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Institutional Report

The following Institutional Report (IR) template should be used by institutions hosting their first visit, a regular continuing accreditation visit, a focused visit, or a probation visit. This IR template includes the prompts or questions to which the institution should respond for each standard. The electronic version of the template for writing the IR online should be open in NCATE's Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS) at aims.ncate.org a year prior to the visit. Detailed instructions for completing the IR online are available in AIMS, in the Resources section.

Responses that have been prepared in Word or another word processing program can be copied and pasted into the online template. Responses to each prompt in the template will be limited to a maximum number of characters as indicated in the template. Again, character limits have been set as a maximum. Institutions should not feel compelled to use all available characters to respond to prompts. In most cases, direct and succinct responses will not require the maximum number of characters. The length of each response should be based on the size of the unit and the prompt being addressed. In addition, 9-11 required tables must be completed or uploaded for selected standard elements. The full set of guidelines for completing the IR tables can be accessed from AIMS or the institution section of NCATE’s Website at www.ncate.org. They are also available as you complete each table in the online IR.

Institutions have found it helpful to identify the key exhibits or evidence that they believe will support the claims that they make in their responses to each prompt. A limited number of additional tables, figures, and lists of links to key electronic exhibits can be uploaded for each standard element when prompted in the Online IR. To do this, an institution has three choices. First, the institution can include a link in the text of the IR. A well placed link can be helpful to the reader, but too many links can interrupt the flow of the text. Also, a short link can be put into AIMS but a link that is longer than one line will cause formatting problems. Directions for making the link hot within the text are provided in the HELP function of the online template. Second, the institution can upload attachments in the form of documents, tables, or figures. Uploading attachments can be helpful to the reader, but space is limited. A maximum of three to five uploads has been specified for each element. Third, an institution can upload a list of links to key exhibits. This list of links could include additional key exhibits or supplemental exhibits.

The institutional report (IR) can be written in the following online template, which includes character limits and space to upload tables, figures, and lists of key exhibits. Another option for writing the IR is to write the entire document in Word or other word processing program and upload the document in AIMS as directed in the Visit Reports section. In the second option, the overall length of the IR should not exceed 85 pages, including tables, figures, and links to key exhibits. Institutions selecting the second option may either use the following template as a guide or respond to each element without using the template. The Word version of the template is available on NCATE’s website (www.ncate.org) and in the Resources section of AIMS.
OVERVIEW

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

A. Institution

A.1. What is the institution's historical context?

The University of La Verne was founded in 1891 as Lordsburg College by members of the Church of the Brethren who moved west from Indiana to California. In 1917, the agricultural community was renamed La Verne and the college became La Verne College. In the 1920s and 1930s, three quarters of the student body were in teacher education. During the next three decades, campus facilities multiplied fourfold. The Board of Trustees became independent of church control although bylaws require a minimum number of church members on the board. In 1955, the Western College Association (now WASC) accredited La Verne. A decade later, the college awarded its first master's degree.

In 1969, La Verne began offering degree programs off campus, and the following year, it opened its College of Law. In 1976, the university began to offer its first doctoral degree program. Reflecting these profound changes, the college reorganized in 1977 as the University of La Verne. In 1979, the first doctorate was awarded. In 1981, ULV founded its first branch campus and continued the trend to provide programs throughout the region.

The University of La Verne is a Carnegie Doctoral/Research University in Southern California enrolling over 8,500 students in four colleges: the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), the College of Business and Public Management (CBPM), the College of Education and Organizational Leadership (CEOL), and the College of Law (COL). The branch campuses are administered through the Regional Campus Administration. The University is a Hispanic and minority serving institution. The Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) defines Hispanic Serving Institution as colleges, universities, or systems/districts where total Hispanic enrollment constitutes a minimum of 25% of the total enrollment. Mark G?

Although the CBPM offers masters degrees on line, the CEOL does not offer entire degrees on line. Most programs in CEOL offer one or more courses delivered through a hybrid or on line format. The college does not offer any alternative paths to teacher credentialing. Teaching and other educational professional candidates can complete their credential or degrees on the main campus and at branch campuses throughout the state including locations in Sacramento, Ventura, San Bernardino, Los Angeles, Orange, San Luis Obispo, and Kern counties.

A.2. What is the institution's mission?

Vision. The University of La Verne will be widely recognized as a learning community of increasing prominence. It will provide challenging and rewarding educational opportunities for a diverse student body and will assure academic excellence for students of all ages and backgrounds.

Mission. It is the mission of the University of La Verne to provide opportunities for
students to achieve their educational goals and become contributing citizens to the global community.

This is accomplished by offering high-quality degree programs to both traditional-aged and adult learners; providing liberal arts and professional programs from undergraduate to doctoral levels; and delivering programs to students at the central La Verne campus as well as regional campuses and satellite class locations throughout California.

The university provides a student-centered, values-based, and diverse learning environment. It takes pride in offering small class sizes in a highly personalized setting. The university encourages effective teaching, research, scholarly contributions, and service to the greater community by sharing its academic, professional and individual resources.

Values. The University of La Verne shares four core values that promote a positive and rewarding life for its students through fostering a genuine appreciation and respect for:

1. Values Orientation
2. Community and Diversity
3. Lifelong Learning

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

The University of La Verne is a private, non-profit university. It is a Hispanic and minority serving institution. The main campus is located approximately 35 miles east of Los Angeles in a suburban town of 35,000 residents surrounded by similarly sized towns and cities. In addition, there are branch campuses in several locations throughout southern California.

A.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the institutional context may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

B. The unit

B.1. What is the professional education unit at your institution and what is its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators?

The College of Education and Organizational Leadership with subject matter courses taught by the College of Arts and Sciences comprise the education unit. One undergraduate program, Liberal Studies, is the pathway into teacher education graduate programs. Although these students have a major in CEOL, they take the majority of their courses in CAS. All state-approved education credential programs are post baccalaureate and in the College of Education and Organizational Leadership.

B.2. How many professional education faculty members support the professional education unit? Please complete Table 1 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.
Table 1
Professional Education Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Education Faculty</th>
<th>Full-time in the Unit</th>
<th>Full-time in the Institution, but Part-time in the Unit</th>
<th>Part-time at the Institution &amp; the Unit (e.g., adjunct faculty)</th>
<th>Graduate Teaching Assistants Teaching or Supervising Clinical Practice</th>
<th>Total # of Professional Education Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>173 full &amp; part time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.3. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare candidates for their first license to teach? Please complete Table 2 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

Table 2
Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and Their Review Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Award Level (e.g., Bachelor’s or Master’s)</th>
<th>Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (Fall 2009 Headcount)</th>
<th>Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents)</th>
<th>Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)</th>
<th>State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)</th>
<th>Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Subject Credential</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>California Commission on Teacher Credentialing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Subject Credential</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>California Commission on Teacher Credentialing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Mild/Moderate Education Specialist</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>California Commission on Teacher Credentialing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.4. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare advanced teacher candidates and other school professionals? Please complete Table 3 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

Table 3
Advanced Preparation Programs and Their Review Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Award Level (e.g., Bachelor’s or Master’s)</th>
<th>Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (Fall 2009 Headcount)</th>
<th>Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents)</th>
<th>Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)</th>
<th>State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)</th>
<th>Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Administrative Services</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>California Commission on Teacher Credentialing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At this time, none of these programs are offered via distance learning technologies. Internship programs are alternative route programs in which candidates are hired by school divisions and supported by the unit through coursework in one of the following programs: Administrative Services, Multiple Subject, School Counseling, Single Subject and Preliminary Education Specialist.

B.5. Which of the above initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs are offered off-campus or via distance learning technologies? What alternate route programs are offered? [In addition to this response, please review the "Institutional Information” in AIMS and, if updating is needed, contact NCATE with details about these programs.]

Administrative support for the university’s off-campus programs is the responsibility of the Regional Campus Administration (RCA). RCA is comprised of nine regional campuses and the Centers for Educators, which is the department that supports the College of Education and Organizational Leadership’s off-campus credential and graduate degree programs. The Centers for Educators utilize the classrooms of many of RCA’s regional campuses. The staff at each regional campus provides secondary support to the faculty and candidates in the CEOL graduate credential and degree programs they are attending at their campus. In addition to the regional campuses, classes are held also at K – 12 schools. Many of these school sites have been used for over 10 years.

The chart below illustrates where The University of La Verne offers educator preparation programs away from the main campus.

### College of Education and Organizational Leadership Programs by Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>California Commission on Teacher Credentialing</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Counseling</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>California Commission on Teacher Credentialing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>California Commission on Teacher Credentialing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Clear Mild/Moderate Education Specialist</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>California Commission on Teacher Credentialing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart below illustrates where The University of La Verne offers educator preparation programs away from the main campus.
The link below contains information on the methodologies used by the unit to maintain high levels of quality in each program throughout all locations served:
http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/evidence/ensuring-consistent-program-quality/

B.6. (Continuing Visit Only) What substantive changes have taken place in the unit since the last visit (e.g., added/dropped programs/degrees; significant increase/decrease in enrollment; major reorganization of the unit, etc.)? [These changes could be compiled from those reported in Part C of the AACTE/NCATE annual reports since the last visit.]

This is the unit’s first NCATE accreditation visit.

B.7. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit context may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

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

C.1. How does the unit's conceptual framework address the following structural elements? [Please provide a summary here. A more complete description of the conceptual framework should be available as an electronic exhibit.]

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

College Vision and Mission
We create caring, diverse learning opportunities that foster intellectual, ethical, and social responsibility in order to imagine, explore, and design the future.

College Mission
The mission of the College of Education and Organizational Leadership at the University of La Verne is to prepare present and future professional educators and change agents who will be capable of improving educational opportunities and organizational outcomes at all levels in California, the Nation and the World. The Faculty in the various academic programs in the College strive to achieve a balanced blend of theory and practice that will serve to equip students with the knowledge, skills and values orientation they need in order to become leaders in their respective fields and effective facilitators of human and organizational development. Program emphases are on the development of growth through self-awareness, appreciation for diversity, lifelong learning and service to humanity. The College seeks to produce graduates who are technically knowledgeable and highly competent, committed to ethical standards, capable of conducting critical inquiry and skillful in building interpersonal and group relationships leading to personal growth and organizational effectiveness.

Philosophical Foundation
The Philosophical Foundation of the unit reinforces the four guiding principles of the unit.

Knowledge Base
The professional literature supports the guiding principles that are the basis of the unit’s teaching, research, and services.

Candidate Proficiencies
The table at the link below aligns state proficiencies with unit proficiencies and the assessment system.

Assessment System
The unit assessment system gathers data to assess candidate progress, program effectiveness, and the effectiveness of the unit’s operations. The link below leads to a summary of the assessment system.

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

NA

C.3. (First Visits Only) How was the conceptual framework developed and who was involved in its development?
Aligned with the university vision, mission, and values and based on the college philosophical foundation, the unit began formulating a conceptual framework in fall 2005. Representatives from each program formed a Conceptual Framework Committee (CFC) to identify a set of unit values. After each meeting, representatives sought feedback from their programs. In May 2006, using a mind map, four guiding principles emerged: Caring, Excellence, Leadership, and Diversity. Professional literature confirmed these principles were essential to the preparation of educators and leaders. The faculty confirmed the guiding principles at the May 2006 college-wide meeting. Feedback from the field including adjunct faculty, advisory committees, and regional educator meetings confirmed the four guiding principles. In May 2007, the team shared the principles and a visual representation with faculty. Minor modifications were made. In 2008, the new dean supported the conceptual framework. At a college meeting in March 2009, the unit confirmed that the guiding principles were evident in teaching, programs, candidates and professional activities of the college.


C.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the conceptual framework may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]
STANDARDS

This section is the focus of the institutional report. A description of how the unit meets each standard element must be presented. Significant differences among programs should be described as the response is written for each element under subheadings of initial teacher preparation, advanced teacher preparation, and other school professionals. Significant differences among programs on the main campus, in off-campus programs, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs should be identified. Links to key exhibits to support the descriptions may be attached to the last prompt of each element.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Directions When Programs Have Been Reviewed Nationally or by a Similar State Review
To reduce burden and duplication, units have fewer reporting requirements for Standard 1 when programs have been submitted for national review or similar state review. These review processes cover many of the elements in Standard 1. For programs that have been submitted for national review or similar state review, units are asked to report in the IR only the following information:

- State licensing test data for Element 1a (content knowledge for teacher candidates) and Element 1e (knowledge and skills for other school professionals)
- Assessment Data for Element 1c (professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills)
- Assessment data for Element 1g (dispositions)
- Results of follow-up studies of graduates and employers (all standards elements)

Because program standards do not generally cover general professional knowledge and skills nor professional dispositions, the unit must respond to all of the prompts in Elements 1c (Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates) and 1g (Professional Dispositions for All Candidates) regardless of whether programs have been submitted for national or state review.

The prompts for each element in the IR include reminders of when data for these programs need not be included. The term "similar state review" refers to state review processes that require institutions to submit assessments and assessment data for evaluation and/or approval. For more information on "similar state review," click on the HELP button at the top right corner of your screen.

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1a.1. What are the pass rates of teacher candidates in initial teacher preparation programs on state tests of content knowledge for each program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate)? Please
complete Table 4 or upload your own table at Prompt 1a.5 below. [This information could be compiled from Title II data submitted to the state or from program reports prepared for national review.]

Table 4
Pass Rates on Content Licensure Tests for Initial Teacher Preparation

For Period: 2008-2009 School Year (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Name of Licensure Test</th>
<th># of Test Takers</th>
<th>% Passing State Licensure Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Pass Rate for the Unit</td>
<td>California Basic Education Skills Test (CBEST)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education - Multiple Subject - Single Subject Special Education</td>
<td>California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET) MSE I</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSET MSE II</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSET MSE III</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Subject only</td>
<td>RICA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education - Multiple Subject - Single Subject</td>
<td>CalTPA (2)</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>University of La Verne Reading Specialist Exam (3)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Scores from Tests with fewer than 10 takers are not reported.
2) (Average of data from Fall 2007 – Summer 2010). Each TPA task is counted separately. Pass rates are based on the scores of the specific year – resubmissions are counted separately.
3) Average data from the past two cohorts.

1a.2 (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below.]

Initial teacher preparation programs that lead to a university recommendation for state licensure submit to the state review process. The Bachelor of Science degree in Child Development contributes to state licensure requirements but a university recommendation is not required, so it is exempt from state review. Candidates in this program must complete a broad general education curriculum along with 50-52 semester-hours of major course work in child development with a minimum 2.0 GPA. Program faculty members meet regularly to discuss the early childhood education curriculum and ensure its alignment with state guidelines, national standards and findings from recent research.

Child Development Program faculty members have identified two key assessments that particularly address content knowledge in candidates, the developmental knowledge exam
(DKE) and the fieldwork supervisor evaluation. The DKE provides evidence of candidates’ understanding of the most important concepts in child psychology and development. Passing the DKE with a score of 70% or better indicates that a candidate possesses the knowledge necessary to complete upper-division coursework at the University of La Verne. Results from these key assessments are included in the program’s 2010 Biennial Report. The majority of candidates achieve a passing DKE score (average 80%) on their first attempt, demonstrating competency in foundational knowledge needed for successful completion of the program (See Exhibit 1a.5.1). These data indicate that candidates both on- and off-campus demonstrate comparable DKE performance. Few candidates (approximately 10%) require extended preparation through group study sessions, individual tutoring, and/or faculty counseling. Data show that all candidates either demonstrate the essential knowledge-base to continue in the program, or, are counseled into a more appropriate program of study based on their demonstrated strengths.

The Supervisor Evaluation provides evidence of candidates’ readiness to apply their knowledge of child development and developmentally appropriate practices to their work with young children. The data show fieldwork evaluations are conducive to gaining an overall “picture” of readiness for candidates’ success in the program. Candidate performance measured an average rubric score of 3.42 of 4.00 (See Exhibit 1a.5.1). As noted in the data, the candidates’ combined scores from the DKE and Supervisor Evaluation assessments provide an overall realistic measurement of candidates’ knowledge and ability.

1a.3. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below.]

Advanced teacher preparation programs that lead to a university recommendation for state licensure submit to the state review process. The Master of Education, Special Emphasis, degree does not lead to a recommendation for licensure, so is exempt from state review. Candidates in this master’s degree program must maintain a minimum 3.0 GPA in order to stay in good academic standing and must satisfactorily complete key content knowledge assessments in order to progress in their program of study.

The Master of Education, Special Emphasis program is a four-class capstone to the fifth year teacher education program. Candidates enter this program with content knowledge preparation already completed in the emphasis area program, typically Teacher Performance Assessments (CalTPA’s) from the Teacher Education Program. CalTPA scores for recent Teacher Education candidates are illustrated in Exhibit1c.5.1.

1a.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates’ preparation in the content area? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate? [A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to content knowledge could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below. The attached table could include all of the responses to your follow-up survey to which you could refer the reader in responses on follow-up studies in other elements of Standard 1.]

Graduates and employers indicate that graduates from education programs at the University of La Verne are well prepared in their content areas. In California, candidates
demonstrate subject matter content by examination or course work separately approved by the State and unassociated with the initial teacher preparation programs. Initial teacher preparation programs, including Multiple and Single Subject Teacher Education and Special Education, indirectly evaluate the quality of subject matter content preparation during classes and fieldwork. They also participate in a comprehensive follow-up evaluation conducted by an affiliate of the California State University system, the Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ), which surveys graduates and their employers after one year of teaching. This questionnaire addresses teaching in the subject specific content areas. See Exhibit 1a.5.2 for sample data. These surveys have varying response rates from year to year, but typically range from 25-50%. These response rates are misleading, however, because many participants were never found or were not working in K-12 education. In addition, initial teacher preparation programs receive regular feedback regarding candidate content knowledge from current practitioners serving as adjunct faculty members and through formal and informal feedback with master teachers, unit fieldwork supervisors and site administrators. These CTQ data reports have been integral in the unit’s program improvement efforts for nearly a decade. The unit annually reviews the data and has observed program strengths as well as areas for improvement. These reviews have led to improvements in technology integration, serving diverse populations, special education strategies, among other things.

Candidates in advanced education programs gather graduate and employer information about candidate content knowledge through end-of-program surveys, advisory committees, adjunct faculty meetings, and informal meetings with on site administrators and fieldwork supervisors. End of Program surveys provide faculty members with candidate feedback immediately after field experiences while program information is still clear in their minds. These surveys regularly indicate candidate satisfaction of 3.5 or higher on a 4-point scale. A sample from the MS in Reading and Language Arts program is included as Exhibit 1a.5.4. Advisory committees gather periodically to review and evaluate programs, including content knowledge requirements. These committees ensure that programs stay abreast of the changing needs of California schools. Some of these programs have attempted to develop graduate and employer surveys but have met challenges of small populations and low response rates. College leadership is making consistent graduate and employer feedback with good response rates a priority for the next biennial reporting cycle. Since many of the advanced education programs at the University of La Verne have small populations, they are characterized by close relationships between candidates and faculty members. In many cases, informal discussions are the best way for these programs to get feedback on content knowledge preparation, and faculty members continue to benefit from their small size and close-knit environment.

1a.5 (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the content knowledge of teacher candidates may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]
1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1b.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the pedagogical content knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]

Candidates for the Bachelor of Science degree in Child Development must complete key assessments in the areas of Knowledge, Planning, Use of Assessments, Diversity and Technology. Child Development Program faculty members have identified two key assessments that particularly address pedagogical content knowledge in candidates, the developmental knowledge exam (DKE) and the fieldwork supervisor evaluation. The DKE provides evidence of candidates’ understanding of the most important concepts in child psychology and development. The majority of candidates achieve a passing DKE score (average 80%) on their first attempt, demonstrating competency in foundational knowledge needed for successful completion of the program. The Supervisor Evaluation provides evidence of candidates’ readiness to apply their knowledge of child development and developmentally appropriate practices to their work with young children. Program faculty also gathers supporting information about candidates pedagogical content knowledge and skills from the planning, use of assessments and diversity key assessments. The Planning key assessment provides evidence that candidates receive preparation to serve as curriculum instructors for young children. Candidates plan, implement, and present a developmentally appropriate (as identified in Developmentally Appropriate Practices) lesson that meets the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) teaching expectations identified for Pre-K through 2nd grade. Candidates reflect on their own lesson plan implementation. The Use of Assessments provides evidence of preparation of candidates’ understanding and application of a broad range of early childhood assessments including questions about quality of tests and research literature from test source and outside sources. An understanding of the role that assessment plays in influencing sound decisions about children and teaching is emphasized. In the Diversity assessment candidates interview a family with children under the age of 18 still living in the home and who are of a culture different from their own. The candidate also spends unstructured time with the family to observe cultural norms and practices. Candidates complete research on the cultural background of their chosen family and integrate knowledge of culture with their observations and results of the interview to write a comprehensive ethnography. Results from these key assessments are included in the program’s 2010 Biennial Report. Aggregated data for these assessments indicate that candidates effectively demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge and skills, averaging over 3.5 on a 4-point scale and 80% correct with 70% considered passing. These data indicate that candidates both on- and off-campus demonstrate comparable performance on key assessments. The results are outlined in Exhibits 1a.5.1 and 1b.4.1.

Candidates are also evaluated on their pedagogical content knowledge and skills during their fieldwork experiences. The Supervisor Evaluation provides evidence of candidates’ readiness to
apply their pedagogical content knowledge and skills of child development and developmentally appropriate practices to their work with young children. Candidates are observed and evaluated by an overseeing supervisor within their organization, or a faculty member within the Child Development Program, who assesses candidates’ interactions and dispositions towards children and adults. The lead classroom teacher also evaluates each candidate. These supervisions occur at carefully selected child development centers in Southern California.

1b.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates know and apply theories related to pedagogy and learning, are able to use a range of instructional strategies and technologies, and can explain the choices they make in their practice. [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]

Candidates for the Master of Education degree, Special Emphasis, must maintain a minimum 3.0 GPA in order to stay in good academic standing and must satisfactorily complete key assessments emphasizing pedagogical knowledge in order to progress in their program of study. This is a four-class capstone to the initial teacher education program. Candidates complete key assessments in planning, use of assessment, diversity and technology to demonstrate their pedagogical knowledge and skills. The planning key assessment consists of a literature review in the candidate’s area of interest. Candidates complete a test review summary paper in order to demonstrate pedagogical knowledge in the use of assessments. The diversity key assessment includes a reflection on classroom behaviors that reinforces pedagogical knowledge adapted to all students, including English Learners. Candidates make use of online resources and create Powerpoint presentations during their graduate projects to demonstrate pedagogical knowledge and skills in using technology. Aggregate data from these key assessments show that candidates are averaging over 3.7 on a 4-point scale, as illustrated in Exhibit 1d.4.1, which indicate that Special Emphasis candidates learn to apply theories related to pedagogy and learning, are able to use a range of instructional strategies and technologies, and can explain the choices they make in their practice. These data indicate that candidates both on- and off-campus demonstrate comparable performance on key assessments. These assessments are more fully described in the program’s 2010 Biennial Report.

1b.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates’ preparation in pedagogical content knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]

Education Programs at the University of La Verne gather follow-up information that verifies graduates’ preparation in pedagogical content knowledge and skills in a variety of ways. Candidates in initial teacher preparation programs, including Multiple and Single Subject Teacher Education, Special Education and Child Development, assess program delivery of pedagogical knowledge and skills through end-of-program surveys. Response rates vary widely from program to program. Programs are making increasing response rates a high priority for the
next set of Biennial Reports. We’ve included BS Child Development program data in Exhibit 1a.5.3 as an example. As noted in Section 1a.4, Teacher and Special Education programs also participate in a comprehensive follow-up evaluation conducted by an affiliate of the California State University system, the Center for Teacher Quality, which surveys graduates and their employers after one year of teaching. This questionnaire indicated that graduates, and their employers, are pleased with the pedagogical knowledge they learned in the program. A sample table summarizing portions of these data is included in section Exhibit 1b.4.2. More information is available in the Teacher Education and Special Education 2010 Biennial Reports. In addition, initial teacher preparation programs receive regular feedback regarding candidate content knowledge from current practitioners serving as adjunct faculty members and through formal and informal feedback with master teachers, unit fieldwork supervisors and site administrators. The special education program also receives regular feedback from its Advisory Committee.

Candidates in advanced education programs also verify through end-of-program surveys through consistently high scores, usually above 3.5 on a 4-point scale. These surveys are available for each program in the 2010 Biennial Reports. As an example, School Psychology program survey data are included in Exhibit 1b.4.3. In addition, advisory committees gather periodically to review and evaluate programs, including their pedagogical content knowledge and skills requirements. These committees ensure that programs stay abreast of the changing needs of California schools. Some of these programs have attempted to develop graduate and employer surveys but have met challenges of small populations and low response rates. College leadership is making consistent graduate and employer feedback with good response rates a priority for the next biennial reporting cycle. Since many of the advanced education programs at the University of La Verne have small populations, they are characterized by close relationships between candidates and faculty members. In many cases, informal discussions are the best way for these programs to get feedback on content knowledge preparation, and faculty members continue to benefit from their small size and close-knit environment.
1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1c.1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced teacher preparation programs demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to facilitate learning? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

The University of La Verne offers two initial teacher preparation programs that lead to state licensure and are reviewed by the State of California and one that does not. Those leading to a licensure recommendation are 1) a multiple and single subject teacher preparation program and 2) a mild/moderate education specialist program. The State of California Commission on Teacher Credentialing requires multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs to address the California Teacher Performance Expectations (CalTPE’s) using the California Teacher Performance Assessments (CalTPA’s). See the CalTPA webpage for more information. CalTPA’s are calibrated state-wide in order to ensure high reliability. The unit has established five key assessments, four of which emphasize professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills including planning, use of assessments, technology and diversity. The University of La Verne has adopted CalTPA’s to measure these key assessments in teacher education. They are:

TPA 1: Specific Subject Pedagogy
TPA 2: Designing Instruction
TPA 3: Assessing Learning
TPA 4: Culminating Teaching Experience

University of La Verne candidates have consistently performed well on these assessments, scoring over 80% first time pass rate and 94.7% overall as illustrated by Exhibit 1c.5.1 and Table 4. A more thorough evaluation is available in the 2010 Teacher Education Biennial Report.

The mild/moderate education specialist program verifies that candidates demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge and skills related to facilitating learning using key assessments in the areas of Knowledge, Planning, Use of Assessments, Diversity and Technology. These assessments are:

1) Case Study: Understanding Academic and Behavior Needs of Mild/Moderate Learners
2) Caseload Management Practitioner’s Notebook
3) Case Study Project
4) Mini-Conference and Self-evaluation

Key Assessment data is somewhat limited for this program, but what is available indicates that candidates are performing well with rubric scores over 3.3 on a 4-point scale as illustrated in Exhibit 1c.5.2. A more thorough evaluation of data is available in the program’s 2010 Biennial Report. The Education Specialist Program is characterized by small class sizes and close
relationships. As a result, faculty members provide candidates a great deal of personalized instruction and evaluation.

The Bachelor of Science degree in Child Development verifies that candidates demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to facilitate learning through key assessments in the areas of Knowledge, Planning, Use of Assessments and Diversity. These are outlined in the program’s 2010 Biennial Report. Aggregated data for these assessments indicate that candidates are performing well, averaging over 3.5 on a 4-point scale and 80% with 70% considered passing. The results are outlined in Exhibits 1a.5.1 and 1b.4.1.

Each of these programs also rely heavily on regular assessments during fieldwork experiences to ensure that candidates are learning and applying the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills necessary to be an effective teacher. Program faculty members meet regularly to discuss the curriculum and ensure its alignment with state guidelines, national standards and findings from recent research.

Candidates for the Master of Education degree, Special Emphasis and Reading and Language Arts, complete key assessments in planning, use of assessment, diversity and technology to demonstrate their professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Special Emphasis data from these key assessments show that candidates are averaging over 3.7 on a 4-point scale, as illustrated in Exhibit 1d.4.1. Reading and Language Arts data indicate that candidates are averaging above 3.4 on a 4-point scale, as illustrated in Exhibit 1c.5.3.

