Education Unit Conceptual Framework

The College of Education serves as the nexus of the professional education unit at California State University, Fullerton (CSUF). Our professional education unit consists of departments and programs housed in four of the university’s colleges. Together, we are dedicated to the preparation and professional development of innovative and transformative educators, and engaging in scholarship and practice that informs the profession and serves the educational community at all levels.

The conceptual framework for the College of Education describes the unit’s mission, philosophy, goals, institutional standards, and professional dispositions that complement and reinforce the university’s mission, goals, and institutional standards.

The conceptual framework reflects a shared vision, one that is continually refined with input from faculty, candidates, school site personnel and other partners in consideration of contemporary practices, needs, and aims in education. Revisions since our last accreditation review in 2007 were made to ensure the unit remained aligned with the most current state standards, institutional goals, college objectives, and educational research. These revisions include:

- A new vision statement, approved in 2011, as part of the development of a five-year strategic plan (approved 2013) for the College of Education.
- A new mission statement, approved in 2012, that more accurately reflects our advances since 2007 and our commitment toward our newly defined vision.
- Minor revisions to the Program Outcome indicators, made in 2012, to align them more tightly with the language of the mission.
- Revisions to the Professional Disposition Statement, made in 2013, to align more closely with the definition of just, equitable and inclusive education (JEIE) as proposed by the College’s JEIE strategic taskforce.
- A new conceptual framework theme selected and approved in 2013, to better represent the vision and mission of the unit as a whole.
- A new conceptual framework graphic, designed and approved in 2013, included on all unit syllabi.
- Updated and approved program knowledge base documents in 2013.
- Unit program outcomes aligned with University Learning Outcomes and approved in 2013.

Mission of the Institution and Unit

University Mission
California State University, Fullerton (CSUF) is a major regional university in a vital, flourishing area that includes Orange County, metropolitan Los Angeles, and the expanding Inland Empire.
The University has more than 37,000 students and offers over 100 degree granting programs in eight colleges. Accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, CSUF ranks first in California for the number of bachelor's degrees awarded to Hispanics, and eleventh in the nation for the number of bachelor's degrees awarded to minority students (http://news.fullerton.edu/formedia.aspx#accreditations). The CSUF mission highlights our institution’s commitment to integrating teaching and learning in ways that support all of our students’ success:

Learning is preeminent at California State University, Fullerton. We aspire to combine the best qualities of teaching and research universities where actively engaged students, faculty and staff work in close collaboration to expand knowledge.

Our affordable undergraduate and graduate programs provide students the best of current practice, theory and research and integrate professional studies with preparation in the arts and sciences. Through experiences in and out of the classroom, students develop the habit of intellectual inquiry, prepare for challenging professions, strengthen relationships to their communities and contribute productively to society.

We are a comprehensive, regional university with a global outlook, located in Orange County, a technologically rich and culturally vibrant area of metropolitan Los Angeles. Our expertise and diversity serve as a distinctive resource and catalyst for partnerships with public and private organizations. We strive to be a center of activity essential to the intellectual, cultural and economic development of our region.

In 2013, under the leadership of our new president, CSUF approved a five-year University Strategic Plan (USP) to further operationalize the University mission. This plan delineates university aims into four goals, one of which involves the implementation of a sustainable campus-wide assessment process. In January 2013, the Academic Senate approved a set of University-wide Student Learning Outcomes (ULOs) as a step to meeting this objective. CSUF’s institutional standards are detailed in the ULOs listed below, which state that:

As a result of engaging with the curriculum and co-curricular activities at California State University, Fullerton, CSUF graduates will:

I. Demonstrate intellectual literacy through the acquisition of knowledge and development of competence in disciplinary perspectives and interdisciplinary points of view.

II. Think critically, using analytical, qualitative and quantitative reasoning, to apply previously-learned concepts to new situations, complex challenges and everyday problems.

III. Communicate clearly, effectively, and persuasively, both orally and in writing.

IV. Work effectively as a team member or leader to achieve a broad variety of goals.
V. Evaluate the significance of how differing perspectives and trends affect their communities.

