



COMMISSION ON
TEACHER CREDENTIALING
Ensuring Educator Excellence

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

Institution	California State University, Fresno
Date report is submitted	August 1, 2012
Program documented in this report	PPS-School Social Work & CWA
Name of Program	PPS Credential Program - SSW and CWA
Please identify all delivery options through which this program is offered (Traditional, Intern, Other)	Traditional
Credential awarded	PPS in School Social Work & CWA
Is this program offered at more than one site? No	
If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered	
Program Contact	Andrea Carlin
Title	Field Coordinator; PPS Credential Program Coordinator
Phone #	(559) 278-3039
E-Mail	andreac@csufresno.edu
If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:	
Name	
Title	
Phone #	
E-mail	

California State University, Fresno: 2010-2012
Section A: Credential Program Specific Information
PPS Program: School Social Work and Child Welfare and Attendance (CWA)

Part I: Contextual Information

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

The Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) program with specializations in school social work and child welfare and attendance (CWA) is part of the Master of Social Work (M.S.W.) degree. The M.S.W. and PPS is a two year, full-time program of 60 units: 50 units of course work and 10 units of concurrent field placement study. The program utilizes an advanced, multi systems social work practice concentration as the model for educating advanced practitioners who can meet complex client needs within a diversity of settings and who can perform in a variety of roles using appropriate social work practice methodologies.

Three important goals of the Master of Social Work degree program include the development of 1) a commitment to social justice, 2) diversity awareness/competence, and 3) an empowerment perspective. The PPS credential program incorporates these educational goals in its mission to prepare social workers to "perform services to children, parents, school personnel and community agencies to promote a school environment responsive to the needs of children and to plan educational programs which will prepare children to function in a culturally diversified society" (CA Ed Code 44046). The program is designed to maximize the integration of theory and classroom knowledge with concurrent field instructed practice in the schools. This curriculum model ensures that students experience the breadth and depth necessary to be prepared for social work practice in the public schools.

Program specific candidate information is depicted in the chart below:

Program Specific Candidate Information				
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported				
	2010-11		2011-2012	
Site (If multiple sites) Delivery Option	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates
CSU, Fresno PPS - SSW & CWA Traditional Delivery	12	12	18	17

In 2010-11, there were 12 MSW students who completed the PPS program in school social work and CWA which was approximately twenty percent of the graduating MSW class. The 12 candidates were all females. The ethnic representation of this group included: 9 Hispanics; 1 Asian (Hmong); and, 2 African Americans. In 2011-12, 18 MSW students completed the PPS

program. This cohort included 15 females and 3 males. The ethnic representation of the 2011-12 candidates included: 10 Hispanics; 4 African Americans; 1 Asian (Cambodian); and, 3 Caucasians.

<u>Changes Since Commission Approval of Current Program Document</u>	<u>Date</u>
• Reconfiguration of MSW/PPS curriculum	2007
• Standardized learning agreements developed for field placement	2007
• Field placement performance evaluations revised	2007
• An exit survey was adopted by the Unit	2008
• A program Dispositions evaluation was developed and implemented	2008
• Development of PPS Portfolio as a requirement for program completion	2008
• Implementation of integrative field seminars for MSW 2 and PPS students	2008
• Implementation of annual regional meeting with PPS field instructors	2009
• Reaffirmation of full accreditation of BA and MSW programs by the national Council on Social Work Education	2009
• The program revised and implemented both the employer and alumni surveys	2010
• Annual field instructor training provided specifically for PPS field instructors	2011

California State University, Fresno: 2010-2012
Section A: Credential Program Specific Information
PPS Program: School Social Work and CWA

Part II: Candidate Assessment/Performance & Program Effectiveness Information

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

List 4-6 Key Assessments (not admissions data):

Key Assessments	Description	When Collected
Program Decision Points Data	Completion rates through program	Annually
Grades in SWrk 274	Assignments in Advanced Social Work Practice in Schools I	Fall semester
Grades in SWrk 275	Assignments in Advanced Social Work Practice in Schools II	Spring semester
PPS Candidate Dispositions Evaluation	Candidate demonstration of program dispositions	December & May
PPS Field Evaluation	Final evaluation of candidate performance in all program competency areas	May
PPS Candidate Portfolio	Compilation of evidence that candidate has met all program requirements	May

