I.   Overview and Conceptual Framework

The California State University (CSU) is a system of 23 universities, the nation's largest and most diverse, and one of the most affordable systems of public higher education in the country. It is moreover, responsible for preparing more teachers than any other system in the state (about 55% of the state's teachers come out of the CSU). Responsibility for the CSU is vested in the Board of Trustees who appoint the Chancellor, the chief executive officer of the system, and the presidents, who are the chief executive officers of their respective campuses. The trustees, chancellor, and presidents work together to develop system-wide policy that is applied at the campus level via broadly based consultative processes. The Academic Senate of the CSU, composed of elected representatives of the faculty from each campus, recommends academic policy to the Board of Trustees through the Chancellor.

California State University, Fullerton (CSUF), located on 236 acres of what once was part of a vast orange grove, is the twelfth state college authorized by the Legislature. Classes began in September 1959, with 452 students, and today CSUF is a comprehensive urban university with a student population of over 38,000, making it the most populous CSU, and second most populous university (behind UCLA) in the state. CSUF enrolls the largest number of transfer students from California community colleges of all of the 23 CSU campuses, is majority ethnic minority students, and serves the largest Vietnamese population outside of Vietnam. In February 2013, Dr. Mildred Garcia, an advocate of student-centered learning for a diverse population, was inaugurated as CSUF's fifth president. A designated Hispanic Serving Institution, CSUF is number one in awarding bachelor's degrees to Hispanics, and fourth in the nation for the number of bachelor's degrees awarded to minority students.

CSUF is accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC); and nationally accredited in 17 disciplines, including teacher education. The university offers 55 undergraduate and 54 graduate degree programs, including a doctorate in education and doctor of nursing practice. Ranked number one among California institutions, and number 21 among 181 nationally ranked programs by U.S. News & World Report in 2015, CSUF's online education offerings include 12 online degree programs, eight online certificate programs, and eight online programs for educators. Additionally, more than 100 courses are offered online. With two satellite locations – The Grand Central Art Center in Santa Ana and the CSUF Garden Grove Center – as well as the CSUF Irvine Campus (which offers mostly upper-division and graduate-level courses in a convenient location for students who live and work in Orange County), CSUF's reach is extensive and diversified.

The university plays a prominent role in one of the strongest regional economies in the United States; current student and alumni contribute substantially to the region's employment and economic growth. CSUF generates $1 billion in economic activity annually, sustains more than 87,000 jobs in the region, and generates more that $65 million per year in state tax revenue. The Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs oversees curricular strategic plans, the distribution of academic resources and faculty personnel matters. Reporting to the Provost are the deans of the eight colleges: Arts, Business and Economics, Communications, Education, Engineering and Computer Science, Health and Human Development, Humanities and Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences and Mathematics.

CSUF's mission is built on a simple precedent: *Learning is preeminent*. We aspire to combine the best qualities of teaching and research where actively engaged students, faculty, and staff work in close collaboration to expand knowledge.

The College of Education (COE) is responsible for the management and coordination of accreditation and assessment requirements for all university programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals to work in P-12 settings, regardless of where these programs are administratively housed. The unit consists of both initial and advanced preparation programs and includes programs from five departments within the COE and programs housed in four other colleges (*Exhibit I.5.a*).

College of Education Departments
     EDAD – Educational Leadership Department
     EDEL – Elementary & Bilingual Education Department
     EDSC – Secondary Education Department
     READ – Reading Department
     SPED – Special Education Department

Outside the College of Education Programs
     HCOM – Communicative Disorders (College of Communications)
     SCED – Science Education, MAT-S (College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics)
     TESL – Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, TESOL (College of
               Humanities and Social Sciences)

Central to the unit's conceptual framework is our commitment to the preparation and professional development of innovative and transformative educators who advance just, equitable and inclusive education. As a professional community of scholar-practitioners, the College of Education promotes creativity, collaboration and critical thinking as fundamental to student achievement and success in a diverse and interconnected world.

The COE has a long history of involving a variety of stakeholder groups in the planning, implementation, and assessment of its programs. While these internal and external groups offer different levels and kinds of guidance, all are invited to provide input on how the COE can enhance the professional preparation of educators. Additional information regarding the relationship of the unit to other units that house P-12 programs is included in Standard 6.

I.3: Summarize programs offered at initial and advanced preparation levels (including off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs), status of state approval, national recognition, and if applicable, findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals. [2,000 characters]

The professional education unit is fully accredited by NCATE/CTC (2007). Due to the state's postponement of accreditation activity in 2012, our 2014 review was deferred to 2015. Program reports were submitted to the CTC for all programs leading to a credential. Program review leads

to a determination of "preliminary alignment" with state standards. Full program approval is awarded following the on-site review. The preliminary review of the initial Single Subject program has been completed. All other programs are currently in the review process. Unit programs are listed below (See comprehensive program table in *Exhibit I.5.a*)

Initial Programs (post-baccalaureate):
    Multiple Subject (K-8)
    Multiple Subject – Combined Credential (K-8)/Masters
    Single Subject (7-12)
    Special Education (K-12; early childhood)

Advanced Programs for Teachers:
    Elementary Curriculum and Instruction
    Bilingual/Bicultural Education
    Educational Technology
    Secondary Education
    Special Education
    Master of Arts in Teaching Science (MAT-S) – *inactive status*

Advanced Programs for Other School Professionals:
    Educational Administration
    Doctorate in Educational Leadership
    Reading
    Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
    Communicative Disorders- Speech Pathology

The Communicative Disorders Program is accredited by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA; per NCATE, only the accreditation letter and documentation for Standard 6 are provided for this review. A School Nurse Program is offered; per NCATE this program is not included in this review.

Alternative Route Programs
    Both Single Subject and Special Education initial credential programs offer an Intern Option. The Multiple Subject Intern option is currently on *inactive status*.

Off-Campus Programs
    The unit has no off-campus sites offering full programs of study.

Distance Programs
    Educational Technology MS is offered completely online. Four other advanced programs offer online and hybrid options.

I.4: Summarize the basic tenets of the conceptual framework, institutional standards, and candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions. [6,000 characters]

The overarching theme of the unit's conceptual framework (CF) is REACH. TEACH. IMPACT. These terms illustrate the unit's purpose and the goals underlying its commitment to candidate preparation and P-12 student development. Specifically the unit's purpose is to prepare candidates who have the capacity to REACH their students at all levels; to TEACH their students using a multitude of instructional and technological strategies; and to have an IMPACT on their students' learning and development. This theme is graphically represented (see full CF, *Exhibit I.5.c*) and appears on every professional education syllabus along with unit program outcomes and indicators (*Exhibit I.5.b*).

The unit program outcomes (goals) are to ensure that credential recipients and program graduates are *Knowledgeable and Competent Specialists, Responsive and Reflective Practitioners, and Committed and Caring Professionals*.

Indicators of candidate proficiency toward meeting program outcomes are grouped by outcome:
1. *Knowledgeable and Competent Specialists*
   a. demonstrate a strong foundation of knowledge
   b. implement effective practice
   c. use current technologies for teaching and learning
2. *Responsive and Reflective Practitioners*
   a. advance just, equitable and inclusive education
   b. make informed decisions
   c. participate in collaborative endeavors
   d. think critically and creatively
3. *Committed and Caring Professionals*
   a. demonstrate leadership potential
   b. maintain professional and ethical standards
   c. engage in continuous improvement

In addition to the unit program outcomes, candidates are expected to demonstrate dispositions that are articulated in the CF and encompass behavioral indicators within the three program outcomes. The dispositions expected of candidates as developing professional educators are to: 1) promote diversity (includes a commitment to fairness and the belief that all students can learn); 2) engage in collaborative endeavors; 3) think critically; 4) maintain professional and ethical standards; and 5) value life-long learning.

Each disposition is described in the Unit Professional Disposition Statement and multiple measures are used to assess candidate dispositions throughout their program.

In 2013, the university approved a set of student learning outcomes that reflect CSUF's mission (stated above). The outcomes state that graduates will:
- demonstrate intellectual literacy through the acquisition of knowledge and development of competence in disciplinary perspectives and interdisciplinary points of view
- think critically using analytical, qualitative and quantitative reasoning to apply previously-learned concepts to new situations, complex challenges and everyday problems
- communicate clearly, effectively and persuasively both orally and in writing

- work effectively as a team member or leader to achieve a broad variety of goals
- evaluate the significance of how differing perspectives and trends affect their communities
- recognize their roles in an interdependent global community.

Unit program outcomes have been aligned with state and national standards appropriate to each program, as well as the new university standards for student learning (*Exhibit I.5.c*). Such alignment ensures that assessments of candidate competence for meeting outcomes identified by the unit also serve to demonstrate the proficiencies articulated by the university and in professional standards.

As indicated in the institution's mission (stated above) and reflected in the university-wide student learning outcomes, learning is preeminent at CSUF. Both the university and the COE mission statements pivot upon elements that are crucial to educational excellence: collaboration, integration of research and practice, cultural and global competence, creativity, technological prowess and critical thinking skills. Both mission statements recognize the faculty's role in preparing candidates to succeed in an increasingly diverse world. While the university serves as a catalyst for partnerships with public and private organizations, unit faculty similarly strive to prepare candidates to be innovative and transformative catalysts for educational development as they work with students, parents, schools and communities.

The CF reflects a shared vision, one that is continually refined with input from faculty, candidates, school personnel and other partners in consideration of contemporary practices, needs, and aims in education. Revisions since the last accreditation review in 2007 were made to ensure the unit remained aligned with the most current state, institution, and professional standards, unit objectives and educational research. These revisions include:

- a new vision statement (approved in 2011) as part of the development of a five-year strategic plan for the COE
- a new mission statement (approved in 2012) that more accurately reflects advances in the unit (since 2007) and its commitment to its newly defined vision
- revisions to the dispositions statement (in 2012) to align more closely with the definition of just, equitable and inclusive education (JEIE) as proposed by the COE's JEIE Strategic Taskforce
- revisions to the program outcome indicators (in 2012) to align them more tightly with the language of the mission statement
- new CF theme and graphic (approved in 2013) to better represent the unit's vision and mission
- unit program outcomes aligned with university learning outcomes (approved in 2013).

STANDARD 1: CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS

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

1.1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

What do candidate assessment data tell the unit about candidates meeting professional, state, and institutional standards and their impact on P-12 student learning? For programs not nationally/state reviewed, summarize data from key assessments and discuss these results.

As stated in our conceptual framework (CF), unit faculty are committed to preparing candidates as "knowledgeable and competent specialists," "reflective and responsive practitioners," and "committed and caring professionals." To this end, the systematic collection and analysis of assessment data ensures candidates exit our programs with the pedagogic, content and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to help all students learn.

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) has approved all of the unit's initial and advanced credential programs. The Communicative Disorders advanced program is accredited by the American Speech and Hearing Association (ASHA). The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership was reviewed in 2012 by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) with numerous commendations (*Exhibit1.5.d*).

Biennial Reports submitted to the CTC provide an overview of each credential program; analysis of candidate assessments and performance; and illustrate how results inform modifications and program improvements. To date, two biennial reports have been submitted (each includes reports from all programs); one in 2010, containing three years of data (2007-10) and one in 2012, containing two years of data (2010-12). Access to these reports and corresponding reviews is available in *Exhibit 1.4.a*. In 2012-13, the CTC deferred all accreditation activities for one year due to fiscal challenges, thus our next biennial report will be submitted late summer 2015, and will contain three years of data (2012-15). The 2015 report will be available in the addendum.

During the fourth year of the accreditation cycle, all credential programs submit a Program Assessment Report to the CTC. These narrative reports substantively and extensively address how our programs meet specific state standards and are in various stages of review as described in the unit overview information on accessing the reports can be found in *Exhibit 1.4.a.*

Data collected on a set of key assessments are identified on program transition point (TP) charts in *Exhibit 2.4.a*. Instruments and scoring guides for these assessments are in *Exhibit 1.4.c*. Two years (2012-14) of data are provided in *Exhibit 1.4.d* for all initial and advanced programs. A third year of data (2014-15) will be submitted with the addendum. Detailed analyses of these data and how results will be used to improve all credential programs will be provided in the 2015

Biennial Reports. Detailed analysis of data for all other programs will be provided in the annual program assessment reports due to the university in June (described in *Exhibit 2.4.d*). Both sets of reports will be available with the addendum. Summaries of data based on aggregate results (*Exhibit 1.4.d*) will be used for discussion in the Institutional Report. Doctoral program assessment instruments and data are presented separately (and not included in aggregate results) because their requirements differ significantly from other programs.

