical practice, a certain portion of program requirements must be met prior to admission to the field component. This may include testing or course completion of specified courses with 3.0 GPA. For the doctoral program, successful completion of the qualifying examination and annual portfolios provides support for continuation in the program.

Final Assessments

Culminating assessment activities for MA programs consist of a comprehensive exam or project/thesis. Some programs also include completion of a national test. The comprehensive exam is developed by program faculty and read by two faculty members. Each question is scored on a 0-5 point scale, with a score of “3” for passage. If there is disagreement regarding a particular question, a third faculty member reads the question to determine pass or fail. There is a scoring rubric for each program. The pass rate for the comprehensive exam is compiled by the COE Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and graduate office staff. These are analyzed by quarter for each program, and are compiled for each exam question to facilitate program improvement. Information about individual pass rates is reported in program annual reports, as well as detail on how the program will use the data to improve program content.

For the project/thesis option, each candidate is guided by 2-4 faculty members who have an interest and expertise in the topic. The decision to complete a project (more practice-based), or thesis (more theoretical in format) is made by the candidate and faculty advisors. We are developing a format for summarizing the results of COE project/thesis completion through the OAR to determine length of time to completion as well as completion rates. COE projects/theses are kept in compliance with standards of graduate level research by the University Graduate Studies Office and require final approval of the Graduate Dean. The comprehensive exam is offered at San Bernardino and PDC. In addition, the exam may be taken using computer if desired by the candidates.

EdD candidates must successfully propose and defend a dissertation. Their committee is made up of 3-5 faculty members with demonstrated expertise in the research area. Dissertations are kept to standards of graduate level research and must be approved by the dissertation committee and the Dean of Graduate Studies.

Unit-Wide Logistics

Office of Assessment and Research (OAR)

Our 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. We are in our third year of benefitting from the services of Dr. Mahoney who has expertise in assessment and evaluation. We view her office as a funnel in which much data is generated or collected and then is 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, & 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. Dr. Mahoney monitors admission GPA, GPA of certain courses, and program completion numbers.

Office of Curriculum & Archives (OCA)

Since 2000, this office has been instrumental in the collection of program and department reports, faculty vita, syllabi, curriculum changes, committee summaries, and accreditation evidence. It houses the unit’s documents including the CF and its history, curriculum changes, and communications from accrediting bodies. 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.

Annual Reporting Process

The unit’s annual report process establishes a means for individual program evaluation to feed into the unit assessment system. Each program leader prepares an Annual Program Report (i.e., http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CounselingGuidanceAR08.pdf) which identifies a multitude of program aspects including transition point assessments, resulting data, survey and advisory feedback, strengths and weaknesses based upon data and feedback, and action plans for program improvement in both operations and candidate performance. These reports are submitted to the chair of the department that houses each program. Chairs do a summary report regarding trends across department programs and possible impact on resources. All reports are submitted to the two associate deans who draft an Annual Unit Assessment Report, reviewed at the Cabinet’s annual fall retreat. Goals for advanced and initial programs are developed and reviewed by program leaders with review by faculty. These ultimately become the unit’s goals for the year. 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.

“Part C” reports provide a history of the evolution of the report process used by the unit. The annual report template has gone through revisions with much input from program leaders and cabinet members. We are very pleased with our most recent version, which was used for the first time in 07-08. This template has incorporated new state requirements into our process to reduce redundancy of reporting. We will also be moving to biennial reporting (with two years of data) rather than annual reporting, to align ourselves with state expectations.

2. How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?

The University has procedures in place to facilitate candidates’ filing of formal complaints. The Student Non-academic Grievance Policy
2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

1. What are assessment data indicating about candidate performance on the main campus, at off-campus sites, and in distance learning programs?

TPA data suggests that PDC and SB campus candidates have similar performance. Off-campus sites for Education Administration do not appear to differ significantly in performance. With the exception of reading, there are not enough completers of distance learning programs to make a comparison. We are in the process of being able to track potential differences through the next phase of assessment tracking through connecting candidate assessments with the COE Candidate Management Database system.

Initial programs are meeting state standards. Areas that have been identified for attention include the following:

- adaptations for EL and students with special needs
- use of instructional technology
- reading across the content areas (for SS only)
- resources for at-risk students

Advanced programs also are meeting standards. The major area identified for increased attention throughout this evaluation period has been ability in professional writing, including abstract writing and literature reviews.

2. How are data regularly used by candidates and faculty to improve their performance?

The unit has institutionalized its use of data for candidate performance improvement through its use of the annual report process. Individual programs review candidate performance data, survey results, and advisory group feedback and summarize its use within the Annual Program Report. Annual Report findings are shared with faculty. Additionally, the Dean meets quarterly with the Student Advisory Committee which also responds to data results. Program advisory groups and teacher education advisory groups also review and react to assessment results, contributing to the unit’s interpretation and use of the data. In addition to program use of data, the unit also analyzes patterns and trends across programs. This often results in unit goals related to candidate performance improvement and unit support of the related activities. Progress toward unit goals is monitored and documented within the Annual Unit Assessment Reports.

The Division of Teacher Education and the Advanced and Professional Program Leaders’ Committee have each identified goals (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/MAGoals08-09.pdf). These typically become a part of Unit Goals. Additional information is also available within the Annual Program Reports (action plans for improvement) and the Annual Unit Report in which unit goals and progress made is recorded.

3. How are data used to discuss or initiate program or unit changes on a regular basis?

The unit has institutionalized its use of data for program improvement through its use of the annual report process. Individual programs review candidate performance data, survey results, and advisory group feedback and summarize its use within the Annual Program Report. Action plans for candidate performance improvement and/or improvement of operations is noted within the reports. The Division of Teacher Education generates goals for initial programs by identifying trends across these programs. Similarly, program leaders for advanced programs generate goals for advanced programs based upon trends in advanced programs. In addition to program use of data, the unit also analyzes patterns and trends across programs. This results in unit goals related to program and/or unit improvement and unit support of the related activities.

Interspersed throughout this process is K-12 school, community, and campus colleague review and input. Assessment results are shared with program level and unit wide advisory boards for review and analysis. Additionally, potential goals based upon data are reviewed by advisory group membership. This process is done minimally on an annual basis, and for some groups quarterly. The Teacher Education Advisory Group, for example, meets quarterly and reviews candidate performance assessment results and the CSU Follow-up Survey results. Multiple discussions have been held on data-stimulated topics such as adaptation of instruction, reading across the content areas, dual language, instruction of special needs students, and instructional technology.

Additionally, data and draft goals are taken to program faculty for dialogue and input. Occasionally, real program change does not occur until after faculty have ample time to discuss, study, and develop consensus on what action needs to be taken. This typically requires review of syllabi, texts, assignments, and candidate work products. Additionally, sometimes faculty request support for training and resources in order for them to proceed in an area. As an example, presently, we are in the midst of a goal related to the teaching of special needs students in the general education setting and IRIS modules are being reviewed by individual faculty in and program meetings.

4. What data-driven changes have occurred over the past three years?

The annual unit and program reports for the last five years provide documentation of data-driven changes that have occurred. A sample of changes from the past three years is shown in the Data-driven Changes Table (http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/DataDrivenChangesTable.pdf). Further information may be found in each program’s annual report. Additionally, all programs identify program strengths and areas for improvement in their annual reports.
5. How are assessment data shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders?

As stated previously, the annual program reports are shared with program faculty at program meetings. Established unit goals are shared at College meetings for faculty and staff. The unit report has also been made available to the College electronically. Related goals for teacher education are shared at Division meetings with staff and at program meetings. Similarly, goals for advanced programs are developed and shared with program leaders at Program Leaders’ Meetings. Assessment data is shared with advisory groups, including the Unit-wide Student Advisory Group, with their invited input into creation and refinement of goals.

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the use of data for program improvement could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 2c. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 2?

We believe that we have implemented an assessment system that is well-suited for a unit with the wide range of programs that we offer. The system was new when approved during the last assessment cycle. Since then, we have continually refined the implementation processes with full participation of program leadership and through them, program faculty (as noted in annual “Part C” reports). The annual report process has worked well to assure that the unit is well aware of issues and strengths related to all programs. The system has promoted all programs’ implementation of advisory groups, analysis of assessment results, and use of data for program improvement. The system has been developed to coordinate with the unit’s organizational structure and procedures, so that assessment is less an “accreditation activity,” but is instead a normal activity for program and unit improvement.

2. What research related to Standard 2 is being conducted by the unit?

We are conducting no formal research related to Standard 2. We have, however, made annual presentations that relate to Standards 1, 2, and 3. Our assessment system has been very well received by participants as evidenced by attendance and also requests for our system (approx. 30 requests in 08 and 45 requests in 07). Presentations (Exhibit 2c62.1) included the following:

- Riggs, I., Sandlin, R., Arlin, P., & Eggleton, E. (2009). Meeting NCATE Standards 2 and 3 through Establishment of Sustainable and Meaningful Partnerships with Advisory Boards: The Use of Candidate Performance Data as a Standing Agenda Item, Presentation made at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Preparation, Chicago.

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 personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

[Note: In this section institutions must address (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus and distance learning programs.]

3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

1. Who are the unit’s partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit’s field and clinical experiences?

Our region’s size necessitates a unique system of partnerships. We have relationships with more than 50 school districts in 2 very large (geographically) counties (School Districts) http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Table10_002.pdf. Effectiveness requires collaboration with 2 county offices of education, the districts themselves, and arts/science colleagues. We have a proven record of partnerships that have included student teacher and intern placements and induction. Most grant-funded projects are in partnership with school/agency colleagues (Grants) http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/GrantsandContractsAwarded_000.pdf. Following, we describe collaboration at county, district, and campus levels.

County Collaboration

CSUSB’s large geographic service area (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/RIMSRegionMap.pdf) necessitates close collaboration with county offices of education. Our partnerships with San Bernardino and Riverside counties are strong and long lasting as since 1992, we were an original partner in Riverside County’s (RCOE) induction program which also serves San Bernardino. Dean Arlin serves on the RIMS BTSA Institutional Review Board while five faculty serve
on Governance. Other representatives include project teachers (teachers-on-release). This partnership was showcased at the Cal Council for Teacher Education 2001 meeting in a collaborative presentation. It reported on benefits when teacher educators collaborate in induction. 

(http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/cte_presentation_final.pdf)

This relationship evolved to achieve state funding to serve MS interns. CSUSB faculty, county office personnel, and a teacher-on-assignment developed the state funded project. Funded since 1998, the teacher-on-assignment and a CSUSB faculty member serve as co-directors. In 2000-2001, the grant expanded to serve SS interns.

Since 1999, funding supported development of workshops for applicants attempting to pass the California Subject Matter Exams for Teachers (CSET). These continue to be offered. A faculty member and project teacher serve as co-directors (ASAP Program Brochure).

http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CSET_Preparation_Flyer_2009.pdf. Strengths of both intern and ASAP programs is the collaborative leadership provided by faculty and project teachers. This enables a unique level of P-12 involvement, in that teachers are in close and frequent contact with professors and/or candidates. The Intern Co-Director (Recently Released Teacher) meets regularly with the faculty Intern Co-Director and has campus office space.

County personnel also partner through membership on advisory boards. Superintendents of both counties have close relationships with CSUSB and have easy access to our president and dean. Additionally, the one of our department chairs, presently serves as president of the County Board of Education (http://www.sbcsc.k12.ca.us/Board/index_BoE.php) and attends county personnel director meetings. All of these efforts provide county personnel a direct line of communication to the unit regarding our educator preparation programs, and they also serve to link the unit to county-identified needs and feedback for all credential and advanced programs.

District Collaboration

County offices of education provide a strong vehicle for communication with district partners through frequent District Liaison Meetings (DLMs). Each induction and/or intern district identifies a District Liaison who attends 4-5 meetings per year. CSUSB initial program directors, the director of supervision, the associate dean for teacher education, CSUSB induction faculty, and the faculty member co-attending and project workshops attend these meetings in which issues are discussed and resolved. Meetings are very well attended and serve as one more source of feedback for teacher education (District Liaison Meetings: Exhibit 3.a.1). All attendees acquire up-to-date knowledge about district needs and new teacher and intern context and needs. Meetings are offered in each region of the service area within county office centers.

In addition to DLMs, unit programs have established advisory councils which include school district membership. Advisory councils have schedules for meeting, established memberships, and their recommendations are reported in each program’s annual report.

Campus Collaboration

The COE has strengthened its collaboration with campus colleagues via a system of advisory groups that provides opportunities for university administration, arts/sciences faculty, COE faculty/administration, along with P-12 school representatives to consider all aspects of teacher education with special focus on content preparation issues. The Associate Provost of Academic Programs chairs quarterly meetings with subject matter and education faculty while she and the Dean co-chair Teacher Education Advisory Council quarterly meetings. (Teacher Education Advisory Minutes)

http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/TeacherEducationAdvisoryMeetingSummaries.htm; Subject Matter Advisory Group Minutes

http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/SubjectMatterAdvisoryGroupMeetingSummaries.htm. Membership has been consistent and has greatly benefitted the unit.

2. In what ways have the unit’s partners contributed to the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit’s field and clinical experiences?

The active role of school site personnel in delivery of site experiences, in addition to their involvement in assessment of candidates provides our school partners with insight into the strengths and weaknesses of both our candidates and our programs. Programs have established protocol for ensuring constant communication with site personnel regarding our candidates, their performance, and the curricular aspects of our program. For example, within initial teacher programs, university supervisors meet site principals and resident teachers at least 4-6 times per quarter. Resident teachers join supervisors in formative and summative assessment of candidates. School site staff meet regularly with university supervisors to discuss intern progress. Also, school principals receive letters of orientation, which provide an overview of the program and its expectations. This introductory letter asks principals to contact the Director to discuss problems/issues. If an intern is having difficulty with an expected competency, the university supervisor, the field support teacher (coach) and the principal may meet to assess the situation. These sessions often include discussions about program variables and have impact on program decisions.

In order to promote meaningful interaction with our partners, the unit also includes a number of advisory groups, at program and unit levels. All programs use advisory groups as a foundation for involving practitioners and faculty in design, delivery and refinement of programs (Education Unit Advisory Groups Chart) (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/EducationUnitAdvisoryGroups_000.pdf). Advisory groups include teachers and other school professionals.

Palm Desert Campus is included within our advisory group structure, as many of our meetings are held regionally. The Educational Administration Program, offered in various districts, also holds advisory meetings within each of its cohort areas. Regularly scheduled meetings provide opportunities to discuss matters of common concern such as program policies, program changes, procedural changes (e.g. online credential application), program coursework, candidate performance, and recommendations for programmatic improvements. Examples of these discussions reside within program documents and archives in addition to meeting summaries.

Faculty and program leadership take input from advisory groups very seriously, and recommendations often lead to change in program operations or curriculum. Program leaders report how advisory group feedback has been used for program improvement within their Annual Program Reports. Advisory Board Contributions to Program Improvement (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdvisoryBoardContributionsToProgramImprovement_000.pdf).

Collaborative relations are also achieved through interactions with the pool of part-time instructors who teach and supervise within the unit’s programs, many of whom are currently employed within the schools. Part-time instructors are often called upon to facilitate curriculum development and candidate assessment. For example, adjunct faculty:

--assess TPAs and supervise clinical practice within initial and advanced programs,
--often serve on advisory committees and attend program meetings, and
--sometimes facilitate recruitment and logistics for courses and field experiences.

Additionally, our placements for field assignments incorporate partner input:

- The Supervision Office coordinates teacher education placements with our many districts. Each district has a field coordinator who collaborates with our Supervision Office Director and Program Directors in making appropriate field assignments.

- The 2042 Programs’ TPE’s & TPA’s were reviewed by each council with major dialogue related to training and field-site needs, participation of K-12 partners in scoring, & curriculum that prepares for passage of the TPA.
The Single Subject Program has developed close partnerships with a select group of districts in which most candidates are placed. Faculty liaisons coordinate placements with each district and conduct a minimum of 3 orientations per year with each district partner in order to enhance dialogue regarding the clinical practice and to provide additional support to district personnel, supervisors, and candidates. The Professional Development Sites provide support by selecting highly qualified resident teachers for our candidates.

Erin Mason, who works with Dual Language Programs of San Bernardino County and is a member of our Teacher Education Advisory Committee, helped identify appropriate field settings in which our BCLAD candidates could complete their fieldwork.

Advisory members prompted development of a resident teacher brochure that outlined qualifications of resident teachers. The brochure was modeled after a brochure used by induction. Councils also reviewed the draft.

Regional Advisory meetings (06-07 & others), RIMS BTSA Governance & DLMs helped establish an online Support Provider Training & Intern Coach Training as recommended criteria for resident teachers.

Hillside University Demonstration School was named CSUSB’s Demonstration School in 1986. The relationship supports collaborative efforts between the school and the entire University. Collaborative projects change over time and have included on site courses; team teaching with site teachers; teacher demonstrations; and most importantly, a Hillside teacher is always available to facilitate CSUSB students’ early field experiences. Hillside University Demonstration School has been recognized with 7 awards, including the Partnership Award for Teacher Education from the California Council for the Education of Teachers and the Christa McAuliffe award for the outstanding national partnership in the county from the American Association for Schools and Universities. Within this review period, the Hillside Governance Council:

* Recommended increased attention to the CELDT (CA Eng Lg Dev Test) within new coursework.
* Received feedback on MS candidates completing early field and/or clinical practice.
* Continually reviewed the 2042 Program with special attention to TPA’s.
* Included a summary of related survey items from initial teacher education coursework.

Despite its large geographic region, the unit has successfully established and maintained the quality of its collaborations at the county, district/school, and campus levels and thus, is maintaining its ability to meet the region’s needs. We include results of related survey items from initial teacher candidates under 3a.6 which demonstrate our candidates seem pleased with the quality of the placements, while, like those on other CSU campuses, they are less aware of our many partnerships with school colleagues.

**3. What is the role of the unit and its school partners in determining how and where candidates are placed for field experiences, student teaching, and internships?**

Program directors identify potential placement sites as they meet with advisory committees, district administrators, and site supervisors. University supervisors often identify appropriate settings for placements. Additionally, once BCLAD candidates prove proficiency in the language of emphasis, primary language sites (http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldSettingswithSpanishPrimaryLanguage.pdf) for BCLAD interns and student teachers are arranged.

Over past years, the SS Program (including Adapted P.E.) has centered efforts on identifying a more limited number of districts in which most candidates are placed. The Director and several faculty have developed close relationships with each district. The program and districts have come to a common understanding of expectations for each partner. SS candidates needing field work during early coursework are placed by collaborative efforts of the Supervision Office (SO) and district staff. In most cases, candidates continue within the same school for student teaching. MS candidates make their own requests for an early field classroom in which to observe and/or participate by using a program-developed letter of request and explanation. The program also makes recommendations to candidates in the form of our partnership school, Hillside Demonstration Elementary School, in which a teacher has the assigned responsibility of matching candidates to the type of classroom and practice they need to access. Kimbark Elementary, a magnet school for technology and science, is one school that we highly recommend.

Over past years, the SS Program (including Adapted P.E.) has centered efforts on identifying a more limited number of districts in which most candidates are placed. The Director and several faculty have developed close relationships with each district. The program and districts have come to a common understanding of expectations for each partner. SS candidates needing field work during early coursework are placed by collaborative efforts of the Supervision Office (SO) and district staff. In most cases, candidates continue within the same school for student teaching. MS candidates make their own requests for an early field classroom in which to observe and/or participate by using a program-developed letter of request and explanation. The program also makes recommendations to candidates in the form of our partnership school, Hillside Demonstration Elementary School, in which a teacher has the assigned responsibility of matching candidates to the type of classroom and practice they need to access. Kimbark Elementary, a magnet school for technology and science, is one school that we highly recommend.

Placement quality is monitored throughout the clinical experience by the university supervisor. Frequent observation visits allow the supervisor to maintain accurate knowledge of the setting and to assess appropriateness for the candidate. Every attempt is made to provide candidates with a supportive environment for learning, and making a new placement during the quarter is only used as a last resort. Typically if issues are identified, the supervisor is able to clarify policies and procedures through communication with the support teacher, principal and/or candidate.

An additional means of monitoring placement quality is done through candidate and supervisor evaluation experience (Resident Teacher Evaluation Forms). Directors scrutinize candidate and supervisor evaluations of RTs and use results to guide future placements (MS and SS Resident Teacher Evaluation 07-08) (Resident Teacher Brochure). Selection is handled by school districts and final placement in confirmed by the university supervisor after visiting the site. In the case of SS, faculty liaisons also facilitate and confirm placements. Any placements deemed as inappropriate come back to the Director of Supervision, who then negotiates with the district.

Interns serve in districts with which we have negotiated Memoranda of Understanding (MOU). The SO serves as support for the process. Additionally, Intern Directors and staff facilitate the approval process, including assignment of field support teachers (coaches). Credential Analysts also work throughout the admission process with school district personnel to verify that candidates meet internal credential requirements—critical for employment for these candidates. The RIMS BTSA DLMs serve to connect faculty with administrators, teachers, and credential analysts of intern districts. Issues are raised and resolved through this established mechanism.

Should a candidate request placement within a school with whom we do not share an MOU (such as charter school), the candidate and school personnel document a description of the context of the school, including a typical day’s schedule, number of students, typical class size, instructional strategies, and school philosophy for review by the program director. The school leadership, program director, and candidate can then meet to discuss any areas of concern.
The nature of advanced programs requires a somewhat different system of placement. Program coordinators, staff, and department chairs are responsible for coordinating field and clinical sites. Clinical experiences in advanced programs are determined jointly by the advisor or program coordinator, school district/agency and candidate. Since most of these candidates work full-time, they are typically assigned to the same site where they are employed. As an example, in Educational Administration Tier I, candidates must be working teachers who self-select an administrative mentor. A faculty member meets with the selected mentor for one-on-one approval and orientation. As they complete Tier II, administrative candidates must be practicing administrators and their clinical practice serves as an induction program. In School Psychology, the candidate negotiates the specific site(s) for placement with the program coordinator. The placement(s) is based upon candidate training needs. For example, a current special education teacher from an elementary school may want more access to a secondary or preschool setting to develop expertise in those developmental areas. Candidates visit with supervising personnel at the site, the candidate and supervisor review the Handbook, the CASP Field Experience Manual, and the various instruments of assessment for the experience. The candidate negotiates with the supervisor the specific professional development experiences that are mandated, with additional expectations and goals added to the School Psychology Field Experience Plan. The plan is individualized, with general expectations of the program stipulated in the Field Experience Evaluation Form.

4. How do the unit and its school partners share expertise and resources to support candidates’ learning in field experiences and clinical practice?

We are fortunate to work with schools that willingly open their doors to our candidates. They share teachers, principals, counselors, students, and materials to our benefit. School personnel observe and assess candidates, confer with candidates for improvement efforts, and dialogue with supervisors regarding candidate performance. While the Unit offers a minimal stipend to resident teachers ($166.70/quarter) and field support teachers for interns ($1000.00/year), clearly, the value of their efforts far exceeds the stipend amount. The schools appreciate hosting our candidates for field and clinical practice due to the added benefit of having another “professional” available to help P-12 students. As reported in advisory meetings throughout the years, they tend to desire CSUSB candidates, want to be involved in their development, and hope to retain them as employees. Our school partners also share of themselves in their involvement as part-time instructors, TPA scorers, grant partners, and advisory members. School administrators give of their time each year as they evaluate our teacher graduates after their first year of teaching as part of the CSU’s follow-up survey. We believe that both the schools and our candidates benefit from these partnerships as expertise is shared and developed.

The Unit’s offering of five state-supported intern programs is another means of sharing resources to support clinical and field practice. Many of our districts experience shortages in critical areas such as special education, mathematics, and science. We have a long history of successfully attaining funding to support intern programs, which are more expensive to offer than traditional programs. Funding allows us to provide interns with more supervised practice, textbooks for candidates, and monetary support for field support teachers. Field support teachers share expertise and experience in the ongoing formative support of interns. Our MS and SS intern programs are in partnership with the RCOE, which shares its support in the identification of site support teachers, the logistics of payment, and collection of state-required consent forms. RCOE also arranges the DLM’s described previously, which bring together district and CSUSB representatives to update and problem solve intern issues. RCOE and CSUSB share in both direct and indirect funding related to the intern grants and also the induction grant—strong evidence our trusting and respectful relationship.

Hillside University Demonstration School also is a model of shared resources. The school provides candidates with a uniquely accommodating field/c clinical site while also holding governance meetings on site. CSUSB returns in kind with candidates from multiple programs (teacher, reading, instructional tech, counseling…) who support Hillside student learning. We also provide support for Hillside events which are sometimes held at CSUSB. Most recently, Hillside students provided CSUSB with over 100 pieces of art that were used as part of our building campaign.

An additional example of sharing of resources was also a result of a grant—in this case, a Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers for Technology (PT3 Website) were mentored in use of technology by school teachers, our candidates were supported in the field by teachers who were receiving technology-related professional development, and the unit donated computers to the involved school sites.

Our Administration Program provides an exemplary model of shared resources within its site-based cohort model in which courses are offered through support of district logistics and personnel. Within our reading programs, the Literacy Center serves as a community resource for both candidates and districts. Schools send children in need of literacy support to the Center where our candidates engage in field and clinical experiences. K-12 students check out Center library materials, and we offer districts a Resource Center.

Advisory groups also result in many shared benefits. A prime example of this was development of a list of classrooms in which Spanish is used as the primary language of instruction. A county office employee worked with our MS Director to develop these potential placements for our BCLAD candidates.

In conclusion, our long-standing partnerships have resulted in a variety of means to support the needs of our candidates. For further evidence, we provide the following examples to demonstrate the roles of partner districts and the COE in sharing the costs of placement and support of candidates:

- Districts provide many hours of human resources to facilitate placement of candidates. The Director of Supervision sends requests for placements to an average of 50 districts a quarter. District administrators follow guidelines provided for selection of resident teachers and contact site principals. Principals (on average 245) assess teaching staff for appropriate personnel, confirm teachers’ willingness to host a candidate, and notify district administration, who in turn confirms suitability to serve as a resident teacher. District personnel then communicate with the Supervision staff.

- Assignment of Intern Coaches begins with identification of the interns at each school site. The Director of Supervision provides this information to districts at the DLM’s. District liaisons work through district and site administration to match coaches and interns. When assignments are finalized, the information goes to both RCOE and the Supervision Office. Again, many hours of personnel time are used.

- Resident teachers and intern coaches give of their time to meet with candidates and university supervisors to discuss responsibilities and provide formative and summative feedback.

- Site principals and/or site staff meet with candidates to provide information for their “School, Class, and Community Report” assignment.

- District office personnel prepare requisitions for resident teacher and intern coach stipends. They also ensure that payment gets to the appropriate support teacher.

- District and/or site personnel provide assistance for candidates who are fulfilling early field requirements. Time is needed to ensure that appropriate teachers/classrooms are assigned to enable candidates to complete their fieldwork requirements.

- Districts send personnel to the DLM’s and other advisory meetings.

- District personnel communicate (email, phone, fax, & written communication) with supervision and credential staff on a wide variety of issues related to candidates’ progress.
5. What differences, if any, exist in collaboration with school partners in programs for other school professionals, off-campus programs, and distance learning programs?

We don’t note any significant differences. As described above, all of our programs collaborate through established advisory groups. They all use part-time instructors who greatly contribute to the experiences of our candidates. Initial teacher intern programs provide more supervision than student teacher tracks. On-site intern coaches provide more collegial support and are not involved in summative assessment. As explained above, the Educational Administration Program is provided at multiple off-campus sites, allowing qualified experts in these communities to participate in field placements and also to serve as part-time instructors strengthening the collaboration with educational leaders in those regions. The Reading Program’s transition to an online model did necessitate a revision of how supervision is implemented. Presently, video recordings allow for assessment of classroom practice, but increased online interaction is under development.

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to collaboration between unit and school partners could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 3a. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

CSU Follow-up Survey - Collaboration Table

See Attachments panel below.

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

1. Please complete the following table (Table 7) to identify the field experiences and clinical practice required for each program or categories of programs (e.g., secondary) at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels, including graduate programs for licensed teachers.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Field Experiences</th>
<th>Clinical Practice (Student Teaching or Internship)</th>
<th>Total Number of Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Subject Student Teaching</td>
<td>EELB 301, 6 hrs field EELB 312: Family, Culture and Schooling, 6 hrs field EELB 313: Pedagogical Foundations for ELL, 6 hrs field EELB 315/316: Riding/LA Curriculum &amp; Pedagogy, 6 hrs field EELB 317: Educ Psychology for a Diverse Society, 6 hrs field 30 hours</td>
<td>Student Teaching, 2 quarters required in two settings: upper &amp; lower elementary, one or which is 800 25% different than candidate ethnically 770 hrs</td>
<td>30 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Subject Internship</td>
<td>EELB 301, 6 hrs field EELB 312: Family, Culture and Schooling, 6 hrs field EELB 313: Pedagogical Foundations for ELL, 6 hrs field EELB 315/316: Riding/LA Curriculum &amp; Pedagogy, 6 hrs field EELB 317: Educ Psychology for a Diverse Society, 6 hrs field EELB 315/316: Riding/LA Curriculum &amp; Pedagogy, 6 hrs field EELB 317: Educ Psychology for a Diverse Society, 6 hrs field 30 hours</td>
<td>Supervised Intern Teaching, supervised with their employment setting for 3 quarters. 1155 hrs</td>
<td>1185 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Subject Student Teaching</td>
<td>ESEC 405, 407, 413 10 hrs each ESEC 550A Seminar, 60 hrs Total 90 hr</td>
<td>Student Teaching, 2 quarters, 480 hrs</td>
<td>570 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Subject Internship</td>
<td>ESEC 405, 407, 413 30 hrs</td>
<td>Supervised Intern Teaching, supervised with their employment setting for 3 quarters; 1155 hrs</td>
<td>1185 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
<td>ESEC 694A—Induction summary, evaluation, &amp; presentation of implementation of induction, documentation &amp; reflection on professional development, 85 hrs</td>
<td>Student Teaching—320 hours Interns—Supervised in classroom, 1540 hrs</td>
<td>86+ (employed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Lg Arts</td>
<td>ERDG 679—Candidates are employed &amp; create a needs assessment, and based on the results develop a series of professional development workshops for teachers and/or parents.</td>
<td>ERDG 625, 640, part of 632— Including assessment, implementation of tutorial program, case study, diagnostic assessment, analysis and profile development, 86 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted P.E.</td>
<td>Field components in all courses—infused in curriculum. Activities in APE include basic motor skill acquisition, adaptive aquatics, modified sport games, 56 hrs</td>
<td>1 quarter student teaching in general education setting 1 quarter student teaching in APE setting 480 hrs</td>
<td>536 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>EAOM 621A-60 hours K-6 setting, EAOM 621B-60 hours 7-12 setting, shadowing an administrator at school sites</td>
<td>EAOM 660, 680-fieldwork at site, including interview skills, self-assessment, reflection-defined by task not hours</td>
<td>120+ hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counseling</td>
<td>Practicum hours assigned in courses. Activities include individual and group counseling, group guidance, consultation in multicultural settings, program evaluation, consultation (in 2 settings—elementary, junior or high school)</td>
<td>Includes 600 hours in 4 identified courses.</td>
<td>600+ hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td>1200 hours in K-12 schools, includes student assessment activities. These hrs are spread throughout program</td>
<td>1200 hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EVO 640, Candidates share their occupational skills at the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>Course Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA in Education: Career &amp; Technical</td>
<td>Provisional Accelerated Learning Center, a charter school near CSUSB. Candidates use technological devices to obtain understanding about technological literacy as it relates to their field/career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-40, dependent on project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Education: Correctional &amp; Alternative Education</td>
<td>EDCA 616, the Assessment Portfolio Project and the Community of Learners Assignment, 12 hrs; EDCA 634, Activities; and Cooperative Projects, 8 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESOL</td>
<td>EESL 670, 10 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EESL 679, required fieldwork in K-12 or adult education setting. Includes tutorial experience, analysis &amp; mentoring work with reflective essay. 80 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Education: Instructional Technology</td>
<td>ETEC 692, Candidates provide 80 hrs of service at selected sites, based on needs of the sites, and make a presentation in class on service they provided and their reflections on learning. 80 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Education: Science</td>
<td>EDSC 643 Assessment in the Science Classroom. Candidates use assessments from their own classroom to develop &amp; obtain reliable &amp; useful information regarding their students' achievement. EDSC 644 Inquiry Teaching &amp; Learning in the Science Classroom. Candidates design questions &amp; concepts to support scientific investigation in their classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Education: Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>EDCI 620, 624, 628 include job-embedded practical assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Education: Holistic Education</td>
<td>Within 6 courses, EDUC 611, 613, 615, 617, 619, 621, candidates are regularly required to apply coursework in their professional setting or an approved educational setting. Two major field assignments include field testing a curricular unit and completion of a mini-project in their professional setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Education: Bilingual Education</td>
<td>EELB 606—Candidates give a survey regarding their colleagues’ views, knowledge and support of Bilingual Education. EELB 619—Candidates develop ESL/ESOL science/social studies curriculum units and implement in their bilingual classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Education: Kinesiology</td>
<td>KINE630 Requires a case study in the public schools. The case study incorporates content knowledge, class observations, interview, &amp; content analysis of adapted physical education. 4.5 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the unit’s conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards through field and clinical experiences in initial and advanced preparation programs?

All initial and advanced candidate assessments are linked to institution, state, and professional standards, which include standards related to field experience and clinical practice performance. To facilitate candidate understanding of these connections, professional and institutional standards are included in the unit’s syllabi. The state of California develops standards for all licensure programs, and each licensure program is designed to meet all state standards. A program document responds to each standard is submitted to the state for a panel of experts’ review. Institutions may offer a credential program once all program standards are judged as met. Continual approval for credential offerings is maintained through updated program document review during each accreditation visit. State teams of credential experts review the written response and conduct interviews of candidates, graduates, and employers as a means of evaluating whether the program is faithfully meeting state standards.

State program standards are periodically reviewed by the professional community and often change in response to review and/or law. The Unit has assigned its two associate deans the task of monitoring state activities to alert program leaders of upcoming changes. The Unit financially supports program leaders, faculty, and school partners in attendance at state-offered meetings to orient programs to new standards and policies. Typically, indirect funds are used to support this travel, much of which is located in Sacramento.

The Unit supports its credential programs’ maintenance of course and field/clinical practice through policies and procedures that require program faculty to submit quarterly syllabi to their department chair. Each credential course syllabus identifies addressed standards within its list of objectives. Programs maintain a matrix of state standards by course, and this document is used as a basis for “generic” syllabi. Faculty have come to consensus on foundational pieces of each course, including knowledge, skills, and dispositions; required assignments; number of field or clinical hours; and, even approved textbooks. Department chairs and program leaders use these generic syllabi as training materials for part-time faculty to maintain consistency across course sections. A unit-wide syllabus template (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/SYLLABUSTemplate.pdf) was developed to facilitate inclusion of unit standards. Non-licensure MA programs also use the syllabus template.

The Unit’s curriculum process provides a similar type of assurance of program consistency for all programs. New programs, program changes, and program dissolution go through the college and university curriculum committees. The Unit’s Office of Curriculum and Archives provides staff support for the college-level committee, maintaining all curriculum records, in addition to state documents. Program and course descriptions live within the University Bulletin and cannot be changed without substantial consultation with program faculty, advisory groups, and arts and science faculty related programs. The Deans’ Cabinet also reviews new program proposals and proposed changes of current programs. All of these practices serve to ensure that programs maintain curriculum as designed, even
through natural transitions of leadership and faculty.

The Unit’s assessment system provides another means of ensuring programs maintain attention to the appropriate standards. Each program completes an annual report which includes any major curriculum changes that the program has undergone. The annual reports include tables of transition point assessments, assessment descriptions, candidate performance outcomes, and the program’s use of data and feedback for program improvement. The department chair reviews the program report, and, ultimately, trends across the Unit’s programs are identified within an annual “Unit Assessment Report” authored by the associate deans. Each individual program, then, is monitored by the program leader at the program level, the department chair at the department level, and the associate dean at the unit level. The Unit Assessment Committee and Deans’ Cabinet also play a critical role in this annual review process, which helps support the unit’s efforts to ensure that programs remain faithful to their standards and established curriculum.

We realize that simple attention to standards does not guarantee that candidates meet established standards, so programs have become more and more able to produce candidates who perform at diversity levels and demonstrate candidate strengths and weaknesses, which are noted in annual reports. Overall program strengths, and weaknesses for candidate performance and program operations are also included in the annual report as are action plans for improvement areas. An example of this comes from initial programs in which “adaptation of instruction” for diverse learners has been a goal. To address the area, programs have worked with advisory groups and faculty to understand the issues. Actual candidate work products have been reviewed in meetings. Training for faculty and supervisors has been offered to develop understanding of the expectations. A faculty developed website (in collaboration with teachers) which facilitates understanding of different language levels has been promoted for use in coursework. Most recently, “IRIS” modules for attention to students with special needs were the focus of faculty training.

Field experiences and clinical practice provide our candidates with the opportunity to hone their knowledge and skills within the school setting, where they are eventually summatively evaluated against standards. Our goal of developing wise school professionals mandates that candidates observe and apply learning within the professional field setting for extended periods. Initial programs include field-based experiences throughout their entirety. Exploratory field experiences are pre-requisites of each program. MS and SS candidates must teach at least a portion of their experience in a classroom in which the ethnicity of at least 25% of the students is different from the candidate’s. Candidates practice within settings that include English Learners and students with special needs.

Minimum levels of supervisor field contact and assessments are required for each program. University supervisors and field support people utilize competency-aligned rating sheets to assess candidates over time and at the end of the field experience. For initial teacher education, assessment documents are submitted to the College and analyzed to provide candidate performance feedback to the program (Fieldwork MS and SS Clinical Practice Results 07-08) (Other clinical practice data in St. 1) (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FieldworkMSandSS07-08.pdf). Advanced credential programs, such as School Psychology, also evaluate candidates and require that candidates maintain a log of hours for review.

Resident teachers (RTs) observe and provide feedback to candidates during early field experiences. Teacher evaluations from the early phase are reviewed by course instructors and retained in candidate program files (Early Field Evaluation Form) (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/EarlyFieldworkEvalforms-MS_000.pdf). The university field supervisor receives copies of the field teachers’ evaluations, and is thus better able to advise and support candidates in identified need areas.

To hold our RTs and supervisors accountable to their responsibilities, a strong system of evaluation has been implemented. Candidates and supervisors rate RTs’ effectiveness, and this data is used to better select RTs in the future. Candidates also evaluate their university supervisors. An evaluation committee reviews the evaluations annually, in addition to data regarding the supervisors’ attendance at orientations/inservices and their submission of observation assessments and summative assessments (Supervisor and Resident Teacher Evaluation Forms) (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Supervisor-ResidentTeacherEvalform.pdf).

For many advanced programs that don’t include a license, field experiences are managed within coursework and follow the standards of course completion and objectives in those courses. The course instructor assures that field-based assignments are implemented within those courses that are designed to integrate field work. They monitor candidate progress and make the summative evaluation.

3. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates use technology as an instructional tool during field experiences and clinical practice?

Candidates’ settings must provide them with access to instructional technology. Within methods courses, candidates are required to complete assignments that incorporate technology. They complete these assignments within early field experiences or within supervised clinical practice. Program faculty and/or supervisors and field support teachers/professionals must carefully assess the candidates’ use of technology as an instructional tool. Field experience assignments is included in the Instructional Technology Table (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/InstructionalTechnologyTable.pdf). Additionally, state standards specify technology-related standards for initial programs. Initial programs respond to these standards within their program documents. We provide the MS response here as an example. (MS Technology Experiences) (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/MSProgramStandard9.pdf). Advanced credential programs also have state standards for technology use. For example, within School Psychology, utilization of computer-based data-manage systems and data-based research is addressed. Candidates gain computer research-related skills and practice. One of ECLG 632’s objectives is the utilization of instructional technology and discovery of the value it holds with regard to the learning process. Ethical considerations and access to technology are included. Candidates also make use of computer-based assessment systems, information systems, the internet, and computer-databases as related to career counseling and guidance. And of course, the use of computer-based data collection, analysis, and interpretation is an integral part of both school counseling and psychology.

As noted under standard 1, candidates’ ability in using technology is systematically assessed. When weaknesses are noted, they become a part of program or unit goals as noted within the annual report process. As noted under #8, the CSU Follow-Up notes that supervising employers are likely to view candidates as well prepared (86%). Our candidates’ perception of preparation in technology within the same survey, is less than we would like (67%), though this is higher than for the CSU (61%). Use of technology has been a goal previously, and continues to be an area in which we work. Within this accreditation review period, the Unit has benefitted from three years of a federally funded Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology (PT3) Grant. Within the MS and SS programs, both faculty and school site teachers received professional development in the area of technology. Teachers mentored faculty, faculty made visits to schools to update their understanding of how teachers and students are using technology for learning, faculty and teachers attended and presented at the TechEd Conference, and CSUSB candidates were placed within partner schools. The Unit has continued its annual support and leadership to the TechEd Conference. The new College of Education building has prompted additional trainings focused on newly available technologies within our classrooms.

4. What criteria are used in the selection of school-based clinical faculty? How are the criteria implemented? What evidence suggests that school-based clinical faculty members are accomplished school professionals?

RTs who supervise clinical experiences are academically prepared and experienced in teaching appropriate curriculum subject(s) and student age groups; they are up-to-date on changes in the profession and the student population. RTs must hold the appropriate California teaching credential, be tenured with their districts, possess a valid English language development credential or certificate, and model effective support of English language development and specially designed academic instruction (SDLAIE). Teachers who supervise BCLAD candidates must hold a BCLAD credential or certificate and model effective bilingual instruction.
Additionally, we desire RTs who are able to demonstrate skills in observation, coaching techniques, and in ways of successfully fostering learning in adults. They must be able to work effectively with adult learners as well as children.

The nature of our service area requires that RT selection be made through negotiation with school site level. Candidates request their top 3 district choices, and the SO submits requests for qualified RTs to districts. School district personnel, typically district level staff people with responsibilities for placements of area university candidates, respond with proposed placements which are verified by the SO. California standards are clear that candidates must be placed with appropriately credentialed teachers, so SO carefully verifies each placement. University supervisors are responsible for an additional check of placement through a first visit to the school. They meet the site administrator and RT, also verifying that the grade level and content area assignments are appropriate.

The Resident Teacher Brochure was developed to guide selection of RTs by specifying qualifications and responsibilities. The brochure is distributed to districts and has periodically come to advisory groups for review. Selection priority is encouraged for teachers who not only meet typical qualifications but who also have completed training for induction mentors or intern coaches. Due to our long time induction involvement, we are well aware that induction training includes a strong focus on observation and other mentoring skills, and thus, encourage districts to select RTs who have this training.

If a placement appears inappropriate due to some aspect of RT performance, after appropriate attempts to remedy the situation to no avail, the supervisor and SO make arrangements to relocate the student teacher. This is not a common occurrence and is delicately handled to be respectful of the school site and candidate.

Intern program leadership and staff work with districts to verify that interns have appropriate contracts to match their credential goals. Intern coaches match the credential area of the intern. Monitoring of selection and completion of support activities is done by intern leadership and staff, which leads to coach stipends. MS and SS interns have access to a new online intern coach training http://rims.pi.csusb.edu/intergrant/. The training is also valuable for RTs, and is thus encouraged as a selection criterion. The training, developed through the use of grant funds, is used to train intern site coaches for effective support of interns. The training (http://rims.pi.csusb.edu/intergrant/) consists of 4 modules which cover Orientation, Conversation Tools and Relationships, Support Across the School Year, and Linking the University Program to Classroom Practice. Again, our collaboration within the RIMS BTSA program is enabling us to better meet the demands of our huge service area.

We have put into place a strong system of feedback related to the helpfulness of the placement, including the RT’s role. Student teachers evaluate their RT at the conclusion of the experience and in a similar manner, supervisors provide evaluative information about the RTs with whom they work (Supervisor Evaluation of Resident Teacher Evaluation) http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/SupervEvalofResTeacherEval.pdf. Program directors, the associate dean of teacher education, and PDC’s Director of Post-Bac Programs evaluate the appropriateness of RT support based on information gained from candidates and supervisors. When concerns are identified, the SO uses it in negotiating RT selection in the future. Districts are either gently encouraged to select an alternative RT or the program selects a supervisor who is capable of providing more support and one-on-one training for the RT.

For advanced programs, field experiences are largely included within course work, and supervision is done by the university instructor. Programs with credential requirements have established criteria for school-based clinical faculty, and selection is determined by the program, candidate, and the site at which the candidate works, as most supervision is completed at the candidate’s own site. Candidates within these programs review the support they receive which is used to guide future actions of the program. For example, school counseling candidates submit a quarterly formal evaluation of their onsite supervisors to their university supervisor. University supervisors then pass these evaluations to the program’s field experience coordinator who investigates, attempts to remedy and documents any problematic experiences candidates have had with their onsite supervisors. A report on these evaluations is then made to the program faculty meeting each month where data is available. Candidates are steered away from supervisors who have not been useful to candidates in the past and towards supervisors whom candidates have found more useful.

All of the above suggests that we have put into place a system to assure that qualified field-based clinical practice support our candidates and programs. The Evidence of School-Based Faculty Qualifications http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/EvidenceofSchool-BasedFacultyQualifications.pdf provides an additional summary of program specific qualifications.

5. What preparation and ongoing professional development activities does school-based clinical faculty receive to prepare them for roles as clinical supervisors?

University supervisors serve as a major means of providing professional development for school-based faculty. Supervisors receive quarterly training for their work with RTs. During orientations, they receive a Resident Teacher Handbook and agenda that they are to discuss with RTs and principals. The Director of Supervision and the MS Director review the agenda to ensure supervisors comprehend all topics which include an overview of student teaching, expectations for candidates, candidate assignments, protocol for supervisor visits, and the role of RTs in assessment and feedback. Supervisors then make initial contact with RTs to confirm appropriate placement and for orientation. RTs are also alerted to strategies for supporting candidates, including means for communicating areas for improvement.

Supervisors continue to work closely with RTs throughout the clinical experience. They acquaint RTs with candidate performance standards, observation protocol, and they collaboratively assess candidates. During each visit, supervisors meet with RTs to dialogue about candidates’ growth and any concerns. As mid-quarter approaches, the supervisor facilitates the assessment process by conferencing with both the RT and candidate to identify areas of strength and areas in need of improvement. Any concerns are well documented at midterm, in order to assure the candidate has ample time to demonstrate growth. The supervisor is the lead in conducting these activities, and RTs know that they can contact the supervisor whenever they have a concern that needs immediate attention.

Because our service area is so large with student teachers in many districts, we have found that supervisors are an effective means of providing one-on-one professional development for clinical faculty. To increase their effectiveness, we offer a strong program of professional development, with 1-2 quarterly inservices. Supervisors’ evaluation process includes monitoring of attendance at orientations and inservices (Supervisor Monitoring Form) http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Supervision-Monitoring-Form.pdf. Inservices held in the last 2 years are listed in the Professional Development for Supervisors Table http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/ProfessionalDevelopmentforSupervisors.pdf. Inservices have been offered to MS and SS supervisors for years by the Director of MS and/or the Intern Director of MS/SS. Within this past year, Education Specialist supervisors have also been added to this opportunity.

The SS Program offers an additional means of one-on-one support to RTs through its Professional Development Districts. Due to its attempt to place a majority of student teachers within a smaller number of districts, the program is able to assign Faculty Liaisons to each of these districts. Liaisons work closely with clinical faculty hosting SS candidates. Due to additional support from university supervisors, in addition to involvement over time, RTs within these districts develop more in-depth knowledge of our program, its expectations, and how to support candidates’ professional growth.

Interns provide an additional challenge for school site support. Because they are employed in a myriad of districts spread throughout our service area, they may be the only intern within a school or district. Supervisors support them in the same way that they support student teachers, except supervision is offered more often, 3-6 quarters (depending upon the program). Additionally, field support teachers, called coaches, are selected to formatively support these candidates. We are very proud of a new online training for intern coaches developed by our MS/SS Intern Director. The training http://rims.pi.csusb.edu/intergrant/ consists of four modules which cover Orientation, Conversation Tools and Relationships, Support Across the School Year, and Linking the University Program to Classroom.
Practice and is being seen as a model with great potential for our large service region.

Due to the nature of most advanced programs’ clinical practice, school-site support people are typically oriented and prepared through one-on-one interaction with faculty supervisors. The School Counseling Program recently designed a training workshop for onsite supervisors. Supervisors (onsite and university) use 4 rubrics to assess observed candidate performance. Rubrics address individual and group counseling; consultation & group guidance design and delivery. A rubric attachment guides evaluators as they consider candidates’ work. School Counseling’s field experience manual is available for supervisors, and in part, serves as training material. Candidates use the manual during the face to face contracting process to highlight expectations and answer any questions about program and state requirements. In School Psychology, the district and site supervisor review NASP, CASP, and APA codes of ethics, and the CASP internship manual and develop the specified Field Experience Plan as part of one-on-one training. Training of field supervisors includes initial orientation by the university supervisor using the handbook as a guide and ongoing reference. The university supervisor communicates that s/he will assist the field supervisor when and if assistance is needed. An annual one-day workshop for field supervisors on topics of need that include supervision activities excerpted from NASP’s “Professional Development and Supervision of School Psychologists” is also offered. Field supervisors are evaluated using the Evaluation of Field Supervisors by Students form found in the handbook, and must receive satisfactory ratings to continue.

6. What evidence demonstrates that clinical faculty provides regular and continuous support for student teachers, licensed teachers completing graduate programs, and other school professionals?

We have greatly improved our ability to monitor the quantity and quality of work of university supervisors. We use a strong evaluation system to assure that candidates receive regular and continuous support. Candidates evaluate their supervisors (Supervisor Evaluation Form) http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/SupervisorEvalform.pdf. Additionally, the SO monitors supervisors’ attendance at orientations and inservices and their completion of required paperwork. The supervisor must submit all assessment documents to the SO at the end of each quarter. The monitoring form makes it very clear if any supervisor has been negligent in observations or documenting assessments.

Annually, an evaluation committee reviews candidates’ ratings of supervisors and the monitoring form. Supervisors are evaluated, receive written documentation of the evaluation, and future employment is dependent upon favorable reviews. This process assures that supervisors complete their important responsibilities.

Interns complete three or more quarters of supervised teaching (depending upon the program) whereas student teachers complete two. Again, supervisors submit completed assessments to the SO at the end of each quarter. Their work is monitored in the same way as that of supervisors of student teaching.

Two to three meetings per term offer orientation and inservice training to supervisors. These sessions provide program leaders with an opportunity to formatively assess and support supervisors through discussion and even informal review of observation and/or evaluation documents.

Interns also are assigned on-site coaches, who offer additional feedback and support from a practicing teacher. Coaches are required to offer 70 hrs of support which is documented in a log across the year(s) and also collaborate with the university supervisor. MS and SS coaches receive an annual stipend of $1000 for each intern they support.

Resident teachers are also monitored through written feedback from university supervisors and candidates, collected at the end of each quarter. An evaluation committee analyzes these documents, making note of RTs in need of support and assistance or RTs who do not appear to perform effectively as support for our candidates, and should therefore, not be used again.

Within the Follow-Up Survey (#8) initial candidates report that their clinical experiences were helpful (88%) as was the guidance received from their supervising field teachers (87%).

Within advanced programs and those for other professionals, supervisors are typically full-time faculty performing supervision as part of a course. These faculty are reviewed through the normal evaluation process. In this process, supervisory duties are documented along with teaching. The unit encourages full-time faculty to supervise at least once per year within its Policy Handbook. A “banking policy” was developed to support full-time faculty who wish to serve as a supervisor while teaching a full load of courses. This is especially helpful in the case of the SS Program, in which we may have a need for one supervisor of a science candidate, for example. The faculty member can supervise, banking the experience until the equivalent of a course load of supervision has been accumulated. At that point, the faculty member may trade in the banked supervision for a 4 unit course. This demonstrates that the unit values the work of supervisors in the same way that it values independent study support or committee work for MA candidates—thus, encouraging full-time faculty to participate through this alternative route.

Field supervisors include full- and part-time faculty COE faculty, arts and sciences faculty, retired teachers with at least an MA, and retired school administrators. A majority of part-time supervisors (52 out of 93) has been serving the college for at least three years with 25 supervisors having more than five years with the COE. This longevity helps support our supervisors’ ability to perform regular and consistent support of candidates.

7. What differences, if any, exist in the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice for programs for other school professionals, off-campus programs, and distance learning programs?

Field experiences and clinical practice for advanced programs are designed according to the level of distance involvement. Programs that do offer significant distance learning options are designed to accommodate the differences. For example, the Reading/LA program has an almost entirely on-line option. In addition, there may not be reading specialists other than the candidate at the field site. For these reasons, the practice is supervised and evaluated by university faculty, either in person or through video. The nature of the correctional and alternative education program is also affected by such dynamics. This program draws students from at least around the entire State, so courses and field experiences are designed as entirely or partially on-line. The Educational Administrations district-based model does not differ from the campus model.

8. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions in field experiences and clinical practice could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 3b. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

See Attachments panel below.

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

1. What are the entry requirements for clinical practice? How many candidates are eligible for clinical practice each semester or year? How many...
The vast majority of candidates do successfully complete clinical experiences (Clinical Practice Eligibility & Completion 2006-08) at http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/ClinicalPracticeEligibilityandCompletion2006-08.pdf. Intern non-completion is more likely to be due to school layoffs impacting program time to completion. Our interns tend to need employment in order to complete the program, and thus, wait until they are rehired to continue clinical practice.

Initial Teacher Candidates’ Eligibility Requirements
Initial teacher candidates must comply with CSU-established Common Admission Standards, which specify program admission requirements and admission requirements for the clinical experience. Those applying for supervision must have met all admission requirements and all requirements for admission to clinical practice.

Program Admission Requirements
- Verification of verbal and written proficiency in English
- Passage of CSET (and/or completion of an approved subject matter program for teachers)
- Taking of the CBEST
- G.P.A. of 2.67 or better within all baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate course work,
- Provision of a negative tuberculin test
- Provision of a certificate of clearance (fingerprinting)
- Completion of an early field requirement (or employment as a teacher)
- Completion of an advising interview
- Submission of letters of recommendation

Additionally, applicants must successfully complete any prerequisites and display a minimum level of competence in technology.

Admission Requirements for Clinical Practice
Candidates must meet the following requirements prior to being accepted for supervised field experiences (2 quarters of student teaching):
- Full passage of subject matter exams and/or completion of subject matter course work (integrated programs only—fifth year candidates met upon program admission)
- Passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST)
- Completion of program pre-requisites and Phase I course work with a B average and no grade lower than a B-

Additional Admission Requirements for Interns (to Clinical Practice)
- hold a baccalaureate degree
- achieve employment by a district
- have experience with students
- complete the U.S. Constitution requirement
- verification of English proficiency
- completion of 120 hrs of additional study, including study of EL
- Interview (for Mild/Moderate)

Advanced Teaching Candidates and Other School Professionals
Candidates planning to enter a master’s degree or professional certification program must hold a bachelor’s degree and have earned a 3.0 G.P.A. on the last 90 hours of undergraduate course work. Hours and content of field and/or clinical practice requirements vary according to state standards. Field experience most often occurs at the candidate’s work place, but practicum coursework is typically required prior to supervised experiences. The Reading Program requires that candidates must successfully complete ERDG 620 with a B or better and have maintained a 3.0 GPA in other coursework prior to ERDG 625 & 640, the clinical practice experiences. Within 620, candidates review their own philosophy and investigate various models of teaching as a prerequisite to field-based practice. In order to develop counseling skills, School Counseling candidates must have passed two practicum courses, the group counseling class, and the consultation course prior to clinical practice, in addition to maintaining a 3.0 GPA. School Psychology also requires maintenance of a 3.0 in 8 courses, including practicum experience, prior to clinical practice. Educational Administration candidates must have met the writing requirement and have completed 7 courses while maintaining a 3.0 prior to clinical practice.

Additional information on field experience requirements can be found in licensure program documents.

2. What is the role of candidates, university supervisors, and school-based faculty in assessing candidate performance and reviewing the results during clinical practice?

Candidates, university supervisors, and school-based faculty are all aware of the candidate competencies that must be met during clinical practice. All of our programs are typically established to incorporate joint assessment of candidate performance. For example, within the MS Program, supervisors do a minimum of 5 visits per quarter. During each visit, they observe and complete an observation assessment aligned with the TPEs that guide the program and they confer with the school-based faculty, gaining input about the daily level of performance. A lesson plan journal and feedback from the resident teacher is available for supervisor review. At mid-quarter, both the supervisor and the resident teacher complete more formal midterm assessments. The candidate, supervisor, and resident teacher all sit down for a conference to review their impressions of the candidate’s performance. If there are any areas in which the candidate is danger of not receiving credit, a plan for improvement is developed (Professional Growth Plan). The final formal assessment and the decision of credit versus non-credit reside with the university supervisor with input from the resident teacher and candidate. However, for both student teacher and interns, school personnel may release candidates whose professional behaviors are unacceptable. While dismissal from a school is at the discretion of the district, program continuance in such cases is at the university’s discretion.

Within MS and SS programs, there is additional assessment that is based upon the TPA, some of which occurs during clinical practice. Here, candidates have the opportunity to self-assess on their performance prior to submitting their documents for scoring. They are also free to get formative support in the lessons that serve as a foundation for the TPAs from their resident teachers and supervisors.

Clinical practice within programs for advanced or other professionals vary somewhat, but typically have the candidate engage in clinical practice within their own school site. Candidates have site-based support that influence their practice and provide formative feedback. Faculty who teach clinical-based courses serve as supervisors and visit candidates in the field. They assess candidates in both coursework and classroom (or school) practice. As an example, the School Counseling fieldwork instructor coordinates fieldwork activities, conducts joint meetings with the school counselor, participates in quarterly supervisor meetings, and evaluates candidates over time and summatively with a grade. Candidates in each field experience class are required to negotiate and establish a supervision contract with their official onsite supervisor, which gives them great input into the process. The contract must specify the type of activities candidates will conduct within the
school setting. Onsite supervisors must provide assessments of candidates’ progress at the end of each quarter, must complete an assessment of candidates’ dispositional qualities relevant for counseling in the student’s first field placement, and must observe and formally assess each student’s work at least twice during the quarter. The university supervisor formally observes candidates work at least twice during each quarter and completes an assessment. The program monitors student observation scores to see that there is rough correlation between the assessments of onsite and university supervisors. School Psychology candidates are evaluated formally by field-based personnel using the School Psychology Fieldwork Evaluation Form, completed collaboratively with the candidate, university supervisor and field site supervisor, and the Assessment of Field Students by Field Supervisors, both found in the program handbook.

Within Educational Administration, the university supervisor visits the site for orientation, and with the site supervisor, approves all activities planned for shadowing and a project. Candidates have ample input within the process as they complete a “proposed program for fieldwork” form. The site supervisor supervises the candidate’s work throughout the experience and confers with the university supervisor, who is ultimately responsible for assigning the grade. Candidates maintain a field log in which they document their administrative experiences, align them to standards, and describe their new awareness of responsibilities. In EADM 620, Practicum: Fieldwork in Educational Administration, the final field experience evaluation is made by the program supervisor with the involvement of the supervising administrator and the candidate. EADM 627, Portfolio Evaluation, provides that the field experience responsibilities are closely related to the job performance requirements of administrators. In this course, the university faculty, field supervisors, and knowledgeable school district personnel assist the candidate in the preparation of a summative review and evaluation of the candidate’s growth in the program utilizing multiple assessment measures tied to the coursework, field experiences, and domains of competence required for Educational Administration Tier I Programs by the State of California. The review is designed to assess the candidate’s ability to perform the responsibilities of an entry-level school administrator and includes a plan for continued growth of leadership and management skills.

All programs provide candidates with opportunities for self-assessment and to have input into the assessment process. Almost all programs have utilized the unit-wide disposition rubric in ways that engage candidates in reflection on CF-aligned dispositions.

3. How is time for reflection and feedback from peers and clinical faculty incorporated into field experiences and clinical practice?

The early clinical experience is designed to include a developmental sequence in which candidates have opportunities to observe inservice teachers at the same time as they teach one-on-one or in small group contexts. Such early experiences, observation and practice teaching enable candidates to connect theoretical knowledge in a practical context. The gradual nature of how candidates are transitioned to more responsibility in the classroom allows them ample time for observation, dialogue with clinical faculty and instructors, and also with peers. Candidates typically start their program with a larger percentage of observation, followed by increased teaching over time. They are expected to write out lesson plans for review by clinical faculty prior to implementation. They write their own critical reflections after teaching, and these documents are reviewed by clinical faculty or instructors, and, during clinical practice, by university supervisors.

Many programs also include courses that incorporate peer teaching in which candidates “teach” their peers prior to instruction in the field. Candidates receive feedback from peers and are assessed on their practice by instructors who assign a course grade. All initial programs incorporate this practice as do many advanced programs for teachers. For example, in the Education MA, KINE 630 includes peer teaching with feedback from both the instructor and peers for kinesiology candidates. The ETEC 692 course requires that instructional technology candidates make presentations to their peers on the instructional technology hours of service they have provided to a school. It is normal practice for all instructors, including those in advanced programs to allow and encourage candidate sharing of field-related issues for problem solving and to provide a real context for classroom discussion and learning.

Within MS and SS programs, assessment seminars provide another means of promoting dialogue amongst teacher education peers. The seminars include time for candidates to share and critique each others’ thinking and planning related to their classroom actions.

Candidates continue to take coursework during their clinical practice. This assures their continued contact with peers who are also enrolled in clinical practice. Within courses, candidates have the opportunity to continue to engage in small and large group discussions in which their lesson plans and field issues have a chance to get input from peers and course faculty. Intern candidates engage in course seminars designed specifically for interns in which they dialogue with peers who are also interning. Courses/Supervisors require written reflections on implementation of lessons.

Student teachers assume responsibility for teaching gradually, after considerable observation and gradual classroom work. Candidates, together with and their resident teachers prepare a long-range plan for their integration into the classroom. Candidates keep their lesson plans within a log that must be approved by the resident teacher prior to implementation.

Because they are employed, interns provide a unique challenge to creation of a developmental learning experience. As teacher of record, the intern teacher must immediately be responsible. Our recent curriculum change that requires 120 hours of study prior to internship has strengthened the developmental nature of these programs. This coursework incorporates field assignments and is designed to better prepare for the diverse contexts in which they will be employed. Intern seminars provide support for these employed candidates and are scheduled throughout the programs. Three supervised quarters (and more for ES), rather than the two required for student teachers, provide interns with additional support and assessment. Candidates are assigned a field coach, who provides informal support and encouragement at the site. The coach receives online mentor training and receives a stipend for spending formative assessment an support time with interns.

Candidates are continually assessed during their clinical experience according to the following:

- Observation of classroom teaching performance by resident teachers and university supervisors
- Mid-quarter & final evaluations by resident teachers and university supervisors
- Lesson plan logs with reflective entries
- Grades in course work

During each visit to the classroom, university supervisors meet with clinical faculty and also meet with candidates before and after the observation/assessment. Lesson plans are reviewed, observation evidence discussed and dialogues held.

Clinical practice in advanced programs for teachers and for other school professionals typically is a foundation of coursework in which the instructor and peers provide feedback and support for what is happening within the classroom or school. Candidates bring in plans for needs assessments, preliminary case study assessments, and professional development plans back to the university setting for reaction and assistance from peers and instructors. At the school site, shadowing of other school professionals, such as school administrators within the Educational Administration program, is designed to provide on-site support for those studying a new licensure area. Supervisor visits and evaluation processes incorporate feedback from school site support faculty and the candidates.

4. What data provide evidence that candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn in field experiences and clinical practice?

TPAs (results in Standard 1d & 1g) provide evidence of our MS and SS candidates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions for helping all students learn. The four TPA tasks include an emphasis on individual student learning from the first task related to content pedagogy through the videotaped final event which occurs in the final quarter of supervised field. Candidates consider various characteristics of students, including language, behavioral, physical, and academic traits; and they identify
how their plans, instruction and assessment consider those traits. As candidates proceed into clinical experience, they identify focus students for study, including one of whom is an English Learner and one of whom is a Special Needs student. Candidates continue to make plans, instruct, assess, and reflect on their efforts in regard to these students with these characteristics. In all cases, they are asked to provide a rationale for the adaptations they make. It is hoped that this emphasis on individual students helps our candidates to develop habitual actions and reflections related to individual student learning—no matter what the unique characteristics of the students.

The nature of Special Education requires that candidates focus on student learning throughout their program. Clinical assessments (under standard 1d) verify their ability to plan, teach and assess for student learning. Advanced and programs for other professionals include a focus on student learning or progress and therefore incorporate courses in assessment, which include field based assignments with actual students. Full evidence for these candidates’ ability and disposition to help all students learn is related under Standard 1f and 1g.

In advanced programs with clinical experience, candidates have hands on experiences with P-12 students which serve to promote candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions for helping all students learn. For example, in the School Counseling Program and also the School Psychology Program, candidates experience tutoring and mentoring a middle school student, often a student who is struggling academically. The tutoring takes place under supervision and is also related to the topics on learning theory that are canvassed in class. In ECLG 658, they are prepared to handle meetings with parents and teachers about students’ academic progress. In particular they rehearse and role-play the facilitation of conferences with parents and consultations with teachers. These include preparation for involvement with AB 1802 conferences, SST conferences and IEP meetings. In ECLG 651, they are introduced to the ASCA national model of school counseling, including the different scopes of counseling practice in schools, one of which is academic counseling. They also develop facility with understanding high school graduation requirements and the A through G requirements for college entry in California and practice developing a guidance lesson. In ECLG 650, they develop skills in career counseling, including the matching of academic preparation for particular career goals.

5. What is the process for candidates to collect and analyze data on student learning and reflect on those data and improve learning during clinical practice?

Candidates developmentally transition into clinical practice, gradually taking on responsibility for instruction and assessment. Early field experiences include observation and work with individual and groups. Through case studies, candidates conduct in-depth assessment of students with analysis of student characteristics’ and abilities’ impact on instructional choices. In clinical practice, candidates take on full responsibility for instruction and assessment. They are responsible for detailed lesson plans and critiques, assessing P-12 students through multiple means and using results in planning. Course instructors also review lesson plan assignments, focus student work products, and candidate self-critiques.

As stated previously, TPAs provide candidates with strong experience in collecting and analyzing student learning. Due to TPAs within clinical practice, candidates identify focus students, one of whom is an English learner and one of whom is a student with special needs. Candidates consider student characteristics, including language, behavioral, physical, and academic traits; and they identify how their plans, instruction and assessment consider these traits. As candidates proceed to clinical experience, they again identify focus students for study. They continue to make plans, instruct, assess, and reflect on their efforts in regard to these students. In all cases, they are asked to provide a rationale for chosen adaptations. This strong emphasis on individual students helps our candidates develop habitual reflections and actions—no matter what the unique characteristics of the students.

MS and SS assessment seminars are another vehicle for promoting candidate reflection on student learning. Additionally, work that candidates do with RTIs and supervisors continually turns attention to the performance of P-12 students. The very nature of the ES program requires that candidates focus on student learning throughout their program. Assessment is infused throughout the program, with one course focused specifically on assessment. Candidates work with P-12 students, assess them through multiple means, and engage in identifying needed interventions on IFPs.

Advanced programs including clinical practice assure candidates work through direct means to promote P-12 student learning. Administration candidates shadow school administrators, access school/district assessment data, study procedures and policies for implementation of testing, and develop and implement efforts to increase student learning such as professional development for teachers. Candidates are expected to promote the success of all students by facilitating development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

School counseling and psychology candidates are immersed in student learning experiences throughout their programs, as required by state standards. Both programs have heavy field-hour requirements, as described previously, to enable ample time to develop assessment skills and to practice interpretation of assessment results. In School Counseling, candidates experience tutoring and mentoring of a middle school student, who is often struggling academically. Tutoring takes place under supervision and is also related to course topics on learning theory. In ECLG 658, they are prepared to handle meetings with parents and teachers about students’ academic progress. These include preparation for involvement with AB 1802 conferences, SST conferences and IEP meetings. In ECLG 651, they are introduced to the ASCA national model of school counseling, including different scopes of counseling practice, one of which is academic counseling. They also develop understanding of high school graduation requirements and A-G requirements for California college entry and practice developing a guidance lesson. In ECLG 650, they develop skills in career counseling, including the matching of academic preparation for particular career goals.

More information on this topic is available in Standard 1d and 1f.

6. What differences, if any, exist in the ways candidates develop and demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn in field experiences and clinical practice in programs for other school professionals, off-campus programs, and distance learning programs?

Assignments don’t vary based upon whether the program is off-campus or has a distance learning component. Candidates still focus on actual student learning and progress.

7. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all student learn could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 3c. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 3?

Given our context, we believe we have established long lasting and meaningful relationships with our school, district, county, and campus partners that have not only had positive impact on field and clinical practice, but have served the region well through joint projects such as providing subject matter workshops, intern programs, and sharing of resources and training. The ultimate result for our programs has been field and clinical practice experiences that provide candidates with opportunities for practice and reflection with the support of site personnel and university faculty and supervisors. We have an excellent inservice program for supervisors and are making great gains in training for intern coaches through a web-based platform. We have established a strong system for feedback and evaluation for supervisors.
2. What research related to Standard 3 is being conducted by the unit?

We have no formal research being pursued at this time, but we are implementing a pilot survey to identify ethnicity of resident teachers for program analysis. We also have refined our system of evaluation for university supervisors in order to verify that all required visits and assessments are being conducted. We have been pleased to note that the vast majority of our supervisors meet or exceed expectations.

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.

[NOTE: In this section, institutions must address (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus and distance learning programs. Institutions should review NCATE’s definition of diversity as this section is written.]

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

1. What proficiencies related to diversity are candidates expected to develop and demonstrate?

The proficiencies related to diversity http://www.cusbus.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/ProficienciesRelatedtoDiversity4a_1_001.pdf are listed by program. All are aligned with institutional and NCATE Standards as noted in the alignment tables http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/MasterComposite-AlignmentTable_000.pdf in the Conceptual Framework.

Diversity proficiencies are embedded in coursework and assessed in culminating projects, portfolios, comprehensive examinations, capstone courses or teacher performance assessments (TPAs). In programs with clinical practice, observations and final evaluations by university supervisors and clinical faculty are key components of the assessment process. The MS and SS programs integrate the cross-cultural, language and academic development emphases formerly achieved by the CLAD emphasis. All ES programs now encompass an emphasis on teaching English learners. Thus, all initial programs prepare candidates to teach English learners within the context of the general or special education classroom.

The evaluation of candidate attainment of diversity-related competencies in initial programs is embedded and assessed in most courses, assessed again during supervision and at the conclusion of the program through Teacher Performance Assessments (TPA) for MS and SS or via ESPE 694a in ES Level II. Candidates are required to identify an English learner and a student with special needs as a part of many of their assignments and also as part of the TPA. They focus on assessment of these students’ characteristics and how these variables influence the learning process. They collect and analyze student work samples for reflection on instruction and planning next steps. Institutional standards and CTC candidate competencies specify outcomes related to diversity. Early field experiences require observation reports by candidates that address key components of diversity; supervisor observation must include an assessment of performance in the diversity categories as well.

Proficiencies for advanced programs and programs for other professionals are embedded in coursework and assessed in culminating experiences including comprehensive examinations and theses. Those programs that have clinical practice require formative and summative assessments by the clinical supervisor and on-site mentor with appropriate follow-up steps as required.

2. What required coursework and experiences enable teacher candidates and candidates for other professional school roles to adapt instruction to different learning styles, connect instruction or services to students’ experiences and cultures, communicate with students and families in culturally sensitive ways, incorporate multiple perspectives into teaching, develop a classroom and school climate that values diversity, demonstrate behaviors consistent with the ideas of fairness and the belief that all students can learn?

Examples of experiences/assignments and assessments http://www.cusbus.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/4a-2courseworkexperienceassessments_000.pdf in relevant courses reflect the infusion of diversity topics throughout all programs so that candidates are able to adapt instruction to different learning styles, connect instruction or services to students’ experiences and cultures, communicate with students and families in culturally sensitive ways, incorporate multiple perspectives into teaching, develop a classroom and school climate that values diversity, demonstrate behaviors consistent with the ideas of fairness and the belief that all students can learn.

MS and SS programs also include the TPA experience, and all initial programs incorporate field and clinical practice experiences that engage candidates with diverse learners. Coursework in the MS Program is structured to promote reflective practice as candidates strive to understand (a) the relationship of educational theory to sound pedagogical practice, (b) the State’s curriculum and teaching standards, (c) the needs of English learners and students with special needs, (d) issues of cultural diversity, and (e) the demands of modern society on education. These five themes are woven throughout the program. The SS Program is based on a philosophy of education embodied in five intersecting themes, one of which is diversity, a thread woven thoughtfully through every course. Designed around three phases, the program provides candidates with a developmental sequence that begins with an introduction to educational foundations, continues with the practice of instructional methods and concludes with the demonstration of skills in school settings. The premise is that students are introduced to the themes first, then study them in more depth while developing corresponding skills, and finally apply what they have learned to classroom settings. This sequence insures that diversity is addressed at the appropriate level and depth in every course. The three courses in Phase I focus heavily on culture, language, diverse populations and schooling with field experiences required. Phase II examines and provides practice in applying the knowledge and skills acquired in Phase I to the development and practice of lessons in the content area. Phase III includes the supervised clinical experience at which time all lesson plans must convey how ELD standards and students with special needs are addressed. In response to student needs and CCTC regulations, the ES Program gained EL Authorization effective July 2007 by augmenting existing courses, creating new courses and substituting courses from other programs to ensure that students are prepared to instruct students who are English learners. All courses in the program are directed toward special needs students. The various student teaching and internship options in all initial programs are detailed on program websites http://csusb.edu/coe/programs.

The experiences, assignments and assessments for advanced programs for teachers and programs for other professionals are listed according to the diversity topic areas with assessments that vary among programs. The assignments and assessments address candidates’ ability to draw effectively upon representations from the students’ own experiences and cultures; to design instruction to challenge and engage all students including English Language Learners and students with exceptionalities; to interact with peers from a broad range of diverse groups; to analyze and reflect on those experiences to enhance their professional growth and development; and, in field experiences/clinical practice and concurrent coursework, to confront issues of diversity that affect teaching and student learning and develop strategies to improve effectiveness as professional educators. Course goals and objectives call on candidates to demonstrate behaviors consistent with the ideas of fairness and the belief that all students can learn with a major focus throughout each program on the adaptation of instruction and/or services to meet the needs of all students. This applies in the classroom, in sessions with counselors and psychologists, to site administrators and other professionals who provide
support services. Candidates must always consider family, community and school context in their decision making. Although we believe it is appropriate to focus on diversity as primary content in specific courses, we believe it is equally important that diversity themes be woven into every course and in clinical practice so that candidates understand the importance of fairness and equity for all students throughout the educational process. They must understand that diversity is not an isolated concept that stands apart from the rest of the educational environment.

2a. (Optional) One or more tables related to coursework and experiences for developing diversity proficiencies could be attached here. What the data tell us that we must continue to improve instruction and experiences to prepare our candidates to adapt instruction for special needs students.

2. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates demonstrate proficiencies related to diversity, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities?

GPAs in courses that have diversity components, TPA results, clinical practice assessments provide evidence of candidate performance in diversity related areas.

TPA Survey of Multiple and Single Subject Candidates (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/TPE-St.4_000.pdf)

The results from the MS and SS programs in expectations related to diversity, show no meaningful differences between the main campus and the Palm Desert campus. In expectations reflective of candidate attitudes and affective behaviors such as creating a welcoming social environment and learning about students, we see some of the highest mean scores. Adaptation of instruction is among the lower scores. Given the TPA results, supervisor evaluations and candidate self assessments, the faculty continues to focus on helping candidates improve in their ability to provide differentiated instruction. Candidates recognize this as a need which they are eager to address.


The attached table isolates “practical knowledge of context and culture” and “developing sensitivity to peer & students/clients” as areas related to Standard 4. Candidates rate how effective the COE is in these areas.

All Initial Programs: The survey results do not indicate meaningful differences between the self assessments of interns and student teachers in diversity related areas, nor are there meaningful differences between candidates on the main campus and PDC. In the one case where there is a notable difference (ES Early Childhood), there is only one intern, so a comparison is not useful. Overall, candidates assess the program favorably in their practical knowledge and context and culture and in developing sensitivity to peers and student/clients with scores that range from 4.1 – 4.3 overall on a 5.0 scale.

Advanced Programs for Teachers: The small numbers, especially at PDC, do not lend themselves to generalizations about differences between the two campuses. There are some programs, however, in which candidates’ assessments portray less favorable pictures in practical knowledge of context and culture than do those in other programs. The master’s candidates in Curriculum and Instruction on the main campus rate the program at 3.8 in both areas, and the candidates in Reading Language Arts reflect 3.7 and 3.9 in “context” and 3.7 at PDC in “sensitivity.” The candidates in the M.A. option in Science Education on the main campus (four candidates) rate the program at 3.8, and the main campus candidates in the M.A.T. show a 3.9 in both categories. The overall score in both categories is 4.2 with a range of 4.0 to 5.0 with the exceptions noted.

Programs for Other Professionals: The overall score in both categories is 4.2. The two programs in which candidates offer lower perceptions are Educational Administration at PDC (with five responses) and the Educational Leadership (Ed.D.) candidates on the San Bernardino campus with eight responses. With these two exceptions, the scores range from 4.3 to 5.0

CSU Follow-up Survey of Graduates (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/CSUFollow-upSurvey4a.pdf)

In the CSU follow-up survey of graduates we have data that align the teacher education outcomes with NCATE Standard 4. These are highlights of the survey responses. In responding to their preparation to meet the instructional needs of students with special learning needs, 66% indicated that they were adequately or well-prepared. With regard to the ability to provide instruction in cultural diversity and multicultural education, 87% indicated that the statement was true or mostly true. Responding to questions about their preparation in building on peer friendships, developing group skills and encouraging leadership roles, 68% judged themselves to be adequately or well-prepared. Candidates also responded to questions regarding the effectiveness of CSUSB preparation for their first year of teaching. In teaching English learners, 87% found the instruction to be very valuable or helpful; instruction in cultural diversity and multicultural education was very valuable or helpful to 87% of respondents. Adaptation of instruction for students with special needs and researched-based teaching of students with special needs evoked responses of very valuable or helpful from 63% and 57% of candidates respectively. This score is considerably lower than those in the other categories, but it confirms what we know to be an area of need. Finally, in response to a statement regarding gaining an understanding and acceptance of differences in culture, language, gender, age, abilities and disabilities, 88% judged the statement to be true or mostly true. Eight-five percent indicated as true or mostly true that they learned how to manage learning environments that are safe, secure and supportive of special education students. Once again, this information tells us that we must continue to improve instruction and experiences to prepare our candidates to adapt instruction for special needs students.

GPA Data (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/GPA_Data_Tables_st4.pdf)

We collected GPA data from those courses in advanced programs for teachers in which four topic areas related to diversity are addressed. These are the same topic areas addressed in 4a2 above and for which assignments and assessments are listed in the attachment to 4a2. The GPA data indicate that although there is some variation among programs, overall the GPA in courses where diversity is addressed ranges from 3.37 to 4.0. The M.A. Core sequence, required of candidates in all M.A. options, has the largest number of candidates, and those GPAs are high over the two year period.

3a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to candidates’ demonstration of proficiencies related to diversity, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities, could be attached here. What the data tell us is that we must continue to improve instruction and experiences to prepare our candidates to adapt instruction for special needs students.
4. What differences, if any, exist in the ways candidates develop and demonstrate their proficiencies related to diversity in programs for other school professionals, off-campus programs, and distance learning programs?

University and unit policies specify that all off campus and distance learning programs must meet the same standards and criteria as programs offered on campus by traditional delivery systems. (FAM440 http://academic-affairs.csusb.edu/personnel/fam/fam440.htm). As noted in the experiences/assignments and assessment table http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/4a2courseworkexperiencesassessments_000.pdf, there are no significant differences in the way candidates in advanced programs and programs for other professionals develop and demonstrate diversity. The proficiencies are developed and demonstrated throughout required coursework and in clinical practice, portfolios, comprehensive examinations and other culminating experiences which vary among programs.

4a. (Optional) One or more tables that disaggregate data on diversity proficiencies by on-campus, off-campus, and distance learning programs could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about any differences in performance should be discussed in the response to 4a4 above.

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

1. What educational interactions do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning programs) have with higher education and school-based faculty from diverse groups?

Candidates have multiple opportunities to interact with higher education faculty from diverse groups given the diversity of faculty in the university and the unit. It is the practice of the unit to cast a wide net and recruit faculty from a broad and diverse pool of applicants. A review of faculty by program level indicates that efforts have been made to have diversity across the unit. Required courses in programs including the M.A. Core are taught by faculty representing many different cultural backgrounds. College wide events such as the Research Symposium allow our candidates to interact with faculty other than those in their specific program. Although demographics vary from school to school, overall the COE makes a concerted effort to insure that school-based faculty are representative of various ethnic and racial groups. This need is conveyed to district personnel who finalize the assignments for clinical practice. Beginning with winter quarter 2009, the Teacher Education Division will collect data on the school-based faculty with a written survey. Currently, the information is gathered informally. Based on the results of our written survey http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/ResidentTeachersurvey.pdf, we will determine if further steps are needed to increase diversity among school-based faculty who mentor our candidates. University and unit policies specify that all off campus and distance learning programs must meet the same standards and criteria as programs offered on campus by traditional delivery systems. (FAM440 http://academic-affairs.csusb.edu/personnel/fam/fam440.htm)

2. What knowledge and experiences do unit and clinical faculty have related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse groups?

Faculty in the COE and related programs are uniquely qualified to prepare candidates to work with diverse students including students with exceptionalities. Nearly all of the COE faculty have P-12 teaching experience in schools with diverse student populations in California and in other states as well. Faculty who prepare educators for leadership roles or for non-traditional settings have professional experience in the relevant roles/settings as noted in Table 11 http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Table11_001.pdf. This is one of our most significant strengths as we prepare professional educators to work in diverse environments. Accomplishments http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/accomplishments.pdf that are illustrative of the scholarship and service by our unit faculty provide further evidence of the preparation of our faculty. The activities include those that are ongoing or new since the 2002 accreditation and attest to the kinds of experiences our faculty bring to the classroom. Full details are available in the faculty vitae.

University, college and program in-service and professional development workshops contribute to the faculty’s expertise in diversity-related areas. For example, in-service meetings for university clinical supervisors regularly address differentiated instruction and working with special needs students. All faculty attend professional conferences during the year and many attend sessions or workshops on diversity. Memberships include but are not limited to: American Educational Research Association (AERA), Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE), California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE), American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), National Middle School Association (NMSA), International Reading Association (IRA), National Science Teachers Association (NSTA), American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AECTE), National Council on Math Education (NCME), International Correctional Education Association (CEA), European Prison Association, National Council for Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), and National Association for Research in Science Teaching.

3. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain a diverse faculty?

The University has a long-standing commitment to recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty. The Faculty Administrative Manual (FAM, section 200 and others http://academic-affairs.csusb.edu/personnel/fam/) specifies that all vacancy announcements developed by a department must be approved by the college dean and the Office of Academic Personnel prior to being disseminated. Furthermore, vacancy announcements are sent not only to the Chronicle of Higher Education but also to select graduate schools and registers that are likely to serve large numbers of underrepresented students. Often announcements are sent to publications such as Black Issues in Higher Education and Hispanic Outlook. The Faculty Recruiting and Appointment Manual http://academic-affairs.csusb.edu/personnel/fam/default.htm housed in the office of Academic Personnel provides detailed instructions to the college deans. Additionally, there are incentives offered through the CSU Chancellor’s Office that are designed to increase the diversity of the pool of qualified faculty candidates. (http://www.calstate.edu/HR/CDIP). The university and the unit make concerted efforts, both formal and informal, to recruit, welcome and support all colleagues irrespective of race, ethnicity, gender or sexual orientation. These efforts are buttressed by the statement of the University’s Commitment to Diversity http://diversity.csusb.edu/ . The university procedure determines that the Dean does not know the race or ethnicity of those applicants whose files she reviews. Therefore, the recruitment of a more diverse faculty must rely to a great extent on proper advertising, professional connections of our faculty with colleagues throughout the country and with the institutions where they earned their degrees. At the conclusion of the recruitment process, the Dean is able to review all the data on applicants so that she can use it to inform future recruitment activities.

All faculty, irrespective of ethnicity, race or gender, benefit from many efforts that support retention. Tenure track faculty and full time lecturers in the COE receive $1,000 per academic year in travel funds for professional development. The Dean also funds faculty to travel to internationally to present papers, and she applies indirect cost monies to fund additional travel for faculty who present at conferences. First year tenure-track faculty in the COE are provided reassigned time, teaching seven instead of nine classes, to give them time to adjust to the new teaching environment and continue their own professional growth. They also receive a $5,000 technology package. Untenured faculty also receive an additional $500-$800 per year from Academic Affairs for professional development.
beyond that provided to all faculty. In 2007 for eight COE faculty it was $663.50 each. Grant activities and university money for technology training are additional sources of professional development funds. This kind of financial support for professional development helps with retention of all faculty.

4. Please complete the following table (Table 8) to identify the gender, ethnic, and racial diversity of professional education faculty members using the U.S. Census categories.

Table 8
Faculty Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Prof. Ed. Faculty in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%)</th>
<th>Prof. Ed. Faculty in Advanced Programs n (%)</th>
<th>All Faculty in the Institution n (%)</th>
<th>School-based faculty n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native Asian</td>
<td>Table Attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What do the data in Table 8 tell the unit about its faculty? Diversity characteristics beyond those in Table 8 should be discussed.

The data in Table 8 indicate that our faculty are mostly white, non-Hispanic with a percentage almost identical to all faculty in the university (73%). We have slightly more female faculty than the university as a whole, although it is a difference of only about six percentage points in initial programs and about four percentage points in advanced programs. With regard to African Americans, our faculty representation in Initial Programs is nearly four percentage points higher than that of the university but slightly lower in advanced programs. Asian or Pacific Islanders make up an average of just under ten percent in all of our programs which is almost two percent less than the all university figure. Although not specified in the table, a number of our faculty are part of the LGBT communities. With regard to teaching assignments, we note that although courses with major emphasis on cultural diversity are taught primarily by faculty of color, these same faculty teach throughout the programs at all levels, so their broad expertise is not limited to a single focus because of their race or ethnicity.

Although the numbers vary by quarter, during the fall quarter 2008, which is typical, the part-time faculty in the Unit included nine African Americans, 13 Hispanics, two American Indians, and 116 whites. The entire University community places a high priority on developing a more diverse faculty; however, the figures indicate that we must persist in our efforts if we are to move closer to having a faculty that is reflective of our student population and the region we serve.

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to faculty diversity could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 4b. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

Table 8

See Attachments panel below.

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

1. What educational interactions do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning programs) have with peers from diverse groups?

The data in Table 9 provide information on candidate diversity by program type. The numbers indicate that candidates have multiple opportunities to interact with Hispanic peers, but interaction with other groups is not as available in the Unit or university-wide. The university has a number of student organizations that are designed around cultural interests, and we have active Cross Cultural http://studentunion.csusb.edu/centers/ccc/ and Pride Centers http://studentunioin.csusb.edu/centers/prc/ as well. Our professional education programs provide structured learning experiences in one or more courses in which candidates can examine their own beliefs, values, prejudices and field experiences in conversation with candidates who are from a different background. Efforts to improve the mix of candidates are on-going as noted in the following comments on recruitment.

2. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups?

Diversity is a stated goal of the COE and one to which the faculty are deeply committed. It reflects a long-time effort of the University and the College to recruit, retain and graduate underrepresented minority students. In 1978, for example, the COE started a Center for Educational Equity, directed by Professor Juan Gutierrez, to address issues related to providing equitable education for students at all levels of the educational system, particularly public school students who are from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds or who are considered “at risk.” The Center is currently on hiatus until additional grants are received. The Teacher Diversity Project, housed in the Center, had 10-year funding from the CSU Chancellor’s Office of $75,000 annually. An average of 50 students per year benefited from the support of the Diversity Project, nearly all of them earning credentials. In its first year, the Paraprofessional Grant Program, housed in the Center and funded by the U.S. Department of Education, recruited and supported 30 instructional aides from the P-12 sector. One of the ways in which we have begun to improve the mix of candidates is through the Educational Administration cohort program and the programs at PDC. The Communities in the Low Desert area of Riverside County (e.g. Palm Springs, Palm Desert, Desert Hot Springs, Coachella, Thermal) have a high percentage of Hispanic residents, and the school districts in those communities have large percentages of English Learners. For example, 55% of the students in the three large school districts combined are English learners. The Educational Administration cohorts are in communities in which the school district percentage of English learners ranges from 24 to 59. We note that ours is primarily a commuter campus like many of the CSUs, and most candidates must live within driving distance of the campus. For a large number of candidates, commuting is a real problem. We have included the data from the National Science Foundation’s National Survey of Student and Faculty Engagement (NSSE) in Table 10 as a way to see which learners in our programs consider themselves “prepared” for a career in education. Finally, although we have not yet started a College of Education Diversity Project, we plan to do so in the fall of 2009, and it is already being funded by the University’s Office of Faculty and Staff Development.
candidates this translates into two – four hours round trip. Our course scheduling and field work placements are designed with consideration for candidate travel needs and employment locations. We believe this is valuable to us in creating access. Further examples of advertisements and specific program recruitment efforts are attached http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Candidate_Recruitment.pdf.