1c.2. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs consider the school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students; reflect on their own practice; know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning; and can analyze educational research findings? If a licensure test is required in this area, how are candidates performing on it? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

The Teacher Education Program, multiple and single subject, uses the CalTPA’s to assess how candidates integrate school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of candidate; reflect on their own practice; know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning; and can analyze educational research findings. TPA 1: Specific Subject Pedagogy, requires candidates to use information provided about particular candidates to identify appropriate subject-specific instruction and assessment plans, and to adopt this information for these candidates. TPA 2: Designing Instruction, requires the candidate to make appropriate connections between what the teacher knows about the students in the class and his/her instructional planning for those students. TPA 3: Assessing Learning, requires candidates to demonstrate their ability to design standards-based, appropriate student assessment activities using a specific standards-based lesson of the candidate’s choice. Assessment is designed for the whole class and adapted for an English learner and a student with special needs. In addition, candidates demonstrate their ability to conduct assessment activities appropriately to assess student learning and to diagnose student instructional needs based on the results of the assessment(s). TPA 4: Culminating Teaching Experience, assesses the candidate’s overall teacher preparation including subject matter preparation, subject-specific pedagogy, pedagogical knowledge and skills and overall teaching experiences. University of La Verne candidates have consistently performed well on these assessments, scoring over 80% first time pass rate and
94.7% overall as illustrated by Exhibit 1c.5.1 and Table 4. A more thorough evaluation is available in the 2010 Teacher Education Biennial Report.

The mild/moderate education specialist program assesses how candidates integrate school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students; reflect on their own practice; know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning; and can analyze educational research findings through the Knowledge, Planning, Use of Assessments and Diversity Key Assessments. They are 1) SPED 408 - Case Study: Understanding Academic and Behavior Needs of Mild/Moderate Learners 2) SPED 407 - Caseload Management Practitioner's Notebook, 3) SPED 406 - Case Study Project and 4) SPED 405P - Mini-Conference and Self-evaluation. Key Assessment data is somewhat limited for this program, but what is available indicates that candidates are performing well with rubric scores over 3.3 on a 4-point scale as illustrated in Exhibit 1c.5.2. A more thorough evaluation of data is available in the program’s 2010 Biennial Report. The Education Specialist Program is characterized by small class sizes and close relationships. As a result, faculty members provide candidates a great deal of personalized instruction and evaluation.

The Bachelor of Science degree in Child Development ensures that it consider the school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students; reflect on their own practice; know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning; and can analyze educational research findings through key assessments in the areas of Knowledge, Planning, Use of Assessments and Diversity. A description for each of these assessments is available in Section 1b.1. These are outlined in the program’s 2010 Biennial Report. Aggregated data for these assessments indicate that candidates are performing well, averaging over 3.5 on a 4-point scale and 80% with 70% considered passing. See Exhibits 1a.5.1 and 1b.4.1 for more information.

1c.3. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates reflect on their practice; engage in professional activities; have a thorough understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they work; collaborate with the professional community; are aware of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices; and can analyze educational research and policies and explain the implications for their own practice and the profession? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

The University of La Verne classifies three programs in the advanced teacher preparation category. They are

1) Master’s degree in Reading and Language Arts
2) Master’s degree in Special Education/Level II Mild/Moderate Education Specialist
3) Master of Education, Special Emphasis, degree

Data from key assessments in each of these programs indicate that candidates do reflect on their practice; engage in professional activities; have a thorough understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they work; collaborate with the professional community; are aware of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices; and can analyze educational research and policies and explain the implications for their own practice and the profession. Aggregate data show that candidates are averaging 3.7+ on a 4-point scale, as illustrated in Exhibit 1d.4.1 and 1c.5.3. These assessments are more fully described in the Master’s Degree, Special Emphasis and Master’s Degree in
The Reading and Language Arts Specialist and Education Specialist Level II programs also rely on regular assessments during fieldwork experiences to verify that candidates reflect on their practice; engage in professional activities; have a thorough understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they work; collaborate with the professional community; are aware of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices; and can analyze educational research and policies and explain the implications for their own practice and the profession.

1c.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates’ preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

Education Programs at the University of La Verne gather follow-up information about graduates’ preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills in a variety of ways. Candidates in initial teacher preparation programs, including Multiple and Single Subject Teacher Education, Special Education and Child Development, assess program delivery of pedagogical knowledge and skills through end-of-program surveys. Teacher and Special Education programs also participate in a comprehensive follow-up evaluation conducted by an affiliate of the California State University system, the Center for Teacher Quality, which surveys graduates and their employers after one year of teaching. This questionnaire includes questions related to candidates’ preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. More information is available in the Teacher Education and Special Education 2010 Biennial Reports. A sample table summarizing portions of these data is included in section Exhibit 1b.4.2. In addition, initial teacher preparation programs receive regular feedback regarding candidate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills from current practitioners serving as adjunct faculty members and through formal and informal feedback with master teachers, unit fieldwork supervisors and site administrators. The special education program also receives regular feedback from its Advisory Committee.

Candidates in advanced education programs also gather graduate information about preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills through end-of-program surveys. School Psychology program survey data are included in Exhibit 1b.4.3. In addition, advisory committees gather periodically to review and evaluate programs. These committees ensure that programs stay abreast of the changing needs of California schools.

1c.5. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of teacher candidates may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution
offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1d.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

The Bachelor of Science degree in Child Development ensures that candidates can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn through key assessments in the areas of Knowledge, Planning, Use of Assessments and Diversity. A description for each of these assessments is available in Section 1b.1. These are outlined in the program’s 2010 Biennial Report. Aggregated data for these assessments indicate that candidates are performing well, averaging over 3.5 on a 4-point scale and 80% correct with 70% considered passing. See Exhibits 1a.5.1 and 1b.4.1 for more information.

Program faculty members also ensure that candidates can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn during their field experiences.

1d.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning; regularly apply them in their practice; analyze student, classroom, and school performance data; make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning; and are aware of and utilize school and community resources that support student learning? [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

The Master of Education, Special Emphasis uses the Use of Assessments and Diversity key assessments to indicate that candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning; regularly apply them in their practice; analyze student, classroom, and school performance data; make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning; and are aware of and utilize school and community resources that support student learning. The use of assessments component provides candidates with the opportunity to apply their understanding about factors that contribute to quality tests. The diversity assessment is a reflection on classroom behaviors that requires candidates to deepen their thinking about their own behaviors as they relate to children who are different, describe typical classroom behaviors and challenges of afflicted children and then analyze their personal issues with those behaviors. Aggregate data show that candidates are averaging 3.7+ on a 4-point scale, as illustrated in Exhibit 1d.4.1. These assessments are more fully described in the program’s 2010 Biennial Report.
1d.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates’ ability to help all students learn? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to the ability to help all students learn could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

Education Programs at the University of La Verne gather follow-up information about graduates’ ability to help all students learn. Candidates in initial teacher preparation programs, including Multiple and Single Subject Teacher Education, Special Education and Child Development, assess graduates’ perceptions of their ability to help all students learn through end-of-program surveys. Teacher and Special Education programs also assess graduates’ ability to help all students learn using assessment conducted by California State University system’s Center for Teacher Quality. A sample from this extensive report is included as Exhibit 1b.4.2. Many unit faculty attend regular meetings of Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment throughout the regions we serve. BTSA is a collaborative effort between higher education institutions and K-12 districts. BTSA is designed to support the professional development of newly-credentialed, beginning teachers and fulfill the requirements for the California Clear Multiple and Single Subjects Credentials. These meetings provide a regular and systematic opportunity for unit faculty to gather feedback about our graduates’ abilities to help all students learn. The special education program also receives regular feedback from its Advisory Committee.

Candidates in advanced education programs also gather graduate information about preparation related to graduates' ability to help all students learn. School Counseling program survey data are included in Exhibit 1d.4.2 as a sample. In addition, advisory committees gather periodically to review and evaluate programs. These committees ensure that programs stay abreast of the changing needs of California schools.

1d.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to student learning may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]
1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

1e.1. What are the pass rates of other school professionals on licensure tests by program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate)? Please complete Table 5 or upload your own table at Prompt 1e.4 below.

The State of California does not require licensure examinations for other school professionals programs. However, several programs at the University of La Verne include comprehensive exams as a requirement. Aggregated data for these examinations are included in Table 5.

Table 5
Pass Rates on Licensure Tests for Other School Professionals

For Period: See Notes Below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Name of Licensure Test</th>
<th># of Test Takers</th>
<th>% Passing State Licensure Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Life (1)</td>
<td>Child Life National Professional Certification Exam</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology (2)</td>
<td>PRAXIS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Average of data from Fall 2007 – Spring 2010. Test given 2 x per year
2) Average of two years of data 1st year norming year 1 10 scores; year 2 16 scores

1e.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that other school professionals demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for programs for other school professionals that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1e.4 below.]

The University of La Verne has three programs for other professionals that are not state reviewed. They include a Master’s Degree in Child Development, a Master’s Degree in Child Life and a Doctor of Education Degree in Organizational Leadership. Candidates in these programs must maintain a minimum 3.0 GPA in order to stay in good academic standing and demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. The master’s degree programs have each verified that candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards through five key assessments and the doctoral program has established an alternate set of evaluations better suited to its unique needs.

The MS in Child Development is a 33 semester-hour program that is aligned with National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) standards. They have identified key assessments in knowledge, planning, use of assessments, diversity and technology that
emphasize the knowledge in candidates. The knowledge assessments are the Human Development comprehensive exam and the Research Review of Developmental Issues Related to Infancy. The planning key assessment is a comprehensive lesson plan including goals, objectives, activities and lecture material. Candidates demonstrate their ability to assess students using the Peabody Picture Vocabulary language tool. In order to meet the diversity and technology key assessments, candidates develop a curriculum presentation, which includes video, photos and other Web 2.0 technologies, that reviews a currently used curriculum, the research that supports it, and the involvement of families and the school. These key assessments indicate that Master’s Degree in Child Development candidates are demonstrating the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards, with scores averaging over 3.0 on a 4-point scale for every key assessment last year. These assessments are more fully described in the program’s 2010 Biennial Report. Aggregated key assessment data is included in Exhibit 1e.4.1.

The Master’s Degree in Child Life is a 36 semester-hour program that is aligned with the standards of Clinical and Practice based Education Programs developed and implemented by the national Child Life Council. The Child Life Council recommends the Masters Child Life Program as a high quality clinical education advanced degree program in the field of Child Life. During the last four semesters the Graduates of the Masters Child Life Program have a 100% pass rate on the Child Life National Professional Certification Exam. In addition, candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards using the unit’s five key assessments. Results from these key assessments indicate that candidates are demonstrating the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards with average scores over 80% as illustrated in Exhibit 1f.3.1. Key Assessments are further discussed in the program’s 2010 Biennial Report. The Masters Child Life Program networks with and provides practicum and internship opportunities for Masters Child Life candidates in over 55 Medical and Hospital Institutions nationwide. Hospital supervisors complete fieldwork evaluations that include knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards on every candidate.

1e.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about the knowledge and skills of other school professionals? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate? [A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1e.4 below. The attached table could include all of the responses to your follow-up survey to which you could refer the reader in responses on follow-up studies in other elements of Standard 1.]

Other professional programs at the University of La Verne gather follow-up information about graduates’ preparation knowledge and skills in a variety of ways. Candidates in most programs complete end-of-program surveys that are linked to State Standards and/or desired proficiencies. School Counseling end-of-program survey data is provided as an example in Exhibit 1e.4.2 and School Psychology data have already been addressed in Exhibit 1b.4.3. Candidates in the Doctoral program in Organizational Leadership periodically conduct a survey of their graduates as a research project and learning exercise during their second year of study. End-of-program data clearly indicates that candidates in these programs are pleased with the professional knowledge and skills they receive through the program. They regularly score programs 3.5+ on a 4-point scale. In addition, programs for other school professionals receive regular feedback regarding candidate knowledge and skills from current practitioners serving as
adjunct faculty members and through formal and informal feedback with professionals in the field, unit fieldwork supervisors and site administrators. Most programs also gather regular feedback from Advisory Committees. Biennial Reports identify key data that have led to recent or planned program changes, which often begin with one of these sources. (Biennial Reports)

1e.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the knowledge and skills of other school professionals may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

1f.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates can create positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental levels of students; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work? [Data for programs for other school professionals that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1f.3 below.]

The University of La Verne has three programs for other professionals that are not state reviewed. They include a Master’s Degree in Child Development, a Master’s Degree in Child Life and a Doctor of Education Degree in Organizational Leadership. Of these, only the Child Development program emphasizes candidate proficiencies directly related to P-12 schools. The Child Life and Organizational Leadership programs recognize student learning in a larger context. The Child Life program uses key assessments to ensure that candidates can create positive environments for students within the context of medically fragile students in hospital settings. The Organizational Leadership program recognizes student learners as participants within the larger context of their organizations. With this in mind, candidates in each of these programs build on the developmental levels of students; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work, whether in a hospital, business, college or P-12 schools. The master’s degree programs have each identified five key assessments and the doctoral program has established an alternate set of evaluations better suited to its unique needs. Aggregated data for the Child Development (Exhibit 1e.4.1) and Child Life (Exhibit 1f.3.1) programs indicate that candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. For a more thorough explanation of assessment results and actions taken, please refer to the Master’s Degree in Child Development 2010 Biennial Report.

1f.2. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates’ ability to create positive environments for student learning? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to the ability to create positive environments for student learning could be attached at Prompt 1f.3 below.]

Education Programs at the University of La Verne gather follow-up information about graduates’ ability to create positive environments or student learning in a variety of ways.
Candidates in initial teacher preparation programs, including Multiple and Single Subject Teacher Education, Special Education and Child Development, assess graduates’ ability to create positive environments for student learning through end-of-program surveys. End-of-program survey data for each program are available in the 2010 Biennial Reports. Teacher and Special Education programs also assess graduates’ ability to help all students learn using assessment conducted by California State University system’s Center for Teacher Quality. A sample from this extensive report is included as Exhibit 1b.4.2. In addition, initial teacher preparation programs receive regular feedback on their graduates’ ability to help all students learn from current practitioners serving as adjunct faculty members, and through formal and informal feedback with master teachers, unit fieldwork supervisors and site administrators. The special education program also receives regular feedback from its Advisory Committee.

Candidates in advanced education programs also gather follow-up information about graduates’ ability to create positive environments or student learning in a variety of ways. Candidates in most programs complete end-of-program surveys address creating positive learning environments. School Counseling end-of-program survey data is provided in Exhibit 1e.4.2 and School Psychology data in Exhibit 1b.4.3. Candidates in the Doctoral program in Organizational Leadership periodically conduct a survey of graduates as a research project and learning exercise during their second year of study. In addition, advanced programs receive regular feedback regarding graduates’ ability to create positive environments or student learning from current practitioners serving as adjunct faculty members and through formal and informal feedback with professionals in the field, unit fieldwork supervisors and site administrators. Most programs also gather regular feedback from Advisory Committees. Biennial Reports identify key data that have led to recent or planned program changes.

1f.3. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to other school professionals' creation of positive environments for student learning may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates. [Indicate when the responses refer to the preparation of initial teacher candidates, advanced teacher candidates, and other school professionals, noting differences when they occur.]

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

The University of La Verne has adopted a unit-wide set of dispositions that candidates are expected to demonstrate by the time they complete their programs. They are:

- Intellectual Commitment
- Respectfulness
- Professionalism
- Empathy
- Socio-cultural Competence
- Responsibility
- Commitment to Professional Development
- Ethical Behavior
The College of Education and Organizational Leadership Dispositions Agreement Form provides a more thorough description of these dispositions. It is included as Exhibit 1g.5.1.

1g.2. How do candidates demonstrate that they are developing professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

Programs in the unit begin discussing dispositions with candidates during the admission process using the College of Education and Organizational Leadership Dispositions Agreement Form (Exhibit 1g.5.2). Every program has assignments and/or activities that require candidates to complete self-evaluation and reflection designed to develop professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Examples can be found in EDUC 460, Diversity, Interaction, and the Learning Process, in the teacher education program (EDUC 460 syllabus) and EDUC 573, Counseling Diverse Populations in the school counseling program. (EDUC 573 syllabus) The unit also has a reporting system, using the Candidate Disposition Form, for faculty members who have serious concerns with a candidate’s expression of the unit’s dispositions. Candidates receive the greatest degree of training and assessment in the unit’s professional dispositions during the fieldwork components of their programs. A supervised teaching evaluation form from the teacher education program is included as Exhibit 1g.5.3. Fieldwork supervisors assess candidates on professional dispositions and work with them on an ongoing basis. From time to time, there are candidates that do not develop the necessary professional dispositions even with significant education and training. Those individuals are asked to leave the program.

1g.3. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions listed in 1g.1 as they work with students, families, colleagues, and communities? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

College of Education and Organizational Leadership programs emphasize professional dispositions as they relate to candidates’ work with students, families, colleagues and communities throughout the program. They are particularly relevant in the diversity key assessment and in fieldwork. An example of the diversity key assessment relating to candidates’ work with students, families, colleagues and communities is in EDUC 573, Counseling Diverse Populations in the school counseling program. (EDUC 573 syllabus) Candidates also emphasize professional dispositions in their work with students, families, colleagues and communities in field experiences. Fieldwork supervisors assess candidates on professional dispositions and work with them on an ongoing basis as noted in the supervised teaching evaluation form included as Exhibit 1g.5.3. The unit does not aggregate data on candidate dispositions.

1g.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' demonstration of professional dispositions? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional dispositions could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

Education Programs at the University of La Verne gather follow-up information about graduates’ professional dispositions primarily through relationships with current practitioners.
This may occur through adjunct faculty members and informal feedback with master teachers, unit fieldwork supervisors and site administrators and/or through Advisory Committee meetings. Teacher Preparation programs also gather information on graduate dispositions through the CTQ Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Survey. Data indicate that unit graduates demonstrate the professional dispositions desired by their employing supervisors. See Exhibit 1g.5.4 for sample findings.

1g.5. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to professional dispositions may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Optional

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

The Teacher Preparation Program was an early adopter of the state-wide Teacher Performance Assessment, collecting data on candidate performance for four years. In addition, the Teacher Preparation Program has participated in the state-wide Center for Teacher Quality graduate survey providing essential feedback on the performance of La Verne program completers compared with peer institutions. These data have been analyzed and used to improve program excellence.

2. What research related to Standard 1 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?
STANDARD 2. ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

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

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

2a. Assessment System

2a.1. How does the unit ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit’s conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards?

The CEOL has developed and implemented a comprehensive assessment plan based on the unit’s conceptual frameworks and aligned with state standards. There are four transition points: 1) admission; 2) preparation for clinical experiences; 3) program completion; and 4) post program. Within these transition points, data-driven decisions are made at the candidate level regarding academics and dispositions. Faculty trainings have been conducted at the “roll-out” phase of the assessment system’s implementation as well as on an on-going basis to capture new faculty additions. These trainings have also helped to maintain momentum in the adherence to the assessment system by reinforcing the importance of the system’s integrity. An Assessment Committee comprised of program chairs meets monthly to address challenges in measurement and data collection. A data collection and management software program (Task Stream) has been purchased and implemented to assist in compliance monitoring as well as data reporting. Resources have been employed, such as internet websites, to allow faculty and students to reference video-based and document-driven tutorials to help maintain the compliance to the data collection system. Each individual program conducts monthly meetings with all faculty and support staff to discuss, among other items, how well it meets program standards using the assessment plan in place. Designated leaders from each program, including the program chairs, meet with the Director of Assessment and Accreditation to discuss the output data, as measured against such standards. These Program Focus Group (PFG) meetings consider data in light of conceptual framework guiding principles and state standards. Using aggregated and disaggregated output data, the appropriateness of the selected program assessments are evaluated. While most of these assessments have been internally designed and created, some programs rely on external assessments such as the California Teacher Performance Assessments (CalTPA) and the Praxis Test Series.

Among the priorities addressed during the PFG meetings is the issue of consistent program performance throughout all campus locations. For example, key assessment data are disaggregated by campus location as well as by instructor to help determine needs for curriculum, data collection and candidate management training.

2a.2. What are the key assessments used by the unit and its programs to monitor and make decisions about candidate performance at transition points such as those listed in Table 6? Please complete Table 6 or upload your own table at Prompt 2a.6 below.
Table 6
Unit Assessment System: Transition Point Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Entry to clinical practice</th>
<th>Exit from clinical practice</th>
<th>Program completion</th>
<th>After program completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
<td>GPA of 2.65. Transfer students must have 28 units with a minimum of 2.7 GPA</td>
<td>Acceptance into each of the fieldwork-based courses</td>
<td>Presentation of reflection activities including comparing and contrasting research project, journaling and interview summaries</td>
<td>End-of-Program Survey</td>
<td>Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development, B.S.</td>
<td>GPA of 2.5 or more in college coursework; Interview with faculty; Assessment of writing ability</td>
<td>Developmental Knowledge Exam; Supervisor Evaluation</td>
<td>Portfolio Development and Final Evaluation of Teaching Performance</td>
<td>End-of-Program Survey</td>
<td>Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development, M.S.</td>
<td>GPA (last 60 units of undergraduate work); Interview with faculty; Assessment of writing ability; Candidate statement of professional goals</td>
<td>Knowledge Comprehensive exam; Research review of developmental issues related to infancy; Comprehensive lesson plan including goals, objectives, activities, lecture material; Standard Language Assessment Tool; Neurological Based Behavior Reflection Paper; PowerPoint presentation reviewing current curriculum</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>End-of-Program Survey</td>
<td>Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>Entry to clinical practice</td>
<td>Exit from clinical practice</td>
<td>Program completion</td>
<td>After program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Life</td>
<td>GPA (last 60 units of undergraduate work); Interview with faculty; Assessment of writing ability</td>
<td>Field Research project; Grief Handbook; Leadership handbook; Final Competency Assignment - Medical, Clinical, Teaching &amp; Preparation; Cultural Scenario, Medical Issue &amp; Family Situation Research Paper; Practicing Child Life Case Study in PowerPoint form</td>
<td>Hospital based Special Project/Practicum Evaluation</td>
<td>End-of-Program Survey</td>
<td>Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Counseling</td>
<td>GPA (last 60 units of undergraduate work); Assessment of writing ability; interviews with faculty</td>
<td>Demonstrate an understanding of the core areas of School Counseling; Ability to develop professional identity; Ability to plan, design, and implement an evaluation of a counseling program; Technology skills development.</td>
<td>Fieldwork Evaluations</td>
<td>End-of-Program Survey</td>
<td>Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Management</td>
<td>GPA (last 60 units of undergraduate work); Interview with faculty; Reflective essay; Letters of Reference</td>
<td>Demonstrated knowledge of theory and practice; Analysis of school strengths and weaknesses and plan program of remediation; budget planning; demonstrated understanding of diversity in education</td>
<td>Portfolio of fieldwork projects; Fieldwork evaluations</td>
<td>End-of-Program Survey</td>
<td>Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, MEd</td>
<td>GPA (last 60 units of undergraduate work); Interview with faculty; Candidate statement of professional goals; Letters of Reference</td>
<td>Mastery of ability to assess children in reading/writing; Mastery of ability to plan appropriate, effective instruction for children in reading/writing; Demonstration of ability to analyze and identify students’ strengths and weaknesses and to provide effective instruction/ further recommendations</td>
<td>Development of technology skills in Blackboard, PowerPoint, and Observation Booths; Reading Specialist Competency Exam</td>
<td>End-of-Program Survey</td>
<td>Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>Entry to clinical practice</td>
<td>Exit from clinical practice</td>
<td>Program completion</td>
<td>After program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td>GPA (last 60 units of undergraduate work); Interview with faculty; Candidate statement of professional goals; Letters of Reference</td>
<td>National Praxis Exam; Evaluation of Comprehensive Assessment Report &amp; Presentation; Evaluation of candidate diversity competencies from Practicum evaluations; Evaluation of technology Competence in assessment classes, program planning and evaluation</td>
<td>Demonstrated Skills Evaluation Portfolio Assignment-culminating record of Candidate competencies; Fieldwork/Internship Demonstrated Skills Evaluation</td>
<td>End-of-Program Survey</td>
<td>Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education – Level I</td>
<td>GPA (last 60 units of undergraduate work); Assessment of writing ability</td>
<td>Case Study: Understanding Academic and Behavior Needs of Mild/Moderate Learners; Caseload Management Practitioner's Notebook; Mini-Conference and Self-evaluation; Technology Portfolio Section</td>
<td>Fieldwork Evaluations</td>
<td>End-of-Program Survey</td>
<td>Center for Teacher Quality Post-Program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education – Level II</td>
<td>GPA (last 60 units of undergraduate work); Assessment of writing ability</td>
<td>Current Issues, Policies and Practices Research Project; Theory and Practice Behavior Change Projects; Assessment Report on a Case Study; Inclusive Instruction Final Project; Technology Support Project</td>
<td>Stakeholder Feedback (parents, teachers, educators, professionals, etc)</td>
<td>End-of-Program Survey</td>
<td>Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>GPA (last 60 units of undergraduate work); Assessment of writing ability</td>
<td>Successful completion of CalTPA Subject Specific Pedagogy; Submission of CalTPA Designing Instruction</td>
<td>Passage of all four CalTPA tasks; Technology assessment</td>
<td>End-of-Program Survey</td>
<td>Center for Teacher Quality Post-Program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Emphasis</td>
<td>GPA (last 60 units of undergraduate work); Assessment of writing ability</td>
<td>CalTPA Task Performance; Literature Review; Test Review Project; Reflection on Classroom Behaviors; Graduate Seminar Project</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>End-of-Program Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2a.3. How is the unit assessment system evaluated? Who is involved and how?

The CEOL unit assessment system is evaluated at multiple levels and at regular intervals. PFG’s consisting of program chairs, faculty, assessment and accreditation coordinators have been created for each program to deeply examine program data and the assessment system. These groups also include representatives from regional campuses to ensure open communication and consistent program operations. These groups meet biweekly and are led by the Director of Assessment and Accreditation. The Assessment Committee then addresses effectiveness and integrity matters at the unit-wide level. The Assessment Committee is also led by the Director of Assessment and Accreditation during monthly meetings. The third level of evaluation occurs between the Director of Assessment and Accreditation, the Accreditation Coordinator and the Dean of CEOL. A fourth evaluation level occurs during program review meetings between the Dean and department chairs. The assessment system is comprehensive, addressing specified key assessment areas, transition points, guiding principles, program standards and dispositions; these various levels are required for thorough evaluations. Each of these evaluation groups examines data on transition points, key assessments and dispositions.

2a.4. How does the unit ensure that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias?

Inter-rater reliability, data triangulation and collaborative evaluations are some of the methods used to ensure accuracy, consistency and freedom from bias in the unit’s assessment procedures. For example, upon applying to one of our initial programs, candidates submit a writing sample that is graded by two evaluators. In advanced programs, program chairs lead the calibration effort on key program assessments. This inter-rater reliability solution is supplemented with the triangulation of a measurement. For example, admissions determinations are made using data derived through interviews, transcript reviews, letters of recommendation in addition to the writing sample. Collaborative evaluations include blind grading by designated assessors. This solution makes use of Task Stream’s assessment evaluation feature. This allows for access to candidates’ work without identifying data.

Fairness is assured through thorough and standardized communication with all candidates. Instances of students’ poor performance have been used to determine if assessments target certain populations for failure. For example, because applicants with learning disabilities struggled with writing, a specific workshop was developed to support these applicants to pass the writing assessment. Program expectations are outlined for candidates at the course level, including methods of evaluation and clear grading policies. Candidates are afforded the opportunity to appeal the handling of an assessment procedure. This involves writing to the various levels within the unit (lead instructor, program chair, lead regional faculty, department chair, and Dean) until all parties agree with a resolution.

