



COMMISSION ON
TEACHER CREDENTIALING
Ensuring Educator Excellence

**Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report**
(For Institutions in the Yellow, Blue, and Violet Cohort Due Summer/Fall 2012)
Academic Years 2010-11 and 2011-12

Institution	California State University, Fresno	
Date report is submitted		
Program documented in this report	Education Specialist Credential Program	
Name of Program	Education Specialist Credential Program	
Please identify all delivery options through which this program is offered (Traditional, Intern, Other)	Intern Traditional	
Credential awarded	Education Specialist Credential	
Is this program offered at more than one site? Yes		
If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered	Fresno Clovis Visalia	
Program Contact	Colleen Torgerson	
Title	Professor	
Phone #	559-278-0328	
E-Mail	colleent@csufresno.edu	
If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:		
Name		
Title		
Phone #		
E-mail		

California State University, Fresno (10-12)
Section A-1
EDUCATION SPECIALIST

Contextual Information

California State University, Fresno is one of twenty-three universities in the California State University system. Fresno State began as a normal school in 1911 and has a strong history of service and preparation of education professionals. The Dean of the Kremen School of Education and Human Development is the Unit Head that oversees 16 programs. Our last joint accreditation (NCATE/CCTC) visit was in March 2006 and our next visit has been postponed to Spring 2014.

The Special Education Credential Program at Fresno State has two levels: the Preliminary Education Specialist Credential Program and we are submitting for Clear Education Specialist Credential Program. The preliminary credential program consists of 45 units in teacher education courses and 10 units of fieldwork completed in three phases/semesters. The Special Education Credential Program is based on a clearly stated rationale that requires candidates to complete foundational classes and content-specific pedagogy coursework while concurrently practicing the application of these concepts and teaching skills in a field placement setting. The Preliminary Education Specialist Credential has two areas of specialization: Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Disabilities. These areas of professional emphasis distinguish the student population with which the candidate seeks to pursue a special education career. Teacher candidates may pursue their credential goals through a Basic Program, an Internship Program, an Early Childhood emphasis Program, and a Dual certification program (MS & ES) at California State University, Fresno.

Candidates are expected to apply the theoretical and scholarly concepts, knowledge, and teaching skills in planning and implementing effective and appropriate lesson and units of study. The program provides extensive opportunities for candidates to learn to teach using the state adopted K-12 academic content standards (and is moving to Common Core standards) to all students. All content-specific courses are based on the CCTC Standards/TPEs and the state-adopted content standards/California Common Core. Fieldwork placements are made in diverse settings.

Changes Since Commission Approval of Current Program Document	Date
• Began implementation of new program that includes the changes in the CCTC standards; this includes significant changes to content and student assignments in courses.	Began Spring 2011
• Added LEE 172 <i>Cultural and Language Contexts in the Classroom</i> as a requirement to meet all EL – Multicultural standards.	Fall 2010
• Partnership with Fresno Unified for a cohort to prepare teachers to earn both a Multiple Subject and Education Specialist credentials; all courses and placement in district.	FA 2012 - SP 2014
• One new faculty member was hired in Mild/Moderate and a failed search in 2012	2010 - 2012
• Classroom Management Plan assignment was revised	Spring 2012
• Added CI 176 <i>Mathematics Instruction & Applied Assessment</i>	Spring 2011

- Added CI 100 *Educational Technology* as prerequisite Spring 2012
- Program orientation materials and the graduate handbook were revised to clarify program requirements. Spring 2011/2012
- Revised courses to provide more emphasis on IEP and ITP development Spring 2012
- Revised courses/fieldwork to provide more instruction, guidance and experience in work with para-educators Spring 2012

California State University, Fresno (08-10)
Section A-2
Candidate Assessment/Performance & Program Effectiveness Information
Education Specialist(s)

A. Candidate Assessments the program used to and through recommending credential

Summary of Candidate Assessment Data

1. ***Classroom Management Plan Evaluation*** - Each semester candidates are required to write a classroom management plan. The assignment is designed to assist candidates in the development of a management system with the goal of creating a meaningful, active instructional environment where rules and expectations are clear, where more attention is given to desired behavior than to inappropriate behavior, and where inappropriate behavior is dealt with systematically, consistently, and equitable. Specific items evaluated by a stated criteria include: philosophy statement, personal commitment statement, classroom rules, expectations, relationship building, responding to minor and major disruptions, crisis management plan, and general strategies for generalization and maintenance. Data are collected in SPED 125.

SPED 125 Mean Scores/Data Collection
Classroom Management Plan: Spring 2012

Preliminary Education Specialist (CCTC Standards PS 12, MM 4, MS 6, TPE 11, 12)

Area to be Evaluated	Evaluation Criteria 5 = Achieved 4 = Developing 3= Beginning 2-1 = Limited 0 = Not Met	Mean Score N = 22
1. Classroom Rules	There are not more than 5 rules. The rules are observable, measurable, positively stated, with no question about meaning. Methods for teaching the rules are clearly described and appropriate for the setting.	4.63
2. Student Routines requesting assistance, entering class, sharpening pencils, class dismissal, passing in papers	Steps for student routines are clearly stated and methods for teaching routines are clearly described.	4.72
3. Teacher Routines greeting & escorting students, signaling for attention, giving directions, providing feedback or corrections, collecting homework, late assignments	Routines are clearly stated and easy for students to follow.	4.77
4. Expectations for encouraging appropriate student behavior, whole-class, independent work, lining up, teacher-directed lessons, small group, transitions	The steps for each expectation are observable and easy to follow. The methods for teaching the expectations are clearly described.	4.63
5. Reminders	3 visual and 3 auditory reminders are clearly stated to help students remember rules, procedures, and/or expectations.	4.95
6. Relationships	Strategies for building relationships with 1) students, 2) colleagues, and 3) families promote	4.78

	a productive learning environment and have the potential to reduce inappropriate behavior.	
7. Student Engagement	Strategies to increase student engagement in learning are supported by research. List References	4.68
8. Effective Instruction	Instructional strategies to teach academic content to students with disabilities are research-based. List references.	4.59
9. Response to Minor Misbehavior	Verbal and Non-verbal strategies are low profile, and provide learners with opportunities to self-correct and practice self-control.	4.72
10. Targeted and Tertiary Interventions and Supports	Intervention strategies are research-based and support student learning of new, more productive behaviors.	4.68
11. Crisis Plan	The plan to respond to behavioral AND medical crises or emergencies includes a step-by-step response. Who will seek assistance, who will be notified, what will the non-participating students do, and what will you do after the crisis is over? A copy of the district policy is attached.	4.72

Data Summary

Classroom Management Plan: Data were collected on 22 candidates in the Spring 12 class. The mean score was 56.87 out of 60. Results indicated that candidates are able to develop a management plan conducive to creating a positive classroom environment with clear expectations and consequences. Candidates were allowed to submit each part of the plan for feedback and most of the re-writes involved writing positive rules and step-by-step classroom procedures.

2. **Curriculum-Based Assessment Report:** The instrument is used to measure candidates' ability to design, administer and use results of assessment data to develop IEPs, and evaluate their instruction by using a certain curriculum (i.e., content taught to students at school. A rubric is used to evaluate the following areas: student description, instructional objective, probes design; probe administration, data analysis, and IEP goals/benchmarks. Data are collected in SPED 130.

Data Summary

Curriculum-Based Assessment Report: data was collected from 63 candidates who took the assessment course (SPED 130) in the first semester after being admitted into the program. This assignment evaluates the description of the context of the student, writing observable and measureable objectives, the probe design and administration, data analysis, and developing IEP goals and benchmarks from the assessment. Results showed course averages from Spring 11 averaging 76%; Fall 11 averaging 80%; and Spring 12 averaging 90% with the average of all candidates at 82%. The candidates have learned some basic skills of curriculum-based assessment scoring 80/100, however more practice is need to improve skills of designing, analyzing data, developing IEP and modifying IEP goals in other SPED core courses and student teaching later in the program.

B. Addition Information Collected on Completer Performance and Program Effectiveness List of Assessments

1. Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate (Level I and II)
2. Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Administrator (Level I and II)
3. CSU Systemwide Survey

Summary of Data

Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate (Level I and II)--This survey is designed to assess whether program graduates believe that goals and objectives of the program are met. The instrument contains (1) a statement of purpose, (2) demographic information, (3) questionnaire examining the level of competency achieved by the Special Education Program graduates and (4) additional comments made by the graduates. This survey is given to each candidate twice: when the candidate exits the Special Education Program at Level I and again when candidate exits Special Education Program at Level II. Candidate performance is rated on a scale of 0-3, with 3 representing well prepared, 2 indicating moderately prepared, 1 being poorly prepared and 0 being no knowledge. Data are used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes are made and subsequent assessment data analyzed.

Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate (Level I)

Spring 2011 – Spring 2012 (Mean)

	Competency Statements	Level I		Level II	
		Candidate N=67	Administrator N= 58	Candidate N=49	Administrator N= 42
1.	Collaborates and communicates effectively with family members, school administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals and other related service providers.	2.46	2.48	2.94	2.75
2.	Knowledgeable of and able to conduct formal and informal assessments of pupils.	2.77	2.80	2.84	2.89
3.	Communicates assessment information to parents and appropriate service providers, and makes instructional decisions that reflect both student needs and core curricula.	2.68	2.83	2.93	2.86
4.	Collaboratively develops IEPs with parents and other service providers to include yearly goals and benchmark objectives that target the student's needs (transition for students age 16 and up).	2.44	2.62	2.83	2.81
5.	Selects appropriate instructional goals, strategies, and techniques based on individual student needs identified in the IEP.	2.52	2.71	2.80	2.88
6.	Plans, adapts, and provides effective instruction that meets the needs of diverse learners across a variety of settings.	2.67	2.77	2.75	2.76
7.	Maintains appropriate classroom management with positive behavioral support plans, proactive and respectful.	2.69	2.75	2.84	2.80

8.	Demonstrates the ability to design and implement positive behavioral support plans and interventions based on observation and assessment data.	2.64	2.67	2.80	2.84
9.	Utilized technology for instruction, communication, and/or assessment	2.37	2.51	2.79	2.78
10.	Professional conduct is exhibited through open discussions of ideas, reflections on own practices, utilization of research based information and consideration of professional advice.	2.76	2.85	2.84	2.80
11.	Means of Competencies Listed Above	2.60	2.70	2.59	2.82

Data Summary

Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate (Level I): A total of 67 candidates completed the survey between Fall 10 and Spring 12. Level I candidates scored highest in the areas related to adapting and providing effective instruction to diverse learners across settings, and in their ability to maintain positive, proactive, and respectful methods of managing student behavior. In the last report candidate scores falling below 2.50 included collaborating to develop IEPs or transition plans with parents and other support providers which continues to be targeted having a 2.52 mean in this report. Another area that scored lower than others at a 2.37 is utilizing technology which is an area targeted for changes in courses and expectations.

Data Summary

Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate (Level II): A total of 49 candidates completed the survey between Fall 10 and Spring 12. Overall, candidates rated themselves higher on most competencies at Level II. Candidates rated themselves quite high in all areas requiring collaboration skills and professionalism. The last report had one area in which Level II candidates scored themselves below 2.50 was specific to their ability to design and implement positive behavior support plans and interventions based on assessment data, but for this report all scores were 2.75 and above.