Initial program applicants must demonstrate subject matter knowledge through performance on state exams (CBEST, CSET), or in subject matter preparation programs (single subject only) before admission. Three years of data provided in Title II reports show a nearly 100% CSET pass rate for CSUF candidates. Once admitted, candidate competence is demonstrated through the application of pedagogic, content, and professional knowledge in course assignments and field experiences. To be recommended for a credential, candidates must also pass the Reading Competency Exam (RICA). Pass rates for three years show that over 90% of our candidates have passed this exam (this is not a requirement for the single subject program). Employer surveys consistently rate teachers prepared in CSUF programs as "exceptionally" or "well" prepared to understand and teach core subjects (*Exhibit 1.4.d*)

To qualify for admission to advanced programs, candidates are expected to possess high levels of content knowledge at the time of admission, and thus must meet knowledge requirements (degrees, GPA, etc.) that exceed university minimums. See program requirements on TP charts in *Exhibit 2.4.a.* and program acceptance data (2012-15) in *Exhibit 2.4.b.* Early in their coursework, all advanced candidates complete a unit-wide writing assignment (evaluating both writing competence and content knowledge).Aggregate data show that candidates score an average of 4.66-4.88 on a 6-point scale (a score of 5 or 6 exceeds expectation). Assignment and scoring criteria are presented in *Exhibit 1.4.c.* and work samples from all programs are shown in *Exhibit 1.4.h.* At program exit, candidates (97%) report leaving their programs more knowledgeable in their field of study (2014 exit survey, *Exhibit 1.4.d*).

Initial programs' carefully planned coursework provides multiple opportunities to learn appropriate subject-specific pedagogical strategies to increase learning for all students. As student teachers, candidates demonstrate proficiency to plan instruction through: developing meaningful learning experiences for all students, using assessments to modify practice to enhance student learning, integrating technology, and considering school, family, and community contexts in order to connect to students' prior knowledge and experiences (see designing instruction work samples in *Exhibit 1.4.h.*). Candidates practice their skills in co-teaching placements with cooperating teachers, and integrate current educational technologies to support student learning. Cooperating teachers and university supervisor program-specific evaluations based on professional standards (*Exhibit 1.4.c*) show candidates in all programs are rated highly on standards related to curriculum planning and effective instruction (*Exhibit 1.4.d*).

Advanced programs provide candidates with opportunities to connect theory with practice under the guidance of faculty and/or on-site supervisors. Through coursework and field experiences candidates collect and analyze data and reflect on their practice related to program outcomes, professional, and state standards. During this process, candidates establish and build upon a foundation of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills as they earn their degrees. In a

culminating course, candidates demonstrate their knowledge and skills in their field of study though the completion of a capstone assessment, which varies by program. These assessments are all graded on program-specific 4-point rubrics (passing is a score of 3/above). Aggregate results show candidates perform very well on these assessments (aggregate average is 3.54). Additionally, year-out survey data indicate that a high majority of candidates find their program of study to be intellectually challenging (*Exhibit 1.4.d*). Doctoral candidates demonstrate and apply their professional knowledge and skills through the completion of their dissertation. These capstone assessments must be completed at high levels of competency, and depend upon the integration of advanced theory, methods, and application. Evaluation results are provided in *Exhibit 1.4.d* and sample dissertations (high and low quality) are in *Exhibit 1.4.h.*

Candidates in all initial programs are evaluated on their ability to assess student learning. Multiple and single subject candidates complete the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) (see *Exhibit 1.4.c)* which includes four comprehensive and complex tasks that evaluate candidate effectiveness (Task 3 is specific to assessing student learning to improve instruction). Special Education candidates construct a cumulative field experience portfolio which includes instructional plans to include the appropriate use of assessments to identify student needs and instructional plans to meet those needs (including the needs of EL students). Select items on student teaching evaluations and unit surveys also evaluate candidates' ability to assess and enhance student learning. In advanced programs, candidates' effectiveness in relation to student learning is evaluated as part of the capstone assessment and using select items on program surveys. These assessment descriptions are in *Exhibit 1.4.c* and two years of data are included in *Exhibit 1.4.d.* Examples of initial and advanced candidates' assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning in course assignments across all programs are provided in *Exhibit 1.4.g.*

All unit candidates are expected to demonstrate a commitment to fairness and a belief that all students can learn in each of five core dispositions listed in the Unit Professional Disposition Statement (*Exhibit 1.4.e*). These dispositions include: promoting diversity, engaging in collaborative endeavors, thinking critically, maintaining professional and ethical standards and valuing life-log learning. Candidates are advised of these expected dispositions at program orientations, in student handbooks, and via a link on all professional education syllabi. Policies and mechanisms for assessing dispositions are in place across the unit, as are methods for alerting and if necessary removing, candidates who do not demonstrate the ability to maintain professional and ethical standards, commitments, or dispositions. Selected items from multiple assessments (e.g., fieldwork and student teaching evaluations, Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA), surveys) measure candidate dispositions throughout the initial programs. A dispositions assessment and selected items from other assessments (e.g., diversity assignment, surveys) measure candidate dispositions in the advanced programs. Assessments are included in *Exhibit 1.4.e* and two years of data are presented in *Exhibit 1.4.f.*

1.2.b: Continuous Improvement
- *Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.*

Cognizant of the importance of using data to reflect upon our effectiveness and to determine how we can improve candidate preparation to teach all students, the unit collects and analyzes data

from across our programs at multiple points during the academic year. Data generally reveal that our candidates are well prepared and perform at good-to-high levels of proficiency. Historically however, in reviewing data from across the unit (e.g., CSU survey data, student teaching data) two areas have been identified as presenting the most challenges to candidates exiting our programs: 1) teaching English Learners (EL); and 2) using technology effectively.

As evident by the scores from previous CSU survey data, meeting the needs of English learners (ELs) has been a major area of focus in our program for the past few years and will continue to be in the future. Additionally, the need to improve candidate capacity to effectively teach EL has been recognized at all levels. In 2013, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) revised program standards to call attention to assuring teachers are prepared to address the needs of EL. These revisions meshed nicely with our own aims to improve our preparation of candidates to teach EL and resulted in the creation of EL Transition documents across our programs. These documents outline planned program changes and/or timelines describing how and when we will implement new EL standard elements into our instruction. All EL Transition plans were approved and are in various stages of implementation. Examples of program changes include:

> Multiple Subject (EDEL): Faculty reviewed syllabi and assignments across the Multiple Subject Program to identify alignment and gaps with the revised standards. Readings that support the teaching of English learners have been identified and included in all content area courses. The faculty worked together to distribute the revised elements across content area courses (and are working to do something similar with assignments in the field). For example, "attention to English learners of varied proficiency levels, educational and cultural backgrounds" is now explicitly included in specific assignments or activities in more than one methods course.

> Single Subject (EDSC): EDSC's course, *EDSC 340: Diversity in Secondary Schools* was modified to: emphasize recognizing and understanding the uses of non-dominant varieties of English by students; place more importance on effective engagement with families and communities; and direct attention to the need for candidates to differentiate between language learning and language disability.

> Special Education (SPED): Faculty added learning goals to all their courses that specifically focus on the new EL standards.

The scores from this report cycle (2010-2012) reflect program changes in the courses and field experiences are having a positive impact on how prepared candidates feel to meet the needs of EL. We will continue to make necessary changes in order to meet candidate and student needs while addressing the revised CTC standards.

The second area, concern about using technology effectively, was initially identified by instructors of Multiple and Single Subject credential courses who indicated that incoming credential students lacked the requisite technology skills needed to address CTC technology standard expectations. Faculty perceptions were corroborated in data collected from surveys of graduates and their employers after their first year of teaching, by the Systemwide Evaluation of

Professional Teacher Preparation Programs (SEPTPP) and the California State University Chancellor's Office. Assuring technological competency was subsequently tackled across the program in a variety of ways at all levels of instruction, professional development, and even outreach. The college has devoted entire retreats to improving faculty's understanding and use of technology and continues to assure faculty and candidates have access to and training with up-to-date tools for teaching with technology. Examples of program efforts include:

COE Technology Committee: Members serve as liaisons between the Academic Senate/University IT committee and the College of Education faculty to promote best practices in effective technology integration, and provide technology leadership, resources and support to all COE instructional staff and faculty members.

COE Computer labs: In addition to campus-wide resources, the COE has three computer labs with 15 to 30 computers in each that are earmarked specifically for education classes.

Laptop Check Out: In addition to campus-wide check-out, the EDEL offers laptop checkout to ensure all candidates have access to necessary technological equipment.

SchoolsFirst Federal Credit Union Center for Creativity and Critical Thinking: This state-of-the-art resource room provides candidates in the CSUF Multiple Subject Credential Program a place to gather, collaborate and utilize some of the newest technologies available in elementary schools today. Candidates can gain knowledge on SmartBoard software, science tools, math manipulatives, laptops, Promethean boards, and more.

COE Tech Cadre: A team of faculty experts in the use of educational technology receive release time to assist other faculty with one-on-one assistance in the pedagogical uses of technology. This additional faculty resource helps to ensure that that new full-time and part-time faculty are competent in using technology to teach and manage instruction.

Most recently, the yearly assessment of policies, programs, and practices led to the creation of the Just, Equitable and Inclusive Education (JEIE) Task Force and the Technology Task Force. Both of these groups meet at least once each semester and are charged with ensuring that assessment, diversity, and technology remain fore grounded in the unit. For example, the JEIE Task Force worked to assure the inclusion of a JEIE activity or assignment in all READ, SPED, EDSC and EDEL courses, and revisions were made to our unit disposition statement to align it more closely with the definition of just, equitable and inclusive education generated by the JEIE Task Force. In practice, these types of efforts have meant that what was once implicit is now explicit, clear, and concrete in every course in our initial programs.

It is evident that the unit's assessment system, developed in 2006, continues to be a major strength of the COE in relation to instruction, field experiences, and unit outreach. Indeed, even though the COE has long been required to complete reports that address candidate performance and to illustrate its use of data to make program improvements, a culture of assessment now

imbues all that we do in the COE. The unit recognizes the importance of using data and presenting evidence to support programmatic or instructional changes to improve the preparation of our teachers. Some of the data-driven reports created by the COE include the: biennial report on credential programs submitted to the CTC; department and college annual reports submitted to the university; CAEP/AACTE annual report submitted to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education; and Title II annual report submitted to the federal government.

The CSU Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs Office also requires each College of Education in the CSU system to submit an annual Improvement and Accountability Plan (IAP). Since 2009, the CSU has been engaged in an enhanced accountability initiative to increase awareness of the critical need for data-driven initiatives in teacher education programs on CSU campuses. Early in the 2008 academic year, each CSU campus compiled baseline data from previous evaluation results and detailed actions taken based upon that data. In spring 2009, each campus then developed an IAP that focused on four areas of teacher preparation (selected as most meaningful for their own system and campus improvement), before setting goals, drawing up timelines, and identifying relevant activities. In 2014, each campus reported on three system-wide focus areas (working with English language learners; working with special needs students; and content area (secondary) reading), as well as their individual campus-identified challenge areas. For each area, the report included: an up-to-date summary of progress related to previous goals; actions carried out in the current year; and any revisions or updates to goals for the future (with relevant timelines). The COE will continue to submit this report annually.

Submission of these and other reports ensures that the unit will regularly collect, analyze and use data to enhance candidate performance and improve its programs.

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.

2.1: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

How does the unit use its assessment system to improve candidate performance, program quality and unit operations?

The unit uses a comprehensive system of assessment that coordinates both a decentralized approach that allows programs to make decisions regarding assessments particular to their specific program goals, and a centralized unit-wide approach that allows for the aggregation and summary of assessment data across programs. The development of this system was a collaborative effort with significant input from stakeholder groups at both the unit and program levels. The Unit Assessment Committee (UAC), a standing committee of the COE with members from each initial and advanced program that is chaired by the director of assessment and accreditation, continually evaluates and modifies the assessment system to ensure that it remains viable, comprehensive, informative and effective. The UAC also serves as a liaison among unit and program faculty, and other stakeholders.

