

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the CCTC Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at California State University, Chico

Professional Services Division
April 17, 1997

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at California State University, Chico. The report of the team presents the findings based on analysis of institutional reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with program participants. Based on the team findings, recommendations are made about each credential program.

Fiscal Impact Statement

The current workplan and base budget for the Professional Services Division includes sufficient funds for a six-year cycle of accreditation visits for credential programs at postsecondary education institutions in California. The periodic review of preparation programs can continue without a budget augmentation or a redirection of resources from other functions.

Staff Recommendations

- (1) The staff recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Commission grant the following status to the credential preparation programs offered by California State University: Chico.

Administrative Services Credential Programs

- Preliminary *Approval with Conditions*
- Professional *Approval with Conditions*

Agricultural Specialist Credential Program *Approval*

Multiple Subject Credential Programs

- CLAD Emphasis *Approval with Conditions*
- CLAD Internship *Approval with Conditions*

Pupil Personnel Services Credential Programs

- School Counseling *Approval*
- School Psychology *Approval*

Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential *Approval*

Single Subject Credential Programs

- CLAD Emphasis *Approval with Conditions*
- CLAD Internship *Approval with Conditions*

- (2) The staff also recommends that:

- The Commission accept the response by CSU Chico to the Commission's preconditions for program approval.

- California State University, Chico, be permitted to propose new credential programs for initial accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, Chico, be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2002-2003 academic year.
- Programs recommended for *Approval with Conditions* provide a response to the Committee on Accreditation about actions taken to remedy all standards less than fully met within one calendar year from the date of this action.

Background Information

California State University, Chico, was founded in 1887 as the second state normal school in California. The institution has prepared teachers for 110 years. As the campus, faculty, programs, and organization of the University have evolved, so too has a renewed emphasis on professional preparation programs and service to public schools in the 12 northeastern counties of California. The University service area covers a region approximately the size of the state of Indiana, with vast reaches of sparsely populated mountain and agricultural areas.

In 1992, the College of Education was merged with the College of Communication to form the College of Communication and Education. The merger enabled dramatic changes to occur, beginning with formation of two distinct departments, the Department of Education and the Department of Professional Studies in Education. Six departments across the University now sponsor professional preparation programs.

On March 16-19, 1997, the professional preparation programs were reviewed by a fourteen member accreditation team for the Commission. The 1996-97 academic year is the last of the transitional years before full implementation of the *Accreditation Framework*, so institutions had their choice to use the Commission's old program evaluation procedures for the visit, or to pilot test one or more aspects of the *Accreditation Framework*. California State University, Chico, chose to implement the new process entirely, and used the *Framework* to organize the institutional report, determine the team size and structure, and develop the team report.

The institutional report was prepared beginning with responses to the Common Standards. The responses were developed in reference to all programs and for the unit as a whole. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution chose which of five options listed in the *Accreditation Framework* would be used for responses to the program standards. Institutional personnel decided to respond using Option 1, California Program Standards. Each team member was provided with a copy of the responses to the Common Standards and a copy of the responses to the Program Standards relevant to his/her cluster.

The decision about the structure and size of the team was made cooperatively between the Dean and Faculty of the College of Communication and Education and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of fourteen consisting of a Team Leader, a Common Standards Cluster of three members, a Basic Credential Cluster of five members, an Advanced Credential Cluster of four members, and a single team member assigned to Experimental Programs. The agreement included the assignment of each credential program area to one of the program clusters. The Commission Consultant then selected the team members to participate in the review. All of the CCTC evaluators were experienced in the Commission's program evaluation process. Team members were selected because of their experience and adaptability, and trained in how this accreditation visit would be conducted differently from prior evaluation visits. In fact, seven of the team members had already gained experience in earlier pilot testing of one or more aspects of the *Accreditation Framework*.

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The Team arrived on Sunday afternoon. The activities on that day included orientation to the new procedures and team organizational activities. The review of programs also began, both as a whole team and by clusters. Clusters were instructed to gather information on each standard and make a determination about each standard, but were informed that the reporting process would deal primarily with identified strengths, identified weaknesses, specific standards which were less than fully met, and team recommendations.

On Monday and Tuesday, the team proceeded to collect data from interviews and to review supporting documentation in a manner similar to the previous CCTC program evaluation process. However, because of the

organization of the team in clusters, the data were handled differently. There was extensive consultation between clusters and much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Tuesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. A meeting of the entire team was held on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning were set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report. During those work sessions, cluster members were constantly sharing and checking their data with members of other clusters and particularly with the Common Standards Cluster, since the Common Standards findings also impacted each of the Program Clusters.