Evaluation and Needs of Assessment Survey- Administrators (Level I and II)--This survey intended to examine the quality of the Special Education Program perceived by the administrators or supervisors who hire our graduates or provide sites for the candidates in our program when completing their final student teaching. This measure consists of 4 sections: (1) a cover letter explaining purposes of survey (2) demographic information (3) questionnaire and (4) additional comments. Administrators are surveyed twice: When the candidates have completed their final student teaching at their practicum sites at Level I and when they complete the clear program at Level II. University supervisors are responsible for distributing this survey to district employers. Candidate performance is rated on a scale of 0-3, with 3 representing well prepared, 2 indicating moderately prepared, 1 being poorly prepared and 0 having no knowledge. Data are used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes are made and subsequent assessment data analyzed.

Data Summary

Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Administrator (Level I): Fifty-eight (58) employers completed the Level I survey between Fall 10 and Spring 12. Employers rated our Level I candidates above 2.5 on each competency. The lowest score (2.44) was for the candidate’s ability to collaboratively develop IEPs and another scores (2.37) was for utilization of technology for instruction and both were consistent data from the chancellor’s survey.

Data Summary

Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Administrator (Level II): A total of 42 employers completed the Level II survey between Fall 2010 and Spring 12. Employers rated our Level II candidates above 2.75 on each competency. No specific deficiencies were noted.

CSU Systemwide survey- In this survey employers and first-year graduates are asked to rate the quality of their program in 13 areas. Table 3 summarizes the results in two parts with Part I including supervisors' rating and Part II first-year graduates' rating. For comparison purposes, two sets of means (%) are provided for each part. Data below is shared from 08-09; the 09-10 data was not included as the N was too small with only 4-5 employment supervisors responding.

Table 3: CSU Systemwide Survey (2008-2009)

Evaluation Area		Part I Employers		Part II Fresno First – Year Graduates	
		% Well Prepared & Adequately Prepared		% Well Prepared & Adequately Prepared	
		CSU Fresno N=15	CSU Wide N=158	CSU Fresno N=24	CSU Wide N=212
C	Overall Effectiveness	84.00	82.00	66.00	71.00
C	Teaching Engl Learners	96.00	84.00	77.00	77.00
C	Teaching SPED Learner	86.00	82.00	71.00	76.00
C	Equity and Diversity	89.00	84.00	59.00	60.00
1.	Understand Subject & Curriculum	93.00	87.00	66.00	70.00
2.	Prepare Lessons	87.00	85.00	63.00	79.00
3.	Maintain Positive Support & Foster Student’s Motivation	87.00	88.00	79.00	83.00
4.	Understand Child Development and Human Learning	100.00	87.00	75.00	75.00
5.	Monitor Candidates Progress by Using formal & Informal Assessments	80.00	79.00	74.00	76.00
6.	Assist Student’s Needs in Reading/Math	92.00	84.00	83.00	74.00
7.	Teach math according to California Content Standards in Math	83.00	79.00	59.00	60.00
8.	Understand Personal, Family &	93.00	92.00	75.00	83.00

	Community Conditions				
9.	Get Candidates Involved in Activities to Sustain On-Task Behavior	73.00	77.00	67.00	73.00
10.	Use Computer –Based Technology Help Candidates Learn Curriculum Subjects	80.00	86.00	38.00	73.00
11.	Learn about Candidates’ Interests and Motivations	87.00	86.00	75.00	77.00
12.	Collaborate With Para-Educators in Meeting Candidates’ Needs	73.00	78.00	52.00	63.00

Data Summary

CSU Systemwide Survey (2008-2009): Overall, employers rated our First-Year graduates (on each of the composites and item competencies;) much higher than our graduates rated themselves. High items which employers scored at the 90-100% level were: communicating effectively with parents/guardians; understanding child development; using positive behavior supports; working with other teachers in inclusive settings; and consulting with general educators. We note that we have not meet the 85% level from employers with assisting in teaching math, on-task behavior, technology, monitoring and assessing, adapting curriculum, and collaboration with paraprofessionals. Some of these items are corroborated in our other assessments.

