

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at

California State University, East Bay

Professional Services Division

June 2025

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **California State University, East Bay**. The report of the team presents the findings based upon a thorough review of all available and relevant institutional and program documentation as well as all supporting evidence including interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** is made for the institution.

Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions For All Commission Approved Programs Offered by the Institution

Common Standards	Status
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Met with Concerns
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	Met
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met
4) Continuous Improvement	Met with Concerns
5) Program Impact	Met

Program Standards

Programs	Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Administrative Services	9	9	0	0
Clear Administrative Services	5	4	1	0
Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern	7	7*	0	0
Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern	7	7*	0	0
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, with Intern	7	6*	1	0
Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs, with Intern	7	6*	1	0
Autism Spectrum Disorders Added Authorization	3	3	0	0
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	10	9	1	0
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	5	5	0	0
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology	5	5	0	0
Speech-Language Pathology	16	16	0	0

***Program Standard 7** - The Commission is currently in the process of certifying all Commission-approved multiple subject and education specialist teacher preparation programs for alignment with SB 488.

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Documentation and Evidence
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report**

Institution: California State University, East Bay

Dates of Visit: April 27-30, 2025

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
April 2018	Accreditation

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, completers, supervisors, coaches, and local school personnel. The team obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Preconditions

All preconditions have been determined to be aligned.

Program Standards

All program standards for the Preliminary Administrative Services program were **met**.

All program standards for the Clear Administrative Services program were **met** with the exception of Program Standard 3, which was **met with concerns**.

All program standards for the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs were **met**.

All program standards for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate and Extensive Support Needs programs were **met** with the exception of Program Standard 4, which was **met with concerns** for both programs.

All program standards for the Autism Spectrum Disorders Added Authorization program were **met**.

All program standards for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization program were **met** with the exception of Program Standard 4, which was **met with concerns**.

All program standards for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling program were **met**.

All program standards for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology program were **met**.

All program standards for the Speech-Language Pathology program were **met**.

Common Standards

Of the Common Standards, standards 2, 3, and 5 were **met**, and standards 1 and 4 were **met with concerns**.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the fact that the team found all program standards to be met for all programs with the exception of Program Standard 3 for the Clear Administrative Services program, Program Standard 4 for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs programs, and Program Standard 4 for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization program, which were met with concerns, and found all Common Standards to be met with the exception of Common Standards 1 and 4, which were met with concerns, the team unanimously recommends **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

The team recommends the following stipulations:

1. Within one year, the institution must submit a report, including evidence documenting the following:
 - a. The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituencies in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs. (CS 1)
 - b. The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation. (CS 1)
 - c. The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development/instruction, field-based supervision and clinical experiences. (CS 1)
2. Within one year, the institution must submit a report, including evidence documenting the following:
 - a. The unit regularly and systematically collects, analyzes, and uses candidate and program completion data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services. (CS 4)
3. Within one year, the Clear Administrative Services program must submit a report, including evidence documenting the following:
 - a. The program provides ongoing training to refine coaching skills. (PS 3)

4. Within one year, the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs programs must submit a report, including evidence documenting the following:
 - a. Appropriate information is accessible to guide and support candidates' meeting all program requirements. (PS 4)
5. Within one year, the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization program must submit a report, including evidence documenting the following:
 - a. Candidates will work with individuals and/or small groups of students at both early (PreK-3) and intermediate (4th grade and up) in fieldwork. (PS 4)
6. Within six months, the institution must submit a progress report to the Committee on Accreditation detailing the actions taken to address the above stipulations.

In addition, staff recommends that:

- CSUEB's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- CSUEB be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- CSUEB continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to offer the following credential programs and to recommend candidates for the appropriate and related credentials upon satisfactorily completing all requirements:

- Preliminary Administrative Services
- Clear Administrative Services
- Preliminary Multiple Subject
- Preliminary Single Subject
- Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate
- Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs
- Autism Spectrum Disorders Added Authorization
- Reading and Literacy Added Authorization
- Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling
- Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology
- Speech-Language Pathology

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Christine Zeppos
Educational Consultant

Common Standards:

Kristin Stout
California State University, Long Beach

Joanne Van Boxel
Vanguard University

Staff to the Visit:

Hart Boyd
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Frances Kellar
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Programs Reviewers:

Kitty Fortner
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Shephanie Serventi
Loyola Marymount University

Mel Spence
California Lutheran University

Eugenia Mora-Flores
University of Southern California

John Erratt
Orange Unified School District (retired)

Veronica Escoffery Runnels
University of La Verne

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission
Program Review Submission
Common Standards Addendum
Program Review Addendum
Course Syllabi and Course of Study
Candidate Advisement Materials
Accreditation Website
Candidate Files
Program Matrices
Assessment Materials

Candidate Handbooks
Survey Results
Performance Expectation Materials
Precondition Responses
Performance Assessment Results and Analysis
Examination Results
Accreditation Data Dashboard
edTPA Data

Interviews Conducted

Constituencies	TOTAL
Candidates	111
Completers	58
Site Administration	9
Institutional Administration	5
Department Chairs	4
Program Coordinators	17
Faculty	48
TPA/APA Coordinators	4
Field Supervisors – Program	46
Field Supervisors – District	30
Fieldwork Partners	2
Credential Analysts and Staff	4
Advisory Board Members	16
Assessment Committee	2
Clinic Director	1
TOTAL	357

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed more than once due to multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background Information

California State University, East Bay (CSUEB) is located in Northern California's Bay Area. The Hayward Hills campus, on 342 acres, includes ten major buildings. In addition to its Hayward campus, CSUEB also has campuses in Concord, Oakland, and online. CSUEB offers 48 bachelor's degrees, 56 minors, 34 master's degrees, 23 credentials and certificates, and one doctoral degree. CSUEB is fully accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The university is organized into four colleges: Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS), Business and Economics (CBE), Science (COS), and Education and Allied Studies (CEAS). The university enrolled 12,323 students with 9,784 undergraduate students and 2,539 graduate/postbaccalaureate students in the fall of 2024. CSUEB is a federally designated Asian American, Native American, Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI) and Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) and has a student body comprised of 37.2% Latinx, 20.5% Asian, 16.3% white, 9.0% black, 4.8% multirace, 4.2% unknown, 0.8% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and 0.2% Native American students.

Education Unit

The CSUEB professional education unit consists of 11 Commission-approved programs, all of which are housed in the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS), with the exception of the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS), which houses the Speech-Language Pathology program. Within each college, CSUEB's credential programs are housed in four separate academic departments:

1. Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences (CLASS: Speech-Language Pathology)
2. Educational Leadership (CEAS: Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services)
3. Educational Psychology (CEAS: Mild to Moderate and Extensive Support Needs, Autism Spectrum Disorders, School Counseling, School Psychology)
4. Teacher Education (CEAS: Multiple and Single Subject, Reading and Literacy)

The mission of the CSUEB's education unit is to prepare collaborative leaders, committed to professional excellence, social justice, and democracy, who will influence a diverse and interconnected world. Additionally, the unit's vision strives to exemplify the ideals of social justice and democracy, distinguished by excellence in teaching, scholarship, vibrant programs, and graduates who are powerful actors in their communities. The following chart provides data on the number of program completers during the 2023-24 academic year and the number of candidates enrolled in the unit's programs during the current academic year, 2024-25. During the 2023-24 academic year, a total of 391 candidates completed credential programs. To date, 368 of the 2023-24 candidates applied for their credential(s) and were recommended by CSUEB. This academic year, 2024-25, there are 574 candidates enrolled in the unit's program.

Table 1: Enrollment and Completion Data

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2023-24)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2024-25)
Preliminary Administrative Services	16	65
Clear Administrative Services	3	0
Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern	61	48
Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern	157	253
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs	36	45
Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs	10	14
Autism Spectrum Disorders Added Authorization	0	1
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	32	34
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	17	12
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology, with Intern	12	17
Speech-Language Pathology	26	85

The Visit

This site visit was conducted virtually. Institutional and program constituencies were interviewed via technology. The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

PRECONDITION FINDINGS

After review of all relevant preconditions for this institution, all have been determined to be met.

PROGRAM REPORTS

Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject, with Intern

Program Design

The Preliminary Multiple Subject and Preliminary Single Subject credential programs at CSUEB are located within the Teacher Education Department (TED) of the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS). The TED chair has administrative authority over the multiple and single subject credential programs. The chair reports to the CEAS dean, who reports to the university provost. The multiple subject program coordinator and the single subject program coordinator report to the chair who oversees the programs, communicates with university supervisors and candidates, and serves as the edTPA Coordinator. There are three placement coordinators who report to the chair and work with districts and public charters to secure placements for candidates both locally and throughout the state. The TED has had a recent leadership change and has a new department chair as of the 2024-25 academic year along with other structural shifts with going from two single subject program coordinators down to one. Candidates, completers, and university supervisors all referenced their work with the two program coordinators and how much they rely on them for the success of the program.

Policies concerning the credential programs in the department are established through a process of shared governance both within the department and with input from associated school districts. Policies, program, edTPA data are discussed at monthly – and sometimes bi-monthly – department meetings which are made up of the TED chair, tenure/tenure-track faculty, adjunct faculty, and the multiple and single subject program coordinators. All participants who attend these meetings reported being able to provide feedback to make improvements and best support candidates. This past year the department has used the second meeting of the month as a working meeting for items such as working on the new literacy standards, preparing for the site visit, etc. Collaboration and involvement within the TED were common themes throughout the two programs and were confirmed during site visit interviews.

Recently, the TED has modified its external feedback mechanisms and has shifted from an annual advisory committee meeting to meeting individually with school partners. This was most evident through one of their residency partnerships. The TED will be assessing this structure for effectiveness in the coming year given the large number of districts and charters they work with in TED. All external constituents, including site administrators and cooperating teachers, reported the accessibility and responsiveness of the TED faculty and staff and felt supported in their working with the multiple and single subject programs.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The multiple and single subject programs are delivered in either a hybrid (in-person and online) or fully online format. The online courses are delivered in a synchronous method via Zoom. The online program serves candidates throughout the state of California. Local candidates in the Bay Area may enroll in either the online or hybrid format. Candidates have the option to pursue one of two pathways: traditional (student teaching) or intern. Both the multiple and single subject credential programs are 43 units and designed to be completed in one year in a cohort format that consists of three semesters (summer, fall, and spring). The placement coordinators facilitate the placements with districts and public charters for both student teaching and intern candidates. The placement coordinators are intentional when collaborating with districts and public charters to ensure placements are aligned with the TED's mission, vision, and goals and only place candidates at schools that meet this need.

When candidates first begin the program, an orientation is held and a handbook is provided to them. Candidates and completers generally reported that they were provided with tools and resources needed to be successful in the program including various checklists, document matrix, guidelines, and a calendar. Both the multiple and single subject program coordinators shared that they are continually collaborating together and refining the materials they provide candidates.

All Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) are confirmed as being covered in both the multiple and single subject programs. Even before current candidates and program completers were asked during the interviews about their knowledge of and experience with the TPEs, they referenced them in their responses to other questions, which demonstrates the success of the programs with covering them. Both the multiple and single subject programs have courses covering the following areas: foundational teaching, emergent bilingualism, literacy, technology, education, subject-specific methodology, and a seminar course. Candidates have three semesters of methodology courses over the arc of the program, which completers reported as being beneficial to their success. Some university supervisors reported wishing for more collaboration with professors to know what is being taught and when it occurs in coursework, while others reported regularly working with professors – specifically the methods professors – and are able to connect the course content to the candidates classroom experience and the feedback they provide them.

Candidates in both pathways have a university supervisor who is employed by CSUEB. Candidates have a cooperating teacher (mentor teacher) and interns employer-provided mentor (EPM), who are employees at their school site that support, mentor, and guide them. Candidates in both the student teaching and intern pathways meet the 600 hours of required supervised clinical experience. In the student teaching pathway for both the multiple and single subject programs, candidates have the following field experiences: 1) pre-admission they complete 45 hours in a school setting; 2) in the fall and spring semesters, they are required to spend five instructional hours per day, four days per week in their placement. Candidates begin by observing the classes taught by the cooperating teacher then gradually move into team-teaching during the instructional hours and are required to take over instruction for 2 weeks

(10 days) for a total of 300 hours each semester, 600 for the year. In the intern pathway, candidates complete the required 600 hours of supervised clinical experience as the full-time teacher of record and receive 144 hours plus 45 additional hours specific to the needs of English learners in mentoring and support – this is specified through an Individualized Intern Plan (IIP) that the intern, university supervisor, and EMP complete together.

The multiple and single subject program coordinators recently developed a TPE/TPA matrix. This is not only beneficial to meet general program goals for candidates being able to connect the TPEs to the edTPA and their coursework, but also when a candidate qualifies for the secondary passing option, the edTPA Coordinators and the candidate are able to immediately see how they met the requirement. One completer reported and others in the interview concurred that although the edTPA is challenging, they now see the benefits of completing it and using specific elements from the edTPA in their classrooms.

During interviews, candidates and completers confirmed completing end-of-semester course surveys as well as end-of-program surveys.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are continually assessed for program competencies and meeting the TPEs over the arc of the program via course assignments, signature assessments, field experiences, and the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA).

Both student teacher and intern candidates are observed by their university supervisor either in-person or by video in which a recording is sent to the university supervisor via GoReact. With either observation method, current candidates, completers, and university supervisors confirmed that university supervisors complete an evaluation that is shared with candidates shortly after observation. The observation form is currently being completed through a Google form, but next year the multiple and single subject programs will be switching to Canvas to submit these. When a candidate does a video observation, the university supervisor is able to add notes directly in the GoReact platform, providing feedback to candidates at a specific point in the video. Intern support hours and student teacher direct student contact hours are tracked in the Time2Track page. Two summative evaluations are completed and shared with candidates: one at the end of the fall semester and one at the end of the spring. At the end of each semester, the candidate, university supervisor, and the cooperating teacher or EPM meet to discuss the growth attained by the candidate over the semester at their placement.