All programs have transition points (TP) at which candidates are assessed. The transition points for <u>initial</u> programs are: 1) admission to program; 2) admission to initial student teaching; 3) admission to final student teaching; 4) exit from program. The transition points for <u>advanced</u> programs for teachers and other school professionals (including the Doctorate in Educational Leadership program) are: 1) admission to program; 2) program continuation; 3) qualifying for culminating experience; 4) exit from program. TP charts for each program list corresponding key assessments and other requirements required at each transition point (*Exhibit 2.4.b*).

Performance and program assessments collected for <u>Initial</u> Programs include:
- Subject matter competency examinations
- Interview scores
- Course grades
- Supervised fieldwork evaluations
- Student teaching evaluations
- Capstone assessments
- CSU exit survey
- CSU one-year-out (graduate and employers) survey
- RICA (Reading Instruction Competence Assessment for California)

Performance and program assessments collected for <u>Advanced</u> Programs (other than the Doctorate) include:
- Admission assessments
- Course grades
- Writing assignment

- Diversity assignment
- Midpoint survey
- Dispositions assessment
- Capstone assessment
- Unit exit survey
- Unit one-year out survey

Performance and program assessment collected for the <u>Doctorate</u> program include:
- Course grades
- Qualifying exams
- Dissertation proposal defense
- Final dissertation defense
- Midpoint survey
- Employer survey

The unit developed the Professional Education Unit Assessment System Handbook in 2007 and updated it in 2014 *(Exhibit 2.4.a)*. The Handbook includes a full description of the assessment system, including program transition points and key assessments collected for analysis. Tables in the handbook (pp. 23-26) show the collection and flow of integrated data sets for initial and advanced programs. Also, matrices are provided that show the alignment of assessments with the conceptual framework program outcomes and NCATE Standard 1 elements *(also in Exhibit 2.4.a)*.

Department admissions coordinators work with the Admissions to Teacher Education office to track candidates' progress toward meeting admission requirements (TP 1). Once enrolled, candidate progress through transition points is tracked by department program coordinators via the unit's database, online evaluation system, and communication with appropriate faculty. At TP 4 (exit from program), the COE Credential Department checks that all requirements are met for program completion and credential recommendation (initial and advanced). The university's Graduate Studies Office monitors the progress of the unit's advanced program candidates and checks that all graduation requirements are met.

The director of accreditation and assessment oversees all assessment for the unit and assures that the assessment system facilitates an iterative process for collecting, analyzing and reporting data on candidate performance, program effectiveness and unit operations, so that strengths and weaknesses can be identified, modifications determined, and improvements implemented *(Exhibit 2.4.d.)*. To aid in this comprehensive effort, a COE data analyst summarizes and charts data from the key assessments for COE chairs and for program coordinators in the unit who are outside the COE. Data pertaining to program outcomes are routinely examined, discussed at faculty and department committee meetings, and presented at stakeholder group meetings that include candidates, alumni, university supervisors and other part-time faculty, and community partners.

External data collected for candidate assessment also provide data for program review each year; results of the CSU chancellor's annual exit, graduate, and employer surveys for <u>initial programs</u> are shared by the COE dean with department chairs and faculty, annually. Department chairs and

program coordinators then share results with appropriate stakeholder groups for feedback and suggestions for program improvement. In addition, assessment results are used by the dean for unit review purposes, which allows for comparison of the strengths and weakness of COE programs with similar programs in the state. The unit conducts its own exit and graduate and employer surveys for advanced programs. The dean shares results from all initial and advanced surveys with unit-level stakeholders and university committees to report on program effectiveness. Data-driven decisions regarding program and unit improvement are made in light of the unit's conceptual framework, professional standards, and licensure and accountability mandates

The COE director of accreditation and assessment and the COE data analyst jointly prepare all data reports for internal and external offices and agencies (e.g., CTC Biennial Reports, NCATE and CSUF Annual Reports, Title II Reports). These reports specify areas in need of improvement and describe implemented modifications. Additionally, each department chair submits an annual report that details how program processes and procedures have been developed, modified, and implemented to meet identified program goals and objectives that are aligned with university missions and goals. The dean includes information from these reports in annual reports to the Chancellor's Office and to the Office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Together, these various reports provide ongoing monitoring of programs by the unit, as well as monitoring of the unit by the university, the chancellor, and state and national reviewing agencies. Other examples of data sources used for program and unit improvement (including unit operations) are: diversity data on faculty, candidates, students and the professional community; faculty evaluations; and budget reports.

A range of technology tools are used to assist with the collection, storage, analysis, and reporting of unit and program assessment data. Access to some of these tools (identified by an asterisk "*," below) is restricted to particular faculty depending on their role in the unit (e.g., department chairs, program coordinators, university supervisors). The primary tools used to manage the assessment system are (described in detail in the Assessment Handbook, p. 30 (*Exhibit 2.4.a*):

- * College Database system developed by the COE to manage candidate admission and enrollment data
- * Evaluation Database system developed by the COE to manage field experience and student teaching evaluations
- Qualtrics, a web-based survey software for creating and distributing candidate, graduate, and employer surveys
- * Taskstream to support the TPA process
- Microsoft Access to facilitate merging assessment data with candidate records about programs and pathways
- Microsoft Excel to support the collection of some key assessment data
- * Dropbox to store and share data reports, program information, and other files

The system is designed to provide support to all candidates to successfully meet program outcomes and professional standards. The university and unit have policies and practices in place to ensure candidates are assessed fairly and accurately *(Exhibit 2.4.c).* In addition, unit faculty employ several strategies to address issues of *fairness*, *accuracy*, *consistency* and *avoidance of*

bias in the implementation of assessment system procedures *(Exhibit 2.4a)*. Candidates have the right of due process if they feel they have been treated unfairly, or with prejudice.

Procedures are in place at the university, unit and program level for candidates who wish to file formal complaints (*Exhibit 2.4.e*). University procedures are contained in the University Catalog and department appeals' procedures are stated in individual program handbooks. In all cases, the candidate must first confer with the course instructor or university supervisor. If a resolution is not reached, the candidate then confers with the department chair or the fieldwork coordinator. Complaints that cannot be rectified at the program level are referred to the associate dean, and when necessary, a faculty appeals board is constructed to mediate the grievance process. Records on formal complaints are maintained by program coordinators at the program level and by the associate dean at the unit level.

Evidence that faculty use data from the key assessments to make changes in their programs is included in Section IV of the Biennial reports for all credential programs. Additional examples of the uses of key assessment data to make program and unit improvements by faculty and leadership are contained in *Exhibit 2.4.g.*

With program input, the dean keeps faculty, staff, and stakeholders abreast of unit changes and accomplishments via two publications: *COE Connected*, an internal monthly publication distributed to all faculty and staff; and *Impact,* a professional quarterly publication widely distributed to university and community partners.

2.2.b: Continuous Improvement *Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.*

With the creation of the College of Education (COE) assessment system in 2006, the unit assembled the first Assessment Committee. Today, the assessment committee is a standing committee of the college. The committee is charged with the continued evaluation and modification of the assessment system to ensure that it remains comprehensive, informative and effective. Composed of faculty members from each of the unit's initial and advanced programs, the Assessment Committee meets regularly to: discuss and analyze data; review assessments; respond feedback from programs, departments and other stakeholders; and determine best next steps to assure candidates are well prepared to teach all students. The diligence of the Assessment Committee has resulted in:

Cohesion and agreement in the Diversity Assignment - Advanced programs
Feedback from programs about the utility of data collected was that the reporting of scores from the diversity assignment was not informative or very useful because only an average pass rate was reported. As a group we made revisions to the assignment to better address diversity program outcomes and standards. To contribute to the fairness of grading across programs and courses we agreed to design rubrics for scoring; each course developed the criteria for their specific assignment. The group agreed to use a 4-point scale and pass point of 3 or better. The assignments and rubrics were piloted in fall 2012. Each program now receives scores from each criterion on the rubric, plus an overall average.

Consistency in the Disposition Assessment – Advanced programs
The unit has always assessed dispositions using elements from existing data sources that address diversity proficiencies. At the initial program level, this assessment method provided performance data through intake interviews and field based assessments (student teaching and fieldwork evaluations), as well as survey data. At the advanced level, there were no performance-based assessments were lacking and most data were collected from surveys (midpoint, exit, and post). In fall 2013, all advanced program coordinators came together and discussed some methods of assessing dispositions that would allow for that the collection of self perception data. It was decided that each program would meet with faculty and other appropriate stakeholders to identify a set of behavioral indicators for each of the unit's five dispositions. As a group, a common rubric was designed and the pass rate determined. Each program designed the procedure for assessment – who was responsible, when and how many times – as well as the procedures for notifying candidates. In spring 14, each program piloted the procedure and made adjustments, as necessary.

A Common Culminating Project Scoring Rubric – Advanced programs
The culminating project (capstone project) for all advanced programs is a key assessment at program exit. Yet, upon careful review, it was determined that there was no consistency in how projects were scored. Some used checklists, committee or coordinator signature sheets, and one used rubrics. The inconsistency made the collection and analysis of scores difficult and summarizing or aggregating at the unit level impossible. In fall 2012, all instructors of the culminating courses met and discussed the development of a common rubric for the scoring of all culminating assignments. Using secondary education's rubrics as a guide, the Assessment Committee asked each program to determine criteria specific to their assignments and objectives. After agreeing to use the same scale and pass point, rubrics were piloted in the spring 13, and scores have been collected, data analyzed, and improvements initiated, each semester since.

Other changes made as a result of the work of the committee include:
- Revision of advanced program midpoint and exit survey questions
- Development and pilot of year-out graduate/employer survey for advanced programs
- Revision of the conceptual framework, which drives program assessment procedures
- Updated Transition point charts to identify key assessments from program requirements
- Aligned unit program outcomes and professional standards with university student outcomes (for each program)
- Designed curriculum maps that included outcomes and standards alignment.

Beginning in spring 2015, the COE will use a new process to analyze data and make data-driven goals for program improvement based on the results. Required and supported by the Office of Assessment & Educational Effectiveness, this process requires the annual analysis of assessment data on program/student outcomes and the reporting of goals for program improvement. Data are provided by the COE Data Analyst to program coordinators who will be entering information into Compliance Assist. This system stores each year's information, which provides the ability to compare results, identify trends, and track progress program improvement goals. Reports can be queried and shared with the Dean, chairs, faculty and other stakeholders. This will provide a more effective method of "closing the loop" for our programs that do not submit biennial reports.

The COE has a dedicated IT staff, which includes an Operating Systems Analyst, two full-time staff, a part time consultant, and two student assistants who support our current college relational data base maintenance and applications for college databases as well as gathering unit-wide candidate performance data. While the system is working, there is much room for improvement in functionality.

As we move forward, COE IT staff and the college data analyst are working with campus IT to improve our methods of collection, storage and reporting of candidate data. The unit is developing a scalable web-based candidate information system. The goal is to create a secure and consistent system with an intuitive and efficient interface to support admissions, tracking, advising, assessment, and reporting needs. The new information system will:

- Collect and store candidate information – data not found in the university's central data system (CMS/PeopleSoft) – such as application, study plans, advising information and assessments to track student progress from application, through the program and post program.

- Integrate candidate information data from the university's central data system (CMS/PeopleSoft), such as demographics, contact information, and transcripts, to reduce duplication of effort, errors in data entry, and increase efficient student tracking.

- Host online program and credential applications for applicants.

- Reduce manual data entry in multiple systems

- Automate reports for recurring data requirements for faculty and staff day-to-day business, state and federal accountability, assessment, continuous improvement, and accreditation purposes.

- Consist of modules for admissions, advising and tracking, key assessments, alumni and credentials recommended.

An effective fully functioning system is an essential next step to increase the efficiency, quality, and consistency of tracking, advising, reporting, and assessment.

2.3: Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard. [12,000]

Area for Improvement: The unit and its programs have not identified common and key transition-point and post-graduation assessments. (Initial and Advanced)

The professional education unit at California State University Fullerton, was reviewed in fall 2007 and received full accreditation without stipulations. The area for improvement (AFI) cited above was the only AFI received. The AFI consists of two parts, both referencing initial and advanced programs. This response addresses each separately.

1.Paraphrasing, the first part of the AFI states that the unit and its programs, both initial and advanced, did not at the time of review, have common and key transition point assessments.

