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I. INTRODUCTION

I.1 Brief overview of the institution and the unit.

The University of La Verne was founded as Lordsburg College in 1891 by members of the Church of the Brethren. In 1917, it was renamed La Verne College reflecting the name of the emerging community. During the college's early years it served primarily as an institution for the preparation of teachers. La Verne's Board of Trustees became independent of church control in the 1950s although a formal relationship remained through the Board. In 1955, La Verne was accredited by the Western College Association (now Western Association of Schools and Colleges). The college began offering graduate degrees in the mid-1960s.

ULV's commitment to off-campus education began in 1969. The College of Law opened in 1970. The college was reorganized in 1977 as the University of La Verne and, in 1979, awarded its first doctorate. In 1981, ULV founded its first branch campus and continued the trend to provide programs throughout the region.

Currently the University of La Verne is a Carnegie Doctoral/Research University located in La Verne, California. ULV enrolls over 8,500 students in four colleges: the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), the College of Business and Public Management (CBPM), the College of Education and Organizational Leadership (CEOL) which is the professional education unit, and the College of Law (COL). The branch campuses are administered through the Regional Campus Administration. The university is a Hispanic and minority serving institution as defined by the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) as colleges, universities, or systems/districts where total Hispanic enrollment constitutes a minimum of 25 percent of the total enrollment.
I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

The partnership with the State of California requires a joint visit in which the NCATE team, including two members familiar with California common standards, addresses the NCATE standards and a state team reviews program standards for those programs leading to a credential. The teams work collaboratively and the chairs of the two teams conduct the pre-visit and the visit with assistance from the state's personnel. There were no deviations from the state protocol.

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

The University of LaVerne offers Initial Teacher Preparation programs at a number of off-campus sites throughout the region. The Multiple Subject Credential is offered at Central Coast, High Desert, Kern County, Ventura County, and the Center for Educators. The Single Subject Credential is offered at Central Coast, High Desert, Kern County, Ventura County, and at the Center for Educators. The Preliminary Mild/ Moderate Educational Specialist program is offered at Kern County. Advanced programs are offered as follows: Preliminary Administrative Services in Kern County and through the Center for Educators and School Counseling at Central Coast, High Desert, Kern County, San Fernando Valley, Ventura County, and the Center for Educators.

The team collected information about off-campus sites through video-taped tours of the sites that included classroom space, offices, and curricula and computer laboratories and interviews with faculty, candidates, and graduates through video conferencing and face to face interviews. Off-campus site administrators were interviewed on the main campus.

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

There were no unusual circumstances.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

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

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

The unit began developing its conceptual framework in fall 2005 when representatives from each of the unit's programs formed a Conceptual Framework Committee (CFC) charged with identifying a set of unit values. Through an iterative process wherein faculty regularly sought feedback from program faculty, the CFC developed a mind map in May 2006 through which the four guiding principles emerged: caring, excellence, leadership and diversity. These principles were endorsed by the faculty at
that time and a process for engaging stakeholders including adjunct faculty, program advisory boards, and regional educators was undertaken. In May 2007, the results of these meetings was shared with faculty and some revisions were made. The unit faculty confirmed these guiding principles in March 2009.

As noted in the university catalog, brochures, and banners that adorn the campus center, the University of La Verne's vision and mission is as follows: "The University of La Verne will be widely recognized as a learning community of increasing prominence. It will provide challenging and rewarding educational opportunities for a diverse student body and will assure academic excellence for students of all ages and backgrounds." The mission of the College of Education and Organizational Leadership (CEOL) is as follows: "We create caring, diverse learning opportunities that foster intellectual, ethical, and social responsibility in order to imagine, explore, and design the future." This commitment was noted in numerous interviews with current candidates and faculty, both full-time and part-time, and in interviews with graduates, advisory board members, supervisors, and employers. According to the IR, "the college seeks to produce graduates who are technically knowledgeable and highly competent, committed to ethical standards, capable of conducting critical inquiry and skillful in building interpersonal and group relationships leading to personal growth and organizational effectiveness."

The college has adopted four guiding principles that inform its work in program design, curriculum development, and with its constituencies, eg, the students and communities in which it works. The principles are leadership, excellence, caring, and diversity and social justice. "Leadership" is anchored in classical thought as well as contemporary concepts of transformational leadership developed by Burns and others. The CEOL subscribes to the belief that "A leader must be a person who takes care of people and emphasizes in his professional activity the social psychology of an organization" (Takala, 1998). "Excellence" for the unit is grounded in the work of Dewey and expanded by Darling-Hammond. It emerges from a constructivist approach that focuses on framing curriculum in such a way as to connect background knowledge and experience. "Caring" is closely aligned with Noddings' writing and is manifested in the concept that one cannot justify oneself as a career by claiming to care. Rather, caring must be demonstrated in the work that one does. "Diversity and social justice" is a major component that shapes the unit's curriculum and is based on the work of Giroux and Friere with a particular focus on the Praxis (Praxis = Reflection + Action).

The unit provides a Philosophical Foundation which reinforces the four guiding principles. They are available at http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/conceptual-framework/philosophical-foundation/.

The knowledge base supporting the conceptual framework is explicated in the unit's knowledge base document that can be found at http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/conceptual-framework/knowledge-base/.

### 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 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this
**Initial Teacher Preparation**

The University of LaVerne offers three programs at the initial level. These include Teacher Education through which graduates earn California credentials for Multiple (elementary) or Single (secondary) Subject teaching, Education Specialist Level I Mild/Moderate (special education credential), and the Bachelor of Science degree in Child Development. Each program leading to a credential is approved by the state through California Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness.

