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Foreword

California State University, Los Angeles and the School of Education have embarked on a unique and creative operational arrangement. While charter school status is becoming a common phenomenon at the K-12 level in most states, the initiative at CSULA is clearly a pioneering effort in higher education. While many internal and external observers are curious about the charter arrangement, it is most important that we learn about the successes, the problems, and the possibilities this innovation offers for schools/colleges of education and other academic units in colleges and universities across the county.

I congratulate California State University, Los Angeles for its courage and willingness to submit the Charter School of Education to an external evaluation by an independent agency, The Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University. The mission of The Evaluation Center is to “forward the theory and practice of evaluation,” and the purpose of evaluation is to improve, not to prove. The evaluation team approached this evaluation project as an opportunity to provide professional assistance to CSULA in its efforts to better understand and to evaluate the Charter School of Education within the parameters of a well-designed set of questions and as a means to convey the importance of evaluation as a basis for decision making and as a demonstration of accountability.

To the other members of the evaluation team, Drs. Mary Harris, Brian Lotven, and Kenneth McKinley, I offer my sincere appreciation for their professionalism and their dedicated effort to conduct this evaluation in an objective, unbiased manner. Also, I want to thank Dean Allen Mori; faculty and staff of the Charter School of Education; and other faculty, staff, students, and administrators of California State University, Los Angeles for sharing descriptions of their experiences and perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the charter school operations. While perceptions may differ on occasion, we appreciate the willingness of everyone to share their knowledge and perceptions with us and for their assistance in making this a successful evaluation project, as well as their devoting the time and effort required before and during the on-site visit by the evaluation team.

Finally, I want to thank key personnel in The Evaluation Center who provided valuable support. Without this assistance and cooperation, we would never have been able to complete this project. Among those who provided these services were Ms. Sally Veeder, Ms. Mary Ramlow, and Ms. Maxine Robb. To the director of The Evaluation Center, Dr. Daniel Stufflebeam, I express my appreciation for his encouragement, professional expertise and input, and support that enhanced the quality of this evaluation effort.

Dr. Jerry G. Horn
Principal Research Associate
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Executive Summary

In response to an invitation of interest (December 10, 1998), Dr. Jerry G. Horn, Principal Research Associate in The Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University, indicated his willingness to serve as an external evaluator of the Charter School of Education, California State University, Los Angeles and to conduct a summative evaluation of this academic unit. This document represents an executive summary of the formal evaluation report. The report is intended to serve as a description and record of the study and as a source of information for improvements and decision making.

California State University, Los Angeles (CSULA), founded in 1947 by action of the California State Legislature, is a comprehensive university offering programs of higher education in more than 50 academic and professional fields. The university is organized into 6 schools that house nearly 50 academic departments and divisions, including the School of Arts and Letters, the School of Business and Economics, the Charter School of Education, the School of Engineering and Technology, the School of Health and Human Services, and the School of Natural and Social Sciences.

CSULA is located at the eastern edge of Los Angeles and adjacent to the San Gabriel Valley cities of Alhambra and Monterey Park. The campus occupies nearly 300 acres on a hilltop site located within 5 miles of the Los Angeles Civic Center and the downtown area, as described in the Common Standards Document prepared for the California Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in 1997.

California State University, Los Angeles is an academic community offering a comprehensive range of liberal arts and professional programs that prepare students for success in advanced study, in their careers, and throughout their lives. The University is committed to free scholarly inquiry and to academic excellence in undergraduate, graduate, and other postbaccalaureate and continuing education programs. This commitment underlies strong educational programs as well as research, scholarship, and creative and community service activities designed for the needs of a uniquely diverse student body. The excellence of these programs derives from a highly qualified faculty and support staff. These individuals are the keystone of the institution.
In 1993, Dr. Allen Mori, as dean of the School of Education, with the support of the CSULA president, Dr. James Rosser, sought authorization from the California State University chancellor, Dr. Barry Munitz, for the School of Education to be the first “charter” school of education in California. Chancellor Munitz approved the charter status of the School of Education for a five-year period beginning with the submission of a program document in June 1995. According to Hafner and Slovacek (1998),

The impetus for the charter came from several areas: the changes in the demographics in the school age population in California, the reform movement and the restructuring of schools and higher education in the US, the emerging evidence for collaboration in school partnerships, and the increasing attention given to teaching and accountability for learning across the K-18 education continuum. The Charter status would permit the school to bypass many institutional and state regulatory constraints and enables it to experiment with other schools and school districts, and to test new and creative solutions to problems that have become obstacles to the success of students in urban schools (p. 55).

With the granting of this authorization, certain institutional rules and regulations that traditionally governed the operational activities of this academic unit could be waived in recognition of its efforts to engage in major education reform. This event initiated a succession of discussions, meetings, and faculty retreats shaped around a systemic process to (1) rethink the philosophy, purposes, and curriculum outcomes of the School and its programs to meet the changing needs of practice in urban schools and related institutions and (2) adopt a model of governance to attain this new vision of professional preparation. A new vision statement was one outcome of these activities as well as an identification of a companion set of goals:

# Create collaborative programs that interact successfully with public schools.
# Prepare teachers who are well grounded in subject matter and teaching methods.
# Measure the effectiveness of teaching practices in real world classrooms.
# Conduct research that leads to positive change in teaching practices.
# Close the achievement gap for poor and minority children.

The mission of the Charter School of Education (CSOE), as publicly presented in information brochures and other documents, is as follows:

As a Charter School, the School of Education at California State University, Los Angeles, is committed to leading educators in their efforts to transform public schools.
The School offers a coordinated, multidisciplinary approach for the education of children and youth.

Collaborating within the Charter School of Education and with public schools in the urban Los Angeles area, the faculty prepares professionals to be learner advocates who demonstrate competence in subject matter and professional knowledge of skills and who are dedicated to improving the educational environment of all children and youth.

A slightly differently worded version of the goals, an additional set of faculty-identified core values, and an organizational committee chart of the Charter School of Education (CSOE) are included in an information packet prepared for new staff and faculty (see Appendix E). The core values are explained in this way:

To support this new mission statement, faculty developed core values that undergird curriculum, field experiences, governance issues, and student services. Faculty-identified core values reflect a strong emphasis on the following:

# use of inquiry and reflection as leading to readiness for change
# preparation of educators in sound curriculum and instructional practices
# accountability for learner advocates
# role of professionals as learner advocates
# appreciation of linguistic and cultural diversity of the population as an asset
# use of technology as a means of transforming schools

A continuing internal formative evaluation and a self-study (Hafner, 1997) of the CSOE have been conducted to assess its progress using a variety of information sources: i.e., professors, administrators, staff, students, alumni, employers of alumni, and community members. In the words of Hafner and Slovacek (1998, p. 63), “The preliminary findings so far are encouraging: the Charter School of Education remains a work in progress.”

In addition, the CSOE and its programs were submitted for reaccreditation review by the California Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in Fall 1997. The results of these accreditation reviews were very favorable. The school became the first institution in California to have its credential programs accredited under the new COA standards and procedures, satisfying all these new standards without any stipulations or suggestions for improvements. In addition, NCATE granted the school full and continuing accreditation in all four standards categories (curriculum and instruction, candidate assessment, faculty evaluation and qualifications, governance and accountability) with no weaknesses cited. Additional professional accreditation is maintained
for specific CSOE programs by groups such as the Council of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP); the American Speech, Language and Hearing Association (ASHSA); the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP); and the International Reading Association (IRA), and the Association for the Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired (AERBVI).

The results of the external evaluation, authorized by the dean of the CSOE and the president of CSULA, is the primary focus of this report. In February 1999, The Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University was informed that it had been selected to conduct an external evaluation of the Charter School of Education. With this notification was a description of the scope of the work, including the purpose, sources of data available, and possible evaluation questions. Initially, it was planned that the evaluation activities would be conducted during late spring and early summer 1999 with submission of the findings by August 1999. However, due to conditions surrounding an unsettled faculty contract with the system as a whole, administrative representatives of CSULA and The Evaluation Center agreed that the on-site team visit and the study should be delayed until Fall 1999 with a reporting date in early 2000.

The remaining sections of this executive summary include an abbreviated description of the procedures used in the evaluation, some of the highlights of the evaluation, and a list of recommendations based on the findings of the study. In the full report of the evaluation, question-by-question responses to the 15 questions that provided focus for the study are described.

Procedures

From an initial set of possible evaluation questions developed by CSULA, the project director for the evaluation, Dr. Jerry Horn, developed a projected Task Plan and Evaluation Work Plan. These plans were reviewed by Dean Allen Mori, Provost Margaret Hartman, Senate Chair Marshall Cates and other CSULA officials, and a formally approved set of questions and plans was agreed upon.

The evaluation team reviewed an extensive set of documents and self-reports used for accreditation purposes, as well as results of surveys and other internal studies, and conducted a three day on-site study/visititation at CSULA and at cooperating public schools on November 8-10, 1999. During the on-site visit, team members interviewed more than 100 persons in individual and group meetings. Included in the interviews were top level administrators of the University, a representative from the Chancellor’s Office, School and All-University Deans, the Chair and members of the Academic Senate Executive Committee, Chairs and members of several school and all-University Committees, numerous professors from other Schools in the University, credentials analysts and other staff members, representatives of the visiting NCATE and COA accreditation teams, a consultant from the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, students, graduates, employers of graduates, and public school representatives.

The schedule was developed by a representative of the Charter School of Education, Dr. Lamar Mayer, former associate dean and professor in the School of Education. The schedule and list of
key persons to be interviewed were developed in concert with and in cooperation with leadership personnel in the School and the University.

Members of the evaluation team are listed below:

**Chair**
Jerry G. Horn, Principal Research Associate  
The Evaluation Center  
Western Michigan University

**Members**
Mary Harris, Dean and Professor  
College of Education and Human Development  
University of North Dakota

Kenneth McKinley, Professor  
College of Education  
Oklahoma State University

Gary Miron, Principal Research Associate  
The Evaluation Center  
Western Michigan University

Concluding Statements and Highlights of the Evaluation

In summary, the School of Education’s first period of approval as a Charter School of Education has produced some remarkable results; and, by now, some of the concerns of those who feared the worst should be sharply reduced. The evaluation team found an academic unit that reflects commitment and dedication to a mission that is not only correct for this school, but likely most appropriate for many others across this country. It has redirected its mission to serve the needs of the local schools of its primary service area as well as the needs of enrolled students at CSULA.

Of the 15 questions that were addressed in the evaluation, 3 seem to address the crux of the major issues related to decision making and future planning. Therefore, the expanded response to these are included in this executive summary.

**Question #1: Has the Charter School of Education (CSOE) met its goals? If so, to what extent?**

The California State University, Los Angeles, Charter School of Education lists the following goals (California State University, Los Angeles, Charter School of Education Programs for the Preparation of Professional Educators {Brochure}, 1999):

# Create collaborative programs that interact successfully with public schools.

# Prepare teachers who are well grounded in subject matter and teaching methods.
# Measure the effectiveness of teaching practices in real world classrooms.

# Conduct research that leads to positive change in teaching practices.

# Close the achievement gap for poor and minority children.

These Charter School goals build upon the core values and goals stated in the 1997 documentation prepared by the CSOE for the joint accreditation/reaccreditation visit of the California Committee on Accreditation and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (CSULA CSOE Common Standards Document, Appendix A, 1997). These goals were affirmed by the Western Michigan University Evaluation Team through interviews, a review of survey data, and perusal of written information documenting the goals of the CSOE and their achievement.

It is obvious that the CSULA, School of Education under its charter status is a “work in progress.” Although it is difficult to measure precisely the achievement of these goals, especially in the form and style that they are stated, it is abundantly clear that the CSOE, through the collective efforts of its administration, faculty, and staff, is making remarkable progress in reaching its stated goals. The faculty feel good about their work and the mission and direction they have charted to reach these organizational goals. As stated in the CSOE conceptual framework document, this process, as it is for any social service organization, is a “journey, not a blueprint.” For the faculty of the CSOE, this journey has literally taken on almost a missionary zeal, in that they know they have been given relief and deregulation of their operation perhaps like no other peer professional education preparation unit in the United States. This places the CSOE in a “fishbowl” environment with its attendant challenges to communicate with its relevant constituent groups and respond to the ever-present demand for accountability for actions and results. Even though the charter experiment has only really been operational for four years (effectively, the first two years were utilized for planning, conceptualization, and development), there is evidence that the CSOE has done an exemplary job of paying attention to and striving to meet its goals.

The CSOE is closest to achieving the numbered goals relating to

4. collaboration through its efforts with the Accelerated School
5. preparing teachers well grounded in subject matter and teaching methods through the development and implementation of the “blended” programs linking content with pedagogical training for undergraduate students preparing for California Level I teaching certification
6. closing the achievement gap for poor and minority children, again in its close collaborative work with the Los Angeles Unified Charter Accelerated School

---

1 November 8-10, 1999. California State University, Los Angeles.
There is less evidence to judge the achievement of the related charter school goals of

1. measuring effectiveness of (its graduates’) teaching practices in real world classrooms
2. the conduct of research that leads to positive change in teaching practices. (However, we did see evidence that, as faculty generate new clusters and teams across divisions and program boundaries to discuss and develop new and innovative solutions to teaching and learning challenges presented to them in collaboration with K-12 schools in the greater Los Angeles area, they are applying an assessment mentality and building a research culture based on the following “real-world” questions: “Is this an improvement?” “Is this quality?” “What difference does or will this make?”)

In addition to the charter school goals listed above, the CSOE utilizes a “Charter School Evaluation Template: Expected Outcomes” to serve as a guideline and reference point in meeting and updating its annual organizational goals. This template includes the following major components:

# Administration/Governance

# Curriculum and Instruction

# Resources

# Students

# Faculty

# Community and Parents

# Facility/Environment

The CSOE has made exemplary progress on a number of the “expected outcomes” that it established for itself. If we were to rank the seven outcomes listed above into three “grades,”—‘A’, ‘B’, or ‘C’—relative to progress on achieving these outcomes, it would be as follows:

# ‘A’: Administration/Governance and Faculty: There is clearly definable and observable evidence of a shift in roles, greater shared decision making, increased collaboration intra-CSOE and inter-CSOE-LA K-12 system, greater sense of empowerment on the part of faculty and staff, and greater recognition of and increased communication between the CSOE and its primary constituent groups.

# ‘B’: Curriculum and Instruction; Resources; Students; and Community & Parents: Although collaborative forms of instruction (blended programs) and evaluation of instruction are being given increased attention, there is less evidence of the infusion of inquiry methods and technology into instruction. Students are being exposed to and provided training in
pedagogy/instructional skills. In summary, resources are being more closely aligned with the mission of the CSOE through modification of support for summer school offerings and creative reallocations of the budget to support focused workload assignments; the impact on community and parents appears to be emerging as work with the collaborative schools expands, but it is a work in progress that will need to be repeatedly identified as an expected outcome.

# ‘C’: Facility and Environment: More creative scheduling is taking place to accommodate students’ schedules, such as offering courses on Saturdays, including internet-based and WEBCT options in several classes. The Model Teacher Education Program (MTEP) blends content courses from science, history, and child development with related courses in pedagogy; and the scheduling of courses in cohort groups is used in several advanced credential programs. Four classrooms have been converted to “smart” classrooms with internet connections, computer and audiovisual equipment to provide settings that differ from traditional classrooms. However, we did not gain an overall perception of extensive “creative use of space” or “visually exciting non-traditional” classrooms.

Question #2: What specific accomplishments since 1994 are perceived to have been strongly facilitated by the charter status of the CSOE?

Even though the charter status was granted in 1993, it was not implemented until 1995, building upon 2 years of discussion, dialogue, planning, and development. A remarkable change has taken place in the CSOE and between it and its constituent groups. We recognize the following important accomplishments, both perceived and real, that have been facilitated by charter status being granted to the CSULA, CSOE:

# The creation of the School as A Whole (SAW) Committee. This form of shared governance and decision making gives all permanent employees (administrators, faculty, and staff) an equal voice in the important decisions and changes affecting the mission and goals of the CSOE and the people who work there. The school’s administration appears to “go out of its way” to hear the collective voices of the faculty and staff and to implement their ideas. It was made clear at the outset by the dean that the only items “off the table” are the conditions/requirements/issues reflected in the employee union contract. Although the dean has administrative responsibility for the budget, the faculty and staff have a major voice in the use of resources for specific activities.