Response: In 2006, the unit developed an assessment system that identified transition points for all of its initial and advanced programs, a set of key and common assessments for all of its initial programs and a set of key and common assessments for all of its advanced programs. Key assessments were identified on transition point charts for every unit program. Since the 2007 accreditation visit, the unit has not changed any of its transition points, but it has changed and improved some of its key assessments at both the initial and advanced levels.

The transition points for <u>initial</u> programs were then, and continue to be: 1) admission to program; 2) admission to initial student teaching; 3) admission to final student teaching; 4) exit from program. The transition points for <u>advanced</u> programs for teachers and other school professionals were then, and continue to be: 1) admission to program; 2) program continuation; 3) qualifying for culminating experience; 4) exit from program. The Doctorate in Educational Leadership Program did not exist in 2007; however, it currently has the same transition points as the other advanced programs as listed above.

In the 2007 institutional report, all key assessments were aligned with conceptual framework program outcomes, professional standards, and by NCATE Standard 1 elements. Two semesters of aggregate data for each key assessment, for both initial and advanced programs, were analyzed and presented in the Standard 1 narrative. Data disaggregated by program was available electronically via hyperlink or flash drive. The full report from the 2007 is available upon request.

The unit assessment system is still functioning and many of the key assessments are the same as what existed in the 2006 system, although modified or improved in some way.

The current key assessments used for all of the <u>initial</u> programs are listed below. For our initial programs, the list of key assessments remain the same as those in 2006. Data tables for two years are presented in *Exhibit 1.4.d*; the third year of data will be submitted with the IR Addendum:
- Interview scores
- California subject examinations for teachers (CSET)
- Course grades
- Supervised fieldwork evaluations
- Student teaching evaluations
- Capstone assessment
- CSU exit survey
- CSU one-year-out (graduate and employers) surveys
- RICA (Reading Instruction Competence Assessment for California credentialing)

The current key assessments used for all of the <u>advanced</u> programs, except the doctoral program, are listed below. Those that were in the original assessment system are marked with an "*".:
- *Admission assessments
- *Course grades

- *Writing assignment
- *Diversity assignment
- *Midpoint survey
- Dispositions assessment (by faculty)
- *Capstone assessment
- *Exit survey
- Year-out graduate and employer surveys

The current key assessments used for the <u>advanced</u> doctoral program are:
- Course grades
- Qualifying exam assessment
- Proposal defense assessment
- Final defense assessment
- Midpoint survey
- Employer survey

This AFI does not match the circumstances in place at the time it was issued.

2. Paraphrasing, the second part of the AFI states that, there were no post-post graduation survey assessments in either the initial or advanced programs.

Post-graduation assessments of graduates and employers have been in place for all initial programs since early 2000 and data have been collected annually. The year-out survey, is actually a survey developed and administered by the Center for Teacher Quality, a part of the CSU system Chancellor's office. The survey is administered to all CSU campuses and data provided for individual campus as compared to the system-wide aggregate. Two semesters of results were provided in the institutional report. This AFI does not match the circumstances in place at the time I was issued.

In 2006, there was no post-graduate assessment for all advanced programs. It was explained that some programs administered them, but there were not collect as a unit assessment. The unit developed a one-year out graduate and employer survey in 2010, for use by all advanced programs. The surveys are administered annually by the COE research data analyst. The surveys were piloted in 2011-2012 in all advanced programs with a response rate of 20 percent for graduates and 26 percent for employers. Rates have improved slightly, but the COE is still working to identify ways to better track its graduates, identify their employers, and therefore, increase the response rates on the surveys. This AFI was appropriate to the circumstances at the time and has been corrected.

STANDARD 3: FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

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

3.1: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

How does the unit work with the school partners to deliver field experiences and clinical practice to enable candidates to develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn?

The unit collaborates with school partners in over 91 school districts, across six counties, to design, deliver, and evaluate the field experiences and student teaching components of its programs (*Exhibit 4.4.f*). As shown in *Exhibit 4.4.b*, over 300 schools in these districts were used to provide field placements for nearly 700 candidates in initial programs alone. Districts in which our student teachers are placed or our interns are employed all sign partnership agreements, which outline responsibilities and criteria for collaboration (*Exhibit 3.4.a*).

Our school partners and professional education community are vital constituents in our efforts to design and implement high-quality programs. As such, we value every opportunity to collaborate with existing partnerships and foster new relationships for the benefit of our programs and the candidates we serve. Examples of partnership activities and collaboration that contribute to program improvement are offered in *Exhibit 3.4.a.*

All programs require field experiences in P-12 settings. Initial programs require hours in the field as a prerequisite for program admission, as well as a carefully planned sequence of supervised fieldwork and student teaching hours, once admitted. Most advanced programs embed field experience hours in courses that require field-based activities (e.g., in-depth case studies and action research projects). Educational Administration and TESOL candidates complete a supervised clinical placement (see required field experience hours for all programs in *Exhibit 3.4.a*). For supervised placements, candidates work with clinical faculty (university and site-based) that are highly qualified and experienced in their fields. Minimum qualifications and additional program specific criteria for selection of clinical faculty are described in *Exhibit 4.4.c.*

Decisions for selecting appropriate school-sites/classrooms are based on the criteria for clinical faculty selection and specific program needs, which vary according to program design and delivery. For example, to assure candidates are exposed to a range of instructional levels and ages, multiple subject candidates must complete student teaching placements at two of three grade-level spans (K-2, 3-5, 6-8). In addition, each program has specific requirements, ensuring that candidates have at least one placement in a classroom with a diverse student population (see program verification documents in *Exhibit 4.4.i.*). The structure and requirements for field work and student teaching are described in program handbooks specific to field experience and clinical practice (*Exhibit 3.4.e*). The selection process is collaborative and decisions are made jointly between program placement coordinators and school district personnel. Advanced candidates

who are not in supervised placements, must either be employed in a P-12 setting in which they can complete required field experiences or must identify a classroom that meets field-based assignment requirements. For example, each advanced program has identified one course that all candidates must take in which they are required to complete a substantial assignment in the field with students who are in some way different from themselves (assignment, *Exhibit 3.4.g*; data, *Exhibit 3.4.h*)

Single subject and special education programs offer an intern option. Intern candidates are employed full-time in teaching positions appropriate to their program of study. Interns complete the same coursework as other candidates, with the exception of completing a full academic year internship in their own classroom. Interns receive support, guidance, and feedback from both a university supervisor and school-site mentor. The school district in which the candidate is employed must have an internship agreement with CSUF, signed by the unit and the school district, detailing roles and responsibilities for each (*Exhibit 3.4.a*).

At the conclusion of each supervised placement, candidates evaluate their university supervisor using student opinion questionnaires (SOQ). SOQ questions are program specific, and candidates rate each question using a Likert-type scale and provide written comments (*Exhibit 3.4.d*). Every three years, all part-time faculty prepare and submit a portfolio that includes computer-generated analyses of candidate SOQ responses, alongside a corresponding reflective narrative that details their successes and areas for improvement. These portfolios are reviewed and evaluated by the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) who provide written feedback to faculty. Supervisors who receive a rating of good to excellent, per department standards are retained (see full evaluation guidelines in *Exhibit 5.4.f*). School-site clinical faculty are evaluated according to their district requirements and procedures.

Initial programs candidates are evaluated on field experiences at several points during the program as shown in Transition Point (TP) charts (*Exhibit 2.4.a*). Field experiences are scaffolded, and candidates may not move into the next field placement without successfully passing all prior required assessments. All field experience evaluations are completed by both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor and based on meeting program outcomes and professional standards. Prior to admission to the first student teaching placement (TP 2), program coordinators verify that candidates have successfully passed all completed courses and received passing scores (≥ 2.0) on fieldwork evaluations. These evaluations are used to determine candidate readiness for student teaching at the beginning stages of developing requisite skills, and nearly 100% of candidates pass (*Exhibit 1.4.d).* To move into their final student teaching placement (TP 3), candidates must successfully pass all additional courses, and initial student teaching evaluations (≥ 2.0). To exit from the program (TP 4) candidates must pass the final student teaching evaluation ($\geq 2.85\%$) and meet all other exit requirements. All evaluations are in *Exhibit 1.4.c* and evaluation data are in *Exhibit 1.4.d.*

Multiple and single subject student teaching evaluations assess candidates on the thirteen Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE), including the candidate's ability to assess student learning (TPE 2) through interpreting and using assessments. Evaluation data show that in both programs, candidate proficiency increases between first and final student teaching experiences, and, of significance to our programs' continuing evolution, ratings show an increase from 2012

to 2014. Programs have noted this area as a goal in biennial reports, and these data suggest that programs are improving their capacity to prepare candidates to use assessments to strengthen their instruction. Candidates in these programs also complete the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) and Task 3 focuses on diversity, requiring the candidate to make assessment adaptations for two focus students: one English Learner and one Special Needs. The candidate scores, reviews, and analyzes evidence of student learning, before reflecting on instructional implications. Candidate final TPA 3 scores in both programs show a high rate of competency, and Multiple Subject candidates' retake rates dropped from 19 to 2 percent over two years. These advances illustrate that our programs are better preparing candidates to use assessment as a means to improve student learning. Special education candidates are also evaluated on standards related to assessment and student learning. See all program (initial and advanced) assessment results in *Exhibit 1.4.d*.

The education unit provides structured field and clinical experiences in collaboration with school partners. These experiences are guided by highly qualified university supervisors and master/cooperating teachers. Data indicate that candidates value the field experiences as an integral part of their professional development.

CSU system-wide survey data help determine the effectiveness of field experiences for initial programs. Results indicate that after one year of employment, at least 84% of credential graduates rate the value of their field experience in the credential programs as having prepared them adequately or well for their first year of teaching.

Advanced program candidates' field-based experiences are designed to enrich their learning experiences through the implementation of new knowledge and skills in real-world settings. A majority of the items on exit surveys ask candidates to respond to how well their programs prepared them to more effectively work in their field as professional educators. Two years of aggregate results indicate high agreement (4=strongly agree) that their programs prepared them to be more effective professionals in their fields (mean range = 3.45-3.51). See survey questions, *Exhibit 1.4.c*; results *Exhibit 1.4.d*.

3.2: Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

*Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.*

3.2.b: Continuous Improvement *[10,000 characters]*
   * *Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.*

Within an ever-changing educational landscape, candidates must be able to apply what they learn in their courses in real, diverse classrooms to be viable, effective, and capable professionals. Providing meaningful field and student teaching experiences in which candidates are able to develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to help all students learn is recognized as a crucial part of the unit's effective preparation of candidates across all of our programs. Indeed, since 2012, the CSUF Improvement and Accountability Plan (IAP) has

required all initial programs to use data from Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ) year-out surveys, exit surveys, TPA, and other sources to analyze and improve fieldwork experiences. Looking across data from all initial programs, departments have made significant efforts to place candidates in classrooms with exemplary teachers in high-needs schools that serve large numbers of EL students (data in the IAP report also led to the single subject credential program (EDSC) revising their field experiences to align with the start and end dates of the high school programs each semester).

Correspondingly, recommendations by the NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel of Clinical Preparation and Partnership for Improving Student Learning and Greatness by Design (Torlakson, 2012) led to our exploration of co-teaching as a model for effective teacher preparation. In the 2011-12 academic year, EDSC piloted the co-teaching model in a low-income school with a high proportion of EL students, and results across departments using the co-teaching model since then have been positive: master teacher student teacher evaluation ratings in the area of TPE 7 (Teaching English Learners) increased from 3.29 to 3.32 in EDEL and from 2.85 to 3.07 in EDSC. These improvements and our more balanced and engaged relationships with our district partners affirm our commitment to continue preparing candidates within the co-teaching model.

All newly hired faculty (full- and part-time in the field), have been provided with on-going professional development in the co-teaching model. For example, the COE funded participation in a two-day co-teaching training for all new EDSC faculty hires in 2013-2014. In addition, new and continuing EDEL and SPED field supervisors were required to attend a collaborative supervisor training during the summer of 2014; 40 fieldwork supervisors attended the full-day workshop, "Collaboration, Coaching, & Consultation in the Clinical Teaching Experience." Supervisors from both departments shared strategies, collaborated to determine best practices, and discussed supervisor roles, how to facilitate candidate growth, coaching goals, co-teaching, conflict resolution, utilizing technology, and research-based practices. The unit intends to continue to offer these professional development opportunities to assure our co-teaching partnerships remain strong and vibrant.

Our presence in local P-12 schools illustrates the COE commitment to assuring our relationships with local schools is mutually beneficial, relevant, and dynamic. We care about how our candidates are developing in the field and solicit feedback on their performance via the Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ) year-out surveys, from administrator and teacher participants on COE committees, and in informal conversations with professionals in the field. Feedback is used to help the COE improve candidate preparation and programs, as well as to identify ways that the COE can better meet the needs of the P-12 schools. As a result, the COE has undertaken several collaborative initiatives since the previous NCATE visit to enhance both candidate and teacher performance. For example:

- The COE's Center for Research on Educational Access and Leadership (C-REAL), established in 2009, is a data-driven, solution-focused research center that strives to develop strategies to address the complex challenges of educational access and leadership through practice, policy and change. It conducts program assessment and evaluation with and for a broad range of education and community partners with the goal

of helping them assess program effectiveness, make program improvements, and identify promising practices.

- The COE's Center for Maximizing Teacher Impact (CMTI) provides support to P-12 teachers in their pursuit of National Board Certification and to schools and districts that seek to embed National Board processes into their program improvement efforts, as well as aiming to improve student learning through an emphasis on improving teacher quality. CMTI coordinates the Orange County National Board Certified Teachers Network that provides resources and contact information for NBC teachers in the local region.

- In the COE's Hazel Miller Croy Reading Center, alumni reading specialists and current graduate students provide a variety of services to meet the needs of elementary and secondary students, educators, parents and the community. Services include the evaluation of student needs, plans for follow-up and intervention, and recommendations for continued instruction.

- The COE's SchoolsFirst Federal Credit Union Center for Creativity and Critical Thinking, established in 2008, builds partnerships that focus on developing creativity, collaboration, critical thinking and decision-making across the curriculum in P-12 schools. Professional development projects are usually a year in length and specifically designed to meet the needs of the schools and teachers involved.

Each of the centers described above is supported by designated staff and is funded by the COE or with grants that faculty have received. The COE intends to maintain and sustain these centers in the years to come, as well as working to establish new centers as needs are identified by the COE and its P-12 partners. These community-derived partnerships help to support continuous growth and improvement of our programs.

For example, the CSU System received a three-million dollar grant from the Bechtel Foundation to fund a new CSU initiative, "Preparing a New Generation of Educators for California." This grant is designed to prepare future teachers for California's new K-12 curriculum (based on the Common Core State standards and Next Generation Science standards).

Additionally, the COE was awarded a $230,000 California State University grant for its innovative project – "Titan PRIDE" – to strengthen teacher preparation. This project will: develop a new teacher preparation approach involving strategies for providing mentoring and supervision to teacher candidates; work to advance the new Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards; enrich current K-12 partnerships; and offer a STEAM (science, technology, engineering, arts and mathematics) summer institute and showcase. A university clinical coach will lead instructional rounds for cooperating teachers and CSU Fullerton candidates each week, in the development of an expert community of practice and excellence in teaching the new standards. The development of a new clinical teacher preparation approach that involves cooperating teachers at carefully chosen school sites serving as mentors for CSUF teacher candidates will aid in enhancing candidate preparation and performance. This grant is renewable for up to 5 years, and will guide the continuous improvement in the areas of field experience and clinical practice.

The Centers, grant work, implementation of innovative strategies (like the co-teaching model) and on-going data analysis as required by the University Annual reports, Title II reports and the CSU IAP reports, all coalesce in support of our attention to continuous improvement.

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.

4.1: Diversity

How does the unit prepare candidates to work effectively with all students, including individuals of different ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and/or geographical area?

Assuring our candidates are prepared to work with and for diverse populations is a critical component of the unit's commitment to the development of professional educators who effectively provide the challenges and supports necessary for all students to attain high-quality outcomes, not predicted by race, ethnicity, SES, gender, family structure, first language, religion, sexual orientation, (im)migration status, or disability. This commitment is central to the College of Education's (COE) goal of developing and maintaining curricular and co-curricular environments that prepare innovative educators who participate in a global society as partners, models, and advocates for just, equitable, and inclusive education (JEIE) (*Strategic Plan, Goal 1, Exhibit 6.4.a.*)

This dedication to JEIE is rooted in our conceptual framework. It is one of the program outcome indicators (2a) and one of the five core dispositions – Promote Diversity *(Exhibit 1.4.e)*. The expectation is that candidates will demonstrate a commitment to just, equitable, and inclusive education that meets the needs of all students in a caring, respectful, and non-discriminatory manner. Initial and advanced candidates are assessed on program outcomes and dispositions as described in Standard 2.

Each program designs curriculum and instructional experiences with the explicit goal of developing candidates' diversity proficiencies that adhere to state, national, and/or professional diversity standards (*Exhibit 4.4.a.1*). Initial program candidates begin their preparation to work with diverse populations before they are even admitted; all candidates complete a three-unit prerequisite course (specific to their program) that provides context, research-based findings, and activities for examining diversity. Upon entering a program, candidates complete a three-unit course supporting their capacity to effectively teach English learners. The unit also offers multiple and single subject candidates the opportunity to add a Bilingual authorization to their credential (offered currently in Spanish, Korean, Vietnamese, or Chinese). Through coursework and a student teaching placement in a relevant bilingual classroom, candidates develop the skills to teach in English and the target language, and to work with students and their families in linguistically and culturally competent ways. From 2012-2014, 33 candidates completed this added authorization program and applied for the Bilingual authorization. In addition to other course readings and requirements, all advanced programs require candidates to complete one key assignment in the field (e.g., an in-depth case study or action research project) with students who

are different (e.g., ethnically, socio-economically, and/or linguistically) from the candidates themselves.

Particular diversity components, including field experiences, in required courses for all initial and advanced programs, including the doctorate, are detailed in *Exhibit 4.4.b.* Data on diversity proficiencies show that upon completion of their program, initial and advanced candidates possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to work with diverse students *(Instruments, Exhibit 4.4.c; Data, Exhibit 4.4.a.).* After a year working in the field, advanced program graduates (unit-wide) highly/agreed that they were well prepared to promote diversity and equity (97%) and to design and implement instruction for diverse learners (92%).

Candidates in initial and advanced programs have multiple opportunities to interact with faculty of diverse backgrounds. *Exhibit 4.4.d* indicates that the ethnic and racial composition of the full-time education unit faculty is comparable with that of the university. Many faculty have broad professional expertise and experience with numerous facets of diversity and their research and teaching reflect these interests (*Exhibit 4.4d*), providing candidates not only with content knowledge but also with insights gleaned through personal experiences. Faculty draw on a broad and rich knowledge base in matters pertaining to diversity, and many tenure/tenure track faculty have active scholarly agendas that address some aspect of diversity. Exhibit *5.4.a and 2.4.d* offer many examples of faculty publications, presentations, grants, and engaged scholarship related to issues of diversity and equity in education. These scholarly pursuits are resources faculty draw upon to inform their teaching, and are compelling indicators of the commitment and intellectual passion they place on matters related to diversity, and share with the candidates they teach.

The university and the COE are committed and focused on good-faith efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty. In fact, Goal 3 of both the university and college strategic plans are specific to this effort. As described in *Exhibit 4.4.g*, the university's commitment to fostering a community of diverse faculty can be illustrated by policies, programs, organization and procedures enacted to both recruit and support diverse faculty. Additionally, in recognition of the significant steps CSUF has taken in creating an environment of inclusivity and diversity, the University was awarded the 2014 "Inclusion Cultivates Excellence Award," by the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources. *Exhibit 4.4.g* describes efforts made by the COE to diversify faculty and create a culture of educators who model and promote just, equitable and inclusive educational practices. For example, at the launch of the Doctor of Educational Leadership program in 2007, just one of six faculty members (16.7%) was a person of color and more than half of newly enrolled students (52.3%) were white. The dean, in collaboration with faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership, as well as school and community college partners, worked together to recruit faculty and candidates of color. As of 2014-15 over 60% of the candidates and over 35% of the faculty are of color and is a model for the attainment of objectives set forth in the strategic plan.

Both the unit and CSUF – a designated Hispanic-Serving Institution – benefit from having a richly diverse student population (demographics provided in *Exhibit 4.4.e*). As such, students of all backgrounds are woven into all aspects of a university life ripe with opportunities to interact with one another in academic and non-academic settings. Based on a report from the U.S. Department of Education, *Diverse Issues in Higher Education,* CSUF is ranked eighth in the nation among colleges and universities for the number of bachelor's degrees awarded to minority

students. This ranking is evidence that attention to inclusivity and diversity remains a priority on the campus and in the unit. For example, the Student Success Team Initiative (SSTI) is a university-wide effort to improve student experience and increase successful outcomes (including retention and graduation rates). Consisting of administrators, directors, and advisers from each of the University's eight colleges, the Irvine Campus, and Graduate Studies, the SSTI focuses on meeting University Strategic Plan goals one and two, which emphasize reducing the achievement gap of underrepresented students through improved advisement. Paralleling these efforts, the COE Student Success Team (which includes the associate dean, assistant dean, advisors, faculty and the director for the Center for Careers in Teaching) focuses on expanding the "reach" of our college partnerships to recruit more under-represented students into teaching, and improve advisement once they are in our programs. Additional information on recruitment efforts and support for diverse candidates is contained in *Exhibit 4.4.h.*

We are fortunate that the P-12 student population in the surrounding area is one of the most diverse in the nation, which makes implementing our commitment to diversity accessible, regionally relevant, and developmentally meaningful. The demographics of the 91 districts with which we hold partnership agreements are provided in *Exhibit 4.4.f,* which show the overall diversity of potential placement sites. All programs have requirements and measures in place to ensure that all initial candidates have the opportunity to work with diverse student populations. For example, the single subject program requires at least one placement in which 25 percent of the students are of an ethnic, cultural, or socioeconomic background different than that of the candidates. Specific requirements of each initial program regarding the diversity of the field placement are contained in *Exhibit 4.4.i.* Many of our advanced program candidates are working in school settings. In most cases, field-based course requirements can be completed in these settings. To provide evidence that candidates have opportunities to work with diverse student populations, we require candidates to complete a Diversity Survey, in which they confirm and report the demographics of their school site, as reported by Data Quest (Department of Education). The survey also asks them to identify what percentage of the student population differs from themselves (ethnically or culturally). Two years of survey results are provided in *Exhibit 4.4.f.* Verifying these data is important because candidates in all advanced program are required to complete a key assignment in which they must work with students who differ from them (ethnically or culturally). If they are not employed, or are not at a diverse school site, they must locate students that meet the assignment requirements. The content of the diversity assignments varies by program and are described in *Exhibit 4.4.i*

4.2: Continuous Improvement

4.2.b: Continuous Improvement
- *Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.*

The College of Education's (COE) mission is premised upon ensuring that candidates have the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to work effectively with diverse populations. This mission drives the COE and determines recruitment and retention efforts, resource

distribution, instructional planning, and fieldwork placements; preparing transformative educators who advance just, equitable and inclusive education is woven through everything we do. We recognize, moreover, that improving candidate performance in relation to working with and for diversity is a dynamic process and we are continuously developing, reflecting upon, and assessing what we do to assure our efforts reflect contemporary needs and anticipate future educational concerns.

One of the ways in which the unit is continuously improving is in our use of data from both exit and graduate follow-up surveys to better reach and teach our candidates to make an impact with diverse populations. For example, data across surveys indicated a need to place more emphasis on diversity in the curriculum, as well as on faculty and candidate recruitment. In response, the COE created the Just, Equitable and Inclusive Education (JEIE) Task Force in fall, 2012. Composed of representatives from each department in the COE, JEIE efforts resulted in the inclusion of at least one JEIE focused article or activity in every required course in our programs. Additionally, we revised our diversity dispositions' statement to align more closely with JEIE. These efforts were further bolstered by refocusing professional development opportunities to reflect JEIE issues and/or instructional strategies (e.g., at annual retreats, dean's symposium, and roundtable hot topic discussions). For example, we created an annual diversity forum (open to faculty and candidates), co-sponsored by the COE, Researchers and Critical Educators (RACE - an interdisciplinary organization started by COE faculty) and the California Chapter of the National Association for Multicultural Education, as well as the Leadership Institute for Tomorrow to provide mentoring for educational leaders from diverse backgrounds.