The unit assessment system employs a series of state required tests and assessments, key assessments included within program courses, and follow-up studies. The California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET) is used to assess content knowledge of initial level teacher candidates. For 2008 - 2009 pass rates Multiple Subject and Education Specialist candidates were 100 percent for Exam I, 96 percent for Exam II, and 100 percent for Exam III. Pass rates for Single Subject candidates across subject areas were 92 - 100 percent (data from 2006 – 2009).

Conditions for meeting California subject matter competence requirements should be noted. (1) All candidates for the Multiple Subject credential must pass the CSET. (2) Single Subject and Education Specialist candidates can meet subject matter competence requirements by passing the CSET in the subject they will teach or by completing a state approved subject matter preparation program offered as part of a bachelor's degree program.

Content knowledge for Teacher Education candidates is also assessed through responses to the California Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) Task 1. The aggregated average score for is 3.12 out of 4 points for 2007-2009. The TPA is a four-task assessment used at specified points throughout the program. Tasks include subject specific knowledge (Task 1), designing instruction and adapting it to learners with different needs (Task 2), assessment of student learning (Task 3), and a culminating teaching event planned for the range of learners within a classroom with video recording of the teaching event and analysis (Task 4). The TPA is designed to assess candidates on the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), which are 13 standards for Multiple and Single Subject candidates similar to INTASC standards. Trained scorers not employed by the unit conduct rubric scoring.

Content knowledge of candidates for the Education Specialist Level I program is assessed through a course embedded case study, Understanding Academic and Behavior Needs of Learners. The 2009 average score was 3.9 out of four for this assessment added in 2009. Most key assessments for all programs are scored using four-point rubrics. The Bachelor of Science in Child Development assesses content knowledge of candidates through the Developmental Knowledge Exam and Fieldwork Evaluation. For 2007-2009 the average percentage correct was 80.

Admission requirements are also used to assess candidates' content knowledge. The unit analyzes candidates' last 60 unit undergraduate grade point average (GPA) for admission. GPA is expected to be 2.75 or above. Data were presented for 2007-2009. The average GPA of Teacher Education candidates was 3.18. Candidates also respond to a writing assessment. The average admission writing score was 2.94. Candidates admitted to the Education Specialist I program had an average GPA of 3.29 and average writing score of 2.85. For candidates entering the BS Child Development program the minimum GPA is 2.5. Average GPA was 3.09; average writing score was 2.85.

For Teacher Education candidates TPA Tasks 2, 3, and 4 are key assessments for pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and student learning. These tasks are associated with three program courses. For 2007-2010 initial pass rates and averages scores were: Task 2 – 87 percent with average score of 3.23; Task 3 – 86 percent, average score 3.38; and Task 4 – 89
percent, average score 3.44. Candidates are allowed to repeat TPA tasks and the unit's eventual overall pass rate for the period was 89 percent. Education Specialist I candidates also complete three key assessments. For 2009 – 2010 average scores ranged from 3.40 to 3.85 out of 4 points. Average scores for Bachelor of Science Child Development candidates ranged from 3.22 to 3.61 on the four key assessments to which they respond.

Follow-up data are collected for Teacher Education and Education Specialist I programs through the Comprehensive Evaluation of Teacher Preparation surveys of initial credential program graduates and employers (supervisors) about graduates' preparation conducted by the California Center for Teacher Quality. Data are from surveys administered near the end of the first year of teaching. The most recent data from 2007-2009 show that high percentages, generally over 80 percent, of graduates and employers indicate that ULV graduates were either well or adequately prepared in content knowledge, issues of diversity, assessment of student learning, and other aspects of teaching. ULV compares very favorably with similar institutions.

During interviews candidates indicated that they felt comfortable and confident in their ability to plan, assess and adjust instruction to meet the needs of all students. Follow up surveys and discussions with master teachers and P-12 administration indicate a high level of satisfaction with ULV candidates and graduates. Graduates confirmed that they feel prepared and confident in teaching and assessing their students to determine student learning and making adjustments to instruction.

Advanced Teacher Preparation
Advanced programs for teachers include the Professional Education Specialist Level II program in Mild/Moderate (the Master of Science degree can be earned with this credential) and the Master of Education (M.Ed.) Special Emphasis for Multiple and Single Subject credentialed teachers. Candidates in advanced programs for teachers must hold basic (initial) teaching credentials. For the Education Specialist program content knowledge is assessed through the Current Issues, Policies and Practices research project embedded in SPED 504. The average score, based on course grades for 2008-2010, was 3.99. For the M.Ed. Special Emphasis content knowledge is assessed through the combined TPA scores. The average for 2007-2009 was 3.39. Admission requirements also indicate candidates' content knowledge. Candidates must have and maintain GPAs of 3.0 during these programs. For the M.Ed. Special Emphasis admission GPAs averaged 3.25. For Education Specialist II GPAs averaged 3.29. Writing assessment scores were 3.19 for M.Ed. Special Emphasis and 2.87 for Education Specialist candidates for 2007-2009.

The unit prepares a Biennial Report for each program that contains assessment results. For each program a series of course embedded key assessments has been designed. Education Specialist Level II candidates are assessed on a key assessment project such as the Theory and Practice Behavior Change project, a case study, inclusive instruction project, assessment report on case study, and a technology support project. Average scores ranged from 3.43 to 3.80 for 2009-2010. Teachers in the M.Ed. Special Emphasis program are also assessed through projects in courses including a literature review, a reflection on classroom behaviors, and the graduate seminar project. Average scores for these projects ranged from 3.22 to 3.63. Scores are for 2008-2010. Advanced teacher candidates in the M.Ed. Special Emphasis demonstrate a thorough understanding of assessment of student learning and ability to make data based decisions through a test review project. Average score was 3.65 for 2008-2010.