All multiple and single subject candidates must pass a TPA prior to being recommended for their credential. CSUEB administers the edTPA to meet this requirement. Candidates submit the edTPA during their final semester in the program. Candidates are introduced to the edTPA during their first course in the summer, and it is covered throughout the duration of the program coursework. The courses that focus on the edTPA the most are the seminar courses in which the candidates are introduced and continually supported with the structural and organizational aspects of the edTPA, and the methods courses based on the specific subject area where specific support in that content area for the edTPA is supported.

During interviews, candidates discussed knowing and feeling comfortable in going to various individuals in the TED based on the situation if they are struggling (e.g., professors, university supervisors, program coordinators, etc.). The multiple and single subject program staff and faculty work collaboratively to assess the situation as a team, including working with the TED chair to determine the best course of action to support the candidate based on the needs. CSUEB also has a Student CARE Team network and process to support candidates for personal and mental health needs.

The overall feedback during interviews with employers, university supervisors, candidates, and completers suggests that the multiple and single subject programs are supportive and effective. This aligns with Commission completer survey results from 2020-24 in that completers reported that the programs were “very effective” or “effective” with an 80.9% combined rating for multiple subject and 77.6% combined rating for single subject.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Preliminary Single Subject programs.

Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs, with Intern

Program Design

The Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) and Extensive Support Needs (ESN) credential programs comprise the special education cluster in the Department of Educational Psychology (EPSY) in the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS). Other programs within EPSY are school counseling, school psychology, and marriage and family therapy.

The MMSN and ESN programs are fully online programs with courses offered in synchronous and asynchronous formats. The programs consist of two main pathways for the completion of clinical practice: traditional (student teaching) and intern. The traditional pathway includes candidates completing fieldwork as teachers of record as well as student teachers. The intern pathway is completed by candidates who hold intern teaching credentials issued by the Commission.

Three full-time faculty manage the program. There is a lead faculty member in the area of ESN and technology and a lead faculty member for MMSN, collaboration, transition, and secondary education. There is a program coordinator whose responsibilities include program management, faculty, schedules, and supervision.

EPSY program coordinators meet regularly with the meetings providing a time for program coordinators to share content and ideas for recruitment, retention, and assessment of

candidates. Program faculty utilize university email, meetings, and phone conversations to share resources including notifications about grading, deadlines, and schedules with adjunct instructors. Program faculty also utilize a shared Google Drive as a repository for program content and materials such as agendas and schedules.

Supervisor meetings are held twice a semester while the orientation for new supervisors is held each semester. Supervisors have access to resources in a shared supervision Google Drive containing resources and training materials, including a thorough supervision guide. Evidence from interviews and meeting agendas confirmed that the MMSN/ESN teams regularly meet and provide opportunities to discuss university, school, and program updates as well as clinical experiences, placements, data, program improvement, and future goals.

Constituents include program candidates, completers, district and Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) program specialists, directors of special education, university supervisors, and other district and county personnel. An advisory board, specific for special education constituents, meets at least once a year and provides valuable input to the program. Further, university supervisors often meet with district personnel when visiting sites to garner feedback. Information from these informal meetings is shared with program faculty. Other areas of collected constituent input include annual Commission program completer survey data, course evaluations, and fieldwork evaluations.

Interview evidence from community partners and special education advisory board members demonstrates a strong partnership with a culture of clear communication. Both internal and external constituents feel that CSUEB provides an open “two-way street” to elicit feedback. Constituents feel like valued members of the program with interviews providing a consensus that CSUEB does a “brilliant job in balancing the need to produce high-quality teachers and the reality of school support.”

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

All candidates in the MMSN/ESN programs complete the same coursework with intern candidates completing an additional course each semester of the internship that provides support and guidance for working out in the field.

Candidates complete four fieldwork experiences over the two-year program for a total of 820 hours. The first two experiences are considered early fieldwork and focus on observation and participation in a variety of school environments (150 hours). Two additional experiences comprise clinical practice (670 hours).

Program curriculum includes concurrent, sequentially organized coursework and fieldwork so that each semester of study builds upon prior semesters work, enabling candidates to develop increasingly complex skills as educators. Courses contain field-based assignments across service delivery models. These assignments enable candidates to implement practices from their coursework into the field. Coursework is appropriately rigorous and keeps up with current research in theory and practice. Interview evidence from external constituents consistently

reveals that they gain significant insights from CSUEB candidates who are perceived as "teacher leaders" that "stand out."

The fieldwork binder is a culminating project filled with assignments allowing candidates to bridge theory and application. The binder is compiled each semester and then submitted during a candidate's final year. All interviewed constituents indicated that program coursework has a direct and strong application to fieldwork activities, stating that the binder is essential for candidates to gain a clear understanding of classroom procedures and become more confident in the day-to-day work of a teacher.

Coursework spans across several critical areas: assessment, communication, autism, instructional strategies, etc. Evidence from interviews indicates a heavy emphasis on equity, inclusion, and cultural competency throughout all coursework and fieldwork activities. Evidence from Commission completer survey data show that the MMSN and ESN candidates feel prepared to teach in critical areas such as Specially-Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) strategies, differentiation, and assessment considerations for culturally and linguistically diverse students.

For the first fieldwork experience, candidates are guided by the course instructor for classroom observations. Candidates receive a university supervisor for the final three field-based experiences. During the second year of clinical practice, candidates are student teaching as a teacher of record (on permit or as an intern) or a student teacher.

For placements, candidates complete a request for a student teaching form. The program coordinator reviews requests and contacts districts/schools to work with the district/site administrators, checking for alignment of program requirements. Candidates who do not identify a district or school site are placed by the program coordinator at an appropriate site and with an identified mentor/cooperating teacher.

Though intern candidates may complete some of their fieldwork/student teaching requirements at their work sites, they are required to find additional settings to complete early fieldwork requirements such as appropriate general education and other special education environments. Candidates document their fieldwork requirements, noting activities from a custom activity log (e.g., using an IEP management system, implementing instruction) and document hours using Time2Track.

Evidence from interviews, clinical practice artifacts, and course syllabi demonstrate that candidates are placed in diverse settings and have the opportunity to work with a variety of disabilities, support needs, age ranges, and placement settings and that they feel exceptionally well-prepared to enter the field, noting their strength, deep understanding of their students and communities, and caring nature, emphasizing they are "not robots." Candidates further reported established clear expectations for clinical practice requirements. Further, intern candidates felt they were provided the appropriate release time to observe different settings and age and disability groups.

From the time they are admitted to the program, candidates are supported through cohort Canvas sites. The Canvas sites house cohort communications and materials (e.g., course schedules, orientation slides, forms, processes). In the field, candidates are assigned a fieldwork university supervisor with knowledge and experience working with students within the credential area. Often the supervisor remains with the candidate for the duration of the program. Candidates receive a minimum of six observation/consultation visits over the course of the semester. Observations may be in person or via an online platform (GoReact). Two of the six observation visits must be via GoReact but the other four are tailored to a candidate's needs. Interviews reported a robust observation cycle consisting of previewing and providing feedback on the lesson plan itself prior to delivering the lesson, tying observational feedback to TPE elements, and candidate self-reflection.

Interviews with constituent groups demonstrated a process to problem-solving and yielding systems of support: email the program coordinator who would investigate and either determine a solution or escalate to the program chair and/or complete a program improvement plan. While interviews corroborated a similar process for reporting an academic or field placement concerns, no one constituent group could describe the formal approach for documenting and following a chain of command to problem-solve challenges. Instead, the process appears to be more informal conversations. Further, current candidates were not aware of any formal process to document challenges with university supervisors, mentors, and/or cooperating teachers during their field placement. While most candidates reached out to a course instructor and or the program coordinator, a few did not reach out to anyone, reporting they did not know what to do when they encountered a problem within the field.

Data is collected via key course assignments, the fieldwork binder, and the fieldwork evaluation form. Assignments in the fieldwork binder are evaluated by both the course instructor and the university supervisor. In the field, candidates are evaluated by their supervisor on a semester basis using the fieldwork evaluation form. Interview data supports that performance data is shared with various constituent groups and analyzed by the special education team.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed via course signature assignments, field evaluation forms, self-reflection, and the CalTPA. Course instructors evaluate candidate's performance on the course and signature assignments. Key signature assignments are largely housed in the fieldwork binder. For fieldwork, university supervisors evaluate candidate performance with respect to the universal and authorization-specific TPEs using the fieldwork evaluation form at the end of each semester. This form follows the candidate and is used to monitor candidate progress towards meeting the fieldwork-based TPEs. Candidates who are student teachers are evaluated by the cooperating teacher in addition to the supervisor as a part of the three-way conference at the end of the semester. Candidates complete a self-assessment of their performance each semester, which is shared with the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher and often serves as a basis for discussion and goal setting. The final source of candidate evaluation comes from candidate performance on the CalTPA. Additionally, candidates are currently part of the pilot for the Literacy Performance Assessment (LPA).

Prospective candidates are first introduced to the assessment process as a part of the application interview, where faculty share information regarding the CalTPA, fieldwork requirements, and coursework. This information is repeated at the orientation session prior to the start of the first semester. Course instructors share information on coursework in syllabi, and all syllabi contain links to the universal and authorization TPEs. In fieldwork courses, the faculty member assigned to the fieldwork courses meets with candidates and explains the assessment process.

Candidates are informed of assessment results through course grades and fieldwork evaluations linked to the universal and authorization-specific TPEs. Further, all candidates have program roadmaps outlining credential requirements, with instructions, to track their progress. The candidate completion form for each program is shared with candidates throughout the program.

At the midpoint of the semester the program coordinator requests that faculty identify candidates who are not making adequate progress. The program coordinator and/or course faculty meet with the candidate to develop a support plan. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss/identify the elements/events impacting the candidate's performance. Ideas for mitigating these factors may be generated. The candidate may need a lighter course load, a change in fieldwork sequence, or a referral to Accessibility Services or to the Student Center for Academic Success for services. In extreme cases, candidates may receive a grade warning notice. Interview evidence demonstrates that candidates feel well supported, with the program providing multiple tiers of assistance (instructors, supervisors, program director) as well as support that is geared towards the needs of each candidate.

Candidates provide feedback regarding their fieldwork supervisor, the student teaching mentor/cooperating teacher, and placement at the end of each semester and are able to share their perspectives on their experiences and level of support (e.g., the appropriate number of observations occurred) provided by their university supervisor and cooperating teacher/mentor.

Interview results validate that candidates feel well supported in taking and passing programmatic and state assessments as well as feel supported by program personnel including supervisors, cooperating teachers/mentors, faculty, and program administration. Candidate confidence is increased in the completion of course assignments and supervised fieldwork experiences.

At the end of each semester, program faculty review and analyze collected data. Based on the content suggestions for fieldwork enhancements, changes or modifications are made. For example, the end-of-semester field placement surveys completed by candidates are used to further guide placement decisions and determine professional development opportunities for university supervisors. Collected and reviewed by the program director, these reviews are also integrated into the evaluation completed by the department chair. Interview evidence shows

that the program coordinator meets with supervisors who may be experiencing difficulties in supervision and/or receives poor evaluations.

Coordination and oversight of the CalTPA are shared by the program coordinator and the CalTPA course lecturer. Candidate placements allow for completion of the CalTPA cycles. The CalTPA is discussed during the application interview and in new student orientation. The CalTPA is mentioned by faculty throughout the program. Candidates complete two courses for CalTPA support during year two of the program. During interviews, candidates emphasized that these courses specifically outline assessment requirements, the appropriate use of materials, the appeal and remediation policies as well as provide clear expectations, a thorough review of the testing materials and prompts, and support for a clear understanding of scores received.

Candidates build knowledge and skills necessary for successful completion of the CalTPA throughout the program. While the CalTPA courses introduce candidates to all of the CalTPA specific information, candidates practice TPA skills in other courses and within the field, specifically in the creation of standards-based lesson plans. The use of GoReact is essential in preparing candidates to practice recording and annotating lessons. Further TPA support is offered via peer review and guidance. Candidates work in pairs and small groups as they complete coursework. Feedback to the candidates is provided to the candidate by their peers using the CalTPA rubrics as a basis for evaluation. Interview evidence demonstrates that candidates feel they can contact their CalTPA course instructor at any time if they need additional support beyond these provided measures.

Candidates who fail the CalTPA meet with the course instructor to review the scores obtained and create a plan for resubmission that highlights the areas where scores of 1 or 2 were earned. Candidates who earned several scores of 1 and 2 may need to complete a new lesson. Candidates may enroll in an assessment support course the following semester. In this course, the candidate will obtain additional content and activities designed to prepare them to successfully complete the CalTPA.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, intern teachers, faculty employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs programs **except for the following:**

Standard 4: Monitoring, Supporting, and Assessing Candidate Progress Towards Meeting the Education Specialist Credential Requirements – Met with Concerns

While interviews corroborated a similar process for reporting an academic or field placement concern, no one constituent group could describe the formal approach for documenting and following a chain of command to problem-solve challenges. Further, current candidates were not aware of any formal process to document challenges with university supervisors, mentors, and/or cooperating teachers during their field placement.

Preliminary Administrative Services

Program Design

The Preliminary Administrative Services credential program (PASC) at California State University, East Bay (CSUEB) is located within the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS) and the Department of Educational Leadership (DEL). The PASC program is led by the program coordinator in collaboration with the DEL chair, the Clear Administrative Services program coordinator, full-time faculty, coaches, adjuncts, site, district, and county office mentors and district partners to provide an ongoing support system for PASC candidates. CSUEB offers two PASC pathways: a stateside hybrid PASC program that meets at the main campus in Hayward and a satellite campus in Concord, and an online program that meets exclusively online.