Additionally, the unit employs a strong lead course faculty system to ensure consistent curriculum design and delivery of core course concepts and program standards. This also helps maintain consistent instructional practices among the various campus locations. While this remains an on-going effort, this lead course faculty system of management has been widely supported by the unit faculty.
2a.5. What assessments and evaluation measures are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit?

The unit employs a variety of assessments and evaluation measures. These include faculty-designed formative and achievement assessment tools, external evaluations and faculty evaluations. The operations and academics of the unit are measured with multiple instruments. At the university level, the Institutional Research (IR) department conducts climate surveys annually targeting faculty and administrative staffs. The IR department also manages the Western Accreditation of Schools and Colleges (WASC) action items and documentation. This department provides the unit with direction on needed growth items and methods for addressing and demonstrating responses to such challenges. Course evaluations are reviewed by faculty, department chairs and the Dean to improve teaching and learning. Faculty evaluations are also conducted through the Tenure and Promotion committee and the Dean. As appropriate, support is afforded to faculty members to facilitate needed growth. At the Unit level, a standardized assessment plan allows for compliance and integrity measurements by program. This plan includes five key assessment categories: 1) knowledge; 2) planning; 3) assessment; 4) diversity; and 5) technology as well as transition points including admissions, preparation for fieldwork, program completion and post program. The plan also requires the use of a standardized rubric template. This is a four-point template with descriptions for the "not present, emerging, competent and exemplary" levels. At the candidate level, data are gathered through course evaluations as well as through student advisement performed by faculty at all levels, credential specialists, fieldwork coordinators and department leaders.

The unit has also identified domains that define effective unit operations and processes to ensure continuous improvement based on data collection and analysis. The table linked below identifies those domains, the type of data collected, the person responsible for reviewing that data, benchmarks, frequency, and expected outcomes.
http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-2/

2a.6. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's assessment system may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

2b.1. What are the processes and timelines used by the unit to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data on candidate performance, unit operations, and program quality?

☐ How are the data collected?
☐ From whom (e.g., applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty) are data collected?
☐ How often are the data summarized and analyzed?
☐ Whose responsibility is it to summarize and analyze the data? (dean, assistant dean, data coordinator, etc.)
☐ In what formats are the data summarized and analyzed? (reports, tables, charts, graphs, etc.)
☐ What information technologies are used to maintain the unit's assessment system?

During the last three years, the unit has engaged in organizing the system by which data are collected, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and used to make decisions about candidates,
programs, and the unit. In the beginning, we found that there were many sources of data, but improvements were needed on the systematic way that all of these sources and stakeholders were processing and using the data to improve candidate and, consequently, student performance. We experienced silos of data collection, analyses, and use of data. Several organizational steps needed to occur. First, the unit’s Assessment Committee became a major forum for bidirectional communication about data. Second, the Director of Assessment and Accreditation was hired to create a web- and server-based data management system so that data from the key assessments were accessible for all stakeholders who needed to collect, summarize, analyze, and use data for decision-making. Third, PFG’s were created for each of the unit’s programs to develop, evaluate, and analyze assessments at the program level.

Data collection is led by program chairs and carried-out by individual instructors. Data entry is accomplished via the university-wide data system Banner by Sunguard for course assignments, course grades, program selection and all demographic data. Task Stream is used for management of key assessment data and distribution of appropriate candidate surveys. All data are gathered after the end of each term and integrated in spreadsheets for analysis, summarization and presentation. These output reports are then shared and discussed at each of the Assessment Committee, PFG and program meetings. Such summary reports are typically in table format and are posted to shared drives for access by all authorized faculty and staff. Program chairs have access to all other program data through the assessment department. Sample summaries of such data are included in Standard 1 above and within the Biennial Reports for each program.

During the biweekly PFG and program meetings, focus is on compliance with the assessment plan. During the monthly Assessment Committee meetings, focus is on data trends requiring unit-wide perspectives and insights. Deeper analysis such as statistical significance and correlations are conducted at the end of the year, with the benefit of higher N values. Performance comparisons among campus locations are also a focus. Data meanings are derived through discussions about program history, staff and faculty turnover, training schedules and other like variables.

2b.2 How does the unit disaggregate candidate assessment data for candidates on the main campus, at off-campus sites, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs?

All data are entered into one or more data systems. These include the university-wide student information system Banner by Sunguard, the learning management system Blackboard and the college-wide program Task Stream. Data from these sources are then exported and integrated into a comprehensive dataset that is then disaggregated by campus location, demographic data, courses, instructors, among other variables. Sample summaries of such data are included in Standard 1 above and within the Biennial Reports for each program.

2b.3. How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?

The Dean’s office has a file of student complaints and appeals. Each time a candidate shares a complaint or registers an appeal by email or letter, the complaint or appeal is addressed
and documentation of the complaint/appeal with resolution is filed in a secure cabinet in the Dean’s office. In addition, there are university level undergraduate and graduate appeals committees with written guidelines. For graduate students, Graduate Services works closely with the dean and Provost to ensure that students’ rights are protected. For undergraduates, the Dean of Student Affairs works with the deans and Provost to address any concerns and to ensure student rights are preserved.

2b.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's data collection, analysis, and evaluation may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2c.1. In what ways does the unit regularly and systematically use data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to its courses, programs, and clinical experiences?

Data are collected at multiple levels for the purpose of informing program improvement. Within the centralized assessment system, all programs submit data on candidate performance in program-designated key assessments through Task Stream and end-of-program surveys are administered centrally. Outside of the assessment system, program leaders collect course performance and candidate evaluation data. Informally, information is gathered by program designers during collaborative meetings. Fieldwork coordinators manage the collection of fieldwork evaluation data. Often, these data include evaluations at multiple levels (of candidates, of unit supervisors and of site supervisors).

All such data are then aggregated by the unit assessment department and disaggregated by campus, instructor, and program level (degree- versus credential- driven students). Summary analyses are then conducted, including analysis of difference across time and between campuses, correlations among course grades, key assessments, admission and exit data. The assessment department then presents these summary data during PFG meetings. Probing questions are asked and explored during these PFG meetings to understand and explain the data trends and anomalies. During the Assessment Committee meetings, such unit-wide trends and anomalies are discussed and, as appropriate, policies are revisited for development and refinement.

2c.2. What data-driven changes have occurred over the past three years?

The unit is proud to showcase a robust data-driven program improvement system. This system is diligently managed at the program level and involves investments from all stakeholders. Each program chair leads this charge and recruits support from the unit's assessment department for data sources and analyses, program faculty for informed input, advisory groups for industry wisdom, as well as formal and informal candidate input. The nature of program improvements include course content refinement, course sequence shifts, enhancing admission criteria, faculty trainings and collaboration as well as program alignment among all campuses.

Data sources include both quantitative and qualitative observations. The Center for Teacher Quality is a firm that the unit hires to administer post program surveys to our graduates and their employers as well as summarize the data gathered. Teacher Performance Assessments
are California-based requirements for all teacher education candidates and allow for the evaluation of knowledge, planning, assessment and fieldwork aspects of the program. Other quantitative sources include license and content exams, survey results, and key assessment data among others.

Qualitative sources include faculty and advisory group input, dispositional evaluations, and input from field partners. Details about data-driven program improvements are outlined in the Exhibit 2c2 linked below: [http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-2/](http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-2/)

2c.3. What access do faculty members have to candidate assessment data and/or data systems?

Faculty have various levels of access to candidate data. At the candidate level, faculty can access course management data using Blackboard, while access to key assessment data is derived through Task Stream. At the program level, faculty can access aggregated data through program chairs. Program chairs then consult with the Unit Assessment Department for any and all aggregated or summarized academic data. The Assessment Department is comprised of two full-time data managers and assists in aggregating and managing data from multiple unit systems. This department has full access to all academic data in Banner and Task Stream and collaboration with the university Institutional Research as well as Student Information System departments.

2c.4. How are assessment data shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders to help them reflect on and improve their performance and programs?

All data gathering and analysis described above are shared and discussed appropriately with stakeholders such as program advisory groups, full-time faculty, fieldwork supervisors, and adjunct faculty. In addition to data examinations at the Assessment Committee, PFG and program meetings, presentations of program efficacy are made to program advisory groups and partners. Candidates are also exposed to such program data at the recruitment and admission stages as well as throughout the program. During these data presentation, emphasis is placed on program quality and how performance can be improved.

2c.5. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the use of data for program improvement may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Optional

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

2. What research related to Standard 2 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?
STANDARD 3. FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

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

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

3a.1. Who are the unit's partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?

Initial Teacher Programs:

The CEOL partners with professionals in schools and community agencies in diverse communities to ensure candidates have a successful experience with children and youth from diverse language, ethnic and racial backgrounds.

The University of La Verne’s initial credentialing programs require that each supervised teaching candidate completes two supervised teaching assignments:

**Introductory Supervised Teaching (ED 468)**

Five-week experience completed in the third semester or term

- Multiple subject candidates complete a K-2: 3-6: or 7-8 core assignment
- Single subject candidates complete a 7-12 assignment

**Advanced Supervised Teaching (ED 478)**

Ten-week experience completed in the fourth or last semester or term

- Multiple subject candidates complete the assignment in a different grade level from ED 468
- Single subject candidates complete the assignment in another 7-12 assignment

The following list of partners is used for both Introductory Supervised Teaching and Advanced Supervised Teaching assignments and for ED 467: Intern Teaching: Multiple and Single Subjects:

- School districts and individual school sites in the following counties:
  - Main Campus: Los Angeles County: San Bernardino County: Orange County: Riverside County
  - Ventura/Oxnard Campus: Ventura County
  - Bakersfield Campus: Kern County
  - High Desert Campus: San Bernardino County
  - Newhall Campus: Los Angeles County
  - San Luis Obispo Campus: San Luis Obispo County and surrounding counties such as North Santa Barbara and South Monterey Counties.

These individual districts and school-sites are partners with the University of La Verne through a contractual arrangement signed by both the unit and the districts whereby the districts and the school-sites agree to the unit’s placement requirements and provide assistance in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the supervised teaching experience and the intern program through semester evaluations based on the performance of the assigned candidates to the districts and school-sites. The unit supervisor assigned to each candidate collaborates with the individual school-sites on a weekly basis. These semester evaluations of the supervised teaching program are assessed by the director/coordinator and the program are used to restructure and/or improve the program, if required. Almost all evaluations are returned with no
suggestions for change or improvement and are complimentary of the overall program organization.

Each district and school-site partner receives written documentation from the unit prior to placing candidates in the sites outlining the unit’s requirements for supervised teaching. This written documentation is in the form of a letter outlining the requirements, received prior to the arrival of the candidate, and a School-Site Handbook and Orientation Packet that is available online. This information is reinforced by the unit supervisor during the first week of the candidate’s assignment and a Letter of Understanding is signed by the school-site administrator and a School-Site Supervisor Agreement document is signed by the school-site supervisor. The unit supervisors, who are retired school-site administrators and classroom teachers, act in a dual role as both candidate supervisors and members of the Department of Education’s Supervised Teaching Advisory Board in providing direction and policy to the design, delivery, and evaluation of the supervised teaching program in partnership with the director/coordinator of the intern and supervised teaching programs. Each unit supervisor completes an evaluation of the supervised teaching program at the completion of each semester. The director/coordinator establishes the infrastructure of the two programs and relies on the advisory board for feedback and suggestions. Full-time faculty members are also members of the advisory board in their dual capacities of instructors and supervised teaching supervisors. Intern Program: Multiple and Single Subjects (ED 467)

The University of La Verne’s Intern Program partners with Region 5 Intern Consortium. This includes the following Local Education Agencies: Cal Poly Pomona, Claremont Graduate University, California State University, San Bernardino, Fontana Unified School District, National University, Palmdale Unified School District, Point Loma Nazarine University, Riverside County Office of Education, Azusa Pacific University, and Whittier College.

All teacher candidates must complete all the requirements indicated in Table 7 prior to completing the final supervised teaching assignment, Advanced Supervised Teaching ED 478.

Advanced Teacher and Other Professionals Programs:
The University of La Verne’s advanced and other school professional programs are more diverse in their approaches to partnerships. This advanced studies department includes Education Management, School Psychology, Child Development, Child Life, Special Education and Educational Counseling. Partnerships with these programs are led and managed by program chairs and include the following:

- Child Life: Health care/Hospital (local, state, national), Interdisciplinary health care team;
- Education Management: School districts throughout regions served/Advisory councils.
- Child Development: The Fairplex Child Development Center, Local agencies such as Head Start service organizations and community colleges.
- School Psychology: Non-public schools, county offices of education, Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPAs), The Fairplex Child Development Center
- Site/Student supervisors, unit supervisors, student self-evaluations.
- Intern director group.

The Educational Counseling program works collaboratively with site supervisors, faculty supervisors and an advisory board.

The list of partners for initial and advanced programs is listed in the link below. http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-3/
3a.2. In what ways have the unit’s partners contributed to the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit’s field and clinical experiences?

Initial Teacher Programs:
Each of the University of La Verne’s partner districts and schools contribute to the design, delivery and evaluation of the supervised teaching program and the intern program by providing the unit’s candidates with an extensive selection of school-sites that meet the unit’s requirements for language and ethnic diversity. Each district has been chosen by the unit to be a partner based on the socio-economic and cultural diversity available within its student population.

The partners’ contribution to the design, delivery, and evaluation of the program starts before the candidate’s first day by being able to respond to the letters of request for placement and requirements and the on-line documents, and then during the first week during the unit supervisors’ first visit.

Each of the participating partner districts and school-sites has the opportunity to give input into the design, delivery, and evaluation of the supervised teaching program each semester by corresponding with the unit either in person to the unit supervisor or by email or telephone contact to the director/coordinator of any concerns, questions, or suggestions that may arise regarding the program from the orientation documents and on-line documents that were received prior to the candidate’s arrival. On-going suggestions during the semester by the school-site administrator and school-site supervisor are possible each week during the unit supervisor’s observation and then at the end of the semester through the program evaluation based on the candidate’s success as demonstrated by the training received through coursework completed at the university.

The unit requires that each participating district and school has a minimum of 25% diversity in both cultural/ethnic and language differences from the candidate. The unit and the partner districts and schools provide each candidate with a rich and varied educational experience through careful placement with school-site supervisors that have experience and knowledge of the different pedagogies required to educate a diverse student body. This requirement is verified by the school-site administrator signing the required Letter of Understanding and the unit supervisor verifying the school-site’s diversity by completing the School-Site Professional Evaluation form at the end of each semester.

Each school-site supervisor must be an exemplary teacher with a minimum of three years of successful experience within the credential area, an excellent mentor and modeler of excellent teaching strategies and ELL certified. Also required is the ability to engage his/her students in effective ELL teaching strategies and to model these strategies effectively for the unit candidate and. This requirement is verified by the school-site administrator, by having the school-site supervisor sign the School-Site Supervisor agreement document and completion of the Credential and Experience Verification form. The unit supervisor oversees this requirement through the weekly observations of the candidate. The Credential and Experience Verification form is linked here:

The unit places the candidates, with the cooperation and assistance of the partner districts and school-sites, only in school-sites that meet these requirements. The candidates participate fully in all the experiences that the school-site offers and participate in experiences designed to
enhance their in-depth knowledge of the academic content program, learner centered pedagogy, and dispositions, especially those reflecting their belief that all students can learn.

Through this placement policy, the partner districts and school-sites assist the unit in maintaining the design, delivery, and evaluation of the overall program that is reflected in the semester evaluation that is required by all participating school-site administrators and school-site supervisors.

**Advanced Teacher and Other School Professionals Programs:**

The advanced and other school professionals programs also offer several opportunities to partners to develop and refine clinical experiences. These opportunities include verbal feedback given at on-site orientations with faculty supervisors and regularly scheduled site observations. Site supervisors provide written evaluation of student knowledge and skills at the end of each field experience. Regular communications through orientations, observations and evaluations are required at each site placement. These communications occur minimally every 16 weeks. The advisory board meets one to two times annually to discuss program design and delivery issues. Several programs interact personally with site personnel and exchange ideas and share expertise, both formally through evaluations and informally through conversation.

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

**Initial Teacher Programs:**

The determination for the placement of students for supervised teaching is a joint decision by the unit and the partner districts. The candidates for supervised teaching attend a pre-orientation meeting in the preceding semester or term where the requirements for supervised teaching are explained and the options for placement are discussed. Candidates may request a partner district and a partner school within that district for consideration for placement. Multiple subject candidates must complete two of three options, K-2: 3-5: 6-8 during the two supervised teaching assignments. Single subject candidates must complete at least two grade levels in their subject area from grades 7-12 for both assignments.

Once the application for supervised teaching has been received and the candidate has been cleared for supervise teaching, the office of the Director/Coordinator for Fieldwork Experience sends out a written request for placement to the requested partner district. The participating partner district reviews the request to determine whether the request can be met. If the partner district determines that the request can be met, then the district contacts the office of the Director/Coordinator for Fieldwork Experience to notify them for suitability and the director/coordinator has the final approval of the placement if it’s in an appropriate classroom setting in an appropriate school with a qualified school-site supervisor that meets the unit’s requirements. If the partner district cannot place the candidate in an acceptable assignment, the request is returned to the unit where the process is then repeated for the candidate’s second choice district and school.

When the candidate has been placed by the partner district, the unit then sends a letter of thanks and explanation to the partner school’s school-site administrator and to the assigned school-site supervisor that outlines the requirements for the supervised teaching assignment and provides both with the on-line link for the School-Site Handbook and the appropriate Orientation Packet.
On main campus all participating school-site supervisors and school-site administrators have been invited to a Saturday Orientation Meeting where the program is discussed and input requested. These orientation meetings were suspended in 2010 due to lack of interest on the part of the school-sites.

During the process of requesting placement for candidates, the office of the Director/Coordinator for Fieldwork Experience is in constant contact with the partner districts that have been requested by the candidate. This contact is a two-way communication with both agencies working in the best interest of the candidate. This agency partnership allows for close contact with the partner districts in building lines of open communication and understanding of both the unit’s and the partner districts’ requirements.

In courses that require fieldwork placement, the unit works with the partner districts through our agreement in accepting fieldwork students in school-sites and classes that meet the unit’s diversity requirements in language and culture/ethnicity. The unit requires that all fieldwork students have the appropriate clearances required by the partner districts prior to starting any fieldwork.

**Advanced Teacher and Other School Professionals Programs:**

The unit’s Educational Counseling program has implemented a clear procedure for placement of candidates in clinical settings. During the first meeting of the Supervised Fieldwork course, faculty discuss and offer guidance on possible site selections. Each faculty maintains a list of previously used sites with site supervisors having a minimum of two years at the site and a Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) credential for all K-12 settings. Candidates choosing to complete a portion of their hours at a community agency working with K-12 students must have a supervisor with a minimum of a Master’s degree in a counseling related field. Students make contact with the proposed site supervisor to schedule an interview. A Verification of Placement form outlining the responsibilities of each party is signed by the candidate, site supervisor and faculty supervisor. The site supervisor receives the unit’s On-Site Supervisors Handbook, with detailed expectations for the fieldwork experience. Candidates and site-supervisors are also responsible for completing and signing a Planning Document that details the activities to be carried out at the site. Faculty supervisors must approve the Planning Document.

Since the unit’s Education Management program must place candidates in one of several school site levels (elementary, secondary, district office, offices of education, etc.), requests are made on this basis and the unit facilitates such placements. The unit’s Child Development and Special Education programs review potential sites and accept them based on specified requirements. The unit’s Reading program manages a Literacy Center on the main campus and arranges for students from local school districts to attend tutoring and small group instruction sessions. All placements for this program are at this Literacy Center. The School Psychology program asks candidates to compete for internships based on presentations and course performances. While candidates can make requests, placement for the unit’s Special Education program must be in an Resource Specialist Program (RSP), Special Day Class (SDC) or a collaborative model where the student teacher candidate can demonstrate whole class and small group teaching. Master teachers must hold a clear Education Specialist credential or equivalent and have a record of quality teaching.

3a.4. How do the unit and its school partners share expertise and resources to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice?

**Initial Teacher Programs:**

Expertise and resources sharing are carried out on a weekly basis during the unit supervisor’s weekly observation of the candidate. During each of the weekly observations, the unit supervisor completes the Observation Form, based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and
Teaching Performance Expectations standards. The supervised teaching candidate and the school-site supervisor each receive a copy. During the weekly observation of the candidate, the unit supervisor will discuss the observation using the completed Observation Form with the candidate and the school-site supervisor. The unit supervisor will also discuss the candidate’s planning, classroom management, instructional strategies, and teaching strengths and weaknesses.

In this way, both the unit supervisor and the school-site supervisor can share their combined experiences and resources with the candidate. The candidate is also required to spend the complete professional day with his/her respective school-site supervisor during the entire Introductory Supervised Teaching and Advanced Supervised Teaching experience. The candidate and the school-site supervisor are required to debrief at the end of each day and to plan ahead for the next day’s teaching assignments.

The school-site supervisor is required to complete two formal observations during ED 468 and four formal observations during ED 478 using the university’s Observation Form and is required to discuss these observations immediately with the candidate and is to discuss the observations also with the university supervisor. As the candidate is in daily contact with the school-site supervisor and weekly contact with the university supervisor, it was decided that further seminars would not be required.

The final evaluation of the candidate is based on the compilation of the observations completed, the dispositions observed, and the successful completion of TPA 3: Assessing Learning in ED 468 and TPA 4: Culminating Teaching Experience in ED 478.

Each participant in the candidate’s final evaluation process, university supervisor, school-site supervisor, and the candidate, meet for both ED 468 and ED 478 as a collaborative group to mutually discuss the candidate’s overall evaluation during the last week of the supervised teaching assignment. Each observed lesson by both the university supervisor and the school-site supervisor is scored based on the CSTP and TPE standards and expectations using a four point rubric: 1-2 unsatisfactory; 3-4 satisfactory for each CSTP and TPE. The candidate has a realistic evaluation of each lesson taught and has a realistic understanding of his/her successful progress. By the time the collaborative evaluation occurs, each participant knows where the candidate ranks. TPA 3 must be submitted and accepted in order to get a grade for ED 468 and is not a part of the collaborative score. The TPA 4 score is separate from the collaborative evaluation that is given for the actual supervised teaching experience and the TPA 4 must be passed to receive a final grade for ED 478 so it becomes an integral part of the final evaluation process and grade for ED 478. The dispositions are a subjective evaluation and are based on a Pass/Fail score for both ED 468 and ED 478.

The Intern Program candidates follow the same requirements. The intern candidate also must complete the following:

- Induction Plan that is agreed upon by the unit supervisor, the school-site support provider, and the school-site administrator;
- This Induction Plan outlines the areas in which the intern considers he/she needs assistance;
- The intern also must meet for a minimum of two hours a week with his/her school-site support provider to discuss whatever matter the intern candidate or the school-site support provider considers of importance.

At the end of this two-hour conference, the intern candidate completes a Contact Log. This Contact Log is checked weekly by the unit supervisor. Courses containing field experience components provide feedback to candidates from the site teacher through daily, formative evaluation as well as a formal evaluation at the end of the experience.
Advanced Teacher and Other School Professionals Programs:

These programs offer ample opportunities for expertise sharing including formal and informal input. The Reading Program treats parents of students as partners and meets regularly with them about progress and receives much valuable feedback about performance in the home environment. In the Educational Counseling program, candidates benefit from shared resources and expertise through regularly scheduled meetings with the counselor trainee and site supervisor, to offer guidance and discuss progress. On-site supervision contact must occur no less than once a week; daily contact is highly desirable. The Site supervisor ensures that the counselor trainee’s role and responsibilities at the site are appropriate for the level of training received, and are communicated to the appropriate staff. The site supervisor also provides a written evaluation of student competencies and discusses the evaluation with the counselor trainee. Candidates are required to attend bi-monthly Supervised Fieldwork Seminars where activity logs are reviewed and students have opportunities to process site activities. Faculty supervisors provide a written evaluation at the end of each experience and review the evaluation with the candidate.

The Special Education program uses an induction form including responsibilities for both supervisors (unit and site supervisor) as well as the intern. The intern, with the assistance of one or both supervisors, creates professional goals that may be long term goals such as developing skills in relation to behavior support in classrooms or short term goals such as learning the IEP computerized process. The two supervisors and the intern create these goals as a joint effort. Each person, however, receives a copy of the goal sheet and can assist the intern in reaching these goals. Interns can also self monitor. At the beginning of each semester, the goals are reviewed and revised as necessary. A checks and balance form for supervisors, interns and school administrators allows verification of how the intern is progressing within the program and when program completion should/will occur. Addition forms of expertise sharing include evaluation forms, log documents, and in-person interaction between the unit’s and school site’s officials.

3a.5. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to collaboration between unit and school partners may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

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

3b.1. What are the entry and exit requirements for clinical practice?