# Leadership of the dean. The positive leadership style of the dean was cited repeatedly in the interview process with faculty and staff, which is likely a key element in the success of the change process. It probably would not have been (as) likely without some major and dramatic change processes such as the charter status being introduced into the system.

# The change of the CSOE faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) document to recognize and reward service and the “scholarship of application” (Boyer, 1990). The CSOE is moving as close to actualizing the ideal of moving toward engagement
with K-12 professionals and their inherent “problems of practice” as any institution of its kind in the United States.

# The **faculty** has gained **control of its mission**; has aligned its collective activities and efforts with that mission; and strives, in all of its major deliberations, to address that mission.

# The **establishment of clusters and teams** allows faculty members to work creatively and without prejudice across internal division and program boundaries. This programmatic change, the waiver of university regulations regarding the review of curriculum changes, and the dean’s leadership have probably been the most dramatic evidence(s) of the change in the culture of the CSOE in responding to calls for training and technical assistance in the K-12 system of the greater Los Angeles area.

# **Response to** the daunting task of helping the state of California and the greater Los Angeles area address the complex and critical problem of qualified and fully **credentialed classroom teacher shortages**. The blended undergraduate initiatives such as the Urban Learning major and the Model Teacher Education Program are primary examples.

# Creation of **collaborative initiatives/effort**. The Accelerated School, a charter school in the Los Angeles Unified School District, and the blended undergraduate teacher preparation program are examples of external and internal collaboration.

# Changed the **summer session** to a **self-supporting** mechanism, which enabled faculty to be placed on the same work schedule and more available for collaboration, and at the same time reserved 60 student teaching slots from the state-supported budget to assist graduates to become credentialed in a more timely fashion.

# **Offerings** such as the CLAD/BCLAD programs **were combined** with special education credential programs.

# **The student record system was revised** to be more user-friendly. An internal database has been created to assure that records can be shared electronically among faculty and staff on a need to know basis.

**Question #7: What are the strengths and weaknesses of the CSOE?**

Based on the documentation that was provided to the Western Michigan University evaluation team and review of the field notes collected from the interviews with all relevant stakeholders, we would prefer to call them “strengths and challenges” of the CSULA, CSOE under its current charter status. The **strengths** are relatively obvious:

# A vision that is commonly shared and acted upon

# Shared governance by faculty and staff, as facilitated by the dean and administrative team
# Ability and willingness of faculty to collaborate and try out solutions to the daunting task of addressing challenges of both quality and quantity shortages of classroom teachers in the greater Los Angeles area

# Assumption of a leadership role on behalf of CSULA in the all-university teacher preparation mission

# Greater recognition of the CSOE in its immediate service area as an institution that cares about educating children in the public schools

# Ability to respond nimbly and relevantly to external requests for assistance by outside agencies and individual educators

# Greater demand for CSOE faculty to serve on local, regional, and state level boards, commissions, and committees that deliberate educational policy reform as it relates to professional educator preparation

# Greater attention to student competency assessment

# Improved CSOE services (e.g., advising, mentoring, recordkeeping) that facilitate student empowerment

# High morale and level of trust among the CSOE “family” (alumni, students, staff, faculty, administration)

A number of challenges continue to confront the CSOE. They are not perceived to be severe weaknesses at this point, but could become so without vigilant attention and action by the CSOE community in the near future (next 2-3 years):

1. **Communication:**

   # Students—although they expressed positive impressions of the faculty and programs being offered and the changes being made by the CSOE, most of the students interviewed revealed little or no understanding of the charter status of the CSOE and what it meant to them, their program, or to their future. Perhaps a charter newsletter, regular updates on the CSULA, CSOE Web pages, and/or invited student-faculty forums around topics generated as a result of the charter status would be helpful to inform the CSOE student body regarding their programs and ultimately the teaching profession, at least in the greater Los Angeles area.

   # Alumni—targeted information and communication with key alumni in the field can help the CSOE better inform its constituent groups, build a strong base of support for ongoing initiatives that impact the schools, and serve as a productive recruiting tool for future students and alumni of the CSOE.
CSULA faculty external to the CSOE—The “blended programs” undergraduate teacher education discussion, development, and implementation with Arts and Letters, Natural and Social Sciences, and Human Services, and other professional colleagues in the CSULA faculty family external to the CSOE have helped to ameliorate some of the tension that was apparently created when the CSOE was granted charter status and exempted from a number of curriculum approval regulations formerly imposed on the School. The CSOE could share its assessment plans and materials with other university committees.

Other CSU system teacher education programs—Evidence was presented that other California State University system institutions are inquiring about charter status, its meanings, and implications for their programs of professional educator preparation. Again, perhaps the CSOE and other non-CSOE CSULA faculty colleagues could sponsor seminars for interested CSU education faculty to share their problems, promises, and challenges of mounting a charter School of Education and sustaining the momentum of change and reform growing out of such a movement.

Schools, Colleges, Departments of Education (SCDEs) nationwide—The CSULA, CSOE experiment and experience over the last five years must be of interest and importance to peer units throughout the country. As data continue to be collected, analyzed, and published regarding the growing critical classroom teacher shortage in the USA in the coming decade, SCDEs throughout the land are going to be under ever-increasing pressure to respond not only to quantity- and quality-driven pressures to respond to this demand, but also to alternative certification of entry-level teachers. CSOE faculty presentations at forums such as the annual meetings of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) and the American Educational Research Association (AERA) will be helpful in communicating strategies and opportunities for charter reform to teacher education colleagues throughout the land. Also, publications such as the one by Hafner and Slovacek (1998) in the leading scholarly journals and other CSOE internal publications will be well received by the SCDE community.

Goal orientation/goal displacement: A continuing challenge for faculty members of the CSOE will be to “keep their eye on the prize.” A constant and vigilant pursuit of the mission and goals of the CSOE is, as both faculty and staff interview groups reiterated several times, “hard work.” It would be easy to become so enamored with membership and involvement on cross-division and program clusters and teams that the final, underlying goal of the CSOE—improvement of both the quality and quantity of teacher education graduates, which will improve teaching and learning in the Southern California and LA area schools—is lost in the process. However, with continuing and increased attention by the faculty to student assessment, the infusion of technology in the curricular process, the blending of content and pedagogy at the undergraduate level, improved communication with all relevant constituent groups, careful implementation of the strategic plan, and continuous internal formative evaluation processes, the faculty of the CSOE will capture that prize.

While not able to attribute all aspects of the current operations and accomplishments of this academic unit to its status as a “charter school of education,” the evaluation team has been able
to cite many accomplishments, within and outside the university, that are associated with school and/or the faculty, staff, and administration of the CSOE.

Some of the highlights of the evaluation are described below.

1. There is an extremely high level of faculty and staff enthusiasm for the direction and the way in which the CSOE is operating.

2. There is a feeling of worth, value, and ownership within the CSOE that is reflected in actions as well as in words.

3. Collaboration and interdisciplinary opportunities and work within the CSOE have given new shape to the faculty’s efforts to address real needs and situations in clinical settings as well as cooperating schools and agencies.

4. The School as a Whole (SAW) form of governance is an innovative approach to university governance and one that should be considered for adoption on a broader scale at CSULA and elsewhere.

5. The CSOE has acted with considerable reserve and not in a thoughtless and reckless fashion as some might have projected. Proposals for changes and other actions are developed, submitted to the SAW for review, and approved by the CSOE as represented on SAW.

6. The CSOE has demonstrated its ability to be responsive to societal needs in a timely manner and to seek collaborative relationships with its primary stakeholders and clientele.

7. Performance/outcomes assessment is developing in an appropriate manner within the CSOE. While not complete or fully developed, it provides a viable test bed for further refinement and strengthening.

8. The CSOE enjoys strong and supportive leadership, which is essential for continuing success and sustainability.

However, no organization or any operating status is likely to result in a perfect system. The CSOE has a fair number of critics across the campus. We have generally concluded that the critics can be identified with one of three groups:

1. Those who are uninformed or misinformed about the rights and responsibilities of charter status

2. Those who have traditionally been in positions to control the course and curriculum approval process

3. Those who are envious of a unit that has been given the authority to define its own direction, with primary accountability for its actions to its school’s inclusive system of governance, and
then accountability to the standards of its state and national accrediting agencies, and then the directives and requirements of the university within the CSU structure.

There are some specific recommendations that we offer for consideration.

1. The conflict about university curriculum approval processes since formation of the Charter School of Education has pointed out limitations in the responsiveness and effectiveness of the traditional process from the perspective of a profession that is trying to effect change in schools. The CSULA Provost, Faculty Senate, and Teacher Education Subcommittee need to recognize that the CSOE curriculum approval process rests with the Charter School and is not subject to duplicative approval processes. Changes in university curricular governance structures should not relieve the Charter School of Education of the responsibility to consult with other units in the design of curriculum but must grant it sufficient authority over teacher education programs to enable innovation and responsive curriculum change.

2. The Charter School of Education is constantly challenged in advising and communicating with students by rapid turnover of students, because many credential-only students are not enrolled in degree programs, and rapid changes in programs and curriculum necessitated by credential requirements and/or in response to societal demands. Although much has been done to improve the ability of the Charter School of Education to communicate with current and prospective students, this area must continue to receive attention. Concentrated attention to use of the Charter School of Education home page and of electronic mail has the potential to improve general communication while advancing the use of technology in education.

3. California State University, Los Angeles, and the Charter School of Education have invested in technology for use by faculty and students. Investment in this area to date has focused more on hardware and software than on human resource development. There is a need to develop strategies for faculty development that have the potential to motivate faculty to invest the time required to use instructional technology in ways that complement their curricular visions.

4. Develop and maintain a system of communication with current students, graduates, and other CSULA faculty and administrators that describes activities and plans, with particular emphasis on opportunities for involvement in creative and innovative programs designed to fulfill the mission of the CSOE.

5. Enhance and continue efforts to develop appropriate assessments of performance outcomes for all CSOE programs and students. Also, continue to offer assistance to other units at CSULA. Particular attention should be paid to assuring that the assessments are related to the goals of the unit as well as the mission of the university.
6. Share the story of the CSOE at CSULA, including problems and failed efforts as well as successes, with the broader profession, including university and systems-level administrators.

Clearly, the CSOE has made substantial progress in building partnerships and demonstrating an ability to work effectively with K-12 schools in its service area. Parallel with these efforts, there is a demonstrated commitment to addressing the demand for courses and programs for noncredentialed teachers, and they are doing this in some creative programmatic and scheduling ways. An exemplary approach to student assessment is developing, which could be replicated in other schools across the university.

Certainly, there is substantial interest among a number of faculty in the use of technology to improve both the quality of instruction and its delivery. Situated in a richly diverse cultural setting enjoyed by few teacher education programs, the faculty recognizes the opportunities it has for including this element in the curriculum as well as in field-based activities. Importantly, there seems to be a general recognition among faculty, staff, and administrators that with the charter status comes an increased responsibility for accountability; this is reflected in both actions and words.

The CSOE has responded well to its charge, and it has answered its critics in an open and admirable way. Probably the two worst threats to its future are (1) an internal or external wavering of support for risk taking by this academic unit and its personnel as they attempt to redefine themselves and serve the real educational needs of society and (2) the failure to recognize the time, energy, and effort that is required to meet both campus and field-based demands for professional educators.
Final Report of the External Evaluation
of the
Charter School of Education
California State University, Los Angeles

Introduction

In response to an invitation of interest (December 10, 1998), Dr. Jerry G. Horn, Principal Research Associate in The Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University, indicated his willingness to serve as an external evaluator of the Charter School of Education, California State University at Los Angeles, and to conduct a summative evaluation of this academic unit. This document represents the formal report of this evaluation. The report is intended to serve as a description and record of the study and as a source of information for improvements and decision making.

As described in the Common Standards Document, prepared for the California Committee on Accreditation and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education in 1997, Cal State LA, founded in 1947 by action of the California State Legislature, is a comprehensive university offering programs of higher education in more than 50 academic and professional fields. The university is organized into six schools that house nearly 50 academic departments and divisions: the School of Arts and Letters, the School of Business and Economics, the Charter School of Education, the School of Engineering and Technology, the School of Health and Human Services, and the School of Natural and Social Sciences. The reputation of Cal State LA as a center of learning attracts students from all areas of the United States and from many foreign countries. One quarter of the students are engaged in postbaccalaureate study in programs leading to master’s and a joint-doctoral degree with UCLA in Special Education; teaching, service and specialist credentials; certificates; and other types of programs that prepare them for professional advancement.

Located at the eastern edge of Los Angeles and adjacent to San Gabriel Valley cities of Alhambra and Monterey Park, Cal State LA occupies nearly 300 acres on a hilltop site located within five miles of the Los Angeles Civic Center and downtown area. The campus is located at a major hub of the 10 and 710 Freeways and is served by a direct Metrolink station and buses, providing transportation to 35 communities in the San Gabriel Valley and to other nearby Los Angeles communities. Although on-campus housing is provided for approximately 1,000 students, Cal State LA is primarily a commuter campus; and the Charter School of Education offers most of its courses from 4:00 - 10:00 PM and on Saturdays to accommodate its constituency of employed professionals.
In this same document, the following statements are included in the description of the institutional mission of CSULA.

California State University, Los Angeles is an academic community offering a comprehensive range of liberal arts and professional programs that prepare students for success in advanced study, in their careers, and throughout their lives. The University is committed to free scholarly inquiry and to academic excellence in undergraduate, graduate, and other postbaccalaureate and continuing education programs. This commitment underlies strong educational programs as well as research, scholarship, and creative and community service activities designed for the needs of a uniquely diverse student body. The excellence of these programs derives from a highly qualified faculty and support staff. These individuals are the keystone of the institution.

In 1993, Dr. Allen Mori, as dean of the School of Education, with the support of the CSULA president, Dr. James Rosser, sought authorization from the California State University chancellor, Dr. Barry Munitz, for the School of Education to be the first “charter” school of education in California. Chancellor Munitz approved the charter status of the School of Education for a five-year period beginning with the submission of a program document in June 1995. According to Hafner and Slovacek (1998),

The impetus for the charter came from several areas: the changes in the demographics in the school age population in California, the reform movement and the restructuring of schools and higher education in the US, the emerging evidence for collaboration in school partnerships, and the increasing attention given to teaching and accountability for learning across the K-18 education continuum. The Charter status would permit the school to bypass many institutional and state regulatory constraints and enables it to experiment with other schools and school districts, and to test new and creative solutions to problems that have become obstacles to the success of students in urban schools (p. 55).

With the granting of this authorization, certain institutional rules and regulations that traditionally governed the operational activities of this academic unit could be waived in recognition of its efforts to engage in major educational reform. This event initiated a succession of discussions, meetings, and faculty retreats shaped around a systemic process to (1) rethink the philosophy, purposes, and curriculum outcomes of the School and its programs to meet the changing needs of practice in urban schools and related institutions and (2) adopt a model of governance to attain this new vision of professional preparation. A new vision statement was one outcome of these activities as well as an identification of a companion set of goals:

1. Create collaborative programs that interact successfully with public schools.
2. Prepare teachers who are well grounded in subject matter and teaching methods.
3. Measure the effectiveness of teaching practices in real world classrooms.

4. Conduct research that leads to positive change in teaching practices.

5. Close the achievement gap for poor and minority children.

The mission of the CSOE, as publicly presented in information brochures and other documents, is as follows:

As a Charter School, the School of Education at California State University, Los Angeles, is committed to leading educators in their efforts to transform public schools.

The School offers a coordinated, multidisciplinary approach for the education of children and youth.

Collaborating within the Charter School of Education and with public schools in the urban Los Angeles area, the faculty prepares professionals to be learner advocates who demonstrate competence in subject matter and professional knowledge of skills and who are dedicated to improving the educational environment of all children and youth.