VI. Recognize their roles in an interdependent global community.

Unit Vision
The conceptual framework for the professional education unit is rooted in seven deep-seated and enduring values that shape the ways in which our vision and mission are articulated and implemented. These values were originally developed in 2006 through the work of faculty, administration, student groups, and community partners. Together these seven values remain at the core of who we are and what we do as members of our professional community. As a unit, we value:

- Learning as a life-long process
- Professional literature that guides and informs our practice
- Responsibility to self and others
- Diversity as enriching the whole
- Multiple pathways to learning, including through the use of technology
- Critical inquiry
- Authentic and reflective assessment

Each of these values informs our vision and mission statements, shapes our candidate learning outcomes and indicators, and establishes the standards by which we evaluate our success.

Our vision encapsulates our seven core values into a single phrase and reflects our commitment to aim high, eliminate inequity, and take responsibility for the development of candidates who dynamically and actively meet all students’ educational needs:

We aspire to be transformational leaders who advance the readiness of all learners to actively participate in an ever-changing, diverse, and digital world.

Unit Mission
In support of our vision, our mission statement directly identifies our commitment to meeting our aims and aspirations as it highlights our attention to equity, inclusion, collaboration, creativity, and the roles of research and technology in education:

The College of Education is committed to the preparation and professional development of innovative and transformative educators who advance just, equitable, and inclusive education. As a professional community of scholar-practitioners, we promote creativity, collaboration, and critical thinking as fundamental to student achievement and success in a diverse and interconnected world.
Alignment of Institutional Mission and Unit Mission Statements
As revealed in the institutional mission statement, “learning is preeminent” at California State University, Fullerton, and the teaching and learning dynamic motivates all that we do at an institutional, college, departmental, and course level. For the University, the primacy of learning manifests in the ways in which we work together to support our students’ capacity to actively engage in academic and professional pursuits; the College builds upon this foundation by ensuring our candidates have the capacity to support their P-12th grade students’ achievement and success. Both the University and the College of Education mission statements pivot upon elements that are crucial to a good education: collaboration, the integration of research and practice, cultural and global competence, creativity, technological prowess, and critical thinking skills. Furthermore, both mission statements recognize our role in preparing our students to succeed in an increasingly diverse (whether ethnically, culturally, technologically, or professionally) world. Finally, while the University serves as a “catalyst for partnerships with public and private organizations,” we similarly work to prepare candidates to be “innovative and transformative” who can act as catalysts for educational development with students, parents, schools, and communities.

Philosophy, Purposes, Goals
Our philosophy is reflected in the overarching theme—REACH. TEACH. IMPACT.—selected by faculty and other stakeholders to represent the fundamental elements that anchor our conceptual framework: our core values, mission, and vision. This theme is the centerpiece of the graphic designed to represent the Unit’s Conceptual Framework:

The three terms, “Reach,” “Teach” and “Impact,” illustrate our purpose and goals underlying our commitment to teacher and student development. Specifically, our purpose is to do everything we can to reach our candidates at every stage of their development so that they have the capacity to reach their students at all levels; to teach using a multitude of instructional and technological
strategies so that our candidates will have a repertoire of practices from which to draw when they enter the profession; and to integrate theory into our practices to assure that our candidates experience educational courses, practices and programs that are designed to make an impact.

Our commitment to these practices is represented in the graphic by positioning the key terms from our program outcomes around the circle (see program outcomes and indicators later in this document). Our program outcomes are used to measure our success at ensuring that our credential recipients and program graduates leave us as knowledgeable, competent, responsive, reflective, committed, and caring educators, practitioners, and professionals. The arrows extending beyond the sphere represent our ultimate goal: the realization of our mission that our graduates will build from this framework to reach, teach, and make an impact in their careers as innovative and transformative leaders in the field of education.

**Knowledge Bases, Theories, Research, and Educational Policies of the Unit**

Our programs are developed and continuously refined based upon a broad and deep knowledge base informed by educational theories, research, practice and policies. This knowledge base shapes the ways in which we continue to develop as a unit, as well as how we work to support candidate development and professional growth.

To illustrate the alignment between theory and practice in our initial and advanced programs, we outline the key resources that constitute our knowledge base across the unit (see also knowledge base by program). This section is organized and discussed relative to our Program Outcomes (or goals) which assist candidates in becoming:

1). Knowledgeable and Competent Specialists;
2). Reflective and Responsive Practitioners; and
3). Committed and Caring Professionals

Below, we detail key theorists, research and educational policies in relation to each of these Program Outcomes, as well as highlighting the work that shapes our attention and commitment to diversity and technology.

**Knowledgeable and Competent**

Candidates are required to explore scholarship that exposes them to various perspectives on the learner and the learning processes (i.e., constructivism, preferred learning styles, and multiple intelligences). The work of Bruner (1990), Piaget (1936, 1963), and Vygotsky (1978) are examined alongside Kohlberg’s work on moral development (1981), and work on multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1983), learning styles (Dunn, 2000), the consideration of sociocultural influences on learning (Delpit, 1988; Ladson-Billings, 1995), and the role of second language acquisition on educational access and achievement (Brown, 2007; Cummins, 1994). Additionally, understanding Bloom’s taxonomy (1956), Shulman’s (1986) work on the
importance of the teacher’s ability to relate subject matter knowledge to pedagogical knowledge, Hunter’s (2004) mastery teaching, and Wiggins and McTighe’s (2011) attention to clear learning goals are essential for successfully planning meaningful learning experiences for all students. Equally important for candidates’ understanding are disciplinary-specific readings like Allington (2013), Rosenblatt (2005), Krashen (2004), and Koegel and LaZebnik (2009). These types of disciplinary-specific readings assist candidates in developing their ability to set objectives, provide meaningful feedback, establish safe, orderly, and inclusive learning environments, and support parent and community involvement.

An essential part of all of our programs is the provision of an empirically supported instructional scaffold that supports the development and implementation of constructivist, engaged, and meaningful learning environments. Faculty model a range of management and discipline strategies that focus on building classroom community and nourishing social participation (Charney, 2002; Kohn, 1999; Scheuermann & Hall, 2012; Wong & Wong, 2004). Candidates then use these models (in contrast with more behaviorist practices) in designing lesson plans and in their fieldwork. Candidates also use theory-based resources to promote student responsibility (Emmet et al., 2003), focus on positive language use (Kyle et al., 2002), strengthen intrinsic motivation (Kohn, 1999), create classrooms that support literacy (Duke, 2008; Gunning, 2012; Reutzel & Clark, 2011; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008), build mathematical understanding through real world problems (Pollak, 1997), or foster the use of inquiry based instructional practices (Minner, Jurist Levy, & Century, 2010).

In advanced programs, Spring (2011) presents a foundation for examining the political and social forces influencing educational politics and policy in the United States and Shafritz, Ott, & Jang (2011) establish a means to frame and understand how schools and school systems work as institutions (structurally as well as functionally). Additionally, the complexity of language acquisition, particularly at the advanced levels, requires exposure to readings that provide candidates with an understanding of the constellation of factors that influence the development of language and provide mechanisms to diminish biases in assessment (Brown, 2007; Carr, 2011; Nelson, 2010; Paul & Norbury, 2012).

In addition to having a strong theoretical foundation, our programs are informed by content-specific state and national professional standards. For example, the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) guide candidates’ development of instruction in all programs. Candidates are also introduced to standards from content-specific national professional organizations and resources available through these organizations. The chart below indicates the state and national standards that inform the knowledge base in our initial and advanced programs.
### CSUF Education Unit – State And National Standards By Departments and Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Programs</th>
<th>Professional Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and Bilingual Education Department (EDEL)</td>
<td>Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE)/based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education Department (EDSC)</td>
<td>Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE)/based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Department (SPED)</td>
<td>Teacher Performance Expectations (beginning 2016) Council of Exceptional Children (CEC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advanced Programs</th>
<th>Professional Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and Bilingual Education Department (EDEL)</td>
<td>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education Department (EDSC)</td>
<td>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Department (SPED)</td>
<td>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership Department (EDAD)</td>
<td>California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Program Standards (CTC) California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Department (READ)</td>
<td>California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Program Standards (CTC) International Reading Association (IRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Communications (HCOM)</td>
<td>American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education (MAT-S)</td>
<td>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)</td>
<td>TESOL Professional Teaching Standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reflective and Responsive

The ability to make informed decisions and think critically about one’s practice is crucial to becoming a reflective and responsive practitioner (Sellars, 2012). In addition to drawing from a solid content knowledge base, candidates are required to draw upon other professional resources and knowledge bases, to reflect upon their past experiences in the classroom (as student and teacher candidate), to dialogue with master teachers, administrators, faculty, and peers, to consider educational policies and mandates, and to be responsive to the developmental levels of their students.