Interviews with candidates at advanced level indicated that they felt comfortable and confident in their ability to assess students and design and adjust instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Other School Professionals
The unit offers six programs for other school professionals that include the Preliminary Administrative
Service Program, M.Ed. in Reading and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Program, Master of Science in Educational Counseling, Master of Science in School Psychology, and the Master of Science in Child Development. Each has assessments for unit themes that have been cross-referenced to NCATE Standard 1 elements. Program key assessments are course embedded and generally scored on four-point rubrics. These programs also look at measures at admission that include prior GPA, writing assessment scores, interview scores, and ratings of applicant references, also on four-point scales. Many of the assessment measures data that were reported on have been phased in over the last three years, however the unit has had an assessment system in place much longer. Assessment data for programs for other school professionals are captured in Biennial Reports.

The Preliminary Administrative Service Program reported admission ratings that ranged from 3.17 to 3.95. The program assesses candidates using five key assessments including the foundations of leadership examination, a school program plan and budget project, the student performance improvement plan, the Windows on Diversity research paper, and technology based assignments. Average scores ranged from 3.51 to 3.90 for 2008-2010. The program has set a passing score of 3 out of 4 points.

Admission data for the M.Ed. in Reading and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program ratings varied from 3.25 to 3.71. Course-based key assessments include the reading specialist competency exam, a lesson plan and an assessment lesson, the diversity in reading reflection paper and a persuasive proposal presentation. Average scores ranged from 3.44 to 3.86 for 2008-2010.

Candidates in the Master of Science in Educational Counseling are assessed through three key assessments that include Evidence of Meeting Learning Outcomes (EMLO) and fieldwork evaluations, an audit project, a diversity project, and a technology-based presentation. Scores averaged from 3.70 to 4.00. Evidence of Meeting Learning Outcomes (EMLOs) are program-defined sources of data for each theme assessed. Program admission data included an average GPA of 3.06 and average writing score of 3.32.

The Master of Science in School Psychology candidates are assessed through four course-based key assessments. They are the national PRAXIS exam, the student portfolio, the multicultural learning outcomes document, and the technological data presentations. Average scores were from 3.18 to 3.72. The School Psychology Program also collects candidate data at admission. Admission data averages ranged from 3.23 to 3.90.

Candidates for the Master of Science in Child Development degree are assessed through course-based key assessments in that include a research review, a final exam in EDUC 550, a lesson plan assignment, an assignment to create an assessment, a curriculum presentation, and a neurological based behavior reflection paper. For 2008-2010 average scores on these assessments ranged from 3.07 to 3.72. The final exam in EDUC 550 had an average during the period of 92.5 percent. Admission data averages 3.39 to 3.56.

Interviews of candidates, graduates and employers indicated that graduates are well prepared with the knowledge and skills needed to be successful in the roles of other school professionals. Employers indicated that they have choices in this region and feel that ULV graduates are able to be effective, caring and responsible on the job. Data from assessments and interviews with candidates confirm that graduates positively impact student learning. Employers verified that program graduates are very well prepared for their positions as other school professionals.

Professional Dispositions
The unit has adopted unit-wide professional dispositions. A review of the data and interviews with
faculty and candidates confirmed that the dispositions are aligned with the conceptual framework and assessed. Professional dispositions defined by the unit are clearly addressed in instruction in all programs. Faculty and students reported on attending to developing dispositions. Further evidence was found in student portfolios, student reflections, clinical evaluations, and course assignments. The unit monitors candidates' professional dispositions through all courses and transition points, primarily through a course-end survey completed on every candidate by faculty and supervisors called the Candidate Disposition Form. A system of review and assistance with dispositional problems through program coordinator, department chair and dean is in place. Candidates who do not develop needed professional dispositions are asked to leave the program.

Follow-up information on candidate and graduate dispositions is gathered through relationships faculty have with area educators and practitioners. Master teachers and P-12 administrators indicated that they believe candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions required to be effective teachers. They are impressed with candidates' professionalism and content knowledge.

1.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?
This visit was an initial visit.

1.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?
As this was an initial visit, the unit did not indicate plans underway to move to target level on this standard.

1.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
None.

1.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None. This was an initial visit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6 Recommendation for Standard 1

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

**Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation**

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

**2.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?**

The College of Education and Organizational Leadership has an assessment system for collecting, analyzing, and disseminating unit data. The unit ensures that the information generated by the system on initial and advanced candidate proficiencies is aligned with state and professional standards as well as its conceptual framework's outcomes and thematic principles. The five core key assessments required of each initial and advanced program measures candidate proficiencies derived from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), the national standards, and reflect the unit conceptual framework outcomes. In addition, multiple key assessments are used by the unit at the initial and advanced program levels to monitor and make decisions about candidate performance at transition points. See IR page. Three years of aggregated data clearly demonstrated candidate proficiencies with respect to rubric scores which were aligned with state standards, dispositions performance criteria, and conceptual framework outcomes. The unit uses multiple assessments both internal and external e.g., assessments of recent graduates end-of-program self-assessment surveys and annual "Quality of Pedagogical Preparation Programs" state standardized respectively.

Apart from outcomes and performance criteria specified for candidates, the unit identified five domains that define effective unit operations to ensure continuous improvement. The domains include teaching quality, student satisfaction (program quality), candidate preparedness for diverse environments, candidate enrollment, and faculty research/scholarship. The unit operations' benchmarks, reviewers, frequency of review and expected outcomes are outlined. Interviews with the University Assessment Vice President and faculty confirmed that unit operations data were collected and analyzed regularly. Assessments and evaluation measures used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit include university-wide climate surveys and accreditation evaluations; faculty and course evaluations for tenure and instructional purposes; and a unit level compliance and integrity assessment.