Our commitment to developing candidate's proficiencies related to diversity is also firmly rooted in our relationships with our P-12 partners, local communities, and international affiliations. Over the last 10 years, the COE has endeavored to prepare teachers and educational leaders who are capable of serving the regional diversity of Southern California and working effectively in a cross-cultural world. To aid in these efforts, the COE Center for International Partnerships in Education (CIPE) was established in 2011. CIPE partners with universities and academic institutes across the globe (e.g., in Poland, South Africa, Russia, Vietnam, Germany and Lithuania) to provide opportunities for study or research abroad, and to recruit international students. In a similar vein, in fall 2014, CSUF enrolled its first students in its new (and one-of-a-kind) bachelor's degree program in Vietnamese and in the Vietnamese Bilingual Authorization Program (candidates learn to provide instruction in both Vietnamese and English). All of these efforts are typical of the ways in which the COE works to continuously improve candidate performance and increase program quality.
Much of the work we do in the unit mirrors and builds upon the aims of the University to better serve diverse students and prepare them for an increasingly globalized work environment.

Three of the four goals in the COE Strategic Plan (in place until 2018) address diversity:

- **COE Goal 1: Develop and maintain a curricular and co-curricular environment that prepares innovative educators who participate in our global society as partners, models, and advocates for just, equitable, and inclusive education.**

- **COE Goal 2: Improve COE student recruitment, persistence and graduation rates, and narrow the opportunity/achievement gap for underrepresented students.**

- **COE Goal 3: Recruit and retain high quality diverse faculty and staff, who are advocates for just, equitable and inclusive education (JEIE), in the College of Education.**

Correspondingly, three of the four goals in the University Strategic Plan address diversity:

- CSUF Goal 1: Develop and maintain a curricular and co-curricular environment that prepares students for participation in a global society and is response to workforce needs.

- CSUF Goal 2: Improve student persistence, increase graduation rates university-wide, and narrow the achievement gap for underrepresented students.

- CSUF Goal 3: Recruit and retain a high-quality and diverse faculty and staff.

Each department and center in the COE submits an annual report that outlines progress made on addressing goals and helps to ensure that the unit maintains continuous improvement in all areas; all colleges submit an annual report to the university indicating how they have and will continue to address the university and their own goals.

In order to sustain and enhance our focus on diversity and to continuously improve our ability to meet the needs of underserved and/or marginalized student populations, we are actively creating new programs, collaborating with groups who support diversity, pursuing and receiving external grants, and implementing practices aligned with our strategic goals.

For example, in collaboration with departments and programs across campus (i.e., Ethnic Studies, Women and Gender Studies, Child and Adolescent Studies, and Theater), COE faculty are creating a Social Justice Education minor. Simultaneously, the Elementary & Bilingual Education department has created a new "Education for Social Justice" masters course and are in the process of designing a social justice masters degree. In the course, candidates analyze poverty and inequality in society and schooling, as they learn to articulate and implement pedagogies of fairness for all communities and families. The course is going through the university approval process and will likely receive approval by fall 2015.

We also work to support diversity with external communities as regularly as we do those located at the university. For example, to foster a teaching population that better reflects the diversity of the student population, the CSUFs one of 10campuses participating in the AACTE Networked Improvement Community (NIC).

The NIC was formed in 2014 to help institutions increase the percentage of Black and Hispanic men receiving initial teaching certification through education preparation programs. Consisting of faculty, staff, and administrators from COE and Health and Human Development (HHD), the NIC has created testimonial videos to tell stories from diverse perspective and produced a new brochure with images of diverse teachers.

The COE faculty also have several grants underway that will help the unit sustain and enhance its efforts regarding diversity. For example, in 2014, a COE faculty member received a five-year $1.25 million grant from the U.S. Department of Education to fund Project STAR (Supporting Teacher Advancement and Retention). STAR helps 32 teacher candidates from diverse and underrepresented backgrounds complete the special education credential program, funds the development of seminars that promote the inclusion of children with special needs into general education preschool settings, and supports the development of new evidence-based course modules. Also in 2014, a COE faculty member received $1.5 million from the National Science Foundation to fund TACIB (Transforming Academic and Cultural Identity through Bi-literacy). TACIB examines the effect of dual-language programs (instruction is in Spanish and English) on the mathematics and science achievement of Latina/o middle school students, and demonstrates a commitment to work with school partners (in particular those serving high-need communities) to prepare teachers to support all learners. The COE was also the recipient of a grant from the U.S. Department of Education for $700,000 (over four years) for the development of a National Resource Center for Asian Languages. Designed to improve the nation's capacity for the teaching and learning of Asian languages, funds are used to design instructional resources and professional development activities.

Our attention to reflecting upon our efforts and determining how to improve persistence for under-represented students is in evidence in our Achievement Gap Plans (AGP). Developed in fall 2013, and enacted in fall 2014, the AGP use data provided annually by the University Institutional Research and Analytical Studies to determine where and how we have progressed and to highlight where we need to improve. Data relevant to each department is analyzed and included in the annual report.

The COE has made significant strides in emphasizing diversity, educational equityand we will continue to do so. Future plans include:

- The Department of Special Education intends to enhance the online master's degree program with concentrations in assistive technology, autism, and early childhood special education.
- The Department of Elementary and Bilingual Education aims to expand program offerings that integrate technology, the arts, and just, equitable and inclusive education, while developing and expanding school and community partnerships.
- The Department of Secondary Education plans to establish learning communities and the use of high-impact practices to emphasize student and teacher diversity in California classrooms.

Program and course modifications, awarded grants, strategic plans, affiliations and structural changes demonstrate the University and the unit's continuing commitment to diversity and clearly demonstrate our capacity to dedication to development and the advance of all of our candidates, students, and communities.

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.

5.1: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

How does the unit ensure that its professional education faculty contributes to the preparation of effective educators through scholarship, service, teaching, collaboration and assessment of their performance?

In order to advance the readiness of all learners to actively participate in an ever-changing, diverse, and digital world, the professionals who comprise the unit collectively implement the unit's mission to prepare innovative and transformative educators. Our highly qualified faculty do this through scholarship, service, and teaching designed to reach, teach, and make an impact on the lives of candidates, teaching professionals, and the students we all serve.

The quality of the unit is strengthened by the caliber of the faculty. A total of 172 professional education unit faculty were employed in fall 2014. All 72 tenured and tenure track (TT) faculty hold a doctorate degree, and all hold or have held professional P-12 credentials or licenses. A majority of full-time (n=19) and part-time (n=81) lecturers hold master's degrees, however 21 percent of full-time and 17 percent of part-time faculty also hold a terminal degree. All education faculty have worked in P-12 settings for a minimum of three years (a hiring requirement) and California law mandates that any faculty who teach methods courses must document evidence of active participation in P-12 settings at least once every three years. A majority of faculty list additional areas of exceptional expertise that qualify them for the positions they hold in the unit (e.g., current CA credential(s), National Board Certification, extensive P-12 teaching experience, and/or teaching awards) (*Exhibit 5.4.a*).

This attention to excellence extends to P-12 master/cooperating teachers who must be certified and experienced in the specific content they teach. As indicated in program handbooks, all initial programs also require P-12 master/cooperating teachers have a minimum of three years teaching experience and competency in a variety of teaching strategies. These requirements are also outlined in the partnership agreements (MOU) the unit holds with over 91 P-12 districts in which candidate field placements may be made.

As a unit dedicated to the preparation of effective educators, quality of faculty instruction is highly valued as evidenced in department personnel standards for tenure-track faculty (*Exhibit 5.4.f*) and in the university policy for evaluation of temporary faculty (full and part-time lecturers) (*Exhibit 5.4.c*). Criteria for evaluation of teaching faculty include quality of course syllabi, teaching methods, professional development experiences, and candidate evaluations through Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs). Field supervisors (clinical faculty) are also evaluated by candidates using SOQs. The questionnaires vary by department and type of

position: teaching faculty evaluations address faculty content knowledge, the variety of teaching strategies used, and integration of diversity and technology in faculty instruction; clinical faculty evaluations address criteria such as, providing adequate support, knowledge of the field, and quality of feedback provided. Faculty use the feedback they receive from student opinion data, as well as peer, chair, and dean reviews of their teaching performance to strengthen their teaching. *Exhibit 5.4.f* include examples of SOQ questions and data, and a summary of evaluation results from the university's formal evaluation process.

Informal evaluation of faculty instruction includes candidate opinions on program surveys (e.g., mid-point, exit, and year-out). Survey data support the assertion that, as teacher scholars, unit faculty possess a deep understanding of their field and integrate current research-based knowledge in their instructional practice. Data from all advanced program exit surveys (2012-14) indicate that no less than 93% agreed or strongly agreed that their course of study had provided intellectual challenges, an opportunity to expand knowledge of relevant research that helped them link theory to practice, and that faculty demonstrated strong subject matter knowledge and were models of good teaching.

Such excellence is also in evidence in the scholarly and creative activities in which our faculty are engaged. Recognized as leaders in the discipline, our faculty are committed to generating and disseminating scholarship that both identifies critical issues and illuminates educational possibility in ways that contribute to the preparation of effective educators. In the past two years, unit faculty published 11 books, 32 book chapters, 92 articles in refereed journals, and made 281 scholarly presentations at international, national and regional conferences. Additionally, faculty were awarded 17 grants totaling more than $4,000,000 for innovative programs (*Exhibit 5.4.d*). Faculty efforts are explicitly supported by the COE in the form of the Emma E. Holmes Faculty Fellowship, which awards three units of reassigned time to full-time tenured faculty who conduct research in local K-12 and community college settings. Details supporting the high quality of faculty scholarship can be found in faculty vita and department annual reports (available upon request).

Faculty are expected and required to actively engage in service activities that contribute to the improvement of the education unit, the institution, the community, and the profession. Faculty document their service by providing evidence of their activities, alongside an evaluation of the relevance, quality, and significance of their service activities. Service activities are also reported annually by faculty, along with teaching and scholarship information, as part of the new electronic annual reporting system. Annual reports from 2013-14 show that COE faculty served the university, college, and department as members, co-chairs, chairs, and directors of a variety of committees and task-forces. Across five departments, 100 such positions were reported as service to departments: 72 as service to the college; and 93 as service to the university. Faculty service to the P-12 community is collaborative and extensive. Annual reports show that faculty contribute to P-12 teaching and learning in a variety of ways, such as designing curriculum, conducting assessments and evaluations, and serving on advisory boards and committees. Grant funding has had a very positive impact on the types of services faculty are able to provide the P-12 community. Such funding provides access to materials as well as time dedicated to implementing long-term, innovative projects that have a positive impact on student learning. Some specific examples are provided in *Exhibit 3.4.a*. Faculty are members of state, national,

and international organizations, as indicated on individual faculty curriculum vitae. In these organizations, faculty provide leadership by serving as board members and committee chairs, and organizing conferences and new special interest groups within large professional organizations (*Exhibit 5.4a*).

The university conducts systematic and comprehensive faculty evaluation in teaching , scholarship and service. The time table for evaluation is dependent on position and rank and is detailed according to university policy (UPS 210). Tenure track faculty are reviewed annually, with either a full or abbreviated review based on year of service. See department standards in *Exhibit 5.4.f.* for details on process, requirements, and decisions. Tenured faculty are evaluated every five years, and full and part-time lecturers are evaluated annually in the area of teaching only.

The university and the education unit offer a wide array of professional development activities to support faculty growth and development. Each department in the COE provides frequent professional development for its faculty as evidenced in *Exhibit 5.4.g.* Relevant and timely professional development is provided by the COE at annual retreats, through the university Faculty Development Center (FDC), special events (e.g., guest speakers, round table discussions, university forums and conferences). Professional development activities such as these promote engagement and enrichment in the areas of teaching and learning, scholarly and creative activities, service and professional endeavors, and the use of educational technologies. For example, COE retreats, workshops and presentations have focused on cultivating a culture of just and equitable educational practices that promote fairness and a belief all students can learn, and the FDC delivers programs for university faculty that focus on designing curriculum, writing grants, developing research projects, and teaching with technology. The FDC employs faculty coordinators (half-time release) who offer targeted workshops in the areas of innovative and effective teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and technology. As a testament to unit faculty expertise, during the past three years all FDC coordinator positions were filled by COE faculty. The FDC also offers competitive funding opportunities to support travel to international conferences and Faculty Enhancement and Instructional Grants (FEID). Other university supported intramural mini-grants include Mission and Goals grants (that advance the mission and goals of the university), Incentive grants, and Junior/Senior grants. Faculty are also encouraged to apply for sabbaticals to refresh and enhance their professional development. The COE allocates ample funding to professional development for faculty (*Exhibit 6.4.f*). Specific examples are included in the moving to target discussion to follow.

In sum, faculty are highly qualified teacher-scholars who regular serve as leaders at the university and in the unit, and are actively engaged in the P-12 community. Unit faculty are widely recognized for their work with awards, honors, and recognition from both internal and external sources. Examples of prestigious honors are provided in *Exhibit 5.4.f.*

TARGET 5

In the unit, our highly qualified faculty are at the heart of everything we do to prepare candidates to be effective teachers of all students. Thus our selection of standard five as a target is purposeful; it allows us to elaborate on how we intend to turn our vision "to be transformational

leaders who advance the readiness of all learners to actively participate in an ever-changing, diverse, and digital world" into meaningful practice for our candidates, communities, and schools through teaching, scholarship, and service. The quality of our faculty is detailed in each of the unit's Department Personnel Standards (DPS) and substantiated in the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) and Periodic Review (PR) portfolios of faculty.

Faculty excellence in teaching is in evidence in the range of issues, strategies, and perspectives addressed in our courses and the ways in which faculty connect instruction to the challenges of contemporary classrooms and schools. Faculty strive to provide leadership in developing, implementing, and evaluating preparation programs that reflect: current research and schooling demographics; attention to diversity, inclusion, and technology; and to use a variety of assessments to assure our candidates are prepared to effectively "reach," "teach," and make an "impact" on all students. All of these elements cohere in our instruction, as aligned with unit, university, state, and professional standards, and evident in our syllabi.

It is important to note that our instruction is constantly evolving because faculty regularly reflect upon their practice and analyze candidate data to improve instruction, as well as participating in professional development offerings related to teaching and learning. For example, in addition to the Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQ) and program surveys, most faculty choose to use informal mid-term evaluations as a formative means of assessing and modifying their teaching in-situ. These strategies are recognized in DPS, and faculty detail how they use data from different sources to enhance candidate learning in their Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) portfolios and Periodic Reviews; at a minimum, all faculty are required to address SOQ evaluations relative to their instructional development. Faculty retreats are also designed to focus on enhancing candidate learning and instructional dynamism (particularly as regards issues related to diversity, technology, and inclusion), and department-specific presentations and workshops which highlight critical issues in education assure that faculty are continuously adjusting instruction to support candidate learning *(Exhibit 5.4.g.)*. The results of our systematic efforts to assure that P–12 student learning remains central to our professional work are in evidence in all of the DPS (across the unit), faculty retreats, Dean's Symposium, Department workshops, faculty meetings, and assessments. Faculty in the collaborate with COE leadership to assure the unit consistently shares new and developing educational research, emerging theories, and best practices, particularly as they relate to the most vulnerable populations. According to the unit's budget included in *Exhibit 6.4.f,* more than $300,000 was budgeted for professional development in each of the past three years. As part of that budget, all new faculty have received three units (credit hours) of release time each semester for each of the first two years; $1000 each year to support professional development (e.g., technology, workshop fees, membership in professional organizations); and a $6000 summer stipend to participate in professional development and/or scholarship activities. Additionally, unit departments and programs - provide a senior faculty member to mentor and support each new faculty member (e.g., in developing syllabi and assignments, understanding the evaluation process, and becoming oriented to the university and its community).

Over the last four years, the COE has focused on supporting faculty growth across a spectrum of educational issues with particular attention to: English Learners (EL), Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGTBQ) populations, Special Needs students, Just, Equitable and

Inclusive Education (JEIE), Technology, and the Arts and Critical Thinking, to name a few. In every case, faculty participated in the design and delivery of these opportunities for professional development. Additionally, some of these foci have resulted in the establishment of committees or generated external funding in support of their continuing development:

Transitional Kindergarten: College of Education faculty members are leading a California State University project to prepare future teachers to teach in transitional kindergarten (TK) classrooms (prompted by the Kindergarten Readiness Act). A $75,000 award to develop instructional materials for CSU teacher preparation programs was made possible through funding from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation to the CSU Chancellor's Office. Elementary and bilingual education faculty are collaborating with the Orange County Department of Education to support TK teacher preparation.

SchoolsFirst Federal Credit Union Center for Creativity and Critical Thinking: The Center is a state-of-the-art resource room in the Pollack Library (PLN 403), equipped with some of the most current technologies available in schools today. Available to faculty for classes and workshops, the Multiple Subject Credential Program uses the Center to hold mandatory technology "boot camps" for all incoming candidates each semester. In these boot camps candidates gain experience using SmartBoard software, science tools, math manipulatives, laptops, Promethean boards, and more in a setting that allows for exploration in a low-anxiety, authentic environment. In addition, Center faculty offer a variety of professional development institutes for P-12 teachers based on current needs in the field. The work of the Center has received several collaboration and partnership awards as a result of its efforts in the community.

COE Tech Cadre: A team of faculty experts in the use of educational technology receive release time to assist other faculty with one-on-one assistance in the pedagogical uses of technology. This helps to ensure that new full-time and part-time faculty are competent in using technology to teach and manage instruction, as well as keeping experienced faculty up-to-date with technology advances.

iSTEM K-6 Partnership: This partnership develops pre-service teachers' skills and enhances the expertise of veteran teachers, while greatly improving student learning outcomes. Teachers and pre-service teachers work together to integrate technology into math and science lessons in daily classroom learning. The program provides professional development to help teachers and teacher candidates improve their use of technology in teaching and gives candidates experience teaching and observing technology-based instruction and planning lesson goals in tandem with their host teachers.

Center for Research on Education Access and Leadership (CREAL):
Directed by faculty in the Educational Leadership department, CREAL offers professional development on current educational issues. Through research colloquiums and roundtable hot-topic discussions, faculty across disciplines have the opportunity engage in thoughtful discussion and share their perspectives, ideas, and experiences.

The successful "reach" of faculty instruction is also in evidence in feedback from our community partners and stakeholders. For example, in data from the 2013 employer one-year out survey, 82 percent of responding principals indicated that graduates across all initial programs were "well" or "adequately" prepared to teach at-risk, English Learner, and special needs students (populations we have been emphasizing). Similar recognition was in evidence in the spring 2014 SOQ, in which faculty from across the unit received 92 percent A and B ratings on their teaching (indicating "excellence" according to DPS).

Faculty also exhibit their "reach" and ability to make an "impact" in their scholarship, which has been disseminated widely at state, national, and international levels. From 2012 to 2014, faculty wrote over 135 scholarly articles and books, and made over 280 scholarly presentations – the majority of which focused on improving teaching, learning, and schools (*Exhibit 5.4.a*). Whether in publications or presentations, or via the awarding of grants for educational research, innovation, or project implementation, COE full- and part-time faculty have been recognized for their rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy by over 30 national and international awards (e.g., 2011 National Educator of the Year Award by the Learning Disabilities Association of America, 2012 Excellence in Mentoring Award by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators), and from 2010 to 2013, twenty COE faculty received university awards for outstanding scholarship. As a further illustration of the quality of the scholarship of COE faculty, we have received more than $4 million in grants that focus on community and school partnerships and improvement.

Our vision to be transformative hinges on our constant evolution, which is exemplified in current efforts to extend our scholarly "reach" beyond traditional research and publications to "engaged scholarship." Defined broadly as the collaboration between academics and individuals outside of the academy for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources, engaged scholarship depends upon a context of partnership and reciprocity, contextualized within the field and reflective of the literature. Faculty efforts to adopt engaged scholarship as one of the criteria for tenure and promotion across all departments (pending university approval), illustrates our leadership in the push to more actively recognize the collaborative nature of our relationship with schools. It is anticipated that this shift will result in even more scholarship from faculty that reflects and connects neighboring communities, schools, and students as it deepens our understanding of how research and practice best informs our preparation of effective teachers. Such efforts mesh nicely with the support provided in the COE's Emma E. Holmes Faculty Fellowship (established in 2012), which gives full-time, tenured faculty in the College of Education three units of reassigned time to conduct research in local K–12 and community college settings.

The move to adopt engaged scholarship as a criteria across all COE DPS also represents our attempts to formally acknowledge the tremendous investment of faculty in local communities. The university's tenured/tenured-track faculty evaluation procedures require three different kinds of service – professional, university and community – and unit faculty serve in all of these capacities, often in leadership positions (and generally in more than one type of service at a time). Adopting engaged scholarship in all COE DPS will more accurately reflect the ways in which we value collaborating with and in our communities as a type of service that benefits all partners involved.

Finally, we would not be able to attain our vision, were it not for the strategic and comprehensive targeting, collection, analysis, and use of data to assure our faculty continue to model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching. Without overburdening faculty, university supervisors, master/cooperating teachers, candidates, employers, or students, the unit has continuously worked to develop a cohesive system of evidence-based assessment that supports responsiveness and rigor. To this end, we have created a full-time director of accreditation and assessment position and a part-time support staff position for assessment to enhance our assessment system (including data entry, dissemination, and analysis). The director is a full-time faculty member assigned to oversee the unit's assessment system and accreditation full time. The new part-time support staff position provides assistance to the unit's data analyst, and a new full-time support staff position provides technical support (for the website, web applications and database systems, server infrastructure planning, deployment and maintenance, project management, technology research, labs and systems support, and asset management) for the unit's assessment system. Each of these new positions illustrates the unit's intention to continually enrich its assessment system as a part of our larger aim to continually support faculty excellence and assure preparation of our candidates to effectively teach all students.

Our faculty serve as the fulcrum that brings our vision into reality by achieving excellence in teacher preparation across three primary domains: teaching, scholarship, and service. As committed teacher scholars, faculty build activities, assignments, and assessments using the latest research to reach all of our candidates' needs, scaffold the work of education theorists to teach the foundations of good instruction, and reflect upon our educational practice to assure we make an impact as we continuously develop. By modeling good teaching, conducting scholarly inquiry that aims to improve teaching and learning for all of our students, and engaging in meaningful service with our P-12 partners in local schools and communities, our highly qualified faculty assure that we REACH our candidates at every stage of their development so they can TEACH using a multitude of strategies and make an IMPACT in their classrooms.

6.1: Unit Governance and Resources

How do the unit's governance system and resources contribute to adequately preparing candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards?

The dean of the College of Education (COE) is charged with full responsibility for oversight of planning, delivering, and operating coherent programs of study that prepare professionals to work in P-12 settings. She fulfills this responsibility in collaboration with the deans of the other colleges in the unit, as seen in the organizational charts in *Exhibit 6.4.b*. The dean is also responsible for oversight of the college's curriculum, enrollment, fiscal and personnel management, as well as building and maintaining strong relationships with the P-12 community. She is assisted in increasing external resources by a director of development, a half-time position allocated to the college (currently vacant).

The COE governance overview (*Exhibit 6.4.a*) outlines leadership positions and other stakeholder groups that support the dean, departments, programs, and candidates. The associate dean, assistant dean of students, and five department chairs report to the dean as they carry out various functions of the college. Program coordinators for each of the initial programs and advanced programs report to department chairs. Essential personnel in the education unit include the research/data analyst, the accountant, the director of accreditation and assessment, the manager of the office of Admission to Teacher Education, and the credential analysts in the Credential Preparation Center.

The Leadership Team in the COE has expanded beyond department chairs (the Council of Chairs) to include other key members of the college. At Leadership Team meetings (held twice monthly), the dean, associate dean, chairs, assistant dean of students, director of accreditation and assessment, director of development, grant specialist, and director of CalState TEACH collaboratively participate to make decisions on a variety of matters germane to the college.

There are five standing committees that also serve to maintain and support essential college functions and provide cohesion of practice across departments and programs. These are the: Curriculum, Technology, Appeals, Credential Program, Secondary Education Cooperative Teacher Education Program (SECTEP), and Assessment Committees; each is described in the governance overview document (*Exhibit 6.4a*).