The DEL chair and PASC program coordinator work alongside the full-time faculty, coaches, adjunct instructors, and district/site mentors to utilize regular and purposeful communication during scheduled meetings and emails to promote candidate progress. Collaborative PASC leadership activities include:

- Monthly department meetings, with PASC collaboration time for faculty cohort leaders, are used to consider syllabi, assignments, candidates, and program assessments
- Frequent meetings with fieldwork coaches and PASC instructors are used to develop common syllabi and course activities, ensure coordinated support of candidates, and discuss changes to curriculum, policies, expectations, and assessments
- Consistent monitoring of PASC candidate progress in fieldwork, cohort, and online courses
- Year-long PASC candidate preparation for the Center for Research, Equity, and Collaborative Engagement (CRECE) Leadership Institute
- Meetings with district leaders and DEL faculty
- District-partnered informational meetings to recruit highly qualified program candidates co-facilitated by the PASC coordinator and student credential services liaison

Constituents for the PASC program include faculty, candidates, completers, coaches, and representatives from local school districts and county offices of education. The structure of coursework and field experiences in the PASC program is evaluated by all constituent groups to ensure the program is meeting the needs of both candidates and the schools they serve. Document review and interviews confirm that all constituents have opportunities to provide feedback to the program for program improvement purposes. District partnerships and a newly formed advisory board focused on program improvement meet up to four times a year to review data and make recommendations to the program leads. Interviews with instructors confirmed that through informal opportunities as well as formal monthly meetings, they are provided with space for input in all areas of the program. The development, implementation, and evaluation of the PASC program is a collaborative effort between all members of the PASC community. In spring 2022, the DEL commissioned an annual survey of all program candidates and completers. The PASC faculty use the annual survey data in addition to candidate exit surveys and evaluations of PASC courses and coaches to set goals for program improvement.

Since 2020, the PASC faculty has facilitated listening sessions with the coaches and collaborated to revise the fieldwork.

Over the past two years, there have not been any structural changes; however, there will be modifications in the coming years due to fiscal changes happening in the university that will affect the CEAS and where the administrative services programs are located.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

A review of the course schedule and interviews with candidates, completers, and faculty verified that the sequence of coursework and its connection with fieldwork experience leads to eligibility for a Preliminary Administrative Services credential in two semesters. PASC candidates also have the option of continuing for a second year to complete a master's degree in educational leadership. The credential and degree programs are organized by cohorts which are facilitated by a cohort leader. Each candidate is supported by a cohort leader and their fieldwork supervisor (coach). A cohort leader is a member of the faculty who is responsible for the cohort's instruction and works closely with the coaches. A cohort is a group of educators who enter the program at the same time and take classes together as a group. Cohorts are designed to create communities of learners and leaders who can work together collaboratively, supporting each other during rich, intense experiences in professional growth. Professionals emerge from these cohort communities prepared to serve as abolitionist leaders. Candidates and completers in interviews indicated that they selected CSUEB's PASC program to pursue leadership development through the lens of social justice and equity.

PASC cohorts complete seven courses across the two-semester program. Candidates take three classes in the fall semester and four in the spring. Course materials and assignments support candidates in understanding leadership theory, offer practice in leadership activities, and provide opportunities to analyze leadership in the field. Course assignments and fieldwork activities are aligned to facilitate candidate experiences with an understanding of the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs), including critical engagement, and prepare candidates to complete the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA). Preparation for fieldwork activities and assessments begins in the cohort-based courses with the development of leadership theory and understanding. Candidates apply their understanding and skills to their fieldwork.

PASC candidates are credentialed, full-time employees in K-12 institutions where they work with diverse candidates and do not require field placements.

The PASC fieldwork practicum provides candidates with opportunities to participate in real-world, job-embedded experiences that are critical to their success as educational leaders for social justice. Fieldwork supports candidates in the completion of the CalAPA and is aligned with the CAPEs. Candidates participate in and complete all course activities for Fieldwork Practicum I (EDLD 695) in the fall semester and Fieldwork Practicum II (EDLD 696) in the spring semester. Fieldwork is supervised by a coach who is a veteran educational leader. Document review and interviews with coaches and candidates confirmed that fieldwork coaches are

assigned to specific cohorts and work closely with the cohort leader and a candidate's site/district mentor to facilitate leadership development. Interviews with candidates and coaches provided evidence that candidates meet with their coach monthly for support with their fieldwork activities, such as the three-way meeting, professional advising, and to process their leadership experiences through the individual induction plan (IIP).

A thorough review of the program handbook revealed supports and systems are in place to help struggling candidates in a variety of ways, from assessment and grade appeal to accessibility services and grievance processes.

Through document reviews and interviews with constituents, evidence revealed that processes are in place for the program to review assessment data and make programmatic improvements. Faculty interviews and advisory board interviews confirmed that data from all relevant program constituents are reviewed regularly and that recommendations are made to support program improvement.

Assessment of Candidates

Document review and interviews with coaches, faculty, and candidates confirmed that candidates are continually assessed for program competencies via course assignments and signature assessments including the following:

- Formative CAPE reflection
- Three-way CAPE candidate inventory (university coach, district mentor, and candidate) in the fall
- Reflections I-III
- CalAPA Leadership Cycle I presentation in the fall and the Fieldwork Activities
- Leadership Institute presentation
- CalAPA Leadership Cycles II and III
- Summative CAPE portfolio
- Final three-way CAPE candidate inventory conference in the spring

Evidence found in interviews with coaches, faculty, and candidates confirmed that candidates receive information about program requirements and assessments during the program orientation before classes begin. Candidate interviews and a review of course syllabi confirmed that at multiple points during each course, candidates are provided with detailed guidelines, rubrics, exemplars, and other resources to assist them with understanding and successfully completing the course and program assessments. Candidate interviews confirmed that all candidates know who to go to for assistance and that they receive consistent support from that person.

Interviews with faculty and candidates and review of syllabi confirmed that candidates receive a scored rubric with detailed feedback for key assessments. Not all candidates felt that the feedback was provided in a timely manner, but they all confirmed that they did receive feedback. Interviews and document review revealed that candidates receive instructor

feedback for all course assignments, and depending on the nature and complexity of these assignments, candidates may receive formative feedback and multiple opportunities to consult with program faculty as they work toward successful completion of the requirements.

A thorough review of the program handbook revealed supports and systems that are in place to help struggling candidates in a variety of ways, from assessment and grade appeal to accessibility services and grievance processes. Students have a direct contact with staff for admissions and registration support and report program needs to the program coordinator.

Interviews with the CalAPA coordinator confirmed that candidates in the PASC program must take and pass all three cycles of the CalAPA before they can be recommended or their Preliminary Administrative Services credential. Each candidate is given a copy of the CalAPA Leadership Cycle templates and assessment guides. Lessons dedicated to the CalAPA provide information about the exam, including performance assessment tasks and passing score standards.

Candidates have multiple opportunities to prepare for the CalAPA, including regular class presentations, work groups, class time with instructor support, and office hours. At the end of EDLD 600 and EDLD 694, candidates present their work in progress on the CalAPA Leadership Cycles to a group of their peers who offer critical feedback. CSUEB is in the process of developing ongoing remediation support and guidance to candidates who need additional support in preparing to complete the CalAPA. Candidates who need support on the CalAPA after graduation work with their former cohort leader.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Administrative Services program.

Clear Administrative Services

Program Design

The Clear Administrative Services credential program (CASC) operates within the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS) and the Department of Educational Leadership (DEL) with coordination among the CASC program coordinator, DEL chair, PASC program coordinator, full-time faculty, coaches, adjuncts, mentors, and district partners to provide an ongoing support system for ASCC candidates. Frequent and purposeful communication occurs based on scheduled meetings and shared commitments to candidate progress. Collaborative CASC Leadership Activities include:

- Monthly department meetings with collaboration time for faculty to consider syllabi, assignments, and candidate and program assessments
- Monthly meetings with CASC coaches to review candidate needs and progress

- Ongoing meetings and communications with fieldwork coaches and CASC and PASC instructors to ensure coordinated support of candidates and provide updates on any changes in standards, expectations, and assessments
- Monitoring (each semester) of CASC candidate progress in the field as well as seminar courses
- CASC candidate participation at the CRECE Leadership Institute that utilizes their expertise as discussants/facilitators of sessions examining current educational issues
- District leaders and DEL faculty meet with district partners to share current and former candidate work and gather input on curriculum and program design
- Informational meetings co-facilitated by the PASC and CASC coordinators, student credential services liaison, and supported by district partners to recruit highly qualified program candidates

A thorough review of the handbook and interviews with the program coordinator and DEL chair revealed that the coaching model used is transformative coaching. This CalAPA-aligned model focuses on effective school leadership, facilitating candidate reflection, and regular check-ins to ensure candidates are progressing in the leadership standards (CAPEs). The coaches co-developed the fieldwork with the CASC coordinator and PASC faculty and review every candidate's fieldwork. They offer advice for revision of submitted work and development of leadership skills.

A review of documents revealed the following qualification requirements are considered when hiring a coach for the CASC program: "The University coach focuses on coaching preliminary and clear administrative credential candidates. The expertise of a university coach should include understanding of current standards and policies governing K-12 education and credentialing, facilitating adult learning, effective coaching methodologies, conflict resolution, the practices and dispositions of equity-minded leadership, and evidence-based practices for leading the state's diverse PK-12 educational organizations." There have been no newly hired coaches since 2017 in the CASC program. Document review revealed that, when hired, the current set of coaches attended a three-day "Coaching for Equity" course through the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration (CAPEA) and followed up with an additional training one year later. While documents and interviews with program leadership revealed that ongoing professional learning was provided by the program coordinator, interviews with coaches highlighted that they felt the ongoing training to refine coaching skills is not clearly articulated.

Document review and interviews with program leadership and advisory board members confirmed that school districts throughout the Bay Area collaborate with the DEL to further develop the leadership capacity of their administrators to better serve students. District leaders provide input on curriculum and program design to the DEL chair, CASC and PASC coordinators, and cohort leaders. District leaders share university partnership goals with university coaches and site/district fieldwork mentors who support leadership development of CASC candidates. District leaders are invited to visit cohort classes to share expertise and provide feedback on district initiatives to further support district candidates. DEL faculty contribute significant

reform research (e.g., serving English learners, conducting collaborative inquiry for equity, STEAM, and the digital divide) to PASC course content and school district improvement efforts. The annual CERCE Leadership Institute is designed to offer multiple opportunities for aspiring and veteran administrators to learn, develop, and share effective leadership practices.

Interviews with candidates, faculty, and coaches confirmed that the program uses both formal and informal options to assess the quality of the coaches' services to the candidate. Candidates complete surveys designed to capture the effectiveness of their coach's work. Coaches receive feedback each year after the analysis of the surveys are completed. Additionally, coaches receive formal evaluations every three years, and these are used to support coaches in the services provided to the candidates.

Interviews with program leadership revealed that no major program modifications have taken place in the past two years. However, due to a fiscal situation at the university, changes will be made in the coming years to the CEAS and where the CASC program is located.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

A review of the program summary and supporting documents confirms that the CASC program is a field-based academic program that leads to a Clear Administrative Services credential in two years. Educational leadership candidates also have the option of completing a Master's in Educational Leadership and/or a Doctorate in Educational Leadership for Social Justice. The credential and degree programs within the DEL are structured in cohorts. A "cohort" is a group of professional educators who enter the program at the same time and are placed into a group for their core classes. Cohorts are designed to create communities of learners and leaders who can work together collaboratively, supporting each other during rich, intense experiences in professional growth. Professionals emerge from these cohort communities prepared to serve as transformational leaders.

Interviews confirmed that candidates work with a veteran educational leader (university coach). CASC leadership match coaches with CASC candidates through a process which considers the expertise and geographic work area of the coach and the needs and geographic work area of the candidate. The coach coordinates support with the site/district mentor. Candidates meet regularly with the coach to complete the fieldwork activities at their worksites. Interviews with CASC program leadership confirmed that coaches attend regular professional development throughout the year with the CASC core faculty and help develop the materials candidates use for fieldwork.

Interviews with coaches and candidates confirmed that coaches meet with their candidates regularly, typically in person; however meetings may occur virtually when needed. Interviews also revealed that coaches meet with candidates and their supervisors at the beginning and end of the academic/school year for a three-way meeting to discuss the candidate's proficiency/knowledge of the standards for educational leaders (e.g., CAPEs/CPSELs). Candidates share a letter with their supervisors regarding the program standards and requirements for successful completion of the program.

Interviews and a thorough review of documentation showed that CASC cohort leaders teach the four-semester course sequence and provide face-to-face and virtual times for candidates throughout the school year. Fieldwork and coursework assignments are aligned to build a candidate's experience with an understanding of the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL). Field experiences inform course discussions and assignments. A thorough review of syllabi, course assignments, and interviews with the faculty and candidates confirmed that course readings, activities, and assignments support candidates in conducting and analyzing their own leadership skills and understanding about their work as leaders. The CPSEL portfolio includes summative CPSEL reflections with artifacts/evidence from the field. Each seminar session focuses on the need to identify and better serve underserved student populations.