The unit assessment system is evaluated on several levels by independent groups. Clarification on the role of each of the independent groups was requested by the offsite team. The onsite team determined four major evaluative levels through interviews with members of the office of Assessment and Accreditation, members of the program advisory councils, and meeting minutes of the Assessment Committee. At one level the assessment system is evaluated through an ongoing collaboration on data type choice and analysis between the director of assessment and accreditation, the vice president of university assessment and other members of the office of University Assessment. The system also undergoes another level of evaluation through the collaboration of assessment directors, i.e., on a regular basis assessment directors of the various schools of the university meet as peers to share and modify assessment tools and processes. Thirdly, members of the professional community, e.g., teachers,
principals, and program advisory councils meet to assess the appropriateness of assessment instruments. In addition, the Assessment Committee consisting of program chairs, faculty and coordinators evaluate the effectiveness and integrity matters of the assessment system at the unit-wide level.

The methods used to ensure accuracy, consistency, and freedom from bias, in the unit's assessment procedures include inter-rater reliability, data triangulation, and collaborative evaluations. Interviews with faculty and alumni confirmed that the unit takes effective steps to ensure that assessments are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias. For example, new faculty and adjuncts are thoroughly indoctrinated on expected norms. Other steps consist of the inclusion of external evaluators; a well aligned system of five key assessments and standards per program; rubrics and scoring guides; clear communication of expectations; alignment with state and professional standards; the thematic principles of their conceptual framework; and a common scale for scoring key assessments. Though a four point scale is consistently used, behavioral expectations for each indicator are not consistently present. In addition alignment for these field experiences are not aligned with the four tenets of the conceptual framework.

The unit maintains a well developed yet "evolving" assessment system. Data from the key assessments are accessible for all stakeholders who need to collect, summarize, analyze, and use data for decision-making. Data entry is accomplished via the university-wide data system Banner by Sunguard for course assignments, course grades, program selection and all demographic data. Task Stream is used for management of key assessment data and distribution of appropriate candidate surveys. Candidate data are gathered at the end of each term for analysis, summarization and presentation. According to faculty, the output reports are then shared and discussed at each of the assessment committee, program focus group, program advisory groups, and program meetings.

The summary reports are typically posted to shared drives for access by all authorized faculty and staff. At orientation and for recruiting purposes relevant summaries are shared with candidates. Candidate assessment data are regularly and systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed in state biennial reports focused on improving candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. State Biennial Reports for all program areas are now available on the college website.

The unit disaggregates candidate assessment data for candidates by campus location, demographics, courses, and instructors, among other variables. Sample summaries of such data by location and year are provided. According to part-time and full-time faculty comparative analysis of such data has led to program decisions. One such decision has been the requisite for adjuncts of the various campuses to observe full time instructors teaching for at least a semester.

In the catalog complaint and grievance policies are stated. Records of formal initial and advanced candidate complaints and resolutions are maintained and archived electronically in the dean's office.

Multiple data sources are evaluated for the efficacy of courses, programs, and clinical experiences. Data collected are both qualitative and quantitative and used for making changes at the unit level. A printout of "Course Evaluation Analysis" provides evidence that the University Assessment Office conducts an annual content analysis on candidate course evaluations for the College of Education and Organizational Leadership. Faculty meet to assess qualitative assessments including candidate field experiences collaboratively to make unit decisions. Structures are in place to ensure that data are used to initiate changes. In an interview the Assessment Committee and the various program Advisory Committee members each confirmed their role in data-driven decisions or changes in the unit. Two major unit changes in 2010 include an increase in the integration and purchases of novel technology and the establishment of an extended required writing course for candidates who need remediation. The committees made the decisions based on survey data on candidates' concerns about technology content.
2.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?
This was an initial visit.

2.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?
This was an initial visit. The institution did not indicate plans to move to the target level.

2.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
None.

2.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.6 Recommendation for Standard 2

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

**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 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this
Initial Programs:
Review of documents and interviews with faculty and unit leaders verified that over 150 school districts have signed contractual agreements through which the districts and school sites agree to the unit's placement requirements. School districts agree to assist in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the supervised teaching experience and intern program. Candidates request a partner district or school from an approved list. The unit sends a written request to the district which determines if the request can be met, and notifies the unit fieldwork coordinator for assignment approval. Assignments and requirements are then confirmed in writing with the district, school principal, and on-site supervisor.

Review of documents and interviews with faculty and unit leaders verified that school-based faculty engage in ongoing communication with programs on the design of field experiences has resulted in changes in the order of courses, increased emphasis on Individualized Education Plans, and closer alignment with school curricula. Schools and the unit share expertise whenever fieldwork supervisor makes weekly observations of candidates. The candidate and the school-site supervisor debrief daily. University supervisor, on-site supervisor, and candidate meet at the end of each field experience to explore the candidate's professional development and allow the candidate the opportunity to reflect. Candidates also engage in ongoing journaling with faculty members and supervisors to reflect on their development.

Review of documents and interviews with faculty and unit leaders verified that initial candidates are provided extensive developmental and sequential opportunities in the schools. Evaluations of field and clinical experiences are grounded in the California Teaching Standards, Teacher Performance Expectations, and the unit dispositions, but are not clearly aligned to the conceptual framework. Documents provided as "rubrics" do not consistently include behavioral descriptions of the anticipated behaviors at each level of performance. Rather, descriptions are provided for the four levels across indicators.

The Institutional Report, documents reviewed, and faculty interviewed revealed that the use of technology is assumed to be addressed in the lesson plans. Interviews revealed that an assessment for the infusion of technology throughout practice has not yet been developed. In addition, though dispositions are assessed in the field, field evaluations are not aligned with the conceptual framework.

Review of documents and interviews with faculty and unit leaders and candidates verified that field experiences allow candidates to act both as teachers and learners. Criteria for school faculty are clear, and qualifications are verified by school administrators. Quality of school-based faculty is assured through direct observation of suggested teachers, training, and district screening for effectiveness. Clinical faculty provides ongoing support grounded in state standards and unit dispositions. These clinical faculty are trained through instruction on requirements and the handbook, and shadow more experienced supervisors.