The format adopted for the team report was a narrative, rather than a series of check lists. For each of the Common Standards, a specific finding of "Standard Met" or "Standard Not Met" was made followed by specific comments about that standard. In some cases a Standard was "Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns. For each separate program area, a narrative report was prepared that highlighted "Strengths/Commendations," and "Concerns/Weaknesses." The team was instructed to point out any standards that were not met or met minimally in the narrative and provide explanatory information about that finding. At the end of the report, "Professional Comments" were made by team members. These comments are only for consideration by the institution and are not binding.

After the report was written, the entire team met late Wednesday morning for a final discussion of the report and a decision about the results of the visit. Each Common Standard and those Program Standards that were not fully met were specifically discussed. The strengths and weaknesses of each credential program were also reviewed. The team then turned to which accreditation decision would be appropriate for the institution and for individual programs. The choices for the institution include: "Accreditation," "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations," "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" or "Denial of Accreditation." After considerable discussion, the entire team voted to recommend the status of "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations."

Since CSU, Chico, was pilot testing the new process, the Accreditation Team made an accreditation recommendation based on the team report following the *Accreditation Framework*. Because the Commission on Teacher Credentialing will be making the decisions about the programs at CSU, Chico, it was then necessary to translate the accreditation decision into program evaluation status recommendations for each program. After making the "practice" accreditation decision about the Accreditation Team Report, the team considered which program evaluation decisions would be appropriate based upon how well the various programs met the Commission's standards. In its deliberations, the team decided that although there were several areas of deficiency noted in the team report, the overall quality of the programs, in part, mitigated their concerns. The Multiple and Single Subject Credential programs and the Administrative Services Credential programs needed to respond to specific deficiencies noted by the team, and thus were recommended for "Approval with Conditions."

Special Circumstances

Two particular special circumstances were a part of this accreditation visit. The review provided an opportunity to gain further information and experience with national accreditation. Further, the institution maintains a rather large experimental program. The visit afforded an opportunity to explore a possible way in which experimental programs can be included in the accreditation process.

National Accreditation - Last Spring, the Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential Program at CSU, Chico, requested that the national accreditation process of the American Speech-Language Hearing Association (ASHA) be substituted for the state process, in accordance with the *Accreditation Framework*. Since the Committee on Accreditation had approved the ASHA standards as being comparable to the Commission's standards, this option was explored with ASHA. There was an expressed willingness by all parties to implement that part of the *Framework*. However, there was not yet a signed Memorandum of Agreement with ASHA to clarify the procedures for implementation. Commission staff was not able to obtain information about the projected dates for the ASHA visit in a timely manner, and thus was not able to take steps to appoint a California representative to the ASHA site visitation team, as required by the Framework. Finally, with less than two weeks until the ASHA visit, Commission staff was notified of the ASHA site visit dates. A number of "last minute" contacts were made with potential team members. Dr. Terry Saenz, from California State University, Fullerton, agreed to represent California on the team. Dr. Saenz is the faculty member at CSU, Fullerton, who negotiated the initial experiment with the use of ASHA accreditation at that institution. Further, she was a member of the Comparability Study Panel for the COA. California was very well represented on the site visit, even with such short notice. The institution and the Commission staff are still waiting for the results of the ASHA site visit.

Experimental Programs - Under existing Commission program evaluation procedures, experimental programs are exempted from program evaluation visits. This is because the Commission approves experimental programs for specified periods of time, after which the institutions are expected to report back to the Commission with the results of the experimental studies. CSU, Chico, has a very large experimental program that involves the Multiple and Single Subject CLAD/BCLAD Credentials and the Special Education Credentials. Under the *Accreditation Framework*, the accreditation review and decision apply to the unit as a whole, experimental programs are to be considered as a part of the entire education unit.

In an attempt to include the experimental program, Commission staff proposed to CSU, Chico, that a member be added to the accreditation team to specifically be assigned to the experimental program. The team member would be one who had a background in program research, would do an extensive review of the experimental program, and would provide a formative evaluation of that program. Dr. Randall Souviney, from the University of California, San Diego, agreed to fill that role. Dr. Souviney participated on the team with a particular assignment different than other team members. He prepared a written report of his findings, which is added to the "Professional Comments" part of the Accreditation Team Report. Initial reactions from the University about this process have been very positive.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION - ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

Institution: California State University, Chico

Dates of Visit: March 16
-19, 1997

Recommendation: ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS

Rationale: The team carefully discussed the report which was based on the data gathered from reading the institutional report, reviewing supporting documentation and interviewing the varied constituents. The team voted on a decision about each Common Standard and reviewed each program standard that was less than fully met. The team then voted on the accreditation recommendation. The team believed that this recommendation was warranted. Even though all standards were met, there were five Common Standards which were met minimally and three standards that were met minimally by the Multiple and Single Subject Credential programs. The team agreed that although there were several areas of deficiency noted in its report, the overall quality of the programs was not seriously compromised. The team agreed, however, that the institution should be required to provide a response to the COA about each of the areas of deficiency within one year of the visit.