Interviews and a review of documents showed that the process of developing candidate professional growth goals on their IIP is driven by the coaching context of the CASC program alongside the faculty and the mentors. The 1:1 meetings, as well as the three-way meetings, are based on the candidate's IIP and focus on supporting leaders through current issues at their sites and the completion of the IIP and culminating documents. A review of documents shows that the program is structured to support a candidate's leadership development as they identify and plan for leadership tasks, implement their plans, receive feedback, and reflect upon next steps. These ongoing cycles of professional learning begin with the initial candidate assessment which serves as the foundation of a candidate's work to develop their leadership skills, knowledge, and capacity in relation to the CPSELs. Upon entry in the program, a meeting with the coach, mentor, and candidate is convened to develop the IIP. The key question addressed is what does the candidate need to know and be able to do in order to lead effectively in their current position? The university coach and site/district mentor monitor job-embedded tasks to determine if there are developments that should be incorporated into a candidate's IIP. They also collaboratively provide direct communication regarding a candidate's ongoing progress throughout the two years of administrator induction.

Document review and interviews with coaches and program staff confirmed there is a regular and timely process for advising and evaluation of induction work. All program constituents take part in the evaluation process through both formal and informal processes, and the program uses surveys, grades, formal and informal class discussion, and one-on-one conversations to collect data.

Interviews with coaches and candidates as well as documents reviewed confirmed that coaching activities and monthly seminars are aligned to address and assess candidate competence in relation to the CPSELs, as documented in first and second-year portfolios which include the IIP. Consistent coaching via face-to-face meetings, observation cycles, electronic conversations, role-play scenarios, analysis of written documents and communications, debriefing and planning sessions, supports individual candidates' acquisition of skills and understanding aligned to the CPSELs. A review of syllabi and interviews with candidates and faculty confirmed that monthly university seminars provide candidates with multiple opportunities to develop and demonstrate their knowledge of and leadership in the CPSELs

including role plays, critical friendship groups (job alike), promising practices presentations, class reflections, case study development, participation, and analysis.

Document review and interviews with constituents revealed that processes are in place for the program to review assessment data and make programmatic improvements. Faculty interviews and interviews with advisory board members confirmed that data is reviewed regularly and that recommendations are made to support program effectiveness.

Assessment of Candidates

Document review and interviews with faculty, coaches, and students confirmed that there are six critical assessment events in the two-year program:

- Year One
 1. Initial self-assessment and development of Individual Induction Plan (IIP)
 2. Mid-year candidate reflection on IIP progress
 3. End of first year IIP Portfolio (completion of three CPSELs)
- Year Two
 4. Revisions to self-assessment and IIP refinement and additions for the second year
 5. Mid-second year reflection on IIP progress
 6. Year two culminating IIP Portfolio – a portfolio (with artifacts) is submitted at the end of the year addressing all six CPSELs

Interviews and a review of documents confirmed that the portfolio documents the candidate's successful progress towards meeting program requirements, which includes the IIP with a description of progress and areas of growth to demonstrate the administrative and operational knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to effectively lead, manage, and improve educational organizations. The portfolio also includes artifacts to provide documentation of work completed in their administrative position. In the transition from year one to year two, coaches and university instructors review year one portfolios to ensure calibration of expectations for administrator proficiency in the standards. Year two plans may be adjusted based on this calibration as well as changes in administrator positions by the candidate. The portfolio is further developed in the second year and submitted mid-year to monitor progress towards completion. At the end of the second year, there is another three-way meeting with the coach, mentor, and candidate to review accomplishments and determine long-term professional learning goals.

A thorough review of the program handbook revealed supports and systems that are in place to help struggling candidates in a variety of ways, from assessment and grade appeal to accessibility services and grievance processes. Candidates have a direct contact with staff for admissions and registration support and report program needs to the program coordinator.

Evidence found in interviews with coaches, faculty, and candidates revealed that candidates receive information about program requirements and assessments during the program orientation before classes begin. Candidate interviews and a review of course syllabi confirmed

that, at multiple points during each course, candidates are provided with detailed guidelines, rubrics, exemplars, and other resources to assist them with understanding and successfully completing the course and program assessments. Candidate interviews confirmed that all candidates know who to go to for assistance and that they receive consistent support from that person.

Interviews and a review of documents confirmed that all final portfolios are reviewed and verified by university instructors, coaches, and the CASC coordinator to show program completion before recommending candidates for their clear credential.

Through document review and interviews with constituents, evidence revealed processes are in place for the program reviewing assessment data and making programmatic improvements. Faculty interviews and interviews with advisory board members confirmed that data is reviewed regularly and that recommendations are made to support program improvement.

Interviews revealed that the process for recommending candidates is the responsibility of the analyst for final review and recommendation of candidates for the clear credential. Interviews with the program coordinator revealed that in the final semester, candidates are contacted by email and in their Saturday Seminar class about how to proceed when applying for the clear credential.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, program coordinators, advisory board members, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **met** for the Clear Administrative Services program except for the following:

Standard 3: Selection and Training of Coaches – Met with Concerns

While documents and interviews with program leadership highlighted that ongoing professional learning was provided by the program coordinator, interviews revealed that coaches felt that ongoing training to refine their coaching skills was not clearly articulated or occurring.

Autism Spectrum Disorders Added Authorization

Program Design

The Autism Spectrum Disorders Added Authorization (ASDAA) program is one of the core components of the MMSN and ESN credential programs. These programs comprise the special education cluster in the Department of Educational Psychology (EPSY) in the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS). Other programs within EPSY are school counseling, school psychology, and marriage and family therapy.

The ASDAA program is a fully online and consists of specific courses with the MMSN and ESN programs. Courses are offered in synchronous and asynchronous formats and coursework occurs over two semesters.

Three full-time faculty and one lecturer faculty member manage the program. There is a lead faculty member in the area of ESN and technology and a lead faculty member for MMSN, collaboration, transition, and secondary education. There is a program coordinator whose responsibilities include program management, faculty, schedules, and supervision. The fourth lecturer provides instruction.

EPSY program coordinators meet regularly. These meetings provide a time for program coordinators to share content and ideas for recruitment, retention, and assessment of candidates. Program faculty utilize university email, meetings, and phone conversations to share resources including notifications about grading, deadlines, and schedules with instructors. Program faculty also utilize a shared Google Drive as a repository for program content and materials such as agendas and schedules.

Evidence from interviews and meeting agendas confirms that the ASDAA teams regularly meet and provide opportunities to discuss university, school, and program updates as well as data, program improvement, and future goals.

Constituents include program candidates, completers, district and Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) program specialists, directors of special education, university supervisors, and other district and county personnel. An advisory board, specific for special education constituents, meets at least once a year and provides valuable input to the program.

Interview evidence from community partners and special education advisory board members demonstrates a strong partnership with a culture of clear communication. Both internal and external constituents feel that CSUEB provides an open “two-way street” to elicit feedback. Constituents feel like valued members of the program with interviews providing a consensus that CSUEB does a “brilliant job in balancing the need to produce high quality teachers and the reality of school support.”

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The ASDAA program does not include fieldwork and no field placements take place. Candidates are completing this sequence of courses as part of their MMSN or ESN pathways. Individuals are eligible to enroll in the ASDAA stand-alone authorization if they received their mild to moderate credential prior to 2015, possess a learning handicapped credential, or possess an education specialist credential in another authorization area that previously did not have authorization for teaching K-22 students with autism. Candidates complete coursework assignments, which include field-based experiences, in each of the ASDAA identified courses. ASDAA candidates request admission through completion of a request form, approved by the program coordinator.

Coursework covers the following areas: characteristics of autism spectrum disorders, behavioral and mental health needs and supports, communication and technology, and instructional strategies for extensive support needs. Evidence from interviews indicates a heavy emphasis on equity, inclusion, and cultural competency throughout all courses. Evidence from Commission completer survey data show that the ASDAA candidates within the MMSN and ESN programs feel prepared to teach students with diverse learning needs.

Data is collected via key course assignments. Interview data supports that performance data is shared with various constituent groups and analyzed by the team.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed via formative and summative assessments embedded in course assignments. Candidates must maintain a “B” average in order to remain in the ASDAA program.

Prospective candidates are first introduced to the assessment process as a part of the admission process. Once enrolled, candidates are informed of the specific assignment requirements during each course, including assignment descriptions, due dates, grading rubrics, and avenue for feedback. Canvas is utilized for coursework structure and communication.

At the midpoint of the semester, the program coordinator requests that faculty identify candidates who are not making adequate progress. The program coordinator and/or course faculty meet with the candidate to develop a support plan. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss/identify the elements/events impacting the candidate’s performance. Ideas for mitigating these factors may be generated. The candidate may need a lighter course load or a referral to Accessibility Services or to the Student Center for Academic Success for services. In extreme cases, candidates may receive a grade warning notice. Interview evidence demonstrates that candidates feel well supported, with the program providing multiple tiers of assistance (instructors, program director) as well as support that is geared towards the needs of each candidate.

Candidates are able to provide feedback to the program via course evaluations.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Autism Spectrum Disorders Added Authorization program.

Reading and Literacy Added Authorization

Program Design

The Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA) is part of the Graduate Reading Program (GRP) offered through the Department of Teacher Education (TED) in the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS) at CSUEB. The program operates under university extension in a fully online format using both synchronous and asynchronous instructional methods. Beginning in the summer of 2025, the program will only offer a summer cohort. Previously, the program admitted a spring cohort as well. The program serves credentialed educators pursuing advanced preparation in literacy instruction. It is offered as a post-credential pathway. Candidates in the RLAA program who have not completed a minimum of three years of teaching experience as the teacher of record can complete the coursework but are not recommended for the RLAA until they have completed their teaching requirement. A program requirements checklist is completed throughout the program and is verified by the credential analyst prior to recommending a candidate for the authorization. The program does not include an intern option.

The RLAA program is part of the GRP with an authorization only option and a master's degree option through extended coursework. The RLAA program coordinator reports directly to the TED chair and attends monthly TED program/faculty meetings. Faculty meetings include program updates, data dives, and program improvement discussions. Meeting agendas and minutes show the use of TED meetings to support the RLAA program. The TED chair and program coordinator confirmed that the RLAA program has become a more integral part of TED and is working directly with the program coordinator on program improvement efforts. The RLAA program coordinator further collaborates with the credential analyst housed within the Credential Student Services Center (CSSC), which reports to the associate dean of CEAS.

The RLAA program coordinator makes policy and program recommendations in collaboration with GRP faculty and the TED chair. Both the program coordinator and chair work closely with the CSSC to ensure credentialing requirements are met. Because the RLAA program is operated by university extension, the faculty for the program are all adjunct faculty with the exception of the program coordinator who is also faculty in the program. Due to course load restrictions, full-time faculty are not able to teach in extension. All RLAA adjunct faculty have regular one-on-one meetings with the program coordinator to review data and engage in planning discussions to maintain alignment across courses and fieldwork components. There are no set monthly meetings due to adjunct faculty workload; however, all faculty confirmed regular meetings and a consistent semester check-in meeting. As part of a new community partnership for the practicum experience, the program coordinator has begun regular meetings with

school-based partners to develop a literacy lab where candidates are now completing their practicum experience. Adjunct faculty teaching classes that align with the practicum course are part of literacy lab planning meetings and provide feedback to improve the practicum experience. All adjunct faculty felt they have been an integral part of program improvement efforts and are consulted frequently about program revisions.

The RLAA program gathers input from multiple constituencies including TED and GRP faculty, current candidates, completers, and school district representatives. Input is formally integrated through the TED meetings, which meet monthly to discuss program goals, effectiveness, and potential improvements. Candidates complete course evaluations which are reviewed by the program coordinator and shared with adjunct faculty during one-on-one meetings. Candidates and program completers shared that, along with the course evaluations, the faculty and program coordinator have an open door policy, and they have frequently provided feedback on the program. Starting in the spring of 2025, candidates will complete an end-of-program exit-survey. This data will further serve as input for ongoing program improvement. All of these committees serve as an essential feedback loop supporting ongoing program development and responsiveness to field needs.

The program has entered a new partnership with a local elementary school for candidates to complete fieldwork requirements. The community engagement specialist and the family engagement, outreach, and equity specialist meet with the RLAA program coordinator to plan the partnership and review program requirements and school needs. This is a new program partnership, therefore, the input opportunities are new. However, partners confirm that student data is presented to the RLAA program coordinator to plan for the upcoming semesters.

Over the past academic year, the program has implemented a variety of modifications including strengthening culturally and linguistically responsive practices into coursework, a new fieldwork partnership, new supervision requirements, a summer only start to the program, upcoming formal support systems and new program supervision guidelines and personnel. The EDUC662 signature assignment was changed to include a specific focus on the science of reading, supporting the needs of multilingual learners and the culture of literacy. The research conducted in EDUC662 is used to develop lessons that are implemented as part of the practicum course. Clinical practice was completely changed this year through a partnership with a local elementary school. All candidates complete their fieldwork once a week in the evenings with students from the partnership school learning lab. These tutoring sessions focus on RLAA candidates monitoring students' literacy development, implementing a research-based curriculum on foundation skills, assessing students, and preparing ongoing lessons to meet the needs of the students. Starting with the summer 2025 cohort, candidates will meet the clinical practice requirement of experiences with PK-3 and 4+ students by completing coursework-related fieldwork in their own classrooms and practicum assignments at the learning lab will be with the "other" required grade span. Completers agreed that in the past there was not a specific grade-span requirement and all fieldwork was completed with any student or class to meet the required assignment. Current candidates shared that fieldwork was completed with

students in two different grade spans within two years of one another. For example, a TK teacher tutored a 2nd grader in a learning lab and a 7th grade teacher tutored a 4th grader. Though two different experiences, they do not meet the standard requirement of a PK-3 and a 4+ fieldwork experience. Therefore, starting with the summer 2025, cohort the expectations for fieldwork will be revised as noted.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Candidates are “supervised” by their faculty members through fieldwork-related course assignments across all courses in the program. Completers and current candidates shared that all feedback was evaluated using rubrics and followed up by one-on-one faculty meetings as needed. Current students shared that observations happened once by the program coordinator as part of the practicum course. Adjunct faculty and the program coordinator shared that in the future, formal observations of teaching will take place twice a semester by program supervisors as part of the practicum course. Program leadership confirmed there will be supervision changes coming, including the frequency of observations and hiring two new supervisors for the program.