A slightly differently worded version of the goals, an additional set of faculty-identified core values, and an organizational committee chart of the Charter School of Education (CSOE) are included in an information packet prepared for new staff and faculty. The core values are explained in this way.

To support this new mission statement, faculty developed **core values** that undergird curriculum, field experiences, governance issues, and student services. Faculty-identified core values reflect a strong emphasis on the following:

6. use of inquiry and reflection as leading to readiness for change

7. preparation of educators in sound curriculum and instructional practices

8. accountability for learner advocates

9. role of professionals as learner advocates

10. appreciation of linguistic and cultural diversity of the population as an asset

11. use of technology as a means of transforming schools
A continuing internal formative evaluation and a self-study (Hafner, 1997) of the CSOE have been conducted to assess its progress using a variety of information sources; i.e., professors, administrators, staff, students, alumni, employers of alumni, and community members. In the words of Hafner and Slovacek (1998, p. 63), “The preliminary findings so far are encouraging: the Charter School of Education remains a work in progress.”

In addition, the CSOE and its programs were submitted for reaccreditation review by the California Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in Fall 1997. The results of these accreditation reviews were very favorable. The school became the first institution in California to have its credential programs accredited under the new COA standards and procedures, satisfying all these new standards without any stipulations or suggestions for improvements. In addition, NCATE granted the school full and continuing accreditation in all four standards categories (curriculum and instruction, candidate assessment, faculty evaluation and qualifications, governance and accountability) with no weaknesses cited. Additional professional accreditation is maintained for specific CSOE programs by groups such as the Council of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP); the American Speech, Language and Hearing Association (ASHSA); the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP); the International Reading Association; and the Association for the Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired (AERBVI).

The results of the external evaluation, authorized by the dean of the CSOE and the president of CSULA, are the primary focus of this report. In February 1999, The Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University was informed that it had been selected to conduct an external evaluation of the Charter School of Education. With this notification was a description of the scope of the work, including the purpose, sources of data available, and possible evaluation questions. Initially, it was planned that the evaluation activities would be conducted during late spring and early summer 1999 with submission of the findings by August 1999. However, due to conditions surrounding an unsettled faculty contract with the system as a whole, administrative representatives of CSULA and The Evaluation Center agreed that the on-site team visit and the study should be delayed until Fall 1999 with a reporting date in early 2000.

The remaining sections of this report include the procedures, findings (including a question-by-question response), and concluding statements, with a limited set of recommendations based on the external evaluation.

**Procedures**

From an initial set of possible evaluation questions developed by CSULA, the project director for the evaluation, Dr. Jerry Horn, developed a projected Task Plan and Evaluation Work Plan. These working documents were submitted to Dean Allen Mori on February 24, 1999, with an explanation that one question from the initial list of possible questions (What specific accomplishments since 1994 can be attributed to the CSOE charter status?) would be difficult to fully answer from this study. A clear line of cause and effect would be nearly impossible to establish due to a number of factors, i.e., limited span and timing of the study, other
interventions during the time of the charter status of the School of Education, etc. However, the evaluation team indicated that it would provide as much information as it could that related to this question.

In the communication of February 24, 1999, a request also was made for the CSOE to provide copies of the following materials for each evaluation team member.

- CSOE Mission Statement
- Conceptual Framework
- Assessment Framework
- Internal Self-Study Document, August 1997
- NCATE and COA accreditation documents, Fall 1997

The Task Plan was discussed with Dean Mori via telephone and email, and it was accepted with minor changes. (Dates for certain tasks were modified to accommodate the agreed-upon delay of the on-site visit from Spring to Fall 1999.) A copy of the accepted version is located in Appendix A.

The Evaluation Work Plan included the evaluation questions that would guide the work of this evaluation, and it required review at a higher level on the CSULA campus. The final Evaluation Work Plan, which was only slightly modified from the original, was returned to The Evaluation Center with President Rosser’s signature of approval on September 10, 1999. (The Task Plan with President Rosser’s approval was received by Dean Mori with a cover memorandum from Provost Margaret Hartman, with copies to M. Cates and J. Rosser, on August 24, 1999.) This work plan is presented in Table 1.

To conduct the evaluation, a team of four persons was responsible for reviewing relevant materials, participating in a three-day on-site visit to the CSOE, and writing draft sections of the final report. Members of the team are listed below:

**Chair**
Jerry G. Horn, Principal Research Associate
The Evaluation Center
Western Michigan University

**Members**
Mary Harris, Dean and Professor
College of Education and Human Development
University of North Dakota

Kenneth McKinley, Professor
College of Education
Oklahoma State University

Gary Miron, Principal Research Associate
The Evaluation Center
Western Michigan University
# Table 1
California State University, Los Angeles–Evaluation of the Charter School of Education
Evaluation Work Plan
(Revised 8/19/99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Procedure(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Has the Charter School of Education (CSOE) met its goals? If so, to what extent?</td>
<td>A. Students B. Faculty and Staff C. Admin. D. Documents</td>
<td>A - B. Survey and interview C. Interview D. Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What specific accomplishments since 1994 are perceived to have been strongly facilitated by the charter status of the CSOE?</td>
<td>A. Students B. Faculty and Staff C. Admin. D. Documents</td>
<td>A - B. Survey and interview C. Interview D. Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is the level of satisfaction of the faculty with the CSOE program?</td>
<td>A. CSOE Faculty B. Faculty outside CSOE who have been involved in development of blended programs C. Senate Executive Committee Educational Policy Committee General Education Subcom. Teacher Education Subcom.</td>
<td>A. Survey and interview B. Interview C. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What is the level of satisfaction of the administrators both inside and outside CSOE with the CSOE program?</td>
<td>A. Administration</td>
<td>A. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What is the level of satisfaction of the students with the CSOE program?</td>
<td>A. Students</td>
<td>A. Survey and interview (focus group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What is the level of satisfaction of the graduates with the CSOE program?</td>
<td>A. Graduates (former students)</td>
<td>A. Survey and interview (focus group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Question</td>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Procedure(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the CSOE?</td>
<td>A. Students (current and former)</td>
<td>A. Survey and interview (focus group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>B. Survey and interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Administration</td>
<td>C. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Documents</td>
<td>D. Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How does the CSOE use standards and assessments to measure its students’ achievements?</td>
<td>A. Faculty</td>
<td>A. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Administration</td>
<td>B. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Documents</td>
<td>C. Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How does the CSOE assume accountability for student outcomes?</td>
<td>A. Faculty</td>
<td>A. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Administration</td>
<td>B. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Documents</td>
<td>C. Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To what degree is the current administrative and organizational structure effective?</td>
<td>A. Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>A. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Administration</td>
<td>B. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Documents</td>
<td>C. Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What type of governance is appropriate for charter status within and outside the campus and university system?</td>
<td>A. Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>A. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Administration</td>
<td>B. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Documents</td>
<td>C. Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. What is the level of quality of the CSOE’s instruction and curriculum?</td>
<td>A. Students</td>
<td>A. Interview and focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Faculty</td>
<td>B. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Documents</td>
<td>C. Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is there evidence that collaboration and partnerships guide decision making?</td>
<td>A. Faculty</td>
<td>A. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Administration</td>
<td>B. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Collaborative Agencies</td>
<td>C. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Documents</td>
<td>D. Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What evidence is there that cultural and linguistic diversity are infused into the CSOE’s curriculum, instruction, and faculty development?</td>
<td>A. Students</td>
<td>A. Interview and focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Faculty</td>
<td>B. Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Documents</td>
<td>C. Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How is technology infused into curriculum and instruction?</td>
<td>A. Faculty</td>
<td>A. Survey and interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Students</td>
<td>B. Direct observation and interview and survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Facilities and Classrooms/labs</td>
<td>C. Direct observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Team members were selected on the basis of their experience and the perspectives they could bring to this effort. Horn, McKinley, and Harris have each had more than 20 years of experience in higher education as faculty members and college administrators as well as public school teaching experience. They are familiar with recognized state and national standards and the processes by which programs, academic units, and universities are reviewed and accredited. Miron brought a unique perspective to this effort, since he and Horn are currently engaged in evaluating K-12 charter school initiatives in Michigan, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania. The project director, Jerry Horn, had primary responsibility for selecting the team members. However, resumes of persons under consideration were submitted to Dean Mori for his review.

The director of The Evaluation Center, Dr. Daniel Stufflebeam, was consulted during the process of developing the evaluation plan. He provided insight and suggestions that helped shape the plan and procedures.

As can be noted in the evaluation plan, a process commonly referred to as triangulation (use of multiple data collection procedures and/or sources of information) was employed to gain different perspectives of the CSOE, to verify initial findings, to gain broader-based input using different procedures and/or sources, and to enhance the credibility of the external evaluation.

In March 1999, Jerry Horn conducted a two-day, pre-study site visit to CSULA. The purpose of this visit was to develop an overall understanding of the CSOE and CSULA; to meet key individuals; to develop plans for the full team’s visit; to review resource materials and make recommendations for other reference materials; to establish a rapport with members of the CSOE; and to affirm the expectations and expected uses of the evaluation study.

An extensive collection of self-studies, accreditation reports and related documents, assessment procedures, etc., was made available to the team during its three-day visit on November 8-10, 1999. A tentative schedule for the visit was prepared by the team chair and submitted to Dean Mori and his staff for review. Using the Evaluation Work Plan as a guide, a retired faculty member and former associate dean, Dr. Lamar Mayer, fleshed out the schedule and arranged interviews, focus group meetings, off-campus site visits, and document review time for the team. A copy of the schedule is located in Appendix B.

During the day, team members carried out their tasks individually. They met in the evenings for review of their observations, identification of issues or questions that should be pursued the next day, and summarization of observations in the discussion of possible findings to be included in this report.

As noted in the schedule, an exit interview was conducted on the last day of the team visit. Participants in this meeting were Provost Hartman, Dean Mori, administrative personnel in the CSOE, and the evaluation team. Horn provided an overview of the process, plans for completion of the study, and comments related to overall perceptions and findings.

A list of persons with whom at least one member of the team met is provided in Appendix C. This list is incomplete in that all persons who were in the selected classes are not mentioned, as
well as certain individuals who were engaged in an informal way during the visit. All comments were accepted, and each of the team members took extensive field notes. Verbatim tape recordings of the interviews/meetings were not made. In the text of the report, direct quotes do occur, but they are not associated with the name of the person who made the comment. Rights of human subjects and the right of anyone to refuse to respond to any questions were honored.

Limitations in this study pertain primarily to the relative newness of the charter status of the school, varying extent and knowledge of the CSOE among interviewees, the dynamic nature of the unit across a more than 4-year period, and lack of resources to conduct more extensive interviews and data analyses.

Findings

This section of the report contains a question-by-question format with a statement of findings and identification of the data that support each finding. Obviously, some questions are more straightforward than others, and the opportunity for the CSOE to address the issues by action varies from question to question.

Question #1: Has the Charter School of Education (CSOE) met its goals? If so, to what extent?

The California State University, Los Angeles, Charter School of Education lists the following goals (California State University, Los Angeles, Charter School of Education Programs for the Preparation of Professional Educators {Brochure}, 1999):

# Create collaborative programs that interact successfully with public schools.
# Prepare teachers who are well grounded in subject matter and teaching methods.
# Measure the effectiveness of teaching practices in real world classrooms.
# Conduct research that leads to positive change in teaching practices.
# Close the achievement gap for poor and minority children.

These Charter School goals build upon the core values and goals stated in the 1997 documentation prepared by the CSOE for the joint accreditation/reaccreditation visit of the California Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (CSULA CSOE Common Standards Document, Appendix A, 1997). These goals were affirmed by the Western Michigan University evaluation team through interviews, a review of survey data, and perusal of written information documenting the goals of the CSOE and their achievement.

2 November 8-10, 1999. California State University, Los Angeles.
It is obvious that the CSULA, School of Education under its charter status is a “work in progress.” Although it is difficult to precisely measure the achievement of these goals, especially in the form and style that they are stated, it is abundantly clear that the CSOE, through the collective efforts of its administration, faculty, and staff, is making remarkable progress in reaching its stated goals. The faculty feel good about their work and the mission and direction they have charted to reach these organizational goals. As stated in the CSOE conceptual framework document, this process, as it is for any social service organization, is a “journey, not a blueprint.” For the faculty of the CSOE, this journey has literally taken on almost a missionary zeal, in that they know they have been given relief and deregulation of their operation perhaps like no other peer professional education preparation unit in the United States. This places the CSOE in a “fishbowl” environment with its attendant challenges to communicate with its relevant constituent groups and respond to the ever-present demand for accountability for actions and results. Even though the charter experiment has only really been operational for four years (effectively, the first two years were utilized for planning, conceptualization, and development), there is evidence that the CSOE has done an exemplary job of paying attention to and striving to meet its goals.

We think the CSOE is closest to achieving the goals relating to

4. collaboration through its efforts with the Accelerated School
5. preparing teachers well grounded in subject matter and teaching methods through the development and implementation of the “blended” programs linking content with pedagogical training for undergraduate students preparing for California Level I teaching certification
6. closing the achievement gap for poor and minority children, again in its close collaborative work with the Los Angeles Unified charter Accelerated School

There is less evidence to judge the achievement of the related charter school goals:

1. measuring effectiveness of (its graduates’) teaching practices in real world classrooms
2. the conduct of research that leads to positive change in teaching practices. (However, we did see evidence that, as faculty generate new clusters and teams across divisions and program boundaries to discuss and develop new and innovative solutions to teaching and learning challenges presented to them in collaboration with K-12 schools in the greater Los Angeles area, they are applying an assessment mentality and building a research culture based on the following “real-world” questions: “Is this an improvement?” “Is this quality?” “What difference does or will this make?”)

In addition to the charter school goals listed above, the CSOE utilizes a “Charter School Evaluation Template: Expected Outcomes” (see bulleted list, Appendix D) to serve as a guideline and reference point in meeting and updating its annual organizational goals. This template includes the following major components:

# Administration/Governance

# Curriculum and Instruction
The CSOE has made exemplary progress on a number of the “expected outcomes” that it established for itself. If we were to rank the seven outcomes listed above into three “grades,”—‘A’, ‘B’, or ‘C’—relative to progress on achieving these outcomes, it would be as follows:

**‘A’: Administration/Governance and Faculty:** There are clearly definable and observable evidences of a shift in roles; greater shared decision making; increased collaboration intra-CSOE and inter-CSOE, LA, K-12 system; greater sense of empowerment on the part of faculty and staff; and greater recognition of and increased communication between the CSOE and its primary constituent groups.

**‘B’: Curriculum and Instruction; Resources; Students; and Community & Parents:** Although collaborative forms of instruction (blended programs) and evaluation of instruction are being giving increased attention, there is less evidence of the infusion of inquiry methods and technology into instruction. Students are being exposed to and provided training in pedagogy/instructional skills. Resources are being more closely aligned with the mission of the CSOE through funding for summer school offerings and creative reallocations of the budget to support focused workload assignments. The impact on community and parents appears to be emerging as work with the collaborative schools expands; but it is a work in progress that will need to be repeatedly identified as an expected outcome.

**‘C’: Facility and Environment:** More creative scheduling is taking place to accommodate students’ schedules at both the undergraduate level (linking courses: 100/400 = content/pedagogy) and graduate level (administrator credential cohorts). However, we did not see much in the way of “creative use of space” or “visually exciting non-traditional” classrooms.

**Question #2: What specific accomplishments since 1994 are perceived to have been strongly facilitated by the charter status of the CSOE?**

Even though the charter status was granted in 1993, it was not implemented until 1995, building upon 2 years of discussion, dialogue, planning, and development. A remarkable change has taken place in the CSOE and between it and its constituent groups. We recognize the following important accomplishments, both perceived and real, that have been facilitated by charter status being granted to the CSULA, CSOE:
The creation of the **School as A Whole (SAW) Committee**. This form of shared governance and decision making gives all permanent employees (administrators, faculty, and staff) an equal voice in the important decisions and changes affecting the mission and goals of the CSOE and the people who work there. The administration appears to go out of its way to hear the collective voices of the faculty and staff and to implement their ideas. It was made clear at the outset by the dean that the only items “off the table” are the conditions/requirements/issues reflected in the employee union contract. Although the dean has administratively responsibility for the budget, the faculty and staff have a major voice in the use of resources for specific activities.

**Leadership of the dean.** The positive leadership style of the dean was cited repeatedly in the interview process with faculty and staff. It probably would not have been (as) likely without some major and dramatic change processes such as the charter status being introduced into the system.

The change of the CSOE faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) document to recognize and reward service and the “scholarship of application” (Boyer, 1990). The CSOE is moving as close to actualizing the ideal of moving toward engagement with K-12 professionals and their inherent “problems of practice” as any institution of its kind in the United States.

The **faculty** has gained **control of its mission**: has aligned its collective activities and efforts with that mission; and strives, in all of its major deliberations, to address that mission.

The establishment of clusters and teams allows faculty members to work creatively and without prejudice across internal division and program boundaries. This programmatic change, the waiver of university regulations regarding the review of curriculum changes, and the dean’s leadership have probably been the most dramatic evidence(s) of the change in the culture of the CSOE in responding to calls for training and technical assistance in the K-12 system of the greater Los Angeles area.

**Response to** the daunting task of helping the state of California and the greater Los Angeles area address the complex and critical problem of qualified and fully credentialed classroom teacher shortages. The blended undergraduate initiatives such as the Urban Learning and Model Teacher Education Program are primary examples.

Development of a “**can-do**” collaborative attitude. The LA Unified Charter Accelerated School is an example in the external environment. The blended undergraduate academic/teacher preparation program is one of several internally.

The **professional educator preparation** as an “all-university” responsibility was moved to the top of the CSULA agenda.

Perhaps helped influence the CSU chancellor to make **teacher education a priority in the California State University system**.
# Changed the **summer session** to a **self-supporting** mechanism and at the same time reserved 60 student teaching slots from the state-supported budget to assist graduates to become credentialed in a more timely fashion.

# **Offerings** such as the CLAD/BCLAD programs **were combined** with special education credential programs.

# **The student record system was revised** to be more user friendly. An internal database has been created to assure that records can be shared electronically among faculty and staff on a need to know basis.

**Question #3: What is the level of satisfaction of the faculty with the CSOE program?**

CSOE faculty and staff expressed strong satisfaction with the program and its charter status. In fact, the comments expressed in interviews at times almost bordered on missionary zeal. Although staff members (defined herein as secretarial and administrative assistants throughout the administrative offices and academic departments of the CSOE) were not included as a specific group in this question initially, their comments and beliefs about the CSOE are included in this narrative.

Staff are especially pleased to be included in the School as a Whole (SAW) and to have their voice(s) heard in the deliberations leading to shared decision making regarding program initiatives and changes in the CSOE. They also express a sense of greater ownership in their work and how it is organized and carried out. Staff say they have the freedom to try new systems and new ways of doing things without the fear that failure or less than full success will “doom” them in their future efforts. They collectively believe they are part of the team and have a stake in the success of the changes being catalyzed by the CSOE.

Staff reported that the charter status is hard work; but the evaluation team sensed, just as we did with faculty, that this professional endeavor was meaningful and fulfilling and was perceived to be work with a sense of purpose. Staff related communicating with other individuals at CSULA who are in peer positions outside the CSOE who expressed either dislike, suspicion, or a sense of mystification about “what goes on in the CSOE.”

CSOE faculty who participated in the November 1999 interview process conducted by the Western Michigan University evaluation team expressed positive satisfaction and a growing sense of pride regarding the programs and accomplishments of the CSULA, CSOE under its charter status. Some of the major points made by faculty who participated in the evaluation interviews were the following:

# The charter status of the CSOE has created a culture of open, enhanced communication and collaboration internally among the faculty, staff, and students.
The charter status has generated new, open, and enhanced avenues of communication and collaboration between the CSOE and K-12 schools in its service area.

CSOE faculty are willing to participate in, contribute to, and spend huge amounts of time on committees. It has been documented that this kind of professional behavior “counts,” is valued by colleagues (including the administration), and that there is follow-through whereby faculty can observe the fruits of their labors and feel comfortable in being held accountable for the outcomes.

The CSOE has assumed a leadership role that the faculty think influenced a call by the CSU chancellor and the CSULA president for teacher education to be an all-system, all-university responsibility.

The faculty perceive their work to be cutting edge, risk taking, engaging and empowering.

Faculty say they can think, share ideas, and problem solve together without fear of a loss of ownership.

Faculty think there is a clear focus and unity of purpose of the CSOE jointly led by the administration and faculty.

There is a jointly held sense of movement toward achievement of the CSOE goals.

Faculty enjoy and appreciate the freedom from university turf battles and the ability to respond quickly to outside initiatives and challenges that the charter status allows.

Faculty are stimulated by the creativity and cross-fertilization of ideas that open group processes under the charter status have generated.

Faculty appreciate the willingness and support of the administration, led by the dean, to allocate and/or move resources to facilitate problem solving and research initiatives generated by the several CSOE clusters and teams.

One faculty member expressed a sense of frustration with the charter culture. Some expressions of problems or hindrances that this faculty person perceives in the current CSOE environment follow:

Faculty must join a cluster or team to have their work recognized, valued, and rewarded, thus suffering the potential of losing academic identity in working together. There is not much recognition for individual work.

*Change* is the operative term around here. Change for the sake of change is not always good.
This charter status creates some pockets of jealousy and ill will in the rest of the campus community.

Question #4: What is the level of satisfaction of administrators both inside and outside the CSOE with the CSOE program?

Although the length and composition of the lists of accomplishments of the Charter School of Education that might be composed by administrators vary, all recognize that the charter has helped California State University, Los Angeles, to be recognized within the California State University system for responsiveness in teacher education and the establishment of the Charter School of Education has been associated with improved morale, efficiency, and effectiveness of the education unit. Administrators, both inside and outside the CSOE, support its mission and appreciate the status that the charter has brought to the Charter School of Education both within the university and in its external relationships with schools and with professional and policy communities.

The satisfaction level of administrators within the CSOE is exceptional. These administrators are euphoric about the extent of progress that has been made since the establishment of the charter. The ability of the Charter School of Education to plan and carry out responsive programs, the spirit of cooperation that has developed among faculty and staff, and the potential of their work to improve urban education inspire and motivate administrators within the unit.

Some administrators and faculty outside the Charter School of Education perceive that the unit has advanced its mission at the expense of others who share some portion of that mission, whether in preparing school personnel or in providing general education and liberal arts curricula that support studies in pedagogy. Some of these administrators represent their dissatisfaction as more with the style of interaction than with the substance of CSOE’s programs and proposals. There is no denying that the concept of a charter releases the chartered unit from traditional administrative structures in ways that change its relationship to other units. The resulting dynamic has the potential to polarize the larger unit around issues of authority for programs and distribution of resources. This potential for structural conflict has been realized at California State University, Los Angeles, and is of particular concern to those faculty and administrators outside the Charter School of Education who perceive their missions to be most closely linked to those of the Charter School.

Question #5: What is the level of satisfaction of the students with the CSOE program?

Students are generally quite satisfied with the CSOE program. This finding was supported by evidence provided by the CSOE as well as by interview data collected by the evaluation team during its visit in November 1999. Specifically, the evidence provided by the CSOE included the following:

- Student survey results (October 1999)
- Customer Service Questionnaire (1997)
- Self-Study/Evaluation (August 1997)
These latter two documents actually contained mixed results, while the first document contained the most positive indications that the students were satisfied. It should be pointed out that the positive results included in the first document are also based on a survey that had a better design, was larger in scope, had a better response rate, and specifically addressed questions regarding the level of satisfaction with the curriculum and instruction of the program. When asked about the quality of the student evaluation data collected, the dean admitted that there was a need to maintain better data on alumni, especially those working in the field.

From interviews with students during the site visit, it became clear that they were essentially satisfied with all aspects of their experience at CSOE aside from the state of the facilities, particularly the rest rooms. In the words of one student, “The bathrooms are gross and terrible, the facilities are a dump, they’re always under construction, and the grounds are not fantastic.”

The decision to provide summer courses through continuing education was not supported by many students. One student reported that it was too expensive for her to take summer courses through continuing education, citing that the cost jumped from $80 per unit to $125 per unit.

The students were satisfied with the faculty at the CSOE. As one student noted, “Since many of the faculty work in public schools, they have great ideas to teach that are based on reality.”

A few students voiced concern that some of the CSOE offices that catered to students were not responsive to students and that staff in these offices were—at times—abrupt and rude. Graduates of the program also alluded to less than satisfactory service from administrative and student service offices at CSOE. Further questioning revealed that some of these problems may be the result of the students’ restricted schedules and limited time on campus.

The students were impressed with the extensive support/help programs available at CSOE, especially for students who were struggling. One faculty member confirmed that they used all sorts of support for the weaker student, but pointed out that there was no control over the number of courses students could take; some students were taking too many courses, plus working full-time, etc. (However, students who wish to enroll in an overload, i.e., more than 16 units at the postbaccalaureate level, must gain permission through a petition process.)

While students indicated that they were satisfied with the CSOE program, it was surprising to also discover that the part-time students were largely unaware and/or uninterested in the governance and ongoing changes in the CSOE program. During classroom focus groups with students attending late afternoon and evening classes, students were asked questions such as the following:

- What is a charter school?
- What changed when their school of education became a charter school of education?
- What is the SAW?
- Who are their student representatives?
None of the students could answer these questions. By the end of the meeting, however, several students were keen to learn more about the CSOE program. One of the team members noted that he was unable to leave the classroom before explaining what a charter school actually was.

It is important to note the difference between students attending graduate programs who were informed about CSOE and the uninformed/uninterested students who attend credential classes after working a full day in the public schools. Such a phenomenon is not unlike the situation at other schools or colleges of education. Nevertheless, if CSOE wishes to truly break the mode of operation in colleges of education, further outreach to part-time students should be considered. While the CSOE mails out its newsletter and communicates with colleges of education across the country, it also needs to communicate better with its students. If students are not informed, they cannot participate.

When asked why many students were uninformed and uninterested in the actual changes/improvements taking place, the dean replied that it’s difficult to involve these students because of their transient nature. “We can, however, build student involvement through our new undergraduate programs. Current student involvement comes from full-time students.”

**Question #6: What is the level of satisfaction of the graduates with the CSOE program?**

Graduates are satisfied with the CSOE program. This finding was supported by evidence such as the Customer Service Questionnaire (1997) and the Self-Study/Evaluation (August 1997) as well as interview data collected by the evaluation team during its visit in November 1999. The quality of the data collected in the Customer Service Questionnaire and in the follow-up of alumni was not viewed as very reliable, however, since the response rates were very low.

One key administrator at the university said that the university didn’t know much regarding how well the teachers trained at CSOE are doing after they are placed.

Another source of evidence regarding CSOE success is the recruitment and placement of the graduates from the Charter School of Education. Several of the students and graduates who were interviewed as well as faculty and staff at CSOE indicated that the public schools in Los Angeles were particularly interested in CSOE graduates. The actual study design or scope of the study did not allow a more thorough inquiry of public school personnel regarding this; however, this was also found to be true in the two schools visited by members of the evaluation team.

All the graduates who were interviewed reported that the programs in the CSOE were excellent compared with the programs their colleagues had completed at other universities in the region. They thought they were better prepared to work in urban settings. One CSOE graduate stated that “I was ready to work with developing and implementing a program of inclusion as soon as I started my job in a public school.”

One student noted that the Charter School of Education has a very good reputation, so “when prospective schools know that you were trained there, doors open!” Graduates who were
interviewed thought they were well prepared for teaching and working in the public schools and they were prepared to work in urban settings.

One graduate actually trains interns from different universities. From this experience, she “knows that the CSOE school psychology program is outstanding.” Graduates in school psychology who were interviewed indicated that they thought there is a clear shift in the public schools to the use of alternative assessment of students. All three graduates were ready for this when they started their new jobs in the schools. They all had taken a course on bilingual assessment. One area for improvement, the graduates stressed, was the need for skills in crisis counseling.

When graduates in school psychology were asked what was innovative about their program, the most often heard responses were

# student association
# diagnostic resource center
# alternative assessment
# clinic for videotaped interviews

When asked whether they were ready and prepared to take part in reform/change in their schools, several of the graduates noted that, in fact, they were already involved in school reforms at their respective schools, such as the shift to site-based management. A few of the graduates thought the CSOE needs to provide more instruction/training on classroom management.

Graduates who were interviewed reported that the services provided by the student services office could be improved. Three students noted that they had had a hard time dealing with this particular office. Another graduate student stated that the “administrators in curriculum and student services are indifferent to students.”

The graduates thought their specializing courses at the graduate level were both challenging and of high quality; however, a few graduates said that most of the courses in the teacher preparation program were insulting to the intelligence level of the students. One graduate reported that she was returning for further coursework at the Charter School of Education because “the program is good and the price is right.”

Students reported that they noticed changes in classes/teachers due to feedback provided in course evaluations. For example, “One teacher shifted the course to Saturday due to feedback.” One graduate suggested that “professors and instructors still need to be observed in addition to student evaluation reform. They need to raise standards.” There appears to be limited input from students and graduates in the formal evaluation of the program at the Charter School of Education, although they are routinely taking part in evaluating individual courses.

Students report that there have been some improvements made in the availability and use of technology in the CSOE. Also, the students thought there is a need for more scholarships for the programs offered at the Charter School of Education, not only bilingual programs. One student
suggested that the CSOE should nationally certify students as does California State University, Fullerton. (However, the evaluation team is not aware of a mechanism for national certification or licensing through any college or university. Likely, the student was confused or had been misinformed about the CSU, Fullerton situation.)

**Question #7: What are the strengths and weaknesses of the CSOE?**

Based on the documentation that was provided to the Western Michigan University evaluation team and review of the field notes collected from the interviews with all relevant stakeholders, we would prefer to call them “strengths and challenges” of the CSULA, CSOE under its current charter status. The strengths are relatively obvious:

# A vision that is commonly shared and acted upon

# Shared governance by faculty and staff, as facilitated by the dean and administrative team

# Ability and willingness of faculty to collaborate and try out solutions to the daunting task of addressing challenges of both quality and quantity shortages of classroom teachers in the greater Los Angeles area

# Assumption of a leadership role on behalf of CSULA in the all-university teacher preparation mission

# Greater recognition of the CSOE as an institution that cares about educating children in the public schools of the area

# Ability to respond nimbly and relevantly to external requests for assistance by outside agencies and individual educators

# Greater demand for CSOE faculty to serve on local, regional, and state level boards, commissions, and committees that deliberate educational policy reform as it relates to professional educator preparation

# Greater attention to student competency assessment

# Improved CSOE services (e.g., advising, mentoring, recordkeeping) that facilitate student empowerment

# High morale and level of trust among the CSOE “family” (alumni, students, staff, faculty, administration)

A number of challenges continue to confront the CSOE. They are not perceived to be severe weaknesses at this point, but could become so without vigilant attention and action by the CSOE community in the near future (next 2-3 years):
1. Communication:

# Students—although they expressed positive impressions of the faculty and programs being offered and the changes being made by the CSOE, most of the students interviewed revealed little or no understanding of the charter status of the CSOE and what it meant to them, their program, or to their future. Perhaps a charter newsletter, regular updates on the CSULA CSOE Web pages, and/or invited student-faculty forums around topics generated as a result of the charter status would be helpful to inform the CSOE student body regarding their programs and ultimately the teaching profession, at least in the greater Los Angeles area.

# Alumni—targeted information and communication with key alumni in the field can help the CSOE better inform its constituent groups, build a strong base of support for ongoing initiatives that impact the schools, and serve as a productive recruiting tool for ongoing students and alumni of the CSOE.