The ability to assess and be responsive to student learning is fundamental to making informed decisions. Kohn’s attention to the dangers of over-emphasizing external testing practices (2000) provides a basis for recognizing the importance of the use of authentic assessment practices (Darling-Hammond, 1995; Herman, Aschbacher & Winters, 1992; Wiggins, 1993). The work of Wiggins and McTighe (2011) and Resnick and Resnick (1992) further assist candidates in understanding how to design and use assessments to measure student performance in ways which align with constructivist teaching practices (e.g., cooperative learning and use of multiple intelligences), and Pieranglelo and Giuliana (2006) and Salvia, Yseldyke, and Bolt (2012) provide candidates with mechanisms to plan and conduct assessments that address special needs and ensure equity for all students.
Texts used in advanced programs (Bauman-Waengler, 2011; Carr, 2011; Guskey & Bailey, 2001; Linn & Gronlund, 2003; Osterhof, 2001, 2003; Stiggins, 2005) build on this knowledge base and help candidates examine and enhance their assessment practices with a focus on the improvement of student learning. Additionally, leadership and supervision practices are connected with cultural diversity and social justice to enable school leaders to act in accordance with ever-changing, new realities (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2009). For example, candidates are presented with Rubin’s (2011) argument for using multiple assessments to develop a comprehensive picture of the achievement of students, as well as Teale’s (2008) argument that assessment be redesigned to improve instruction for all students served.

Our candidates also engage in endeavors that bolster their capacity to support student collaboration in the classroom, as well as increasing their capacity to collaborate with others in the profession, in schools, and in local communities. To this end, Johnson and Johnson (1988), Slavin (1990), and Vygotsky (1978) expand candidate understanding of the benefits of collaborative learning, as well as helping them determine specific ways to organize instruction, engender classroom participation, and make subject matter more meaningful via student cooperative learning. Epstein (1991, 1995), Calabrese Barton (2004), and Berger Kaye (2004) correspondingly provide a foundation for increasing parent engagement in the student learning process, as well as introducing candidates to, or expanding their experience with, the benefits of service-learning. Collaboration and consultation with language specialists and instructional aides in the school setting are addressed by Law and Eckes (2000), Peregoy and Boyle (2012), and Vaughn, Bos, and Schumm (2012).

In advanced programs, Cooper, Cibulka, and Fusarelli (2008) highlight relationships between the macro-level (structural and institutional) basis of the educational system, the micro-level political behaviors and cultural influences operating at the school level and among interest groups, and ideological and philosophical positions that support discussions related to equity and excellence in education. Additionally, our advanced programs expand candidates’ understanding of accountability – both internal and external – as well as the role of individual teacher responsibility within the collective expectations of the school (Elmore, 2008). For example, Miller and Stewart (2013) provide an overview of how literacy coaches and teachers can work as a team to achieve site-based professional learning goals, and Friend and Cook (2010) cover a range of topics in collaboration (e.g., interpersonal communication, strategies for dealing with conflict, co-teaching, working with teams, and working with paraprofessionals and parents), all of which prepare candidates to work with special needs students.

Throughout our programs, we highlight constructivism as the foundation of good teaching, and as a crucial means to developing candidate and student critical thinking (Bruner, 1990; Dick, 1991; Driver, Asoko, Leach, Mortimer, & Scott, 1994; Duffy & Jonassen, 1991; Piaget, 1929). Following the constructivist tradition, candidates in initial and advanced programs are encouraged to actively develop their own skills as critical thinkers, building upon what they know and understand as they develop increasingly sophisticated and complex understandings of
the processes of teaching. Expanding on the work of Dewey (1910; 1916), who focused on critical thinking as the active development of skillful reasoning to support one’s beliefs, Glaser (1941), who provides the understanding that dispositions play an important part in becoming a critical thinker, and Ennis (1996) and Paul (1993), who assist candidates’ understanding that critical thinking goes beyond evaluating one’s own beliefs to include the development of reflective thinking skills that are essential to making evidence-based decisions, candidates move into fieldwork well versed in the importance of critical thinking. Dewey’s (1910) classic work *How We Think* and Bloom’s (1984) taxonomy on the levels of thinking, serve as the foundation for the ways in which we develop candidate knowledge about and ability to teach critical thinking skills to their students.