The RLAA program requires the completion of six courses (14 units) over the course of one year, starting in the summer. All classes are online, including the clinical practice requirement in the spring through the learning lab. Each semester candidates take two classes, starting with foundational classes in reading, writing, culturally responsive teaching, science of reading, foundational skills, and cultural literacy, followed by courses that focus on assessment and intervention and ending with a practicum course. Fieldwork is embedded throughout the program in relevant courses. Candidates complete a range of signature assignments utilizing their own classrooms and in the final semester of the program complete a formal fieldwork placement requirement through the learning lab.

Critical areas are covered throughout the program and the respective courses where they are learned, reinforced, and assessed. This includes literacy assessment and intervention in TED663 and 664. Candidates are required to learn about, administer, analyze, and plan with a range of literacy assessments, including school-based assessment measures. Program completers shared that they have learned and implemented a broad range of literacy assessments, planned using data, and implemented literacy plans to support students in the field. Reading and writing comprehension strategies are reviewed in depth in TED 660 and 661 which are foundational courses that also require candidates to complete fieldwork where they demonstrate their ability to plan for reading and writing instruction and reflect on their own planning and implementation. The focus of the signature assignment in TED662 was updated to concentrate on equity and diversity in literacy instruction. This assignment requires reflective practice of their own school’s practices in literacy equity and their own personal philosophy of the intersections of equity, literacy, and the science of reading. A core focus of the TED662 class is on diversity and literacy instruction for English learners with ongoing integration of ELD across all TED courses. The program continues into the second and third semester with signature assignments that focus on action research and evaluation in literacy. The assessment class does a deep dive in administration and evaluation of student data followed by instructional plans

that are implemented and reflected upon to determine students' next steps in literacy development. The practicum course, in partnership with the learning lab, provides one-on-one tutoring in literacy by RLAA candidates. Site administrators, including the principal and program specialists, have seen the positive impact of the tutoring sessions on their school community. Data from the literacy labs is collected and will be shared with the school and the RLAA program coordinator.

The RLAA candidates are classroom teachers and therefore are not provided a district-employed supervisor/cooperating teacher. Candidates are closely supported by university faculty who serve as clinical supervisors during the practicum experience. In the final semester of the program, specific fieldwork requirements are submitted and evaluated to provide detailed feedback to candidates including:

- Lesson Planning and Instructional Implementation: Candidates develop a comprehensive diagnostic case study and design intervention lesson plans for a student in need of literacy support. The identified student must be from a different grade level or class than the candidate's current teaching assignment, ensuring a broadened range of application and field exposure. Completers shared that this was a recommendation and not a requirement in the past. Starting with the summer 2025 cohort this will be required by all candidates.
- Assessment and Reflection: Candidates maintain an intervention hours/activity log, documenting 10–15 intervention sessions throughout the semester. Faculty review this log as part of the evaluation process to ensure candidates are engaging in sufficient and meaningful instructional practice.
- Capstone Case Study: Candidates complete a comprehensive diagnostic report on the selected student. This includes assessment data, instructional recommendations, and an analysis of intervention outcomes. The final case study is aligned with real-world reporting standards and adapted for multiple audiences (e.g., educators, parents, administrators).
- Feedback Frequency and Type: Faculty provide feedback at multiple points — on lesson plans, diagnostic assessments, and intervention reflections. Feedback is both formative (guiding instructional planning and revision) and summative (assessing candidate proficiency against program standards). This includes detailed rubrics, written comments, and one-on-one consultation as needed. Starting with the summer 2025 cohort, two formal observations in their learning labs will be conducted by a university supervisor who may also serve as the faculty member for the practicum course. Faculty supervisors use a standardized practicum observation rubric to evaluate each recorded lesson, providing clinical feedback and assigning grades. These evaluations focus on the candidate's instructional decisions, responsiveness to student needs, and application of evidence-based literacy strategies.

Previously, current students were observed once by the program coordinator as part of the practicum course. Currently, if candidates are struggling in a course they speak with their respective faculty members. If there are ongoing concerns, the candidates reach out to the program coordinator for support. Completers shared that this was their understanding of the

support system but that it was an informal, assumed process. A formal support system process is not currently in place, as was confirmed by the program coordinator, program completers, current students and the TED chair, but it will be developed as part of a program handbook that will be presented at the candidates initial orientation starting with the summer 2025 cohort.

Each of the six courses include signature assignments, including fieldwork assignments. The data is reviewed by the faculty of the courses. The program coordinator meets with the program faculty to discuss candidate needs and program concerns. As a result of current candidate data, the program implemented a new practicum learning lab in partnership with a local elementary school. The new partnership allows faculty to monitor candidate learning of the diagnostic, evaluation, teaching, and reflective process. All candidates complete practicum fieldwork through the learning lab. Student literacy data has been collected and will be reviewed with site-based administrators and the RLAA program coordinator during their end-of-semester meeting to plan for the next cohort.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are informed about all required assessments in their courses. Completers shared that they learned about broader program requirements from the program website and got more specific information when they started their classes from their faculty members. The start of a program orientation began with the current student cohort. During the orientation, candidates were able to meet the program faculty and learn about the program design. Personal emails and one-on-one meetings with the program coordinator followed the orientation to help students register for their classes. The same one-on-one process continues each semester with the program coordinator.

As part of coursework, candidates complete signature assignments that are reviewed in their respective classes and evaluated by the course instructor using rubrics. At the end of the program, the Credential Student Service Center (CSSC) uses an electronic candidate progress monitoring documentation system. A checklist of RLAA program requirements are checked by the CSSC prior to recommending the candidate for the authorization.

The RLAA program coordinator is responsible for monitoring candidate concerns or challenges in the program. Candidates are encouraged to email the coordinator and she works one on one with the candidate to determine needed accommodations or next steps. Program completers and current candidates reinforced the importance of the role of the program coordinator. They were able to reach the coordinator at any time and had individual meetings as needed. The program coordinator confirmed that all candidate needs and concerns are addressed to her but that all course-specific concerns are reported to the faculty of the course. All course assessments are evaluated by the faculty, and candidates work directly with their faculty members if they are struggling. Program completers shared the successful feedback loop with faculty and the clarity of working closely with their faculty members on course-specific questions and challenges. A formal support system, when candidates are struggling, is not currently in place. Informally, candidates understand that they can go to the program coordinator at any time.

Program completers confirmed that the main point of feedback is through course evaluations and direct communication with faculty and the program coordinator. Formal program feedback was not in place at the time but since then, a formal end-of-program survey is being used for program feedback. Data from the survey will be shared as part of faculty meetings with the coordinator for program improvement and at the TED monthly meetings.

In addition to regular faculty meetings, the program coordinator meets with the school-site partners at the beginning and end of the spring semester to plan the literacy labs (clinical practice experience in practicum) and to review student literacy data to review and revise practicum requirements for the next cohort.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization program **except for the following**:

Standard 4: Integrating Curriculum through Fieldwork – Met with Concerns

The program standard requires that candidates will work with individuals and/or small groups of students at both early (PreK-3) and intermediate (4th grade and up) levels of literacy acquisition. Based on document review and interviews with program completers, candidates, and program leadership, evidence of the current implementation of this portion of the standard was not found.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling

Program Design

The Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling program (SCP) at CSUEB is situated within the Department of Educational Psychology (EPSY) in the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS). This program offers three distinct outcomes: comprehensive coursework leading to a Master of Science in Counseling, specialized preparation for the SCP credential, and clinical training designed to meet the requirements for Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT) associate licensure as established by the California Board of Behavioral Sciences.

Grounded in the standards set forth by the Commission and aligned with the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) national model, the program emphasizes the development of academic, career, and social-emotional competencies in candidates. Central to the program is a strength-based approach that prioritizes the cultivation of candidate content knowledge, professional skills, and programmatic dispositions.

The SCP operates as a field-based model offering two pathways: the traditional school counseling pathway and the fieldwork/internship pathway. Both pathways are offered exclusively at the CSUEB campus. The program aligns with both the college and university missions by promoting data-driven, comprehensive school counseling practices that advance

equity, inclusion, and diversity for all students and their families. It is accredited by and adheres to the standards set forth by the Commission as well as the statutes and regulations of the Board of Behavioral Sciences.

The SCP is co-coordinated by a program coordinator and the department chair, both of whom are responsible for overseeing program operations. The program coordinator specifically is responsible for the operation of the SCP and reports to the EPSY department chair. The program coordinator is responsible for course scheduling, facilitating communication between faculty and candidates as well as between the program and partnering school districts, collecting student learning outcome data, and supporting the facilitation of training activities. Administrative oversight of the program is provided by the department chair and the CEAS dean.

Leadership demonstrates a clear recognition of the importance of addressing both programmatic and candidate needs. As a result, the leadership team consisting of the SCP coordinator, EPSY chair, and school psychology coordinator meet weekly to review training curriculum, candidate progress, and program development. Additionally, EPSY faculty meet semi-monthly for department meetings to discuss training updates, issues of continuous improvement, ongoing program needs, and event planning. Evidence shared by the EPSY chair also indicates that CEAS faculty attend quarterly meetings of the Campus Committee on Professional PK-12 Education. Communication with the institution at large, regarding annual student learning outcomes and program changes, is facilitated by the department chair and coordinator through attendance at the university's annual Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) report.

Candidates are recognized as key constituents in the program's ongoing improvement efforts. Regular communication is maintained through the CSUEB's learning management system and email, providing timely updates on program announcements, training resources, required forms, surveys, evaluations, and information requests. Candidates expressed that their feedback is acknowledged and considered by both the SCP coordinator and faculty. This engagement occurs through direct communication with the program coordinator, as well as through scheduled cohort meetings designed to gather input on candidate needs and concerns. Additionally, candidate perspectives are actively solicited through quarterly course evaluations and annual program evaluations, which encompass coursework, university supervision, and advisory support.

Similarly, the SCP actively seeks feedback on training and program effectiveness from external constituents including field-based supervisors, school district coordinators, and lead counselors. This feedback is facilitated through annual site supervisor orientation meetings, periodic candidate placement discussions, and routine check-in conversations. Formal input regarding program improvement and candidate skill development is gathered during the fall and spring terms when site supervisors complete candidate evaluations. These practices were confirmed through constituent interviews which highlighted that communication between the program and its partners is open and reciprocal.

At present, the program is working to reestablish its advisory committee. While this committee has not been fully constituted, the SCP program coordinator reported that feedback received from district partners and site supervisors during the above noted meetings has been valuable in guiding decision-making and supporting the program during its current period of transition. Over the past two years, the SCP has undergone two modifications. The first pertains to program leadership: a new program coordinator was appointed in 2023 to lead the program. The second change involves the program of study. Prior to fall 2023, SCP candidates had the option to pursue a part-time pathway, allowing them to complete the master's degree and school counseling credential over three years, including summer coursework. This part-time option is no longer offered. Candidates are now required to complete the study program within a two-year period. Based on feedback from the end-of-program survey and group advising meetings, candidates expressed a need for earlier notification and additional resources related to the Praxis exam. In response, the program coordinator implemented changes to provide timely information and enhanced support to better prepare students for the exam.

A complete review of program documents, along with interviews of candidates, faculty, field supervisors, and administrators, provides evidence of a structured credential program. Current candidates and program completers report feeling prepared for field placements and professional counseling roles in schools, attributing their readiness to the instruction, fieldwork experiences, and applied knowledge acquired during their time in the program. Candidates consistently highlighted the quality fieldwork experience and expressed appreciation for the support and mentorship provided by faculty during this transition period and their respective fieldwork site supervisors.

Feedback from fieldwork site supervisors, lead school counselors, and district-level counseling coordinators indicated that candidates consistently demonstrate the ability to provide meaningful services to children, families, and school staff. They also noted that candidates exhibit good collaborative consultation skills and effectively integrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions in real-world educational settings.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Course alignment is an integral part of the SCP's admissions process. Based on the reviewed materials, prospective candidates are required to complete one prerequisite course prior to beginning graduate-level coursework. This course must be completed with a grade of "B" or higher; otherwise, the candidate must retake it before entering the program. For admission to the SCP with an option in MFT, a three-unit course in Introduction to Statistics and Probability is also required. The program provides a list of approved prerequisite courses for prospective candidates to reference during the application process.

Upon admission, candidates engage in a comprehensive sequence of coursework, fieldwork, and experiential learning at the Community Counseling Center (CCC). Through these experiences, candidates develop essential counseling competencies that enable them to collaborate effectively within and beyond school communities, promote inclusive and

meaningful student participation, and demonstrate a sustained commitment to ongoing professional growth.

The SCP is a 60-unit degree and credential. Courses are developmentally sequenced to support candidate development of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required by the program standards and the ASCA national model.

The program is strongly fieldwork oriented, with coursework intentionally designed for implementation in real-world educational settings. Faculty members tailor learning experiences to match a candidate's developmental readiness, offering progressively challenging and complex assignments as candidates advance through the program and deepen their training. Current candidates emphasized the essential role of fieldwork, noting that completing assignments in school environments allowed them to connect classroom theories with practical application. These insights from candidates and site supervisors underscored the value of field-based learning.

SCP candidates are required to complete a minimum of 800 hours of fieldwork over the course of the program. Candidates pursuing the MFT option must complete an additional 225 hours focused on social-emotional development and client-centered advocacy. During their first year, SCP candidates must complete 300 hours within a PK-12 school setting (elementary or middle school), where they gain knowledge and demonstrate skills through activities such as implementing guidance lessons, conducting case studies, and collecting data to assess the effectiveness of their services.

In the second year, SCP candidates are required to complete 500 fieldwork hours (middle or high school setting), including hours dedicated specifically to providing direct and indirect services to students in the PK-12 setting. In addition to continuing activities similar to those in the first year, second-year candidates must also dedicate 75 hours to academic counseling, 75 hours to college/career counseling, 75 to social/emotional well-being, and 150 working with diverse populations. Client advocacy and social justice and democracy remain a critical component of fieldwork with an emphasis on serving students or clients from culturally diverse backgrounds.

To ensure the quality of fieldwork, the provision of professional supervision, and a breadth of diverse experiences, the SCP has established a required placement process. A pre-approved list of site agreements, or memoranda of understanding (MOUs), is maintained with a wide range of diverse school districts across the region. Many of the potential site supervisors are graduates of the program which positively effects alignment between fieldwork experiences and program expectations.

Additionally, the fieldwork coordinator collaborates closely with candidates to identify schools and supervisors that meet the program's training criteria. First-year and continuing candidates are required to submit placement request forms and have the option to select field placement or internship sites from the approved list of schools. Candidates wishing to pursue placement at

a school outside the approved list may do so through a process referred to as "pioneering" within the CEAS. Pioneering allows candidates, with coordinator approval, to establish a new MOU site. Once a fieldwork site is confirmed, candidates must submit all required placement verification forms including supervisor contact information, work schedules, and other pertinent documentation.

During the program coordinator interview, it was clear that fostering sound professional values, alongside the development of professional knowledge, is a central priority. To support this goal, the SCP emphasizes the importance of supervision. Candidates receive weekly supervision from both their site supervisors and university supervisors in addition to group advising from the program coordinator. Faculty provide annual feedback on each candidate's academic progress and professional dispositions throughout the program and fieldwork experience. During fieldwork, site supervisors complete evaluations for first and second-year candidates at the end of each semester, using the respective first-year fieldwork evaluation and second-year advanced fieldwork evaluation forms. Evaluation data is then aggregated and analyzed to inform program improvements and enhance candidate learning.

Effective communication between university supervisors and site supervisors is vital to the success of the SCP. Each fall, the SCP holds a supervisor orientation meeting, where supervisors review the supervisor handbook, discuss best practices in supervision, are able to ask questions, and clarify their roles. Supervisors also formally acknowledge their understanding of supervisory responsibilities and program requirements by signing the supervisor agreement form.

Interviews with site supervisors and a review of the handbook confirmed that communication channels are in place. These supervisors reported knowing the appropriate protocol for contacting university supervisors should dispositional or other candidate issues arise, ensuring a mutually beneficial experience for both candidates and partnering districts. Formal communication begins with calls and emails at the start of each semester, with additional formal check-ins occurring at least twice per semester to monitor candidate progress and address any concerns, supplemented by informal contact as needed.

In support of candidates who may experience challenges with coursework or clinical practice, the program provides ongoing feedback through the mechanisms previously described and promotes a candidate's ability to self-evaluate. The goal of the SCP is to support and ensure that trainees develop and demonstrate professional competence in program standard skills and in program dispositions. Accordingly, the faculty work together and use a three-part plan to support candidates who have experienced academic or professional challenges.

The program coordinator, instructors, and faculty work collaboratively to review student progress. Academic concerns are initially addressed between the candidate and the course instructor. For more serious issues, the program coordinator meets with the candidate, and if necessary, a support and remediation plan is developed. This process is applied consistently whether concerns arise in coursework or at the fieldwork site.

If a supervisory concern arises, the university supervisor initially contacts the site supervisor to address the issue directly. If further intervention is needed, the program coordinator becomes involved to facilitate resolution. Should concerns regarding supervisory effectiveness or relational dynamics remain unresolved, the program coordinator collaborates with district placement coordinators to identify and secure a more appropriate supervisor for the candidate.

When concerns arise regarding a candidate's competence, the first step involves directly communicating the issue, identifying specific standards of concern, and providing clear direction to support the development of skill competence. Following this, the university supervisor, site supervisor, and candidate collaboratively engage in goal-setting discussions aimed at addressing the identified concerns. If the issues pertain to professional dispositions, faculty offer targeted feedback highlighting both strengths and areas for improvement to guide goal development. Should academic or professional competency not be demonstrated after a semester of this initial intervention, the program coordinator, along with another faculty member, meets with the candidate to establish a more comprehensive remediation plan. This plan may include adjustments to field placement, additional formative folio or professional portfolio casework, or the extension of training through an additional semester, depending on the nature of the concern.

During this process, a remediation support plan can be developed by the program coordinator and faculty team. The plan could include a candidate retaking a course or being placed on academic probation until the issue is remediated. After the remediation plan is developed, the remediation support tracking plan document is used to monitor candidate progress. Candidates who do not successfully remediate aptitude, academic, or dispositional issues may be counseled out of the program.

During an interview with the program coordinator, it was evident that the program works closely with the candidate to address issues before they rise to the level of the remediation plan. When asked about available support and what the steps there are to acquire support for themselves or a colleague, candidates noted that faculty advising would be the first step they would take due to the fact that program faculty members are consistently responsive to emails and phone calls and impromptu meetings after class.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidate performance is based on multiple assessments beginning with admission and continuing throughout the program during appropriate transitions and at the completion of the program. School counseling program standards and the ASCA national model and school counselor professional standards and competencies are integrated into the program curriculum.

Both formally and informally, candidates receive evaluations from site and university supervisors. Additionally, each candidate is assessed through the professional practice portfolios and the Praxis II exam in school counseling.

Throughout the program, candidates are guided to become self-reflective practitioners who advocate for, develop, and evaluate counseling and educational practices that support academic achievement, community engagement, and social justice. SCP candidates are assessed in three key areas: academic performance, clinical aptitudes, and professional dispositions. These expectations are clearly outlined in the program handbook and thoroughly explained to candidates. Additionally, assessment requirements are communicated during initial program orientation, reinforced each fall semester, and reviewed in class, ensuring candidates remain informed throughout their progression in the program.

Academic performance reflects the integration of knowledge, attitudes, and skills required to meet course objectives, with candidates demonstrating proficiency through key indicators such as maintaining a grade of “B” or higher in all coursework and active participation in class. Clinical aptitude is essential for recommendation for the school counseling credential and the associate MFT registration. This is demonstrated through competencies such as micro-counseling skills, case conceptualization, and cultural responsiveness. Similarly, professional dispositions, also required for credentialing and registration, are reflected in a candidate’s demonstration of attributes such as integrity, empathy, and a commitment to social justice and democracy.

Additional candidate assessments occur during the fieldwork component of the program through self-evaluations, where candidates reflect on their clinical aptitudes and professional dispositions. The purpose of these evaluations is to assist candidates in tracking their progress and fostering self-awareness. Candidates share their reflections with both site and university supervisors throughout the practicum experience. In parallel, site supervisors conduct mid-term and final evaluations of candidates. To receive course credit and be recommended for the school counseling credential and/or associate MFT registration, candidates must achieve a minimum passing score of “satisfactory” on all competencies in the final evaluation. University supervisors also assess candidates using the Counselor Competencies Scale (CCS) which requires a minimum proficiency score of 6 across all sections.

At the conclusion of the program, candidates complete a series of self-assessments, program surveys, and placement surveys in the spring prior to graduation. The exit survey verifies the completion of all program requirements, while the field placement survey evaluates the quality of the candidate’s fieldwork experience. This feedback is used by the SCP to inform future placement decisions. Additionally, candidates complete an end-of-program survey to evaluate their overall experience in the program. According to the program coordinator, feedback from the end-of-program and field placement surveys has proven valuable in identifying candidate needs and facilitating timely program improvements.

During interviews, candidates reported that during the most recent leadership transition, communication challenges arose, and they felt they had insufficient notice regarding the change. However, they also shared that once the new program coordinator assumed leadership, communication significantly improved. Candidates expressed appreciation for the

opportunity to voice their opinions and concerns openly, noting that the surveys required helped them feel heard and supported.

In addition to completion of the professional practice portfolio, second-year candidates complete an exit interview with program faculty. The interview involves a collaborative dialogue and provides the candidate with a platform to share evidence of their professional growth and the impact they have had the schools where they served during their two years within the program. The professional practice portfolio includes key assignments and evidence of candidates' professional development, illustrating their practice and competence as a beginning school counselor.

Candidates and completers report a clear understanding of assessment requirements and expectations. During interviews, candidates indicated that both faculty and the program handbook prepared them at each level of the assessment process. Both groups reported that they felt confident in their understanding of program requirements for matriculation in and completion of the program.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling program.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology, with Intern

Program Design

The Pupil Personnel: School Psychology program at CSUEB is housed in the Department of Educational Psychology (EPSY) within the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS). The program is certified by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and offers rigorous studies toward the Master in Science (MS) in Counseling, professional training toward school psychology credential, and clinical training and experience toward the Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT) license specified by the California Board of Behavioral Sciences.

The program, although multidisciplinary, is a three-year, full-time specialist-level school psychology program. The core training is in school psychology with integrated training in counseling and MFT. The training philosophy of the program is to train and prepare graduate students/candidates to become credentialed school psychologists who demonstrate skill, knowledge, and competency in the NASP 2020 training standard domains and school psychology performance expectations.

Candidates enter the program in the fall semester and follow one pathway (intern) as a cohort toward the MS counseling degree, school psychology credential, and hours and training toward the MFT licensure.

The coordinator of the school psychology program is responsible for program operations, including course scheduling, advising, admissions, faculty-student communication, field placement, faculty/staff concerns, program-district communication, student outcome learning data collection, and facilitation of training. Administrative oversight of the program rests with the EPSY chair and the CEAS dean. The program coordinator meets weekly with the school psychology faculty and additional meetings with the counseling faculty/department chair. There are monthly collaborative meetings with department program coordinators. Ongoing meetings occur with credential and office staff to support candidate credential recommendation and program completion.

The program communicates with candidates primarily through the university's learning management system and email, providing announcements, training resources, required forms, and requests for information. District-related updates are also shared through these channels. Within the college, the coordinator collaborates with other programs by attending quarterly meetings of the Campus Committee on Professional PK-12 Education. At the institutional level, the coordinator submits annual student learning outcomes and program updates through the university's Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) report.

The school psychology program collaborates with community partners to prepare candidates for careers in the field. At the start of each academic year, initial meetings with field supervisors and district coordinators are held to review field-based requirements, clarify expectations, and gather feedback. Throughout the semester, the program collects formative input from faculty and field supervisors or districts. Additionally, formal feedback is solicited at the end of each semester through structured surveys. This ongoing collaboration with faculty, staff, and community partners – through systematic data collection and feedback – supports continuous program improvement and ensures alignment with credentialing standards.

Interviews with constituents and a review of documents revealed that the program consistently engages its constituencies and solicits feedback. One completer noted the frequency of surveys during the program, viewing it as useful preparation for the paperwork demands of their current role and an appreciated opportunity to offer input.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Before entering the school psychology program, candidates must first complete five prerequisite courses to establish a foundational understanding of core psychological concepts. Upon admission, candidates begin developing the competencies necessary to serve students, families, and communities representing diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, socio-economic contexts, and a broad range of learning needs. These competencies are cultivated through a comprehensive combination of coursework, field experiences, and clinical training at CSUEB's Community Counseling Clinic (CCC).

The program requires completion of 95 semester units, encompassing coursework and fieldwork leading to an MS in counseling degree, school psychology credential recommendation, and MFT preparation. Candidates progress through a structured, sequential

curriculum as a cohort, with each course intentionally designed to address standards set the Commission, NASP, and the Board of Behavioral Sciences. In their third year, interns are not required to take additional coursework beyond participation in a university supervision group and completion of a portfolio section each semester.

The program integrates field-based experiences with school-site assignments across all three years. Assignments are progressively structured to match a candidate's developmental readiness, increasing in complexity as they advance. This approach allows candidates to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and core values essential to the program's philosophy and preparation for school psychology credentialing.

First-year candidates engage in pre-practicum experiences, practicing basic counseling and assessment skills with general education students exhibiting mild difficulties in public elementary schools for 12 hours per week. In the second year, candidates provide direct and indirect services in general or special education settings at the elementary or secondary level for 16 hours weekly. Third-year candidates complete a full-time, 1200-hour school psychology internship, demonstrating NASP and Commission competencies.

All placements require supervision by a credentialed school psychologist (minimum of three years credentialed) and a university supervisor. First and second-year candidates must complete at least 32 face-to-face field supervision hours, while interns must complete 64. Supervision provides case support, check-ins, and professional development. University supervision includes case monitoring, formal presentations, and oversight of field experiences. All candidates must be enrolled in a university-based supervision course during field placement. University and field supervisors collaborate regularly to support training and skill development. First-year placements are determined through a screening process to assess candidate readiness. The program coordinator collaborates with first-year candidates to select assignments from a pre-approved list. Second and third-year candidates have greater flexibility in choosing placement sites that already have an MOU. Candidates wishing to pursue placement at a site outside of the approved list may do so through a process referred to as "pioneering" within the college. Pioneering allows candidates to propose and pursue a new site. Pioneering requires multiple discussions between the candidate, the district, and the program coordinator before a new MOU can be established.

Each spring, the program hosts a district recruitment fair, allowing districts to recruit candidates for upcoming placements. For all placements, the program coordinator communicates program expectations to districts. Prospective field supervisors complete a supervisor agreement and application to document their qualifications, training, and agreement to supervision requirements. All placements must be approved by the program coordinator and require a current MOU, as well as a signed Candidate and Supervisor Responsibilities Guidelines and Placement Contract.