Admission to student teaching is clear and requires mastery of content and pedagogical knowledge. Through the Teacher Performance Assessment candidates perform an analysis of student work and differentiate instruction. In interviews candidates were able to describe formal and informal assessment strategies and tools, and the differentiation of instruction developed through these assessments.

Advanced programs:
Review of documents and interviews with faculty and unit leaders verified that candidates in advanced programs have structured field experiences supported by handbooks, school-based supervisors, and university supervisors. Candidates specifically engage in activities related to the roles for which they are preparing; one evidence of school and district input into field experience design included revision of...
school counseling and educational administration tasks to better align with requirements in the schools. All field experiences for advanced programs are conducted in settings with at least 25 percent of students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups as well as students with exceptionalities.

Interviews with faculty described the degree to which patterns in data about advanced candidate performance in field experiences, some of which are qualitative, are reviewed by each program faculty for program improvement decisions. School and campus faculty share information through evaluation forms, log documents, and personal interaction. Review of program documents suggest that evaluations of project assessments appear to be based on the successful completion of specific tasks and activities rather than the evidence generated from these tasks and activities as described in the standards or conceptual framework. Entry and exit criteria are clearly monitored, and grounded in the candidates' abilities to demonstrate the desired outcomes. Though the use of technology appears to occur throughout the program, and involves efforts such as virtual meetings, direct evaluation of the use of technology is not apparent. Evaluations of field sites and supervisors are qualitative in nature and are reviewed by rereading rather than generating aggregated data.

3.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?
This is an initial visit.

3.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?
This is an initial visit.

3.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
This is an initial visit.

3.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluations of candidates' infusion of technology throughout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candidates’ performance on the infusion of technology throughout teaching and practice is not systematically assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates’ performance on the infusion of technology throughout teaching and practice is not systematically assessed.</th>
<th>teaching and practice occurs through informal observation and lesson plans. Members of the Assessment Committee indicated that assessment of candidate implementation and infusion of technology is not formally assessed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The level of specificity in assessments rubrics and scoring used in field and clinical experiences is inconsistent and not clearly aligned with the conceptual framework.</td>
<td>The conceptual framework was designed at the beginning of the NCATE accreditation process, and linkages with current field and clinical evaluations are not apparent. Rubrics did not consistently include behavioral descriptions of performance at each level and were not aligned with the conceptual framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Recommendation for Standard 3

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

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 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Interviews with faculty, candidates and leaders verified how deeply the unit is committed to diversity. Diversity is reflected in the mission and vision statements. The unit has clearly identified candidate proficiencies related to diversity, listed on page 17 of the Student Teaching Handbook. The university has adopted various policies demonstrating their commitment to diversity including a Strategic Plan for Diversity that put this commitment into practice. Policies of the unit are based on those of the institution and on the belief that diversity should be taught as a set of conscious practices that are outlined on page 65 of the IR. Faculty members are instrumental in influencing and bringing forth the process for the creation of the strategic plan.

The faculty has developed diversity-related projects that have included training for faculty, staff, and students. The College Diversity Committee (CDC) collaborates with other groups on campus and continues to support efforts to design, implement, and promote the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. The resulting program has both action and reflective components. Interviews with the CDC reflect the active role that the unit takes in creating a diverse experience for candidates.

Diversity issues are a curricular strand that run through all programs and courses. Candidates are introduced to the dispositions, and philosophical foundations at the admissions interview and in initial courses. Course syllabi and supporting program documents demonstrated how much candidates are expected to develop interactive skills that will enable them to work with all students and to implement skills in meaningful and intentional ways. Candidates engage in fieldwork and clinical experiences in diverse settings as they learn to contextualize teaching by drawing upon actual experience with diverse students.
A review of syllabi support that coursework focuses on understanding adaptations, learning differences, and diversity begins with the initial courses in the Liberal Studies Program and the Teacher Education Program. All initial and advanced programs have diversity themes woven into required coursework. Details of coursework requirements may be viewed on pages 68-71 of the IR. Review of syllabi and interviews confirm that candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to develop and teach lessons that incorporate diversity, connect instruction and services to students' experiences and cultures, demonstrate sensitivity to differences, allow for multiple perspectives and create environments that value diversity throughout their coursework.

Program faculty explained how each program has developed key assignments and assessments that allow for program review at different levels to examine the effectiveness of diversity related experiences for candidates, and through which candidates demonstrate awareness and skill in working with a wide array of children, families, and communities. A listing of key assignments and assessment may be viewed on pages 72-75 of the IR. Review of syllabi and conversations with candidates during interviews confirm the variety and commitment to diversity throughout coursework.

Candidates interviewed reported that candidates have multiple opportunities to interact with higher education faculty and school-based faculty from diverse groups in formal and informal ways. Faculty in all programs have a variety of backgrounds and areas of expertise which provide for attention to diversity issues into all programs in meaningful ways. Interviews with candidates, faculty (both unit and school based), and unit leaders confirm that candidates have interactions with school, unit and other faculty. Classes provide opportunities for interactions with unit faculty. Candidates report feeling a personal and professional relationship with unit faculty. Candidates interact with school personnel during their field and clinical placements. Both candidates and supervisors report a positive interaction as supervisors observe candidates in their clinical settings weekly. White non-Hispanic faculty members constitute about 60 percent of faculty with the remaining 40 percent representing American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, and other ethnicity groups. This compares to 60-90 percent white non-Hispanic population in counties served by the university. Unit and school faculty gender breakdowns are about 70 percent female and 30 percent male, and faculty from both settings are represented by more than two racial and ethnic groups for both initial and advanced candidates on all campuses.