Initial Teacher Programs:

Entry Requirements – completion of the following:

The following entry requirements have been met and verified prior to being cleared to take ED 468: Introductory Supervised Teaching in the third semester or term. These requirements must be cleared and verified by the end of the first semester or term with the exception of the Writing Prompt, which can be cleared as late as the end of the second semester or term. Verification of completion of these requirements is managed on-line through the Banner student information system.
• Full admission into the program: met before registering for the first two courses: ED 460 and ED 470 in first semester or term
• Pass Writing Prompt: score 3-4: full admission into program: score 2: provisional admission into program; may take first two courses only; must take Writers’ Workshop in first semester or term; if pass, full admission into program, if fail, may take two more courses only, must retake Writers’ Workshop and pass: score 1: not admitted into program; must take writing course, pass course, retake Writing Prompt, pass: full admission into program
• Pass CBEST: verified before admission, or, must verify that CBEST is scheduled to be taken the first test date; must be passed by the end of the first semester; cannot register for any future courses until passed
• CSET: verified passing all sections before admission, or, must be registered and take minimum one section first semester; must show satisfactory progress in passing to be cleared for ED 468
• Certificate of Clearance: must be cleared prior to admission, or, must be cleared before the end of the first semester or term; cannot register for any future courses until cleared
• TB clearance: must be verified before admission; cannot take any courses without clearance
• Pass TPA 1: verified on Banner
• Complete and submit TPA 2: verified on Banner
• Complete the following courses with a B average: verified on Banner: ED 460, ED 470, ED 462 or ED 466, ED 472

Exit Requirements for ED 468: Introductory Supervised Teaching
• TPA 3 submitted and accepted
• Credit grade in ED 468

The following entry requirements have been met and verified prior to being cleared to take ED 478: Advanced Supervised Teaching in the fourth or last semester or term. These requirements must be cleared and verified by the end of the semester or term preceding ED 478. Verification of completion of these requirements is managed on-line through Banner student information system.
• Entry Requirements for ED 478: Advanced Supervised Teaching
• All ED 468 requirements
• CSET passed, or approved university waiver, single subject only: verified on Banner
• RICA passed-Multiple Subject only: verified on Banner
• Following courses completed with a B average: ED 474 or ED 476: ED 464-multiple subject only; verified on Banner
• SPED 457 completed or concurrently enrolled verified on Banner
• TPA 2 passed: verified on Banner
• TPA 3 submitted and accepted: verified on Banner
• Health, computers, U.S. Constitution, speech completed: verified on Banner: C grade or better; verification of examination or waiver

Exit Requirements for ED 478: Advanced Supervised Teaching
• SPED 457 completed with a B grade or better, verified on Banner
• TPA 3 passed: verified on Banner
• TPA 4 passed: verified on Banner
• SPED 457 passed: verified on Banner
• ED 478 passed: B grade or better

Advanced and Other School Professionals Programs:

Entry into Clinical Experience:
• School Psychology:
  o Admission to program.
  o Pass beginning practicum to advanced practicum.
• Educational Counseling Level I Fieldwork Prerequisites:
  o Certificate of Clearance
  o California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST)
  o 100 hours of practica
  o EDUC 571 Individual Counseling Skills completion
  o EDUC 572 Group Counseling Skills completion
  o EDUC 546 Introduction to School Counseling & Guidance completion
  o EDUC 549 School Counseling Theories completion
• Educational Counseling Level II Fieldwork Prerequisites:
  o CBEST passage
  o EDUC 583A completion
  o Must score a 3 or 4 to move on to second or third placement site. Candidates scoring lower than 3 or 4 meet with faculty and Lead Regional Faculty to determine remediation through designated second placement with clear improvement in areas of question or removal from program based on overall level of skills, knowledge, and dispositions previously reported.
• Special Education: Sufficient performance in all fieldwork related coursework

Exit Requirements:
Most of the programs in advanced and other school professionals department monitor the progress of each candidate throughout the clinical experience portion and only allow those who meet all stated standards and expectations to move forward. The list below offers some of the additional requirements for successful completion of clinical experiences:
• Child Development: three hour culminating teaching experience.
• Special Education: final portfolio
• Education Management: 21 projects; ½ elementary and ½ secondary
• School Psychology: National Praxis Exam

3b.2. What field experiences are required for each program or categories of programs (e.g., secondary) at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels, including graduate programs for licensed teachers and other school professionals? What clinical practice is required for each program or categories of programs in initial teacher preparation programs and programs for the preparation of other school professionals? Please complete Table 7 or upload your own table at Prompt 3b.9 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Field Experiences</th>
<th>Clinical Practice (Student Teaching or Internship)</th>
<th>Total Number of Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED 470: Theories and Methods of Education for Linguistically Diverse Students</td>
<td>Fieldwork in linguistically diverse classrooms</td>
<td>30 hours in K-12 classrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 462: Literacy Methodology for Multiple Subject Candidates</td>
<td>Fieldwork in primary emerging reading classrooms</td>
<td>10 hours in K-3 classrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 464: Introduction to the Teaching of Reading for Multiple Subject Candidates</td>
<td>Fieldwork in reading classrooms grades 4-8</td>
<td>20 hours in K-8 classrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 466: Introduction to the Teaching of Reading for Single Subject Candidates</td>
<td>Fieldwork in Reading Across the Curriculum grades 7-12</td>
<td>20 hours in 7-12 classrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 472: Teaching Strategies</td>
<td>Fieldwork in K-12 classrooms: teaching specific units</td>
<td>30 hours total in K-12 grade classrooms: 15 hours in preparation, planning 15 hours in teaching in K-12 classrooms combined with ED 468 or total 15 hours if ED 474 not taken with ED 468 30 hours in 7-12 classrooms combined with ED 468 or total 30 hours if ED 476 not taken with ED 468 Five weeks: 175 total hours of teaching, observation, and conferencing in K-12 classrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 474: Teaching in the Content Areas: Multiple Subjects</td>
<td>Combined fieldwork with ED 468: Introductory Supervised Teaching: minimum 15 hours of teaching experience in K-8 classrooms</td>
<td>15 hours if ED 474 not taken with ED 468 30 hours in 7-12 classrooms combined with ED 468 or total 30 hours if ED 476 not taken with ED 468 Five weeks: 175 total hours of teaching, observation, and conferencing in K-12 classrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 476: Teaching in the Content Areas: Single Subject</td>
<td>Combined fieldwork with ED 468: Introductory Supervised Teaching: minimum 30 hours of teaching experience in 7-12 classrooms</td>
<td>30 hours in K-12 classrooms combined with ED 468 or total 30 hours if ED 476 not taken with ED 468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 468: Introductory Supervised Teaching</td>
<td>Five weeks of introductory supervised teaching: full-time, all-day teaching and observation experiences in K-12 classrooms</td>
<td>Ten weeks: 350 total hours of teaching, observation, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 478: Advanced Supervised Teaching</td>
<td>ED 468 is taken during the third semester or term</td>
<td>Ten weeks: 350 total hours of teaching, observation, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Field Experiences</td>
<td>Clinical Practice (Student Teaching or Internship)</td>
<td>Total Number of Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development, B.S.</td>
<td>Throughout the program, students have a total requirement of 67 hours of practicum outside of class time</td>
<td>Three courses require supervised fieldwork hours at an approved site selected by the instructor. 360 hours</td>
<td>427 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development, M.S.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Life</td>
<td>120 hours hospital practicum</td>
<td>600 hours internship</td>
<td>720 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Counseling</td>
<td>100 hours of practicum are completed in preparation for fieldwork. Practica hours are divided among four core courses and specific to area of study.</td>
<td>600 hours of supervised fieldwork are divided among 2 Field Experience courses.</td>
<td>Total number of hours:100 practica, 600 fieldwork is required by CCTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDUC 546 Introduction to School Counseling</td>
<td>EDUC 583A- Supervised Fieldwork Level I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDUC571 Individual Counseling Skills</td>
<td>EDUC 583B- Supervised Fieldwork Level II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDUC 572 Group Counseling Skills</td>
<td>The 600 hours must consist of a minimum of 400 hours in k-12 public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advanced and Other Professionals Programs Field Experiences and Clinical Practice by Program**

- **SPED 457: Introduction to Exceptional Individuals and Their Families**
  - and observation experiences in K-12 classrooms
  - Special education visits to K-12 special education classrooms: Minimum 2 visits: each visit 1 to 2 hours: total 3-4 hours: observation and write-up of visit
  - Two visits: 1 to 2 hours a visit: total 3-4 hours

- **Child Development, B.S.**
  - Throughout the program, students have a total requirement of 67 hours of practicum outside of class time
  - Three courses require supervised fieldwork hours at an approved site selected by the instructor. 360 hours
  - 427 hours

- **Child Development, M.S.**
  - N/A
  - N/A
  - N/A

- **Child Life**
  - 120 hours hospital practicum
  - 600 hours internship
  - 720 hours

- **Educational Counseling**
  - 100 hours of practicum are completed in preparation for fieldwork. Practica hours are divided among four core courses and specific to area of study.
  - 600 hours of supervised fieldwork are divided among 2 Field Experience courses.
  - Total number of hours:100 practica, 600 fieldwork is required by CCTC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUC 565 Career Development</th>
<th>schools serving 2 levels (200 hours at each level). 150 hours must be devoted to issues of diversity.</th>
<th>45 hours plus completion of the 21 required projects.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Management</strong></td>
<td>Credential candidates must complete a 21 project portfolio successfully. One third of the projects are clinical practice tasks called Benchmarks which coordinate with each class. These are graded by the instructor for that class but are included in the Fieldwork Portfolio. One third (7 projects) of the remaining 21 projects are completed at the elementary level and the other one third (7 projects) at the secondary level (middle school or high school). During this time the candidate is assisted by the course instructors (who grade the Benchmarks), the unit fieldwork supervisor and two site supervisors (one elementary, one secondary) who grade the projects completed at their schools. Upon completion of the Portfolio, the candidate presents it to the Fieldwork class and the unit supervisor grades the entire Portfolio. Each class has a clinical practice experience in the form of the Benchmark Assignment. Candidates complete the Benchmark while they are taking the class under the supervision of the course instructor, the site supervisor, and the fieldwork supervisor. These Benchmarks are included in the Fieldwork Portfolio and account for 1/3 of their projects. Interns who are working in administrative positions requiring a credential complete all Benchmark assignments and all Fieldwork projects. They are required to identify projects for fieldwork that come directly from their job requirements giving them further clinical experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading, MEd</strong></td>
<td>All done in a clinical setting, the Literacy Center; candidates tutor children from the local community, using a specific process of assessment, diagnosis, setting of student outcomes, planning, and evaluation. Professors provide immediate feedback, and the tutoring time is followed by a Fieldwork Seminar component of the Total number of fieldwork hours in the program: 40 for the Reading Certificate and 70 for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### School Psychology

Students in school psychology take Practicum A - 225 hours and Practicum B - 225 hours for a total of **450 hours**

Internship school psychology trainees take Field Work I and Field Work II and spend **1,200 hours** working in school districts doing school psychology.

**1,650 hours in total all required by the CCTC**

### Special Education – Level I

Teaching candidates complete 119 hours of fieldwork in addition to student teaching requirements.

Teaching candidates complete two supervised teaching assignments totaling 525 hours. (one five-week assignment and one ten-week assignment)

644 hours

### Special Education – Level II

Each of the 7 courses has some outreach into the community.

- 503-The Induction Course indentify a person in the field to provide support (required Support form);
- 504-Interview and consult with a person who supports legal issues (required contact and discussion verification regarding final project);
- 505- Interview the learner of the case study about the behavior/s of concern and interview and consult a stakeholder who works with the behaviors being studied (example: parent, teacher, or aide);
- 506- Interview with a school psychologist who does assessment;
- 507- Interview and consultation with a learner with NA

NA
special needs about the work being studied and a stakeholder (for example a teacher); 508- Interview with a parent and learner who is about to transition out of high school; 509- All those interviewed are invited to the culminating seminar as well as the district support team. Each interview and consultation is ongoing throughout the course and so there is no time frame or hours minimum. In each situation the candidates have a form to complete which also requires signature by the site supervisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Education</th>
<th>Teaching candidates complete 94 hours of fieldwork in addition to student teaching requirements.</th>
<th>Teaching candidates complete two supervised teaching assignments totaling 525 hours. (one five-week assignment and one ten-week assignment)</th>
<th>619 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Emphasis</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3b.3. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards through field and clinical experiences in initial and advanced preparation programs?

Initial Teacher Programs:

The total supervised teaching experience for both Introductory Supervised Teaching and Advanced Supervised Teaching is based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession standard and the Teaching Performance Expectations. Each observed lesson is graded using a four Point Rubric from 1) Not Present; 2) Emerging; 3) Competent; and 4) Excellent. Each California Standards for the Teaching Profession Standard and associated Teaching Performance Expectations are to be included in each lesson planned and taught.

The unit supervisor and the school-site supervisor must be able to identify each of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession Standards and all Teaching Performance Expectations in each lesson observed. These California Standards for the Teaching Profession Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations are discussed with each candidate after the observed lesson and are focal to the content of the lesson.

Each one of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and Teaching Performance Expectations is graded separately and any California Standards for the Teaching Profession Standard or Teaching Performance Expectation not graded as a three or four from the Rubric will be discussed in detail with the candidate. All dispositions outlined in our conceptual frameworks must also be clearly demonstrated. Courses containing field experience also emphasize TPE’s during the fieldwork portion of the courses.

Advanced and Other School Professional Programs:

These programs thoroughly address the state and professional standards throughout clinical experiences. Evidence for this is provided via alignment between key assessments and clinical experience. These assessment data are examined collaboratively by the Assessment Department and all program leads. Secondly, observations by unit officials are focused on such standards and are an integral part of the evaluation of the candidates’ preparedness for passage out of clinical experience.

The Educational Counseling program has taken the 32 CCTC Standards required for Professional School Counselors and developed nine categories of experience into which students are required to log their weekly fieldwork hours. Students must have a minimum of 10 hours in each of the nine categories. This system was developed through a collaborative effort with on and off campus faculty and other partners such as county offices of education. Plans for improvement of this process include aligning evaluations with the four point rubric/dispositions. The unit’s Special Education program requires observations by the site supervisor and the ULV supervisor, discussions during seminars and a mid-semester self and supervisor evaluation with a formal four-point scale evaluation at the end of the semester for student teachers.

3b.4. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates use technology as an instructional tool during field experiences and clinical practice?

Initial Teacher Programs:

Technology is part of the requirements for both Introductory Supervised Teaching and Advanced Supervised Teaching. Each unit supervisor will monitor the candidate’s lesson plans to ensure that some form of technology is used in each lesson. Candidates must incorporate a variety of technology uses into each and every lesson. Students are expected to use at least PowerPoint, overhead projection, Smart Boards, where available, and computers for instructional purposes. At each weekly observed lesson, the unit supervisor will expect to see technology used to enhance
student learning. While use of technology is addressed during clinical experiences, the unit acknowledges that there is room for growth.

**Advanced and Other School Professional Programs:**

These programs address the infusion of technology into the clinical experiences. For example, computerized IEP’s are mandated in the Special Education program and are integrated into the clinical practice lessons. Portfolios also require clear and effective use of technology. Additionally, the School Psychology program generates psychological reports through software-based programs.

**3b.5. What criteria are used in the selection of school-based clinical faculty? How are the criteria implemented? What evidence suggests that school-based clinical faculty members are accomplished school professionals?**

**Initial Teacher Programs:**

The unit requires that each school-site supervisor meet the following minimum requirements:

- Minimum three years teaching experience with the appropriate credential;
- Exceptional teaching ability;
- Exceptional mentoring ability;
- Exceptional modeler of excellent teaching strategies.

These requirements are verified by the school-site supervisor by completing a Verification of Credential and Experience Form. These requirements are implemented through the advice and selection by the school-site administrator. The unit relies heavily on the professionalism and concern of the school-site administrator. The evaluation of the school-site supervisor is completed by the unit supervisor and the supervised teaching candidate at the end of both Introductory Supervised Teaching and Advanced Supervised Teaching. These evaluations are returned to main campus where they are reviewed for future eligibility of the school-site supervisor.

The Credential and Experience Verification form is linked here: [http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/files/2010/10/Section-G-School-site-Verification-Experience.pdf](http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/files/2010/10/Section-G-School-site-Verification-Experience.pdf)

**Advanced and Other School Professional Programs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Minimum Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Life</td>
<td>Master’s in Child Life, Child Life Council certificate, approved hospital site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Counseling</td>
<td>Must hold a California Pupil Personnel Services Credential and have 2 years experience counseling students in a California k-12 public school setting. Settings other than k-12 schools must provide an experienced professional with a masters degree in a counseling related field to serve as the on-site supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Management</td>
<td>Must have Tier 1 and Tier 2 Administrative Credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Master’s degree in Reading, 3 years teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td>Onsite supervisors must be credentialed school psychologists and have a minimum of two years of full time or the equivalent experience, must have time to spend two hours per week with the school psychology trainee, have 2-3 years experience or more, and be a good fit with the student who is the trainee; the National Association of School Psychologists requires 3 years of school experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3b.6. What preparation do school-based faculty members receive for their roles as clinical supervisors?

Initial Teacher Programs:

The unit provides the school-site supervisor with a letter explaining the requirements for a school-site supervisor and an orientation packet prior to the start of the supervised teaching experiences, Introductory Supervised Teaching and Advanced Supervised Teaching. A similar correspondence is used for fieldwork portion of courses. This letter and orientation packet explains both the school-site supervisor’s role and the unit’s role in the supervised teaching experiences. This correspondence is reinforced by the unit supervisor during the first week visit when the unit supervisor covers the requirements and expectations with both the school-site administrator and the school-site supervisor. The school-site supervisor is also required to sign an NCR document, School-Site Supervisor Agreement that is covered by the unit supervisor during the first week meeting. On main campus, each school-site supervisor and school-site administrator is invited to attend a Saturday morning orientation where the program is explained and questions can be answered and suggestions taken.

Advanced and Other Schools Professionals Programs:

The Educational Counseling Program provides School based faculty with a handbook at the beginning of the supervision period. This handbook provides detailed information and guidelines for the site supervisor and counselor trainee. Regular meetings between faculty supervisors and on-site supervisors also provide an opportunity for answering questions and exchanging information. Use of the handbook is pivotal in this effort.

3b.7. What evidence demonstrates that clinical faculty members provide regular and continuous support for student teachers, licensed teachers completing graduate programs, and other school professionals?

As the unit observes the supervised teaching candidate each and every week during both Introductory Supervised Teaching and Advanced Supervised Teaching, the unit supervisor maintains and monitors a close relationship with the school-site supervisor for each course. This close relationship allows the unit supervisor to check with both the candidate and the school-site supervisor regarding the quality and quantity of the support provided by the school-site supervisor. The final evaluation of the school-site supervisor is completed at the end of both Introductory Supervised Teaching and Advanced Supervised Teaching by both the supervised teaching candidate and the unit supervisor. These final evaluations are monitored by main campus after Introductory Supervised Teaching and Advanced Supervised Teaching are finished.

Decisions are made regarding the school-site supervisor at that time and the decision as to whether or not to use the school-site supervisor again is determined. All candidates must e-mail their daily lesson plans to their unit supervisor each night prior to teaching the lesson the next day. The supervisor responds accordingly back via e-mail thereby providing electronic support. E-mail is also used to communicate with the candidate and the school-site supervisor on a regular basis between weekly observations.

3b.8. What structured activities involving the analysis of data and current research are required in programs for other school professionals?

Initial Teacher Programs:
Each lesson taught in Introductory Supervised Teaching, Advanced Supervised Teaching, and ED 467 is required to have a Formative Assessment that is given in Checking for Understanding and must be observable and measurable following the Modeling and Guided Practice. The supervised teaching candidate must analyze this assessment to determine how successful his/her lesson was. From this formative assessment, the candidate must determine who needs re-teaching and who can go on to the summative assessment in the Independent Practice section of the Beyond. The Summative Assessment is completed in the Beyond (part of the lesson plan format called Into, Through and Beyond) portion of the lesson under Independent Practice and the candidate must analyze this summative assessment prior to teaching the next lesson. In Introductory Supervised Teaching, the supervised teaching candidate must complete TPA 3: Assessing Learning where a complete analysis of the date is required. In Advanced Supervised Teaching, the supervised teaching candidate must complete TPA 4: Culminating Teaching Experience where another complete analysis is required. The results of both the daily Formative and Summative Assessments and the analysis from TPA 3 and TPA 4 are shared with the school-site supervisor.

**Advanced and Other School Professionals Programs:**
These programs address the collection, analysis and reporting of data during the lecture and discussion portions of clinical practices. This includes evaluation of case studies, action research, psychologist reports, and related items.

3b.9. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

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

3c.1. On average, how many candidates are eligible for clinical practice each semester or year? What percent, on average, complete clinical practice successfully?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Average Number Eligible Annually</th>
<th>Average Percentage of Completers Annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Development, B.S.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Life</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Counseling</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Management</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, MEd</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education – Level I</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education – Level II</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3c.2. What are the roles of candidates, university supervisors, and school-based faculty in assessing candidate performance and reviewing the results during clinical practice?

**Initial Teacher Programs:**
The candidate is reviewed each week by the unit supervisor following the weekly observed lesson and informally by the school-site supervisor each day and formally twice during Introductory Supervised Teaching and four times during Advanced Supervised Teaching. The candidate can see how he/she is progressing based on the Rubric score given during the unit supervisor’s and the school-site supervisor’s formal lesson observations based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and Teaching Performance Expectations standards. Each day, the candidate is required to complete a Daily Journal where he/she reflects and analyzes the day’s lessons. Each week, the candidate completes a formal Reflection and Analysis of the lesson observed by the unit supervisor. Another Reflection and Analysis is completed after each of the school-site supervisor’s formal observations. These Reflections and Analyses are checked by the unit supervisor each week and are part of the Portfolio. At the end of Introductory Supervised Teaching and Advanced Supervised Teaching, the supervised teaching candidate completes a self-assessment evaluation of his/her overall performance based on the observations completed and the input given by the unit supervisor and the school-site supervisor. An overall evaluation is also completed by the school-site supervisor based on the overall performance of the candidate during Introductory Supervised Teaching or Advanced Supervised Teaching. This evaluation is based on the candidate’s teaching, planning, and overall participation in the class with the students. The unit supervisor completes his/her own evaluation of the candidate based on the lessons observed, the daily lesson plans e-mailed each day to the unit supervisor, and the input received from the school-site supervisor. These final evaluations of Introductory Supervised Teaching and Advanced Supervised Teaching are conducted in a collaborative meeting with the candidate, the school-site supervisor, and the unit supervisor giving input. The final grade is the responsibility of the unit supervisor.

**Advanced and Other Professionals Programs:**

For the unit’s Educational Counseling program, the unit supervisor will complete periodic site observations of the student regarding his/her performance at the fieldwork site and conduct regular Fieldwork Seminars with the counselor trainee every two weeks. A formal written evaluation based on a 4-point rubric will be completed at the end of each placement and reviewed with the candidate.

The site supervisor will provide opportunities for the student to develop professional competencies with a broad range of programs and populations, including, but not limited to: regular education, special education, bilingual education, age, disability, and culture. Site supervisors schedule regular meetings with counselor trainees to offer guidance and discuss progress. On-site supervision contact must occur no less than once a week; daily contact is highly desirable. The site supervisor will ensure that the counselor trainee’s role and responsibilities at the site are appropriate for the level of training received and are communicated to the appropriate staff. Site supervisors communicate problems or concerns directly to the unit supervisor. The site supervisor will provide a formal written evaluation of student competencies based on a 4-point rubric and discuss the evaluation with the counselor trainee.

The counselor trainee will document competencies in weekly logs that are verified by unit supervisor and on-site supervisor. Review of the logs provides candidates with time for reflection of weekly activities and performance. At the end of each placement, candidates are required to complete a written evaluation of the site supervisor.

For the unit’s Special Education program, candidates are observed between one and eight occasions by their ULV supervisor during the final 10-week student teaching experience, and one up to four occasions by their site supervisor depending on their experiences in the classroom. For each observation, candidates provide a complete formal lesson plan and then a reflection within 24 hours after the lesson. Supervisors reflect on and respond to the candidate’s reflection to maintain an open dialogue regarding issues, concerns, and “done right” activities during the lesson. In addition, candidates maintain a contact log indicating length and type of contact with the site supervisor. Candidates also maintain a journal throughout the student teaching experience and respond electronically to blog prompts related to best teaching practices. Some of the prompts are written statements or questions, and some include
videos of teachers in action with a prompt following. Seminars ensure that student teachers maintain high quality conversations regarding their teaching experiences and also assist student teachers in creating their professional portfolios that are a significant part of the student teaching experience.

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

Initial Teacher Programs:
The following feedback and reflection is required:
- Feedback is given to the candidate each week following the unit supervisor’s observation.
- Feedback is in the form of verbal feedback and numerical feedback based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and Teaching Performance Expectations standards.
- The school-site supervisor is also responsible for giving feedback to the candidate informally at the end of each day and formally after each formal observation: two observations for Introductory Supervised Teaching and four observations for Advanced Supervised Teaching.
- The candidate keeps a Daily Journal that allows him/her to reflect informally on the day.

At the end of each of the weekly observations by the unit supervisor and the scheduled two observations by the school-site supervisor for Introductory Supervised Teaching and the four observations by the school-site supervisor for Advanced Supervised Teaching, the candidate is required to complete a formal Reflection and Analysis of the observed lesson. This formal Reflection and Analysis allows the candidate to reflect and analyze what went well with the lesson, and why; what didn’t go as planned, and why; and what would he/she do differently when they teach the lesson or the next lesson again. The formal Reflection and Analysis and the Daily Journal are reviewed by the unit supervisor each week during the weekly observation.

3c.4. What data from multiple assessments provide evidence that candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn in field experiences and clinical practice?

Assessment of the supervised teaching candidate is based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession Standards, The Teaching Performance Expectations, and the unit’s Dispositions. Each candidate for both Introductory Supervised Teaching and Advanced Supervised Teaching is assessed using the following methods:
- Each lesson plan is assessed daily by both the school-site supervisor and the unit supervisor.
- The school-site supervisor must read and approve the lesson plan prior to the candidate teaching the lesson.
- The unit supervisor receives an e-mailed copy of each lesson plan the night prior to the candidate teaching the lesson.
- This e-mailed lesson plan is reviewed by the unit supervisor with revision suggestions e-mailed back to the candidate.
- The school-site supervisor informally evaluates each lesson taught and gives feedback to the candidate each day.

The unit supervisor assesses the candidate formally each week by completing the weekly observation followed by a verbal debriefing and contact with the school-site supervisor. The school-site supervisor conducts two formal observations for Introductory Supervised Teaching and four formal observations for Advanced Supervised Teaching on the candidate and debriefs with the candidate immediately following the lesson. A copy of each of these formal observations by the school-site supervisor is given to the unit supervisor. The unit supervisor always gives the school-site supervisor
a copy of his/her weekly observation at the time of debriefing the lesson with the school-site supervisor. Each formal observation is based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession Standards and the Teaching Performance Expectations and each are assessed using the four point Rubric. All of these assessments are shared immediately with the supervised teaching candidate. The final evaluation assessment of the candidate is completed in a collaborative way with the candidate, school-site supervisor, and unit supervisor equally contributing.

The Teacher Performance Assessments (TPA) are mandated by the State of California for all teacher candidates. They require candidates to demonstrate knowledge about the students in the class, the students’ academic achievement levels, and their specific learning needs. The teacher candidate uses this information to:

- plan lessons based on California standards and adapt lessons for English learners and other students with identified learning challenges;
- teach the standards-based lessons to the K-12 students in public school classrooms;
- plan and administer student assessments based on the lessons;
- reflect on the effectiveness of their own instruction; and
- examine student work and assessment results as evidence of the effectiveness of their instruction.

Candidates then use all of this information for the next planning and instructional cycle in order to help students succeed.

3c.5. What process is used to ensure that candidates collect and analyze data on student learning, reflect on those data, and improve student learning during clinical practice?

Each lesson for both Introductory Supervised Teaching and Advanced Supervised Teaching requires the supervised teaching candidate to complete two assessments:

- Formative assessment in the Through section of the lesson plan under Checking for Understanding
- Summative assessment in the Beyond section of the lesson plan under Independent Practice
- The formative assessment must be observable and measurable and must assess all students equally.
- This formative assessment must be one that assesses how well each student has mastered the objective through Modeling and Guided Practice.

The candidate is required to use this formative assessment to check to see which students need additional instruction, re-teaching, and which students are able to continue to the summative assessment in the Independent Practice section of the Beyond. The summative assessment allows the students to gain additional practice, confidence, and knowledge of the objective. The summative assessment must also be measurable and observable. Informal assessment is required throughout the lesson by informally checking for understanding. From these formative and summative assessments, the candidate must plan for future instruction.

3c.6. How does the unit ensure that all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice that includes students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups?

Initial Teacher Programs:
The University of La Verne requires that all supervised teaching candidates be placed in classrooms and schools that are at least 25% diverse and have mainstreamed special needs students. These requirements are included in the original contract signed by the district and in the letter of placement request sent to the district. To assure that these requirements are met, the unit requires that the school-site administrator signs a Letter of Understanding that states that the school is diverse in population and maintains a policy of mainstreaming of special needs students. This Letter of Understanding is given to and reviewed with school-site administrator by the unit supervisor during the first week of Introductory Supervised Teaching and Advanced Supervised Teaching. This signed letter is returned to main campus and reviewed for suitability for future placement of supervised teacher candidates. The unit only places students in school districts with diverse populations, as the TPA requirements for ED 468 and ED 478 require that there must be both English learners and children of other identified educational needs in the classroom. Each classroom within which unit’s candidates are placed must verify that they have a diverse population with which the candidates work. These students can be ethnically and racially diverse, linguistically, diverse, gender diverse, and socio-economically diverse as identified by the partner district and school, and verified by the school-site supervisor and the unit supervisor by completing the School-Site Professional Form. The unit requires that each classroom be a minimum of 25% diverse.

Advanced and Other Professionals Programs:
Advanced programs ensure this through placement in diverse schools, including bilingual and special education settings. For example, in the Educational Counseling program, students are required to track the number of hours they accumulate working with racially and ethnically diverse populations on weekly logs. A minimum of one hundred fifty (150) clock hours shall be devoted to issues of diversity. This requirement may be met by: up to one hundred (100) clock hours in a diversity program or with the development and implementation of a program that addresses diversity issues AND at least fifty (50) clock hours working with at least ten (10) students (individually or in a group) of a racial or ethnic background different from that of the counselor trainee OR all one hundred fifty (150) clock hours working with students of a racial or ethnic background different from that of the counselor trainee.

3c.7. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Optional

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

Initial Teacher Programs:
The University of La Verne considers the policy of having each unit supervisor meet with each supervised teaching candidate each week as a definite strength of Standard 3. These weekly observations and visits allow the unit to keep abreast of the supervised teacher candidate’s needs and also allows the unit to be in constant contact with the school-site supervisor to help at all stages to assure the supervised candidate’s success. The supervised teacher candidate benefits from this close contact and association as does the school-site supervisor and the school-site in having the expertise and support of the unit supervisor. Problems are addressed immediately, and the supervised teacher
candidate is supported on a weekly basis by the unit supervisor and on a daily basis by the school-site supervisor.