B. Addition information collected on completer performance and program effectiveness

Assessment Tool	Type of Data Collected	Data Collection Process
Unit Exit Survey	Self-assessment of general program knowledge and skills	Survey upon program completion annually in May
Program Exit Survey	Self- assessment of specific program knowledge and skills	Survey upon program completion annually in May
Employer Survey	Preparation of graduates to utilize program knowledge and skills in employment	Survey of employers every three years
Alumni Survey	Alumni perceptions of their preparation for advanced practice	Survey of alumni every three years

C. Summary of Data:

Program Decision Points Data – The summary of program decision points data is depicted in Table 1. It illustrates that 22% of the admitted MSW cohort participated in the PPS program in 2010-11, while there was a 28% participation rate in 2011-12. In both 2010-11 and 2011-12, 100% of the candidates completed their PPS field placement. Last year, 100%, or 12 of 12 candidates, completed the MSW and PPS program requirements. This year, 94% or 17 of 18 of the PPS candidates completed the program requirements.

Table 1: Program Decision Points

Program Name	Number of Applicants	% Admitted	% Admitted to Clinical Practice	% Completing Clinical Practice	% Completers	Completed of Admitted
Social Work 2010-11	186 (n=186) (MSW)	40% (n=74) (MSW)	22% (n=12) (PPS)	100% (n=12) (PPS)	100% (n=12) (PPS)	100% (n=12) (PPS)
Social Work 2011-12	198 (n=198) (MSW)	32% (n=64) (MSW)	28% (n=18) (PPS)	100% (n=18) (PPS)	94% (n=17) (PPS)	94% (n=17) (PPS)

Grades in SWrk 274, Advanced Social Work Practice in Schools I – This course is a requirement of all PPS candidates. It covers core generic and specialization standards content on the school as a context for practice and the laws that govern public education in the state. Course assignments are carefully designed and graded using standardized rubrics to assess candidate comprehension and application of this required content. PPS candidates are required to earn a grade of “B” or above to meet program requirements. Table 2 illustrates the course grades for each assignment for the fall 2010 and 2011 semesters.

Table 2: Grades Earned in SWrk 274– Fall 2010 and Fall 2011

Assignment	Possible Points	2010 Range	2010 Mean	2010 % Passed	2011 Range	2011 Mean	2011 % Passed	Action Plan Target
Participation	50	35-50	46	75%	36-50	47	94%	
School Paper	150	124-147	138	100%	121-150	136	100%	√
Attendance Assessment	100	81-99	91	100%	84-95	90	100%	√
SSW Plan	100	85-100	92	100%	86-97	92	100%	√
Final Exam	100	78-92	87	92%	76-92	85	78%	√
Final Grade	500	431-477	454	100%	422-477	450	100%	

Fall 2010, n=12

Fall 2011, n=18

Grades in SWrk 275, Advanced Social Work Practice in Schools II – This course is the second of two classes required of all PPS candidates. It covers additional generic and specialization standards content on the school as a context for practice and advanced practice strategies for intervention. Course assignments are carefully designed and graded using standardized rubrics to assess candidate comprehension and application of this required content. PPS candidates are required to earn a grade of “B” or above to meet program requirements. Table 3 illustrates the course grades for each assignment for the spring 2011 and 2012 semesters.

Table 3: Grades Earned in SWrk 275 – Spring 2011 and Spring 2012

Assignment	Possible Points	2011 Range	2011 Mean	2011 % Passed	2012 Range	2012 Mean	2012 % Passed	Action Plan Target
Participation	50	35-50	46	83%	34-50	46	82%	
Integration Paper	100	82-96	89	100%	80-96	89	100%	√
End-of-Year Report	100	85-97	92	100%	84-98	92	100%	√
Case Presentation	150	128-142	134	100%	132-143	140	100%	
Quiz 1	100	66-96	83	66%	72-97	87	82%	√

Final Grade	500	418-467	444	100%	430-462	453	100%	
-------------	-----	---------	-----	------	---------	-----	------	--

Spring 2011, n=12

Spring 2012, n=17

PPS Candidate Dispositions Evaluation – An evaluation tool was developed and utilized to specifically evaluate candidate acquisition of professional dispositions. This data is collected at the end of each semester that candidates are engaged in their PPS field placement. Candidate demonstration of each disposition is rated by the field instructor on a scale of 1-4, with one representing unsatisfactory and four representing above average. A rating of three represents satisfactory and is considered the benchmark for meeting program requirements. The data for 2010-11 is depicted in Table 4 and the data for 2011-12 is located in Table 5.