Faculty has knowledge and experiences to help candidates work with students from diverse groups as evidenced in their scholarly work and their service work while at the unit. Many full-time unit faculty have taught and part-time faculty continue to teach within the surrounding communities and have access to current best practices and classroom situations that candidates may encounter. Interviews with faculty confirmed that members are committed to issues of diversity and actively seek to create an atmosphere of acceptance and growth for all candidates. According to interviews with the Clinical Experience Team, cooperating teachers are screened within school districts, observed by unit supervisors, and attend training to ensure that they are demonstrating appropriate, effective and research-based strategies for diverse learners. Cooperating teachers must also hold an ELL credential to be considered for hosting a candidate. The School-Site Supervisor Verification of Credential and Experience Form is a checklist that also verifies the level of knowledge and experience school site faculty must have. Clinical supervisors report that because observations of candidates are made weekly, school-based faculty are considered "Master Teachers" in all school settings where candidates are placed.

Interviews with unit leaders and faculty members, as well as the Diversity Committee verified how much the CEOL attempts to recruit a diverse faculty by appealing to potential diverse candidates in their advertising and interview processes. The unit attempts to achieve a high retention rate for all faculty. New faculty are assigned to a senior faculty member and have no committee assignments. An informal mentoring protocol has also been developed. Professional Assistance Committees have been adopted for
use in the process of tenure and promotion as needed. An interview with the CDC revealed, the CEOL has been in the process of forming a search committee for the position of Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) to further support diversity issues at the university for several years. Interviews with the Diversity Committee, substantiate that the unit is continually hiring from a diverse field of candidates.

Candidates have the opportunity to interact with other candidates from diverse groups. A majority of candidates come to the university from local communities which have a high level of ethnic and cultural diversity as well as socioeconomic diversity. The university recruits candidates from the surrounding geographic area which has high ethnic representation and retains students by supplying one-on-one academic counseling and small class sizes with flexible enrollment. Both initial and advanced candidates claim in interviews that "it was worth the money" to come to and stay at the unit throughout their educational programs because of the level of support and commitment to the candidates from unit faculty. The CEOL ensures that candidates develop and practice knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity during their field experience and clinical practice. Confirmed in Table 10 and in interviews, candidates have their field experience and clinical practice in diverse settings, and have specific assignments and assessments that include diversity-related concepts. The lesson plan template and the Supervised Teaching Observation Report both have areas of diversity that need to be addressed by the candidates. Candidates state that from the first course, all facets of diversity are addressed and taught, and that is continued throughout the program. The unit has been recognized nationally by Forbes Magazine for its racial diversity. Graduation rates for African American and Hispanic students are typically above the national average. A complete summary of candidate diversity may be viewed in page 81 of the IR. Table 9 shows the representative community demographics, showing that they are similar to the demographics of the unit.

Program documents, candidate files, and interviews with faculty and candidates verified that field experiences and clinical practice occur in settings with students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, socioeconomic and exceptional groups. Table 10 lists the demographics of school sites that accommodate candidates from both initial and advanced candidates. Interviews with candidates, school and unit faculty, and supervisors state that all field and clinical experiences occur in diverse schools. Candidates are required through a variety of course assignments and assessment at both initial and advanced levels, to conduct field research around multiple issues of diversity.

Candidate and faculty interviews verified that candidates receive feedback from peers to reflect on their skills when working with students from diverse groups. Candidates may choose to remain within their original cohort where they have developed a working relationship where formal and informal feedback takes place. Candidates are also evaluated on Supervised Teaching Observation Report form that reflect state standards for the teaching profession. Candidates stated during interviews that they do receive valuable feedback from supervisors during weekly visits and observations to their clinical placements. The Supervised Teaching Observation Report also has space for comments and questions that may arise during an observation to discuss during a conversation at a later date. Candidates and Supervisors report that reflective feedback is also given during email and phone conversations as needed by candidates. Candidates must submit lesson plans daily to field and clinical supervisors for review, and this also lends itself to an opportunity for feedback.

4.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Not applicable. This was an initial visit.

4.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target
level?
Not Applicable. This was an initial visit.

4.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
None.

4.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.5.1 What AFI s have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.5.2 What AFI s remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.5.3 What new AFI s does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFI s may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.6 Recommendation for Standard 4

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

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 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Reviews of faculty vitae reveal that there are 59 fulltime faculty; of these 33 are tenure-track. Sixteen faculty have the Ed. D.; 15 the Ph. D. and two have Master's degrees. Of the 26 non-tenure track faculty, two hold the Ph. D., six have the Ed. D. and 12 have Master's degrees; and, all have the appropriate
degree and professional experience.

There are 114 adjunct instructors. All hold a credential in their area of expertise. Adjunct faculty teaching in specific programs must have at least a BA degree but an MA is preferred for teacher education plus three letters of recommendation. For Advanced Studies adjunct faculty must have an MA degree with extensive experience in the field. In the case of adjunct faculty holding only a BA degree, interview data indicate that such adjuncts are working toward a MA degree. Through interviews with program chairs, full-time and adjunct faculty at the regional campuses the same expectations for qualifications are held and met.

Interviews with program chairs and field coordinators confirm that school-based faculty must be tenured and credentialed within the field. Clinical faculty must have at least five years of experience, an MA degree and credentialed in the field that they are supervising. Interviews with clinical faculty, program chair and field coordinators verify that clinical faculty have extensive experience in their profession as teachers; principals, superintendents, counselors etc.