**Committed and Caring**
Committed and caring professionals go beyond the basics of the profession. They lead others in bringing about changes to improve learning for *all* students, with a focus on equity issues in schools. We expect that our graduates will become transformational leaders who provide direction and leadership for improving learning for all students. Faculty members serve as leadership models through their participation in professional organizations (e.g., American Educational Research Association; National Science Teachers Association) that inform and influence policy and legislation. In advanced programs, candidates are required to read and reflect on educational policy statements and legislation, write position papers, and conduct action research in their school settings. These are all means to help our candidates develop the skills, a mindset, and educational practice that help them learn how to effect change.

Becoming practitioners who engage in continuous improvement reflects the core value of learning as multi-layered and transformative. To this end, initial and advanced candidates are introduced to the array of resources available through membership in professional organizations. Candidates also engage with a range of texts across our programs that present case studies of educational change, continuous improvement, and the ways in which teachers and other educational professionals overcome obstacles to assure all students are learning (see, e.g., Vanderburg & Stephens, 2010). Faculty model their commitment to continual growth by sharing their research, presentations, and publications with candidates. All of these experiences, activities, and affiliations assure our candidates maintain ethical and professional standards at the very highest levels, across every aspect of their work in schools.

Finally, each of the professional organizations upon which our programs are based includes standards or propositions that call for ongoing professional development and learning. Correspondingly, in our advanced programs, school administration is presented as an evolutionary and dynamic enterprise, subject to societal changes, whether legal, ethical, or technological (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2009; Smith, 2009), and candidates are encouraged to engage in continuous improvement of their skills by utilizing effective assessment to guide instruction (Pierangelo & Giuliani, 2012).
Commitment to Diversity
A critical component of being a reflective and responsive practitioner is the ability to plan, instruct, and assess so that all learners (e.g., those with special needs, English Learners, and students traditionally marginalized from educational opportunity) can succeed. Work from Vaughn, Bos and Schumm (2012) is used in methods courses to help candidates understand how to consider and support students with special learning needs in instructional planning and management. Planning meaningful instruction for English learners is also a required element of professional preparation across all our programs. The work of Perego and Boyle (2005), Cummins (1994), Echevarria et al. (2000), and Chamot and O’Malley (1994) is featured across our initial programs and assist candidates in determining, designing, and implementing meaningful instruction for English learners at all levels of proficiency.

Additionally, being knowledgeable about diversity in its broadest interpretation, and identifying and capitalizing on diverse students’ strengths are foci in our professional preparation programs. Candidates read the work of Delpit (1988), Ladson-Billings (1995), Nieto (2012), and Sleeter (2005) to develop their understanding of the influences of culture on the learning process.

In advanced programs, Gay (2013), Sleeter (2009), and Lindsey, Robins, & Terrell (2009) provide a framework to inform culturally responsive teaching, and Au (2000), Diaz-Rico (2004), Gee (1996), and Morris & Hiebert (2011) help candidates understand multicultural and sociocultural aspects of learning and literacy. It is our expectation that our graduates not only develop the professional capacity to teach all students but actively seek ways to promote diversity in their workplaces. Across the unit, candidates are supported and trained to provide effective, sensitive, and culturally competent services with and for all of their students. To this end, candidates read Rogers, Mosley, and Kramer’s (2009) exploration of the relationship of literacy, equity, and social justice, Lynch and Hanson’s (2008) discussion of the complexity of cultural factors (e.g., family structures, values, approaches to child rearing, and disability) that shape educational opportunity, and Halvorsen and Neary’s (2009) research-based strategies for implementing inclusion at the school or district level. Additionally, discipline-specific research into individuals of different cultures (e.g., McCabe & Bliss, 2003) highlight the importance of distinct cultural styles in our candidates’ understanding of the range of possibilities inherent in all students.

Commitment to Technology
Using current technologies for teaching and learning is essential for both the educator and the learner as a means to improve student learning, make informed decisions, support student engagement in collaborative endeavors, and maintain currency in the global economy.

Guided by the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE, 2006), candidates learn to: demonstrate a sound understanding of technology operations and concepts; plan and design effective learning environments and experiences supported by technology; implement curriculum plans that include methods and strategies for applying technology to maximize student learning;
apply technology to facilitate a variety of effective assignment and evaluation strategies; use technology to enhance their productivity and professional practice; and understand the social, ethical, legal, and human issues surrounding the use of technology in P-12 schools and apply those principles in practice.