**Advanced and Other Professionals Programs:**

Counselor trainees benefit from close contact with unit supervisors, the professional association between school sites and the unit, and the expertise and support offered by both unit and site supervisor. Through open, regular communication, problems are addressed immediately, and the counselor trainee is supported on a regular basis by the unit supervisor and on a daily basis by the school-site supervisor.

2. What research related to Standard 3 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?
STANDARD 4. DIVERSITY

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty; candidates; and students in P-12 schools.

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

The College of Education and Organizational Leadership (CEOL) adopted a conceptual framework based on the unit’s Guiding Principles, where diversity is prominent. Diversity is evident in the unit’s mission statement, as well as in its daily function. The University of La Verne has been committed to providing a quality, personalized education experience for leadership and participation in a diverse society to a student population that reflects the full diversity of the its metropolitan surroundings. Recently, The institution created a Strategic Plan for Diversity, where this commitment is put into practice by creating a climate that supports diversity, social justice, and sensitivity to global interdependence.

The CEOL adopted the definition of diversity found in the unit’s Strategic Plan for Diversity. The unit embraces the active and intentional commitment to support and embrace difference and multiplicity for the sake of expanding knowledge, educating capable citizens, developing the whole person, and serving our local and global communities. The unit believes that promoting and sustaining diversity is a commitment to educational quality, social justice, and the creation of positive, respectful communities. The unit believes diversity plays a critical role in the integrity and intellectual strength of an educational institution. Through the open exchange of different beliefs, knowledge, experiences, and values individuals can freely learn, explore, innovate, flourish, and develop the critical thinking skills that will serve them throughout their life.

The unit is based on the belief that diversity means more than acknowledging and/or tolerating difference. Diversity is a set of conscious practices that involve:

- Understanding and appreciating the interdependence of humanity, cultures, and the natural environment;
- Practicing mutual respect for qualities and experiences that are different from our own;
- Understanding that diversity includes not only ways of being but also ways of knowing;
- Recognizing that personal, cultural and institutionalized discrimination creates and sustains privileges for some while creating and sustaining disadvantages for others;
- Addressing practices that perpetuate discrimination and unfair treatment while also instituting other practices that support diversity and diverse people; and
- Building alliances across differences so that we can work together to eradicate all forms of discrimination.

Unit faculty were instrumental in influencing and bringing forth the process for the creation of the institutional strategic plan. Faculty created the CEOL College Diversity Committee (CDC) in 2007 and have been working on the development and implementation of short and long-term diversity-related projects. For example, the College Diversity Committee sponsored...
Safe Zone training (preparing faculty and staff to support LGBT individuals) for faculty and staff in the unit. After this training, the CDC collaborated with other groups on campus to offer continuous Safe Zone training for faculty and staff, as well as students. The CDC continues its collaboration with other groups on campus, and continues supporting the unit’s efforts in the design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum that promotes the knowledge, skills and dispositions essential to working and living with diverse populations.

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum, field experiences, and clinical practice for candidates to acquire and demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. The unit implements assessments where candidates are able to demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Candidates engage in working with diverse populations, including higher education and p-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in p-12 schools.

In our philosophical foundations for diversity and social justice, the unit has on several theoretical perspectives. Therefore, our programs have a strong action component based on a strong reflection component as well.

Diversity is an important guiding principle in the unit. Language diversity is an important factor in diverse students’ learning and achievement. The unit recognizes the need to implement effective bilingual programs for English Learners (EL’s) in California. Thus, the unit fully supports the Bilingual Crosscultural and Academic Development (BCLAD) Program within our program offerings. In addition the Counseling Program recently implemented an innovative Spanish Bilingual Bicultural Certificate emphasis, the first in the state.

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

4a.1. What proficiencies related to diversity are candidates expected to develop and demonstrate?

The CEOL has integrated diversity throughout all its programs creating a strand that is woven throughout the college. Candidates are admitted into their respective programs fully aware of the importance of diversity, as they are introduced to the dispositions at the admission interview and in the initial courses. Candidates are also introduced to the philosophical foundations developed by the unit. Candidates are expected to develop interactive skills that will enable them to work with all students, to implement those skills in meaningful and intentional ways, and to receive feedback and to reflect on their effectiveness.

This content is based on state and national standards, including in non-credential programs, for example, NAЕYC and ASC. Candidates engage in challenging content in the classroom in which they learn to develop adaptive instruction to meet the needs of all students, to work with diverse student populations, and includes English Learners at all levels of language proficiency.

In order to provide candidates an opportunity to practice implementing skills in a meaningful and relevant way, the unit has designed and implemented a strong field experience component that is embedded in well developed phases, culminating in supervised clinical experiences. Candidates engage in fieldwork and clinical experiences in diverse settings as they learn to contextualize teaching by drawing effectively on representations from the students’ own experiences and cultures. Courses have specific outcomes related to fieldwork, as well as specific requirements. For example, in EDUC 470, candidates in the teaching credential program spend 30 hours of fieldwork in a classroom that has at least 25% English Learners. The
cooperating teacher has to have appropriate teaching credentials to teach English Learners and has to have had at least five years of successful teaching experience. This assignment has a reflection component as well. Candidates participate in a Blackboard (the unit’s Learning Management System) discussion where they engage in at least six out of nine discussion threads related to their fieldwork experiences.

The unit affirms its commitment to diversity by preparing candidates to develop effective interactive skills, by creating opportunities to implement those skills in meaningful and relevant ways, and by creating opportunities for reflection and action.

4a.2. What required coursework and experiences enable teacher candidates and candidates for other school professional roles to develop:

- awareness of the importance of diversity in teaching and learning; and
- the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to adapt instruction and/or services for diverse populations, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities?

The process for enabling candidates in the Liberal Studies Program BA (the undergraduate pathway into Teacher Education) to understand adaptations, learning differences, and diversity begins in the following two courses:

Candidates in EDUC 310, Foundations in Education: Ethics, define and understand culturally responsive teaching. Candidates also develop understanding of strategies to teach diverse learners and to understand diverse learning styles.

Candidates in EDUC 317, Literature for Children and Adults, focus on the selection and evaluation of well-written multicultural books, matching selections to students’ needs and interests.

Candidates in EDUC 336, The Power of Language, begin to develop an understanding of literacy and language development and begin to acquire effective instructional strategies that meet the needs of linguistically and culturally diverse students.

The process for enabling candidates in the Teacher Education Program to understand adaptations, learning differences, and diversity in all its aspects begins with the first two courses they take in the teaching credential program, EDUC 460 and 470.

Candidates in EDUC 460, Diversity Interaction and the Learning Process, engage in curriculum related to the examination of psycho-social developmental tasks, contemporary schooling practices, essential communication skills, preparation for multi-cultural education, and an appreciation for linguistic, cultural, racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic diversity. The primary emphasis of the course is on social and emotional interaction, the development of motivation and self-esteem, mastering practical interpersonal skills, a critical analysis of education in society, development of critical thinking skills, and evaluating attitudes toward diverse cultural and socio-economic groups.

Candidates in EDUC 470, Theories and Methods of Education for Linguistically Diverse Students, engage with curriculum designed to develop understanding of first and second language acquisition theory and research. Candidates acquire specific strategies for teaching content and language development.
In EDUC 474, candidates engage in cooperative learning activities to support diverse learners.

The Diversity strand is infused throughout the rest of the courses and the clinical experience. For example, the reading courses offer candidates the opportunity to acquire specific teaching methodology to teach transitional reading to English Learners. During the clinical experience, candidates are expected to apply those skills. The clinical experience sites are selected on the basis of experience, expertise, and diversity.

The process for enabling candidates in the Child Development Program BS to understand adaptations, learning differences, and diversity begins with the following five courses.

Candidates in EDUC 251, Curriculum Development for Early Childhood Education, acquire skills that allow them to create developmentally appropriate curriculum plans and schedules for young children, to create anti-bias curriculum and environments for young children, and to identify and plan curriculum for dual-language learners.

Candidates in EDUC 253, Child, Family, & Community, examine relationships of the growing child to family, school, community, and society by studying culture, support groups, safety, family structure, and social policy.

Candidates in EDUC 451, Infant & Toddler Group, acquire skills for working with parents of infants and toddlers in diverse settings. Candidates also acquire skills to describe patterns of physical, cognitive, social, emotional, and language development in infants and toddlers.

Candidates in EDUC 452, Parenting for Early Childhood Educators, become familiar with parenting styles and philosophies from other cultures and acquire skills to work with parents taking into consideration the child’s development, the child’s individual differences, and the family’s cultural differences.

Candidates in EDUC 454F Early Childhood Teaching, engage in a clinical experience where they apply the skills and knowledge gained in previous course work, including diversity-related ones.

The process for enabling candidates in the Child Development Program MS to understand adaptations, learning differences, and diversity begins with the following three courses.

Candidates in EDUC 518, Language, Concept, & Reading Development, are able to apply the developmental theories of cognitive development, language development, and second language acquisition. Candidates develop an awareness of and an appreciation for the cognitive and linguistic abilities that children bring to the task of learning to read, and develop an awareness of and an appreciation for the factors involved in second language acquisition.

Candidates in EDUC 557, Teaching Adults & Active Learning, engage in discussions and presentation related to adult learning theory, such as Transformative Learning adult v. child learning theory, Freire, Knowles, Gagne, and Mezirow.

Candidates in EDUC 559, Developmental Curriculum, demonstrate the ability to combine theory with practice as exemplified by the theories of Piaget, Erikson, Vygotsky, Gardner, and other developmental and constructivist theories.
The process for enabling candidates in the Child Life MS to understand adaptations, learning differences, and diversity encompasses the following two courses.

Candidates in EDUC 530A Multicultural Family-Centered Care, examine various aspects of how a Child Life Specialist can educate and support patient/families during their hospitalization, illness, etc. through understanding and awareness of diversity and differences in culture, religion, family structure and beliefs. Candidates enhance their understanding of various cultural groups and start to develop their own style and approaches in working with all families/parents and their forms of communication/parenting styles. Candidates obtain basic knowledge in Spanish to be able to communicate with Spanish speaking patients and families.

Candidates in EDUC 530S, Developmental Issues of Grieving, learn about the concepts of death, loss and grieving and how people of differing ages, gender and cultures look at death. Candidates also learn about cultural, generational, and religious considerations – before, during and after death, grief, loss, etc.

The process for enabling candidates in the Educational Counseling Program to understand adaptations, learning differences, and diversity encompasses the following:

The Educational Counseling Program has a Socio-cultural competence component defined as involving counselor trainees in the continual development of attitudes/beliefs, knowledge, and skills related to: (a) awareness of one’s own assumptions, values, and biases; (b) understanding the worldview of the culturally different client; (c) culturally appropriate intervention strategies and techniques; and (d) sociopolitical influences that impinge upon the life of racial/ethnic minorities.

The program also has specific components infused within specific courses. Candidates in EDUC 573, Counseling Diverse Populations, gain knowledge and understanding of various diverse cultures represented in California’s schools. Candidates acquire specific skills for counseling diverse populations. Candidates also acquire effective strategies for affecting educational equity and advocating school success for all students.

Candidates in EDUC 583 A&B, Supervised Fieldwork, engage in supervised fieldwork which includes field experience and classroom instruction. Counselor trainees use the fieldwork setting to gain and extend their knowledge and skills related to school counseling, advocacy, team-building and collaboration, use of assessment data, multiculturalism, diverse populations as well as the understanding and implementation of the national school counseling standards.

The Educational Counseling Program implemented an innovative counseling certificate starting in the fall of 2010. The Spanish Bilingual Bicultural Certificate (SBBC) is for candidates who have a proficient level in Spanish and who want to receive a Spanish Bicultural specialization. This program requires additional course work, specific fieldwork requirements, and a community action research component.

Courses required for Bilingual Bicultural Counseling Emphasis
EDUC 531 Assessing Bilingual Bicultural Youth (3 units)
EDUC 532 The World of Immigrant Youth (3 units)
EDUC 533 Counseling the Latina/o Family (3 units)
EDUC 534 Bilingual Educational Theories (2 units)

The process for enabling candidates in the Educational Management Program to understand adaptations, learning differences, and diversity encompasses the following:
Candidates in EDMT 570, Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment, identify and apply strategies for advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to learning for all students. Candidates identify ethnic, racial, cultural, and gender factors in selecting and presenting curriculum materials and in meeting the needs of diverse learners. Candidates acquire strategies that promote equity among diverse student populations.

Candidates in EDMT 573, Contemporary Issues in California Schools, identify, understand and respond to diversity in the community including diverse cultures, ethnicities, and individuals with disabilities. Candidates examine appropriate use of resources, including technology, to address the diverse needs of the community. Candidates understand the principles of English language development (ELD) and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE).

The process for enabling candidates in the Reading Program to understand adaptations, learning differences, and diversity begins in the following two courses:

Candidates in RDG 518, Concept Development & Language Acquisition, develop an understanding of primary (L1) and secondary (L2) language acquisition principles and processes and their relationship(s) to concept formation and literacy development. Candidates also acquire specific strategies for the development of background knowledge, academic language, concept formation, and vocabulary. Perspectives on developmental, linguistic, psycholinguistic, and sociolinguistic influences are presented. Particular attention is paid to ethnic, cultural, gender, linguistic, and socioeconomic differences among learners.

Candidates in RDG 520, Advanced Methods & Materials, develop advanced, professional perspectives on reading and language arts curriculum, instruction, and assessment for adolescent learners. Candidates enhance their own repertoire of techniques to support students of all levels and further develop their abilities to make instructional decisions, based on research and assessment.

The process for enabling candidates in the School Psychology Program to understand adaptations, learning differences, and diversity begins in the following courses:

Candidates in EDUC 573, Counseling Diverse Populations, examine diversity in a school setting from the culture-general to culture-specific. Emphasis is placed on previously learned counseling skills as applied to culturally diverse populations including, but not limited to, racial/ethnic, socio-economic status, environmental factors, religious, sexual orientation, differently-abled, educationally handicapped, and children in non-traditional homes.

Candidates in EDUC 577, Individual Assessment, are introduced to individual assessment of cognitive abilities. The emphasis of this course is on the administration, scoring, and understanding of the results of cognitive assessment instruments such as the WISC IV and the Woodcock-Johnson III Cognitive Abilities. Non-verbal cognitive assessment with concern for cultural and linguistic issues is also addressed.

Candidates in EDUC 578, Advanced Assessment, continue developing a basic assessment battery. Conduct assessments of children and adolescents from a variety of ethnic backgrounds suspected of handicapping conditions: learning disabilities, ADHD, gifted, and language delays. Candidates analyze results and effectively communicate results.

Candidates in EDUC 579, Alternative Assessment & Behavior Intervention, focus on alternative modes of assessment for behavioral and emotional disorders, preschool assessment, and assessment of low incidence populations. Candidates also demonstrate knowledge of the
biological foundations of behavior, including neuropsychology, physiology, psychology, and psychopharmacology.

The process for enabling candidates in the Special Education Program to understand adaptations, learning differences, and diversity begins in the following courses:

Candidates in SPED 457, Introduction to Exceptional Individuals & Their Families, learn about laws related to special education, IDEA disability categories, as well as expectations for all stakeholders. Candidates acquire skills in accommodation techniques for exceptional learners.

Candidates in SPED 406, Mild/Moderate Assessment & Curriculum Practice, acquire assessment skills and strategies that respond to cultural and linguistic differences within an urban classroom. Candidates acquire skills in writing and reporting assessment results to parents from a variety of cultural and ethnic groups.

Candidates in EDUC 470, Theories and Methods of Education for Linguistically Diverse Students, engage with curriculum designed to develop understanding of first and second language acquisition theory and research. Candidates acquire specific strategies for teaching content and language development.

Candidates in SPED 405, Diversity & Professional Communication, continue acquiring skills related to various types of diversity: gender, ethnicity, race, religion, sexual preference, age and individual learning and temperament styles and the effects on special needs learners and their families. Candidates develop sensitivity to issues of diversity in order to achieve effective communication skills for participation in meetings, and leading meetings, workshops and in-services.

The process for enabling candidates in the Special Emphasis Program to understand adaptations, learning differences, and diversity begins in the following courses:

Candidates in EDUC 501, Educational Assessment, acquire skills in analyzing and evaluating the influence of multiple factors in assessment of student achievement, including, but not limited to: cultural, linguistic, ethnic, socio-economic status, gender, peer groups, medical, motivational factors, levels of social/emotional health and support, parental support, school and community support, and school climate and safety. Candidates develop an understanding of the link between curriculum, testing, and evaluation; they use assessment data to support decision making for individual students and programs.

Candidates in EDUC 503, Educational Psychology, apply learning theories to teaching practice by becoming knowledgeable about cognition, memory, attention, perception, emotion, motivation, organization, gender, culture and language; they develop strategies for application of those issues in order to advocate for student learning. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of potential barriers to learning including social, cultural, gender, learning styles, school culture, other community issues and develop strategies for promoting student achievement through increased student self-esteem, autonomy, and personal goal setting.

The diversity related content within all the programs serve as catalysts to frame the diversity thread, and establish the level of expectation, as well as the value and priority the unit has assigned to this aspect of our development. Candidates learn to connect instruction or services to students’ experiences and cultures.

4a.3. What key assessments provide evidence about candidates' proficiencies related to diversity? How are candidates performing on these assessments?
**Key Assignments**

The unit affirms its commitment to diversity in its program design by having diversity as one of five key unit assessments. The unit requires that every program include diversity assignments and key assessments. The key assessment matrix in the link below lists such assignments by program:

http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/conceptual-framework/assessment-system/transition-point-key-assessment-matrix/

Each program has developed key assignments that allow for program review at different levels to examine the effectiveness of diversity related experiences for candidates. The following is a brief description of key assignments embedded in individual courses. Key assessments will be presented in the next section.

Candidates in Child Development, B.S., EDUC 253, Child, Family, & Community, do a Family Cultural History assignment. This assignment is designed to help students explore their personal and family cultural history as a basis for understanding and working with families of diverse backgrounds. This assignment has a strong reflection component as outlined in the assignment rubric.

Candidates in Child Development, M.S., EDUC 550, Human Development, write a research report on an individual difference. Candidates also write a personal development paper, where they describe their personal psychosocial development. Candidates engage in deep personal analysis and reflection.

Candidates in Child Life, M.S., EDUC 530A, Multicultural Family Centered Care, prepare a pocket guide to languages, including a communication board in Spanish and in English. Candidates prepare a deaf culture handbook as well as an in-class presentation of culture in a hospital setting. Candidates also prepare a hospital parent handbook in Spanish and in English.

Candidates in Child Life, M.S., EDUC 530S, Developmental Issues of Grieving, write a paper where they explore their own, and their family’s, cultural beliefs about death and dying.

Candidates in Child Life, M.S., EDUC 530, Program Development/CL Administration, write a research report on U.S. regional or state Child Life Programs with the intent of exploring programs that serve the different needs of different cultural groups.

Candidates in Child Life, M.S., EDUC 530H, The Effects of Disease and Injury on the Hospitalized Child, prepare a case study on a diverse family’s medical situation and how child life specialists can support diverse families.

Candidates in Educational Counseling, EDUC 573, Counseling Diverse Populations, prepare a cultural genogram. Candidates work individually and with small groups of classmates to research and develop a cultural genogram of their family of origin with the goal of better understanding their cultural identity. Candidates also engage in a 30-hour fieldwork component at a K-12 school, where they will work with culturally diverse students.

Candidates engage in a field trip designed to emphasize a cross-cultural experience and to provide an interactive opportunity which focuses on the theme of multiculturalism, racism, and/or prejudice.

Candidates in Educational Counseling, EDUC 571, Individual Counseling Skills, participate in a practicum experience. During the practicum experience, candidates are expected
to log a minimum of twenty-five (25) practicum hours in relevant activities and develop and present a diversity-sensitive case management summary for a student and/or a school in crisis.

Candidates engage in a Personal Counseling Project where they are required to get personal counseling for a minimum of ten one-hour sessions. At the end of the semester, candidates submit a journal designed to engage them in self-reflection and assist them in their personal growth.

Candidates in Educational Management, EDMT 570, *Contemporary Issues in California Schools*, complete a benchmark assignment that consists of identifying a work site problem and developing an action plan for solving the problem based on current research.

Candidates in Educational Management, EDMT 570, *Curriculum, Instruction, & Assessment*, complete a benchmark assignment in which they develop a year-long plan for improving student achievement in their school.

Candidates in Liberal Studies, EDUC 317, *Literature for Children & Adults*, read a variety of multicultural books and prepare a lesson plan based on multicultural literature.

Candidates in Liberal Studies, EDUC 499D, *Culminating Experience for Liberal Studies Majors*, write a reflective cultural awareness statement about their teaching philosophy.

Candidates in Reading, RDG 518, *Concept Development & language Acquisition*, prepare a presentation using a strategy as part of the *Into, Through, or Beyond* lesson plan format. Candidates also prepare a mini-literature review on one aspect of second language acquisition, and make a in class presentations.

Candidates in School Psychology, EDUC 573, *Counseling Diverse Populations*, study a specific diverse population and present findings in class. Candidates also complete a final examination paper on multicultural school counseling competencies.

Candidates in Special Education, SPED 406, *Mild/Moderate Assessment and Curriculum Practice*, view a video of an IEP, and critique it based on their understanding of multicultural competencies.

Candidates in Special Emphasis, EDUC 501, *Educational Assessment*, work in small groups to develop a test that addresses cultural phenomena discussed in class.

Candidates in Special Emphasis, EDUC 503, *Educational Psychology*, do a research assignment on a relevant topic. Candidates have an opportunity to discuss their findings and come to their own conclusions. Candidates write their opinions based on the evidence found.

Candidates in Teacher Education, EDUC 460, *Diversity, Interaction & the Learning Process*, engage in the following assignments:

a) Candidates interview two people at a school using Banks’ Multicultural Checklist to determine if the school is meeting the needs of their diverse students. Prior to engaging people at school sites, candidates do research about the school to examine the ethnic makeup of the students and the teachers.

b) Candidates prepare a lesson plan that is purposeful and intentional about meeting the needs of diverse students. Candidates outline the adaptations they’ll make on their lesson plan for Special Education Students.

c) Candidates research a cultural group, make a presentation to the class, and provide resources that can be used to better serve the needs of the students within this cultural group.

d) Candidates prepare a presentation on an article related to history, politics, and research on bilingual education.
Candidates in Teacher Education, EDUC 470, *Theories and Methods of Education for Linguistically Diverse Students*, engage in the following assignments:

a) Candidates prepare an English Language Development (ELD) lesson plan.

b) Candidates prepare a Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) lesson plan.

c) Candidates engage in a 30-hour fieldwork experience in a multicultural classroom.

d) Candidates prepare a presentation on an article related to pedagogy for English Learners (ELs). Be sure to use the same term across the IR

Candidates in Teacher Education, EDUC 466, *Introduction to the Teaching of Reading for Single Subject Candidates*, engage in a culturally responsive pedagogy project including a literacy and diversity group project.

Candidates in Teacher Education, EDUC 474, *Teaching in the Content Areas – Multiple Subject*, write a research paper related to a current issue in the multiple subject classrooms. Candidates also prepare a presentation using their research on the topic.

Candidates in Teacher Education, EDUC 476, *Teaching in the Content Areas – Single Subject*, will engage in the following assignments:

a) Develop lessons using various learning theories that express sensitivity to cultural diversity, adaptations for EL students, and content reading strategies.

b) Prepare an autobiographical paper describing their personal, educational/professional background. They reflect on their life and schooling experiences and analyze the roles diverse socioeconomic, ethnic, race, gender, linguistic contexts, etc. have had on their life. Explore their identity (ies) and their positions and the impact their backgrounds have on the way that they view the world.

c) Engage in self-reflection about their fieldwork and practicum experience.

d) Prepare a culturally responsive teaching literature circle presentation.

The following link leads to a chart of competencies, where standards are aligned with our four guiding principles which includes diversity.


**Key Assessments**

In addition to the key assignments described above the unit has developed key assessments. Every program has assignments through which candidates demonstrate awareness and skill in working with a wide range of children, families and communities. Each program has identified one assignment or a cluster of assignments that are evaluated as a key assessment for diversity. The scores for these key assessments are summarized across the unit to determine the college’s success in preparing professionals for diverse communities. At the program level and at the unit level, the assessment in the area of diversity leads to discussions regarding the success of programs and the unit or the need for improvement in this key area.

Each program in the chart below is linked to the program resources web page. This web page contains the program key assessment rubrics where assessment guides can be found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Key Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Management Tier 1</td>
<td>“Windows on Diversity” Research Paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Educational Counseling          | - Assessment of Learning Objectives  
|                                 | - EMLO & Diversity Project |
| School Psychology               | Multicultural Learning Outcomes Document |
| Special Education Level 1       | Diversity activity that demonstrates cultural competence and sensitivities. |
| Special Education Level 2       | Diversity activity that demonstrates cultural competence and sensitivities. |
| Teacher Education               | Teacher performance assessment that demonstrates the ability to create and maintain effective environments for student learning. |
| Child Development BS            | Ethnography activity examining knowledge of cultures, depth analysis of family, and integration of knowledge about generational and parenting differences. |
| Child Development MS            | Curriculum presentation and cultural responsiveness examining multicultural sensitivities and adaptability of curriculum. |
| Special Emphasis                | Neurological based behavior reflection paper |
| Child Life                      | Multi-cultural family assignment examining knowledge of diversity, challenges and use of relevant research. |
| Liberal studies                 | Cultural Poster Activity  
|                                 | Diversity Strategies |
| Reading                         | Reflective writing that broadly and sensitively defines diversity, addresses relevant culture, language, and ethnicity matters as well as learning styles. |
| School Psychology               | Diversity skills activities examining advocacy, cultural competency, knowledge of dynamics of culturally sensitive strategies for engagement, and effective implementation of culturally-appropriate interventions. |

Prior to the collection of data from the unit-developed key assessments, the unit already participated in the Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ) survey. Data from that survey indicate we have a favorable comparison on most items compared to other institutions who also participate in the same survey. For example, in the analysis of the data from 2006, employment supervisors of teaching graduates overwhelmingly (92%) responded that our candidates “…adhere to principles of educational equity in the teaching of all students.”

Teaching graduates rated themselves high (95%), and thought they were well-prepared to work with diverse students. A significant part of the diversity of students in Southern California is the issue of English Learners. In our analysis of CTQ data, we noticed that teacher graduates thought they were well-prepared (90%) to meet the instructional needs of students who are English language learners, but their employment supervisors ranked our graduates at a lower level.

Employment supervisors thought that ULV was doing better than the “other” universities in preparing candidates to meet the instructional needs of students with special learning needs (85%) and to understand how personal, family & community conditions may affect learning (92%). Employment supervisors of our teaching graduates also thought that ULV prepared our candidates to effectively meet the needs of students who are English Learners (90%). The rating
for meeting the instructional needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds was 91%, and the rating for meeting the instructional needs of students with special learning needs was 84%.

As the unit analyzed multiple year CTQ data, we noticed that, in general, the numbers were still favorable. However, we noted some items that gave us reason to continue our analysis of CTQ data and to put in place our own assessment system. For example, there was a dip in the rating of our candidates by employment supervisors in 2007-2008, as compared to 2006-2007 ratings of candidates.

The unit’s assessment system is based on key assessments. The key assessments presented above are part of a larger analysis of data which is in the process of taking place as the assessment system evolves.

The assessment system was begun with the implementation of the TPA process. The unit had a phase-in period between spring 2004 and summer 2008. During this time, faculty and student teaching supervisors received training in TPA implementation and scoring. Taskstream was introduced and developed to assess TPA’s. A full-time assessment coordinator and a full-time staff person were hired. With their assistance, the unit has begun to analyze data.