A review of syllabi reveal that faculty use a variety of instructional strategies and activities (e.g. cooperative learning; demonstrations; action research projects; case studies; multimedia; instructional technology venues) that assist the candidates in the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving and the development of professional dispositions. Technology is an integral part of the instruction that candidates' experience. Interviews with candidates, faculty and program chairs state that candidates have exposure to and use of Blackboard and newer delivery programs such as jing and softchalk. On campus classrooms are smart rooms. According to the off campus dean most of the classrooms are smart rooms. Interviews with off campus candidates state that access to technology is not a problem though not all classrooms are smart rooms. Some faculty interviewed indicate that at the regional campuses some technology is unavailable. However, the assistant director of the Center for Teaching and Learning has developed accessible YouTube modules to assist distant faculty and candidates for addressing technology issues. Candidates' interviews verify that instructors use a variety of instructional strategies and technologies. The poster session, presentations, and conversations demonstrate candidates' use of portfolios, case studies, course activities such as: peer counseling, performing diagnostics, preparing conference presentations and action research projects. Assessments are an integral part of instruction with its emphasis on reflective practice. In addition, many courses are aligned with the required four TPAs and other key assessments supporting candidates' development.

The unit employs the Task Stream system as a means to manage candidate assessment collection and analysis. Interviews with candidates reveal that faculty incorporate an array of technologies into coursework, for example, Blackboard, net books and clickers. Syllabi and candidate interviews verify the integration of technology and candidates' use and familiarity of various technologies.

The unit is in a transition period with its development of new expectations for scholarship. Using Boyer's definition and description of scholarship the unit has identified the expectations for tenure and promotion from assistant to associate as having two peer-reviewed publications and for promotion to full professor an additional two peer reviewed publications. However, a review of faculty vitae, faculty publications and unit publications highlighting faculty scholarship demonstrates that faculty are engaged in a variety of scholarship such as: regional, national and international conference presentations; grant writing, journal articles, book chapters and books as well as written instructional guides and textbooks.

A review of promotion and tenure document, faculty vitae, and interviews with program chairs reveal that faculty provide service to the department, unit and university; to professional organizations, and to the community. Unit faculty are involved in service activities at the department, unit and university levels and to the various professional organizations serving as reviewers, chairs and co-chairs of
professional organizations committees. Faculty provide professional development to school districts, child development hospital units and other community groups through activities such as: Family Literacy Day, Early Child Conferences, Special Education Conferences and Literacy Tutoring Activities.

Based on interviews with program chairs, unit leadership and a review of the unit's tenure and promotion document a systematic process details how full-time and adjunct faculty are assessed. Full-time faculty submit an annual report documenting their accomplishments related to teaching, scholarship and service. Faculty review and summarize course evaluations, meet with department and program chair to review their annual performance. In addition, faculty develop goals and objectives for the coming year addressing improvements in teaching, scholarship expectations and service. Full-time tenure track faculty have a third year review when documentation of goals and accomplishments are submitted in a portfolio for review. Interviews with program chairs reveal that adjunct faculty are evaluated for their instructional and content expertise and also submit written summaries of their course evaluations and meet with program chairs to discuss areas of improvement related to teaching. A new peer observation process reported in the IR and verified by the Peer Observation Document has been developed and is being implemented. Interviews with full-time faculty and adjunct express positive comments about the process. The peer observation process along with compilation of the yearly performance document and reviews serves as a means to assist faculty in teaching improvements. The IR, faculty and program chair interviews reveal that monthly meetings, four annual college-wide meetings and one annual all-faculty meeting assist faculty in addressing teaching issues and introduce faculty to new teaching strategies. Adjunct faculty are invited to attend. A review of past agendas identify various teaching activities such as writing workshop, and new technologies such as jing and softchalk.

Data reveal that the unit faculty teaching evaluations' ratings of 3.65 on a 4-point scale are slightly above the campus norm of 3.59.

Interviews and program agenda reveal that the unit has a systematic process for professional development for its faculty. Unit programs have monthly meetings to provide professional activities to its faculty. A yearly all-faculty meeting is used to provide professional development activities. Faculty minutes describe several discussions about the annual meeting addressing an agenda for professional development around new technologies such as jing and softchalk. Other examples include workshops related to diversity training and Safe Zone training. New unit directions are introduced at the annual meetings, for example, transformative integrative education; authentic field based training models and social justice and culture focused education. Faculty interviews reveal faculty's interest in and appreciation for such professional development activities. In addition, the CTL also provides professional activities for new technologies used for instruction. Interested faculty full-time and adjunct can apply for an advanced certification and receive a $500 stipend. For full-time faculty, $1,000 is available to support travel expenses to attend professional development venues. In summary, the unit supports and provides opportunities for its faculty.

5.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Not Applicable. This was an initial visit.

5.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not Applicable. This was an initial visit.
5.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

None.

5.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Recommendation for Standard 5

**Initial Teacher Preparation**

| Met |

**Advanced Preparation**

| Met |

**Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources**

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

6.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Unit documents and interviews revealed that the professional education unit is comprised of the College of Education and Organizational Leadership (CEOL) and departments in the College of Arts and Science (CAS) that provide content instruction. The dean of CEOL is assisted by an associate dean, three department chairs, and program coordinators. All off-campus operations are administered by the dean, Regional Campus Administration (RCA) which includes nine regional campuses and the Centers for Educators, which is the department which supports the unit's off-campus programs, however, the unit head retains authority over all academic quality decisions. The unit manages its programs through the work of its Leadership Team (department heads and program coordinators), monthly departmental meetings, quarterly meetings of faculty, and a system of faculty committees and task forces.
The unit's recruiting and admissions policies are clearly and consistently described in the publications and catalogs provided both in print and online by both the institution and the CEOL. Academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading policies, and advertising appear to be accurate and current. The institution reports it provides an three-year academic calendar on-line. Undergraduate and graduate student appeals committees are reported to meet monthly to consider grading policy issues.

Documents and interviews verify that each academic program has designated advisers at both the main campus and at all off-campus sites. Candidates may meet with advisers either face-to-face or using email. In addition to program advisers, candidates have access to two credential analysts who assist with questions about credentialing and personnel in the office of field experiences.