Team Leader: **Randall Lindsey**
California State University, Los Angeles

Common Standards Cluster: **Vera Lane**, Cluster Leader
San Francisco State University

Jim Reidt
San Juan Unified School District

Jody Daughtry
California State University, Fresno

Basic Credential Cluster: **David Georgi**, Cluster Leader
California State University, Bakersfield

Helene Mandell
National University

Dave Baker
Azusa Unified School District

Bill Kellog
California Polytechnic State University

Felicia Bessent
Elk Grove Unified School District

**Advanced Credential
Cluster:**

Robert Blackburn, Cluster Leader
California State University, Hayward

Cara Garcia
Pepperdine University

Barbara Wilson
California Department of Education

Harris Teller
National University

**Experimental Program
Reviewer:**

Randall Souviney
University of California, San Diego

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog
 Program Documents
 Course Syllabi
 Candidate Files
 Fieldwork Handbooks
 Follow-up Survey Results
 Needs Analysis Results
 Information Booklets
 Field Experience Notebooks
 Schedule of Classes
 Advisement Documents
 Faculty Vitae

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Stand. Cluster	Basic Cred. Cluster	Adv. Cred. Cluster	TOTAL
Program Faculty	4	19	17	10	50
Institutional Administration	2	17	6	7	32
Candidates		35	108	43	186
Graduates		16	28	24	68
Employers of Graduates		2	17	7	26
Supervising Practitioners		3	16	8	27
Advisors		8	15	7	30
School Administrators		1	11	22	34
Credential Analyst		1	1	1	3
Advisory Committee		1	22	4	27

Common Standards

Standard 1 - Educational Leadership

Standard Met Minimally - Quantitative Concerns

The team met with a number of unit leaders and examined documents to gather evidence regarding educational leadership at the various levels. There was evidence of effective leadership at the program level for most credential programs and in the Field Experience Placement Centers. However, the team is concerned that there is no clearly articulated overarching vision for the unit that is communicated among all the constituents. The team noted that the leadership represents perceived needs of the unit within the institution. While faculty did not report concerns regarding opportunities for input, there is little evidence that the credential program faculty are consulted in the identification of needs of the unit.

Strategies fostering cohesiveness coming from the highest level of leadership in the unit were not readily apparent. Encouragement and support does not seem to be equitably distributed among all programs and program faculty.

Strengths/Commendations

The institution is to be commended for recognizing and rewarding faculty service to the K-12 community through the retention, tenure, and promotion and the performance salary step increase processes. It is unusual to have such campus-wide involvement and recognition.

Concerns/Weaknesses/Recommendations

Particular attention needs to be paid to articulating the vision for the unit and ensuring that programs use the vision as their guide. Efforts to develop the vision must be led by the highest level of leadership in the unit. A consultative process needs to be developed to allow faculty the opportunity to share in the creation of this vision.

To take advantage of expected opportunities for new resources, the unit should have an agreed upon plan which prioritizes future directions to address increasing demands in the field.

Given past history, it is vitally important to the health of the unit that strategies fostering cohesiveness be implemented.

Standard 2 - Resources

Standard Met Minimally - Qualitative Concerns

Field Experience Placement Center Leaders receive varying amounts of assigned time. Criteria for allocating assigned time to Center Leadership are not clearly defined.

The Agriculture Specialist Credential Advisor is responsible for teaching undergraduate and graduate courses, supervising Phase II student teachers, and is an integral member of the faculty in the School of Agriculture. Student teachers receive a minimal number of on-site visits, however additional visits would be desired by the candidates. Because of the distant locations of student teacher sites, it is difficult for the advisor to make more frequent reviews.

Evidence from the Administrative Services Credential Programs indicates that there is a need for a northern center. Additionally, credential candidates would benefit from opportunities to receive instruction from more than one faculty member in the Preliminary and Professional Programs.

Strengths/Commendations

The unit is commended for providing up-to-date networked computers for each faculty member to use.

Concerns/Weaknesses/Recommendations

Clear criteria for allocating assigned time to Field Experience Placement Center Leaders needs to be established and utilized.

Given the responsibilities of the Agriculture Specialist Credential Advisor, additional faculty to assist in the program should be considered.

The team recommends that a northern center or cohort arrangement be established in the near future to serve the needs of candidates from that area for the Administrative Services Credential. Additional faculty to add variety of experience for Administrative Services Credential Candidates should be considered.

Standard 3 - Faculty

Standard Met

The team found that most faculty members are highly qualified and committed to offering effective programs. Students and graduates report that the faculty are readily available to address student needs as they arise. Additionally, most faculty members are approachable and generous with their time in dealing with any concerns that students may have.

The team found that the unit adheres to University policy regarding course evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

An example of faculty professional development is their participation in training in use of technology.

Strengths/Commendations

The unit is to be commended for ensuring that most faculty in the Department of Education are involved in the supervision of students in field placements.