California State University, Fresno: 2010-12
Section A-3
Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS (M/M & M/S)

The candidate assessment data presented in the previous section of this report indicate that the program is meeting its goal of adequately preparing candidates to teach students with diverse needs in a variety of school settings. The data reveal a number of program strengths as well as some areas for improvement within the Special Education credential program. Areas of strength and areas for improvement derived from the data are outlined below:

Program Strengths

- Level I candidates demonstrated proficiency in all required CCTC standards at the “applying” or “developing” level in final student teaching.
- University instructors’ evaluation of candidates’ knowledge and skills involved in classroom management, functional assessment, design and implementation of positive behavior support plans indicate that our candidates score at the achieving or developing skill level in required competencies.
- Program Evaluation Surveys completed by our candidates at the end of Level I and again at Level II indicate a perceived increase in competency in almost all areas evaluated.
- Program Evaluation Surveys completed by Administrators/Employers of our candidates rank our Level I and Level II candidates high in required competencies.
- The CSU Systemwide Exit Survey rates our candidates higher than candidates Systemwide in the composite scores. In particular we have worked to improve our differentiated instruction and the scores for EL and SPED were very strong and higher than the CSU average. Other areas were: communicating effectively with parents/guardians; understanding child development; using positive behavior supports; working with other teachers in inclusive settings; and consulting with general educators.

Areas for Improvement

- CSUF Practicum supervisors’ evaluations of Level I candidates, Curriculum-based Measures, and the system-wide survey indicate a continued need for additional training in adapting curriculum and instructional skills in general education settings.
- The Level I survey and the system-wide survey both reveal the need for more instruction and skills in the use of technology in instruction and to enhance student learning.
- Candidates’ surveys indicate that need to address IEP and transition plan development.

Section A-4
Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate & Program Performance

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS (M/M & M/S)

Data Source	Data Focus	Action(s)	Contact Person	Timeline
CSUF Supervisor Evaluations of Candidates Performance in Practicum	Improve curricular and instructional skills in General Education.	Implement newly revised program that streamlines the credential, clear and MA requirements	SPED Faculty	Spring 2013
CSUF Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Administrator & Candidate Preliminary	Improve ability to design and implement positive behavioral support plans and interventions based on observation and assessment data	The program continues to require candidates to design and implement a positive behavior support plan and will develop ABA plans including Single Subject Design in course assignments and during Final Practicum.	SPED Faculty	Continuing through Spring 2014
CSUF Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Administrator & Candidate Preliminary	Improve IEP development with attention to transition planning	To implement changes to courses (SPED 145 & 219 and Practicum seminars) to provide more support and demonstration of IEP and transition plan writing.	SPED Faculty	Begin Fall 2012
CSU Systemwide Survey completed by First-Year Graduates	Teach mathematics according to California Content Standards/Common Core	In response to the newly revised CCTC standards for Ed Specialists, we now require all candidates to take CI 176 Mathematics Instruction and Applied Assessment. Continue to track when these candidates graduate.	SPED Faculty	Began Spring 11 for candidates entering the new program & ongoing
CSU survey completed by First-Year Graduates	Plan instructional activities in integrated settings for pupils with disabilities	Ed Specialists candidates are required to complete the Teaching Sample Project (currently a TPA task required of Multiple Subject & Single Subject candidates) The Teaching Sample Project (modified according to adaptations for ED Specialists) will be completed both formatively and summatively.	SPED Faculty	Began Spring 11 for candidates entering the new program & ongoing
CSU Systemwide Survey Completed by First-Year Graduates	Use computer-based technology for instruction, research, and record keeping	A Pre-requisite was added to the program CI 100	SPED Faculty	Began Spring 12 for candidates entering the new program & ongoing
CSU Systemwide Survey Completed by Employers of First-Year Graduates	Collaborate with para-educators to meet student needs	Content and activities involving work with para-educators will be integrated across coursework. Candidates will be required to develop and implement a plan to work collaboratively with para-educators during Final Practicum.	SPED Faculty	Began Spring 11 & ongoing