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I. INTRODUCTION

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

San José State University began as Minn's Evening Normal School in San Francisco, in 1857. The campus was relocated to San Jose in 1870, and opened a branch in southern California in 1881, a center that was to become the University of California at Los Angeles. The university is conveniently located on 154 acres in downtown San José, midway between San Francisco and the Monterey/Carmel area at the sunny southern end of San Francisco Bay, and is easily accessible from area freeways. San José State University, the metropolitan university for Silicon Valley, is a member of the 23-campus California State University, the largest public education system in the nation. Located in downtown San José, the third largest city in California (pop. 929,936), San José State University is California's oldest public institution of higher education. The university now offers more than 134 bachelors and masters degrees with 110 concentrations.

SJSU's fall 2010 enrollment showed 29,076 students of which 79 percent were undergraduates. The university's fall 2010 ethnic composition showed 15,916 or 55 percent minority, 7,916 or 27 percent White, 2,327 or 8 percent Foreign Nationals, and 2,917 or 10 percent Others. Females represent 53.2 percent of the university student enrollment and males represent 46.8 percent of the student enrollment.

The mission of the university is to enrich the lives of its students, to transmit knowledge to its students along with the necessary skills for applying it in the service of our society, and to expand the base of knowledge through research and scholarship.

The university consists of seven colleges; Applied Sciences & Arts, Business, Education, Engineering, Humanities & the Arts, Science, and Social Sciences. The Connie L. Lurie College of Education is the unit for preparing professional educators. The college has the unique distinction of preparing the
majority of the teachers, administrators, and counselors who have served throughout Silicon Valley and the South Bay area for more than 150 years. The Lurie College collaborates with the Colleges of Applied Sciences and Arts, Humanities and Arts, Science and Social Sciences to prepare teachers for Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Educational Specialist Credentials. Undergraduates from San José State seeking a teaching credential acquire subject matter expertise in the subject matter waiver programs offered in some of these colleges as well as in the Department of Child and Adolescent Development. In addition, the other colleges support single subject programs by offering subject specific pedagogy courses and supervision of student teachers in their final clinical experience.

The unit provides general oversight for the School Librarian credential in partnership with the School of Library and Information Science, which is housed within the College of Applied Sciences and Arts. The unit has a long history of close collaborative partnerships with the region's schools and social service providers. The majority of students gain their experiences in Silicon Valley schools and clinics, however programs also reach students as far north as the Oregon border and as far south as the Monterey Peninsula.

1.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

California is a joint partnership state. The protocol agreement between California and NCATE requires a joint team. Four national team members, three state members, and three CTC representatives conducted the review. The visit was a joint visit where members worked together, sharing equal roles and responsibilities in all functions of the review. The NCATE team, with input from the CTC team, made a single recommendation for each NCATE standard resulting in one BOE report.

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

There are no programs offered at a branch campus, off-campus, or via distance learning.

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

This was a pilot visit for the Continuous Improvement accreditation model. There were no unusual circumstances during the visit.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

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

II.1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.
The conceptual framework has been reviewed and revised since the last visit in 2005. Two very similar frameworks were developed to capture the fundamental nature of the initial and advanced programs. For initial teacher preparation programs, the theme is "Educators as Facilitators of Learning" with three key elements, 1) Knowledge, Skills and Application, 2) Reflective Practice, and 3) Professional and Ethical Behavior. The theme for the advanced programs is "Professional Educators as Leaders and Enhancers of Human Development" with four key elements, 1) Knowledge, Skills and Application, 2) Human Relations, 3) Inquiry, and 4) Professional and Ethical Behavior. Diversity and technology competencies are interwoven through the conceptual frameworks for both initial and advanced candidates. In 2008, the faculty adopted diversity competencies for both levels. Technology competencies have been expanded and better integrated into the programs of study. Course syllabi include a section on the conceptual framework. The current conceptual framework has been updated to show current alignment to standards and the integration of technology to support the assessment system. Most significant among the changes are the development of a college-wide comprehensive assessment system, investment in new technologies to support the collection and analysis of program and PACT data, aligned identified transition point assessments with the elements of standards, continuous and aligned the assessments with the key elements in the unit's professional preparation program as illustrated graphically in the 2003 conceptual framework.

The main tenets of the Connie L. Lurie College of Education's (COE) conceptual framework are expressed in statements about values, vision and mission. The Connie L. Lurie College of Education faculty agrees to a set of shared values that undergird the vision and mission of the College and provide the framework for their philosophy, purpose and goals, knowledge bases, and expectations for candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions. The unit assessment system is designed to inform the extent to which unit values are operationalized to help the COE realize its mission and meet its goals. The faculty of the Lurie College of Education value the following:

- Access to quality education for every student
- Evidence based practice
- Ethical and reflective practice
- Scholarship – research and dissemination of information to inform theory and practice
- Inclusive, engaged, diverse collegial communities
- Equity and excellence in education
- Life-long learning

These values are reflected in the Lurie College of Education vision and mission statement printed on its website and in other documents. Documents show that the unit commitment to the principles and core values expressed in these statements continues to evolve. Data show that COE continues to refine its vision and mission through continuous dialogue within and among the programs and departments. Reflected in the conceptual framework is COE comment toward embracing a culture of inquiry, emphasizing evidence based practices in its operations, and continuous improvement of all programs.

Since the last accreditation visit, some of the changes COE has made are:

- significant investment developing a comprehensive assessment system that regularly collects and analyzes data.
- regular review of the analyzed data to help evaluate the effectiveness in preparing school professionals.
- significant investment in the use of new technologies to support instruction.
- redesigned classrooms that contain many of the new instructional tools found in local P-12 schools.
increasing new instructional technology that includes SMART boards, clicker systems, and the university's Learning Management System.

**Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions**

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

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

To ensure initial teacher preparation candidates possess an acceptable knowledge of content in the subjects they are to teach, the unit requires all candidates to have at least a 2.87 grade point average and pass the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST). Additionally, candidates must pass the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET) pertinent to their credential requirements. Single subject candidates may substitute a major or approved course of study for the CSET.

According to the 2008-2009 Title II report, the unit achieved a 99 percent passing rate for program completers on state licensure exams that measure content knowledge. Over the previous three years, programs with less than 10 completers had passing rates of 100 percent. The 2009-2010 Title II report was not available at the time of the onsite visit.

The state team, who participated in the joint onsite visit, validated that all programs listed in the unit's Institutional Report are approved.