As the unit began collecting evidence using the key assessment results, we began to understand that the TPA assessment system is working effectively. The data gathered show a high passing rate of all the TPA’s, including the components that focus specifically on English Learners and on students with special needs.

Another component of the assessment system that the unit has analyzed is the writing component of the admissions process. The unit developed a writing proficiency assessment that candidates take as a condition of admissions. Candidates have to receive a minimum passing score. If they don’t, they take a remediation course that the unit offers. Candidates re-take the writing assessment, and until they pass it, they’re not formally admitted into the program. We have candidates who have been identified as English Learners and/or special needs students who have a difficult time passing the writing assessment. In those cases, individual faculty work one-on-one with the candidates until their writing skills improve enough for them to be able to get a passing score.

Our assessment system is still a work in progress, especially as it relates to the diversity-related competencies/key assessments. The unit is committed to the full implementation of diversity related competencies as well as to their effective assessment. The current analysis of CTQ assessment data shows that the diversity-related components are yielding favorable results. Our own assessment system concurs with these results. We’ll need to continue monitoring these key assignments to support the claims we’re making from our preliminary data.

4a.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to diversity proficiencies and assessments may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

4b.1. What opportunities do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning or alternate route programs) have to interact with higher education and/or school-based faculty from diverse groups?
Candidates throughout our programs have opportunities to interact with higher education faculty and with school-based faculty from diverse groups in formal and informal ways. The unit makes every effort to ensure that candidates interact with school based faculty through the implementation of fieldwork and practicum experiences. Most courses in all our programs have a fieldwork component. This assignment is very specific in regards to the place and the people with whom candidates are to work: the unit places candidates only in diverse settings. To facilitate the placement and supervision of candidates in practicum, Master Teachers and unit supervisors are EL (English Learner) certified.

The unit ensures that candidates at the main campus and candidates in our branch campuses get the same or a similar level of interaction with diverse higher education faculty. It is for this reason the unit ensures programs have full-time faculty, who represent diverse population groups, at their satellite locations on a regular basis. Other opportunities provided for students to interact informally with diverse higher education and school-based faculty are arranged by bringing speakers on campus. Many faculty bring in class speakers. Examples include:

- [http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-4/](http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-4/)

- Colloquium Series on Diversity [http://www.laverne.edu/academics/institutional-review-board/faculty-events.php](http://www.laverne.edu/academics/institutional-review-board/faculty-events.php)

- International Studies Institute [http://www.laverne.edu/academics/arts-sciences/international-studies-institute/immigration-theme](http://www.laverne.edu/academics/arts-sciences/international-studies-institute/immigration-theme)

- Safe Zone Training [http://academic.laverne.edu/~ear/safelist/](http://academic.laverne.edu/~ear/safelist/)


4b.2. What knowledge and experiences do faculty have related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse groups?

The University of La Verne is in a diverse area, and the majority of the CEOL main campus candidates come from the surrounding area. Candidates go back to serve in their communities as well. Faculty understand the implications of working in a diverse setting like ULV and often have chosen this environment for that very reason. Faculty, both adjunct and full-time, have excellent professional and academic experiences and backgrounds that make them effective in preparing candidates to work with students from diverse groups. Most of the unit’s faculty members were successful teachers and administrators in diverse California school districts.

The unit promotes collaboration between full-time and adjunct faculty by regularly scheduling meetings where adjuncts are included in the implementation of competencies and in the training and development of procedures for implementing new initiatives. The unit recognizes adjunct faculty members’ expertise in their schools, communities, and in their consulting areas.

The unit benefits from shared faculty expertise. Faculty in all programs have a variety of backgrounds and areas of expertise which allow for infusion of diversity into programs in relevant and meaningful ways. Faculty infuse diversity within the curriculum in their program
areas, as described above in the course and program offerings. Faculty share their expertise as well through a variety of cultural trainings, such as Safe Zone. Many faculty are bilingual, some are licensed therapists, and some have expertise in Critical Race theory (see Table 11 which displays faculty qualification characteristics).

4b.3. How diverse are the faculty members who work with education candidates? [Diversity characteristics in addition to those in Table 8 can also be presented and/or discussed, if data are available, in response to other prompts for this element.] Please complete Table 8 or upload your own table at Prompt 4b.5 below.

The left side of Table 8 below displays the unit-based faculty demographic breakdown as well as the institution as a whole. The right side displays the school-based faculty demographic data within the counties the unit serves. A detailed breakdown of the faculty demographic data for each partner school will be available by the start of December 2010 at the link below:

http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-4/

### Table 8

**Faculty Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Kern County</th>
<th>Los Angeles County</th>
<th>Orange County</th>
<th>San Benardino County</th>
<th>San Luis Obispo County</th>
<th>Ventura County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Indian or Alaska Native</strong></td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>2 (0.3%)</td>
<td>35 (0.4%)</td>
<td>346 (0.5%)</td>
<td>58 (0.3%)</td>
<td>118 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td>2 (2.6%)</td>
<td>11 (0.1%)</td>
<td>6228 (8.2%)</td>
<td>1382 (6.4%)</td>
<td>417 (2.2%)</td>
<td>113 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black or African American, non-Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>4 (5.3%)</td>
<td>26 (4.2%)</td>
<td>6666 (8.8%)</td>
<td>204 (0.9%)</td>
<td>972 (5.2%)</td>
<td>7 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</strong></td>
<td>10 (0.1%)</td>
<td>326 (0.4%)</td>
<td>34 (0.2%)</td>
<td>47 (0.3%)</td>
<td>1 (0.1%)</td>
<td>5 (0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic or Latino</strong></td>
<td>47 (61.8%)</td>
<td>373 (51.8%)</td>
<td>2143 (10.0%)</td>
<td>3383 (18.1%)</td>
<td>111 (6.2%)</td>
<td>1166 (18.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White, non-Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>47 (60.4%)</td>
<td>6243 (75.3%)</td>
<td>2059 (27.0%)</td>
<td>2013 (10.0%)</td>
<td>111 (6.2%)</td>
<td>1166 (18.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two or more races</strong></td>
<td>47 (0.6%)</td>
<td>498 (0.7%)</td>
<td>111 (0.5%)</td>
<td>95 (0.5%)</td>
<td>18 (1.0%)</td>
<td>70 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>7 (1.1%)</td>
<td>72 (0.9%)</td>
<td>152 (0.7%)</td>
<td>191 (1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>11 (14.5%)</td>
<td>4 (3.8%)</td>
<td>1 (7.1%)</td>
<td>141 (22.8%)</td>
<td>52 (0.6%)</td>
<td>340 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4b.4. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain a diverse faculty?

The unit is committed to the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty. Even before the unit implemented a formal procedure to ensure the recruitment of diverse faculty, the CEOL had already made specific changes to the way in which the process was done.

The unit ensures the inclusion of knowledgeable and experienced people who provide direction in the makeup of the recruitment/hiring committee, in the way in which job announcements/descriptions are written to appeal to potential diverse candidates, in the way the interview questions and procedures are conducted, and in the way in which diversity is presented as an important component within the other preferred qualifications of candidates.

The unit attempts to achieve a high retention rate for all faculty. During their first semester as new faculty at the CEOL, new faculty members shadow a senior faculty member in courses they’ll be teaching, and there are no committee assignments. New faculty members do not teach in the satellite campuses during the first semester either. The unit has implemented an informal mentoring protocol as well that complements the formal process the unit has established. During the first year, the new faculty member gets matched to a veteran faculty member on campus for mentoring support.

The unit and the CEOL have been working on developing and implementing a variety of retention related strategies. The CEOL is in the process of developing a peer observation protocol to enhance the feedback faculty receive in their student evaluations. Student evaluations have been recently revised as well.

Another important strategy the unit has implemented is the development of Professional Assistance Committees. Within the review process for tenure and/or promotion, there is an opportunity to implement a professional assistance process should it be needed. The Professional Assistance Committee is assigned the task of mentoring the candidate in specific areas of concern and to assist the candidates in resubmitting their application to continue forward in the process.

Finally, the institution is in the process of forming a search committee for the position of Chief Diversity Officer (CDO). Faculty from CEOL were instrumental in advocating for this position, which the institution had not had before. One of the duties for the new CDO will be to implement a unit-wide recruitment/retention process for diverse faculty and staff. Recruitment and retention of diverse faculty, staff, and administration is goal number three in the University’s Strategic Plan for Diversity. This plan was recently drafted by a group of faculty, staff, and administrators, and approved by the Board of Trustees. The plan has a set of prioritized initiatives, one of which is the recruitment and hiring of a Chief Diversity Officer. The institution
has given this initiative a high level of importance, and faculty and staff from CEOL continue playing an important role in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Diversity.

**4b.5. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty diversity may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

### 4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

**4c.1. What opportunities do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning or alternate route programs) have to interact with candidates from diverse groups?**

Candidates in all programs have the opportunity to interact with candidates from diverse groups. Southern California is a diverse area. A majority of our candidates come to our programs from these local communities and they obtain employment back in their communities. Our student population reflects the diversity of Southern California. The University of La Verne (ULV) is designated as a [Hispanic Serving Institution](https://www.hacu.net/). The Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) defines Hispanic Serving Institutions as colleges, universities, or systems/districts where total Hispanic enrollment constitutes a minimum of 25% of the total enrollment.

ULV is recognized among the nation’s higher education leaders. The U.S. News & World Report in its 2008 “America’s Best Colleges” issue, ranked La Verne No. 8 in overall racial diversity among all U.S. National Universities and No. 1 in Hispanic student presence among the most racially diverse National Universities. Graduation rates for African American and Hispanic students are typically 15-20% above the national average, and 58% of the students declared themselves minority.

One of the unit’s four values is that of [Community and Diversity](#). ULV values diversity and makes an attempt at being at the forefront in innovation to serve the needs of diverse learners. Nearly 40 years ago, the [Campus Accelerated Program for Adults (CAPA)](http://www.calverna.edu/capa/) was designed to address the needs of adult learners. Today, the CEOL works closely with CAPA to plan and deliver high quality programs on campus as well as in the satellite campuses. Table 9 displays candidate demographic data.

**4c.2. How diverse are the candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs? [Diversity characteristics in addition to those in Table 9 can also be presented and discussed, if data are available, in other prompts of this element.] Please complete Table 9 or upload your own table at Prompt 4c.4 below.**

The left side of Table 9 below displays the unit candidate demographic breakdown as well as the institution as a whole. The right side displays the demographic data of the general populations within the counties the unit serves. This was done to represent all areas served given the multi-site set-up of the unit.
Table 9
Candidate Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Candidates in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%)</th>
<th>Candidates in Advanced Preparation Programs n (%)</th>
<th>All Students in the Institution n (%)</th>
<th>Diversity of Geographical Area Served by Institution (%) (based on Census data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kern County</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>San Bernardino County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULV Enrollment Distribution by County:</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kern County</th>
<th>Los Angeles County</th>
<th>Orange County</th>
<th>San Bernardino County</th>
<th>San Luis Obispo County</th>
<th>Ventura County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>11 (1.09%)</td>
<td>5 (0.54%)</td>
<td>56 (0.7%)</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>26 (2.57%)</td>
<td>35 (3.75%)</td>
<td>683 (9.1%)</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>42 (4.15%)</td>
<td>75 (8.04%)</td>
<td>665 (8.9%)</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N.A</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>326 (32.5%)</td>
<td>387 (41.48%)</td>
<td>2315 (30.9%)</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>402 (39.76%)</td>
<td>276 (29.58%)</td>
<td>2231 (29.8%)</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>121 (11.97%)</td>
<td>91 (9.76%)</td>
<td>469 (6.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity unknown</td>
<td>83 (8.21%)</td>
<td>64 (6.86%)</td>
<td>1066 (14.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1011 (100%)</td>
<td>933 (100%)</td>
<td>7485 (100%)</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>102.3%</td>
<td>101.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>805 (79.62%)</td>
<td>809 (86.71%)</td>
<td>4669 (62.4%)</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>195 (19.29%)</td>
<td>105 (11.25%)</td>
<td>2736 (36.6%)</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Reported</strong></td>
<td>11 (1.09%)</td>
<td>19 (2.04%)</td>
<td>80 (1.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1011 (100%)</td>
<td>933 (100%)</td>
<td>7485 (100%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - N values are based on Fall 2009 enrollment
4c.3. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups?

The unit successfully recruits and retains candidates from diverse groups. The majority of our candidates come from the surrounding area, and the Southern California area is very diverse. Candidates have many choices of private and public institutions, and many diverse candidates choose ULV. The CEOL has identified important steps in the admissions and recruitment process that make it possible for diverse candidates to be admitted into programs, enroll at the unit, and register for classes in a smooth process.

The unit recruits at college fairs and community colleges. We have recruiters who attend college and graduate program fairs. We have general education transfer agreements, as well as articulation agreements, with many community colleges in our service areas.

Some of our collaborative relationships have resulted in further programs. In 2005, ULV and Citrus College received a $3 million Title V grant, over a five year period, for the purpose of establishing a transfer center between Citrus and ULV.

After students come to ULV, they choose to stay. Faculty and staff understand and are aware of the possible barriers minority and diverse students encounter as they begin the process of enrolling and seeking admissions to programs. Thus, the unit has admissions advisors who assist potential candidates to seek admission into programs. Candidates meet with individual faculty to be admitted into programs, to receive one-to-one advising, and to receive a general orientation into the program and services available to them. In addition, advisors are available to students at anytime throughout their educational program.

The unit is committed to small class sizes, making every effort to keep low enrollment courses open. Candidates have the support of the Learning Enhancement Center (LEC) in the form of academic tutoring, academic workshops, and individual assistance with papers, projects, time management, study skills, etc.

Faculty and staff are knowledgeable about recruitment and retention concerns, especially in regards to diverse candidates, and offer empathic encouragement to them. In addition to the resources listed above, the unit has developed a writing intervention support program. This program was implemented for the purpose of ensuring that candidates demonstrate basic minimum writing skills in English. When candidates cannot meet this requirement, the unit fully supports the candidate until he/she is successful in meeting this proficiency.


4c.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to candidate diversity may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

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

4d.1. How does the unit ensure that candidates develop and practice knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity during their field experiences and clinical practice?
The unit ensures that candidates develop and practice knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity during their field experience and clinical practice. Candidates do their field experience and clinical practice in diverse settings, and have specific assignments that have diversity related competencies. Faculty and Unit Supervisors are well trained in the area of diversity and in supporting candidates in the implementation of diversity-related competencies.

Candidates are required to infuse competencies and adaptations for English Learners and for Special populations. The unit has developed lesson plans that address specific competencies. Candidate evaluation forms include competencies related to knowledge, skills and dispositions when working with diverse populations. The chart below displays fieldwork activities associated with each program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Courses in which fieldwork is required</th>
<th>Brief description of fieldwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
-Community Resources Notebook  
-15 hours observation & writing of sociodramatic play/interpretation paper  
-80 hour practicum/case study  
-10 hour fieldwork observation using DRDP-R.  
-15 hour fieldwork. Teach math lesson plan  
-15 hours fieldwork. Cultural literacy  
-15 hours fieldwork. Observation/ evaluation using ITERS-R  
-Ethnographic study  
-8 hour observation, focused on a director of a licensed child care facility  
-15 hour shadowing assignment  
-Supervised student teaching  
-One observation. Write observation report |
| Child Development M.S.    | None required                          |                                                                                               |
| Child Life                | EDUC 530H, EDUC 530I, EDUC 530M, EDUC 530S, EDUC 530T, EDUC 553F, EDUC 553P | -Visits to various hospital departments.  
-Observations of educational aspects of Child Life  
-Observation & participation with hospitalized children/families  
-Funeral home/crematorium visit  
-Observation/participation in grief activities  
-120 hr. hospital experience  
-Observation & participation with hospitalized children/families  
-Observation & participation with hospitalized children/families |
| Educational Counseling    | EDUC 543, EDUC 546, EDUC 550, EDUC 564, EDUC 565, EDUC 571, EDUC 572, EDUC 573 | -Case study & interview.  
-25 practicum hours shadowing a counselor  
-Fieldtrips  
-Fieldtrips  
-25 practicum hours shadowing a specialist  
-25 practicum hours shadowing a certificated staff  
-25 practicum hours shadowing a certificated staff  
-30 practicum hours and fieldtrip |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 583A</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Supervised fieldwork. Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 583B</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Supervised fieldwork. Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMT 576</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMT 570</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Benchmark activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMT 573</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Benchmark activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMT 574</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Field experience action plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMT 576</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 310</td>
<td></td>
<td>-School model comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 330</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Two school observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 336</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Child interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 350</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Observations of preschool &amp; school age children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 389</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Teacher interview/class observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 389</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Teacher interview/class observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 390</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Weekly observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 407</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Two observations/interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 499D</td>
<td></td>
<td>-15 hours observation/participation in classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 510</td>
<td></td>
<td>-10 hour reading tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 514</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Assessment of 4-6th grade reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 516</td>
<td></td>
<td>-10 hour one-to-one tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 518</td>
<td></td>
<td>-10 hour tutorial of English Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 520</td>
<td></td>
<td>-10 hour tutorial of adolescent learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 521</td>
<td></td>
<td>-15 hour tutorial of reluctant reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 525</td>
<td></td>
<td>-10 hour tutorial of struggling reader k-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 530</td>
<td></td>
<td>-One in-service presentation to parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 598</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Observation/intervention reading plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 535</td>
<td></td>
<td>-School visits/observation/interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 547</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Interview special ed. student support personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 548</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Shadow school psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 549</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 564</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Fieldtrips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 571</td>
<td></td>
<td>-25 hour practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 572</td>
<td></td>
<td>-25 practicum hours shadowing a certificated staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 573</td>
<td></td>
<td>-30 practicum hours and fieldtrip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 578</td>
<td></td>
<td>-School visits/observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 579</td>
<td></td>
<td>-School visits/observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 586A</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Practicum (1 unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 586B</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Practicum (1 unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 589 A &amp; B</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Supervised fieldwork. Levels 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 457</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Two visits special education or exceptional services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 406</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Observe IEP meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 470</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Interview three professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 462</td>
<td></td>
<td>-30 hours working with EL’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 468</td>
<td></td>
<td>-10 hours fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 468</td>
<td></td>
<td>-30 hours of fieldwork, observation &amp; interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 407</td>
<td></td>
<td>-K-12 observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 464</td>
<td></td>
<td>-20 hours fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 409</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Directed student teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 459</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Education Specialist Intern Seminar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4d.2. How diverse are the P-12 students in the settings in which candidates participate in field experiences and clinical practice? Please complete Table 10 or upload your own table at Prompt 4d.4 below. [Although NCATE encourages institutions to report the data available for each school used for clinical practice, units may not have these data available by school. If the unit uses more than 20 schools for clinical practice, school district data may be substituted for school data in the table below. In addition, data may be reported for other schools in which field experiences, but not clinical practice, occur. Please indicate where this is the case.]

Table 10
Demographics on Sites for Clinical Practice in Initial and Advanced Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of school</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black or African American, non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>White, non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Two or more races</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Race / ethnicity unknown</th>
<th>Students receiving free / reduced price lunch</th>
<th>English language learners</th>
<th>Students with disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please see Table 10 posted in link below: [http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-4/](http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-4/)

4d.3. How does the unit ensure that candidates use feedback from peers and supervisors to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups?

Paulo Freire defines praxis in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* as “reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it”. The CEOL believes that candidate feedback is important, and candidates’ reflection on such feedback is crucial. Candidates’ conscious thinking about their craft will enable them to become better at it. Therefore, the unit offers multiple opportunities for candidates to receive feedback and to reflect on the feedback received.

Candidates use feedback from peers to reflect on their skills when working with students, especially from diverse groups in every program. Candidates enroll in a cohort model in most programs. Even in programs where there are multiple course offerings of the same course, candidates may choose to remain with the same group of candidates with whom they take the first course. The cohort model and the informal groupings utilized in all programs allow candidates to develop a working relationship where formal and informal feedback takes place.
Informal feedback happens as a result of candidates working together on projects, as well as a result of candidates sharing experiences. The environment of small class sizes and individual attention from faculty and staff encourage candidates to interact with each other, not just in class, but outside of it.

Formal feedback happens in courses where candidates engage in assignments and projects that have a formal interactive mode embedded within the assignment. Every course in every program has at least one assignment embedded this way. For example, candidates in the Teacher Education Program, EDUC 470 Theories and Methods of Education for Linguistically Diverse Students, have a series of assignments that have an interactive mode. Candidates share some assignments in small groups. The small group sharing allows and encourages candidates to provide feedback on their assignment in a non-threatening manner.

In addition, every course in every program has at least a minimum level of content online. This means that candidates must use the virtual environment Blackboard. Blackboard has communication features which allow candidates to collaborate formally and informally. For example, candidates in the Teacher Education Program, EDUC 460 Diversity, Interaction & the Learning Process, collaborate on a project where they research a diverse group and share their findings in a formal class presentation. Candidates use the virtual environment to collaborate on the assignment and to share their research findings materials/references with the entire class. This level of interaction allows students to provide formal and informal feedback.

Candidates use feedback from supervisors to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups. Candidates engage in fieldwork while still taking courses, as most courses have a fieldwork component. The courses that have a fieldwork component, include a written reflection component. The course professor is in a position to provide feedback to the candidate and to engage the candidate in reflecting about diverse students, their needs, and how to best meet their needs, within the framework of the content being addressed.

Candidates are introduced to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) in their first course, EDUC 460. When candidates begin their student teaching phase, they are instructed at the student teaching orientation on the specific requirements in regards to student teaching responsibilities. Evaluation forms that are based on the CSTP are shared with candidates. The Supervised Teaching Observation Report forms reflect a strong emphasis on the CSTP and the TPE. Student Teacher Supervisors use these forms to observe candidates on a weekly basis. Candidates and supervisors meet to discuss the observation, after the observation, once a week. Supervisors have an opportunity to observe the following week if candidates used the feedback to improve and/or enhance their lesson planning and delivery.

4d.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the diversity of P-12 students in schools in which education candidates do their field experiences and clinical practice may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 4?

The unit has made a commitment to be intentional about diversity and social justice. In our recent faculty searches, we’ve made a commitment to recruit and hire diverse faculty or
faculty who have successful experiences working with diverse candidates and/or diverse settings. Faculty who interview understand the importance the unit places on diversity. Selected faculty join the unit and contribute to their departments, the school, and to the unit in meaningful and relevant ways.

Faculty from every department ensure diversity is woven throughout the curriculum. Diversity is taught in meaningful and relevant ways, and it is also assessed. Faculty assist in the recruitment of diverse candidates, and also understand their needs and potential barriers to their success. This understanding enables faculty to be successful when working with diverse candidates and to model effective strategies for their students as well.

ULV received one of the first Title V grants for graduate students. One component of this grant’s activities is the development of the first bilingual, bicultural counseling certificate program in California. Faculty from CEOL are leaders at the unit on issues of diversity and social justice. Faculty regularly participate in faculty governance committees, ad hoc committees, and unit-wide task forces. Faculty organize events and make presentations to different groups on campus.

Faculty also engage in scholarly work related to diversity and social justice. Faculty present at professional conferences and publish in scholarly journals. Faculty also serve on dissertation committees that focus on diversity topics.

The staff in our unit plays a major role in welcoming potential candidates and in making sure they understand program requirements and procedures. Our staff is committed to assisting all candidates and is particularly understanding and knowledgeable about the needs of diverse candidates. Most of our support staff also take classes in our programs, so they have theoretical understanding, as well as relevant practical knowledge that enables them to be successful in providing support for all candidates, including diverse candidates.

The unit receives feedback on our performance from candidates and from employers. The feedback overwhelmingly points to the fact that our candidates feel well prepared to work with diverse students. Their employers confirm that our candidates are well prepared and effective when working in diverse settings. The Transition Point 4 portion of the link below offers data from the Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ) including graduate and employer feedback on performance and dispositions.

http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/evidence/

2. What research related to Standard 4 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?
STANDARD 5. FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE, AND DEVELOPMENT

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

[In this section the unit must include the professional education faculty in (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

5a. Qualified Faculty

5a.1. What are the qualifications of the full- and part-time professional education faculty (e.g., earned degrees, experience, and expertise)? Please complete Table 11 or upload your own table at Prompt 5a.5 below. [Professional Education Faculty information compiled by AIMS from earlier reports submitted for the national review of programs and updated by your institution (see Manage Faculty Information page in your AIMS workspace) can be imported into Table 11. For further guidance on completing this table, see the directions provided below (select link "click here") as well as in the Help document (click on "Help" in the upper right corner of your screen.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University</th>
<th>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service: List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years</th>
<th>Teaching or Other Professional Experience in P-12 Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 is available here: [http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-5/](http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-5/)

The faculty represented in Table 11 are CEOL faculty currently employed in the fall of 2010. This group is selected as representative of a typical semester and the most recent data. Twenty two (22) faculty are in the Department of Advanced Studies in Education and Human Development (ASEHD), twenty six (26) faculty are in the Department of Education and ten (10) faculty are in the Department of Organizational Leadership. In ASEHD, ten faculty are full-time non tenure track while Education has eight full-time non tenure track and Organization Leadership Ed.D. department has only one non tenure track full-time faculty. Fifty-five percent of full-time tenure track faculty have Ed.D.s and forty-five percent having Ph.D.s. The 19 non tenure track faculty have 2 Ph.D.s and 1 Ed.D with four more non tenure track faculty working on post graduate degrees. All faculty are teaching in their area of academic emphasis. Of the 59
faculty, 29 have earned degrees in institutions representing foreign and domestic universities. The 59 full time and 114 adjunct faculty have degrees and credentials in their area of course assignment as well as relevant P-12 experience.

Forty percent of classes are taught by full-time faculty and 60 percent are taught by adjunct faculty. All adjunct faculty hold either a Master’s or Doctoral degree. These faculty are selected to teach due to their specialized qualifications, certifications, school/district level teaching and/or administrative experience. While hired to teach on an as needed basis, many have been teaching in CEOL for a number of years and bring expertise, experience and continuity to the programs.

5a.2. What expertise qualifies professional education faculty members who do not hold terminal degrees for their assignments?

Faculty who are tenure track hold doctoral degrees. Of the 19 full-time non tenure track faculty, four have earned doctoral degrees, three are in progress for earning their doctoral degrees and twelve faculty hold a Master’s degree and significant expertise and/or experience in the area(s) they are assigned to teach and/or manage. These faculty members have pursued professional education, credentialing, and in some cases, have many years of experience. Clinical Supervisors (part time) in Counseling, Psychology, Administration, Special Education and Teacher Education require the appropriate California Credential in the program area as well as a minimum of 5 years P-12 experience in the field they are supervising. Adjunct Faculty teaching coursework within specific programs are required to hold a B.A., Masters preferred for Teacher Education as well as three letters of recommendation, personal interview and orientation binders. For Advanced Studies courses, instructors must have a Master’s Degree with extensive experience/expertise in the field(s) being taught.

5a.3. How many of the school-based faculty members are licensed in the areas they teach or are supervising? How does the unit ensure that school-based faculty members are adequately licensed?

All school-based supervisors are tenured by their districts and credentialed by the California Teacher Credentialing Commission in the areas they are supervising. This is ensured by the memorandums of agreement signed by school districts and the unit. Principals and/or district human resource officers collaborate with CEOL program chairs to assure appropriate qualifications of P-12 school site faculty. All site based faculty teaching as adjuncts are screened through an application process that ensures that their credentials match subject areas they are teaching as in the case of a reading course adjunct must be credentialed with a reading specialist credential and have experience as a reading teacher. Bilingual instructors must be fully credentialed for California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) or Cross-Cultural Language Acquisition and Development (CLAD) and have P-12 experience as a bilingual teacher. These instructors are also provided a Shadowing Experience prior to teaching the course. Shadowing means that the potential instructor observes with the full time professor during a semester prior to the adjunct being contracted to teach the course on his/her own.
5a.4. What contemporary professional experiences do higher education clinical faculty members have in school settings?