Discussions with the program coordinator highlighted that cultivating strong professional values, alongside building professional knowledge, is a core priority of the school psychology

program, which places a strong emphasis on the role of supervision in achieving this goal. To support effective supervision, a training is held at the start of the school year to orient field supervisors to program requirements, expectations, and policies, as well as to address district and supervisor needs. Integrated with this meeting, is the opportunity for the program to receive information from their advisory board. Following the training portion of the meeting, the program actively solicits input from district coordinators and site supervisors on intern performance, district needs, and recommendations for program improvement. Faculty and site supervisors interviewed noted that these meetings foster meaningful dialogue and serve as a valuable forum for exchanging insights among educational professionals.

Each candidate receives weekly supervision from both their site supervisor and university supervisor, along with quarterly advisement from the program coordinator. In addition, candidates participate in annual reviews through which university faculty provide formal feedback on their professional growth and development. Site supervisors complete evaluations for first and second-year candidates at the end of each semester, while third-year interns are evaluated by their site supervisors according to internship requirements. The resulting data is aggregated and analyzed to inform program improvements and enhance candidate learning. Formative check-ins between the university and field supervisors occur regularly throughout the semester – at the beginning, middle, end, and as needed – to discuss candidate progress and address any university/district concerns. When concerns arise, the university supervisor serves as the initial point of contact and collaborates with the field supervisor and candidate to resolve issues. All concerns are documented and shared with the program coordinator, who becomes involved as needed to ensure proper support and resolution.

Informal communication also takes place as necessary to address day-to-day questions or emerging issues. Interviews with both university and site supervisors confirmed that communication channels are sufficient and effective and that the university is responsive when candidate dispositional or other issues arise. This responsiveness helps ensure that field placements remain positive and mutually beneficial for both the candidate and the district. At the end of each semester, field supervisors assess a candidate's skill development and professional growth. In turn, candidates formally evaluate both their site supervisor and the overall field placement at the conclusion of the spring semester. Throughout the field experience, the program coordinator collaborates with university supervisors to review evaluations and monitor candidate progress. When concerns arise related to placement fit, candidate performance, or supervisory effectiveness, faculty and the program coordinator work together to determine whether changes are necessary. In cases where a placement or supervisor is deemed unsuitable, the program coordinator leads collaborative problem-solving efforts with all constituencies to support an appropriate resolution.

Candidates reported feeling well prepared for fieldwork through both their coursework and experiences in the CCC. Site supervisors affirmed this, noting that CSUEB interns were often better prepared than those from other programs. Candidates specifically identified courses such as Micro Counseling, Fieldwork Supervision, and Psychoeducational Report Writing as pivotal to their development and readiness for applied practice.

Feedback from candidates, field supervisors, and districts is reviewed annually by program faculty to support continuous program improvement. Faculty collaboratively evaluate program strengths and areas for growth, considering how potential changes may influence candidate learning outcomes.

Assessment of Candidates

At the beginning of each academic year, all candidates are provided with the program handbook and are required to review its contents and sign an acknowledgment of receipt. For first-year candidates, the handbook is thoroughly reviewed at the program orientation and candidates are assessed on its content. The program handbook outlines the comprehensive assessment framework used throughout the program, including evaluations through coursework, field-based experiences, the professional practice portfolio, the PRAXIS II examination, and surveys assessing professional dispositions and ethical standards. In addition to course-based assessments, candidates are continually evaluated on core competencies, knowledge and skills, and dispositions. Throughout their time in the program, candidates receive weekly updates from the program coordinator, which include important semester dates, program deadlines, and reminders about upcoming assessments.

All candidates must complete courses with a minimum grade of “B” and supervision courses with a “Credit” grade. A credit grade indicates the candidate has met satisfactory course requirements. A course grade below a “B” will automatically result in academic probation. A remediation plan is then required with ongoing meetings with the program coordinator. The goal of the remediation plan is to master content, apply knowledge, and demonstrate skill to levels of course expectation. Remediation actions range from retaking exams, resubmitting assignments, university tutoring, or retaking courses.

When concerns regarding a candidate’s academic or dispositional competence arise, the initial response involves direct communication of the issue(s), identification of specific standard(s) of concern, and clear guidance to support skill development. The university supervisor, field supervisor, and candidate then collaboratively engage in goal-setting discussions to address the identified areas. If the concern relates to professional dispositions, faculty provide targeted feedback that highlights both strengths and areas for growth to guide the candidate in developing appropriate goals.

If a candidate does not demonstrate sufficient improvement in academic, professional, or dispositional competence following one semester of initial intervention, the program coordinator, in collaboration with faculty members, meets with the candidate to develop a comprehensive remediation support plan. This plan may involve changes to the candidate’s field placement, additional work on the formative or professional portfolio, retaking a course, or extending the training period through an additional semester. In some cases, the candidate may be placed on academic probation until the identified concerns are resolved. Progress is closely monitored throughout the remediation process. Candidates who do not successfully meet the expectations outlined in the remediation plan may be counseled out of the program.

Each year, candidates receive formal evaluations from their site supervisors through the completion of the fieldwork supervisor evaluation form. Beginning in the second year, candidates develop a formative portfolio that reflects their growing skills and knowledge. In the third year, as full-time interns, candidates are assessed through multiple feedback mechanisms, including supervisor rating forms, direct communication (telephone and in-person) between university and field supervisors, and documentation of performance within the professional practice portfolio. The professional practice portfolio serves as a comprehensive demonstration of competence across key domains and is evaluated by program faculty using a standardized portfolio rubric to assess skill proficiency.

All interns are required to complete a professional practice portfolio as their capstone project during the third year of the program. The portfolio includes ten case studies aligned with the 2020 NASP training standard domains and serves as a comprehensive demonstration of competence across these key areas. The final professional practice portfolio is submitted at the end of the spring semester and is evaluated by the university supervisor using a standardized 1–4-point rubric. A minimum score of 3 (expected/passing) or 4 (above expectations) is required to demonstrate competency. Scores of 1 or 2 indicate that competency has not been met. In such cases, a remediation plan is developed collaboratively between the intern and the university supervisor to revise and improve the relevant case studies.

As part of program completion and credential recommendation, all candidates are required to take the PRAXIS II examination in school psychology. To be eligible for the school psychology credential, candidates must achieve a minimum passing score of 147 on exam #5402. The updated version of the exam, #5403, requires a passing score of 155.

Within the program, all candidates are required to participate in annual reviews at the end of each academic year. For candidates in years one and two, they complete the evaluation. For third-year candidates, they complete an exit interview. This interview is the culminating dialogue with faculty members or university supervisor regarding the development of the candidate's professional identity and practice as a professional school psychologist. It requires candidates to complete self-evaluation surveys assessing their professional dispositions and skills.

A review of documents and interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, and district constituents indicate that the program is thoughtfully designed and effectively implemented. Candidates express confidence in their preparedness to meet the demands of serving as school psychologists in diverse and complex educational settings. Candidates attribute this readiness to both rigorous coursework, meaningful fieldwork experiences at school sites, and within the CCC.

Candidates and completers also highlighted the strength and adaptability of program leadership, as well as their appreciation for the ongoing support provided by faculty. Fieldwork site supervisors, lead psychologists, and student services coordinators affirmed these perspectives, noting that the program consistently prepares candidates who engage in

culturally responsive practices, apply data-driven problem-solving strategies, and approach students, families, and communities with a resiliency and strengths-based mindset.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology program.

Speech-Language Pathology

Program Design

The Speech-Language Pathology (SLP) credential program at CSUEB is housed in the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences (CLASS) in the Department of Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences (SLHS). The department chair reported that the program will be housed in the College of Health beginning in fall 2025. A master's degree is required for recommendation for the SLP credential. In addition to Commission approval, the program is also fully accredited by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA). Some or all of the Commission's SLP program standards may be fully addressed by the ASHA standards.

SLHS is comprised of five full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty (including department chair and program coordinator), two and a half regular clinic supervisors (including clinic director), adjunct faculty, part-time clinical supervisors, and one administrative support staff.

The department offers undergraduate and graduate degrees including a traditional master's degree program for students with a bachelor's degree in communicative disorders and an extended Master of Science degree for students with bachelor degrees in other fields wishing to pursue a career in SLP. The extended master's degree program is a three-year program while the traditional master's degree program is a two-year graduate program.

The department communicates regularly with the special education program in the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS). University credential analysts support students in applying for the SLP credential.

Faculty communication is reportedly regular and takes the form of conversations, emails, and department meetings. Additional meetings between off-site clinical supervisors and program leadership are generally held twice a semester at the mid and ending points or more frequently as needed.

The department does not presently have a community advisory board in place.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The SLP master's of science program requires 60-62 units, including 44 core units, at least one semester of summer school, and clinic/internship placements – candidates are concurrently

admitted to the master's of science program and credential program. Candidates whose goal is placement in medical settings have the option for one medical and one school-based internship. Candidates have the option to complete the program with a research thesis or comprehensive examination.

The required coursework exceeds the standards set by the Commission and ASHA. Course content is delivered in-person, online, or in hybrid formats. Candidates complete a course of study that includes, but is not limited to, course content in the areas of:

- Special education including legal requirements
- Developmental and acquired speech-language and hearing disorders
- Assessments in all areas of SLP
- Therapeutic interventions in medical and educational settings
- Augmentative and alternative communication
- Working with diverse populations including clients/students and families
- Working with interpreters and translators
- Clinical practica
- School-based internships

Coursework intentionally embeds materials and discussions related to cultural and linguistic diversity including working with interpreters and translators in clinic and school settings, reflecting the program's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Additionally, this commitment reflects the university's commitment to equity and social justice.

Candidates participate in clinical and practicum placements in medical and education settings depending on the candidate's interest areas. Candidates are encouraged to complete the school-based practicum which is required for the SLP credential. Practicum candidates receive regular feedback and formal evaluations from their clinic supervisors, program faculty/staff, and site clinicians.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are regularly assessed throughout the program. They are assigned supervisors for all clinic/therapy experiences and meet with them regularly to discuss and review interactions. Candidates are required to self-reflect on their therapy sessions. Assessment measures are integrated and periodic and involve regular progress evaluation during at least three points in the program. Assessment measures involve completed coursework, key assignments, clinical evaluations, and the option for a final comprehensive examination or research thesis.

Candidates meet and review their evaluation with supervisors and faculty regularly. Interviews with candidates and completers indicate strong satisfaction with the program, their preparation to enter the field, and the support received as students.

Candidates meet with assigned faculty and clinic supervisors on a regular basis to review progress and provide support for students who may be struggling in their program.

Faculty and clinic staff expressed a shared vision for program planning and growth in response to community and student needs and changes in legal and professional regulations, candidate development, and ensuring candidate competence.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Speech-Language Pathology program.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The educator preparation programs at California State University, East Bay (CSUEB) are offered in the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS) and the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS). The CEAS dean leads the unit; however, the speech-language pathology program is housed in the CLASS. It was confirmed in interviews with the interim provost, the CEAS dean, and the Department of Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences (SLHS) chair that the CEAS dean is the unit head for all Commission-approved programs who has the authority and influence over hiring, budget, and curriculum as needed to ensure adherence to Commission standards. The institution is undergoing significant reorganization and a change in resource-allocation methodology. Interviews with the interim provost and deputy provost confirmed a strong commitment to supporting educator preparation programs both with new funding to support growth and with new organizational structural support as the unit will be moving to the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS) and the SLHS programs moving to College of Health in the 2025-26 academic year.

CSUEB's educator preparation programs are grounded by a vision and mission dedicated to equity and excellence, which are well aligned with California's adopted standards and curricular frameworks. The mission is infused throughout the preparation programs. The administration, faculty, and staff are well qualified and committed to following articulated processes to ensure that student outcomes are achieved and evaluated appropriately. The relationships that each program has with its candidates, completers, and community are impressive. There is an opportunity with a new organizational structure to improve unit-wide resource allocation, cohesive decision-making, and assessment practices to ensure consistency in the collection and use of data for continuous improvement. In addition, there is an opportunity for the new unit head to formalize community relationships and activities unit-wide, ensuring that they are regular and systematic for unit and program improvement. All credentials are processed through highly trained and skilled credential analysts who, while stretched to capacity, effectively serve students, program faculty, and leadership.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:	<i>No response needed</i>
The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among, and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California's adopted standards and curricular frameworks.	Consistently
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituencies in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	Inconsistently
The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation.	Inconsistently
The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development/instruction, field based supervision and clinical experiences.	Inconsistently
The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.	Consistently
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	Consistently
The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. Qualifications of faculty and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service.	Consistently
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 1: **Met with Concerns**

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The programs in the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS) at CSUEB are grounded in a mission and vision that are well aligned with California's adopted standards and curricular frameworks. The vision articulates a commitment to the ideals of social justice and democracy, distinguished by excellence in teaching, scholarly programs, and vibrant community engagement, with graduates who are powerful actors in their communities. The mission is to prepare collaborative leaders committed to professional excellence, social justice, and democracy who will influence a diverse and interconnected world. Both the mission and vision are infused throughout the preparation programs. Constituents who were interviewed (employers, administration, faculty, candidates, and completers) were able to articulate the importance of the unit's mission and vision in guiding their work and personalized their commitment in many ways.

Interviews during the site visit highlighted that the institution inconsistently involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituencies in the organization, coordination, and decision-making for all educator preparation programs. Document review and interviews with the university and unit administration, employers, faculty, and staff confirmed that the unit typically involves these relevant constituencies to solicit feedback to inform decisions, but the decision-making and implementation processes are not coordinated and organized for all educator preparation programs, leading to perceived lost opportunities for growth, misalignment of resource allocation, and employee dissatisfaction and turnover. For example, both internal and external constituents shared frustration that the institution is unable to meet the high demand for CSUEB completers in the East Bay school districts due to a perceived lack of effective decision-making, planning, resource allocation, and coordinated processes in place to fulfill the widespread desire of most constituencies to produce more CSUEB educators. Offering programs through CSUEB Extension and initiating some programs outside the CSU systemwide cycle in the summer further complicates the unit's operations, necessitating even greater communication and coordination in the decision-making processes.