The Multiple Subject Faculty is to be commended for the following: collegial atmosphere among faculty, rapport among students and faculty, and promotion of high standards in candidates during field experiences.

The Single Subject Program has, on the whole, a dynamic and effective faculty that serves its students to a commendable level. They are appreciated by the students for their expertise, access, and care.

Concerns/Weaknesses/Recommendations

None noted.

Standard 4 - Evaluation**Standard Met Minimally -
Qualitative Concerns**

The team found evidence of the use of informal procedures in all programs for program evaluation and subsequent use of the information for program improvement. However, evidence of formal evaluation was minimal in some programs. In the Basic Programs, the team was concerned that there is no evidence that program participants, graduates, and local practitioners are involved in a comprehensive, systematic evaluation of the quality of programs which leads to substantive improvements.

Strengths/Commendations

The PPS Credential Programs are commended for their on-going evaluation process.

Concerns/Weaknesses/Recommendations

The team recommends that the unit establish a comprehensive systematic evaluation procedure which lead to substantive improvements in all credential programs.

Standard 5 - Admissions**Standard Met**

Evidence indicates that candidates are admitted to the programs based on well defined criteria. Most candidates reported that information was readily available to them regarding the application process. Candidates who did not initially meet the criteria reported that they received guidance and assistance which helped them to later meet the entrance requirements.

Strengths/Commendations

A strength noted is the newly designed "Focus on Teaching" admission information packet. This comprehensive information booklet is clearly designed for easy use and understanding.

Concerns/Weaknesses/Recommendations

None noted.

Standard 6 - Advice and Assistance**Standard Met Minimally -
Qualitative Concerns**

There are mixed reports from candidates regarding the quality and consistency of advising. The quality and consistency varies widely across and within programs. The exceptions are the PPS Programs and the Agriculture Programs in which candidates and graduates reported uniformly good advice and assistance.

Strengths/Commendations

The Multiple Subject and Single Subject handbooks are clearly written, comprehensive documents which provide students with a clear overview of the programs. Students reported that the handbooks provide detailed information that is important for them to have as they move through the program.

Some PPS candidates reported that they received assistance when they had problems in report writing or other academic areas. Remedial course work or counseling was provided by qualified personnel.

Candidates and graduates expressed high satisfaction with the quality of advisement from the Agriculture Specialist Advisor.

Concerns/Weaknesses/Recommendations

Candidates should be given clear direction regarding faculty advising as soon as they are admitted to the program.

A method of advising undergraduates regarding CLAD prerequisites needs to be devised.

Refinements to the candidate advisement process for the Reading/Language Arts Specialist Program are critical in situations where competencies have been met via prior training/course work. Written records should be kept and candidates should receive copies of their records.

Standard 7 - School Collaboration

Standard Met

In almost all cases, schools and school districts reported a positive collaborative process had been established with the unit. There is a planned sequence of field work/clinical experience based on a well developed rationale in each program.

Strengths/Commendations

The unit is commended for their open lines of communication with schools and school district personnel.

Concerns/Weaknesses/Recommendations

None noted.

Standard 8 - Field Supervisors

**Standard Met Minimally -
Qualitative Concerns**

Evidence indicates that there is inconsistency in the adherence to the prescribed procedure for the selection of field supervisors in some programs. The training of field supervisors is limited to informal instruction and there is an inconsistent distribution of printed material.

Strengths/Commendations

Most candidates reported that they had good to excellent field supervisors.

Field supervision in the PPS Program is a strong component. Candidates were closely supervised by both the school psychologist on site and program faculty.

The Agriculture Specialist Program is commended for utilizing field supervisors who have participated in the state-wide cooperating teacher workshops.

The unit is to be commended for maintaining monetary rewards for field supervisors in light of the competing demands for resources.

Concerns/Weaknesses/Recommendations

The established process for selection of field supervisors should be adhered to across all programs.

A systematic, formalized training program for field supervisors should be developed and implemented.

Administrative Services Credential Program: Preliminary and Professional Levels

Findings on Standards

The Administrative Services Credential Program meet all prescribed Standards on Program Quality and Effectiveness for both the Preliminary and Professional levels. Two old program standards have been met minimally with concerns. They are:

- **Standard 2** - Institutional Attention to the Program with a qualitative concern; and
- **Standard 3** - Resources Allocated to the Program with a quantitative concern.

These standards are now subsumed under Common Standard 2 - Resources. The concerns are noted in the Common Standards Report but are further described below.

Strengths/Commendations

The two (2) regular faculty members received consistently high praise for their instructional excellence, relevance, and versatility. Graduates and candidates reported a rigorous and demanding set of courses and field experiences, "...but they stick by us every step of the way." Most described the program as crucial to their development as educational leaders. The graduates now hold the faculty as role models, cherished colleagues, and career-long mentors.

Concerns/Weaknesses/Recommendations

The qualitative concern about Institutional Attention to the Program has to do with the urgently-expressed desire to see the University, college, department, and program establish (at least) a leadership preparation program in a more northern location, presumably in the Redding area. Many current and former students spoke heatedly of an "access and equity" issue. Three private universities are happily unfolding plans to meet the demand. An aggressive, FTE-hungry university cannot justify neglecting (or punishing) a large constituency, while running large summer programs for long-distance students through Continuing Education. Nor should this outreach program be run "out of the hides of" the current regular faculty. New faculty, regular and adjunct, should be recruited regionally for the new program. For a college describing itself as having a "...dramatic increase in professional outreach...", animated and energized to exploit new opportunities, this is a logical next step.

The quantitative concern having to do with Resources Allocated to the Program is connected to the concern above; there was strong support for adding a third regular faculty position. Even without the northern location issue, employers spoke of diminishing pools of well-prepared candidates. Students yearned for even more on-site clinical visitations and more Master's advising capacity, and some relief from the demands facing each of their faculty as sole prime providers of a complex program. Everyone acknowledged the realities of budget constraints, but hoped for eventual support and strengthening of a deeply-respected program.

Agricultural Specialist Credential Program

Findings on Standards

The Agricultural Specialist Credential Program meets all the required standards. The program meets the professional needs of students from varying backgrounds in school districts within the CSU-Chico Service Area.

Strengths/Commendations

The Team found significant evidence in the following areas:

1. Good collaboration exists between the program advisor (housed in the School of Agriculture) and the Department of Education.
2. A good relationship exists between the program advisor and I supervisors.
3. The agricultural specialist program advisor collaborates effectively with the California Department of Education and other universities preparing agricultural specialists.
4. Cooperating teachers have attended state-wide workshops to develop their skills for effective student teacher supervision.
5. Candidates and graduates complimented the program advisor for providing excellent advising throughout their credential program.
6. The program advisor provides recommendations to I supervisors for candidate placement. Phase II placements are made directly by the program advisor.
7. Candidates are interviewed for admission by the Agricultural Education Advisory Council. When appropriate, specific recommendations for strengthening candidates are provided.

Concerns/Weaknesses/Recommendations

1. The Agricultural Education Advisory Committee is composed of a majority of university faculty and staff. The program advisor should consider reconstructing the membership to include: supervising practitioners, candidates, graduates, school administrators and agricultural industry representation.
2. The program advisor has a significant workload, managing several credential programs (single subject, agricultural specialist, and internship). Based on comments from candidates and graduates, the School of Agriculture should consider increasing the number of faculty assigned to the program.

Professional Comments

1. Most candidates expressed a real desire to do more teaching in Phase I. They felt there was too much observation and wanted the feedback that teaching experiences would provide.
2. Candidates and graduates appreciated the peer taught lessons prior to the Phase I field experiences.
3. Additional exposure to computer instructional strategies were desired by candidates and graduates.
4. Candidates and graduates expressed a desire to be better prepared in agricultural mechanics.
5. The program advisor was very accessible to his students. Candidates and graduates appreciated his advice and counsel.
6. In recent years the program advisor has contributed significantly to the School of Agriculture. The program offers career options available in agricultural education and has been successful in recruiting students into the program.
7. High school principals indicated a desire to see student teachers more involved in school-wide activities during their Phase II assignment.
8. An effort should be made to involve all cooperating teachers in the state-wide Cooperating Teacher Institute at least once every three years.

9. A greater expectation of student teachers in conducting more home visits would enhance their supervisory skills, increase their understanding of student backgrounds, and provide greater opportunities for interaction with parents. This is especially important when working with students from underrepresented populations.
10. A regular, systematic evaluation of program graduates should be conducted and the results shared with the Agricultural Education Advisory Committee to better assist the program in meeting the candidates' needs.
11. The multiple subject program coordinator expressed a desire to include agricultural literacy in the program. Recent state frameworks have included many agricultural topics. The Department of Education might consider encouraging multiple subject faculty to attend "Ag in the Classroom" activities sponsored by the Farm Bureau.
12. Candidates and graduates praised the use practitioners as guest lecturers in their courses. Continued use of high school and community college agriculture teachers in on-campus courses should be encouraged.

Multiple and Single Subjects CLAD and Multiple and Single Subjects CLAD Internship Credential Programs

Findings on Standards

The Multiple Subjects CLAD and Multiple and Single Subjects CLAD Internship Credential Programs meet all the required standards except for Standards 1, 6, and 8. The programs meet the professional needs of students from varying backgrounds in school districts within the CSU-Chico Service Area.

Standard 1

Standard 1 was minimally met with qualitative concerns for the Multiple Subjects CLAD and Multiple and Single Subjects CLAD Internship Credential Programs based on evidence examined by the Cluster Team. There was evidence that representatives from the various constituencies could not readily articulate a cogent rationale for the program

Standard 6

Standard 6 was minimally met with qualitative concerns for the Multiple and Single Subjects CLAD program only based on evidence examined by the Cluster Team. Some candidates reported that they did not receive adequate supervision from their university supervisors during Phase I field experience.

Standard 8

Standard 8 was minimally met with qualitative concerns for the Multiple and Single Subjects CLAD program only based on evidence examined by the Cluster Team. While the procedures were well outlined in program materials, there was evidence that the frequency and quality of supervision from their university supervisors and cooperating teachers was inconsistent during Phase II field experience.

Strengths/Commendations

The Team found significant evidence that the Field Experience Placement Centers provided opportunity for effective collaboration between the university faculty and school site personnel. There appeared to be a strong sense of collegiality and shared vision across the constituencies. There also appeared to be an excellent rapport between faculty and students. All cluster team members were impressed with the overall quality of instruction as reported by students, cooperating teachers and program faculty. The faculty is to be commended for their success in integrating theory and practice in both the classes and field experiences. The integrated thematic units and interdisciplinary approach supported this link as well as provided opportunity for students to learn to work collaboratively.

Students consistently noted the sincere dedication and commitment by the program coordinators. Additionally students reported that the Center Leaders were sensitive to students' individual needs in making field assignments.

The Team was impressed with the well-written program handbook and cooperating teacher materials. We recommend that a structure be established for assuring that all policies and procedures are followed by all program faculty and school site personnel. Additionally, we commend the program faculty's commitment to high standards evidenced by the thorough, humane and rigorous procedures in place for ensuring that only well-qualified candidates are recommended for the credential.

There was much evidence in support of the multiple subject program coordinators. Faculty spoke positively about the "Friday" meetings and a student characterized their leadership as "the ones who pull the program together." The Team was impressed with the attention to individual students as found in the minutes of the MSP meetings.

The single subject program coordinator was also praised by students, faculty and staff. The students found her to be both knowledgeable and accessible, and the single subject advisors complimented her leadership skills. Graduates of the single subject program praised the preparation they had received and cited "classroom management" as an area in which they felt well prepared. One student interviewed described the program at Chico as the "best preparation I could have gotten."

The Team commends the efforts underway to better connect the subject matter preparation programs to the professional preparation programs. We encourage extending this articulation and collaboration in all content areas.

Internship Credential Program

Current interns and graduates of the intern program noted many positive attributes about the program. Specifically students reported that they found the program faculty and staff to be flexible and appreciated the personal attention they received from the program faculty and school site personnel.

Concerns/Weaknesses/Recommendations

With respect to Standard 5 for the internship program only, the team acknowledges and supports the changes in the intern program under the new FLEX Plan. It appears that the new FLEX Plan will eliminate situations such as having interns begin the program without taking the required summer classes, as was reported by some interns under the current program structure.

Comments from single subject students reflected concern about the range of subject matter covered in the combined (music, art, science, business.) content methods course. The Team recommends the program faculty explore new approaches to address this concern.

Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program: School Counseling and School Psychology

Findings on Standards

A careful comparison of the data collected from interviews, the document review, and observations indicate that the program meets, and often exceeds, both the letter and the spirit of the Standards on Program Quality and Effectiveness for both the School Counseling and the School Psychology programs. Students who are in the first year of the program and waiting to be advanced to candidacy perceive the program as strong, and well worth the time and effort it will take to complete. Graduates view the program as having more than adequately prepared them for their positions. Employers and other community persons appreciate the fact that the program provides them with highly trained and well qualified professionals.

Graduates report that more emphasis on laws, perhaps embedded across the curriculum, would be helpful. One candidate and one graduate stated that additional training in the assessment of low incidence conditions would have been helpful. Students who did part of their internship in county settings did have these experiences.

Strengths/Commendations

The faculty is to be commended for their dedication and demonstration of commitment to meeting the needs of students. Current students, graduates, and alumni consistently shared their admiration for and appreciation of the depth and integrity of the program. Almost universally, respondents stated that the program was "intense, demanding, and time consuming"; but worth the time and effort. The faculty was described as "dynamic" and the training designed to prepare the candidate for most of the challenges they would encounter. An area of particular strength is the emphasis on consultation and consultation skills.

The rigor, completeness, and uniqueness of the program can be noted by these samples of comments by Interviewees:

- **Graduate:** "The program does an excellent job. I felt prepared, I knew how to do the job. The program is really geared toward prevention...primary prevention. In comparison to others who I work with, I feel better prepared."
- **Student:** "If I can get through this (thesis, course work, family responsibilities), I can get through anything."
- **Employer:** "We tend to hire Chico graduates over others. They are especially good report writers. The students have learned to write with sensitivity and without judgmental statements. They have an ability to work in team situations with others, don't take the "I'm the psychologist and I know it all" attitude."

Concerns/Weaknesses/Recommendations

None noted

Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential Program

Findings on Standards

The Reading/Language Arts Specialist program is being impacted by demands at the state level and by a rapid pace of change in the local school districts which offer teachers educational alternatives to the traditional, university graduate training. The program at Chico has been responsive to this by collaborating with the local districts. Two (2) cohorts have been formed in which students who have had "early literacy training" from their own district are granted Reading/Language Arts Specialist program credit for that training which is also extended to meet the Standards of the K -12 Reading/Language Arts Specialist credential.

A careful comparison of the data collected from interviews, the document review, and observations indicate that, in sum, the program concept, design, and execution adequately meet the Standards on Program Quality and Effectiveness across curriculum, field experiences, and performance outcomes.

Strengths/Commendations

It is evident that the Reading/Language Arts Specialist program is a beacon for critical thinking, research, and professional expertise to the wide range of constituencies interviewed. These characteristics are deeply appreciated by supervisors, employers, and graduates. They perceive the program as a solid touch point during these times of rapid change. This perception is not entirely shared by some current candidates, especially those who seek to hear a "right answer" from an "authority". The Reading/Language Arts Specialist program will need to exercise patience in the future as practitioners, who are besieged by a variety of claims, come to realize that the university-based program stands for process over product.

Concerns/Weaknesses/Recommendations

The program is served by a team, each member of which has numerous other responsibilities which tends to make formal coordination difficult. This is complicated by the fact that there is little or no formal record of decisions made and actions taken by each team member. While the current situation has, as yet, not impacted the education of candidates adversely, it is recommended that the program review its decision-making process to ensure input from all team members

Professional Comments**Common Standards**

The role of the Credential Analyst and her accessibility to candidates needs to be clarified.

Administrative Services Programs

None noted.

Agricultural Specialist Program

None noted.

Multiple and Single Subject Programs

As the Department of Education seeks new constituencies and the programs grow, additional resources, including faculty and staff positions, should be provided.

To promote more harmonious and collegial relationships in the Department of Education, a review of the policies and procedures for assigning time for program coordination and field supervision might be in order.

Pupil Personnel Services Programs

As noted, the PPS program is an excellent one and is an asset to both the university and the community. However, due to the changing demographics in the greater service area, some formalized provision needs to be made to provide candidates with the skills to work with non-English speaking parents and to assess non-English proficient students. This might be accomplished by including instruction and training in the use of interpreters in their seminars.

The program's ability to provide continued excellent service would be greatly enhanced by the following:

- Additional space for assessment instruments - presently the assessment material for the various programs in psychology are housed in space that has been completely filled. The PPS program might be better served by having a space for those instruments that are clearly PPS in nature.
- Additional clerical assistance - student assistance for assessment materials would make control over the material more secure.

- Additional assistance for the credential analyst including both personnel and space - the more that the system can make easy and available the kind of unique information that is the purview of the credential analyst, the less time and energy students will waste in anxiety producing activities and the more time can be devoted to the highly rigorous program.

Reading/Language Arts Specialist Program

The entire phrase "Reading/Language Arts" should appear on all artifacts of the program.

The program is well-positioned to pursue a research program on the extension of emergent literacy principles and practices to grades four through twelve.

Experimental Programs

The following collaboratively developed formative evaluation report was prepared by a member of the team.

A Collaborative Experimental Professional Preparation Program for Teaching Exceptional Learners and Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Student Populations

The faculty in the Department of Professional Studies in Education (PSED), directors of Upward Bound, California Mini-Corps, Teacher Development, and Pre-collegiate Academic Development Programs met with Randall Souviney, Associate Coordinator of Teacher Education, University of California, San Diego, to discuss the research and evaluation element of the experimental credential program. Interviews were held with 18 faculty, 5 institutional administrators, 26 candidates, 5 graduates, 3 employers, 10 supervising practitioners, and 3 school administrators.

As schools and teachers learn to accommodate full inclusion of special education children into regular classrooms, increased language and cultural diversity, and an increased demand for well educated professionals due to class size reduction, the program needs to know more about the performance and knowledge requirements of the classroom teachers they prepare. In response, several PSED credential programs banded together to create an experimental environment to explore ways to address these preparation issues by systematically coordinating academic and field experience components among credential options. The credential options involved are the Bilingual/Multicultural (BCLAD/CLAD Multiple and Single Subject), Concurrent (Special Education), Tri-Placement (CLAD), and Learning Disabled (Internship) credentials.

The faculty and directors provided an overview of respective program elements at an initial meeting. This was followed by a wide-ranging conversation with the faculty about collaboration efforts to date and potential areas of intersection that exhibit potential for future research. For example, last year elements of two credentials were combined in the "concurrent" BCLAD/CLAD/special education option. Students in this program participate in a three semester course of study and specialized field experience leading to the BCLAD/CLAD Credential and substantial elements of the Learning Handicapped Credential. The faculty are evaluating the relative effectiveness of these graduates when working with mainstreamed children. An example of an emerging collaboration is an interest in developing a BCLAD internship option for some candidates next year. The faculty plan to use the experience of a long standing special education internship program to inform their development efforts.

The PSED faculty participated eagerly in the discussions about the unique research opportunities afforded by the confluence of these well respected programs. The group listed existing and planned intersections among the credential elements and explored potential research designs, metrics, and ways to document candidate performance and the effectiveness of program reorganization. It was agreed that periodic research meetings should be scheduled to encourage ongoing reporting on faculty research and evaluation activities. It would also be helpful if a researcher from outside the department were periodically invited to confer with faculty on mutual research and evaluation activities.

The Faculty is charged with collaboratively developing a research agenda that will continue throughout the period of the experimental credential, and beyond. The PSED administration will assist with the identification of personnel and resources needed to gather data and report the results associated with research and evaluation activities. The

original experimental credential proposal identified five areas of research which the faculty intended to address. The following is a summary of these research issues:

1. Identifying elements in professional preparation that serve as predictors of candidate success.
2. Documenting characteristics of early field experience on admission and success in professional preparation.
3. Identifying particular intersections among program options that enable candidates to develop advanced skills for serving children with special needs.
4. Exploring the effects of internship-type experiences on teacher performance and retention.
5. Describing the process of collaboration among previously separate programs as faculty actively seek opportunities to inform each others work.

Over the two days of intensive large and small group meetings, the faculty began to unpack these general areas of interest and identified specific points of confluence where students might benefit from involvement two or more credential options. Each faculty member then proposed specific questions he or she were prepared to pursue.

The following list of potential research questions were jointly developed by the PSED Faculty and the visiting researcher. These questions are not intended to be exhaustive nor is there any implied priority among those listed:

1. What is the duration and nature of early classroom experiences which students bring to the professional education program? How do these experiences affect students' performance in seminars and field placements during the professional education program? How these experiences affect students' retention rate in the teaching profession? How does this retention rate compare to that of individual who completed the minimum 30 hour requirement?
2. Is there a relationship between specific characteristics of interns' experiences and rate of retention in the profession? Do other intensified field experiences lead to higher teacher retention rates.
3. What special expertise for meeting the instructional needs of English language learners in bilingual settings do Concurrent/BCLAD participants display during their field experience? During their first year of teaching?
4. What special expertise for meeting the instructional needs of English language learners in special education settings do Concurrent/BCLAD participants during their field experience? During their first year of teaching?
5. What special expertise for meeting the instructional needs of educationally challenged and/or gifted English language learners in full inclusion bilingual settings do Concurrent/BCLAD participants possess during their field experience? During their first year of teaching?
6. How does the entry level language proficiency of BCLAD participants influence the performance of candidates in professional preparation seminars and field placements? Is there any continuing effect into the first year of teaching?
7. How do intern consortium LEAs provide effective support for interns while they are working towards their special education certification? Can the experience with this program inform the development of other internships within the program (i.e., BCLAD)?
8. What are the advantages and disadvantages of a university-facilitated support network for interns? Does the University play a unique role in providing assisted performance or are there specific conditions under which LEA's can provide effective support for teacher development?
9. What are effective characteristics of the portfolio process that allow candidates to adequately document the acquisition of their competency to teach?
10. What is program efficacy? How does one recognize and measure it?
11. What are the effects of inter-cadre course work on the performance of student teachers and interns?

12. What is the effect of introducing theory and practice in an iterative fashion throughout the professional preparation period? Using an iterative approach, are there measurable differences in candidate practices or performance when compared to programs where theory and practice are introduced sequentially?
13. Does an intensive, internship-type experience produce measurably superior professionals? Do intern graduates express greater job satisfaction? A higher initial employment rate? A higher teacher retention rate?
14. What are the characteristics of effective early field experiences (i.e., starting as juniors or earlier) that help prepare undergraduates for entry into a professional preparation program?
15. To what extent does a "strategy-based" curriculum build on liberal arts competence to produce beginning teachers who are able to match classroom practice with the developmental needs of learners?

16. What knowledge and performance characteristics do graduates of a merged Special Education/BCLAD/CLAD credentials possess that differs from those of graduates from traditional programs? Does "concurrent" preparation offer any measurable effects on the candidate's ability to meet the instructional needs of diverse populations and exceptional learners in regular classrooms.
17. Are mathematics and science instructional practices consistently, and adequately represented in all experimental credential options? Are there observable differences in mathematics and science teaching methods knowledge and effectiveness across the credential options? Can program experience be used to inform effective development of mathematics and science teaching practices across all options?
18. Can the advising and recruitment procedures be improved for all PSED credentials by using the experience within PSED or elsewhere? Can features of some program elements inform all credential advising and recruitment procedures and provide more consistent advising procedures across all credential options? Can basic advising information be made available in other systematic ways such as a PSED homepage or unified advising office?