Table 4: 2010-11 Evaluation of Candidate Dispositions (n=12)

Disposition	Range F 10	Mean F 10	SD F11	Bench-mark	Range Sp 11	Mean Sp 11	SD Sp 11	Bench-mark	Change
Reflect	3-4	3.25	.45	100%	3-4	3.75	.45	100%	+.50
Critical Thinking	2-4	3.42	.67	92%	3-4	3.75	.45	100%	+.33
Professional Ethics	3-4	3.42	.52	100%	3-4	3.92	.29	100%	+.50
Values Diversity	3-4	3.58	.52	100%	4	4.00	0	100%	+.42
Collaboration	3-4	3.25	.45	100%	3-4	3.75	.45	100%	+.50
Life-Long Learning	3-4	3.17	.39	100%	3-4	3.75	.45	100%	+.58
Overall	3-4	3.25	.45	100%	3-4	3.83	.39	100%	+.58

Table 5: 2011-12 Evaluation of Candidate Dispositions (n=18)

Disposition	Range F 11	Mean F 11	SD F11	Bench-mark	Range Sp 12	Mean Sp 12	SD Sp 12	Bench-mark	Change
Reflect	3-4	3.28	.46	100%	3-4	3.72	.46	100%	+.44
Critical Thinking	3-4	3.44	.51	100%	3-4	3.67	.48	100%	+.23
Professional Ethics	3-4	3.67	.49	100%	3-4	3.78	.43	100%	+.11
Values Diversity	3-4	3.67	.49	100%	3-4	3.72	.46	100%	+.05
Collaboration	3-4	3.39	.50	100%	3-4	3.78	.43	100%	+.39
Life-Long Learning	3-4	3.39	.50	100%	3-4	3.72	.46	100%	+.33
Overall	3-4	3.28	.46	100%	3-4	3.78	.43	100%	+.50

PPS Evaluation of Student Performance in Field Placement – A comprehensive evaluation of candidate knowledge and skills is conducted by the MSW/PPS field instructor at the end of the 600 hour PPS field internship. The evaluation addresses professional development, professional values and identity, multi systems practice, and evaluation of practice. Candidate performance is rated on a scale of 1-5 with five representing excellent and one representing poor. Table 6 depicts the outcome data for candidate performance in field placement for 2011 and 2012. Action plan targets are denoted with an asterisk.

Table 6: 2011 and 2012 Evaluation of Candidate in PPS Field Placement at Program Completion

Skill Area	Range F 11	2011 Mean (n=12)	SD F11	Bench-mark	Range Sp 12	2012 Mean (n=18)	SD Sp 12	Bench-mark	Change
Professional Development									
Organizes Effectively	3-4	4.58	.67	100%	3-5	4.33	.69	100%	-.25

Initiative	4-5	4.67	.49	100%	2-5	4.39	.85	100%	-.28
Seeks Learning	4-5	4.67	.49	100%	2-5	4.22	.81	94%	-.45
Uses Theory*	3-5	4.08	.67	100%	3-5	4.11	.68	100%	+.03
Plans for Supervision	4-5	4.67	.49	100%	3-5	4.17	.62	100%	-.50
Open to Feedback	4-5	4.83	.39	100%	3-5	4.39	.70	100%	-.44
Uses Supervision	3-5	4.58	.67	100%	3-5	4.50	.62	100%	-.08
Communication Skills	4-5	4.75	.45	100%	3-5	4.33	.59	100%	-.42
Socio Cultural Competence (#1)	3-5	4.75	.62	100%	3-5	4.39	.61	100%	-.36
Values and Identity									
Ethical Practice	4-5	4.75	.45	100%	2-5	4.61	.78	94%	-.14
SSW Role	4-5	4.67	.49	100%	3-5	4.50	.62	100%	-.17
Professional Relationships	5	5.00	0	100%	3-5	4.56	.62	100%	-.44
Team Member	4-5	4.58	.51	100%	3-5	4.39	.61	100%	-.19
Diversity Awareness	3-5	4.64	.67	100%	3-5	4.33	.59	100%	-.31
Multi Systems Practice									
Organizational Structure*	3-5	4.17	.58	100%	3-5	3.83	.51	100%	-.34
Organizational Climate (#2*)	4-5	4.25	.45	100%	3-5	4.17	.71	100%	-.08
Change Agent	3-5	4.25	.62	100%	3-5	4.29	.69	100%	+.04
Collaborative Relationships (#4)	4-5	4.50	.52	100%	3-5	4.33	.69	100%	-.17
Facilitation/Consultation (#5)	3-5	4.33	.79	100%	3-5	4.22	.81	100%	-.11
Laws (#3)*	3-5	4.17	.58	100%	3-5	4.17	.62	100%	0
Advocacy	4-5	4.58	.51	100%	3-5	4.39	.70	100%	-.19
Brokering	4-5	4.50	.52	100%	3-5	4.39	.61	100%	-.11
Assessment (#6)	3-5	4.33	.65	100%	3-5	4.33	.77	100%	0
Attendance Intervention (#10)*	3-5	4.50	.67	100%	3-5	4.50	.71	100%	0
Intervention Plans	4-5	4.58	.51	100%	3-5	4.39	.61	100%	-.19
Pupil Safety (#9)*	4-5	4.58	.51	100%	3-5	4.06	.73	100%	-.48
Multiple Interventions	3-5	4.42	.67	100%	3-5	4.28	.58	100%	-.14
Prevention & Intervention (#7)	4-5	4.58	.51	100%	3-5	4.33	.69	100%	-.25
Work with Families (#8)	3-5	4.33	.78	100%	3-5	4.28	.75	100%	-.05
Learning Theory (#11)*	3-5	4.33	.78	100%	3-5	4.06	.75	100%	-.27
Evaluation of Practice									
Evaluates Practice	4-5	4.92	.29	100%	3-5	4.44	.62	100%	-.48
Applies Research	3-5	4.33	.65	100%	3-5	4.22	.65	100%	-.11