Starting spring, 2015, there will be a link to the ISTE standards on every syllabus (initial and advanced) to familiarize candidates with the standards and how they inform the uses of technology in schools. The following description will be added to every syllabus:

ISTE STANDARDS

Teachers in the 21st century are responsible for preparing students for career and college readiness in a digital and interconnected world. Changes occur rapidly in our society today and as a result we are preparing many of our students for jobs that do not currently exist. In order to identify the knowledge and skills that teachers must have to support creativity, collaboration, communication, and critical thinking in the classroom, standards have been developed by The International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE).

Some programs have worked already to align their course objectives and assignments with the ISTE standards. It is our aim to have this technology alignment on all unit program syllabi to ensure our commitment to using technology that advances student achievement and increases educational opportunity. Texts by Ivers (2003), Harris et al. (2009), and Reiser and Dempsey (2012) are also used across the unit to assist candidates’ understanding and application of educational technology. These general resources are supported by readings such as Anderson and Balajthy (2009) who provide explicit examples of the uses of electronic text, literature discussion blogs, and powerpoints that incorporate the “language experience approach.”

In advanced programs, questions of educational technology go beyond applications in discrete classrooms to developing candidate awareness of the role of comprehensive school-wide efforts. For example, Picciano (2010) focuses on providing leadership across and through a range of technological platforms, in consideration of human resource needs, and in relation to designing and supporting professional development for educators. Additionally, Palloff and Pratt’s (1999) practical guide to designing virtual classrooms offers candidates helpful vignettes and case studies which support their capacity to establish meaningful online instruction.

In addition, candidates in Education Specialist programs learn to understand and effectively utilize Assistive Tech that will allow children with disabilities from birth through adulthood, to have access to the same environments, curriculum, academic and social experiences that are available to normally functioning children P-12. Standards from the International Council for Exceptional Children guide candidate training. Advanced program candidates receive additional training in Assistive Technology with an emphasis on learning how to collaborate effectively with families and school personnel to implement assistive technology for students.
Candidate Proficiencies – Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Indicators of candidate proficiency are grouped by program outcome. Unit assessments were selected or developed to measure candidates’ continuous improvement toward meeting these proficiencies as they matriculate through their program of study. Program outcomes and indicators are theoretically grounded and aligned with state, national, and institutional standards. As such, they articulate the direction of the unit in preparing candidates who leave our programs as knowledgeable and competent, reflective and responsible, and caring and committed specialists, practitioners, and professionals.

Program Outcomes and Indicators
After successful completion of a program of study, our credential recipients and program graduates are:

1. Knowledgeable and Competent Specialists who
   a) demonstrate a strong foundation of knowledge
   b) implement effective practice
   c) use current technologies for teaching and learning

2. Reflective and Responsive Practitioners who
   a) advance just, equitable, and inclusive education
   b) make informed decisions
   c) participate in collaborative endeavors
   d) think critically and creatively

3. Committed and Caring Professionals who
   a) demonstrate leadership potential
   b) maintain professional and ethical standards
   c) engage in continuous improvement

In addition to the Unit Program Outcomes, candidates are expected to adhere to the expressed values in the education unit’s Professional Disposition Statement. This statement is included in education unit documents, course syllabi, student handbooks, admissions statements, and program websites. In addition to the unit dispositions, candidates in both initial and advanced programs are required to adhere to the state and national professional standards, as appropriate for their discipline. Policies and mechanisms for assessing dispositions are in place across the unit, as are methods for alerting, and if necessary, removing, candidates who do not demonstrate the ability to maintain professional and ethical standards, commitments, and dispositions.
Summarized Description of the Unit’s Assessment System

Assessment System Organization
The Unit Assessment System is a comprehensive means of assessment that allows for both a decentralized and individualized approach within a coordinated, centralized, unit-wide process. This assures programs can make decisions regarding particular assessments that best reflect their discipline-specific standards, while allowing for the aggregation and summary of assessment data across all programs. The continuous improvement of this system is a dynamic, responsive, and collaborative effort that depends upon significant input from a variety of stakeholder groups, at both the unit and program levels.

The assessment system manages the flow of data collection and analysis of all unit programs. As designed, the system supports on-going data-driven program reviews and unit studies that examine: (1) alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with unit, state, and professional standards; (2) efficacy of courses, field experiences, and programs; (3) candidate’s development of content knowledge, skills and dispositions that lead to effective student learning; and (4) effectiveness of programs and unit operations.