# CSULA faculty external to the CSOE—The “blended programs” undergraduate teacher education discussion, development, and implementation with Arts and Letters, Natural and Social Sciences, and Human Services, and other professional colleagues in the CSULA faculty family external to the CSOE have helped to ameliorate some of the tension that was apparently created when the CSOE was granted charter status and exempted from a number of curriculum approval regulations formerly imposed on the School. Another initiative, carefully introduced and cultivated, could be a campus-wide, CSOE-led student assessment program. (See findings under question #9.)

# Other CSU system teacher education programs—Evidence was presented that other California State University system institutions are inquiring about charter status, its meanings, and implications for their programs of professional educator preparation. Again, perhaps the CSOE and other non-CSOE CSULA faculty colleagues could sponsor seminars for interested CSU education faculty to share their problems, promises, and challenges of mounting a charter School of Education and sustaining the momentum of change and reform growing out of such a movement.

# Schools, Colleges, Departments of Education (SCDEs) nationwide—The CSULA, CSOE experiment and experience over the last five years must be of interest and importance to peer units throughout the country. As data continue to be collected, analyzed, and published regarding the growing critical classroom teacher shortage in the USA in the coming decade, SCDEs throughout the land are going to be under ever-increasing pressure to respond not only to quantity- and quality-driven pressures to respond to this demand, but also to alternative certification of entry-level teachers. CSOE faculty presentations at forums such as the annual meetings of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) and the American Educational Research Association (AERA) will be helpful in communicating strategies and opportunities for charter reform to teacher education colleagues throughout the land. Also, publications such as the one by Hafner and Slovacek (1998) in the leading scholarly journals and house organs will be well received by the SCDE community.
2. **Goal orientation/goal displacement**: A continuing challenge for faculty members of the CSOE will be to “keep their eye on the prize.” A constant and vigilant pursuit of the mission and goals of the CSOE is, as both faculty and staff interview groups reiterated several times, “hard work.” It would be easy to become so enamored with membership and involvement on cross-division and program clusters and teams that the final, underlying goal of the CSOE—improvement of both the quality and quantity of teacher education graduates, which will improve teaching and learning in the Southern California and LA area schools—is lost in the process. However, with continuing and increased attention by the faculty to student assessment, the infusion of technology in the curricular process, the blending of content and pedagogy at the undergraduate level, improved communication with all relevant constituent groups, careful implementation of the strategic plan, and continuous internal formative evaluation processes, the faculty of the CSOE will capture that prize.

Question #8: How does the CSOE use standards and assessments to measure its students’ achievements?

The CSOE has made a major commitment to the use of standards and student assessments to guide and to evaluate its development and operations. As stated in the document *Assessment in the Charter School of Education*, “The school is committed to assessment both as having an important intrinsic value in encouraging student development and as a measure of accountability for student learning and later success in practice.” The Student Outcomes Assessment Framework was developed and adopted by the faculty in 1996 as a guide for establishing accountability for student learning at the division and course levels and for student improvement. The *Standards for Student Outcomes* document, adopted in 1998, was developed to operationalize the Framework. A defined set of student outcomes is used in program descriptions and, along with a common format for syllabi and the expected outcomes for each course, they are communicated to students. A variety of procedures are used to assess student outcomes, including portfolios, rubrics, case studies, and authentic assessment strategies. Less course-specific student evaluation feedback of programs is accomplished through graduate and employer follow-up surveys, advisory groups, focus groups, informal feedback from school/practice-based colleagues, etc. Further, state and national accreditations, which require the use of established standards, are maintained. Recent accreditation reviews by NCATE and the California Committee on Accreditation resulted in very positive conclusions. The CSOE continues to remain abreast of and responsive to changing standards of accreditation and professional organizations.

As stated in *Assessment in the Charter School of Education*,

> The purpose of the *Student Outcomes Assessment Framework* is to guide and direct each division, program, and cluster in the Charter School of Education in the assessment of candidates in programs offered by the Charter School linking program quality to candidate competence in professional roles based on the principles of:
preparing candidates with the knowledge, skills, behaviors, and values essential to effective practice;
participating with colleagues in the university, schools and community in offering and improving curricula;
evaluating instruction in ways that are purposeful and authentic; and
assessing and measuring student performance in ways that are constructive, developmental, and continuous.

Included in the *Framework for Student Outcomes Assessment*, adopted by the SAW on May 16, 1996, is an extensive list of expectations for divisions and clusters. These demonstrate a unified commitment and a holistic expectation for the assessment of student outcomes rarely found in higher education. Examples of some of the stated expectations are found below.

Each program within a Division or Cluster has developed or revised student outcomes assessment processes consistent with the Charter School of Education Conceptual Framework and the general characteristics of student outcomes assessment (stated above).

Each program within a Division or Cluster assesses students upon admission to the program to establish a baseline for measuring growth and improvement in performance.

Each program within a Division or Cluster conducts a cumulative assessment of student performance against the defined outcomes of the program at exit, using multiple measures in addition to cumulative GPA.

Each program within a Division or Cluster has established rubrics or criteria for evaluating discrete levels of performance, ranging from unacceptable to superior performance.

Each program within a Division or Cluster has established its student assessment outcomes that include but are not limited to the following: equity, diversity, global perspectives, tools of research/inquiry, ethics, technology, and communication.

Operational definitions of the various terms used in the assessment plans and procedures have been provided to the faculty and others. Among the assessment procedures/terms defined are *performance-based assessment*, *authentic* or *alternative assessment*, *standards* and *rubrics*, and *portfolios*.

To implement the assessment plan, a faculty member was appointed to coordinate the effort and to encourage and assist the development of authentic assessment activities in each division. As the magnitude of this effort was more fully understood, in Fall 1998 funding was sought to buy the time of one member of each division’s assessment team to aid the faculty. Several strategies were used to provide assistance: create examples of procedures and products, conduct
miniworkshops on strategies and other associated topics, and offer tutorials on specific topics and in response to faculty requests. Initially, financial support for these efforts resulted from a proposal for “Campus-Based Lottery Funds,” but the effort continues with support from reallocation of resources within the CSOE. In the WMU interview with the Student Assessment Team, it was reported that “the dean has funded the effort to meet the Student Outcomes Goals Framework and to get everyone comfortable with performance assessment.” The dean confirmed his understanding of the importance of this effort and the need for it to function as an ongoing activity.

Information about various assessment procedures is made available for students, faculty, and others on the CSOE’s web site. This is evidence of a growing interest and expertise on assessment and what we consider a sense of openness about individual and program evaluation approaches. Faculty have begun to share their experiences and to coordinate efforts within and across divisions.

With a large number of part-time or adjunct faculty, it is important that there is consistency of course/program content and assessment. As reported by the Student Assessment Team and verified in individual interviews with faculty, common course syllabi are used, and these include the stated performance objectives and assessment procedures for each course.

Graduate and credentialing program requirements and procedures for assessment and evaluation are described in detail and publicly available. For example, for the MA program in Instructional Technology and Computer Education, there is a substantive description of the portfolio requirements with regard to content, format and procedures, and evaluation, and another section of the written comprehensive exam. For the master’s degree in special education, an even more detailed description is provided.

The Student Assessment Team indicated the student assessment process will be continuously monitored by reviews of syllabi by an associate dean with the help of others. The dean has indicated a willingness to continue support for the team as it provides assistance to faculty and develops templates for assessment procedures. Members of the team have offered their assistance to the Assessment Committee of the Faculty Senate, but this offer had not been accepted at the time of the on-site evaluation team’s visit.

The CSOE has made substantial strides toward performance/authentic student assessment at the course and program levels. The Student Assessment Team, a body charged with major responsibilities in the development of appropriate procedures and exemplary products, does its work even now within the context of the following questions.

Are our students better?
Are we providing our students with good models of assessment?
Are we communicating with our students?
Are we practicing what we preach?
While this evaluation of the CSOE is not designed to answer these specific questions, there is strong evidence that the latter three questions can be answered in the affirmative, while at the same time, current students and employers of graduates indicate strong satisfaction with the programs and on-job performance of graduates. Informal feedback from employers suggests that students are better able to perform their current duties in local schools and that this overall improvement in quality is improving. However, without more defensible baseline data, the evaluation team can offer little more information in response to the first question.

Question #9: How does the CSOE assume accountability for student outcomes?

This question is directly related to Question #8, but it introduces the concept of accountability for student outcomes. Traditionally, accountability in higher education has been focused on generally defined sets of inputs (required courses and related experiences; course grades; availability of basic resources; quality of faculty based on earned degrees; evidence of scholarly productivity of faculty; instructional factors such as number of hours/minutes of instruction; use of appropriate methods and resources; and quality of students in terms of GPAs, entrance exams, etc.). However, the chartering mechanism requires an entirely different form and depth of accountability. As the first charter school of education, this academic unit had to move into a new arena, one in which it had to accept expected and unexpected challenges and opportunities. We are encouraged by the apparent lack of fear of accountability and the willingness of the CSOE to “open its books” to outside examiners in the form of voluntary national accreditation (NCATE), state accreditation (COA), and an external evaluation of the school itself.

The CSOE is committed to be a major player in the upgrading of teacher candidates for Los Angeles and surrounding school districts. This involves restructuring programs and schedules to meet the needs of temporarily certified persons, likely deemed by many as unqualified, as they move toward becoming fully credentialed for specific K-12 teaching assignments. At the same time, the CSOE is committed to be actively involved in the reform of education in the schools in its primary service area. To be credible and to fulfill the expectations of charter status, it had to reform itself, and that included the assumption of a shared responsibility for student outcomes. It must be remembered that CSOE students are not solely the products of this college. Students bring many hours of college work and years of experience, including teaching or other related professional experience, with them. In interviews/discussions with current students, previous college work was completed at a variety of institutions, some of which are even out of state. Therefore, it is reasonable for the CSOE to be accountable for student outcomes in the courses and programs they offer and for the recommendations they make for credentials and other professional recognition.

As stated in Question #8, students are evaluated in all courses and related experiential assignments on the basis of a growing emphasis on performance and authentic measures. Short of actual on-the-job assessment, this is as close as one can get to reality. By publicly stating course/program requirements, each faculty member and program area have defined what each student should learn or be able to do upon completion of this experience/course. In essence, each faculty member for a particular course has said that this is what can be expected from students who complete this course.
Further, the CSOE and its faculty have become active players, if not leaders, in the development and operation of educational programs and partnership arrangements with a variety of schools and organizations. This close involvement facilitates the direct observation of graduates and students in these activities. Feedback on graduates and current students in field-based assignments are sought on a formal basis through surveys and focus group meetings and informally through an increased amount of contact and collaboration between CSOE and practicing professionals in the field. Accountability, from the perspective of one faculty member being interviewed in this evaluation, was “whether we walk the walk or merely talk the talk.”

The Program Document for the CSOE, dated June 1995, describes the evaluation design developed by the Research and Evaluation Committee (See Appendix G). Under the heading Student Outcomes, the following information was provided.

| OUTCOME: | An analysis of present (& future) status of students in the CSOE on student outcomes and attitudes |
| METHOD: | Student survey, interviews, field interviews, alumni survey, interviews with faculty, record audit, grades, observations |
| KEY OUTCOMES: | # of placements in schools, first year student teaching evaluations, employer satisfaction with students, pass rates on comprehensive exams, # of theses, alumni attitudes, writing, CBEST pass rates, graduation rate, GPA, # CLAD/BCLAD credentials awarded. |

In the Common Standards Document prepared for the California Committee on Accreditation and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education in 1997, it was stated (p. 58) that

Each professional education program at Cal State LA is evaluated on a periodic, systematic, and continuous basis involving:

- # student evaluation
- # evaluation of student outcomes
- # graduate follow-up surveys
- # employer follow-up surveys
- # input from advisory groups
- # informal data collection by individual and from focus groups
- # university program review

A review of document files by the evaluation team confirmed that these procedures had been followed and the results were available for review. These results are reported to the SAW, and it was reported (p. 64) that “. . . (the results are) used to continue ‘benchmarking’ the change process, and used to institute improvements in the offering of programs.” Faculty and administration were queried about instances of which they were aware when assessments of
student outcomes and/or program assessment data had been used as a basis of some change, and they were almost always able to recount such an incident.

Obviously, accountability for student learning is a shared responsibility between the learner and the teacher and/or the institution responsible for the design and delivery of the instruction. From direct observations, reviews of documents, and interviews, it appears that the CSOE has identified student outcomes, developed procedures to assess whether or not they are achieved, and is assuming an appropriate degree of responsibility for their successful acquisition. Thus, there is a sense of accountability that goes beyond mere words and, as the program and the effects of the charter status are more fully realized in the field, there will be more and stronger evidence as to the extent to which the goals of the school are being fulfilled. While the evaluation did not seek such information, persons outside the CSOE with whom we spoke generally perceive that the CSOE is much further ahead of other academic units in the development of techniques and operational strategies for the assessment of student outcomes.

**Question #10: To what degree is the current administrative and organizational structure effective?**

The Charter School of Education is organized administratively in four divisions, each with a chairperson, who reports to the Dean, as do two associate deans, one with responsibility for student services and the other for curriculum and assessment. The Administrative Council also has a staff representative. The Dean reports to the Provost, who reports to the President. The primary administrative body of the CSOE is an Administrative Council that includes the division chairpersons, the associate deans, and two faculty representatives. The primary policymaking body of the CSOE is the SAW, which includes all faculty and staff of the unit as well as representatives of students and the community. This governance structure is working well for the CSOE at this time in its development.

The current conflict about the organizational structure at CSULA focuses on the authority for the teacher education curriculum within the university. The organizational chart provided by the CSOE in a report prepared in 1997 for the California Committee on Accreditation and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education reflected two different structures for curriculum approval.

One of these structures was frequently explained to the external evaluation team by members of the committees involved in its implementation. This curriculum approval structure prior to charter status provided for recommendations of the School of Education Curriculum Committee to be forwarded through the Faculty Assembly to two or more subcommittees of the Educational Policy Committee on their way to the agenda of the Faculty Senate. From there they are passed to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and, where appropriate, to the President and the Board of Trustees. The Educational Policy Committee has three subcommittees: the Undergraduate Studies Subcommittee, the Graduate Studies Subcommittee, and the Teacher Education Subcommittee.
The process followed under the charter is distinctly different. Thus, a teacher education program that blended undergraduate with graduate studies, recently proposed by the CSOE, did not require action by all three subcommittees, which is usual in higher education, even though there was evidence of consultation with other schools and departments affected by the proposed changes. Awareness of this structure has been heightened by its having been bypassed by the CSOE in several curriculum initiatives undertaken since the charter. Thus, the organizational chart used by the CSOE to interpret curriculum approval processes showed, alongside the approval process described above, a process for direct recommendation by the CSOE to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. At the time of the evaluation team’s visit, these two processes were competing for recognition and authority.

The evaluation team found that the traditional approval structure at California State University, Los Angeles, placed curriculum regulation beyond that faced by nonteacher education units on the School of Education. Proponents of this regulation represented it as the university’s accepting “university-wide responsibility for teacher education,” but this was not confirmed by results. Restrictive curricular processes stand in the way of a growing national consensus that a school or college of education must be enabled to exercise authority and accept responsibility for programs that prepare professional educators. Current NCATE standards call for a professional educator, typically the dean of the education unit, to have authority over teacher education programs. Similarly, John Goodlad’s concept of a Center for Education Renewal calls for schools of education to be given authority over their own programs. The traditional curriculum approval structures of CSULA do not give the CSOE sufficient authority over teacher education programs to meet the standards of the field. The resolution of the current conflicts about this issue require redesign of the university’s lines of curricular consultation and approval.

**Question #11: What type of governance is appropriate for charter status within and outside the campus and university system?**

There are various operational perceptions of governance within the university. For the CSOE, the major governance structure is the School as a Whole (SAW), a body that includes all faculty and staff in the school and community representatives. Resolutions for action may be submitted by individuals or designated groups, i.e., clusters, divisions, etc. Each person has a vote, and the collective actions and, for all practical purposes, resulting policies and procedures govern the CSOE. As described in the Common Standards Document for accreditation, the SAW became effective in Fall 1995, and it replaced the former Faculty Assembly. The agenda for the SAW is developed and managed by a steering committee, but actions taken by the SAW are subject to the approval of the dean. In conversations with the dean, he indicated that he retained control of personnel and overall budgetary matters in concert with university policies and procedures and employee union contractual agreements; otherwise, the decisions made by the SAW directed the CSOE. The SAW unit operates with the following standing committees:

- Steering Committee
- Faculty and Staff Committee
- Innovation, Curriculum and Assessment Committee
- Fiscal Resource Development Committee
-Student Development Committee  
-Academic Information Resources Committee

A detailed table describing SAW’s structure, committee structure, and the membership, charge, and interfacing university committees is found in the SAW Information Packet for New Staff and Faculty (see Appendix E).

Officially, the dean is the chief academic officer for the educational unit and is responsible for all academic and administrative operations of the CSOE. In addition, he is the primary liaison officer for educational affairs within the university, among schools, and within the CSOE. The dean reports to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who in turn reports to the President of the university.

In interviews with the administrators, faculty, and staff of the CSOE, there is strong support for the current governance structure. Individuals report that they feel involved and a part of the whole School, not just their individual unit. The structure allows them to collaborate with individuals from other related academic interests and to forward resolutions and proposals that will have a positive impact on their work. From the Fall 1999 staff survey (see Table 2), more than two-thirds indicated that they “Agreed” or “Strongly Agreed” that “Our current committee and governance structure is a good one.” In response to the statement, “I plan to attend most SAW meetings,” almost three-fourths of the 27 respondents to the staff survey “Agreed” or “Strongly Agreed.”

From the Spring 1999 Faculty and Staff Survey reported by Anne Hafner, there was a median response of 4, on a scale of 1 = No progress to 5 = A lot of progress, to each of the following two statements.

“I believe that our current committee & governance is a good one.”

“I believe that the governance structure will help us improve our charter school.”

With few exceptions, there is strong support for the SAW governance structure among faculty and staff within the CSOE. Administrative personnel seem to have adjusted well to these new arrangements and are supportive of it. Its value seems to be centered around the factors of involvement, ownership, responsiveness, and compatibility with the overall philosophy and mission of the school.

Another perception of governance is held by some CSULA personnel with whom the evaluation team spoke, including representatives of the Academic Senate and administrators and faculty of non-CSOE academic units. In the main, they consider the Academic Senate and its committee structure and procedures as the appropriate and legitimate governance structure. These procedures demand university-wide participation in decisions about course and curriculum changes. Beyond holding to the belief that charter status does not negate existing academic governance, as reflected in Senate bylaws, the statement that “teacher education is a university-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentages of Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Staff members have the opportunity to participate in decision making in the Charter School of Education.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree (5)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I value and act upon diversity concerns.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree (5)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff members in the Charter School value and use technology in their work.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree (5)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Charter School has a long-range plan to infuse and integrate technology into the school’s program.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree (5)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Now there is a greater degree of collaboration between faculty, staff, and K-12 schools than before the Charter School.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree (5)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Now there is a greater degree of collaboration between faculty, staff, and the community than before the Charter School.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree (5)</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The CSOE has greater freedom from red tape than in previous years.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree (5)</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel committed to the idea of a charter school.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree (5)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I think I have a contribution to make in the charter school process.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree (5)</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am enthusiastic about participating in the charter school process.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree (5)</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Our current committee and governance structure is a good one.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree (5)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I believe our efforts in this process have the potential to improve the general quality of our school.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree (5)</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. A great deal of progress has been made in the past three years on creating and operationalizing the CSOE.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I plan to attend most SAW meetings.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am interested in serving on one of the CSOE governance committees.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
wide responsibility” is interpreted to mean that the university, as a whole, has oversight and controlling responsibilities over programs in the CSOE.

The CSOE argues that the traditional process for course and curriculum approval is slow to respond and would prevent it from responding to rapidly changing societal needs in a timely and effective manner. Further, CSOE personnel have demonstrated that they sought advice and input from persons outside the CSOE who had knowledge of the issues under consideration. This is verified by letters/memorandums of requests for input and participation and signed attendance sheets at planning meetings related to course and program development.

As to the governance related to course and curriculum approval, this is an issue confounded by conflicting statements of procedures, understanding, and changes. Confusion and conflict will continue without an executive decision and statement that clarifies what charter status means at CSULA. It seems that the CSOE staff think that external oversight and adherence to restrictive rules and regulations are waived with an expectation of greater accountability for quality and effectiveness. In the context of what the CSOE is trying to accomplish, as per its stated mission, goals, recent activities, and commitment to outcomes assessment, it seems that the SAW governance structure is working well and that the issues related to course and curriculum development and approval ought to rest within that unit. However, this is not to say that advice and consultation should not be sought from others within the university and elsewhere who have the knowledge to be helpful and who have a stake in the activities of the CSOE.

Importantly, it should be noted that the CSOE approved a process for curriculum approval on May 16, 1996, that includes a requirement for a consultation process “... with the affected Divisions, Clusters, Themes and other campus units”; a notification process to “... the CSOE and to other schools on campus of the approved curriculum proposal”; an appeal process pertaining to “... concerns about a curriculum proposal that cannot be resolved by the Curriculum, Innovation, Assessment Committee (CIAC) [Note: This committee’s name was changed in Fall 1996 to Innovation, Curricula and Assessment Committee (ICAC)], the originators of the proposal, and/or the CSOE faculty who challenge the proposal may request that the School as a Whole (SAW) hear the concerns and render a final decision”; and a reporting process in which the approved curriculum is transmitted to the “... Executive Secretary of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) with a request to enter curriculum into the catalog and the OASIS system.” These procedures seem to be wholly compatible with the content of an October 13, 1997, memorandum from Provost and Vice President of Academic

For the duration of the Charter period of five years, all graduate and undergraduate curriculum changes, including new options, new degrees and new credential programs, will not require any approval on this campus beyond that of the CSOE, although responsible consultation does need to occur with the appropriate schools prior to the changes being approved by you.

The memorandum of October 13, 1997 goes on to include comments about review of proposals by the Chancellor’s Office, an issue which does not seem to be in dispute. However, a later
memorandum of May 18, 1998, from Provost Hartman to the chair of the Academic Senate (Rosemarie Marshall), with copies to President Rosser, School Deans, School Associate Deans, and Executive Secretaries of Senate Standing Committees and Subcommittees, seems to reflect a weakening of the original position, and to be more consoling to adversaries. The key phrases in that communication, which apparently followed a meeting between President Rosser, Dean Mori, Provost Hartman, and the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, are as follows:

The procedures to be followed are:

The CSOE consults with affected schools and departments prior to making decisions, and a good faith effort is made to resolve concerns.

The CSOE makes a decision on the most appropriate course of action regarding the curriculum in question.

If a department/school outside the CSOE has a significant problem with the decision, the Dean of the School and the Dean of the Charter School try to work out the problem between them.

If this is unsuccessful, the Deans will bring the problem to the Provost for resolution.

The important question is whether the governance structure is supportive of the mission and goals of the CSOE and is within the framework of the charter status as proposed by CSULA and as approved by the Chancellor of the CSU system. The current SAW governance arrangement is satisfactory and serving the needs of the school at this time, but this is not to say that it will not need continual monitoring and evaluation. With an understanding of the objections and concerns voiced by several groups outside the CSOE, the current governance structure is not in violation of the framework of the concept and agreements related to the granting of charter status to this academic unit.

While there may be many other versions of governance systems that are appropriate for charter status within and outside the campus and university system, the current one with SAW as its central core is appropriate and highly valued by those most directly affected by its actions. Governance goes beyond control of the course and curriculum approval process, and this realization has been captured and incorporated into the concept and operations of the SAW.

**Question #12: What is the level of quality of the CSOE’s instruction and curriculum?**

The evaluation team concluded that curriculum in the CSOE is well designed and continuously redesigned in response to the perceived needs of students. Examples of curricular improvements cited by CSOE faculty included the separation of social studies and science methods courses in the Multiple Subject credential program; revision of the master’s program in secondary education to include attention to middle level as well as secondary education; and
introduction of the Urban Learning major, which will enable students to begin their formal studies in education at the undergraduate level. The undergraduate alternative to the current model of fifth-year licensure in California is perceived by the faculty as offering opportunities for students to engage in reflective inquiry about practice in teaching without the pressures associated with emergency licensure. Currently, many of the CSOE students are unable to benefit from the planned field experiences of its curricula because the students are already teaching with emergency credentials.

CSOE students are best able to experience the curriculum when they enroll in formal programs leading to a degree over a time period of no more than three years. This ideal is not met by students who enroll in courses rather than programs or whose enrollment in programs is spread out over many years. These conditions detract from the ability of the faculty to deliver and the students to experience the coherence of the curriculum at any given time. The CSOE has recently reorganized student advising structures to provide more adequately for students to be informed about its programs. Still, communication with students, and especially with students whose affiliation with the CSOE is tenuous, has to be a constant challenge. Results of a 1999 survey of 891 CSOE students showed that 61.6 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that curriculum in the CSOE is of high quality.

The curricula of the CSOE are generally well executed through instructional practices that are innovative and responsive to the needs of students. The 1999 survey of almost 900 CSOE students showed that 62.7 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that instruction in the CSOE is of high quality. Among the examples of quality in instructional practices cited by students interviewed by the external evaluation team were role playing, responsive reading of student journals by faculty, use of case studies, and references to actual practice in the Accelerated School and other settings. The richness of the resources available to educators in the Los Angeles area is deliberately tapped by the CSOE in the design of curriculum and instruction; however, the survival mode of the system sometimes stands in the way of student ability to experience the resources that are available. Students interviewed by the team also cited examples of instructional practices that individuals found less than helpful. In general, however, they confirmed that teaching in the CSOE is generally excellent and is consistently professional and focused on its intended goals. Faculty are more likely than students to link issues in curriculum and instruction to evidence of student learning as defined in the Conceptual Framework and Framework for Student Outcomes Assessment. This has led to diligence in syllabus preparation and in attention to student portfolio preparation as observed in the 1997 self-study. A trend toward continued improvement in curriculum and instruction as reflected through attention to assessment was reported in the 1999 faculty survey.

**Question #13: Is there evidence that collaboration and partnerships guide decision making?**

In answering this question, we divided our discussion of the findings by level or forms of collaboration. We found that faculty and staff in the CSOE and the public school community clearly have influence in decision making in the CSOE and have collaborated in its development. Students enrolled in CSOE programs, as well as faculty and administrators from other schools on
campus, apparently have little or no influence on decision making in the CSOE. Collaboration between the CSOE and other CSULA academic units has occurred to a limited extent in a formal way.

**Collaboration within the CSOE.** Faculty have been closely involved in the development of the CSOE. As members of SAW, staff members are involved in the decision making process. Although this status was not initially a part of the organization, once instituted it has resulted in a feeling of increased worth among staff and a sense that they are aware of what is happening in the CSOE. These findings were supported in interviews conducted by the evaluation team as well as by the documentation provided by CSOE, including information collected through interviews, rubrics, and surveys of faculty and staff.

Students enrolled in the degree programs or individual courses appear to have had limited influence in the development of the CSOE. Results from the student survey conducted in October 1999 indicated that among all indicators, students rated their opportunity to participate in decision making the lowest. This finding was also supported in the interviews conducted by the evaluation team. In fact, during focus groups with students, whole classes of students indicated that they did not know what the SAW was, nor could they describe the governance structure or explain how the CSOE differed from other schools of education.

**Collaboration with other schools/departments on campus.** Based on interview data, there was evidence that other university faculty or committees outside the CSOE had only minimal influence in decision making in the CSOE. The limited contact/collaboration that occurred was usually done through informal rather than formal channels. There was, however, evidence that the amount and quality of input was increasing.

This particular finding is negative, depending on where one stands. It is important to keep in mind that one essential purpose of the CSOE was to insure autonomy so the school could reinvent itself and pursue its new mission. With this in mind, it should not be surprising to find that there was limited collaboration with the rest of the university community. From the standpoint of faculty and administrative leaders in the other schools, collaboration is essential since students training to become teachers take a large number of courses in their schools.

Some faculty and academic leaders in other schools at the university have strong concerns. Below are some of the comments shared with the evaluation team:

# “The CSOE has interpreted silence as consensus.”

# “The CSOE has a desire to rectify the past when they were looked down on. The charter gives them power to fix this, but it must be used carefully.”

# “The CSOE does not adequately collaborate with other campus divisions on content. Actually, there seems to be a battle between content and pedagogy. There’s a need for a balance between the two.”
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“For five years the CSOE has been removed from the curricular consultative process on
campus. At times we were envious.”

“Now we speak a different language. They don’t know about undergraduate programs in
general education, and we don’t know enough about credentialing.

“I would like to see them come back to the curricular consultative process.”

“The CSOE has a shortsighted view on what teachers need. They feel that teachers need
more pedagogy and less content. If the CSOE is to be successful, it means a collaboration
with the rest of the university.”

“With lack of communication comes apprehension and fear. Collaboration could take place
at the levels of advisers, particularly credentialing advisers. Faculty at the CSOE are using a
new terminology that is not always familiar to others outside of their school.”

“The academic departments that are involved in teacher training are concerned that they are
expected to be innovative, yet there are no resources to support innovative practices within
their component of the teacher training programs.”

“The funding system based on full-time equivalency (FTE) creates competition and
undermines collegiality.”

“It’s wrong that the CSOE is not part of the university review process.”

“Others find out about initiatives after they are complete.”

“There is a need for a document that outlines how the CSOE interfaces with the rest of the
university.”

“The CSOE consults, but has no obligation to address concerns. I have no evidence that they
have abused that privilege, but the Child Development Department might be able to provide
such evidence.”

“Why can’t the CSOE understand that teacher education is everyone’s responsibility?”

“If you have to present proposals to outsiders, the quality is certain to be better.”

“They have reported new innovations, but we must remember that not all innovations are
effective.”

“There is no rationale for the urban learning program. They did ask us for input in this
program, but it was informal.”
“The CSOE started a rehabilitation program, early on, but then withdrew that program. There was duplication of courses with the School of Health and Human Services. Rather than consult with others and improve this program, they just dropped it.”

“We have not heard much about successes of the CSOE due to their separation.”

“There’s some degree of institutional arrogance on the part of CSOE faculty and staff.”

“The CSOE has received more funding as a result of their new status and programs: $1 million came to the university for teacher training, and $900,000 went to the CSOE, even though teacher training occurs across the university. There has been a shift in resources due to the CSOE’s move into the undergraduate area.”

“Even though they [CSOE] had never worked with baccalaureate programs, they would take no input from us.”

One particular example of how the lack of collaboration and communication might have negatively affected university students and another department concerns the decision by the CSOE to alter its way of offering summer courses, i.e., via continuing education. Some believe this led to a sharp decrease in students enrolled in summer courses in the CSOE as well as in other schools on campus. One department reportedly hired two new instructors for summer courses, but then had to release one of them during the first week due to a shortage of students.

Faculty members from the CSOE and from other schools on campus confirmed that during the last year there has been a deepening collaboration between the CSOE and other entities on campus. Some persons expressed that with the appointment of the new associate dean in the CSOE, “The process of collaboration will work even better.” For several persons, the model teacher education program (MTEP) was a focus of the new efforts to collaborate. There was clearly a sense of ownership of this particular program across the schools. Some statements from faculty and administrative leaders about the increasing collaboration are included below:

“Our department collaborated on the model teacher education program. This was a good example of collaboration, although there was a lack of consultation on top.”

“Communication has improved over the last year as a result of the uproar and complaints by others.”

“MTEP is an excellent example of cooperation.”

“Now, after five years, they’re being pushed back into the consultative process.”

“I want to sit down and truly collaborate with the CSOE. There is no lack of goodwill.”

Although critical of the CSOE, it is important to highlight that faculty and administrators in other schools on campus were still cognizant of the gains made by the CSOE. When asked about
positive outcomes or gains made by the CSOE, one dean noted that the CSOE faculty have more professional esteem. These faculty members and administrators, although not happy with all aspects of the CSOE and the impact it has had on their departments, did admit that CSOE faculty were now more enthusiastic and that there was increasing respect for the faculty from the CSOE. A number of these ‘opponents’ even expressed their respect for the dean of the CSOE. For example, one person stated that “Allen Mori is a very strong and effective dean for the CSOE.”

The CSOE has clearly exhibited its autonomy during the last five years. While it will likely retain this autonomy and not be obliged to work through the established curricular approval process, there seems to be some consensus that communication needs to improve and that a better understanding is needed about how the CSOE will interface with the rest of the university.

**Collaboration with public schools.**

*“The CSOE brings the research base and knowledge that we don't have at our school.”*  
(Teacher in local public school)

In terms of the public schools community, there was evidence that collaboration and partnerships have guided decision making. Evidence included documentation on collaborative activities with K-12 schools; interviews conducted by evaluation team members with personnel from the Los Angeles Unified School District and friends of the CSOE; and site visits to two public schools with which CSOE staff are working. Two particularly good examples of collaboration are the Task Force on Teacher Supervision and The Accelerated School.

The staff at one local school noted the following forms of collaboration between their school and the CSOE:

1. Placement of new teacher education students in the school early in their freshman year. Students spend a total of 14 hours observing in classrooms.

2. The school also is a site where CSOE places student teachers for the practical component of their program.

3. One-third of the school’s teachers and teacher assistants are emergency certified. Most of these staff are involved in coursework at the CSOE. A few of the teachers are taking courses provided by the Los Angeles Unified School District.

4. Two senior teachers at the school also teach in the CSOE credential program. Sometimes, there are as many as four teachers from the school who provide instruction in the CSOE teacher certification program.

5. The school hosts night classes for the CSOE.

6. The school also collaborated with the beginning teacher support activities such as BTSA-SABE and BTSA-SAMME. One model they developed is reportedly being adapted across
the state for evaluating new teachers. The school also has district mentors and BTSA-SABE mentors who work with the university.

7. **Project Plus.** Together with the CSOE, staff at the school helped set up and designed a program for early intervention and prevention of special education problems/needs. This project has a number of components including the following: staff development, classroom observation, referrals of students, teaching assistants in the classroom, and family counseling. The CSOE, together with Harrison School, applied for a federal grant for this program and received $1.4 million from the U.S. Department of Education. Staff at both CSOE and the school are supported by this grant.

During the summer, 100 teachers will attend the summer institute for the purpose of staff development. This is a component of Project Plus: i.e., inclusion, early intervention, staff development, work with teaching assistants. The teachers will come from throughout the cluster.

Two local educators said that, regarding Project Plus, “We sat together and brainstormed about what we could do with the new opportunities provided by the CSOE.” Project Plus became the dream and happened due to the pilot project that was subsidized by the CSOE since one person was allowed time to work at the school and develop the pilot project that led to the grant proposal.

8. The Family Counseling Unit at the CSOE uses interns to assist families at Harrison School. They provide counseling to students on weekends. This is now a component of Project Plus but actually predates that project.

The assistant principal at one local public school was asked about influence and input from public schools in the CSOE program. She noted that she and the principal attended meetings early on with representatives from other public schools regarding the needs assessment conducted by CSOE regarding student teaching placement.

“The Accelerated School Project is a good example of changing public schools. They had the best scores of all schools in the cluster. We plan to build a new school there. We will fund half of the facility and the district will pay for the other half. We are looking for urban renewal in that particular community and feel we can contribute with our involvement in the charter school.” Dean Mori said, “We want better homes, jobs, security. We have a vision!” Now this school is one of the brightest accomplishments of the CSOE in its efforts to change public schools. In the future, this effort, including its focus and forms of collaboration and community involvement, could be a national model for educational reform.

“We are like an incubator. We are incubating charter schools. We want to spin off charter schools and have faculty on charter school boards. We helped design the new model in accelerated schools . . .” (Dean Allen Mori)
One local public school teacher who has worked with faculty at the CSOE noted that “the CSOE allows/encourages teachers to coauthor papers with their faculty.”

A local teacher said that the “student teaching program needs improvement, and this is happening now.”

**Task Force on Teacher Supervision.** This task force was comprised of representatives from the CSOE, public schools, and teacher training. The purpose of the task force was to improve student teaching experiences and, in turn, the qualities of new teachers.

The task force did small group work and collaborated in revamping student teacher practices.

A CSOE faculty member indicated that the dean of the CSOE pushed for the Task Force on Teacher Supervision. She thought the program was the same that has been used for more than 20 years even though students and the public schools they will work in are very different today.

A local school administrator indicated that there has been teacher input in the program at the CSOE. “The CSOE has been more inclusive of all stakeholders. Since becoming the CSOE, they have opened more classes at different times to meet the needs of students. The CSOE has made significant progress and they are improving further.”

The special education department runs a Saturday school when parents can bring in their children. This happens because of the desire of faculty to serve local schools.

“Faculty members at the CSOE are down in the trenches.”

**Question #14: What evidence is there that cultural and linguistic diversity are infused into the CSOE’s curriculum, instruction, and faculty development?**

Due to its geographical location and service population, the CSULA, CSOE is about as culturally linguistically diverse as any institution of its kind could expect to be. Interestingly, these circumstances present both benefits and challenges. From the evaluation team’s observations and interviews, the faculty, staff, and students are acutely aware of the diversity that exists. To its credit, there is evidence that a clear strength of the CSOE is its ability to infuse cultural and linguistic diversity into the curriculum, instruction, and faculty development. This was supported in interviews conducted by the evaluation team as well as in student survey data (October 1999) collected by the team. In the student survey, 85 percent of the students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they value diversity and respect students from other ethnic groups.

Graduates confirmed that every course they took at the CSOE touched upon cultural diversity. The students also noted that the program has diversity in terms of age and cultural backgrounds. In the words of a visiting professor to the CSOE, “Regarding diversity and multiculturalism, the Charter School of Education does not just talk about this, it is these things.”
Question #15: How is technology infused into curriculum and instruction?

The Charter School of Education has provided baseline personal computers and printers for every faculty member and invested university equipment dollars in development of smart classrooms and smart carts. Resources of the CSOE to support technology use by faculty and students include six computer labs and two technicians, who maintain equipment, orient users to its use, and develop the CSOE web site. This year, an instructional designer has been added to the staff to assist faculty in development of software to enhance teaching and learning.

Results of a random sample of 891 CSOE students undertaken in 1999 showed that 61.6 percent agreed or strongly agreed that students use technology in their classes in the CSOE, with a statistically significant tendency for students who had completed 5 to 12 courses to agree more strongly that students used technology in their classes than students who had taken fewer than 5 or more than 12 courses. Results of a 1997 self-study survey of faculty, staff, and students indicated that “some classes use technology as a focal point (especially technology and computer classes) or a primary tool (e.g., statistics, language testing, and counseling), while others maintain a traditional lecture format” (p. 18). A 1999 follow-up survey of faculty reflected the belief that some progress had been made in this area. Although the use of technology in instruction is on the increase, with many faculty utilizing communication and presentation software, and although “technology” is a theme of the CSOE, there is not yet a vision of infusion of technology that is consistent with the curricular conceptions of many of the faculty, including addressing the issues of social justice and technology.

Concluding Statements

The School of Education’s first period of approval as a Charter School of Education has produced some remarkable results and, by now, some of the concerns of others who feared the worst should be sharply reduced. The evaluation team found an academic unit that reflects commitment and dedication to a mission that is not only correct for this school, but likely most appropriate for many others across this country. It has redirected its mission to serve the needs of the local schools of its primary service area as well as the needs of enrolled students at CSULA.

In the narrative of this report, there is an evaluative response, with the basis or evidence for the response, for each of the 15 questions the evaluation team was asked to address. As predicted, the team was probably least able to identify the specific accomplishments that are solely the result of the charter status. However, it was able to cite many accomplishments, within and outside the university, that are associated with school and/or the faculty, staff, and administration of the CSOE.

Some of the highlights of the evaluation are described below.

# The faculty and staff have an extremely high level of enthusiasm for the direction and the way in which the CSOE is operating.
There is a feeling of worth, value, and ownership within the CSOE that is reflected in actions in addition to words.

Collaboration, interdisciplinary opportunities, and work within the CSOE have given new shape to the faculty’s efforts to address real needs and situations in clinical settings as well as cooperating schools and agencies.

The School as a Whole (SAW) form of governance is an innovative approach to university governance and one that should be considered for adoption in a broader scale at CSULA and elsewhere.

The CSOE has acted with considerable reserve and not in a thoughtless and reckless fashion as some might have projected. Proposals for changes and other actions are developed, submitted to the SAW for review, and approved by the CSOE as represented on SAW.

The CSOE has demonstrated its ability to be responsive to societal needs in a timely manner and to seek collaborative relationships with its primary stakeholders and clientele.

Performance/outcomes assessment is developing in an appropriate manner within the CSOE. While not complete or fully developed, it provides a viable test bed for further refinement and strengthening.

The CSOE enjoys strong and supportive leadership, which is essential for continuing success and sustainability.

However, no organization or any operating status is likely to result in a perfect system. The CSOE has a fair number of critics across the campus. We have generally concluded that the critics can be identified with one of three groups:

Those who are uninformed or misinformed about the rights and responsibilities of charter status.

Those who have traditionally been in positions of control of the course and curriculum approval process.

Those who are envious of a unit that has been given the authority to define its own direction, with first accountability for its actions to its profession and secondly to the university.

We offer some specific recommendations for consideration.

The conflict about university curriculum approval processes since formation of the Charter School of Education has pointed out limitations in the responsiveness and
effectiveness of the traditional process from the perspective of a profession that is trying to effect change in schools. The CSULA Provost, Faculty Senate, and Teacher Education Subcommittee need to recognize that the CSOE curriculum approval process rests with the Charter School and is not subject to duplicative approval processes. Changes in university curricular governance structures should not relieve the Charter School of Education of the responsibility to consult with other units in the design of curriculum, but must grant it sufficient authority over teacher education programs to enable innovation and responsive curriculum change.

The Charter School of Education is constantly challenged in advising and communication with students by rapid turnover of students, because many credential-only students are not enrolled in degree programs, and by changes in programs and curriculum necessitated by credential requirements and/or in response to societal demands. Although much has been done to improve the ability of the CSOE to communicate with current and prospective students, this area must continue to receive attention. Concentrated attention to use of the Charter School of Education home page and of electronic mail has the potential to improve general communication while advancing the use of technology in education.

California State University, Los Angeles, and the Charter School of Education have invested in technology for use by faculty and students. Investment in this area to date has focused more on hardware and software than on human resource development. There is a need to develop strategies for faculty development that have the potential to motivate faculty to invest the time required to use instructional technology in ways that complement their curricular visions.

Develop and maintain a system of communications with current students, graduates, and other CSULA faculty and administration that describes activities and plans with particular emphasis on opportunities for involvement in creative and innovative programs designed to fulfill the CSOE’s mission.

Enhance and continue efforts to develop appropriate assessments of performance outcomes for all CSOE programs and students and to continue the offer of assistance to other units at CSULA. Particular attention should be paid to assuring that the assessments are related to the goals of the unit as well as the mission of the university.

Share the story of the CSOE at CSULA, with the broader profession, including university and systems-level administrators, and include problems and failed efforts as well as successes.

Clearly, the CSOE has made substantial progress in building partnerships and demonstrating an ability to work effectively with K-12 schools in its service area. Parallel with these efforts, there is a demonstrated commitment to addressing the demand for courses and programs for noncredentialed teachers in some creative programmatic and scheduling ways. An exemplary
approach to student assessment is developing, which could be replicated in other schools across the university.

Certainly, there is substantial interest among a number of faculty in the use of technology to improve both the quality of instruction and its delivery. Situated in a richly diverse cultural setting enjoyed by few teacher education programs, the faculty recognizes the opportunities it has for including this element in the curriculum as well as in field-based activities. Importantly, there seems to be a general recognition among faculty, staff, and administrators that with the charter status comes an increased responsibility for accountability; this is reflected in both actions and words.

Finally, the evaluation team concludes that the CSOE has responded well to its charge, and it has answered its critics in an open and admirable way. Probably the two worst threats to its future are (1) an internal or external wavering of support for risk taking by this academic unit and its personnel as they attempt to redefine themselves and serve the real educational needs of society and (2) the failure to recognize the time, energy, and effort that are required to meet both campus and field-based demands for professional educators.
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Appendix A

Evaluation Task Plan
California State University, Los Angeles
Task Plan
(Revised 9-2-99)*

Task 1: Conduct prestudy site visit:
  S discuss scope of work and clarification of evaluation questions, issues, and responsibilities
  S gather documents for review
  S develop interview lists (faculty, administration, school-based personnel, current and former students)
  S develop/obtain mailing lists for surveys
  S gather input on scope of interview and survey questions
  (March 1999)

Task 2: Develop and distribute survey instruments to faculty and to samples of current students and graduates
  (Student survey to be coupled with internal CSOE effort)
  (September 13 - October 15, 1999)

Task 3: Analyze survey data and build tables of the results
  (October 15 - December 3, 1999)

Task 4: Develop protocols for interviews based on prestudy site visit and review of documents made available during the prestudy visit
  (Completed by October 29, 1999)

Task 5: Organize and orient the Review Panel [Horn, Miron, Wegenke, and consultant(s)] and distribute documents to them for preliminary review
  (Completed by October 5, 1999)

Task 6: Make arrangements for Review Panel’s on-site visit
  (Completed by October 12, 1999)

Task 7: Review Panel conduct 2-3 day on-site visit (interviews, review institutional documents, etc.)
  (To be determined in conjunction with CSULA officials, but expected to be completed during the period of November 8-10, 1999)

Task 8: Develop draft report (including an executive summary) and submit to the dean/contact person with a request for suggested clarifications and corrections
  (Completed by February 1, 2000)

Task 9: Submission of final report and discussion with California State University, Los Angeles officials as appropriate
  (February 29, 2000)