Clinical faculty have P-12 experiences within the last five years or have significant long term experience supervising student teachers, serving as counselors, school psychologists, or school administrators or recently retired from school service roles. Monthly meetings are held with these faculty members to assure that they are current in their pedagogy and instructional strategies. All are expected to be in contact with their students in classroom program settings and to communicate with site administrators.

5a.5. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty qualifications may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

5b.1. How does instruction by professional education faculty reflect the conceptual framework as well as current research and developments in the fields?

Unit faculty are recognized for their exceptional expertise in their teaching fields and develop their syllabi to reflect the conceptual framework pillars identified as leadership, diversity, caring and excellence. Developing knowledge, skills and self awareness through technology and demonstrated dispositions is a concurrent experience for candidates. Content, objectives and assessments are aligned to the Conceptual Framework as well as to professional standards set by the California Commission for Teacher Credentialing. The delivery of programs in the Unit can be described as learner-centered and experiential. Program proficiencies enable candidates to exhibit intellectual, ethical and social responsibilities in order to imagine, explore, and design the future. These practices are documented in a number of ways. Every program has competencies aligned with the four guiding principles. Each credential program in the unit derives its candidate proficiencies directly from California standards for credential programs. In order to insure cohesion between these standards and the unit’s four guiding principles, each program has identified points of alignment among them. The following link illustrates those relationships.

http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/conceptual-framework/chart-of-guiding-principles/

Additionally, varied instructional approaches addressing the needs of all learners, technology and performance assessments are described in course syllabi and program submissions. Faculty use current research in teaching as they differentiate their instructional strategies with candidates. Candidates are required through projects and assignments to access, analyze and critique research. Experts are often invited into classes to discuss their experiences and research.

5b.2. How do unit faculty members encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions?

All programs within the unit view reflection as central to candidate success. Course and program assessments, such as portfolios, peer counseling, diagnosing reading difficulties, case studies, and clinical practice promote the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions. Candidates are observed and provided with feedback.
during practica, student teaching, or internship. Faculty meets individually with candidates to review their portfolio and/or progress while requiring candidates to reflect on their progress as developing teachers, school professionals and leaders. The following link leads to Biennial Program reports and course syllabi that provide ample evidence of the myriad of ways candidates interact with content, reflect on practices, and learn about professional dispositions. In the link below, biennial reports and syllabi provide many examples of ways in which faculty promote reflection, critical thinking, problem-solving and professional dispositions. Examples include reflection after developing and teaching lessons, self-assessment of mastery for the Evidence of Meeting Learning Objectives (EMLO’s) and responding to prompts for Teacher Performance Assessments (TPA). http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/evidence/
The above link documents the quality of candidate engagement with educational tasks. Constructivist teaching strategies of faculty and the use of course assessments serve to further develop the problem-solving and critical thinking abilities. Candidate dispositions are monitored throughout the program by faculty. Professional dispositions are assessed unit wide and candidates are made aware of dispositional requirements. This approach creates an awareness of professional behavior and expectations.

5b.3. What types of instructional strategies and assessments do unit faculty members model?

Unit faculty model a range of best instructional practices. They use both direct and more inquiry/inductive instruction while favoring constructivist teaching to support student centered learning. A variety of techniques are modeled with assignments that mirror the tasks that teachers and other school professionals will perform at P-12 sites. Some of the strategies incorporated into teaching and assessment include cooperative learning, role playing, think/pair/share, simulations, writing workshop, guided discussion, critical friends’ review of peer work, case studies, literacy workshops, Socratic questioning, lecture and teaching for understanding. Faculty members intentionally use authentic assessment strategies, employing rubric based and descriptive documentation regarding candidates’ performances in field-based or classroom experiences.

5b.4. How do unit faculty members incorporate the use of technology into instruction?

Faculty members have integrated technology into their courses beginning with TPA assessments which are posted online and managed through the Task Stream system. Courses are taught as high tech/high touch blends best described as a combination of Blackboard and face to face meetings. Webinars facilitate group discussions and presentations. Classroom sets of Net Books and Clickers are checked out by faculty to use in their class meetings. Lesson plans from clinical experiences are submitted to faculty on a daily basis. Technology is a strand that is required in all courses and observed by faculty through assignments and demonstrations. Faculty members are trained by the Center for Teaching and Learning to support course development for online delivery. Specific trainings and participant numbers are cited below in the answer to 5f.2.
5b.5. How do unit faculty members systematically engage in self-assessment of their own teaching?

Faculty members systematically engage in self-assessment of their teaching through at least four activities. Faculty members develop a professional plan designed to focus on personal strengths and to improve in areas where there may be weaknesses. In their initial faculty evaluation plan, faculty identify specific measurable annual goals in teaching, scholarship, and service. (Tenure and Promotion document: [http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-5/](http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-5/)) The prior year of work provides feedback upon which new goals are developed. Faculty members are encouraged to use candidate course evaluations for self-assessment of their effectiveness as instructors. At the end of each course, candidates evaluate their instructors online with feedback becoming available after the conclusion of the semester.

**Instructor, Course and Facilities Evaluation**

Candidates opinions are an integral part of the process of assuring the quality of instruction and academic offerings at the University of La Verne. The instructor, his/her department chair, and dean receive this information in summary form, only after final grades are submitted. This evaluation is completely anonymous. Thank you for completing it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor: ___________________________</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course #: ____________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructional Materials**

1. The course materials helped me achieve the course objectives.  
   1.  2.  3.  4.  N/A

2. The course assignments helped me achieve the course objectives.  
   1.  2.  3.  4.  N/A

**Teaching Techniques**

3. The instructor’s teaching techniques helped me learn the subject matter.  
   1.  2.  3.  4.  N/A

**Learning Environment**

4. The instructor was respectful of diversity among students.  
   1.  2.  3.  4.  N/A

5. The class environment was conducive to my learning.  
   1.  2.  3.  4.  

6. The instructor supported and encouraged student questions and discussion, in class or online.  
   1.  2.  3.  4.  N/A

**Feedback and Evaluation**

7. Feedback on my coursework was provided in a timely manner.  
   1.  2.  3.  4.  N/A

8. Feedback on my coursework was helpful.  
   1.  2.  3.  4.  N/A

9. The instructor was accessible, either in person, by telephone or through online communication channels.  
   1.  2.  3.  4.  N/A

**Overall**

10. Overall, the instructor was effective in this course.  
   1.  2.  3.  4.  N/A
Comments about the Instructor

11. What were the instructor’s most satisfactory teaching attributes?

12. What could the instructor do to improve his/her teaching effectiveness?

Comments about the Course

13. What were the most satisfactory aspects of this course?

14. How could this course be improved?

Periodic Institutional Effectiveness Questions—One-time only questions that WILL NOT be included with the Instructor’s scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. There were adequate library research resources (e.g. databases, librarian help, class sessions, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. There was adequate support available from the Learning Enhancement Center (e.g. tutoring, writing assistance, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Online Class Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. The Blackboard help desk provided adequate support for utilizing the online platform.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. My online instructor was either able to assist me with technical support, or could direct me to adequate help.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. The physical classroom environment was comfortable and conducive to helping me learn.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many faculty supplement their formal evaluations with candidate conversations at the end of the course. Comments from candidates are printed and reported for the instructor as part of their course evaluation summary. Student teacher supervising faculty members are evaluated by both the teacher candidates and the cooperating teacher (master teacher). The program chair
meets each semester to debrief with these supervising faculty to provide feedback. Peer feedback occurs through team teaching, shadowing experiences, and formal observations. Each faculty member meets annually with his/her program chair to reflect on his/her teaching and set goals for action plans for continued improvement. In addition, faculty meets on a monthly basis to discuss their teaching and candidate learning. Overall unit faculty members have demonstrated effectiveness in teaching as measured by candidate evaluations as well as their success in gaining tenure and promotion.

5b.6. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty teaching may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

5c.1. What types of scholarly work are expected of faculty as part of the institution's and unit's mission?

The University of La Verne has long emphasized its teaching mission. However, the university is now in transition to a teaching-research model and is increasing expectations for scholarly activity. The unit faculty personnel committee recently passed a change to the tenure and promotion guidelines to include the expectation that to become tenured and promoted to associate professor, faculty members would have at least two refereed publications. To become promoted to full professor, a minimum of two refereed publications were expected after tenure. The unit continues to review and work on the definition of scholarship. The framework of “Scholarship Reconsidered” offered by Boyer (1990) is seen as representing CEOL research. These definitions of scholarship that inform the basis of the unit’s reappointment, tenure and promotion policies are grounded in the first two types of scholarship (Scholarship of Discovery and Scholarship of Integration). The four types of scholarship are appropriate at different times in a faculty member’s academic career. Such categories of scholarship include discovery, integration, application, and teaching. These are defined as follows:

*Scholarship of Discovery:* The pursuit of new knowledge; original research or creativity.

*Scholarship of Integration:* Interpretation, drawing together, and bringing new insight to original research or creative activity.

*Scholarship of Application:* Using knowledge responsibly to solve consequential problems; knowledge that arises out of the very act of application.

*Scholarship of Teaching:* The act of teaching as well as the planning and examination of pedagogical procedures.

In the unit, there is an emphasis on scholarship which informs teaching with some emphasis on applied research related to work with P-12 schools. Faculty are encouraged to collaborate with P-12 partners. Scholarship includes peer refereed journals, authored and edited books, book chapters, invited articles for thematic issues of a journal, monographs, reprints of articles in books of readings that are peer-reviewed and scholarly projects with external support and research grants are highly valued. In addition, given the unit’s emphasis on teaching and learning, many faculty members are involved in scholarship exploring their own teaching. Scholarship also includes those intellectual activities that contribute to the development and dissemination of the knowledge base of the faculty member’s respective discipline and the
advancement of educational practice. The college looks at scholarship from the aspect of additional activities such as: book reviews, chairing research sessions at professional meetings, editorship of professional journals, evidence of clinical site development for research purposes, government and agency publications, grant proposals, evaluations and other technical documents, colloquia at other universities and academic conference presentations, membership on professional journal editorial boards, non-refereed professional publications, original curricular projects (e.g., CD ROMs, videos, tests, clinical documents), presentations at professional and scholarly meetings, consulting activities on behalf of organizations and institutions, and assessment work related to accreditation and preparation of accreditation documents.

5c.2. In what types of scholarship activities are faculty members engaged? How is their scholarship related to teaching and learning? What percentage of the unit's faculty is engaged in scholarship? (Review the definition of scholarship in the NCATE glossary.) [A table could be attached at Prompt 5c.3 below to show different scholarly activities in which faculty members are involved and the number involved in each activity.]

All full-time faculty tenure track faculty members engage in the forms of scholarship identified above, though the type of scholarship might vary depending on career stage and work assignment. Junior faculty (pre-tenure) tend to focus most on the scholarship of teaching, discovery and integration, as necessary for successful tenure and promotion review. Given the professional nature of the college and its faculty, many focus their research agendas on aspects of teaching and learning in their respective fields through the publication of textbooks, for both P-12 and college environments, research studies related to effective teaching methodologies, and publications aimed at providing immediate input for practitioners. Faculty members are active contributors to their profession. Tenured and senior faculty have engaged in the development of an Educational Policy Center to elicit policy research which is and presented to P-12 Leaders. A review of faculty curriculum vitae describes faculty engagement in book or book chapter publications, scholarly articles and numerous presentations at professional meetings/conferences at various levels.

5c.3. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty scholarship may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

http://www.epiculv.org/topics.php
Faculty Vita: http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-5/

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

5d.1. What types of service are expected of faculty as part of the institution's and the unit's mission?
Faculty members are expected to demonstrate service to one’s college, to the unit itself, and to the broader community including the professional community. Examples of faculty service and expectations are documented in:
http://faculty.laverne.edu/qm/peppit/PEPPIT4_13_09.pdf
Tenure and Promotion document:
http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-5/
The unit encourages its faculty to serve the college and its goals, including active participation in meetings, retreats, multiple committees, development and writing of reports, development and promotion of programs, and work with candidates and candidate groups. The institution expects faculty to be participants in the life of the unit, serve on unit committees, provide leadership in various venues with candidates, faculty, and external constituencies, participate in candidate events, and provide an active voice for continued unit improvement. Faculty members are expected to serve both the local community and their professional community. Within their professional community, they are expected to maintain active involvement in the state and/or national professional associations, to serve on association committees or leadership, or to provide consultation to others based on their professional involvements. All education faculty members are involved to various extents with local professional communities (schools and districts) and or state and national professional communities. In addition, faculty are expected to provide service to the community by working with individuals or organizations who are not in the faculty member’s professional field, such as action with community groups, consulting with non-professional groups, or other service which contributes to the public good.

5d.2. In what types of service activities are faculty members engaged? Provide examples of faculty service related to practice in P-12 schools and service to the profession at the local, state, national, and international levels (e.g., through professional associations). What percentage of the faculty is actively involved in these various types of service activities? [A table could be attached at Prompt 5d.3 below to show different service activities in which faculty members are involved and the number involved in each activity.]

As Table 11 illustrates, unit faculty are broadly and consistently involved in service activities to P-12 schools and their profession (Faculty vita:
http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-5/)
Most faculty lead professional development sessions with P-12 schools, provide collaborative activities such as Family Literacy Days, Early Childhood Conferences, Teacher Education Summer Camp, Diversity Training, and Literacy Center Activities to tutor students from surrounding school districts. Faculty members are involved in unit/community collaboration, including such activities as Partnership Schools, sustainability efforts with regional centers, statewide committees. Faculty members are substantially involved in unit service through participation in unit-wide committees, unit committees, and program advisory committees. As a unit faculty, are members of multiple professional associations at both the state and national levels.

5d.3. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty service may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]
5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

5e.1. How are faculty evaluated? How regular, systematic, and comprehensive are the unit evaluations of adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as graduate teaching assistants?

Faulty evaluation is a unit and college process that is viewed as regular and systematic continuous program improvement. Annual reviews are conducted by program chairs, faculty committees, department chairs, the Dean’s Office and the unit personnel committee. These evaluations are guided by unit and college policies and guidelines. (http://faculty.laverne.edu/qm/peppit/PEPPIT4_13_09.pdf
Tenure and promotion document: http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-5/

Expectations for tenure track faculty include observations of their teaching as well as careful analysis of candidate course evaluations, scholarly work, improvements to their teaching, service and progress toward annual goals jointly set by program chairs and faculty. Non – tenure track faculty are held to all evaluation components with the exception of scholarly work. A portfolio is prepared to provide documentation and artifacts that support the goals established during years of service and submitted during a third year review, promotion and tenure years. Candidates evaluate instruction in every course through an online site (see course evaluation form in 5e2). Adjunct faculty members are evaluated by peer observation and or regional center administrators. They too receive summaries of online candidate evaluations. Adjunct faculty members are subject to course by course hiring. Clinical Supervisors for Student Teaching/Internships, special education, counseling, psychologist, and school administrators are evaluated by candidates, master teachers with program chairs providing individual feedback through face to face or written communication.

5e.2. How well do faculty perform on the unit's evaluations? [A table summarizing faculty performance could be attached at Prompt 5e.4 below.)

Faculty generally perform very well on candidate evaluations of them. Response rates have been lower in the last several years due to the transition to an online evaluation of instruction. Unit faculty average ratings are 3.59 on a four point Likert Scale (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree). University average ratings are 3.56. Candidates evaluate instructors using fourteen questions by which they receive a mean score and standard deviation score. Additionally candidates are asked what were the most satisfactory aspects of the course and how could the course be improved? All responses are printed and reported to the faculty member.

01: The course materials helped me achieve the course objectives
02: The course assignments helped me achieve the course objectives
03: The instructor’s teaching techniques helped me learn the subject matter
04: The instructor was respectful of diversity among students
05: The class environment was conducive to my learning
06: The instructor supported and encouraged student questions and discussion, in class or online
07: Feedback on my coursework was provided in a timely manner
08: Feedback on my coursework was helpful
09: The instructor was accessible, either in person, by telephone or through online
10: Overall, the instructor was effective in this course
11. What were the instructor's most satisfactory teaching attributes?
12. What could the instructor do to improve his/her teaching effectiveness?
13. What were the most satisfactory aspects of this course?
14. How could this course be improved?

Course Evaluation Means for Spring 2010
by full-time/Part-time faculty & Main/Off Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Main Campus</th>
<th>Off Campus</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>90 courses</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>25 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>48 courses</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>79 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138 courses</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>104 courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data may indicate that course evaluations for main and off campus are very similar. Evidence indicates that candidates regard courses off campus as equally high quality to those offered on the main campus. Course evaluations for part-time faculty are slightly higher than full-time faculty which is partial evidence of the advantage of using our part-time faculty. The lowest data point is full-time faculty teaching off campus. This evidence will be used in discussions of continuous improvement among departments.

5e.3. How are faculty evaluations used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service?

All faculty complete an Annual Growth Plan to identify their goals and activities related to teaching, scholarship and service. New faculty members are assigned mentors by the university and/or college to support them during the first year. In the spring semester, faculty reflect on their accomplishments for the academic year and establish new targets for the following year. This self reflection includes feedback from the online candidate evaluations and comments. Program Chairs review the accomplishments and documentation, discussing where the faculty member has achieved his/her targets as well as giving suggestions for improvement and growth. These evaluations become part of the faculty members’ Tenure and Promotion portfolios. Faculty members are given an opportunity to request an assistance committee to meet with them and provide support and advisement regarding areas that are not meeting growth targets. http://faculty.laverne.edu/qm/peppit/PEPPIT4_13_09.pdf and http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-5/
Faculty evaluations are on file in the CEOL office. Department Chairs review faculty/program chair documentation. During Tenure/Promotion processes, a comprehensive review is conducted by program chairs and tenured faculty, department chairs, college level Tenure/Promotion Committee, Dean of CEOL, University Personnel Committee and Provost. At each step of the review, a summary/recommendation is written. The Unit Head reviews the recommendation summaries and professional recommendations with faculty members. This review is conducted prior to the portfolio/binder and recommendations being presented at the University Personnel Committee meeting. Adjunct Faculty are reviewed for their instructional and content expertise. Program Chairs and Regional Administration Faculty review these
adjunct faculty members. Two adjunct faculty from the counseling program have recently been released due to disregard for curriculum and class regulations.

5e.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's evaluation of professional education faculty may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

5f.1. How is professional development related to needs identified in unit evaluations of faculty? How does this occur?

Professional education goals of faculty are addressed in part by attending conferences and other professional development activities. Most tenure-track faculty attend and present at the annual conventions of their state/and or national associations. Each faculty member has access to College funding in the sum of $1,000 to facilitate support at professional development activities. This financial support is supplemented by additional funding from other campus sources including our Professional Development Committee funds and Research Development Committee. In particular cases where a faculty member needs support for his/her teaching, an assisting committee is established to provide support and feedback. Peer review guidance is also provided to faculty through a mentor who reviews instructional materials, visit classes and meets with faculty to provide reflection opportunities. The university provides a Part-time faculty workshops held the second Saturday in November bringing part-time faculty from around Southern California to the Main Campus for recognition, discussion of pressing legal issues, to learn about new technology and to work with their full time colleagues. Morning meetings are devoted to general issues and questions with afternoons devoted to college and department meetings. On campus and off campus part-time faculty are brought together by Department Chairs and Program chairs to meet with full-time faculty focusing in semi annual meetings to address the larger issues that have been discussed during the year. Department chairs meet on a monthly basis with full time, tenure track, non tenure track and adjunct main campus and off campus program faculty to address professional development related to program requirements.

5f.2. What professional development activities are offered to faculty related to performance assessment, diversity, technology, emerging practices, and/or the unit's conceptual framework?

Professional development activities are offered to faculty at the University, unit, and external levels. In the area of assessment, the university is responding to WASC accreditation and has committees working on candidate outcomes and assessment criteria. The unit works with committees and faculty to determine program assessments and select a tracking system for data use followed by decision-making based on data. A monthly meeting is held by the college assessment committee to discuss assessment issues, analyze data, and develop faculty. Faculty have served on state reviewers for credential programs as well as serving on the university Level committees for assessment, educational capacity and educational effectiveness.

Technology is a major emphasis at the institution and unit levels. There are ongoing trainings for full time and part time faculty to implement Blackboard Instructional Delivery,
Task Stream Assessment Management, Webinars, use of classroom sets of technology resources such as Netbooks and Clickers.

Faculty members are trained by the Center for Teaching and Learning to support course development for online delivery. CTL staff provides four levels of training.

**Level I  Awareness/Technology Talks** - for general information and faculty showcasing.

**Level II  Course Management Systems.** Faculty members have participated in the hour long training to present tools for use with Blackboard.

**Level III  Hybrid Certification.** This intense online six module training has had 24 faculty members complete the training with additional faculty still in process.

**Level IV One on One Tutoring.** Three unit faculty have received this option. Smart Board 09 entails three sessions.

A longitudinal study is being conducted by unit and CTL faculty to document how unit faculty are integrating to technology.

**Center for Teaching and Learning – Technology Trainings for CEOL On Campus (OCF) and Regional Campus Faculty (RCF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>2010 OCF</th>
<th>2010 RCF</th>
<th>2009 OCF</th>
<th>2009 RCF</th>
<th>2008 OCF</th>
<th>2008 RCF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certificate Program - 7 Full Time and 12 Part Time Faculty are participating in this year long training and certification program conducted by CTL.

The area of diversity has been the focus of multiple main campus and off campus trainings. The Chair of Advanced Studies in Education and Human Development, along with three faculty members, has conducted Safe Zone training. The University Mission and the unit Conceptual Framework embrace the philosophy and outcomes for attracting a diverse candidate population as well as providing the appropriate support and environment for diverse groups of candidates. Two CEOL faculty members serve on a campus wide diversity committee that meets monthly to discuss diversity issues. The institution has been identified as one of three “Hispanic Serving Private Institutions” in the nation. Title V funds (2.8 million dollars) are provided for training faculty and assisting graduate candidates through enhancing cultural opportunities. An additional two million dollar Title V grant was used to partner with Citrus Community College for training and early orientation to transfer (including credit equivalencies) to La Verne. Faculty members have developed bilingual courses for teaching and counseling certification. During the summers of 08/09 and 09/10, two faculty and the Dean (summer 09/10) traveled to Vietnam to deliver leadership development strategies to University Professors. A partnership agreement was signed to continue an exchange of cultural understanding and study. The university offers regular and on-going professional development for faculty. Faculty Research Day [http://faculty.laverne.edu/qm/ftfh/lr.html#resday](http://faculty.laverne.edu/qm/ftfh/lr.html#resday) and Faculty Lecture Series are offered to all on campus and off campus full- time and faculty.[http://www.laverne.edu/academics/academic-affairs/faculty-lecture-series](http://www.laverne.edu/academics/academic-affairs/faculty-lecture-series)
The unit also regularly co-sponsors workshops on campus in collaboration with area school districts focused on professional development for teachers, administrators, and other K-12 personnel. As co-sponsors of these workshops, CEOL faculty members are regularly invited to attend to learn about these issues and techniques. Examples of conferences are: Teacher Camp, Literacy Events, Counselor and Psychology credentialing, Early Childhood, Turning Schools Around, Policy Institutes, and Summer Teacher Institutes. A faculty committee was also initiated to support and promote “Professors and Writers,” an editorial board was established and ultimately produced an inaugural issue of Thought Leaders, The Anthology of Faculty Scholarship.


Faculty members also have multiple opportunities to participate and present in development activities at local, regional, state, and national professional conferences. The selection of these opportunities is related to their area of growth and expertise.

5f.3. How often does faculty participate in professional development activities both on and off campus? [Include adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as graduate teaching assistants.]

The Unit supports professional development opportunities for all faculty members by providing financial resources to attend instructional conferences and workshops. Tenured and non-tenure track faculty members have equal access to resources to support development. New and potential adjunct instructors are provided “shadowing experiences” both on and off campus. The focus of professional development is to further the Conceptual Framework statement that “We create caring, diverse learning opportunities that foster intellectual, ethical, and social responsibilities in order to imagine, explore, and design the future.” The principles of leadership, diversity, caring and excellence guide the choices made for faculty growth.

The institution has a Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) which focuses on developing technology and research. The institution provides grants for research and sabbaticals as well as Faculty Research Days and Faculty Lecture Series. Monthly meetings are held on campus with tenure track/non tenure track faculty to discuss assessment, curriculum, instructional strategies and address technology needs related to the Unit’s programs. Additionally the unit holds College Wide Meetings four times a year to bring all faculty, full time on campus and off campus, off campus and on campus, part time faculty are brought together to address key topics related to NCATE and our long term vision. The Dean and Leadership Team develop College Wide Meeting Agendas, i.e.
1. Transformative integrative education
2. Collaborative partnerships
3. Comprehensive authentic field based training models
4. Innovative use of technology for teaching and learning
5. Social justice and culture focused education

Yearly College Wide Program Meetings are held on campus to ensure that the issues of technology, equity, best practices and continuity of delivery and instruction are being addressed by all who deliver courses and programs on campus and off campus for the unit.

Three years of data provide evidence that full time tenure track, full time non tenure track, clinical supervisors and adjunct faculty have professional development activities spanning the venues of on campus, district, county, regional, state and national levels of professional
development. The topics are related to new knowledge, skills and practices that inform their area of expertise and program responsibility.

The unit’s faculty members are fully qualified and model best practices in scholarship, service and teaching. The faculty members have a passion for teaching and learning, thus their scholarly work informs their practice. Their professional development is focused on putting theory into practice through their interactions with candidates. The link below contains the Professional Development Chart displaying such activities:
http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-5/

5f.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit’s facilitation of professional development may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 5?

   The unit has a new vision for greater integration of technology into programs and for more faculty scholarship. The unit, CTL, and the library have provided a multitude of workshops and support for faculty and candidates to learn new skills, collaborate with each other, and network with colleagues nationwide to propel the unit in the direction of the new vision.

2. What research related to Standard 5 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?
STANDARD 6. UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

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

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

6a.1. How does the unit manage or coordinate the planning, delivery, and operation of all programs at the institution for the preparation of educators?

The College of Education and Organizational Leadership (CEOL) along with departments in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) form the education unit. The unit head (Dean of the CEOL, Dr. Mark Goor) leads the planning, delivery, and operation of the programs. The associate dean, Dr. Barbara Poling, oversees annual evaluations and tenure and promotion activities; mentors faculty; represents the college on university committees and ensures college membership on university committees; produces the quarterly CEOL newsletter, and consults with the dean daily. There is also a dean of Regional Campus Administration (RCA), Dr. Steve Lesniak, who manages all off-campus operations. RCA is comprised of nine regional campuses and the Centers for Educators, which is the department that supports the College of Education and Organizational Leadership’s off-campus credential and graduate degree programs. The programs offered through the Centers for Educators are the Single and Multiple Subject teaching credential programs, the special education credential, the Master of Education – Special Emphasis, the Pupil Personnel Services credential/Master of Science - Educational Counseling, and the Preliminary Administrative Services credential/Master of Education - Educational Management.

Dr. Lesniak in partnership with the unit head, associate dean, and the department chairs make decisions about the location and facilities of off-campus programs. However, all academic quality decisions are made by the unit head, associate dean, department chairs, and program chairs. Dean Goor is one of four college deans who report to the provost as seen in the Organizational Chart below.


Unit administrative duties are divided among the unit head, associate dean, and three CEOL department chairs as seen in the unit Org Chart below.