The assessment system uses the College’s conceptual framework as the foundation for specific outcomes that guide the operation of all initial and advanced programs in the Unit. The three program outcomes and indicators (which are aligned with professional and ethical standards) provide benchmarks for the assessment of candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions in a continuous improvement process. In spring 2007, a Unit Assessment Committee was formed. Committee members include assigned representatives from all unit programs. Chaired by the Director of Accreditation and Assessment, the Committee members communicate with the Unit, program faculty, and other program stakeholders. The Assessment Committee meets monthly and is responsible for the continued evaluation and modification of the assessment system to ensure that it remains viable, comprehensive, informative, and effective.

Methodology
The unit’s assessment system allows for the collection of data from multiple sources, both internal and external, to monitor candidate performance and to manage and improve program effectiveness. These data sets are analyzed and used to determine if candidates have met the requirements necessary to matriculate through specified program levels and are collected at four (4) transition points:

Transition Points for Initial and Advanced Programs
Candidate data collected at the first transition point (Admission) establish that candidates entering programs have the knowledge and dispositions necessary to be successful in pursuit of their educational and professional objectives. Data collected at the second and third transition points (program continuation points) provide information on candidates’ ability to demonstrate deeper understanding of acquired knowledge, growth in implementation of skills, and continued development and display of dispositions, as outlined in institutional and professional standards. The fourth transition point (Exit from Program) provides data for determining whether candidates have acquired the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to be successful as professionals in the field of education. While not a program transition point, additional data are also collected from graduates and their employers (once candidates become practicing professionals – post program) to assess how knowledge and skills transfer into the workforce, after one year of employment.

A multifaceted and interlocking set of unit assessment measures are used across all programs so that data sets that can be aggregated and summarized across programs (additional assessments may take place at the program level). The following charts identify the unit data sets we collect to measure candidate performance and program effectiveness in initial and advanced programs; detail when data are collected, analyzed and reported back for program level analysis; and describe how the results are used to close the assessment loop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[TP = Transition Point]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Assessments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Subject Matter Competency Exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Major GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Interview Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Course Level Assignments/Grades*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Fieldwork Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Student Teaching Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Capstone Assessment (Teacher TPA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Additional Program Assessments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Use for Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU Exit Surveys</td>
<td>Each Semester</td>
<td>Course modification decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Graduate and Employer Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment process and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Instruction Competence Assessment® (RICA) Test Scores</td>
<td>Annually [post program]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Course assessments are included as one type of evidence for evaluating candidate performance. To ensure that course assessments measure candidate proficiency in relationship to program outcomes and professional standards, course objectives have been aligned with outcomes and professional standards on every syllabus, for all required courses, within each unit program.*

---

### ADVANCED PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS

[TP = Transition Point]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Collected, Analyzed &amp; Reported</th>
<th>Results Used For</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Assessments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Process Assessments including Interview Scores</td>
<td>Each Admission Cycle [TP 1]</td>
<td>Feedback to candidate regarding program progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Level Assignments/Grades*</td>
<td>Each Semester [TP 2, 3, 4]</td>
<td>Candidate retention decisions through transition points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Credential recommendation decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Diversity Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Assessment (Culminating Project, Exam, Thesis, etc.)</td>
<td>Each Semester [TP 4]</td>
<td>Curriculum and course modification decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Program Assessments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment process and procedures modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit-Wide Mid-Point Survey</td>
<td>Each Semester [TP 2/3]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit-Wide Exit Survey</td>
<td>Each Semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit-Wide Graduate/Employer Survey</td>
<td>Annually [post program]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Course assessments are included as one type of evidence for evaluating candidate performance. To ensure that course assessments measure candidate proficiency in relationship to program outcomes and professional standards, course objectives have been aligned with outcomes and professional standards on every syllabus, for all required courses, within each unit program.*

All assessment data are analyzed, results are tracked and charted by the College of Education Research Analyst, and results are reported back to departments/programs through Dropbox. Department chairs or designees examine the data reports, and results are shared with faculty, candidates, and appropriate stakeholders, per department protocol.
Conclusion
Our conceptual framework reflects a shared vision, one that we built together and continuously refine as a professional community with input from faculty, candidates, and school site personnel. It is derived from the real work we all do, and assures coherence among curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practice, assessment and evaluation. Reflective of our vision, mission, core values, outcomes and assessments, this framework establishes the basis for assuring our graduates are prepared to reach, teach, and make an impact in their careers as educators.
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