*Revision based on contract requirements of May 13, 1999
Appendix B

On-Site Evaluation Visitation Schedule
## SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES FOR THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 9:00</td>
<td>Arrive on Campus - Continental Breakfast - Orientation to Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KH D2076A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 - 10:00</td>
<td>Charter School of Education Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Allen A. Mori - KH D2077 (Charter Room)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 - 11:00</td>
<td>James Rosser, President - ADM 815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - 12:00</td>
<td>Margaret Hartman, Provost &amp; V.P. - ADM 713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 1:00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised: 11/3/99
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 - 2:00</td>
<td>Senate Executive Committee</td>
<td>KH D2076A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 - 1:30</td>
<td>Carl Selkin, Dean Arts &amp; Letters</td>
<td>KH C2061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 - 2:00</td>
<td>James Kelly, Dean Health And Human Services</td>
<td>KH C2058</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 - 2:30</td>
<td>David Soltz, Dean Natural &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>KH D2081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 - 3:00</td>
<td>Faculty Group Joy Morin, &amp; Darlene Michener</td>
<td>KH D2081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 - 3:30</td>
<td>Documents Review</td>
<td>KH D2077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 - 4:00</td>
<td>Educational Policy Committee</td>
<td>ADM 313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 - 5:00</td>
<td>Visit Classes - For Group Interviews with Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Faculty member will leave so you can interview classes of current students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 9:00</td>
<td>Breakfast with the Steering Committee of the Friends of the Charter School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dining Room - University Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 - 9:30</td>
<td>Current &amp; Former Chairs of the School as a Whole Committee (SAW) Diane Fazzi, Randy Campbell, &amp; Michael Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KH C2081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 10:00</td>
<td>To Harrison St. School (Interview with Admin. &amp; Teachers at the school) (Coordinated by Diane Haager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 - 11:00</td>
<td>Teacher Education Subcommittee (Marlene Zepeda, chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KH D2076A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - 11:30</td>
<td>John Hansen, Director Educational Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KH C2081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 - 12:00</td>
<td>Faculty Group Gay Wong, Sabrina Mims, &amp; Simeon Slovacek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KH C2081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 1:00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 - 1:30</td>
<td>Faculty Group Ray Hillis, Marty Brodwin, Hershel Swinger, Franklin Jones KH C2081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Peterson, Visiting Endowed Chair KH C2061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Group Dorothy Keane, John Eichinger, Norm Unrau, Carolyn Frank KH D2077 Charter Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Group Nancy Hunt, June Szabo-Kifer, Sherry Best, Mary Falvey, Diane Haager KH D2076A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 - 2:30</td>
<td>Supervisors of Student Teaching Bob Barnes, Billie Miller, Murray Shapiro, Margaret Garcia KH D2076A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documents Review KH D2077 Charter Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone Interview Bob Monke, Co-chair of NCATE/COA Visit (will call us)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documents Review KH D2077 Charter Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Faculty from Other Schools Ken Wagner, Louis Negrete KH C2061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documents Review KH D2077 Charter Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone Interview Larry Birch, Consultant from CTC (will call us)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 - 3:30</td>
<td>Student Assessment Team Barbara Clark, Chris Givner, Bob Land, Lia Kamhi-Stein, Margaret Garcia KH D2076A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documents Review KH D2077 Charter Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Parachini, Principal Loreto St. School KH C2058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teachers David Alonzo, Mark Engel, Jessica Ware KH D2069 Dean's small conf. room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 - 4:00</td>
<td>Student Teachers Roberto Calderon, Mayra Calzadillas, Stacy Carroll-Hutter, Linda Christian, Gary Cristiano, May Takata KH D2076A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documents Review KH D2077 Charter Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documents Review KH D2077 Charter Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 - 5:00</td>
<td>Visit Classes - For Group Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C &amp; I John Eichinger EDEL 418 KH D2074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFIS Lia Kamhi-Stein TESL 560 KH B1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDAD Ruth Johnson EDAD 508 KH D2071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 9:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 - 9:30</td>
<td>Telephone Interview Ms. Lupe Sonnie, Principal, Lincoln High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(323) 223-4021 x2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 10:30</td>
<td>Technology Theme James Wiebe, Penny Semrau, Ray Hillis, Helen Quon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KH D2068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 - 11:00</td>
<td>10:00 11:00 PERC Anne Hafner, G. Roy Mayer, Anthony Kunnan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KH D2076A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - 12:00</td>
<td>10:00 - 11:00 MTEP Cherie DeJong-Hawley, Bruce Campbell, Ann Bingham-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newman, Frances Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KH D2077 (Charter Room)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 1:30</td>
<td>Review Team - Work Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch with Dean Mori and CSOE Administrative Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday November 10, 1999</td>
<td>Jerry Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office - KH C2081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>343-4310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 - 2:30</td>
<td>Exit Interview - with Dean Mori and the Evaluation team members, Division Chairs, Jamie Dote-Kwan, Anne Hafner - KH D2076A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

List of Persons Interviewed During On-Site Evaluation Visit
Interview List

This is not intended to be a complete list of all persons who were interviewed and/or provided input to the evaluation team. However, it is illustrative of the broad range of individuals who contributed to the evaluation team’s understanding of the CSU LA Charter School of Education during the on-site visit of November 8 – 10, 1999. Among those on the list are program graduates and students in eight classes that were visited by members of the team. While the positions of all interviewees cannot be recalled, the positions of many are included to illustrate the breadth of sources from which the team gathered information about the CSOE.

1. Adams, Celia
2. Alonzo, David
3. Anagnoson, Ted, Professor, Political Science
4. Baaske, Kevin
5. Barger, Michael
6. Bob Barnes, retired public school teacher, supervisor of student teachers
7. Best, Sherry, Professor of Special Education, Member of CSOE curriculum committee
8. Bingham-Newman, Ann, Professor of Education, Co-coordinator of the new blended degree/credential programs
9. Birch, Larry, Administrator, Commission on Teacher Credentialing, Consultant for the recent accreditation visit
10. Bishop, Wayne, Professor of Mathematics, member of the Teacher Education Sub-committee
11. Boston, Bradford
12. Stan Burstein, Professor of History, member of the ad-hoc committee for development of the blended degree/credential program
13. Cadenas, Lupe, Professor of Secondary Education
14. Claderon, Roberto
15. Clazadillas, Mayra
16. Campass, Marise
17. Cash, Susan, Professor of Art and Chair, Educational Policy Committee
18. Cates, Marshall, Professor of Mathematics and Chair of the Academic Senate
19. Brodwin, Marty, Professor, Rehabilitation Counseling
20. Bruce Campbell, Professor of Education, Co-coordinator of the new blended degree/credential programs
21. Randy Campbell, Professor of Education, former Chair of the SAW
22. Carroll-Hunter, Stacy
23. Carter, Michael, Professor of Education, Counseling Area, Chair of the SAW
24. Cervantes, Fernando
25. Chi, Mynaga
27. Clark, Barbara, Professor of Special Education, Chair of the Committee on Evaluation Standards
28. John Clemman, Professor of English,
29. Clue-Shepherd, Sandra, Credentials Analyst
30. Connors, David, Professor of Art, member of the ad-hoc committee for developing the blended program, Member of the Teacher Education Sub-committee
31. Cristiano, Gary
32. Crovello, Ted, Dean of Graduate Studies
Interview List (continued)

33. Cruchfield, Dianne
34. Curiel, Carmen
35. Dearmin, Evalyn, recently retired Associate Dean, CSOE
36. Dejong-Hawley, Cherie, Professor of Education, Coordinator of the MTEP program
37. Diep, Thu Le
38. Dote-Kwan, Jamie, Associate Dean for Student Services, CSOE
39. Eichinger, John, Professor of Elementary Education
40. Engel, Mark
41. Esteem, Michelle
42. Falcon, Mirabelle
43. Falvey, Mary, Professor, Special Education
44. Fazzi, Diane, Professor, Special Education, Past Chair of the SAW
45. Frank, Carolyn, Professor of Secondary Education and member of the CSOE Curriculum Committee
46. Funes, Lourdes
47. Galvan, Jose, Professor, TESOL Area and Acting Associate Dean of Graduate Studies
48. Garcia, Eva, Administrator, Los Angeles Unified School District, Member of the CSOE Advisory Committee
49. Garcia, Margaret, Professor of Educational Administration, Member of Student Assessment Team
50. Garcia-Encinas, Rachel, Administrative Assistant, Member of the Curriculum and Assessment Committee
51. Gary, Ann, Professor of Philosophy, Member of ad-hoc committee for the blended programs, member of the General Education Sub-committee
52. Gerst, Harry W., Administrator, Los Angeles Unified School District, Member of the CSOE Steering Committee
53. Giannimi, Michelle,
54. Chris Givner, Professor of Special Education, Member of the CSOE Curriculum Committee
55. Gonzales, Alfredo, Dean of Undergraduate Studies
56. Gutierrez, Maria, Administrative Assistant, Member of the SAW Steering Committee
57. Haager, Diane, Professor of Special Education, Coordinator of the off-campus program at Harrison Street School
58. Hacopian, Armine, Professor of Educational Administration
59. Anne, Hafner, Professor of Educational Foundations, Coordinator for the Evaluation Visit
60. Hansen, John, Director of Placement
61. Hartmen, Margaret, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, CSLA
62. Hernandez, Fernando, Chair, Division of Educational Foundations and Interdivisional Studies, Member of the ad-hoc committee for development of blended programs
63. Hillis, Ray, Professor of Education, Member of the ad-hoc committee for development of blended programs
64. Hunt, Nancy, Professor of Special Education
65. Huynhy-Dinh, Tien
66. Hyman-Peterson, Madeline, Program Graduate
67. Irias, Dormanda
68. Johnson, Karen, Associate Dean, School of Health and Human Services
69. Jones, Franklin, Professor of Educational Administration
70. Kamhi-Stein, Lia, Professor of Education
71. Kanell, Rita
Interview List (continued)

72. Kelly, James, Dean, School of Health and Human Services
73. Klein, Diane, Chair, Division of Special Education
74. Kreft, Ita, Professor of Education, Educational Foundations and Interdivisional Studies
75. Kunnan, Anthony, Professor, Educational Foundations and Interdivisional Studies
76. Land, Bob, Professor of Secondary Education
77. Lang, Frances, Professor, Elementary Education
78. Malecki, Edward S., Associate Dean, School of Natural and Social Sciences
79. Maurer, Ron, Retired LAUSD Administrator, Supervisor of Student Teachers
80. Maurizio, Don, Professor, School of Engineering and Technology and member of the Teacher Education Sub-committee
81. Maxie, Andrea, Professor of Secondary Education and member of the Teacher Education Sub-committee
82. Mayer, C. Lamar, Former Associate Dean CSOE, Part-time faculty
83. Mayer, G. Roy, Professor, Counseling and Guidance
84. McEvoy, Suzanne, Academic Language Skills Coordinator
85. McGee, Kathleen
86. Walter McIntyre, Chair of recent NCATE Visiting Team
87. Michener, Darlene, Professor of Elementary Education and Coordinator of Reading
88. Mims, Sabrina, Professor of Elementary Education
89. Mirfanda, Maria
90. Monke, Bob, Associate Dean, Fresno State University and Chair of the CSULA Accreditation Visit for the Committee on Accreditation
91. Mori, Allen, Dean, Charter School of Education
92. Murphy, Marguerite
93. Morin, Joy, Professor of Elementary Education
94. Nakamura, Bob, Professor of Biology and Member of the General Education Sub-committee
95. Nakamura, Debra
96. Negrete, Louis, Professor of Chicano Studies, Member of the ad-hoc Committee for Blended Programs
97. Omidsalar, Teresa, Kennedy Memorial Library
98. Otadoi, Edison, Student member of the Teacher Education Sub-committee
99. Otto, Nancy
100. Parachini, Nancy, Principal, Loreto Street School, LAUSD
101. Perez, Alex
102. Peterson, Nancy, Visiting Professor, Endowed Chair in Special Education
103. Placeres, Vic, Administrator, Los Angeles Unified School District and Member of the CSOE Advisory Committee
104. Ponce, Ann
105. Quinn, Julie, Professor of Elementary Education and Coach to the Accelerated School
106. Quon, Helen, Instructional Designer
107. Kathryn, Reilly, Associate Dean, Curriculum and Evaluation, CSOE
108. Roberts, Melanie
109. Rosser, James, President of California State University, Los Angeles
110. Salcido, Patricia
111. Schaeffer, Deborah
112. Schultz, Judy, Administrative Assistant, CSOE
Interview List (continued)

113. Selkin, Carl, Dean, School of Arts and Letters
114. Semrau, Penny, Professor, Educational Foundations and Interdivisional Studies
115. Slovacek, Simeon, Professor, Educational Foundations and Interdivisional Studies
116. Soriano, Marces, Chair, Division of Administration and Counseling
117. Sugiura, Sandy, Administrative Assistant, Student Services Office, CSOE
118. Sved, Kevin
119. Szabo-Kifer, June, Professor of Special Education, Member of the ad-hoc Committee for Blended Programs
120. Takata, May
121. Tamehiro, Nancy, Administrative Assistant, Division of Curriculum and Instruction
122. Tannenbaum, Debbie
123. Taylor, William, Professor of Physics
124. Wayne Tikkanen, Professor of Chemistry and member of the Teacher Education Sub-committee
125. Unrau, Norm, Professor of Secondary Education
126. Vittimberga, Glenda
127. Wagner, Ken, Professor, Department of Political Science
128. Ware, Jessica
129. Washburn, Judy, Chair, Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Chair of the ad-hoc Committee for Blended Programs
130. Weckbacher, Lisa, Advisement Center
131. Wiebe, James, Professor, Division of Educational Foundations and Interdivisional Studies
132. Wilson, Bill, CSU Chancellor’s Office
133. Windmueller, Michelle
134. Wong, Gay, Professor of Elementary Education
135. Wu Frank, Professor and Member of the Teacher Education Sub-committee
136. Yamamoto, Jeanne, Administrator, Los Angeles Unified School District, Member of the CSOE Advisory Committee
137. Yasuhara, Eri, Associate Dean, School of Arts and Letters
138. Young, Russell, Instruction Technology Consultant
139. Zepeda, Marlene, Professor of Child Development, Chair, Teacher Education Sub-committee, Member of the ad-hoc Committee for Blended Programs

Classes Visited

EDEL 419
EDFN 553
EDSP 554
EDAD 516
EDEL 418
TESL 560
EDSP 511
EDAD 508

Schools Visited

Harrison Street School, Los Angeles Unified School District
Los Angeles Accelerated School Center
Appendix D

Charter School Evaluation Template:
Expected Outcomes
Charter School Evaluation Template:
Expected Outcomes*

ADMINISTRATION/GOVERNANCE
• Shift in roles: shared decision making
• Creative workload assignments
• Changes in governance (committee/division structure)
• Increased user friendliness of system
• Improved school-wide communication w/students (newsletter, forms)
• Improved forms documentation of programs, schedules, changes
• Reduced red tape
• Increased support for changes

CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION
• Increased use of distance learning
• More creative use of technology
• Increased use of constructivist practices
• Increased collaborative instruction
• Increased evaluation of instruction
• Infusion of technology into instruction
• Infusion of diversity into instruction
• Infusion of inquiry methods into instruction

RESOURCES
• Increased resources (staff/computers)
• Increased contracts/grants
• Increased space
• More outside support/Friends
• Increased access to computers

STUDENTS
• Better knowledge of subject area
• Better communication skills (reading, writing, understanding cultures)
• Improved human relations skills
• Improved pedagogy/instructional skills
• Greater knowledge of inquiry methods (assessment, research)
• Greater knowledge/skills in technology
• Greater professional, political, civic skills (greater professionalism & employability, advocacy)
• Higher graduation rate/improved candidate pool

FACULTY
• Increased collaboration w/faculty
• Increased collaboration w/K-12
• Greater sense of empowerment
• More participation in professional development.
• Improved attitudes & morale (trust)
• Higher professional status
• Decreased turnover
• Raised expectations of students
• Shared vision
• Increased satisfaction w/productivity
• Improved advisement & mentoring

COMMUNITY & PARENTS
• Greater recognition of CSULA
• Greater collaboration w/CSULA
• Greater involvement w/CSULA
• Increased community visibility
• Increased communication w/media

FACILITY/ENVIRONMENT
• Creative use of space
• Visually exciting non-traditional classrooms
• Greater number of lab schools
• More creative scheduling
• Space inviting to students

*Retyped from original
Appendix E

Information Packet–Charter School of Education
SAW
—Information Packet: Charter School of Education SAW—hard copy not on disk—
Appendix F

Matrix of Sources of Information for Responses to Evaluation Questions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty and Staff</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Has the CSOE met its goals? If so, to what extent?</td>
<td>Survey and interview</td>
<td>Survey and interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What specific accomplishments since 1994 are perceived to have been strongly</td>
<td>Survey and interview</td>
<td>Survey and interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitated by the charter status of the CSOE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is the level of satisfaction of the faculty with the CSOE program?</td>
<td>Survey and interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Evaluation Work Plan for groups to interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What is the level of satisfaction of the CSOE administrators both inside and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside CSOE with the CSOE program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What is the level of satisfaction of the students with the CSOE program?</td>
<td>Survey and interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What is the level of satisfaction of the graduates with the program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey and interview (focus group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the CSOE?</td>
<td>Survey and interview (focus group)</td>
<td>Survey and interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How does the CSOE use standards and assessments to measure its students’</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How does the CSOE assume accountability for student outcomes?</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To what degree is the current administrative and organizational structure effective?</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What type of governance is appropriate for charter status within and outside the campus and university system?</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. What is the level of quality of the CSOE’s instruction and curriculum?</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is there evidence that collaboration and partnerships guide decision making?</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Collaborative agencies)-Interview</td>
<td>See Evaluation Work Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What evidence is there that cultural and linguistic diversity are infused into the CSOE’s curriculum, instruction, and faculty development?</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Facilities and classrooms and laboratories)-Direct observation</td>
<td>See Evaluation Work Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How is technology infused into curriculum and instruction?</td>
<td>Direct observation, interview, and survey</td>
<td>Interview and survey</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Facilities and classrooms and laboratories)-Direct observation</td>
<td>See Evaluation Work Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>