A review of key assessments, rubrics, assessment results and candidate work samples confirm candidates possess acceptable to in-depth knowledge of the content they plan to teach. For example, aggregate data of summative field experience ratings show multiple subjects, single subject, and special education candidates demonstrate adequate to effective subject matter competence. Candidates' portfolios confirm this grasp of content knowledge through lesson plan design, analysis of assessment data, and reflections.

When analysis of assessment data reveal limitations, faculty work to mitigate or remedy the situation. For example, the Special Education Department's Biennial Data Report (BDR) to the California Commission on the Credentialing of Teachers identified curriculum and instruction as an area for improvement for candidates in the Moderate to Severe Disabilities Credential Program. In response, the department reviewed the program and implemented changes that included aligning assessments to updated standards, upgrading coursework, and working with the Educational Leadership Department to prepare principals who are able to support current special education practices.

Exit surveys of program completers and employers corroborate assessment results as well as the unit's responsiveness to addressing concerns. For example, while multiple subject employers noted strength in the preparation of candidates to teach reading and mathematics, surveys of both employers and alumni of the multiple subject programs revealed a lack of adequate preparation in teaching art and physical education. Consequently, faculty began to develop experiences for candidates to gain knowledge of these subjects outside of class and through integrated lessons in core subject methods classes. In 2009, the unit secured funding from an alumna to sponsor an annual conference that provides candidates...
exposure to arts education.

Interviews with candidates, alumni, cooperating teachers, site supervisors, employers, and faculty validate content knowledge for teacher candidates are at an acceptable level. For example, candidates state a high level of confidence in their preparation to deliver the content. They are effusive as they praise the faculty for their wealth of knowledge and ability to model content specific instructional strategies.

Candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate their pedagogical content knowledge and skills through a variety of key assessments including portfolios, performances, and exams. Prior to acceptance into credential programs, candidates must pass a technology test that assesses their understanding and ability to use technology or successfully complete an educational technology class. Candidates demonstrate their ability to integrate technology into instructional and assessment practices during field experiences and through assignments in various methods courses.

Candidate work samples validate these results as portfolios containing lesson plans, analysis of assessments, reflections, and feedback forms demonstrate candidates' pedagogical content knowledge and skills. For example, multiple subject candidate portfolios include an analysis of students' reading profiles and appropriate instructional plans designed to meet each student's specific needs. Candidate lesson plans also include sections that require articulation of instructional strategies that account for diverse learning needs.

For the use of technology, candidates are exposed to various emerging instructional technologies in their classes. The unit received a generous donation from SMART Technologies that placed SMART Boards, SMART Tables, and student response systems in each department. Beyond producing electronic slideshows, candidates are instructed on how to evaluate online research, use spreadsheets to analyze data, and develop blogs to demonstrate learning.

Interviews with candidates, alumni, cooperating teachers, site supervisors, employers, and faculty validate these findings. For example, candidates in the Special Education Program praise their exposure to emerging technologies. Multiple subject faculty provides instances of how they task candidates to learn how social networks enhance reading and writing instruction.

Candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills through a variety of key assessments including portfolios, performances, and exams. On these assessments and through coursework, candidates are expected to consider students' contexts, analyze and incorporate research, and be reflective practitioners.

Candidate work samples validate these results as portfolios containing lesson plans, analysis of assessments, reflections, and feedback forms demonstrate candidates' ability to apply professional and pedagogical knowledge; consider school, family, and community contexts; consider prior experiences of students; reflect on their practice; and know major schools of thought and analyze research.

Exit surveys of program completers and employers confirm that candidates possess acceptable professional and pedagogical knowledge. Furthermore, the unit's program improvements based on survey results demonstrates its responsiveness to addressing concerns. For example, 99 percent of multiple subject program completers indicated feeling adequately or well prepared to evaluate and reflect on their teaching and seek out assistance that leads to professional growth. However, 39 percent felt less than adequately prepared to meet the instructional needs of all students. As a result, the program increased the number of opportunities to provide formative feedback to and monitor progress of candidates as they learn to work with students with diverse needs. The survey of secondary education
supervisors reports that they view alumni as adequately prepared to communicate with parents and consider students' interests or motivations. However, they perceive alumni as less than adequate in managing student behavior. Hence, the Single Subject Program now offers a course on classroom management that prompts candidates to put theory into practice, analyze research and reflect throughout the process. Meanwhile, special education alumni rate their program as strong in preparing them to manage learning environments, design learning environments for families, and put into practice theoretical and philosophical foundations.

Candidates in programs that train other school professionals demonstrate professional knowledge and skills through clinical practice, field experiences, research papers, exams and portfolios. On these assessments and through coursework, candidates are expected to demonstrate knowledge of their fields as they relate to professional standards; knowledge of their students, families and community; skills related to using research to improve one's practice; and skills related to using technology to improve one's practice. The only candidates required to take a state licensure test are those pursuing a credential in Speech Pathology. These candidates take the Praxis Examination in Speech-Language Pathology and their program completer passing rate is just under 90 percent.

The Speech Pathology Program is fully accredited by the Council of Academic Accreditation (CAA) of the American Speech-Language and Hearing Association (ASHA). Candidates must demonstrate proficiency by developing a comprehensive case-study that incorporates theory, assessment methods, diagnosis methods, and evidence-based treatment strategies. A review of assessment data show that candidates attained a median score of exceeds standards on their culminating assessment. These expectations and assignments have been verified through review of candidate work samples, survey results and interviews.

All credential and masters programs within the School of Social Work in the College of Applied Sciences and Arts achieved Council on Social Work Education renewal accreditation in 2008. Candidates are expected to demonstrate proficiency by conducting research, analyzing their practice, engaging in field experiences assembling a portfolio, and passing a comprehensive exit exam. A review of assessment data show that all candidates pass key assessments with a median score of 4 on a 5 point rubric. These expectations and assignments have been verified through review of candidate work samples, survey results and interviews.

The Educational Leadership Program experiences completer rates of 91 percent with a median score of 4 on a 4 point rubric on nearly all key assessments, except for the literature review for which the median score is a 3. Candidates are expected to research best practices and apply these strategies to whole school initiatives. Candidates must advocate on behalf of students as they strive to attain social justice and equality within their schools. Technology is used to analyze data, conduct research, and present findings.