Interviews and documents viewed demonstrated the unit is engaging faculty, P-12 practitioners, and other members of the professional community in program design, implementation, and evaluation through several mechanisms. The Teacher Education Committee, comprised of representatives from the CAS and CEOL, constitutes a unit-wide advisory group that proposes improvements to teacher education. The Grant Advisory Committee also brings CEOL and CAS faculty members together on issues related to the preparation of mathematics and science teachers.

The university is a private, non-profit institution that relies on student tuition for 98 percent of its operating budget. Interview with the vice president for finance (VPF) revealed that the CEOL generated $11,055 in total revenue and was permitted to maintain 62 percent for its budget. The sister college Regional Campus Administration (RCA) unit, that house CEOL programs generated $28,480,939, a portion of which was from CEOL courses. RCA retained approximately 51 percent of its budget. The VPF estimated that the RCA accounted for additional support to CEOL programs of about 20 percent. By contrast the College of Business only retained 38 percent of its revenue and the College of Arts and Sciences retained 69 percent of its revenue. The institution has had budget cuts of five percent in the two past years, however, the unit has been able to replace retiring senior faculty and hire several additional junior faculty. The budget adequately supports on-campus and clinical work in additional to the off-campus programs.

Workload policies, as reported in the IR and including class-size and online course delivery, allow faculty to be effectively engaged in teaching, assessment, advisement, collaborative work with P-12, and service. Generally, faculty teach six courses (18 hours) per year although they may teach additional courses for additional pay. In fall 2010, 20 percent of the faculty taught more than three courses. The university also provides a stipend for redesigning a course for online delivery. The unit equates the supervision of five student teachers as one 3-credit course for which the faculty member may have a course release or additional compensation. The institution is in transition from being primarily teaching emphasis to a focus that encourages increased scholarship.

The unit uses a mix of full-time and part-time faculty for the delivery of instruction. In spring 2010, approximately 40 percent of the instruction was delivered by full-time faculty and 60 percent by part-time faculty. There was a substantial difference in the ratios between on-campus and off-campus. In 2008, sixty-five percent of on-campus courses were taught by full-time faculty but only 25 percent of off-campus courses were taught by full-time faculty. Interviews with administration and faculty revealed that in 2010-11 the ratio changed to 60 percent adjunct/40 percent full-time consistently across locations. Part time faculty are invited to participate online in a program orientation activity. Personnel policy and letters offering employment for full time faculty require six courses (18 units) per academic year. Beyond that faculty may have assigned administrative responsibilities. Faculty have opportunity to teach additional courses for additional compensation in January and in summers.
The unit has sufficient support personnel so that programs can prepare candidates to meet standards. On-campus there are nine full-time staff providing administrative support to the departments, Office of Field Experiences, and the dean as well as two credential analysts. The off-campus Centers for Educators have 4.5 FTE administrative assistants, two assistant directors/advisers, three full-time advisers, and one credential analyst.

Documents and interviews demonstrated that faculty are provided with adequate support for professional development, including approximately $1,000 per faculty member to attend local national professional conferences. Faculty are also eligible to apply for a sabbatical once every six years; three unit faculty have been approved in the last two years. The unit also provides workshops, through the Center for Teaching and Learning, to support faculty professional development in the use of technology, including support for work on Blackboard, the online instructional delivery system. Faculty also receive technical training on CDroms and a stipend of $500 upon completion of training.

Program documentation indicated adequate campus and school space to support candidates meeting standards. The CEOL is housed in four primary building on campus: Barkley Hall, Barkley Annex, Leo Hall, and the Organizational Leadership building. All full-time faculty have private offices and a choice of desktop or laptop computers.

In the last two years, the dean's office suite has been built and other space has been remodeled to provide new faculty offices and conference space. In the next two years, the institution plans to add new offices for the Department of Organizational Leadership and the liberal studies program. The institution has a master plan to replace old classroom furniture and upgrade faculty office furniture.

On-campus facilities appear to support faculty and candidate use of information technology. The Center for Teaching and Learning has newly remodeled space that accommodates technology training. Leaders interviewed reported that all classrooms are on-campus are "smart" classrooms and provide appropriate technology support as do those at the RCA's regional campuses. The availability of appropriate technology at RCA sites and in the schools where candidates engage in clinical practice varies although the unit works with the RCA to provide the needed support or to move courses or placements if the technology is not acceptable.

Documents and interviews demonstrated the degree to which the unit allocates resources across programs to prepare candidates to meet standards for their fields. In order to support, develop, and implement the unit's assessment plan, the unit has added a full-time director of assessment and accreditation and a full-time coordinator of teacher performance assessment. The unit has also internally funded TaskStream, the unit's operational assessment system for the past two years until a student fee-based revenue stream becomes active. TaskStream also interfaces with the institution's student information system, Banner. Through these and other actions, the unit provides adequate information technology to support faculty and candidates and to provide reliable, speedy, and confidential connections for faculty and candidates engaged in distance learning.

Professional education faculty and candidates interviewed explained how they have access to both sufficient and current library and curricular resources and electronic information. The library houses over 40,000 electronic books and has access to the collections of over 40 libraries in California and Nevada. Faculty and candidates may also use LeoDelivers, the library's web-based inter-library loan system. The library has over 7,000 relevant journal titles available online and more than 10,000 more resources.

6.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?
6.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not Applicable. This was an initial visit.

6.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

None noted.

6.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.5.1 What AFIIs have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.2 What AFIIs remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.3 What new AFIIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6 Recommendation for Standard 6

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

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

Documents Reviewed

Persons Interviewed
Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of LaVerne candidate and graduate interviews.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of LaVerne Faculty interviews.docx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of LaVerne interviews.docx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

(Optional) State Addendum: