

Cal State Fullerton

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

(657) 278-3411 | <https://ed.fullerton.edu/>

To: Dean Kirtman

From: Dr. Ioakim Boutakidis, Chair Department of Educational Leadership

Dr. Rodolfo Acosta, MSEDAD/PASC Program Coordinator

Subject: MSEDAD/PASC PPR External Report

Date: February 27, 2025

We have now completed a comprehensive examination of our MSEDAD/PASC program. The Internal PPR report and the External PPR report demonstrate that the program has performed well overall, with specific areas requiring attention and future action. Our final draft of the PPR report that was submitted to the External Review Committee External included pertinent recommendations provided by an internal review sub-committee organized by the Dean's office. The feedback from the External review committee provides us with additional considerations regarding improvements to our program and its offerings.

We are extremely grateful for the work taken on by the External Review Committee comprised of Drs. Fernando Rodriguez-Valls (CSU Fullerton), Charles Flores (CSU LA), and Michael Gulbransen (CSU Chico).

What follows below are responses to the recommendations provided by the External Review Committee.

Section #	External Review Team's Challenges & Recommendations	MSEDAD/PASC Program Coordinator & Dept. Chair Response
I. Department/Program Mission, Goals & Environment	Challenges: As detailed in the short and long-term goals, a greater effort has to be placed on recruitment strategies. Strengthening the relationship with LEAs would serve this purpose as would the development of additional LEAD	Recruitment for the program in general will be reconceptualized towards two specific outcomes: 1) to recruit candidates for the program and 2) to increase the possibility of LEAD like partnerships with other local LEAs. During the summer or fall of 2025, department chair, program coordinator, CalAPA coordinator, and any additional

CSUF

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON
800 N. State College Park Blvd., Fullerton, CA 92831

	<p>programs outside of the Anaheim USD.</p>	<p>COE staff will meet to create a recruitment plan to contact LEAs in increase student recruitment</p>
	<p>Recommendations: What other considerations have been given to strengthening the field work completed by candidates? Aligning FW activities to individual coursework/projects would serve to create a more cohesive program and allow for required FW hours to be completed during the entirety of the program.</p>	<p>Fieldwork is implemented across the program. For example, candidates will experience field work in EDAD 566 their first year and take EDAD 567 their second year which is the designated field work course. Nonetheless, it may help to add a fieldwork section in all of the syllabi so that future evaluators can see where in each class students will experience field work and describe the assignments that will require it as the review committee recommends.</p>
<p>II. Department/ Program Description and Analysis</p>	<p>Challenges: Although the coursework offered is closely aligned to the CalAPA, we were unable to locate in the syllabi where each of the cycles are introduced or discussed. It is noted that Special Sessions are offered for students not passing the CalAPA.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What supports exist during the course of the program to prepare students for the CalAPA? 2. How has leadership addressed the 2-year and 3-year graduation rates? 3. Are there support structures in place for those students who are struggling academically? 4. What type of outreach is provided to those who may be experiencing challenges outside of the program? 5. Of concern is the equity gap existing in graduation rates. As discussed in the report, students identified as Under-Represented have shown a drop in graduation rates when compared to earlier cohorts. 	<p>CalAPA cycles are introduced to the students in the program orientation during their first class session. Each Cycle is briefly described. The CalAPA coordinator then holds a different webinar or Special Session for students to attend to describe the cycles in detail.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In addition, the community Canvas page has all of the recordings so students can view each of the cycles in their own time. 2. Students that are in track to graduating in two years continue to get support specifically towards finishing the CalAPA. Students that struggle with a class or have to take a leave of absence meet with the program coordinator to determine a plan of action to move forward with the program. 3. Students that struggle academically, first meet with their professor to determine a plan of action. If that does not yield the adequate academic outcome, then the student meets with the program coordinator to determine next steps. 4. During the orientation, the program coordinator addresses what students can do if they struggle academically. The main issues that have arisen from outside challenges have been students



		<p>that have been unable to balance school and work, family commitments, and students returning from maternity leave what have to join a different cohort. In all cases, students work with program coordinator and the MSEDAD administrative office staff to determine the adequate plan of action that supports students.</p> <p>5. While any significant equity gap is of potential concern, it is important to note that we do not yet see a meaningful pattern of larger gaps in the most recent cohorts. The size of the gaps have been quite erratic year to year (as noted in our PPR self-study), with reversals in whether UR or non-UR students were graduating at higher rates. One reason for this is the low numbers that result when the graduation cohort is split along demographic lines. Single digit changes in graduation rates by UR status result in large changes in terms of percentages, which may not be reflective of any systematic problem.</p>
	<p>Recommendations: So as to provide students with further support, signature assignments could be aligned with the focus or elements of the CalAPA. Not so much teaching to the test, but providing students with opportunity in the coursework to replicate elements of the CalAPA: data collection and analysis, data-driven instructional plans, developing and implementing communities of practice. These are just suggested activities. An early identification system for students struggling with the demands of the program should be developed. How will leadership address the equity gap existing in the graduation rates of students classified as under-represented? Consideration</p>	<p>CalAPA has been embedded directly into one course and two course series. Students have to submit Part 1 and 2 of CalAPA Cycle 1 in EDAD 593 as part of addressing an equity gap supported by both quantitative and qualitative data. For EDAD 505 and 510, students have to design a community of practice. Students complete various tasks throughout the semester focused on logistics, pedagogy, and facilitation skills to effectively lead a community of practice. The project is directly aligned to CalAPA Cycle 2. Finally, in EDAD 503 and 504, students learn the organizational dynamics of coaching and evaluation which are specifically aligned to CalAPA Cycle 3. For CalAPA 1, the actual language of the assessment is explicitly explained yet for CalAPA 2 and 3, the assignments are designed to support students towards</p>



	<p>should be given to developing structures that would support students struggling with the academic load. This may include writing workshops and continual mentoring.</p>	<p>completion of the assessment. Regardless of the support, what we are seeing is students waiting to complete the program and finishing the assessments after graduating from the program. Students have mentioned that they are stressed or anxious about completing course work including reading and assignments in addition to CalAPA submissions. In response, the program is offering support for students using the Canvas self-pacing guide for a year after their graduation towards completion of the CalAPA. If students fail to pass any cycle of CalAPA, they are mandated to meet with the CalAPA coordinator to review their assessment to make corrections towards resubmission.</p> <p>In terms of structures to support students, the program has two main assessments to gage student progress. Students have an evaluation of JEIE in their first semester in EDAD 593. Based on the results of this assessment, the program coordinator proactively meets with students that are not in track or are struggling with the work/school balance. If necessary, the program coordinator created a course of action for each student to ensure successful completion of program.</p>
<p>III. Documentation of Student Academic Achievement and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p>Challenges: A. Not a great deal of information here; this area describes who is generally responsible, but little detail on what the process is, especially timetable. B. We are unsure of how the survey/inventory is assessing SLO's (or what the inventory is). We are assuming candidates are self-reporting their efficacy with each SLO but not sure. Also, isn't each SLO being assessed each year? The table indicates 1-2 per</p>	<p>A. In 2018, the program aligned the courses to the CalAPA. In addition to this alignment, the program embedded two program wide assessments: A JEIE assessment in EDAD 593 and the culminating Masters project in EDAD 597. These two formal assessments are graded by a rubric and submitted to the COE. These were designed by the program coordinator at the time, but these assessments should be re-evaluated to see their impact on JEIE and overall completion of the CalAPA</p>



	<p>year. What other ways are they being assessed?</p> <p>C. There are some connections being made here to describe how assessments are influencing syllabi and instruction but this section is very vague. How has teaching changed (curriculum, specific assignments, etc) based on assessments? For example if SLO's are being well-covered, discuss how teaching has impacted this. OR, if they are not, how has the curriculum changed to address this? No mention of prof. Learning being influenced by SLO's.</p>	<p>B. All of the Leadership Department met between 2021 and 2023 to discuss the SLOs. They are leveraged during instructional evaluations per instructor.</p> <p>C. The program is in the process of revising their SLOs. That process began last Fall (2024) and will continue through this current semester (Spring 2025) and likely into Fall 2025 before complete. Until these program level SLOs are revised, the next steps in re-organizing and improving assessment practices, such as curriculum mapping, creation of new assessment measures, etc.) cannot begin.</p>
	<p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a table of process and timeline for cohort year. Should show connection and alignment across the curriculum. The plan should clearly show what assessments, if any, are summative or culminating throughout the program. 2. Indicate a summary of assessment for all SLO's with clear indicators of where each SLO is being assessed (which signature assessment is assessing each SLO). 3. Be much clearer on how assessment has impacted the design, curriculum, and prof learning of this program. I would want to know what skills faculty are adding to their toolbox based on this. For example, have there been any curricular changes based on SLO assessment or emphasis of prof learning for faculty? 4. Use the CalAPA completion/submission rates rather than pass rates as they tend to be more indicative of program success. This would indicate how 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The program office does have a tracker for students. It's used predominantly to track student course completion. This is an excellent opportunity to re-evaluate structures around tracking that look at assessments, course work, and CalAPA completion. 2. As noted in section C above, the program is in the process of significantly revising its assessment process, including revisions to all SLOs. We also acknowledge that the program needs to do a better job in professional development follow-up for adjunct instructors (who teach the majority of our courses) so they understand the structure of their evaluations along with having a deeper ownership if JEIE in action. 3. We agree with this concern, and as stated above, the program should re-evaluate the synchrony between SLOs, formal assessments, and CalAPA implementation. 4. This will be a new task added to the CalAPA coordinator to create reports that help program measure growth and recruit new candidates. Currently, the passing rates are shared with students,



	<p>well the program is supporting students in successfully completing all three cycles. Also, need another indicator such as job placement rates or perception surveys of educational partners.</p> <p>5. This may be a good place to consider field experience as a different modality. I get that if there are no other modalities such as online, compressed terms, etc., it would make sense to consider on-site field experience as another modality and discuss how this would be assessed. For example, would there be a portfolio or prof growth plan?</p> <p>6. What overarching assessments exist that would be considered summative for the program?</p>	<p>but it may help to create an internal policy brief that addresses CalAPA. In terms of job placement, it will help to ass an alumni column in the tracking sheet the program currently uses to track where students land.</p> <p>5. The program is for the most part taught online with only 3 in person days. Summer courses are compressed. LEAD programs are also amended accordingly to LEA partners. There is a way to incorporate experience as a different modality in terms of an assessment portfolio. The program gets students from traditional public schools, charter schools, councilors, district offices, and private schools. Students in private schools and in some cases charter schools struggle with course assignments (private schools do not capture dashboard data and online charter schools work as independent study which makes it difficult to conduct a Community of Practice for CalAPA 2). Students can potentially submit a portfolio assignment in their fieldwork course leveraging a JEIE framework or similarly in the Masters course.</p> <p>6. The two main assessments in EDAD 593 and EDAD 597. Both of these assignments are graded by a rubric and leveraged as data for the COE.</p>
<p>IV. Faculty</p>	<p>Challenges:</p> <p>1. There is no discussion of instructional faculty. How are course instructors identified, and what factors are determining the most appropriate choices for instructors? For example, are they expected to have knowledge in CI, MTSS, etc? What are the priorities for staffing in both coursework and fieldwork?</p> <p>2. We would provide more clarity and information here; how much</p>	<p>1. With the exception of two faculty, all of the instructional faculty are adjunct. There is a section in the community page that introduces all of the faculty. Every instructor is selected from the pool and assigned based on their leadership experience. Department Chairs have staffed the department over the last four years.</p> <p>2. Here is the breakdown: EDAD 593-Adjunct EDAD 505-Adjunct EDAD 566-Adjunct EDAD 510-Adjunct</p>



	<p>is tenure track faculty teaching (if any)?</p>	<p>EDAD 503-Adjunct EDAD 504-Adjunct EDAD 576-Adjunct EDAD 561-Adjunct EDAD 597-Adjunct CalAPA Coord-Adjunct Program Coord-Adjunct LEAD Elem-Full Time LEAD HS-Full Time</p>
	<p>Recommendations: Priorities for the hiring of faculty and their requisite skills should be clearly identified here. It may be as simple as having instructors who have a certain level of experience/education or specific knowledge of relevant content knowledge. This is a good section to provide more info around the on-site Lead-focused faculty as I'm unclear on their role here. Are they supervisors of fieldwork or mentors? If they are considered faculty, what is their role?</p>	<p>All of the adjunct faculty have a doctorate (PhD or EdD). Four are full time administrators. Three of the faculty have PhDs in educational leadership. The full-time faculty run the LEAD partnerships. The LEAD faculty collaborate with the LEAD LEA administrators but they are not themselves mentors. The mentors are designated in coordination with the LEAs.</p>
<p>V. Student Support and Advising</p>	<p>Challenges: Potential barriers when providing cohesive support may include how the program and faculty create cohesiveness on the support given through each course candidates are taking to complete the program. It seems like that at this point, the program is working on how to amplify the number of opportunities students have to do research with faculty and participate in honor programs, among other possibilities.</p>	<p>Overall, we believe the program provides good support to our students. As noted in our self-study, students have ready access to our graduate advisor, CalAPA coordinator, and the Program Coordinator. All three are in on-going contact with one another. In addition, the inventory of online resources regarding student support (both academic and financial/personal needs) are robust, and the recent hiring of a college-wide student support specialist has added to that mix.</p>
	<p>Recommendations – Explore how the program can collaborate with the ELEVAR (https://www.fullerton.edu/upgrads/news/index.html) initiative at CSUF. - Describe in detail how, when, and what support is</p>	<p>There is an opportunity to provide leadership narratives of Latinx students leading California K12 schools. This will promote educational excellence among other Latinx folk seeking to get not just a teaching credential but</p>



	<p>provided to candidates with disabilities. - Include specific initiatives on how the program supports candidates to fully use their linguistic repertoires. - Map what support is provided through the coursework and how this is aligned with the content and goals of each syllabus.</p>	<p>hopefully in the future and administrative credential too.</p> <p>All of the program syllabi are aligned to address support for students with disabilities. In addition to that, during the program orientation, the program coordinator addresses the steps to how students with disabilities should direct faculty towards having them create amended programming for the semester. In terms of leveraging their linguistic repertoires, students do learn about translanguaging during EDAD 593. As part of that, students submit their final assignment in two ways: a traditionally written paper and via a presentation as part of a broader discussion. The broader discussion and one embedded in the pillars of JEIE, is to have candidates think critically around language as they become leaders that will have to leverage both instructional and educational policy. Nonetheless, as the program begins to plan a Community of Practice around SOQ, assessment, and a broader alignment of the program, linguistic repertoires conversations will definitely be discussed</p>
<p>VI. Resources and Facilities</p>	<p><i>Recommendations</i> Develop a needs assessment based on a program evaluation and student feedback. Interact with other programs in areas that concern both programs. For example, preparing candidates to lead and guide teachers who are working in English-Medium classrooms.</p>	<p>We agree with this recommendation and believe that one purpose of the self-study was to address the needs of the program going forward. The recommendation regarding better interaction and collaboration with other programs that align with, or otherwise implicate, the future work of our students, is a good one. This will require additional discussion and planning with program faculty.</p>
<p>VII. Long-term Plans</p>	<p><i>Challenges</i> One candidate shared that all the program courses were taught by the same faculty. This comment and the fact that only 1-2 faculty teaching the program are full-time could decrease the possibility of</p>	<p>LEAD programs are currently taught by the faculty that started the partnerships with the specified LEAs. While the faculty remains the same throughout the duration of the program, internal LEA staff do change. For example, the associate superintendent of instruction</p>



	<p>diversifying who is teaching the courses, thus reducing the possibility for students to be exposed to other views. It was exciting to read that the program looks to expand their partnerships with 1-2 new districts. Would the program need more faculty to effectively implement these new partnerships?</p>	<p>coteaches with CSUF faculty one semester, the superintendent another semester, and human resources a different semester. This however, does open the discussion or opportunity to centralize partnerships and have the program coordinator or department chair disseminate assignments depending on the structure of the LEA. Depending on the number of partnerships, the department could assign faculty to teach different courses. Currently one faculty teaches all of the courses of the program.</p>
	<p><i>Recommendations</i> To diversify the faculty teaching the courses, these can be co-taught by one faculty member from the program and another faculty member from another department at the COE. The program could amplify its recruitment and impact by creating a cohort of bilingual candidates. Currently, there is a scarcity of bilingual leaders equipped with the tools and expertise to lead DLI programs.</p>	<p>This is a great opportunity to also amplify MSEDAD/PASC recruitment. It will be helpful to come into the BCLAD certification courses and talk to teacher candidates working on their credential to consider a leadership program. More so, this collaboration could also yield faculty that can co-teach in future LEA partnerships</p>