Candidates pursuing a Reading Certificate or Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential demonstrate proficiency through practicum experiences and research projects. For each, candidates are expected to focus on students with diverse learning needs including those learning the English language. As they work with students, they continually assess and diagnose reading challenges, design appropriate lessons, employ instructional strategies, and reflect upon the results.

The Teacher Librarian Services Credential Program has a 100 percent passing rate with 73 percent of completers demonstrating achievement of all professional standards. Candidates are expected to design units of online instruction, develop vision projects, develop virtual learning projects, and engage in field experiences. They are expected to apply current educational theory regarding information literacy, utilize technology, and demonstrate knowledge and skills related to supporting student learning through school library services.
Candidates in programs that train other school professionals demonstrate a focus on student learning through clinical practice, field experiences, research papers, exams and portfolios. On these assessments and through coursework; candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to create positive learning environments; build on students' developmental levels; understand student, family and community diversity; and understand the policy context in which they work. A theme that weaves throughout each program relates to demonstrating these skills through supporting diverse learners. Consequently, assessments focus on competencies related to this theme.

Speech pathology candidates demonstrate these competencies through a comprehensive case study. Candidate means scores exceed the standard for assessing and treating specific disorders. These expectations and assignments have been verified through review of candidate work samples, survey results and interviews.

Counselor education candidates demonstrate student learning competencies through a culminating portfolio and field experiences. One hundred percent of candidates pass both assessments with a median score of 4 on a 4-point rubric on standards related to creating positive learning environments and understanding student, family, and community diversity. These expectations and assignments have been verified through review of candidate work samples, survey results and interviews.

Educational leadership candidates demonstrate student learning competencies through field experiences, research projects, and a comprehensive portfolio which documents how they used an inquiry process to improve learning for all students. On a 4 point scale, the median score on standards related to student learning is 4.

Candidates pursuing Teacher Librarian Services Credentials must demonstrate proficiency in student learning through field experiences and creating relevant learning experiences including units of online instruction and virtual learning projects. While 100 percent of candidates pass these assessments, 74 percent demonstrate achievement of the standard related to diversity and 79 percent demonstrate achievement of the standard related to access. To address these areas, the program adapted rubrics to focus on student outcomes and made curricular changes.

Dispositions for most candidates preparing for initial teacher credentials are measured through field experiences and reported through the PACT results. Attainment of these dispositions is further validated through comparison with exit and employer surveys. These dispositions include advocating for social justice and equality, being a reflective practitioner, and engaging in activities that demonstrate a love of learning. Candidates pursuing a Special Education Credential are assessed explicitly on their demonstration of the unit's dispositions.

Dispositions for candidates preparing for other school professional credentials are embedded in key assessments such as clinical/field experiences and portfolios. As stated previously, the unit's dispositions include advocating for social justice and equality, being a reflective practitioner, and engaging in activities that demonstrate a love of learning.

Assessment data shows candidates demonstrate an acceptable level of professional dispositions. For example, educational leadership candidates demonstrate professional dispositions through field work, research project, and culminating portfolio. For all standards related to professional dispositions, candidates achieve a median score of 4 on a 4 point scale. One hundred percent of counseling candidates, through their field experiences, demonstrate dispositions by applying evidence-based research to overcoming school challenges including barriers to optimizing student learning.
1.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?
Since the last visit, the unit has demonstrated continuous improvements in both initial and advanced programs. These improvements have been based on data collected from unit faculty evaluation of programs and courses, candidate exit interviews, and employer surveys. For example, unit faculty and field personnel recognized candidates emerge secure in their understanding of the dimensions of individual differences and in the particular educational needs of different segments of student populations (English learners and learners with special needs), but they continued have some difficulty translating that knowledge into practice. Therefore, unit faculty and field personnel began to analyze the Teacher Performance and PACT data to focus more deliberately on ways to adjust content and experiences throughout the preparation programs, and provide additional support for students, and to anticipate challenges sooner, through articulated "transition point" measures of student progress. Also, onsite documents and interviews with faculty revealed that components of the revised and recently approved curriculum for Education Specialist Instruction Level I credential in each specialization, candidates are required to take additional courses in subject matter teaching to ensure they can support student learning of the academic content standards in English/language arts/literacy and mathematics.

Given the evidence presented and verified by the onsite visit, the unit is performing at the acceptable level for Standard 1 and progressing towards target. Assessment data, survey results, candidate work samples, and interviews validate that program completers across the unit possess the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to foster student learning and ensure access to all. When data show limitations in candidate preparation, programs work to adjust curriculum, instruction and assessments. For example, when the Special Education Department detected limitations in preparing candidates in the Moderate to Severe Disabilities Credential Program, they did not limit their actions to changes within the program. Instead, the department engaged the entire unit, providing seminars addressing Response to Intervention (RTI). They worked with the Educational Leadership Department to prepare their candidates to foster inclusive educational settings. Additionally, a review of candidate work samples demonstrates how the unit is moving towards target in certain areas. Although not yet institutionalized, there are instances where assessment data are being consistently monitored and used to inform instruction.

1.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?
Not appropriate to this standard.

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

1.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

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

1.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

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

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

1.6 Recommendation for Standard 1

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

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

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

The Connie L. Lurie College of Education continues to use the Unit Assessment System (UAS) to collect, analyze, evaluate, and use data for unit and program continuous improvements. The assessment system provides key assessments at various transition points that are aligned with the conceptual frameworks at the initial and advanced level. The UAS is composed of three major components: program assessments, infrastructure to support the system, and policies that guide its implementation and continual operation.

In spring 2008, the unit adopted Waypoint Outcomes as the tool for its Assessment System. Waypoint Outcomes is a web-based criteria-based assessment tool for educators to develop assessments (rubrics and surveys), publish those assessments into multiple faculty accounts, and then aggregate the resulting data to show learner outcomes for continuous program and unit improvements. Waypoint Outcomes can be integrated in the institution's current e-learning platform (Desire-to-Learn). Interviews with the Assessment Committee assured that Waypoint Outcomes is accessible to all unit faculty. The committee also indicated that a representative from each department and program serves as a lead Waypoint Outcomes facilitator whose role is to provide assistance to departmental faculty with the use of Waypoint Outcomes.

The UAS is designed to allow flexibility in the development of specific forms of assessments to accommodate the specific assessment needs of each program. Each program develops its forms of assessment that can evaluate professional competencies that are sensitive to the environmental factors for a specific program. Program assessment transition points are unique to each program and are integral to the Biennial Data Report. For example, the Secondary Education/Single Subject program focuses on three key assessment transition points that are used to make decisions about candidate competence prior to being recommended for a credential. These transition points are (1) Phase I Student Teaching Evaluation, (2) Phase II Student Teaching Evaluation, and (3) Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT).
Key transition point assessments in the Special Education Program (with four separate programs) include (1) Signature assignment from EDSE 279, (2) Managing Behavior and Emotional Problems Dispositions Evaluation, and (3) Directed Teaching course evaluations. Candidate performance on key assessment is correlated with California Commission on Teacher Credentialing standards, California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSIPs), and the Department of Special Education Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Other unit programs have similar diverse key transition assessment points. Although each program may define its key transition points and assessments used, every program is required to collect data at all transition points. The results of the analysis of data collected from program assessment transition points establishes the data set for the Biennial Data Report that the unit submits to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) for each program.

TABLE S2.1: Summary of Transition Point Assessments, found in the IR Addendum accurately describes the unit programs, levels, and various transition points. Review of the UAS operations and interviews with the dean, assessment coordinator, and the assessment committee provided validation of items found in TABLE S2.1.

The offsite team expressed concerns about the reading specialist program and other school programs not having complete assessment data for all key assessment transition points. Additionally, the offsite team was concerned about procedures for sharing program findings for unit-wide continuous improvements. The IR Addendum stated that the "Reading Specialist program is in the process of developing In-program and Transition and Program Completion assessments ... and the unit plans to have gathered program completion data by the end of the spring 2011 semester." The onsite team found that the reading specialist and other school programs did have assessment data for the defined transition points, but all data had not been reported correctly in documents presented.

Interview with the Reading Specialist Coordinator confirmed that the Reading Specialist program is in the process of refining current assessment transition points. Additionally, the department is developing In-program and Transition and Program Completion assessments. For example, the program is developing a mechanism for assessing candidates at the end of the EDTE: Ongoing Assessment Classroom Course. In this course candidates must analyze and interpret various ongoing reading assessment data on a given student (e.g., running records, miscue analyses, checklists, reading interviews); determine appropriate instructional needs; and plan for instruction. Candidates demonstrate they have mastered key ongoing reading assessment tools, including analyzing assessment data and planning for appropriate and specialized reading instruction; which will serve as a prerequisite for enrollment in the reading practica, EDTE 216A and EDTE 216B.

The program is also developing mechanisms for use in the EDTE 217A and EDTE 217B practica that can be used to determine whether candidates for the Reading Certificate or Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential demonstrate a level of competence in teaching reading that is commensurate with being a reading specialist. Conversations with Literacy Across the Curriculum for and Equitable Society (LACES) instructors confirmed they meet to discuss the progress of students, identify students who are struggling/not meeting expectations, and determine next steps for these students. Plans are underway to gathered program completion data by the end of the spring 2011 semester.

Interviews with unit faculty and review of the IR addendum show that programs at the initial and advanced level are being assessed and faculty are analyzing data and using the results for individual program changes, but evidence was not available to show how results from program assessment were used for overall unit continuous improvements. Several documents did reveal that the unit has plans in place to update the UAS over the next year to ensure unit wide program assessment results will be shared across the unit for continuous improvements.
The UAS has procedures embedded for ensuring that key assessments of candidate performance and evaluations of unit operations are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias. Procedures presented in the IR and supported in the exhibits include:

1. Actively involves all stakeholders in the evaluation process and continues to improve the evaluation process.
2. College-wide process and meetings can be helpful to share data collected and discuss the issues encountered.
3. Inter-rater reliability is established for all signature assignments through discussions among faculty.
4. Unit's approved response to PACT Standard 19: Assessment Administered for Validity,
5. Accuracy and Fairness.

The unit has policies in place and available for candidates related to the process of filing complaints related to unit programs and faculty/staff. Located in the electronic exhibits is a sample of the Student Complaint Policy and Department of Educational Studies Student Concern Form.

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

Since the last NCATE visit, the following represents significant program and unit changes as a result of data collection from the unit assessment system and analysis at all transition points that show how the unit has been engaged in continuous improvements (Initial and Advanced Programs):

1. Developed a new comprehensive assessment system where each program identified transition points that characterize the candidates' developing competency in the skills and knowledge required for their credential or degree program. The competencies are aligned with professional standards.

2. Used candidate portfolios to assess candidates' emerging competencies. Candidates in the Special Education Department develop a portfolio in the final directed teaching course of each level of the program and at the end of the first semester for Interns that is evaluated by the university supervisor.

3. Engaged in faculty professional development activities that addressed the design of assessments and the creation of rubrics for the key transition points in their programs.

4. Decided in fall 2009 that key assessments for teacher candidates is the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT).

5. Established procedures and policies for each department to ensure fair and consistent administration of other transition point assessments.

6. Adopted technological tools that allowed faculty to share program-level assessments in ways that had not occurred previously.

7. Initiated effort to identify and pilot test web-based tools that facilitate the building of rubrics and collection of data for each transition point assessment. In fall 2008, the unit adopted Waypoint for assessment purposes.

8. Unit program assessment data are encapsulated in the unit's Biennial Data Reports and are submitted to the California Commission on Teachers Credentialing (CCTC).

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

Not appropriate to this standard

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

2.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

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

2.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The UAS procedures for sharing evaluation data for candidate performance and program improvement for unit continuous improvements are not clear.</td>
<td>Rationale: The unit is assessing its professional education programs at the initial and advanced levels, but there is limited evidence as to how these data are being used across programs for unit improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Recommendation for Standard 2

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

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

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

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

The San Jose State University PEU works closely with their multiple school partners to provide a variety of field experiences and clinical practice, for candidates in professional preparation programs. Each program's field experiences and clinical practices afford candidates the opportunity to develop the requisite knowledge, skills and dispositions they will need to work effectively in California schools.
The diverse communities in and around San Jose provide school placements whereby university supervisors and school-based professionals conduct formative and summative evaluations of candidates' preparation for working effectively in those contexts. Appropriate to the specific program, candidates in professional preparation programs have opportunities to experience the full-range of activities and responsibilities of a public school teacher, or counselor or administrator.

Particular requirements for field placements vary from one unit program to another, but specific considerations guide decisions about site selection across all programs. These include the qualifications and responsibilities of site personnel as well as the manner in which College faculty and site personnel work together to assess the quality and outcome of the experience for all candidates.