PPS Candidate Portfolios - Upon program completion, PPS candidates submit a portfolio that is a compilation of classroom and field placement assignments representing achievement of program requirements. The portfolio is evaluated using a standardized rubric. Candidates must achieve an overall portfolio rating of 80% or higher in order to be recommended for the credential. Table 7 illustrates the portfolio evaluation data for 2011 and 2012.

Table 7: 2011 and 2012 Evaluation of PPS Candidate Portfolios

Portfolio Content Area	2011 Range (%)	2011 Mean (%)	2011 % Meeting Benchmark	2012 Range (%)	2012 Mean (%)	2012 % Meeting Benchmark
Multi Systems Practice	86-95	91	100%	88-96	93	100%
SSW and CWA	83-94	89	100%	80-95	88	100%

Competencies						
Evaluations	85-91	88	100%	83-93	89	100%
Total	87-91	89	100%	84-94	90	100%

2011, n=12: 2012, n=17

Exit Surveys:

Unit – An exit survey was developed and implemented by all credential programs in the Unit in spring 2008. The collection of outcome data across the unit was an important addition to the assessment system. PPS candidates in the social work program complete these exit surveys in May. Candidate preparation is rated on a scale of 1-5 with one representing excellent preparation and 5 representing very inadequate preparation. The benchmark for PPS candidates is a rating of three or lower. Table 8 provides a summary of the 2011 and 2012 unit exit survey data for the PPS program. Action plan targets are denoted with an asterisk.

Table 8: 2011 and 2012 Unit Exit Survey (2011, n=12; 2012, n=18)

Area of Preparation	2011 Range	2011 Mean	SD	Bench-mark	2012 Range	2012 Mean	SD	Bench-mark
Building rapport	1-3	1.50	.67	100%	1-4	1.28	.75	94%
Organizing tasks	1-3	1.58	.66	100%	1-4	1.72	.75	94%
Diversity	1-3	1.50	.67	100%	1-4	1.50	.78	94%
All can learn	1-2	1.42	.51	100%	1-4	1.56	.78	94%
Theoretical grounding in field*	1-4	1.92	.99	92%	1-3	1.72	.66	100%
Research in field	1-4	1.83	.83	92%	1-3	1.67	.76	100%
Apply learning*	1-2	1.42	.51	100%	1-3	1.22	.54	100%
Assess progress	1-3	1.75	.75	100%	1-3	1.39	.60	100%
Ethical conduct	1-3	1.42	.66	100%	1-3	1.22	.54	100%
Collaboration	1-2	1.42	.51	100%	1-3	1.39	.69	100%
Self-evaluate	1-2	1.50	.52	100%	1-4	1.56	.85	94%
Received appropriate supervision	1-3	1.58	.79	94%	1-3	1.56	.70	100%
Apply theory and research*	1-4	2.08	.90	92%	1-3	1.61	.77	100%
Life-long learning	1-2	1.50	.52	100%	1-4	1.56	.85	94%
Prepared for employment	1-3	1.83	.71	100%	1-4	1.44	.78	94%

Program – Exit survey information is collected from PPS candidates upon completion of the program in May. This instrument surveys candidates on their perceptions of program administration and delivery, program strengths and weaknesses, and their acquisition of core knowledge and skills for effective social work practice in schools. Content areas for program information are rated on a scale of 1-6 with one representing strongly agree, three meaning undecided, and six indicating that the item is not applicable. The benchmark for meeting program expectations is a rating of two or lower. The content areas for knowledge and skills are rated as high (3), medium (2), and low (1). The benchmark for meeting program requirements for this section of the survey is a rating of 2 or above. Table 9 illustrates the outcome data for the 2011 and 2012 PPS candidate exit surveys. Action plan targets are denoted with an asterisk.

Table 9: 2011 (n=12) and 2012 (n=18) PPS Candidate Exit Survey

Content Area	Range 2011	2011 Mean	Bench -mark	Range 2012	2012 Mean	Bench -mark	Change
Program Information							
Prerequisites	1	1.00	100%	1-2	1.06	100%	+.06

Clear Requirements	1-2	1.25	100%	1-2	1.11	100%	-.14
Courses	1-2	1.08	100%	1-2	1.11	100%	+.03
Integration in Field	1-2	1.25	100%	1-2	1.39	100%	+.14
Field Assignments	1-2	1.17	100%	1-2	1.06	100%	-.11
PPS Field Instructor	1-2	1.25	100%	1-2	1.06	100%	-.19
Supervision	1-2	1.08	100%	1-3	1.28	100%	+.20
PPS Liaison	1-3	1.25	100%	1-2	1.06	100%	-.19
Liaison Support	1-4	1.33	92%	1-2	1.11	100%	-.22
Prepared for Practice	1-2	1.17	100%	1-2	1.17	100%	0
PPS Knowledge & Skills							
Ecological Approach	2-3	2.73	100%	2-3	2.61	100%	-.12
Ethics	2-3	2.91	100%	2-3	2.89	100%	-.02
Socio Cultural Competence (#1)	3	3.00	100%	2-3	2.67	100%	-.33
Organization, Advocacy & Discipline (#2)*	2-3	2.55	100%	2-3	2.61	100%	+.06
Laws (#3)*	2-3	2.36	100%	2-3	2.44	100%	+.08
Collaboration (#4)	3	3.00	100%	2-3	2.78	100%	-.22
Facilitation/Consultation (#5)	2-3	2.82	100%	2-3	2.67	100%	-.15
Assessment (#6)	2-3	2.73	100%	2-3	2.72	100%	-.01
Prevention & Intervention (#7)	2-3	2.55	100%	2-3	2.50	100%	-.05
Work with Families (#8)	2-3	2.73	100%	2-3	2.83	100%	+.10
Pupil Safety (#9)*	2-3	2.64	100%	2-3	2.61	100%	-.03
Attendance & Intervention(#10)	2-3	2.82	100%	2-3	2.88	100%	+.06
Learning Theory (#11)*	1-3	2.27	100%	2-3	2.61	100%	+.34

Note: For Program Information, a negative value in the change column denotes improvement. For PPS Knowledge and Skills, a positive value in the change column denotes improvement.

California State University, Fresno: 2010-2012
Section A: Credential Specific Program Information
PPS Program: School Social Work and CWA

Part III: Analysis and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

Candidate assessment data was presented in the previous section of this report that represents performance through the program, to recommendation for the credential, and after program completion. The data indicate that the program continues to meet its goal of adequately preparing candidates for social work and CWA practice in schools. A number of program strengths as well as some areas for improvement within the PPS credential program are evident. The data did not demonstrate any major changes in program outcomes or areas of significant concern regarding program effectiveness or candidate competence. Areas of strength and areas for improvement derived from the data are outlined below:

Program Strengths

- The PPS program is well organized and includes clear requirements, relevant courses and field placement assignments that facilitate the integration of theory and practice as indicated by the data from program exit surveys.
- Candidate satisfaction with field instructor and faculty liaison expertise and support increased since the 2008-10 reporting period as well as from 2010-11 to 2011-2012.
- During the program, the vast majority of candidates demonstrated mastery of both the generic and specialization standards content in most PPS course assignments. All candidates met the program benchmark for mastery of this content based on final course grades in both 2010-11 and 2011-12.
- There was a high percentage of program completion: 100% in 2011 and 94% in 2012. 100% of portfolios for program completers met the benchmark to be recommended for the credential.
- At program completion, the 2011 candidates' demonstrated proficiency in applying specialized program knowledge and skills to school social work and CWA practice by meeting program benchmarks in field placement in all areas evaluated. The following areas were rated highest: professional relationships; evaluation of practice; ethical practice; sociocultural competence; and, communication skills. The 2012 candidates demonstrated proficiency in 30 of 32 areas evaluated and were rated highest in use of supervision, ethical practice, and attendance interventions.
- At program completion, candidates in this reporting period rated their knowledge and skills generally higher than in the 2008-10 reporting period. Specifically, they rated themselves highest in relation to ethics, assessment, attendance and multi systems intervention, socio cultural competence, collaboration, and work with families.
- At program completion in both years, 100% of candidates met the program benchmark for demonstration of overall professional dispositions. Moderate growth was evidenced over the year in all disposition areas.
- The 2010 action plan goal to increase proficiency with knowledge of the organizational structure of schools was partially met. Data from course assignments and exit surveys show slight improvement. Data from field placement evaluations also demonstrate growth (.34 points) from 2010 to 2011.

- The 2010 action plan goal to increase proficiency with laws that influence attendance and education was also achieved. Mean scores on candidate field evaluations increased modestly from the 2008-10 reporting period (.9-.21 points). Exit surveys also indicate slight increases in this target area from 2011 to 2012.
- The 2010 action plan goal to increase proficiency in understanding and applying developmental and learning theory was evidenced in the data from course grades in SWrk 275 and on program exit surveys. Unit exit outcomes also reflect an improvement in theoretical grounding of candidates from 2011 to 2012.

Areas for Improvement: The mean values of all areas of candidate assessment meet program benchmarks. Some complex content areas that rated lower in 2010, but still met program benchmarks, were targeted for improvement:

- The 2010 action plan goal to increase knowledge of the organizational structure of schools was partially met. Data from course assignments and exit surveys show minimal improvement. Data from field evaluations shows some progress from 2010 to 2011 but a slight decrease from 2011 to 2012 indicating that improvement is neither strong nor stable.
- While the 2010 action plan goal to increase proficiency with laws that influence attendance and education was achieved, the accompanying target on pupil safety was not met based on field evaluations. Both are critical areas of school social work and CWA practice and require continued efforts toward improvement.
- There continues to be a need to strengthen understanding and application of developmental and learning theory as evidenced in course assignments, field evaluations and prior alumni surveys.
- A downward trend is noted in the field evaluation outcomes in the areas of professional development from 2011 to 2012. A t test analysis comparing the 2011 and 2012 cohorts revealed significant differences in two areas related to openness to learning and the use of supervision. Stronger socialization to professional behavior and openness to learning seems indicated.

California State University, Fresno: 2010-2012
Section A: Credential Program Specific Information
PPS Program: School Social Work and CWA

Part IV: Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate & Program Performance

Data Source	Data Focus	Action Plan
Course Assignments, Field Evaluations, Exit Survey	Increase candidate proficiency with knowledge of the school as an organizational structure/context for practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborate with Fresno Unified School District to provide comprehensive candidate field orientation to the school as a context for practice for all interns. • Include specific field assignments in the PPS learning agreements that address the school as an organization
Course Assignments, Field Evaluations, Exit Survey	Increase candidate proficiency with CWA laws and pupil safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize course assignments in SWrk 274 and 275 to specifically address these competencies. • Strengthen weekly field supervision to address learning progress in these areas via training and liaison support. • Institute use of tracking form to monitor completion of field assignments in the PPS learning agreements that target these areas. • Provide annual training for PPS field instructors regarding candidate need for increased exposure to these learning areas.
Course Assignments, Field Evaluations, Exit Survey	Increase candidate understanding and application of developmental and learning theories to practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued consultation with HBSE sequence to discuss streamlining theoretical content in HBSE courses. • Utilize specific course and field assignments to strengthen understanding and application of theory.
Field Evaluations	Increase candidate demonstration of professional development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide more specific and comprehensive orientation and training to PPS candidates regarding professionalism and internship expectations. • Strengthen weekly field supervision to address learning progress in professional development via field instructor training and liaison support.