Several boards, external to the college and the university, advise the dean, departments, and programs, as described in *Exhibit 6.4.a*. Of particular note are the following: the All University Responsible for Teacher Education Committee (AURTEC), whose members include deans, chairs, and other personnel relevant to teacher education from across the university; the Dean's Advisory Board, which consists of superintendents and other representatives from local school districts; and the Leadership Council, which focuses on advancement.

Numerous university and college resources, publications, and websites advertise, inform, and invite candidates to consider careers in educational settings. Current information about CSUF and the COE, including the university catalog, calendars, and program information, is detailed in *Exhibit 6.4.e*. On site, the COE office of Admission to Teacher Education (ATED) houses all

outreach and admission materials. ATED staff and faculty also coordinate orientations for prospective candidates, as well as organizing new student orientations at the beginning of every semester for each initial program. Each advanced candidate program has established policies and procedures, as well as a faculty coordinator to guide and assist candidates in the application process. Additionally, the Center for Careers in Teaching (CCT), now housed in the COE, is a rich campus resource that helps students navigate and determine the best pathway for earning an initial credential. See *Exhibit 6.4.d* for a list of campus and college resources.

The university's divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs provide resources that encourage and support students in achieving academic, personal and career goals. COE's full time assistant dean of students provides individual counseling, guidance, and support for candidates who experience personal and/or academic problems (see additional resources in *Exhibit 6.4.c*).

As a state institution, CSUF is primarily funded by general state funds based on student enrollment. In comparing the COE budget with eight other academic units over the last three years, COE's budget showed a slight decline (*Exhibit 6.4.g)*, but over all three years the COE received the highest amount of funding per full time equivalent student (FTES). The allocation of funds, shown in *Exhibit 6.4.h*, demonstrates a consistent provision of funds for assessment, technology, professional development, and distance learning.

Descriptions of university unit resources for faculty development are discussed in Standard 5 and found in *Exhibit 5.4.g*, and department chairs often allot funds from department budgets to provide additional professional development opportunities. Tenure/tenure track faculty typically receive $1,000-$1,500 annually to attend professional conferences as a presenter. Full-time lecturers can receive $500 annually for professional development, if the activity is tied to the COE strategic plan.

University policy considers 15-units a full-time teaching load for full-time faculty, and lecturers carry the full 15 teaching units. Tenure/tenure track faculty carry a teaching load of 12 units with three units allocated for service and scholarly activity. Units assigned for clinical supervision are either a 2:1 or 3:1 ratio (students:supervisor), dependent on department policy. In general, 6 units is the maximum carried for supervision, which equates to 18 candidates, but most carry fewer units of supervision. Online course delivery and workload policies are governed by collective bargaining agreements. Department chairs must report their faculty workloads to the college accountant each semester and workloads must be reported as a part of the faculty evaluation process per university policy (UPS 210). Course release and other factors affecting workloads are presented in *Exhibit 6.4.h.*

To support the work of faculty and candidates, the COE employs 36 support staff: five department coordinators, five staff in the ATED office, four staff in the Credentialing Department, four staff in CCT, two student service professionals, three technology specialists, one budget analyst, three research analysts, two staff in the dean's office, one grant specialist, three staff who oversee grants, two staff in CalState TEACH, and one development coordinator (currently vacant).

The COE is located in the College Park (CP) building, across from the university's main campus, and includes the dean's suite, four COE departments, and the Communicative Disorders program. The other unit departments and programs are on the main campus. All full-time faculty have private offices and are provided a desktop computer, a laptop, and an iPad for office and home use.

Information technology (IT) resources that support teaching and learning are extensive and reflect a system-wide advanced technology infrastructure that includes "smart" classrooms, state-of-the-art candidate labs, and secure, wireless Internet access. College Park also has a podcasting studio, with high-tech hardware and software for faculty use in recording digital media. In addition to these structural resources, the COE has a dedicated IT staff, which includes an Operating Systems Analyst, two full-time staff, a part time consultant, and two student assistants who support college relational data base maintenance and applications for college databases (including budget, contract, and master databases necessary to run queries for required reports), as well as gathering unit-wide candidate performance data. These IT resources and staff illustrate how well equipped the COE is to support the most up-to-date preparation of all of our candidates across all of our programs.

In addition to all the COE provides, the university offers online orientation for online courses and learning management systems (e.g., Blackboard, Moodle) for faculty and students, as well as technology support online or by telephone 24/7. In 2006, the CSU began the Accessible Technology Initiative (ATI) to assure full access to information resources within the CSU to all individuals with disabilities. This initiative was fully embraced by COE faculty who have worked to create ATI compatible syllabi for use in their courses. A full list of resources is provided in *Exhibit 6.4.j*.

The Pollack Library houses over 1.4 million books/e-books and 50,000 periodical subscriptions. Of these holdings, over 1500 scholarly journal titles are specific to education research and 26 databases relevant to the COE are available. Additionally, total education book expenditures exceeded $25,000 for each of the past three years, and the Curriculum Materials Center and the Learning Resource Display Center in the library offer instructional resources to support present and future teachers. Over 500 computers are available in the library for student use, as are nine high-tech group study rooms where students can create multimedia presentations using the latest software applications and equipment. Technical support staff are available during designated hours and technical assistance is available over the phone 24/7. The COE has a designated library liaison who assists faculty in identifying resources, making new purchases, presenting to candidates, and the provision of other services, as needed. Additional information on library resources is contained in *Exhibit 6.4.i*.

6.2.b: Continuous Improvement Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.

The current governance structure contributes to the continuous improvement of the unit by virtue of its comprehensively collaborative, reflective, and responsive nature. Designed so that we regularly discuss, modify, and strengthen our capacity to prepare candidates to be effective

teachers for all students, the COE works within and across the unit, as well as with our P-12 partners to assure we reach, teach, and make an impact in teacher preparation. For example, the All University Responsible for Teacher Education Committee (AURTEC) and the Dean's Advisory Board require on-going communication and data analysis with our partners to maintain relevance in the field and continuously advance.

Additionally, the COE works closely with other units on campus to enhance our education programs and meet the needs of P-12 schools and the community. For example, the Catalyst Center for the Advancement of Research in Teaching and Learning Math and Science brings science and math education experts together across two colleges and seven departments to advance research across the entire spectrum of math and science education (from preschool through graduate school). This joint endeavor among faculty in the COE and the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics serves to strengthen and broaden learning opportunities for our candidates.

In-house committees such as the Council of Chairs, Secondary Education Cooperative Teacher Education Program (SECTEP), the Technology Committee, and the Just Equitable and Inclusive Education (JEIE) Task Force also illustrate the value of communication, collaboration and the uses of on-going assessment to improve candidate preparation.

All of these efforts are crucial to securing improvements, but undoubtedly the most critical was the creation of the Assessment Committee and the commensurate addition of the Director of Accreditation and Assessment position (a part-time support staff position was also added). The director works with leadership, faculty, and staff across all programs to identify, collect, and analyze data in a timely fashion, so that we may actively respond to candidate needs, anticipate opportunities, and implement improvements consistently.

The COE budget includes fees collected and distributed by the university (in addition to the provision of general state funds) that support continuous improvement. For example, a student fee assessed for online courses is distributed to each department to improve technology use in the programs (e.g., for professional development, software, and equipment). The university also collects a general fee for all courses, distributed to the departments as Miscellaneous Course Fees, used to fund advanced educational experiences beyond basic course requirements. These funds must be used for materials that have a direct impact on candidate preparation (e.g., supplies, equipment, fieldtrips, or guest speakers). The COE receives both fees annually, with each department typically receiving from $5000 to $50,000, depending on enrollment.

Unit personnel are continuously adapting to meet changing needs, and based on university retention data, the CSUF Center for Careers in Teaching (CCT) was moved from the Division of Academic Affairs to the COE in fall 2013. A full-time director was appointed in spring 2015. The center – the first of its kind in the CSU system to centralize undergraduate academic advising for future teachers – provides comprehensive undergraduate academic advisement and mentoring for candidates planning careers in teaching special education, elementary, middle or high school, as well as counseling prospective teachers currently in high school or community college. It is a one-stop-shop resource in which advisors help candidates create study plans that combine all course requirements into a comprehensive plan, as well as collaborating with faculty

from majors in the other CSUF colleges to create four-year plans. The CCT thus establishes opportunities for greater connections and networking among candidates, staff, and faculty at the undergraduate level, connections that are scaffolded into the credential program and additional advanced degree programs. The CCT also forges partnerships with community colleges to develop course articulation agreements and streamline the transfer process. Advisors visit local community colleges, provide group and one-on-one counseling to interested transfer students, and conduct workshops about teaching careers. One of these partnerships, the Regional Teacher Educational Council, is a consortium of CSUF faulty, advisors, and community college faculty and counselors who are directly involved in undergraduate teacher preparation. This addition of personnel supports recruitment and advisement for the unit.

Further addressing the need to enhance undergraduate advisement, as well as orientation and admission to teacher credential programs, the COE adopted and incorporated the state's Early Assessment Program in 2013. The program's ultimate goal is to prepare California high school graduates to enter the CSUF teacher education program and begin college-level study, thus reducing the number of entering first-time freshmen who need remediation. Opportunities are provided for students to measure their college-level readiness in English and mathematics during their junior year of high school, and to facilitate skill improvement during their senior year. Program coordinators give presentations at local high schools illustrating a seamless college transition and success in the teacher education program.

The COE continues to undertake technology initiatives based on analysis of exit surveys and the one-year-out survey data. For example, the COE created the Technology Committee in fall 2011 to support the effective use and integration of technology in teaching and learning, throughout all initial and advanced programs (in face-to-face, hybrid, or online learning environments). The committee members serve as liaisons between the Academic Senate's University Instructional Technology Committee and COE faculty to promote best practices of effective technology integration and provide technology leadership, resources and support for all COE instructional faculty and staff. Additionally, the Technology Cadre was created in spring 2014, to address objectives within the COE Strategic Plan, Goal 4: to assure that all new full-time and part-time faculty are competently using technology to teach and manage instruction; provide awareness of best practices and college guidelines for effective use and integration of technology; and incorporate technology goals into department annual goals. Further enhancing the structure for technology within the COE were the addition of two full-time technology positions and one student assistant.

All of these technology resources and personnel have assured that we continuously improve our capacity to reach and teach candidates online. The COE, a university leader in online instruction, launched the university's first online degree program in 2002, the Master of Science in Instructional Design and Technology. Since 2010, improvements in our capacity to design and deliver online programs have resulted in the addition of Master of Science in Education online degree programs in Educational Technology, Elementary Curriculum and Instruction, Reading, and Secondary Education. Our efforts have not gone unnoticed, in 2015 the U.S. News & World Report ranked CSUF's online education programs first among California institutions, and 21st among 181 programs, nationally. Rankings are based on faculty credentials, student services and engagement, technology, admissions selectivity and peer reputation.

The COE recently adopted a Governance and Organizational Overview that illustrates the structures, roles, and responsibilities of our committees and leadership (February 2015). This overview was created to provide clear guidelines for anyone stepping into any of the roles or committees listed. This document will help to sustain progress in our structures and programs as we continue to grow and advance.

Based on university retention data, every CSUF College created a Student Success Team in fall 2014. The COE team consists of the associate dean, assistant dean, Early Assessment Program coordinator, two student service professionals, and a faculty member. The teams from the various colleges work together to streamline advising and to improve the graduation and retention rate specifically for under-represented students. This recent structural change will continue to improve our services, support candidate success, and increase the diversity of our candidates.

As part of a pilot project to enhance advisement, the COE recently created two professional service staff positions charged with overseeing and improving advisement in the EDEL and EDAD departments. In the past, all COE department faculty advised candidates throughout their programs, but due to teaching, scholarship and service commitments, faculty were not always available. To bridge this gap, the two staff members now advise candidates on program requirements and procedures, and these departments' faculty serve as career advisors, only. The success of this new advising model will determine the creation of similar staff advising positions in the other three COE departments.

The unit has a clear plan for sustained and enhanced performance through assessment detailed in the COE Strategic Plan, in place until 2018. The COE Strategic Plan outlines how faculty will maintain and continue to improve the unit programs based on the college's four goals and related objectives (*Exhibit 6.4.a*). Each COE department and center submit an annual report in which they outline the progress made in addressing the COE goals and objectives so we can assure continuous improvement across the unit.