The figures from 2006-2007 http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/PercentageofMinorityCredentialCompleters.pdf indicate that as Cal State basic credential recipients continue to be hired by school districts throughout the region, the composition of the faculty in those districts should change over time. The percentage of CSUSB minority credential recipients last year was considerably higher than the percentage of minority teachers employed in the region. Since our last accreditation, for example, the number of minority teachers in each county has increased by five percent.

3. Please complete the following table (Table 9) to identify the gender, ethnic, and racial diversity of candidates preparing to work in P-12 settings using the U.S. Census categories.

### Table 9

**Candidate Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Candidates in Initial Teacher Preparation Program n (%)</th>
<th>Candidates In Advanced Preparation Program n (%)</th>
<th>All Students in the Institution n (%)</th>
<th>Diversity of Geographical Area Served by Institution (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>Table in Attachments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How diverse are candidates in the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs? Diversity characteristics beyond those in Table 9 should be discussed. What do the data in Table 9 tell the unit about its candidates?

CSUSB draws students from an unusually diverse population due in part to the size of the region we serve (27,000 square miles.) A comparison among the different types of professional education programs and between our programs and the University overall reveals several notable differences. Asian/Pacific Islanders are better represented in the University than in the Unit (almost double); African Americans are more well represented in programs for other professionals than in those for initial and advanced programs for teachers. Initial programs enroll only 5.2% African Americans, and advanced and other enroll 12.8% and 14.5% respectively. The institutional enrollment is of African Americans is 11.97%. The enrollment of Hispanic/Latino candidates is strong in all program types and is similar to that in the University (34.11%) except in advanced programs where the enrollment is the lowest at 23.1%. When combined by program type, we note that those who are traditionally underrepresented in universities make up 41.6% of candidates in initial programs, 40.7% in advanced programs, and 50.7% in programs for other professionals. University-wide, the percentage is 54.7. Comparing the university enrollments to the populations in the two counties, we note several differences as well. The African American enrollment is higher in advanced programs and programs for other professionals than in the two-county population; the opposite is true of Hispanic/Latino enrollments. In looking at gender differences, the male/female distribution is similar in our programs and in the university overall with the exception of programs for other school professionals in which the female enrollment is higher with 73.6% compared to the university figure of 65.2%.

5. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to candidate diversity could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 4c. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits from the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See Attachments panel below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

1. How does the unit ensure that each candidate has at least one field/clinical experience with students from ethnic/racial groups different than his/her own, English language learners, students with exceptionalities, and students from different socioeconomic groups?

All candidates in multiple and single subjects programs complete at least one half of their clinical practice in schools with a strong minority enrollment or in schools where 25% of the students are ethnically different from the candidate. Likewise, field experiences in the early stages of the programs include numerous assignments related to pupil diversity including diversity of ethnicity, race, religion, socio-economic status, gender and language. As noted in # 2 above, the student composition of schools in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties provides a variety of excellent opportunities for our candidates to have experiences with students from diverse backgrounds and to be supervised, supported and evaluated in their work with those students. Because most of our candidates in advanced programs for teachers and programs for other professionals are currently employed in schools or agencies, placements by the university are not possible during the traditional academic year. In the very unlikely situation that a candidate would be in a school without sufficient minority enrollment, the candidate would have to make special arrangements to complete the program in another setting in order to satisfy program requirements. In advanced programs that contain a credential requirement, candidates are required to demonstrate working with diverse groups.

As an example, in the School Psychology Credential Program, candidates meet a significant amount of the 1,650 practica hours in the prerequisite course, ECLG 679A, which has field experience in a multicultural setting. In the first field experience in the School Counseling Program, candidates take a multicultural field experience class (ECLG 679A) which includes being observed and assessed twice delivering a guidance lesson on a topic of cultural awareness. In the field work application for Educational Administration, candidates are advised that the fieldwork site must offer “authentic and significant experiences addressing a variety of school levels and a variety of school settings … including field experiences, at least one of which involves a site with a diverse school population.” In the Career and Technical M.A. option, candidates share their occupational skills at the Provisional Accelerated Learning Center, a charter school near CSUSB that serves a significant minority population. Many of the advanced programs work in programs that contain a high percentage of students with special needs. The advanced
2. How does the unit ensure that candidates develop and practice their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity during their field experiences and clinical practice?

Early field experiences in initial programs required as part of coursework include specific assignments related to diversity. These are typically reported in a short paper or maintained in a dialogic journal with class discussion based on the candidates’ experiences. For example, candidates conduct interviews with students (usually one EL and a student with special needs), administer learning style inventories to students from different backgrounds, and observe classes for assessing classroom interaction as it may be influenced by ethnicity or gender and the like. An early assignment in initial programs is to develop a profile of the student body. A recently adopted dispositions rubric (http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/UnitDispositionalRubric_000.pdf) in the COE is used as one tool for assessing candidates’ progress in responding to diversity competencies in all programs. In clinical practice, the first step is to insure an appropriate field assignment as described in #1 above. The observation reports by the university supervisor and the end-of-quarter assessment by the supervisor, and if applicable, the resident faculty (master teachers) or site administrator/coach/mentor, include specific performance elements related to diversity. This includes the assessment of lessons plans that must include strategies for adaptation. A candidate who is not developing and practicing in areas related to diversity works with the university supervisor and site supervisor to create a professional growth plan with benchmarks for continuing in the program.

3. How does the unit ensure that candidates use feedback from peers and supervisors to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups?

One of the categories in the observation report for MS and SS programs refers to candidate professionalism including the ability to respond to feedback. In most courses, especially in seminars that accompany clinical experience, professors make specific efforts to encourage/require peer evaluation and feedback in all areas of performance including the ability to work with diverse groups and adapt instruction. Clinical supervisors have post-observation (and often pre-observation) conferences with candidates and engage in written exchanges through the reflective logs and journals that candidates maintain and in which candidates typically indicate how they have responded to feedback from university supervisors, school site coaches or resident teachers. During clinical supervision, MS and SS candidates complete TPA tasks 3 and 4 and are required to focus on a special needs child and an EL child and videotape their teaching. In preparation for these tasks and adaptation of instruction in general, the supervisor and the candidates engage in on-going analysis of the candidate’s performance. In advanced programs for teachers and programs for other professionals, peer review is common in many classes and blocks of time are set aside to discuss peer responses to candidate performance. Clinical practice and concurrent coursework includes reflective journals with attention to and conferences concerning providing instruction and services to all students. This requirement is built into course assessments. Students in advanced programs and programs for other professionals are encouraged to participate in their professional organizations, and often are mentored to present papers and presentations. Because candidates are working in their fields, real life situations in the school or clinical setting are brought to the university for review and adjustment. These candidates are expected to become leaders in their fields through professional development activities at the local site, state, and national levels.

4. Please complete the following table (Table 10) to identify the diversity of P-12 students based on their gender, ethnicity, racial, and socioeconomic levels, native language and exceptionalities in the schools in which education candidates do their clinical practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of school</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaskan Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black, non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White, non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Race / ethnicity unknown</th>
<th>Students receiving free / reduced price lunch (student socioeconomic status)</th>
<th>English Language Learners</th>
<th>Students with Disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table uploaded in Attachments

5. What do the data in Table 10 tell the unit about the diversity of students in the schools in which candidates do their clinical practice?

The data in Table 10 indicate that the population of the schools is more diverse than that of the university, the higher education faculty and the teachers in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. The opportunities to teach students of diverse backgrounds are unlimited. In general the same schools are used for field experiences and clinical practice, so the demographics apply to all. The data tell us that the students in the school sites represent all types of diversity in great numbers. They provide a rich laboratory in which our candidates can apply what they have learned in coursework, acquire new skills for differentiating instruction and develop a deeper understanding of how cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic and ability differences affect the teaching/learning process. The experiences facilitate the assessment of candidate performance by clinical supervisors and instructors of concurrent coursework.

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the diversity of P-12 students in schools in which education candidates do their field experiences and clinical practice could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 4d. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

See Attachments panel below.
1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 4?

We believe that our unit does an excellent job of helping candidates to understand their own culture and their own biases so that they can (a) identify broad cultural elements that are significant across cultures; (b) examine their own behaviors and attitudes toward people of other cultural/ethnic/racial/linguistic backgrounds; (c) understand how such behavior and attitudes influence their interaction with learners; (d) continue to enhance their understanding of people who are different from themselves, and (e) modify their behavior as needed. We achieve this through the course experiences described in the response to this standard, including being sure that all of our candidates have field experiences that bring them together with diverse students. We note as well that candidate surveys, GPA data, employer surveys and evaluations by clinical faculty support this contention.

2. What research related to Standard 4 is being conducted by the unit?

Recent research addressed how the requirement of CSET passage prior to admission impacted candidate diversity statistics. There was no significant impact.

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.

[NOTE: In this section, institutions must address (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus and distance learning programs.]

5a. Qualified faculty

1. Please complete the following table (Table 11) to identify the qualifications of the full- and part-time professional education faculty. (These data may be compiled from the tables submitted earlier for national program review by clicking on “Import” below.)

Table 11
Faculty Qualification Summary

2. What do the data in Table 11 tell the unit about the qualifications of its faculty?

The data in Table 11 [http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Table11_001.pdf] tell us the following about our full-time faculty: They come from diverse institutions and have diverse P-12 and agency experiences. The work of our faculty is generally balanced with significant contributions in scholarship, leadership and service. Their scholarship often makes important contributions to the literature, and it nearly always informs their instructional practices. The extent of their P-12 experience, coupled with their scholarship, brings to our students an important blend of theory and contemporary practice, as advocated within our Conceptual Framework. Our part-time faculty, most of whom are current or retired practitioners, bring many years of relevant experience to their assignments. They provide instruction and clinical supervision that reflect the realities of today’s schools and agencies and provide an important link between our professional education programs and the districts, agencies and communities that we serve. The longevity of part-time faculty (not including supervisors) with the unit is remarkable with 52% having been with us for one to five years, 30% five to ten years, and seven percent in excess of ten years. University policy (Distributed Learning Policy http://senate.csusb.edu/docs/Policies/FSD%2001.R2_DL.pdf and FAM440 [http://academic-affairs.csusb.edu/personnel/fam/fam440.htm]) requires that all off-campus and distance learning programs adhere to the same personnel and curriculum standards as on-campus programs.

3. What expertise qualifies faculty members without terminal degrees for their assignments?

Full-time tenure track faculty possess the terminal degree. Some full-time and part-time lecturers do not; however, they do all have an advanced degree. Their extensive experience in the P-12 or agency sectors brings an important and additional perspective from the field to our programs. These lecturers benefit regularly from on-campus inservice activities, and those who are full-time lecturers receive the same professional development benefits as tenure track faculty with funding for travel and opportunities to apply for grants. The part-time faculty in the unit, generally stay with the university over extended periods of time and are part of the instructional teams as noted in the previous response.

4. How does the unit ensure that school faculty members are licensed in the areas they teach or are supervising?

All school faculty who supervise candidates in initial programs must be tenured and licensed in the fields they teach according to College and district policies, qualification brochures, supervisors, the Supervision office, and advisory councils communicate regarding this requirement. The Supervision office, university supervisors, and in the case of S8, faculty district liaisons, confirm the appropriateness of each placement at the start of each clinical practice experience. In other programs, faculty members visit the sites and make sure that the site faculty, counselors or administrators selected as mentors are qualified to serve in those roles.

5. What contemporary professional experiences in school settings does higher education clinical faculty have?

The faculty members in the unit are exceptionally well prepared and qualified to teach, mentor and provide support to preservice and inservice educators. All tenure-track faculty and approximately 25% of the part-time faculty possess the terminal degree and nearly all have extensive experience as P-12 educators or as practitioners in their fields. In the case of part-time faculty, many are current practitioners. (Table [http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Table11_001.pdf]) Faculty who teach courses that include instruction in how to teach (methods courses) are required, under California Senate Bill 813 [http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/SB813Form.pdf], to document time spent in P-12 schools at least once every three years. Faculty are encouraged to maintain current knowledge of the practical setting by supervising, conducting inservice workshops, observing P-12 classrooms and the like. A number of the grants obtained by faculty engage them in P-12 or agency partnerships. The College has developed a “banking policy” to support full-time faculty’s ability to supervise one-two students while teaching a full load. As soon as a faculty member has accumulated supervision of eight students, he/she can exchange the banked supervision for a four-unit course. This policy also encourages qualified faculty from the subject matter departments to consider including supervision in their workload. Documentation collected by department chairs is maintained in department offices. As part of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA), some COE faculty receive training on the CSTP, K-12 Content Standards and induction’s formative
6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to faculty qualifications could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 5a. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

\[
\text{Table 11}
\]

See Attachments panel below.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

1. How does instruction by professional education faculty reflect the conceptual framework as well as current research and developments in the fields?

As active scholars, unit faculty bring to the classroom the most recent developments in the discipline. The syllabi, choice of course materials and the continuing development of new courses and refinement of existing ones provide evidence of how instruction reflects current research and developments in the field. Although the Conceptual Framework guides the faculty, more importantly, it evolved over time from the expertise, beliefs and practices of the faculty. Therefore, it is only natural that the principles of the Framework are embedded in programs and courses. Each program in the unit embodies the Framework through the key values that inform instruction. For example, in all programs, but in initial programs especially, rich content knowledge is an essential prerequisite to pursuing the credential.

Instruction in all programs focuses on the need to integrate theory and practice by requiring candidates to explain the theoretical underpinning of decisions. Multicultural content is infused throughout all programs so that instructional/professional choices consider the context and the experiences of students, families and communities. Faculty require continual reflection, and they assess candidates at multiple intervals so that needed adjustments can be made and problems addressed. Course syllabi, biennial reports and the alignment tables http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/MasterComposite-AlignmentTable_000.pdf note the relationship among the institutional standards described in the Framework, the course content, objectives and proficiencies.

2. How does unit faculty encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions?

Faculty encourage such behaviors by modeling them and requiring them as part of the course assessments in many instances as noted in course syllabi. Examples include critiques of literature, lesson plan reflections, and peer teaching/presentations followed by dialogue and feedback. In clinical practice, candidates are required to reflect on their work and on the results. This typically occurs with the use of a dialogic journal as well as in post-visitation conferences with the clinical supervisor(s) and school-based faculty. The relevant TPA requires candidates in MS and SS programs to include a rationale for teaching strategies and assessments that they select. Course syllabi indicate that in all programs, candidates not only make instructional and professional decisions, they also explain the rationale for those decisions which requires them to bring together their knowledge of the students, the context and their pedagogical and content knowledge. The use of case studies in many courses provides problem solving opportunities for candidates. The unit-wide dispositions rubric http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/UnitDispositionRubric_000.pdf is adapted for all programs so that candidates are assessed with regard to professional dispositions.

3. What types of instructional strategies and assessments do unit faculty model?

Faculty model multiple teaching strategies, the majority of which reflect the constructivist philosophy espoused in the Conceptual Framework. Active engagement in the learning process, problem-solving and collaboration are characteristics of models evident across programs. Instruction for classroom teachers, for example, faculty employ key models of teaching (e.g. inquiry, direct instruction, cooperative learning, Socratic questioning) so that candidates have experience with models they will use in their clinical practice. In those courses that focus on EL adaptation and instruction, faculty model SDLIE techniques and ways to adapt instruction. Similarly, faculty use multiple types of assessments to draw on the learning styles and individual strengths of candidates as well as to set an example for them. Instructors are careful to address entry level, formative/monitoring, and summative types of assessment—especially within methodology coursework. Common types of assessments include lesson plans and self-assessments, unit plans, case studies, journal article critiques, written examinations, self-assessments and reflections, peer teaching, videotapes of teaching or counseling sessions, supervisor evaluations of field observations and research papers. All programs emphasize the application of relevant research to professional decision making. Sample lists of experiences, assignments and assessments are in Standard Four, page 3 http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/On-lineSt4_033.pdf used in courses are indicative of the variety of approaches used to meet the needs of our candidates.

4. How does unit faculty instruction reflect their knowledge and experiences in diversity and technology?

All course syllabi http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/red_unit_course_syllabi.htm reflect the knowledge and experiences of faculty in varied environments and with diverse student, site and peer populations. The syllabi, choice of course materials and the continuing development of new courses and refinement of existing ones provide evidence of how instruction reflects knowledge and experiences in diversity. New courses such as KINE 330 - Movement Skill Assessment for Individuals with Disabilities, and ESPE 515 - Language and Literacy for Children under Five with Special Needs, indicate that faculty continue to move forward in preparing candidates to address the needs of English learners and special needs students. The master’s theses from 2006–2008 http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Thesis-diversity-06-08.pdf offer examples of ways in which instruction reflects faculty knowledge and mentoring in diversity. Nearly all faculty employ commonly used (and sometimes cutting edge) technology http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/InstructionalTechnologyTable.pdf for teaching and require the same from their students in course presentations, demonstrations and clinical practice where appropriate. Examples include requiring candidates to access and utilize information from the Internet and evaluate the usefulness and the integrity of web-based information. By utilizing Blackboard, many instructors provide their students with access to lecture materials and any other pertinent course materials, and provide external links to additional resources, as well as holding class discussions via the Discussion Board. On Blackboard, quizzes may be completed electronically, as can the submission of assignments. Faculty members use their knowledge and experience with updated versions of software (e.g., Microsoft Excel; Microsoft Word; Microsoft Power Point; etc.) to develop their instruction as well as to model the appropriate use of these technologies in teaching. They may also use web-based materials provided by publishers to develop and enhance classes offered in an on-line format. Faculty members use their knowledge and experience in searching electronic databases in the university library system to access current research literature in instruction. Almost all faculty members have the training and experience to utilize Smart Classroom equipment. Methods faculty typically use the micro teaching labs to have candidates videotape mini lessons and critique them with peers. One component of evaluation during clinical practice for teachers is the application of technology in instruction. Training for using classroom technology in the new building and for ADA compliance in on-line instruction is offered regularly as are numerous other workshops that deal with employing technology in university teaching and making certain that it is accessible (see ACM web accessibility http://acm.csusb.edu/webaccessibility/default.html and ODL http://odl.csusb.edu/).
5. How does unit faculty systematically engage in self-assessment of their teaching?

In at least two courses a year, faculty are evaluated by students as required by the University evaluation policy. Prior to attaining the rank of full professor, faculty are observed and evaluated by peers. These activities align with the rigorous retention, promotion and tenure process required to standard self-assessment of teaching. When submitting the Faculty Activities Report (FAR), faculty complete a section on teaching which includes a self-assessment based on a variety of sources. Follow-up conferences with the department chair assist faculty in improving or adjusting teaching as needed. Senior tenured faculty are reviewed every five years in a similar manner. Some faculty arrange periodically for video taping of a class session to enhance the self-assessment process. Many faculty design mid-term or end-of-term questionnaires in which candidates are asked to comment on specific elements of the course thus giving instructors the opportunity to reflect on their teaching and make adjustments as appropriate. These questionnaires are more course specific than the generic one administered university-wide. The MA Core protocol requires that a questionnaire be administered in all Core courses at the end of each quarter.

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to faculty teaching could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 5b. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

1. What types of scholarly work are expected as part of the institution's and unit's mission?

The university policy on retention, promotion and tenure [http://academic-affairs.csusb.edu/personnel/rpttoc.htm](http://academic-affairs.csusb.edu/personnel/rpttoc.htm) (RPT) notes that “…no single type of scholarly work is required, but that many types are considered, often depending on the academic field. Work reviewed by peers in the field is generally more significant.” The University and the unit believe that scholarly endeavors of all types lead to improved instruction as faculty develop greater breadth, depth and experience in their academic discipline.

2. In what types of scholarship activities are faculty engaged? How is their scholarship related to teaching and learning? What percentage of the unit's faculty is engaged in scholarship? [NOTE: Review the definition of scholarship in the NCATE glossary]

Unit faculty are productive scholars engaged in seminal investigation and applied research as well as serving as experts in their fields and as consultants to school districts and other agencies. Consultant work with school districts and agencies is viewed favorably in the RPT process because of the research required and the opportunity it affords to test one’s ideas in the field and integrate current developments into course planning and instruction. Unit faculty are active in submitting grant proposals [http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/GrantsandContractsAwarded_000.pdf](http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/GrantsandContractsAwarded_000.pdf) as well. The variety of work that is done provides rich and diverse learning opportunities for students who benefit from the practical, real world experiences of the faculty and the deepening of the faculty’s understanding of their own disciplines and how that understanding can enhance the teaching and learning process. All faculty are engaged in some type of scholarly activity [http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Table11_001.pdf](http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Table11_001.pdf) over the course of their careers, and most are engaged with only a few (brief) breaks.

3. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to faculty scholarship could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 5c. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

1. What types of service are expected as part of the institution's and unit's mission?

The institution and the unit require service as a component of the RPT process [http://academic-affairs.csusb.edu/personnel/rpttoc.htm](http://academic-affairs.csusb.edu/personnel/rpttoc.htm). Service in several areas, with leadership in at least one, is required to earn retention, promotion and tenure. Service may be at the program, department, college, university, local, national or international levels. The unit places high value on those types of service that connect faculty members to their counterparts in off-campus sectors.

2. In what types of service activities are faculty engaged? How is their service related to practice in P-12 schools and to service to the profession at the local, state, national, and international levels (e.g., through professional associations). What percentage of the faculty is actively involved in these various types of service activities?

Unit faculty are active in service [http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Service-5d2_000.pdf](http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Service-5d2_000.pdf) to the program, department, college, university and external community. While most service is tied directly to teaching or other university responsibilities of the faculty member, extensive service to the community-at-large is a commitment as well and one that reflects the community engagement goal of the University Strategic Plan. All faculty are active in one or more levels of service. In late 2008 CSUSB was identified by the Carnegie Foundation as one of the top 100 institutions in the country for community engagement and outreach. The College of Education has been in the forefront of this endeavor for many years.

3. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to faculty service could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 5d. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here.)

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

1. How are faculty evaluated? How regular, systematic, and comprehensive are the faculty evaluations for adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as for graduate teaching assistants?

The University has carried out a rigorous retention, promotion and tenure review process [http://academic-affairs.csusb.edu/personnel/rpttoc.htm](http://academic-affairs.csusb.edu/personnel/rpttoc.htm) since its founding.
The criteria are under the purview of the Faculty Senate through its Faculty Affairs Committee and are in accord with relevant provisions of the California State University collective bargaining memorandum of understanding (MOU) which assigns the faculty evaluation process to the Faculty Senate rather than to the Faculty Union. The elected department evaluation committee, the chair, the dean and the college evaluation committee evaluate tenure-track faculty independently. Those cases that result in conflicting recommendations at the early levels are adjudicated by the university evaluation committee, which includes representatives from five colleges. In either case, the Provost makes the final decisions on retention, promotion and tenure. The department chair and the department evaluation committee evaluate full-time lecturers in a similar manner. The performance of part-time clinical faculty is reviewed by the Program Directors, the Associate Dean of Teacher Education, and the CSUSB Palm Desert Director of Post Graduate Programs in Education (as appropriate). It is based on information gained from candidates in addition to the Supervision office’s tracking of supervisor attendance at orientations and inservice http://www.csusb.edu/coe/ncate/documents/Supervision-Monitoring-Form.pdf as well as their completion of all required assessments. All assessments of candidates by full- or part-time faculty are maintained in the Supervision office. Continued employment and merit pay (when available) are contingent upon adequate performance. Full-time program faculty who serve as University supervisors receive their student evaluation data and are encouraged to include their analysis of it within the regular R.P.T. and merit pay reports.

The department evaluation committee, the chair and the dean evaluate tenured full professors, including those in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) every five years. They submit faculty activity reports with documentation similar to those submitted by the probationary faculty. The review is followed by a conference with the department chair, the dean and the committee chair.

Teaching is evaluated formally using multiple sources including the university-wide Student Opinions of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTEs) http://academic-affairs.csusb.edu/personnel/fam/fam320.htm, peer reports of classroom visitations http://ecampus.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/RPTClassroomVisitationReport.pdf, syllabi and other materials submitted by the faculty member for review. Field supervisors are evaluated using a form designed specifically for that purpose followed by conferences with program directors or coordinators. Informal assessment of teaching occurs when faculty team teach, visit the classes of peers to share ideas and teaching strategies, and administer questionnaires to candidates at the conclusion of a class to elicit reactions and suggestions to be used in course revision. “Course-alike” groups of instructors of multiple-section courses meet throughout the year to exchange teaching strategies, agree on master syllabi and improve course design. In the same way that faculty stress reflection on the part of candidates, faculty themselves are reflective professional educators.

2. How well do faculty perform on the unit’s evaluations? (A table summarizing faculty performance could be attached at the end of Element 5c.)

After a lengthy period of study and review by university faculty, the system for gathering student opinions on teaching was revised to allow for more open-ended questions designed by instructors. This change took effect in fall 2007. While the new SOTE form is more instructive for faculty, the results are compiled in a different manner. A summary of a recent SOTE cycle http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/College_of_Education_SOTE_009.pdf indicates that the faculty are rated very favorably by candidates. In Overall Quality of Instruction, about 93% indicate very good or excellent, with regard to the professor’s contributions to learning, the excellent/very good combined are about 93%. Prior to the format change, evaluations in the COE were consistently high as well, ranging from 3.65 – 3.85 on a 4.0 scale and generally higher than those of the other colleges. The Student Evaluation of Supervision Effectiveness http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/SupervisorsEvalForm.pdf form is used exclusively in the College of Education to evaluate clinical supervisors. Results http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/SESMeans.pdf from academic year 2007-2008 indicate that supervisors were rated overall at 3.7 (fall quarter), 3.2 (winter) and 3.6 (spring.) We note that supervisors have weekly contact with candidates, help them to apply what they have learned in their coursework and are open and available to provide support which is one of the most critical needs during clinical practice. Faculty quality ratings http://www.csusb.edu/coe/ncate/documents/FacultyQualityRatings2008.pdf from the COE Current Student Survey in 2007-2008 indicate that main campus and Palm Desert Campus faculty in initial, advanced and programs for other professionals receive mean ratings of 4.00 – 4.3 overall on a 5 point scale. We believe that the rigorous evaluation process and the support provided to our faculty combined with the excellence of our scholarship and commitment to teaching offers our candidates high quality instruction in the classroom and in the field. This is borne out by student opinions and through the formal RPT process.

3. How are faculty evaluations used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service?

The faculty can improve themselves in all three areas of review through conferences with the department chair and, if needed, a specific plan of action to be undertaken prior to the subsequent review cycle. It is common for evaluation committees to recommend steps that the faculty member must take to meet the RPT criteria in the subsequent review cycle. On occasion a faculty member will develop a support team of colleagues who may observe and/or video tape a class to be followed by a discussion among team members. In other cases, a faculty member may identify a superior teacher and observe his or her class over a period of time. In the case of scholarship, a more senior faculty member may team-up with an untenured faculty member to assist with professional development both in research and in grant writing. The chair typically helps faculty members identify appropriate opportunities for service on and off campus.

4. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the unit’s evaluation of professional education faculty could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 5c. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

1. How is professional development related to needs outlined in faculty evaluations? How does this happen?

RPT reports at each level are specific in indicating what a faculty member needs to do to meet university and unit standards for retention, promotion and tenure. For example, if a faculty member needs to improve in the area of professional development, the committee might suggest something similar to the following: apply for a campus mini grant; confer with a staff member in Research and Sponsored Programs to learn of grant opportunities in the field; focus more on research to bring his/her work to readiness for a conference presentation or publication. At times, the committee may recommend that the faculty member strike a different balance among professional development, teaching and service to devote additional time to professional development. The college deans have a good overall understanding of the needs and allocate resources accordingly. Since the last accreditation visit, tenure track faculty and full-time lecturers in the COE have continued to receive $1,000 per academic year in travel funds for professional development. The Dean also uses these funds for faculty to travel internationally to present papers, and she applies indirect cost monies to fund additional travel for faculty who present at conferences.

2. What professional development activities are offered to faculty related to performance assessment, diversity, technology, emerging practices, and the
3. How often does faculty participate in professional development activities both on and off campus? [Note: Include adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as graduate teaching assistants.]

Higher education clinical faculty participate annually in three to four orientations and three in-service sessions. Faculty working in induction participate in ongoing training to maintain their ability to teach within the program. The two to four sessions per year engage them in practicing formative assessment strategies for promoting growth in new teachers. MS and SS faculty who serve as TPA scorers must receive initial training, attain calibration in scoring, attend scorer orientations, and be retrained if they do not participate for a year or more. The money provided for travel also contributes to professional development of faculty.

Full-time faculty report a range of participation in professional development workshops from one to eight per year. A summary of COE faculty attendance at TRC workshops [link to the workshop attendance report] is an example. Adjunct faculty (part-time lecturers) attend one to three workshops a year on campus. We do not have information on their attendance at off-campus workshops or conferences; however, most are employed by a P-12 district or other agency and have numerous opportunities for professional development through their work.

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the unit’s facilitation of professional development could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 5f. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 5?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Dean of the COE uses any flexibility she has to provide reassigned time to new faculty members and to support those faculty who present papers, conduct workshops at professional conferences, or simply attend professional meetings. She uses indirect cost monies to make sure faculty receive training offered by the state that is specific to our programs. Our faculty are rated very favorably as teachers and clinical supervisors by candidates.

| 2. What research related to Standard 5 is being conducted by the unit? |

A recent study addressed how the training of TPA scorers affected scoring outcomes. The value of the dispositions rubric to clinical faculty in the Multiple Subjects program was examined through a survey.

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.

[NOTE: In this section, institutions must address (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus and distance learning programs.]

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

1. How does the unit manage or coordinate the planning, delivery, and operation of all programs at the institution for the preparation of educators?

The College of Education (COE) is one of six colleges in the Division of Academic Affairs at CSUSB, plus one satellite campus and is administered by a dean, two
associate deans and four department chairs as illustrated in the organizational chart [http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COE/OrganizationalChart.pdf]. The COE dean confers and interacts with the deans of the other colleges through the Deans Council chaired by the Provost and the Administrative Council chaired by the President. The Palm Desert Campus is administered by a dean and associate dean, with a director of post baccalaureate programs who oversees all education programs and is a member of the division of teacher education leadership team.

Recent reorganization in the COE (described in the Overview [http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Overview_005.pdf]) resulted in an arrangement based on a combined program and departmental structure with most departments typically made up of faculty from more than one program. Nearly all faculty are part of a program (i.e. credential or master’s degree) and all faculty are members of a department. The Division of Teacher Education, led by the associate dean and the directors of the Single Subject (SS), Education Specialist (ES) and Multiple Subject (MS) Credential Programs, also includes the newly created Student Services Office (SSO) which brings together several separate offices and includes additional support for advising and recruitment. Partly in response to concerns expressed during the 2002 combined NCATE/CCTC visit, two new professional staff positions, dedicated to advising, were added. The Supervision Office, which is part of the SSO, coordinates field placements for student teachers and arranges for supervision of interns and student teachers in consultation with program directors and, in the case of the single subject program, with the district liaisons.

The curriculum development and revision process begins at the program level and, following review by the COE Curriculum Committee, proceeds to the Dean’s Cabinet and then to the University levels. This is an on-going process as courses and programs are refined. The Teacher Education Council, which meets quarterly, enhances communication among its members who include college associate deans, the Associate Vice-Provost for Academic Programs, district and county representatives and community college colleagues. The Council focuses on issues related to the preparation of teachers in degree and credential programs. As a member of the Academic Affairs Council and the Administrative Council, the Dean of the College of Education is in regular communication with fellow deans who have oversight responsibility for programs outside the College.

Other avenues for insuring that the COE has appropriate communication with programs outside the college include the regularly scheduled meetings between the COE Associate Dean for Graduate Programs and Administration with faculty in programs outside COE, the meetings between single subject program faculty and faculty who teach in the undergraduate majors; and frequent meetings between the associate dean for teacher education and liberal studies faculty. Subject matter advisory groups for multiple and single subjects are chaired by the Associate Provost for Academic Programs and have quarterly meetings. These multiple structures insure that the primary coordinating responsibility for all programs that prepare professional educators resides with the dean of the COE in close and frequent collaboration with colleagues. An added benefit of the move into the new building is the relocation of the Liberal Studies Office to the building, making it easier for multiple subjects candidates to seek advice.

CSUSB and the unit maintain and articulate a research-based vision for preparing educators that is aligned with California’s standards and frameworks. This vision, described in the Conceptual Framework, provides guidance for programmatic, fiscal and human resources decisions.

2. What members of the professional community participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation? In what ways do they participate?

There are unit-wide advisory groups, and each program has an advisory committee [http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/EducationUnitAdvisoryGroups_000.pdf] made up of personnel from the field. Meeting two or three times a year, the advisory committee members review and react to program changes or proposals. Part time faculty members, most of whom are current or recently retired practitioners in the field, are included in program reviews. Informal participation occurs when clinical faculty, programs directors/coordinators and district liaisons interact with site supervisors and other site personnel. Biennial program reports provide details on the types and uses of information [http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdvisoryBoardContributionsToProgramImprovement_000.pdf] generated by advisory board members.

3. How does the unit ensure that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling?

The staff in Student Services, available by appointment or on a drop-in basis, provide advice to students who make initial inquiries regarding initial and advanced programs. Two full time advisors and a third recruiter/advisor assure that all unit programs have access to initial and ongoing advising. All staff advisors hold a master’s level degree, one of which is within the field of counseling. They facilitate informational meetings for initial programs and assist with the program admission file while also serving as helpful resources to candidates throughout their programs. All other offices of the SSO also are available from 8-6 on M-Th and from 8-4:30 on Fridays to assist candidates through every stage of their program. Every candidate who enrolls in a program is assigned a faculty advisor who assists with mapping out a course of study for the candidate. Program coordinators and directors also assist with initial inquiries. The COE single subject program director, in particular, works with faculty in approved subject matter programs so that they know when and under what circumstances to send their advisees to the COE for assistance in looking ahead to the pursuit of a credential. The MS Program Director has a similar pattern with the Director of Liberal Studies. The new COE building’s expanded student services area provides a welcoming environment and clusters support in one location making it easier for students to navigate the admissions and credentialing process more efficiently and effectively than was possible in the past.

The University provides information tables during the first two weeks of every quarter to facilitate candidate ease into their courses. For more than three years, the COE has been co-hosting with the university, first Saturday information tables to provide the same service to candidates beginning class on Saturdays. This service was prompted by the COE due to the recognition that we have many Saturday candidates, and our college is the only college participating.

It should be noted that our unit has invested much thought and effort into how candidates are supported throughout their experience. It had been a challenge to facilitate access to our service staff and faculty due to our location in four buildings spread across our large campus. We are optimistic about the ease of access that our new building is providing, but we will continue to maintain the many strategies we had put in place to support candidates such as informational meetings, faculty one-on-one meetings, program plans, advancement to candidacy (for master’s candidates), and a free pre-evaluation of candidates planning to apply for the credential within 1-2 quarters. We have also redesigned our website and decentralized maintenance of program specific information to allow programs to assure that website information is accurate and keeps up with frequently changing licensure laws.

The university has a Community Counseling Center operated by the Psychology Department with interns who are supervised by faculty and a professionally staffed Psychological Counseling Center that is part of Student Health Services.

4. What are the unit’s recruiting and admissions policies? How does the unit ensure that they are clearly and consistently described in publications and catalogues?

Each credential and degree program has a set of admissions policies [http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/AdmissionRequirements.pdf] that incorporate university or system -wide policies that apply. The CSU has established common admissions standards [http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/EO-896.pdf] for initial programs. Admission to the university, a minimum GPA and the completion of prerequisites exist for each program and are described in the University Bulletin and on the Website. Recruitment activities [http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Candidate_Recruitment.pdf] are carried out by the College and by individual programs. All biennial program reports must list recruitment activities undertaken during the time period. The Cabinet members and appropriate staff review the policies each year to check for changes that may be required due to system, campus or unit changes. In the faculty offices and the Student Services area,
updated brochures and forms are available to students. Most programs schedule quarterly orientation or informational sessions to review the programs, explain admissions standards and processes and answer questions.

5. How does the unit ensure that its academic calendars, catalogues, publications, grading policies, and advertising are accurate and current?

Each year the university office of academic programs provides a timetable for making changes to the University Bulletin (catalog). That office monitors carefully the accuracy of information based in part on any curricular changes that were made during the prior year. A recruiter in Student Services is responsible for the accuracy of brochures and fact sheets, and the administrative analyst in the dean’s office coordinates changes to the University Bulletin. Changes to Websites are the responsibility of designated program faculty/staff and must follow the approved format established at the university policy level.

The Office of Academic Programs sends reminders at the beginning of the academic year and the beginning of each quarter regarding the academic calendar so that faculty can make sure that their syllabi reflect the university calendar. Similarly, that office informs faculty of any changes to grading polices or grade grievance policies. Typically the deans and the chairs follow up on such communications with the faculty to make sure they have accurate and current information.

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to unit leadership and authority could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 6a. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

6b. Unit Budget

1. What is the budget available to support programs preparing candidates to meet standards? How does the unit’s budget compare to the budgets of other units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other institutions?

As reported in the 2007-2008 financial plan for the University, the Academic Affairs budget includes $7,508,787 for the COE, which is the same as the prior fiscal year. Note that this amount does not include benefits, figured at 38% of salary, nor does it include trust or foundation accounts. The actual breakdown of the baseline budget is as follows:

- Academic Salaries $5,998,932
- Part Time Faculty 59,733
- Department Chairs 192,641
- Mgmt Salaries 76,008
- Staff Salaries 997,509
- Student Assts 31,947
- Supplies & Services 161,017

In the past, the CSU System had one-time growth money, some of which was added to the COE baseline budget enhancing the overall budget in subsequent years. Although the COE’s current budget represents an equitable allocation vis-à-vis other colleges, the COE’s equipment budget was hampered by the absence of a dedicated building. Group 2 equipment money, included in all allocations for new facilities, establishes the baseline inventory for each college. The completion of the new COE building has helped significantly.

The university budget process includes a campus-wide committee that holds public hearings and makes subsequent recommendations on requests from the five vice presidents. All requests are for funds in addition to the baseline budget. The President retains 20% of the new dollars available so that funds can be directed to new initiatives or program enhancements that are especially responsive to the University’s Strategic Plan. Faculty lines are allocated by the Provost based on enrollments and are not part of this budget process. Given the formulaic nature of the budgeting process, the COE receives a share proportionate to that of other colleges at CSUSB.

A comparison of the 2007-2008 baseline funding for the College of Education to that of other colleges indicates that the COE has the second highest cost per fulltime equivalent faculty (FTEF) with a figure of $98,804 Average baseline funding per fulltime equivalent student (FTES) positions the College of Education at the highest level with an average of $5,556.05. The rich formula for supervision contributes to the figure.

2. What changes to the budget over the past few years have affected the quality of the programs offered?

For this fiscal year (7/1/08-6/30/09), the vacant faculty lines’ total is $688,588.00. As of 1/31/09, approximately $311,000.00 has been subtracted as part of the overall budget reductions. The impact is that we are unable to hire in areas of need in Single Subjects and secondary reading. Searches remain open for a Department Chair of Educational Leadership and Curriculum and for a doctoral level research faculty member in Educational Leadership. Funding is from a separate budget account specifically for the doctoral program with no mingling of funds from the COE baseline budget. Because of on-going substantial grants and contracts, quality of programs is not compromised but expansion and new ventures are curtailed. Other than salary increases being frozen, there currently is little impact on faculty. Travel is being funded out of foundation indirect cost monies.

Due to the new COE building being completed in 9/08, new equipment, facilities, and space have enhanced overall COE programs.

3. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the unit’s budget could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 6b. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit’s electronic exhibit room.)

6c. Personnel

1. What are the institution’s workload policies? What are the unit’s workload policies? What is included in the workloads of faculty (e.g., hours of teaching, advising of candidates, supervising student teachers, work in P-12 schools, independent study, research, and dissertation advisement)? How do workload policies differentiate between types of faculty positions?

The standard workload for a full-time tenure-track faculty member is 45 weighted teaching units (WTUs) per academic year. This normally translates to three courses per quarter that meet 200 minutes a week or a combination of courses and clinical supervision. Either assignment equates to 36 WTUs annually with the remainder of the time (9 WTUs) dedicated to advising and committee work. One contact hour (50 minute period) in the classroom is represented by one WTU.

Full-time lecturers (non tenure track positions) typically teach 11 classes a year or a combination of classes and supervision that equates to 11 classes. There is a
provision for variation in lecturer contracts in which case the teaching load may be reduced in exchange for service or commitment to carry out research. Faculty who teach in the doctoral program receive six WTUs for teaching a four unit class. They all teach non-doctoral courses as well at the regular rate of four WTUs for a four unit course.

2. What are the workloads of faculty for teaching and clinical supervision?

Supervision of eight student teachers or interns in a single quarter equates to teaching one four-unit class. Thus, the multiple or single subjects faculty member who teaches a typical full load has eight contact hours a week in class each quarter (8 WTUs) and supervises eight students in the field (4 WTUs), or has 12 contact hours (12 WTUs) a week in class with no supervision assignment. In advanced programs for teachers and programs for other professionals the candidate: faculty ratio is typically 1:2.1.

3. To what extent do workloads and class size allow faculty to be engaged effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service (including time for such responsibilities as advisement, developing assessments, and online courses)?

Although the faculty workload in the CSU is high compared to workloads in comparable institutions, the evidence indicates that unit faculty on our campus manage effective engagement in all areas of responsibility as noted in Table 11 http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/Table11_001.pdf and in the SOTE summary http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/College_of_Education_SOTE_000.pdf.

4. How does the unit ensure that the use of part-time faculty contributes to the integrity, coherence, and quality of the unit and its programs?

Successful grant-writing has resulted in an increase in the number of part time faculty. For example, part-time faculty play a major role in the supervision of students carrying out field work in all programs. Given the geographic expanse of our region, it is often to the advantage of candidates and faculty to have supervisors who live closer to the field site than may be the case with full time faculty. It is common for a retired teacher or administrator from a district to supervise our candidates in that district. The part-time faculty meet with the full-time faculty for orientation and to contribute to program development and program review discussions. They are evaluated through the peer visitation program and the student opinion of teaching effectiveness (SOTE http://academic-affairs.csusb.edu/personnel/fam/fam320.htm) system. The peer visitation programs provides for a faculty member to have a pre-visit conference, observe one hour of a class session, write a report http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/RPTClassroomVisitationReport.pdf and have a post visit conference. In the MS and SS programs the Student Evaluation of Supervision Effectiveness (SESE http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/SupervisorEvalForm.pdf) system is used also. The College is able to attract part-time faculty who remain with the University for extended periods of time.

During the 2006-2007 academic year, 25 full-time COE faculty were reassigned from regular teaching duties to carry out research or outreach. An additional 33 faculty received release time for grant-funded activities. Sixteen faculty received reassigned time for program coordination. The total time reassigned was 856 WTUs. Much of the time is generated by grants funded by the U.S. Department of Education and other public and private funding agencies as noted in Standards 4 and 5. The initial time needed to develop grants is often provided by the University or the COE in the form of reassigned time and/or graduate assistant support. Because the reassigned time is used for important professional and organizational work in the College, it creates a need for a highly qualified cadre of part time faculty who can remain with us over an extended period of time if their performance is satisfactory. Seventy part-time faculty have been teaching at Cal State at least one quarter per academic year for six – ten years. Another 72 have been part of the programs for three – five years. Fifty-seven part-time faculty are in their second year of employment with Cal State. Part-time faculty have excellent qualifications and often strengthen the link between the University and P-12 or other field agencies; however, the staffing of so many courses with part-time faculty increases the advising and committee workload for full-time tenure-track faculty. The unit insures that part time faculty are included in periodic in-service sessions and receive copies of master syllabi as models for preparing their classes. As noted in Standard 5 http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/On-lineSt5_021.pdf, part time faculty are subject to and benefit from a rigorous evaluation process.

5. What personnel provide support for the unit? How does the unit ensure that it has an adequate number of support personnel?

To ensure that the Unit has an adequate number of support personnel http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COE08-09Staffing_000.pdf staff supervisors report to the associate deans or the Dean regarding needs they have for additional staff. Chairs and associate deans bring concerns to the Dean’s Cabinet whenever a need arises, and Cabinet performs an annual review of staff resources at its fall retreat. The ratio of support personnel to full-time faculty is currently 1:10.5. In recent years, it has averaged about 1:15. These figures represent basic clerical support and do not include staff in the Student Services area, the dean’s office or in department offices. Reductions in temporary staff are common during lean budget times.

6. What financial support is available for professional development activities for faculty?

Full time COE faculty are eligible for a basic amount of professional development/travel funds ($1000 per faculty member in each of the last eight years) plus additional allocations that may be available from summer monies or unused merit increase appeal funds. This is a considerable improvement over 1997-98 and prior years when each faculty member received $300 for travel. Unused funds may be pooled in the department near the end of the year to assist faculty who have additional needs, or they may be used to cover other faculty needs such as additional phone or duplicating costs or purchase of materials. Each department develops policies on the use of these funds within the parameters outlined in the Policy and Procedures Manual http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/FacPolMan.pdf. In addition, the Dean’s office retains a percentage of available funds for allocation to faculty who have opportunities to present papers requiring them to travel great distances or for other special professional development needs. Indirect cost monies from grants provide an important source of funds for professional development as well and are used frequently to support training and orientation offered by the state. “Professors Across Borders” through the CSUSB International Institute and mini grants offered by the University are additional sources of professional development funds.

7. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to personnel could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 6e. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here.)

6d. Unit facilities

1. How adequate are unit facilities--classrooms, faculty offices, library/media center, and school facilities--to support teaching and learning? [Note: Describe facilities on the main campus as well as the facilities at off-campus sites if they exist.]

The new state–of–the art building dedicated to the College of Education supports teaching and learning with appropriate teaching space, technology and office accommodations. The recently opened Indian Wells Center for Education on the Palm Desert Campus http://pdc.csusb.edu/ serves candidates in education
programs with office and classroom space. On the San Bernardino campus, the Business Building (JB) and the Health and Physical Education Building (HPE) provide classrooms and laboratories for the programs outside the COE. Every fulltime faculty member at CSUSB has a single office. Part time faculty have access to offices that typically are shared with other part time faculty. Many part time faculty choose to arrive early and stay late to meet with students in the vicinity of the classroom prior to and following class sessions. Off campus programs at sites other than Palm Desert use district facilities for classes. Capital Planning statistics http://www.csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/SB_CapP-07.pdf for JB, HPE and Indian Wells are attached; the CE Building is so new that it is not yet included.

The main features of the COE building http://csusb.edu/coe/NCATE/documents/COE_Building_Maps.pdf are 40 classrooms, of which 36 are outfitted with state of the art multi-media Polyvision Walk-n-Talk ActiveBoard Systems http://www.tangraminteriors.com/sw/swchannel/productcatalogcf_v2/internet/templates/steelcase/model.asp/ProductMasterID/326887/ParentID/158585/SWID/1. One hundred ten (110) faculty offices, 580 computer stations in 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 at 54 mbps are key features. Students, faculty and staff have immediate internet access from anywhere in the building. The classrooms include ten interdisciplinary classrooms on the first floor of different sizes: (a lecture hall with 230 seats, four rooms size 20-25, and five rooms size 40-45. There are four foundations labs on the third floor with 24-30 seating capacity in each. In addition, there are six large methods labs on the 3rd floor (Science, Math and Subject Matter Methods) with 30-40 student capacity in each. The Subject Methods lab includes two micro-teaching labs. There are two large interdisciplinary computer labs on the 2nd floor open to all students providing 48 computer stations. These labs are outfitted with brand-new Dual Boot Apple Imacs and HP Windows Vista workstations. More technology is planned for the building. The Evaluation and Assessment Center, the Literacy Center and Observation and Rehabilitation Centers will all be outfitted with DVR (digital video recording) camera systems for classroom teaching purposes. Finally, each conference room will eventually have the campus standard SMART technology including compute and overhead projectors.

2. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to unit facilities could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 6d. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here.)

6e. Unit resources including technology

1. What information technology resources support faculty and candidates? What evidence shows that candidates and faculty use these resources?

All faculty have a computer that is replaced (hardware and software) on a reasonable schedule as newer technology becomes available. The COE and the other colleges in which unit programs are housed have fulltime technicians that provide advice and technical support to faculty. All students have 24 hour access to computer stations through the campus. The College of Education building has classrooms with smart technology including the latest computer systems and “Polyvision” interactive boards. The COE also operates five computer labs with 150+ computer workstations each. These computer labs are equipped with Windows PC and Macintosh terminals for the faculty and candidates. With the new COE building, there is an increase in faculty and candidate use of computer labs for instruction and a greater variation in the ways in which they use the labs. In the smart-classrooms throughout the COE building, faculty use the Polyvision Systems Interactive White Board in daily coursework. This is a new technology introduced in all the classrooms throughout the building in 2008. With the advent of the new building, the Informational Technology Consultants report that more instructors are asking for computer lab time for their students to integrate technology into their course preparation. A log of that use is managed and maintained in the SMTE department. There is considerable variety in the types of software application requested by faculty who reserve time. For example, one instructor might reserve it for qualitative/quantitative/statistical purposes. Another may reserve for video and multimedia applications. Faculty operate numerous distance learning and on-line courses through technology for which support http://www.csusb.edu/distancelearning/classroomandsupport.html is available. Blackboard usage and hybrid classes have increased in recent years. Evidence shows an increase in video conferencing via Skype and p2p video systems as well. Candidate use of technology has increased, and a daily log of that use is maintained in the self-instructional labs. Candidate use includes e-mail correspondence, Blackboard and other distance learning applications, research (Eric/Library Databases), homework assignments (Word, Excel, Powerpoint, SPSS, Inspiration, Nivio/Nudist), Internet access, and Adobe CS4 Suite (Premiere, Photoshop, Contribute, Flash, Fireworks). Graduating candidates are given the opportunity to take comprehensive exams via the computer. The COE now hosts quarterly comp exams via a monitored computer-assisted essay format.

2. What resources are available for the development and implementation of the unit's assessment system?

Since the last accreditation visit, the College of Education has hired an academic and institutional studies associate with a Ph.D. who provides much of the data required for program assessment. She is able to provide trend analyses and tailor reports to meet specific program needs. A second professional position in the office has been added along with two graduate assistant positions. Both associate deans and the associate provost for research and graduate studies dedicate part of their time to assessment activities. All have received special training as part of the system-wide conversion to PeopleSoft. FileMakerPro is currently undergoing an update which requires the allocation of substantial resources and will allow major improvements to our candidate records. Implementation of the TPA, one component of the unit assessment system, has required substantial financial support for coordination of scorer training, scorer calibration, and staff support.

3. What library and curricular resources exist at the institution? How does the unit ensure they are sufficient and current? How does the unit ensure the accessibility of resources to candidates, including candidates in off-campus and distance learning programs, through electronic means?

Subscriptions to the following electronic data bases support the specific research needs of the College of Education: ERIC, Education Abstracts, PsycINFO, Education Index Retrospective, Dissertations & Theses: Humanities & Social Sciences, Social Science Citation Index (paid for by the COE), and Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts, and Project Muse. For books, users have online access to the Pfau Library catalog, other local library catalogs, Metalib (CSU union catalog), CalCat (California libraries union catalog), WorldCat (libraries nationwide), Melyli (UC union catalog), the U.S. Government Publications Office (GOPO); and the Library of Congress catalog. The Library’s website provides links http://www.lib.csusb.edu/article/findarticles.cfm|http://www.lib.csusb.edu/article/findarticles.cfm. As a government depository, the Pfau Library selects virtually everything related to education produced by the federal government. More than 80% of these are delivered electronically and have full text linking through the library’s catalog.

All of the library’s electronic resources, from databases to reserve- and ILL-article delivery, are available to students and faculty 24 hours a day, seven days a week anywhere in the world using their campus ID. An education librarian is assigned to develop resources to meet the needs of the students and faculty of the COE with purchases, teaching new skills, advocating for the college in the library and maintaining the curriculum collection, the juvenile collection, and all material areas related to education in support of the departments of the Collection of Education. Strong collaboration between the education librarian and the faculty insure the Pfau Library offers a number of instructional services. In addition to in-person reference desk assistance and telephone reference assistance, the library offers e-mail reference service and chat reference. Faculty in the College of Education are encouraged to schedule customized library instruction sessions for their classes. Librarians are also available to assist faculty in integrating information literacy/skills into their syllabi. For faculty who use Blackboard in their courses, librarians can be of assistance by showing them how online library resources and services can be incorporated into their Blackboard course. Librarians are available to help their contact information and office hours posted on syllabi or on Blackboard courses. In addition, the library offers private research consultations to both faculty and students by a librarian. Librarians are available to attend college department meetings, teach faculty workshops, and schedule visits to classes. The library’s “Faculty Support” website http://www.lib.csusb.edu/about/support.cfm facilitates the use of these services by faculty (Services and Policies).
In addition to central resources, Correctional Education has a library that contains the only set of Correctional Education materials in the nation (or most likely the world). Their website [http://www.csusb.edu/coe/programs/correctional_ed/index.htm](http://www.csusb.edu/coe/programs/correctional_ed/index.htm) posts articles, books and other resources for faculty, candidates, and districts. Reading’s website also posts resources for children, parents, and teachers, all of which are resources for our faculty and candidates. Within the Literacy Center, there is a literature collection from which K-12 students check out reading materials. There is also a Teacher Resource Center which shares literacy materials with teachers, candidates, and faculty.

4. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to unit resources, including technology, could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 6e. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here.)

---

### Optional

1. **What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 6?**

   The new building with state-of-the-art technology and facilities designed for the type of instruction typically provided by the COE are major assets. Programs outside the COE have been housed in new buildings for over a decade thus taking advantage of newer technologies. All of the facilities serving our candidates have dedicated space for students to study individually or in groups. Additionally, the support of a librarian dedicated to and knowledgeable about the preparation of professional educators helps candidates and faculty to make maximum use of the resources available.

2. **What research related to Standard 6 is being conducted by the unit?**

---