The professional development—specifically how school site personnel are prepared to "coach" and provide on-site supervision—is accomplished differently in the different programs. Several of the programs are extremely successful in providing relevant professional development for cooperating teachers and school-site personnel, assisting them in honing their own teaching practices. Specific examples for the teacher candidates are that two of the college faculty are currently providing training for cooperating teachers in how to teach academic language so as to enhance the math abilities of English learners in several school districts. The intent is to assist cooperating teachers to provide more appropriate instruction for their students and to model these strategies for the teacher candidates the reflective stance that characterizes excellent teachers. Another program requires that cooperating teachers regularly come to campus to meet and discuss ways to better support teacher candidates in the field. A third model has university supervisors providing this professional development to school site personnel on a one-to-one basis.

The Department of Educational Leadership conducted a series of professional development sessions on "mentoring and coaching" with the New Teacher Center in Santa Cruz. The three-day institute was offered to all Educational Leadership faculty and there were 30 participants (both tenure track and part-time instructors). Beginning in 2009, the department contracted with Dr. Enid Lee for a series of meetings on ways to incorporate/embed issues of equity and social justice into their courses. This practice continues on a monthly basis.

Based on the fact that the California License Board in Speech-Language Pathology implemented a continuing education requirement for all licensed SLPs who provide clinical supervision, the Department of Communicative Sciences and Disorders (CDS) began offering Continuing Education Unit (CEU) opportunities to their supervisors at no charge to ensure the supervisors meet state licensure requirements.

All programs appear to have delineated guidelines for the field experiences and clinical practices. The exhibits provide these guidelines and specifics that are appropriate to the credential being sought. Similarly all programs have assessment instruments posted in the exhibits with the necessary rubrics, etc. for each.

Through document review and faculty and candidates interviews, it is evident that all professional education candidates participate in systematic field experiences and/or clinical practices that form a cohesive set of learning experiences. The field experiences are designed to be a collaborative effort between candidates, P-12 practitioners, and university personnel.

During the supervised field experiences, multiple and single subject teacher candidates are evaluated based on the California Teaching Performance Expectations. SJSU has been a pioneer with respect to the state-mandated teaching performance assessment. Faculty were involved in the original design, pilot
studies and benchmarking and they were one of the first programs to fully operationalize the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). They have a highly successful system for all aspects of its implementation.

With respect to P-12 student learning, candidates in the advanced programs systematically collect and examine data on P-12 student learning during the field and clinical experience. The School Counseling program has had three Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) grants over the past 12 years whereby the majority of their candidates are placed in schools serving students from low social economic families. A key aspect of that grant includes the examination of data on student learning tied to the interventions that the GEAR UP counselors are using in the P-12 schools. Candidates who are not part of the GEAR UP grant have similar opportunities in their field sites to examine data on P-12 student learning as part of their roles as academic advisors for students.

Candidates in the Administrative Services credential program learn to analyze and interpret data from standardized test data for P-12 students during their coursework. Candidates focus specifically on failing subgroups of students and make recommendations for interventions. An entire Saturday class is devoted to data analysis for beginning administrative services candidates with guest speakers who are experts in the field. Later in the program, candidates gather and examine data on access to more specialized programs.

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

SJU’s efforts for continuous improvement on this standard are centered on honing their candidate assessment tools and procedures, and modifying the design and implementation of their programs as warranted by the student outcome data emerging from those assessments. One example of this effort pertains to candidates’ effectiveness in using instructional technology. University faculty and school personnel are currently collaborating to identify experiences in campus-based coursework and field placements that will together enable candidates to learn how and when to infuse their pedagogy with state-of-the art instructional technology. School site visits validated that candidates were readily using instructional technology during field experience. Moreover, candidates and alumni stated that the use of technology was required in methods courses.

The secondary education department had made great strides in strengthening their field experiences. The department faculty have developed more specific guidelines for the cooperating teachers to use when working with student teachers. Clearly delineated student teaching activities are published for student teachers and mentor teachers, including timelines and implementation strategies. In addition, plans are underway for all teacher candidates to experience a full-year of student teaching, regardless of program pathway.

There were several program strengths noted during interviews. Candidates in both initial and advanced programs commented that the cohort model provided an important support system. Interviews with faculty in the counseling social work program described the rigorous process they used in selecting site mentors for their candidates.

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

Not appropriate to this standard.

3.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
### 3.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

#### 3.5.1 What AFIIs have been removed?

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

#### 3.5.2 What AFIIs remain and why?

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

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

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

### 3.6 Recommendation for Standard 3

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

### Standard 4: Diversity

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

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

Candidate proficiencies related to diversity are well documented and are aligned with NCATE and California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Candidates must demonstrate mastery of diversity standards through course assessments and their final portfolios. The unit has identified several courses with diversity standards and proficiencies embedded. For example, regardless of the program option they select, all candidates in the Multiple Subject Credential programs must take EDEL 102 and 103, Psychological and Socio-multicultural Foundations courses. Other courses are EDTE 162, Second Language Acquisition, EDEL 108 – Methods sequence, and EDEL 143A and EDSC 184X, Field
Experience courses. Data provided in Table S4, Results from Survey of Employers of Graduates of Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Educational Specialist Programs 2008-2009, reveal candidates scored in the 83 - 84 percentiles, outperforming candidates in the entire CSU system in terms of the ratings employers gave of their ability to meet the needs of a diverse population of K-12 students.

The unit carefully reviews and evaluates selected field sites to ensure candidates will have experiences with students and clients reflecting the full range of cultures, ethnicities and academic abilities, and to pair them with experts who have the pedagogical, professional and cultural competence that reflects their professional education. The unit requires multicultural field experiences that provide candidates opportunities to develop an awareness of the importance of diversity in teaching and learning. Documents and interviews confirm all students in the multiple subjects, single subjects and education specialist credential programs complete at least one of their student teaching assignments in a hard-to-staff school, or a school with high proportions of English learners, with cooperating teachers who have extensive experience with diverse student populations. Additionally, counselor education candidates work with over 200 students from low-income schools in the GEAR-UP program.

The unit has partnerships with 56 Bay area school districts where candidates are placed to ensure opportunities for interactions with faculty from diverse groups. Based on interviews and data presented, faculty diversity in selected public schools reflects the students in the district. Within the unit, two faculty members who are classified as an ethnic minority group, interact with candidates. Unit faculty gained knowledge and experience in preparing candidates to work with students from diverse backgrounds through their personal experiences working with K-12 students from diverse groups.

Data and interviews confirm candidates have opportunities to work with diverse faculty. Of the 152 full-time and part-time unit faculty members, 30 percent are non-White. University-wide, 36 percent of the faculty are non-White. Efforts of the unit to recruit diverse faculty are documented in the Office of Faculty Affairs. Unit faculty received funding to attend professional conferences in order to identify prospective tenure-line applicants from diverse backgrounds. Unit faculty follows university procedures when searching for new faculty.

Candidates have opportunities to interact with candidates of diverse groups in their professional education courses. Data from the university's Office of Institutional Research, interviews, and observations provide evidence of diversity in the unit's programs. Documents show 56 percent of candidates enrolled in unit programs are non-White. From the gender perspective, the majority is female (86 percent).

Candidates experience working with diverse students in P-12 schools though the selected field experiences. Data show that 90 percent of candidates are placed in districts where more than half of the students are non-White. Also, data shows that 75 percent of candidates are placed in districts where more than half of the students qualify for free and reduced lunch. Finally, 80 percent of candidates are placed in districts where 15 percent or more of the students are English learners.

The unit ensures, and interviews confirm, that candidates use feedback from peers and supervisors to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups by assessing their reflections about diversity experiences through class discussions, reflective journals, portfolios, and field experience assignments.

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

The unit has identified six keys to successfully preparing candidates to work effectively with all
students. The six keys are:

1. The first key is the core set of values that unit faculty members model.
2. A second key is the consistency with which these values have guided the unit as they worked together to craft programs and courses.
3. The third key is the professional expertise and pedagogical skill of unit faculty.
4. A fourth key lies within the candidates themselves. They embody the full range of diversity the unit is preparing them to embrace and they learn about meeting the needs of all students as they interact with one another in the classroom activities.
5. A fifth key to success lies beyond SISU's campus. The unit has forged enduring partnerships with schools and community organizations, in SJSU's immediate community and beyond. The cooperating teachers and supervisors who work with candidates share unit values and model ways to reach and teach all of their P-12 students and clients effectively.
6. A sixth key is the process of assessment the unit is continuing to design and implement. The unit has undertaken an ambitious, multi-faceted approach to monitoring learning outcomes for candidates in all unit programs.

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

Based upon the exhibits presented, observations, and interviews, the unit is moving toward the target level with the following elements of the standard:

- Curriculum, field experiences, and clinical practice promote candidates' development of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity within the context of the unit's conceptual framework (4a)
- Candidates engage in extensive and substantive field experiences and clinical practices for both conventional and distance learning programs that are designed to encourage candidates to interact with exceptional students and students from broad range of diverse groups (4d)

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

The unit is addressing Standard 4d. at the target level - Candidates Experiences Working With Diverse Students In P-12 Schools. The unit strength in addressing this standard is matching the diversity of K-12 students and unit candidates in Field Placements. See the attached chart in uploaded sources of evidence section of this document.

4.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.5.1 What AFIIs have been removed?

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

4.5.2 What AFIIs remain and why?

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.6 Recommendation for Standard 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Teacher Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development**

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

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

Multiple interviews with faculty and candidates as well as a review of electronic documents reveal that the faculty in the Connie L. Lurie College of Education are well qualified for the teaching assignments and related responsibilities that they hold. Review of faculty vitae indicate all of the full-time tenured and tenure track faculty hold terminal degrees in their disciplines. A review of course syllabi demonstrate a connection to the conceptual framework and a commitment to student learning outcomes. Faculty mentioned the intentional involvement of students in activities designed to gain mastery of concepts and strategies related to critical thinking and teaching and learning pedagogies. Candidates and community partners frequently note the continued involvement of faculty at the school sites. Alumni note the responsiveness of their faculty advisors to provide assistance when requested even after they have successfully exited the programs. Current candidates indicate that faculty are accessible and respond quickly to their needs.

Faculty are engaged in research involving collaborative groups from within the college and also are involved in research and development collaborations across the university and with community partners. Of note is the "Staying Alive" project which serves to engage mid-career faculty whose productivity often lags at this point in their professional development. This was a college project that has been adopted for use with faculty throughout the university. Other noted projects involve the math education and math department faculty co-teaching courses in which one emphasizes teaching and learning strategies as well as math content.

Professional development funds are limited across the CSU system but the college has a commitment to faculty development and provides all faculty a minimum of $500.00, with the possibility of an additional $250.00, if they are presenting at conferences. Further, junior faculty have potential to receive an additional $1000.00 for research and scholarship endeavors.
Members of the Retention Tenure and Promotion Committee describe a process based on the California State University contractual requirement, which demonstrates a college commitment to assisting junior faculty in successful pursuit of tenure and promotion. The committee also awards development funds as they are available for scholarly pursuits.

The full-time tenure track faculty are evaluated annually by the department chair and each semester by candidates in their classes. Adjunct faculty are also evaluated regularly by both the departments in which they work and the candidates who they teach. A review of the candidate perception of faculty teaching surveys indicates a high degree of candidate satisfaction with the teaching and learning they are receiving in the courses taught by college faculty. Data indicate that college faculty are rated higher in comparison than faculty from across the university.

A commitment to faculty service is evident. Of note is that in 2008 and again in 2009, faculty in the college were selected as recipients of the university Award for Faculty Service. Evidence that college faculty serve on department, school, university and community committees is demonstrated in a review of the vita.

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

Interviews revealed that faculty are engaged in semi-annual thematic day long retreats and semi-annual day long faculty forums designed to engage faculty in discussions and activities related to assessment, diversity and interdisciplinary collaboration. The Education Specialist faculty have been engaged in revising programs to meet new state standards and best practices, in the field and was recently commended by the California State University Chancellors office as the best Education Specialist program in the system. Intentional use of assessment data and evidence based decision-making is an ongoing goal for the college.

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

Not appropriate to this standard

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

Not applicable

5.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.5.1 What AFIIs have been removed?

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

5.5.2 What AFIIs remain and why?

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

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

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

5.6 Recommendation for Standard 5

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

**Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources**

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

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

The Lurie College of Education (COE) is headed by a dean and assisted by an associate dean. The dean has responsibility for all academic and administrative operations which include management of fiscal, curricular, administrative, operational, personnel, research and grants, and student issues. The unit maintains responsibility for managing and coordinating all programs it offers. The governing structure includes the dean, associate dean, council of chairs from each of the five departments, and the budget analyst (nonvoting), and Director of Pre-Collegiate Programs (nonvoting). Additional administrative support for the COE comes from the Budget and Personnel Services Office, the Credentials Office, and the Information and Technical Support Office. Because of state-mandated Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), there is now a half-time coordinator of the newly created PACT office. The organizational chart confirms this framework and lines of authority.

There are three standing unit committees: Curriculum, Personnel, and Research. These committees are part of the governance system that plans, delivers, and assesses the unit’s programs. Departments also have separate committees appropriate to their program needs. Ad hoc committees can be proposed by faculty when they are needed. An All University Teacher Education Committee (AUTEC) has responsibility for reviewing changes to the teacher preparation curriculum. The secondary education department chair presides over the Single Subject Credential Program committee with representatives from single subject content areas housed in other departments. Bylaws confirm that the committee members coordinate their efforts to support program articulation.

Numerous websites, both unit and program-oriented, confirm that the policies for student services—counseling and advising, recruiting and admission, academic calendars, catalogs, unit publications and grading policies are accessible, current, and accurate.

The COE’s budget is comparable to that of similar units on campus; namely, Occupational Therapy and the School of Library and Information Science. The COE’s allocation for professional development and
assessment was proportionately more than either of the other two units. Faculty interviewed were satisfied with their share of professional development funds. The college has had to balance its continued commitment to low student-faculty ratio of six to one in clinical experiences by increasing enrollments in seminars and lecture classes. The college has also had to reduce the number of students admitted into teacher education, because state funding for all of public higher education in California has been significantly reduced in the last four years. Tables 6.1 and 6.2 confirm this information. The Instructional Technology Department and Master's degree in Instructional Technology were eliminated because of the enrollment-based budgetary process and changing market needs. Interviews with many faculty confirm that the budgetary cuts have imposed increasing burdens on faculty. Faculty say they are stressed, because they do the same amount of work with fewer resources. They take great pride in their commitment to continue to prepare quality educators.

As part of the California State University system, the institution is unionized. The faculty workload is defined in the contract between the California Faculty Association and the California State University system. The document confirms that a normal faculty load consists of 15 Weighted Teaching Units (WTUs) per semester. Twelve WTUs are for instruction; the remaining three WTUs account for instruction-related activities including office hours, department and committee meetings and assignments. The contract also contains a specific policy regarding overloads. Interviews and posted faculty schedules confirm that faculty loads conform to the union contract. The counselor education program has hired an additional full-time faculty member which has reduced the student-faculty advising load.

Sweeney Hall houses the Lurie College of Education. Many faculty share offices. Several faculty interviewed stated that they liked having an office mate. Faculty schedules posted on office doors confirmed that offices hours for each faculty member did not overlap with those of the office mate so that privacy with students was maintained. Classrooms and offices are adequate.

The unit has focused on developing technology resources and training. Through donor gifts and unit allocation, Lurie College reconstructed two classrooms with interactive whiteboards and one has a dual projection system. In May 2010, the college and SMART Technology partnered on a SMART classroom initiative. The six COE renovated classrooms received SMART technology: interactive whiteboards, tablets, speakers, student response systems, mobile chairs, desks, tables, and a SMART table for K-6 pupils. Each department and the dean's office have control over these SMART rooms. The unit has an incubator classroom designed for experimenting with a flexible learning environments and technology tools. All other classrooms have projectors and laptop hookups. The faculty also use Apple iPods and iPads. The unit trained one faculty representative from each department to lead departmental colleagues in Waypoint, the college's web-based assessment technology. The college retreat and Elementary Education meeting agendas confirm this training.

Library resources adequately support the preparation of teachers and other school professionals. The IR lists the library resources for each department. In addition, the library provides support for faculty research.

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

The unit has been engaged in improving program articulation between the secondary education preparation for the single subject credential and those content departments housed outside the COE. The second area of improvement has been the reduction of the student-faculty advising ratio in the Counselor Education program. Posted office hours in shared faculty offices do not overlap, thus ensuring student
6.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not appropriate to this standard

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

6.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.5.1 What AFI's have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The College of Education lacks effective coordination with other departments housing programs for school personnel, resulting in a lack of program articulation. This lack of coordination is particularly evident with the College of Science regarding the M.A. in Mathematics (Math Education concentration) and the M.A. in Natural Science. (ADV)</td>
<td>The Single Subject Credential Program committee systematically and formally deals with program articulation between the COE and departments housed outside the COE that prepare school personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inadequate office space limits opportunities for faculty to meet with and advise candidates.</td>
<td>Office hours that do not overlap ensure student privacy and confidentiality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In the Counselor Education program, full-time faculty members carry excessive advising loads that compromise candidate advisement.</td>
<td>The Counselor Education program has hired an additional full-time tenure track faculty member reducing the student-teacher ratio for advising.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.2 What AFI's remain and why?

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

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

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

6.6 Recommendation for Standard 6

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

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE
Documents Reviewed

See SJSU Exhibits Doc.doc in the sources of evidence below

Persons Interviewed

Individual Interviews
Don Kassing - President
Gerry Selter – Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Elaine Chin – Dean, College of Education
Mary McVey – Associate Dean, College of Education and NCATE Coordinator
Katya Karathanos
Jennifer Madigan
Patty Swanson
Arlando Smith
Sue Kendall
Mark Felton
Jolynn Asato
Judy Schierling
Steve Zlotolow
Ruth Huard
Katharine Davies Samway

All University Teacher Education Committee (AUTEC)
Sheila Bienenfeld  Dean, College of Social Science
Robin Love - College of Education, Department of Child & Adoles. Development
Elba Maldonado-Colon - Chair, Elementary Education
Sue Kendall - Library - Liaison for Education
Stephen Branz - Asso. Dean, Undergraduate Studies
Susan Verducci - Liberal Studies Coordinator, College of Humanities and Arts

Speech Pathology
Kristi Iwami
Kathy Wolff
Jean Gallagher
Carol Zepecki
Maureen O'Connor
Julie Olsen
Astrid Rieber
Gus Wang

Social Work
Jeanne Davis East Side Union High School District
Taquelia Washington City of Fremont Robertson Continuation High School
Rachel Bull Eastside Union High School District
Janette Glasser Achieve Kids
Randall Ramirez Rebekah Children Services
Michelle Albanese
Cathy Gomez Sunnyvale School District
Kristine Edmonston SF Unified Student Intervention Team
Marcy Trinidad