The leadership of the unit is shared with the Leadership Team, comprised of all department and program chairs, which meets monthly. The CEOL faculty meets quarterly for a half day of topic-focused discussions and planning based on input from faculty and chairs. Departments meet monthly to coordinate the activities of the programs. There are many faculty committees that ensure the quality of programs and student services and guarantee a positive, conducive working environment. Faculty members are elected to committees that have the responsibility and authority to develop and apply policies, procedures, and curriculum, and encourage and document continual improvement. The college committees are: Conceptual Framework; Tenure and Promotion (T & P); Curriculum; and Assessment. In addition, many initiatives and changes are made through faculty task forces, for example, the technology committee is a group of volunteers committed to increasing the effective use
of technology in our courses and programs. Curriculum change begins at the program level, is approved by the college curriculum committee and the unit head and then, is approved by the institution senate and assembly. The unit benefits from external feedback from alumni, professionals and the community at the program level. Each program has an advisory group that meets regularly to provide input and review assessment and curricular issues. Department chairs of CAS meet with teacher education faculty on several committees, but especially on the Teacher Education Committee to discuss pertinent issues. Adjunct faculty members are in continual communication with course lead faculty and program chairs. Annually, adjuncts are invited to an all-day learning event with full-time faculty. The director of assessment and accreditation, coordinator of state accreditation, and coordinator of Teacher Performance Assessment collaborate with the unit head on the use of data for continual improvement and required reporting. Personnel decisions involve input from the department tenured faculty, college T & P committee, unit head, and institution personnel committee to the provost who makes the final decisions.

6a.2. What are the unit's recruiting and admissions policies? How does the unit ensure that they are clearly and consistently described in publications and catalogues?

Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions have separate offices. Program chairs of the two undergraduate programs communicate with undergraduate admissions about policies, procedures and accurate information. Undergraduates are admitted to the institution prior to enrolling in either of the two undergraduate programs. If undergraduates are interested in one of the two programs, they meet with an advisor to plan their program. All other programs in the unit work with Graduate Admissions to recruit and admit and communicate policies and procedures. Graduate Admissions has one staff member dedicated to coordinating the efforts of their office with faculty in each of the unit's programs. Each regional campus has staff who distribute advertising, respond to inquiries of prospective candidates, and gather potential clusters for programs to be delivered in that location (or referred to other locations as appropriate.) The Admissions Office hosts monthly information sessions for prospective candidates on the main campus. Unit faculty members provide specific break-out sessions for each program. Program and department chairs continually review publications to update for changes or clarifications. The admissions office gathers applications and forwards them to each department for review by faculty. Admission decisions follow published criteria. Admission policies are communicated on the institution webpage under “admissions” http://laverne.edu/admission/graduate-doctoral/admission-requirements.php
and under the CEOL page http://laverne.edu/academics/education/ .
In addition, admission requirements and procedures are in the university catalog in each program section available in print and on line pages 115-128 at the link below.
The institution is piloting an online application system. Most programs require a 2.75 (3.0 preferred) undergraduate GPA with relevant coursework and experience. All programs require applicants to pass a writing competency exam and required state tests. All programs require professional references. Most programs interview applicants prior to admission. Allowances are made for candidates with potential who may not meet published criteria. These candidates are admitted provisionally with time to show success in courses or workshops to improve writing skills before retaking the exam.
6a.3. How does the unit ensure that its academic calendars, catalogues, publications, grading policies, and advertising are accurate and current?

The academic calendar is established by the faculty senate for three years in advance and published on the institution web page. The registrar oversees the publication of course schedules. The unit head submits course schedules to the registrar at least three months prior to the semester/session. Main campus programs follow a semester schedule (plus January and summer terms). Off-campus programs follow a quarter schedule that aligns with the semester schedule to the greatest extent possible. Annually, the associate vice provost asks all program and department chairs and deans to review the university catalog to update and correct all text. All changes are submitted through the dean’s office. All program publications originate with the program chairs and are approved by department chairs and the unit head and are distributed through the Office of Enrollment Management. Grading policies are published in the university catalog. The undergraduate and graduate appeals committees meet monthly to consider candidate grading concerns. These committees provide feedback to the Faculty Senate and academic deans regarding the need for grading policy clarification. The unit head considers whether patterns or issues are evident and discusses these with program and department chairs.

6a.4. How does the unit ensure that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling?

Each academic program has designated advisors both on the main campus and at all off-campus locations. Candidates can make appointments with these advisors at the department offices and at office campus sites from the time they are considering admission and continuing while in the program. Increasingly, candidates ask questions through email. However, for those who seek face to face interaction, the departments guarantee availability of advisors during peak times (Monday-Thursday 3-5). Two credential analysts are available to answer candidate questions and assist with the submission of credential applications. The full-time director of field experiences and his assistant are available to answer questions regarding practicum and internships. A full-time coordinator of Teacher Performance Assessments is available to answer questions about the process and their success in the process.

The institution has an office of Graduate Services that supports all graduate candidates in finding appropriate answers or services. There is a university Counseling Center that typically offers counseling support services to undergraduates. Candidates who have concerns about their experience in courses are guided to speak with the instructor, then the program chair, then the department chair, and ultimately to the unit head. Advising is considered an essential element of good teaching. Faculty members report their advising activity in annual reviews and in tenure and promotion documents.

6a.5. Which members of the professional community participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation? In what ways do they participate?

Every program has a professional Advisory Committee that provides input from schools and communities.

http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/evidence/program-advisory-committees/

These advisory members are carefully selected alumni and professionals in the field. Advisory Committees participate in program development and improvement. These committees review candidate and program data to determine if candidates are learning the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to be successful in their field. The Teacher Education Committee (TEC) consists of CAS department chairs and CEOL teacher education faculty. This committee discusses
current issues and proposes improvements to teacher education either in academic course preparation or in methods courses. The Director of Field Experiences meets regularly with unit supervisors who provide feedback from schools about the performance of student teachers. The director shares this feedback with the Department of Education and Teacher Development in order to improve the preparation of teachers. In addition, other programs that require field experiences have faculty who are designated as coordinators of field experience. These coordinators are in regular communication with professionals who supervise our candidates, continually collecting feedback to inform our programs. These processes garner participation from P-12 teachers, principals, central office administrators, and agency leaders. Annually, full-time and part-time faculty of the two largest programs, teacher education and school counseling, meet to share updates, provide training, and listen to feedback from the field. The other smaller programs meet with adjuncts more regularly to discuss course concerns or ideas for improvement. The unit participates in annual evaluation of program completers as part of a state-wide program. This large scale evaluation informs the unit of the opinion of supervisors of new teachers and how they rate the preparation of our candidates compared with other universities.

6a.6. How does the unit facilitate collaboration with other academic units involved in the preparation of professional educators?

The unit consists of all CEOL faculty members plus faculty members from CAS. CEOL faculty members are very active in institutional governance in which they work closely with faculty from CAS. As a matter of fact, in the last four years, two of the four presidents of the faculty assembly elected annually have been CEOL faculty members (and many more of the last decade). These collaborations result in easy communication between the two colleges. There are several cross-college committees that address teacher preparation issues. The Noyce grant Advisory Committee considers the preparation of math and science teachers. This committee has both CEOL and CAS faculty members. The Teacher Education Committee consists of CAS department chairs and Teacher Education faculty. This committee meets to discuss ways to improve the preparation of teachers.

6a.7. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit leadership and authority may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

6b. Unit Budget

6b.1. What is the budget available to support programs preparing candidates to meet standards? How does the unit's budget compare to the budgets of other units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other institutions?

As a private, non-profit institution with a small endowment, the institution gets 98% of its operating budget from tuition. The University of La Verne has been very careful about spending throughout its history. However, it is clear that its reputation has long been associated with excellent teacher preparation. Therefore, the institution has been more generous with CEOL than with other colleges. Even in the last few years when there were budget cuts, the institution was careful not to cut education budgets. (see 6b.2) The unit generates $20,000,000 in revenue on and off campus per year. Of that, 60% is used for direct expenses, that is, the unit has an expenditure budget of $12,000,000. Compared with the College of Business and Public Management, the unit spends twice as much per
credit generated on unit faculty and candidates. That is, CBPM has a similar size expenditure budget but generates twice the credit hours. The unit has been able to meet all spending requests and stay within budget for the last three years. This link shows the most recent budget. 
http://sites.laverne.edu/ceol-accreditation/standards-1-6/ceol-exhibits-for-standard-6/ceol-budget-summary/

This budget focuses on main campus activities. Additional revenue and expenditure information is available from the Regional Campus Administration for off campus programs link above. The unit has benefited from several Title V grants that supported undergraduate programs and this last year a new Title V grant that focused on graduate level programs, two of which are new certificates in CEOL. The unit does not have any other external research funding. The only program that has attracted the support of donors and foundations is the Literacy Center that offers free reading tutoring to the community.

6b.2. How adequately does the budget support all programs for the preparation of educators? What changes to the budget over the past few years have affected the quality of the programs offered?

As with many other universities, these have been lean times. Three years ago, budget managers were told to cut up to 5% of their budgets and the next year 5% more was cut. However, last year, the enrollment picture improved and budget managers were clear that we were living well within guidelines. In response, budgets were increased for 2010-11. The institution supports the CEOL’s goal to achieve its first NCATE accreditation. Even during the budget cut years, the institution approved the replacement of retiring faculty and hired several additional faculty to meet the demands of robust programs. This year, the unit added two additional faculty and is recruiting for two more positions. The two education departments use one budget so that there is no inequity between those departments. The EdD program has its own budget. They have been able to spend what was planned and needed for the past three years. The overall picture of the unit is that many new faculty have been hired and offices and furniture are systematically being upgraded.

6b.3. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's budget may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

6c. Personnel

6c.1. What are the institution's and unit's workload policies? What is included in the workloads of faculty (e.g., hours of teaching, advising of candidates, supervising student teachers, work in P-12 schools, independent study, research, administrative duties, and dissertation advisement)?

According to institutional policy, full-time faculty members teach six courses each year as outlined in their “Offer Letter” from the institution. The unit follows this personnel policy. Additional personnel policies are available at the personnel policy link below.
http://faculty.laverne.edu/qm/peppit/PEPPIT4_13_09.pdf

In fall 2010 of 59 full-time faculty members, 25 teach fewer than three courses to enable them to attend to administrative duties or special projects, 22 teach the required three courses, and 12
teach more than three courses. Faculty members may teach more each semester or in January or summer terms for which they are paid additionally at the rate of adjunct faculty members. Faculty are also expected to advise candidates (Education departments policy requires a minimum of ten hours per week of office hours), although increasingly, candidates ask for advisement through email. Many faculty members may elect to supervise student teachers. Supervising five candidates in schools may be considered a course equivalent, or the faculty members may be paid for supervision above their course load. All faculty members are expected to provide service to the college, institution and community. Doctoral faculty members supervise dissertations. If masters or undergraduate faculty members are interested in working with dissertations, they receive training and mentoring through dissertation committees. All faculty who participate on dissertation committees are paid above their salaries. Until a few years ago, the institution emphasized its primary teaching mission. A faculty member could have been promoted to associate and full professor without any refereed publications. Faculty members were expected to participate in professional development through reading in the field and state professional organizations. There were some faculty members actively engaged in research and publication with impressive records of scholarship. However, the institution is now in transition to a teaching-research model and, therefore, increasing its expectations for scholarly activity. The institution faculty personnel committee recently passed a change to the tenure and promotion guidelines to include the expectation that to become tenured and promoted to associate professor, faculty members would have at least two refereed publications. To become promoted to full professor, a minimum of two refereed publications were expected after tenure. The new unit head arrived almost three years ago having experience at a research intensive institution. He and active scholars in the college have created a new vision for more scholarly activity and supported this new direction with writing workshops, encouragement to participate in national conferences, and presentations that highlight the accomplishments of scholars. The recent publication, Thought Leaders, demonstrates a major shift in a positive new direction of scholarly activity by showcasing the scholarly presentations and publications of CEOL faculty in the last year. http://sites.laverne.edu/thought-leaders/files/2009/10/Thought-Leaders-with-cover-total-801.pdf

Some faculty members were hired in non-tenure track positions that included administrative duties at regional campuses. All program and department chairs are full-time tenured or tenure track faculty who receive additional compensation to perform program leadership and administration. Part-time faculty members teach courses and offer support to candidates but are not expected to engage in scholarship.

6c.2. What are the faculty workloads for teaching and the supervision of clinical practice?

Workload policies are the same for undergraduate and graduate teaching. Faculty are expected to teach six courses per year as required in their “Offer Letter” when beginning employment at the institution. Additional personnel policies are found at the link below: http://faculty.laverne.edu/qm/peppit/PEPPIT4_13_09.pdf

The institution and the unit are known for “caring”, one of the four unit guiding principles. This shows up particularly with faculty members’ approaches to teaching and advising. Applicants are attracted to the institution and specifically to the CEOL for the personal attention they receive. Faculty members may request to supervise one or more candidates in schools. Faculty members have the option to request a course equivalent if they prefer rather than additional pay for
supervision. In the last two years, the unit has worked hard to establish relationships with particular P-12 schools with the hope that one or more would become professional development schools. At this time, the unit is in the “capacity building” stage and has not formally developed an MOU with any one school.

6c.3. To what extent do workloads and class size allow faculty to be engaged effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service (including time for such responsibilities as advisement, developing assessments, and online courses)?

The unit faculty are outstanding teachers and caring advisors, as evidenced by high course evaluations and a regional reputation for taking care of students. Most classes are small, allowing faculty members to get to know their candidates. The institution and unit are in transition to encourage more scholarly activity among all faculty members. During this transition time, faculty members frequently discuss how to manage their time so that they can work on scholarship. The shift is coming as faculty members find they like investigating their interests and that there is support for their participation in workshops, conferences, and writing. If faculty members have an interest in redesigning courses for online delivery, the institution offers them a six-module training program with pay for completion, and the unit offers the equivalent pay for one course when the redesigned course is ready for hybrid or online delivery.

6c.4. How does the unit ensure that the use of part-time faculty contributes to the integrity, coherence, and quality of the unit and its programs?

A balance of full-time faculty and part-time faculty offers an ideal blend of theory and practice. Each program seeks professionals/leaders with expertise to hire as adjunct faculty members to offer candidates current stories and best practices from the field. There is a lead faculty member for each course (most often a full-time faculty member, but sometimes a veteran part-time faculty member). New adjuncts shadow an experienced faculty member in the course they will teach for the entire semester prior to teaching the course. The lead faculty member provides a master syllabus and helpful guidance as the adjunct faculty member begins teaching and encounters challenges. Program chairs and lead faculty members offer information about grading policies, the purpose of the course in the context of the program, instructional technology, textbooks, and the best ways to get assistance. If the adjunct teaches a course with a required “key assessment”, he/she receive training in the use of the online assessment system, TaskStream. Programs have meetings with full-time and their adjuncts at least annually to discuss program updates, share challenges, and gather input to improve programs. For one sample semester, spring 2010, the balance between courses taught by full-time/part-time faculty for the unit was 40% full time/60% part time (on-campus courses were 65% full-time/35% part-time compared with off campus which were 25% full-time/75% part-time). Candidates rate courses taught by adjunct faculty at the same level or above those taught by full-time faculty members. Candidates may contact the program chair, department chair or the unit head if there are concerns. Department chairs and the unit head monitor course evaluations and listen to concerns to provide support to part-time faculty members or to decide that the adjunct is not suited for that particular course or for college teaching. The part-time handbook is at:

http://faculty.laverne.edu/qmn/ftfh/ptfr.html

The institution collected data from part-time faculty regarding the “climate” of their work. The following link presents all the responses from all colleges. Specifically, page 29 of the
6c.5. What personnel provide support for the unit? How does the unit ensure that it has an adequate number of support personnel?

Each department has administrative support to answer phones, complete paperwork, schedule appointments and get answers to questions as they arise. There are three full-time staff for the Education Department’s front office, one more for the Office of Field Experiences, four more for the Department of Organizational Leadership, and one for the Dean’s Office. The Centers for Educators (off-campus programs) is led by an experienced director with over 25 years of experience. She is supported by two assistant directors/academic advisors, three full-time professional academic advisors, and one full-time credential analyst. All are supported by 4 ½ administrative assistants. The offices for the Centers for Educators are located on the central campus however the academic advisors, the director and assistant directors make frequent and regularly scheduled visits to all the off-campus sites. All candidates are assigned an academic advisor who assists them through the admission process and once admitted, provides regular progress updates to the candidate’s credential and degree completion plan.

In addition to the central office staff, there are five permanent, part-time “Regional Administrators” who represent the Centers for Educators programs in their local region. They help coordinate the recruitment efforts in their regions and they schedule and monitor classroom facilities. The Center for Teaching and Learning provides workshops to support faculty in the use of new technologies. CTL provides basic through advanced training as well as individual support for learning new technologies or producing specific products such as Jings or PowerPoints. Candidates receive technology support in the effective use of online resources such as Blackboard. There are nine computer labs on the main campus and a fully equipped lab at each off campus site. The Education Departments have student workers to assist with many tasks. Faculty members who have requests complete a form for student-worker support. The office monitors the need for support. The office of Field Experiences and the Credential Analysts offer a great deal of support to faculty and candidates about field and credential requirements. The librarians are available and welcoming to faculty requests for support or candidate needs. Enrollment management and admissions offices provide support in the recruitment and admission of candidates. Undergraduate programs have full-time advisors for candidates. The associate dean oversees the tenure and promotion process, annual reviews, and hiring of staff.

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

The CEOL budget has professional development funding to support each full-time faculty member at the rate of $1,000 per year. There are some faculty members who have not requested this support while others have requested support for several conference trips. It is the practice of the unit head to encourage all faculty members to participate in state and national conferences. However, he recognizes that the college should support people at their levels of activity. If faculty members are highly productive, they should be supported in contributing to their professional specialization areas and organizations thereby enhancing the reputation of the
institution. Title V grants have also supported faculty in their travel to professional development conferences and workshops. The library routinely orders books and media requested by the unit faculty. Faculty may apply for sabbaticals every six years. Sabbaticals are competitive at the institutional level. However, CEOL faculty members who have applied have been successful. In the last two years, three faculty members have taken sabbaticals. Faculty may take courses at the institution at no cost. Six CEOL faculty members completed their EdD degrees through the college EdD program in Organizational Leadership. The Center for Teaching and Learning has provided generous support to the college to prepare faculty members to integrate more technology into their courses and to offer courses through a hybrid or online format. The unit has offered many workshops to promote scholarly activity such as writing successful conference proposals and writing for publication. Every Monday at noon, the institution offers a series of faculty speakers presenting on their research topics.

6c.7. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to personnel may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

6d. Unit facilities

6d.1. How adequate are unit--classrooms, faculty offices, library/media center, the technology infrastructure, and school facilities--to support teaching and learning? [Describe facilities on the main campus as well as the facilities at off-campus sites if they exist.]

All classrooms on campus are “smart” rooms with a technology podium for faculty and a projector in the ceiling. In addition, the entire campus offers wireless web access. Three classrooms have been equipped with smart boards. Classrooms in off-campus facilities are modern and have up-to-date technology. Faculty members are learning to integrate the new technology functions into instruction. All faculty members have private offices (on campus in Barkley, Barkley Annex, Leo Hall and the Organizational Leadership building) with their choice of a desktop or laptop computer. There is a rotation for upgrading computers every five years which is not sufficient for the needs of high-end users. In the case of faculty who increasingly participate in hybrid and online course delivery, we ask the institution to upgrade their computers in time for the development or the implementation of new course initiatives. We have purchased a set of “netbooks” for classroom use to encourage faculty to integrate technology into courses. The support desk is quite responsive to requests for help. There is a master plan to replace old classroom furniture, some of which is in bad shape. By spring, all on campus classrooms used by CEOL should have new furniture. The institution is also upgrading faculty office furniture, first by specific request due to inadequate chairs, desks and unsafe bookcases (new earthquake standards require built-in bookcases) and then systematically for all CEOL faculty members. In the last two years, the institution has built a new dean’s office suite and remodeled a poorly designed space to add new offices for faculty. The new construction added much needed conference space. Over the next two years, more construction for the college will add newer offices for the Department of Organizational Leadership and the Liberal Studies programs. There are faculty workrooms in the Barkley building and the Organizational Leadership building as well as a Curriculum Lab in the Barkley Annex. There is a separate building for the Literacy Program that offers free tutoring to children and youth in the community. The Center for Teaching and Learning has a new remodeled space that provides training with up to date
technology. The library is a great resource to faculty and candidates (see 63.4). There are sufficient computers and outstanding librarians who go out of their way to support classes and faculty and student research. There is interlibrary loan guaranteeing access to sufficient books and journals through “Link+”. There are electronic journals and archives available to faculty and candidates. The library resources can be reviewed online with “LeoDelivers”. Off campus resources are effective when courses are offered in centers supported by the institution. There are faculty and staff offices and classrooms in a suite built for the institution. In some cases, courses are offered in P-12 school buildings. Faculty members who teach in these rooms do not rate these settings as adequate because they struggle with technology and access passed firewalls. When this is the case, the CEOL program chairs work with the Regional Campus Authority to find the better settings. During spring 2010, Teacher Education faculty expressed dissatisfaction with the location in one public school due to frustrations with technology and access afterhours. In response, the unit head and dean of RCA visited alternative locations to find a more suitable location for the next cohort of candidates.

6d.2. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit facilities may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

6e. Unit resources including technology

6e.1. How does the unit allocate resources across programs to ensure candidates meet standards in their field of study?

Department chairs meet monthly with the unit head and associate dean to discuss current and future issues that affect budget and allocations. Based on these discussions, topics are brought forward for the Leadership Team to consider how to support programs, faculty and candidates. The Leadership Team proposes policies and compensation guidelines. Each year, program chairs submit a rationale to department chairs regarding the need for new faculty or resources based on candidate numbers, program activities, and strategic planning. Department chairs review the data and meet together to discuss priorities for funding requests to optimize candidate performance toward master of program standards. The unit head and associate dean develop a three-year budget request to the provost to promote the quality of programs for all candidates. The unit budget is adequate to hire sufficient full and part-time faculty members as well as staff to teach courses and advise candidates. The institution has increased its allocation of resources to advertise more broadly than before to recruit nationally and attract the highest caliber of new faculty. Search committees increasingly look for applicants who have experience with using data to make program improvements. The Director of Assessment and Accreditation meets with each program chair to analyze candidate data. The unit head and chairs review course evaluations to determine program strengths and weaknesses. In response, the unit has allocated resources for faculty training and support. The unit head has successfully made appeals for more space and more, updated technology.

6e.2. What information technology resources support faculty and candidates? What evidence shows that candidates and faculty use these resources?

Every classroom is a smart room with a professor podium and ceiling mounted projector. The campus is wireless, providing web access in most buildings and most outside areas. The Centers for Educators utilize the classrooms of many of RCA’s regional campuses. All of the classrooms at
the regional campuses are smart classrooms. The staff at each regional campus provides secondary support to the faculty and candidates in the CEOL graduate credential and degree programs attending at their campus. In addition to the regional campuses, classes are held also at K–12 schools. Many of these school sites have been used for over 10 years. Classrooms at these school sites also have smart technology either provided by the school site or by the university.

The institution supports the online system, Blackboard. Every course is automatically given a Blackboard site and populated with candidates. The unit requires that all courses provide the course syllabus and as many course materials as possible on the Blackboard site. The decrease in the requests for paper copies of course materials is evidence of the greater reliance on course management technology. All faculty members have their choice of desktop or laptop computer and access to printers, copiers, scanners, and netbooks. Computers for candidates are available in many buildings including the library. The unit supported the annual fee for the online assessment system, TaskStream for two years until a course fee structure could be developed. The amount of candidate data on TaskStream is evidence of the use of technology by both candidates and faculty. The Center for Teaching and Learning offers technology workshops and course support for both candidates and faculty. Over the last two years, dozens of faculty have participated in the training to deliver courses through hybrid or online modes. The unit supports webinars and conference calls for faculty and candidates in the hybrid-format Ed.D. program. The library’s online system provides valuable resources to faculty and candidates. See below 6e.4

6e.3. What resources are available for the development and implementation of the unit’s assessment system?

In the last two years, the unit added a full-time Director of Assessment and Accreditation and a full-time Coordinator of Teacher Performance Assessment. A third faculty member has release time to support the unit in the development of accreditation documents. These three have a “can do” attitude and offer training and support for faculty and chairs as they have developed and implemented program and unit assessment. Their helpful attitudes and assessment/technology expertise have been key to the transformation of the faculty’s ownership of the assessment system. The Director of Assessment and Accreditation and the faculty accreditation coordinator have developed important and helpful relationships with the personnel in the institution’s office of Institutional Research and the staff member who oversees the institution’s data system, Banner. The unit paid for two years of TaskStream services until a course fee process could be put in place in fall 2010. Using a trainer-of-trainers model, faculty members with skill in technology and the use of the TaskStream assessment system were compensated for offering training to other faculty on and off campus to facilitate the use of the online assessment system.

6e.4. What library and curricular resources exist at the institution? How does the unit ensure they are sufficient and current?

The CEOL is served by the Elvin and Betty Wilson Library located on the institution’s main campus. The library houses a collection of 178,000 print and 40,000 electronic books. In the fields of psychology, sociology, leadership and organization studies, and in other relevant fields, thousands of books, available to CEOL faculty, staff and candidates. If Wilson Library does not own an item needed by a faculty member or candidate, he/she can order the item from the library’s homepage to be delivered by LINK+, a consortium of 40+ libraries in California
and Nevada that has five days a week courier service to get the book to La Verne in 48-72 hours. CEOL candidates and faculty have access to over 9 million additional books via LINK+. If an item is not available from LINK+, particularly articles that appear in journals unavailable through Wilson Library, faculty and candidates can order books and articles through LeoDelivers, the library’s web-based interlibrary loan system. Articles are scanned and sent from lending libraries to Wilson Library, then delivered via email to the requestor; books are mailed to the library and made available for pickup on campus or mailed to the requestor off campus. LeoDelivers provides access for ULV candidates and faculty to resources available at thousands of libraries across the United States and around the world. Wilson Library subscribes to 25,680 journal titles: 250 are print journals and all other titles are electronic journals accessible 24 hours daily exclusively to ULV candidates, faculty and staff wherever they are located via the library’s proxy server. Of those journal titles, over 7,000 are of primary interest to education and organizational leadership, and over 10,000 journal titles are available in related disciplines. The library subscribes to 64 databases, of which 49 are directly relevant to the degree and credential programs within the purview of the CEOL. In summer 2010, two collections of streaming video were added that can be viewed 24 hours daily from the library’s webpage or embedded by faculty directly into the Blackboard and/or WebCT course management system modules for their specific courses. Annually, the library orders journals, books and media for faculty to ensure comprehensive research resources and to purchase specific items upon request. In FY 2009-2010, the library ordered for the unit Print Journals: $4,099, Online Databases/Journals: $61,575, Print Books: $8,300, and Videos/DVD: $195.00. There is a Curriculum Lab available on the main campus and at several regional locations convenient to candidates. This lab provides materials for faculty and candidates to develop instructional tools and activities.

6e.5. How does the unit ensure the accessibility of resources to candidates, including candidates in off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, through electronic means?

Librarians go to off-campus sites to deliver instruction and explain how to access books, journals, and resources. The library mails resources to candidates. There is a toll-free number to call to get information from the library everyday during posted hours. Outside of these hours, candidates may contact “Ask a Librarian” which is a 24-7 live chat service online. Candidates can Skype directly with unit liaison librarians. In these sessions, librarians can view candidates’ screens, and candidates can view the librarian’s screens. ASK Us is a knowledge base on the library’s homepage that responds with answers to similar questions (key word search). Candidates can also text message questions to the ASK US page phone number. The near future goal is to have mobile access to the libraries online resources through faculty and candidates smartphones. Librarians do webinars with doctoral candidates to demonstrate using electronic and other resources for research.

6e.6. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit resources, including technology, may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 6?
We have made an extraordinary transition from limited use of instructional technology and resistance to online teaching two years ago to technology in every course as appropriate and every program working to redesign one or more courses for hybrid and online delivery. Faculty leadership has emerged to create regular support groups for faculty to explore and pilot technology options. Two faculty members created a new certificate program to prepare faculty to use high end technology in instruction.

2. What research related to Standard 6 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

The unit has engaged in administering an annual survey of faculty scholarship activity and need for support since the 2008-2009 academic year. The purpose is to track the impact of professional development with a focus on academic achievement.