The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units, and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation; however, the involvement is not regular or systematic (except for special education) and is often informal and primarily from internal constituents (e.g., employers who are CSUEB completers/instructors). Employers and education partners reported that responsiveness to feedback is excellent, and changes have been made based on that feedback. However, meetings and feedback opportunities outside of the special education programs are sporadic and not systematic. Employers and community partners noted changes in recent years, commenting that advisory boards had previously met and offered more formal opportunities for structured feedback.

Interviews confirmed that the institution inconsistently provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program. All constituencies

confirmed in interviews that the institution needs to provide the unit with increased resources to support the effective operation of each educator preparation program, particularly in areas such as admissions processes and reviews, credentialing processes and recommendations, and program coordination and administrative support. The university administration acknowledged the budget constraints resulting from enrollment declines but emphasized a strong desire to increase resources to the unit to support enrollment growth and address the stretched credential staffing. Limited credential staffing support has already been approved but has not yet been implemented. Interviews with the interim provost and deputy provost confirmed a strong commitment to supporting educator preparation programs both with new funding to support growth and with new organizational structural support as the unit will be moving to the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS) and the Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences (SLHS) programs moving to College of Health in the 2025-26 Academic Year.

The unit is led by the CEAS dean; however, the SLP program is housed in the CLASS. It was confirmed in interviews with the interim provost, the CEAS dean, and the SLHS chair that the CEAS dean is the unit head for all Commission-approved programs who has the authority and influence over hiring, budget, and curriculum as needed to ensure adherence to CTC standards.

The recruitment of diverse and highly qualified faculty, along with faculty development support, is a best practice at CSUEB. Document review and interviews with the interim provost, deputy provost, dean, and associate deans confirmed a genuine commitment to diversity, excellence, and professional development support, as well as an evaluation system that ensures only qualified personnel are retained.

Document review and interviews with administration and staff confirmed that the credential analysts staff is responsible for maintaining records for all programs in the unit. The credential analysts are the only authorized representatives who recommend candidates for licensure by following a straightforward process (admission through recommendation) to ensure that candidates have met all the requirements for the credential. This process is primarily tracked using the PeopleSoft and Salesforce Systems.

Rationale for the Finding

CSUEB inconsistently involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituencies in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs. Document review and interviews with the university and unit administration, employers, faculty, and staff confirmed that the unit typically involves these relevant constituencies to solicit feedback to inform decisions, but the decision-making and implementation processes are not coordinated and organized for all educator preparation programs leading to perceived lost opportunities for growth, misalignment of resource allocation, and employee dissatisfaction and turnover.

The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation; however, the involvement is not regular or

systematic (except for special education), and is often informal and primarily from internal constituents (e.g., employers who are CSUEB completers/instructors). Employers and education partners reported that the responsiveness to feedback is excellent and changes have been reported to have been made based on that feedback, but the meetings and feedback opportunities other than for the special education program and not regular and systematic.

All constituencies confirmed in interviews that the institution needs to provide the unit with increased resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, particularly in supporting admissions processes and reviews, credentials processes and recommendations, and program coordination and administrative support. University administration acknowledged the constraints of the budget due to university enrollment declines but shared that there is a strong desire to increase resources to the unit to support enrollment growth and to support the stretched credential staffing. Limited credential staffing support has already been approved but has not yet been implemented.

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Team Finding
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	<i>No response needed</i>
The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	Consistently
The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.	Consistently
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements.	Inconsistently
Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 2: **Met**

Summary of information applicable to the standard

CEAS and the CLASS house the credential programs offered by CSUEB. Interviews with university staff confirmed that candidate recruitment is accomplished through marketing outreach efforts including social media, flyers targeted to school districts in the service area, and presentations across the campus. Guidance for admission and advising is provided through

a variety of faculty and staff, including academic coordinators, the Credential Student Center, and graduate coordinators. Once admitted, these offices focus on connecting candidates to campus resources and enrichment activities relevant to student life. Candidates overall confirmed a supported and effective process for admission and advising.

CSUEB has a unified system with multiple measures for accepting applicants to all the educator preparation programs. Interviews with coordinators, staff, and candidates highlighted the consistent admission process across the programs. University admission begins with a common CSU-apply portal, and then specific program applications across the unit are completed, calling for common items including fingerprinting, interviews, recommendations, and GPA expectations. The program admission process is predominantly completed by program coordinators. Interviews with program coordinators and department chairs confirmed that strategies to diversify the candidate pool include intentional outreach to local school districts and drawing from other CSUEB colleges. Interviews supported the notion that some programs within the unit utilize graduate student leaders as a resource to connect with candidates, beginning at the application process and continuing through program completion.

Within the programs, candidates are supported by both staff and faculty advising for timely completion of their programs. Interviews with candidates confirm they are provided varied support for program-required assessments, including 1:1 coaching. Interviews confirm the provided evidence that programs within the unit use documented formative feedback to guide candidates to meet state standards and program expectations. Interviews with chairs confirmed that programs throughout the unit use candidate performance data to identify areas where candidate support is needed. Resources for candidate access to credential-specific assessments were identified across programs. Dashboard data from 2022-23 show that elementary education literacy and math, K-12 performing arts, and secondary social sciences have 100% pass rates on the TPA and high pass rates (98%) on the RICA assessment.

Credential-specific advising focuses on preparing candidates for their state licensure requirements. Both completers and current candidates report consistency in knowing who their assigned personnel are to advise them in meeting the requirements. However, inconsistencies emerged from candidate interviews, highlighting candidates' knowledge of the process in the event of challenges or grievances with their clinical practice experience.

Programs across the unit have a process in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies. Many programs have a process that relies on programs identifying candidates through informal measures and then responding individually to offer support.

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards.	Consistently
The unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.	Consistently
The unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites, as appropriate to the program.	Consistently
Through site-based work and clinical experiences, programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	Consistently
The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	Consistently
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	Consistently
For each <i>program</i> the <i>unit</i> offers, candidates have significant experience in <i>California public schools</i> with diverse <i>student</i> populations and the opportunity to work with the range of <i>students</i> identified in the <i>program</i> standards.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 3: **Met**

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Interviews and review of documents confirmed sequential clinical practice linked with coursework content across programs. Clinical practice across the unit is supervised and documented, and interviews with current candidates and completers confirmed that the variety of experiences prepared them for the school climate surrounding the East Bay. Interviews with district representatives also confirmed that CSUEB candidates are prepared to work in the schools. Almost all CSUEB programs provide, or will be implementing, clinical experiences across a range of ages. Evidence shows opportunities for all candidates to experience the diversity of student needs by participating in clinical practice settings across East Bay schools.

Interviews with district supervisors, completers, current candidates, and university site providers (supervisors/coaches) confirmed that programs across the unit implement and regularly evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice. Candidates and completers varied in their report of the effectiveness of fieldwork feedback during interviews, but all reported that systems existed to guide candidates to meet program standards. Completers noted that university supervisors play a crucial role in mentoring and preparing them for the field. Supporting this, Employer Survey data from 2023-24 indicates that 90% of respondents believed CSUEB candidates were prepared to create and maintain effective learning environments, while 85% felt candidates were well prepared to engage and support all students.

District-employed site supervisor qualifications were outlined for each program within supporting documents, and interviews confirmed the consistency of these expectations. Programs in the unit offer orientations, with many offering training on coaching/supervision practices to guide site supervisors in their role. Interviews with candidates confirm that selected site supervisors are experienced in their program content and possess the appropriate credentials for this service.

The selection of clinical practice sites is done collaboratively, utilizing the expertise of the districts and programs to match candidates with sites. Interviews with both district and program personnel confirm this is a well-established process that centers the needs of candidates.

The unit employs qualified university supervisors/coaches who guide candidates through their fieldwork. Interviews and evidence confirmed that the programs hire qualified providers to support candidates during clinical experiences. New university site supervisors/coaches are provided orientation during the onboarding process for the selected program. Many programs include in their handbook guidelines on university site supervisor/coach roles. Programs across the unit provide ongoing training on resources and currency with course-related content. Candidates and university supervisors/coaches confirmed that a process is in place for matching a candidate to a supervisor/coach, and interviews with coordinators confirm their role in this. Across the unit, evidence shows that selection of university supervisors/coaches follows a vetting process which includes review by the department/program chair, interviews that focus on discipline-specific skills, and review of provided documentation to support their

qualifications. An established faculty review process is in place by CSUEB to conduct on-going periodic assessments, and a few programs provide an opportunity for student candidates to evaluate the effectiveness of their experience with supervisors or coaches.

Candidates are oriented to clinical practice expectations through handbooks or web-based resources, although some candidates reported they were unaware of these tools. Programs deliver clinical experiences using online, hybrid, or in-person models.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.	Consistently
The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.	Consistently
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completion data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.	Inconsistently
The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from key constituencies such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 4: **Met with Concerns**

Summary of information applicable to the standard

CSUEB's programs engage in the systematic collection, analysis, and use of data for continuous improvement purposes. Data sources such as edTPA scores, course evaluation data, exit surveys, constituent input through advisory boards, and just-in-time candidate feedback to faculty and program leadership is used routinely to determine program effectiveness as well as modifications needed based on trends and feedback. Program leadership consistently reported instances of making responsive adjustments to courses of study, clinical experiences, and support services through mechanisms such as department-level and program-level meetings involving key faculty and lecturers. For example, data reviewed in "data dig" meetings in the multiple and single subject programs demonstrated candidates were struggling with assessment and the program made adjustments to the edTPA support seminar based on trend-analysis. Another example where a program was responsive to the needs of candidates was highlighted in the Pupil Personnel Services programs. A student council meets with faculty regularly to discuss strengths and areas of need. Program leadership also incorporates several mechanisms for assessing candidate preparation to enter the field including TPE self-

assessments, exit surveys, and exit interviews. Documentation, interview findings, and exit survey samples confirmed that these practices are firmly in place.

Throughout all programs, a recurring theme in interviews was that employers and community partners are highly satisfied with the quality of program preparation as evidenced by a local demand for CSUEB-prepared candidates. Documentation, such as constituent advisory board agendas and meeting minutes and interviews with multiple constituents, corroborated strong preparation. Of note was the high regard and care all program leadership, faculty, and staff have for their candidates and their dedication, eagerness to learn, and advocacy for equitable practices as evidenced by the commitment to continuous improvement process noted throughout numerous interviews, including interviews with candidates and completers. Candidates remarked on the accessibility and responsiveness of key program faculty as well as other supports that are in place to guide them toward meeting competencies such as individualized email communication, checklists, and learning management system materials and modules.

At the unit level, the systematic collection, analysis and use of data is currently evolving. A unit assessment system that is cyclical in nature and involves the unit, program leadership, and faculty is in place with timelines for data collection and analysis. A matrix is in place indicating all data sources to be collected along with timelines. Recently, programs have engaged in a more formalized and systematic process to analyze candidate and completer data through a structured protocol using an institutional-level assessment system (Pioneer Insights) and the completer surveys. However, it was reported that there is no longer an assessment coordinator or data specialist at the unit level, which was also noted as a resource need. At this time, it is unclear how collected unit-level assessment data is analyzed and used for unit effectiveness.

Rationale for the Finding

There was inconsistent evidence that the unit regularly and systematically collects, analyzes, and uses candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services. Reports and interview findings indicate there is a gap in formalizing a systematic data analysis and use process at the unit level to reflect the effectiveness of unit operations.

Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Team Finding
The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.	Consistently

Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Team Finding
The unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California’s students.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 5: **Met**

Summary of information applicable to the standard

CSUEB employs multiple mechanisms to ensure candidates are well prepared to serve their diverse local communities as professional school personnel. Reports, documents, and interview findings indicate the unit evaluates data from multiple sources such as candidate surveys provided by the Commission, the CSU Chancellor’s Office’s EdQ Center, and supervisor surveys. Programs continually seek feedback from local school and district partners through their advisory boards and many program completers return to teach and/or supervise in multiple programs. Unit and program leadership are highly dedicated to preparing professional school personnel for diverse school contexts through a reciprocal and student-centered approach. They stay engaged through several active residency programs, by seeking scholarship grant funding for candidates, as well as by serving as field supervisors and by serving on local advisory boards. Currently, there are several active grant-funded partnerships in place including two school counseling residency grants, two teacher residency grants, as well as a \$4M K-16 regional collaborative grant with several school districts. This was confirmed through a review of documentation and throughout multiple interviews, and these partnerships indicate a robust relationship between the unit, its programs, and local school community.

Formative and summative assessments such as supervisor and coach evaluations and edTPA and CalAPA scores indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements and that they demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students in meeting state-adopted academic standards with an equity lens. Program leadership and program faculty utilize sources such as course evaluations, exit surveys, and candidate interviews to monitor candidate progress, which was corroborated through document reviews and multiple interviews with department chairs, coordinators, and program faculty. Documentation reviews and interview findings also indicate programs provide routine performance feedback to candidates toward meeting competencies and tools are in place that allow candidates to self-assess their progress through the programs. Multiple advisory board members remarked on the exemplary preparation of CSUEB candidates across programs. Completer and exit interview data confirm that the majority of candidates perceive that they are “well prepared” and “very well prepared” by their programs.

The positive impact the unit and its programs are having on teaching and learning in California schools was also demonstrated during interviews with site administrators and program supervisors. For example, site administrators expressed that teacher candidates are capable and versed in daily agenda and unit plan, lesson planning. Site supervisors for the SLP program

noted numerous candidate strengths such as strong assessment skills and a strong foundational knowledge base of theory and best practices. It was noted in interviews with multiple constituents that demand for CSUEB preparation across programs currently exceeds capacity, which further demonstrates the positive impact the institution and its programs are having on California schools.