Single Subject
Pooya Hajarian
Jenna Smith
Emily Lane
Manuel Vasquez
Tom Avvakumovits Associate Superintendent, Human Resources
Cathy Giannmona Associate Superintendent, HR and Instruction
Julie Andrade
Harriet Garcia
Christina Graham

School Counseling
Bill Erlendson Assistant Superintendent
John Tweten Retired Administrator
Ed Canda Counselor
Woody Moynahan Counselor Supervisor
Cathy Giannmona Associate Superintendent
Daniel Romero Counselor
Sonia Perez Counselor
Jenel King Counselor
Sunny Choi Counselor
Murry Scheckman Assistant Superintendent
Maria Villanueva Counselor
Annya Artigas Counselor
Pablo Viramontes Counselor
Olga Morales Counselor
Anna Fierro Counselor
Charlotte Ratzlaff Employer
Marti McGuirk Counselor
Steve Berta Instructor
Vince Mora Counselor
Milisa Crosby Counselor
Brian Stevenson Counselor
July Goulart Counselor

Multiple Subject
George Flores Teacher, CampbellComm Day/CUSD
Deborah Jaggers-Baccino Principal
Cindy Mackenzie Teacher, Washington Open/Santa ClaraUSD; Lecturer/SJSU
Teresa Coughlan Teacher, Mariano Castro/MtnViewWisemanSD
Veronica Medina Teacher, Brentwood Acad./RavenswoodCitySD
Ambre Glover Teacher, Dwn College Prep
Sharon Weight BTSA Consortium Coordinator
Barbara Fredenbach SJSU Lecturer
Erin Hussey Teacher, Blue Hills/ CupertinoUSD
Gina Manfredi Teacher, McKinley/FMSD
Erin Scullion Teacher, Bernal Intr./OGSD
Allyson Tilton Teacher, Boeger Jr/MtPleasantSD
Cynthia Ortiz Teacher, Harder/ Hayward UnifiedSD
Anne McDermott Principal
Dawnel Sonntag Principal
Caroline Randazzo ST, Stipe/OGSD
Gina Sainten ST, Scott Ln/SCUSD
Carla Kirby ST, Laurel/Menlo Park CitySD
Bryn Pennington ST, Dahl/FMUSD
Alicia Chapman ST, Muir/CupertinoUSD
Victoria Chavez ST, Dahl/FMUSD
Heidi Westmoreland SJSU Student
Christina Beals Teacher, Meyerholz, Cupertino
Steve Lewis Teacher, Moreland Mid Sch/Moreland
Ronald Hammond Teacher, Linda Vista/ARUSD
Beth Russell Teacher, Easterbrook Discovery/Moreland
Karen Hunt Teacher, MMS/CUSD
Laurie Brandt Saratoga Elem/ SaratogaSD
Kathy Sweeney ST, Taylor/OGSD
Catherine Thornton ST, Westwood/ SCUSD
Christine Evans ST, Monroe MS/ CUSD
Samantha McMillian ST, Moreland Mid/MorelandSD
Annie Burgess ST, Cureton/ARSD
Myra Chan ST, Buchser, Santa ClaraUSD
Meredith Griffin ST, Briarwood/SantaClaraUSD
Gus Balla ST, Capri/CampbellUSD
Daniel Garzon SJSU Student
Jane Kim SJSU Student, Teacher, Braly/ Santa ClaraUSD
Yanet Rivera SJSU Student, Teacher, Hubbard/ARSD
Katie Morse Student, Teacher Easterbrook Discovery/Moreland
Brett Mastaler SJSU Student
Pat Belvel PT faculty
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Kelly Mack Teacher, Dahl/FMUSD; SJSU Lecturer
Bridgett O’Shea Teacher, SanLorenzo Val Elem/SLVSD
Kimberly Oakley Teacher, Dorsa/ARUSD
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Mary Ann Harlan
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Educational Specialist
Jennifer Sullivan
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Greg Ziemman
Robert Salinas
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Jessica Alvarez
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Robin Zane
Wendy Burhardt
May Marr

Administrative Services
William Barr Lecturer
Miguel Perez Assistant Principal
Margaret Bonanno Lecturer
Judy Demko Lecturer
Victoria Sorensen Principal
Stephanie Palmeri Farias Assistant Principal, Guidance & Activities
Sylvia Mendez Principal
Patricia McDonald Principal at Northwood Elementary
Donna Vaughan President, South County Advisory
Ramon Martinez
Marco Osuna Alumni
Noe Ochoa Physical Ed. Teacher
Madeline Breazeale Social Science/Dance Teacher
Randy Schmidt Assistant Principal at Castillero Middle
Dr. Ruth Bareket Associate Superintendent
Paul Perotti Lecturer
Robert Lowry Lecturer
Georgia Grijalva Lecturer
Cecilia Burciaga Lecturer
Leo St. John Lecturer

Assessment Committee
Katya Karathanos
Mary McVey
Katharine Davies Samway
Ji Mei Chang
June McCullough
David Whitenack
Lisa Oliver
Rebeca Burciaga

Curriculum Committee
Chris Hagle
Dolores Mena
Patricia Swanson
Maureen Smith
Brent Duckor
Wendy Quach
Katya Karathanos
Arlando Smith
Jennifer Madigan
Patricia Swanson

Open Interview Session with Faculty
Gary Stebbins
Mei-Yan Lu
Jolynn Asato
Judith Schierling
Alicia Henderson
Judith Lessow-Hurley

School Visit -- Monroe Middle School
Dawnel Sonntag - principal
Carol Delville
Jessica Judson
Karen Hunt
Christine Evans
Kevin Duchmann
Anne Brinkmann
Sue-Ting Chene

Council of Chairs

Department, Credential, Chair
Secondary Education, Single Subject, Dr. Mark Felton
Elementary Education, Multiple Subject, Dr. Elba Maldonado-Colon
Educational Leadership, Administrative Services, Dr. Noni Reis
Counselor Education, School Counseling, Dr. Xiaolu Hu
Special Education, Educational Specialist, Dr. Chris Hagie
Communicative Disorders & Sciences, Speech Pathology, Dr. Michael Kimbarow

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SJSU_Exhibits_Doc.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>diversymatch.docx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

(Optional) State Addendum: