



AAQEP Annual Report for 2025

Provider/Program Name:	California State University, Bakersfield
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or “n/a” if not yet accredited):	12/31/2030. CSUB received a Good Cause Extension approval to align the CCTC and AAQEP site visits for Fall 2030.

PART I: Publicly Available Program Performance and Candidate Achievement Data

1. Overview and Context

This overview describes the mission and context of the educator preparation provider and the programs included in its AAQEP review.

California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) serves the dynamic and growing communities of California’s Southern San Joaquin Valley and the Antelope Valley. The Bakersfield region is a fertile hub for agriculture, energy production, and transportation, while the Antelope Valley features the aerospace industry. The relatively inexpensive cost of living and availability of land in both regions make these communities attractive to families and others seeking affordability and space.

While the regions’ current growth bucks the state’s general demographic trends, the trend continues a long history of movement. In the early twentieth century, residents were joined by ranchers, Dust Bowl migrants, and immigrants from Mexico. Movement into the region from other parts of California, the United States, and the world, including significant Central and South American, Asian, and Indian populations, continues to create complex and dynamic communities. While Bakersfield itself is the state’s ninth-

largest city, the university also serves the dozens of rural communities across Kern, Inyo, Kings, Tulare, and North Los Angeles counties, where our students, staff, and faculty call home.

CSUB serves these communities with about 10,500 students enrolled in over 55 degree programs categorized into majors that work, majors that matter, majors that mean business, and majors that make a difference. Among the majors that make a difference are the university's Educator Preparation Programs (EPP), including teacher education, special education, educational counseling, educational administration, and the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership. University-wide, the students, or Rising Runners to acknowledge the university's roadrunner mascot, are about 86% undergraduates and 14% graduate students. Most educator preparation students are graduate students. The university has a Hispanic Serving Institution designation and a large proportion of first-generation students.

Improving students' capabilities, opportunities, and potential for positive impact on their communities forms a central university mission reflected in the motto 'Runners on the rise! To this end, CSUB continues to distinguish itself in national rankings for economic value, social mobility, and commitment to student success. Notable rankings include:

- No. 4 in California Futures Foundation's California Mobility Index, 2025
- No. 10 in CollegeNET's Social Mobility Index, 2024
- No. 14 in Best Bang for the Buck College: West, Washington Monthly, 2024
- No. 28 in Master's Universities, Washington Monthly, 2024

This focus on value, mobility, and success can be found throughout the university, college, and educator preparation mission, vision, and values statements.

CSUB Mission, Vision, Values, and Goals

CSUB Mission

California State University, Bakersfield is a comprehensive public university offering excellent undergraduate and graduate programs that advance the intellectual and personal development of its students. We emphasize student learning through our commitment to scholarship, ethical behavior, diversity, service, global awareness, and life-long learning. The university collaborates with partners in the community to increase the region's overall educational attainment, enhance its quality of life, and support its economic development.

CSUB Vision

CSUB will be a model for supporting and educating students to become knowledgeable, engaged, innovative, and ethical leaders in the regional and global community.

CSUB Goals

- Strengthen and inspire student success and lifelong learning
- Advance faculty and staff success
- Develop and sustain high-quality and innovative academic programs and support services
- Recognize and address regional needs in collaboration with our community
- Diversify, enhance, and responsibly steward our campus resources

College of Social Sciences and Education (SSE) Mission and Goals**SSE Mission**

The mission of the College of Social Sciences and Education is to enrich the lives of our students and improve the communities in which they live by providing high-quality undergraduate, credential, and graduate programs in the social sciences and education. Our programs provide opportunities for students to grow as wise leaders, engaged and compassionate citizens, reflective users of disciplinary knowledge, well-prepared working professionals, and lifelong learners. We embrace diversity in thought and experience. The College is a resource and partner for increasing the quality of life in our community. In all we do, the College strives for educational access, efficiency, and quality.

SSE Goals

- Recruit, retain, and support high-quality faculty and staff who are dedicated to the mission of the University and College.
- Provide opportunities for strong disciplinary preparation and rich overall academic experiences leading to timely graduation.
- Develop stronger relationships with external partners in order to create opportunities for students and to improve the quality of life within our community.
- Expand academic programs with the College that increase educational access without sacrificing quality or efficiency.

Educator Preparation Programs (EPP) Mission, Vision, and Theme**EPP Mission**

CSUB Educator Preparation Programs cultivate school, university, and community partnerships that prepare highly qualified education professionals who work collaboratively to nurture an equitable and informed education community.

EPP Vision

The CSUB Educator Preparation Programs will be the nexus of a network of ethical educational leaders who promote student growth and improve the quality of life in their communities.

EPP Theme

Expanding minds. Engaging hearts. Enhancing communities.

[Unit Assessment System](#)

Public Posting URL

Part I of this report is posted at the following web address (accredited members filing this report must post at least Part I):

<https://www.csub.edu/educaccred/aagep/>

2. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows current enrollment and recent completion data, disaggregated by program and license/certificate, for each program included in the AAQEP review.

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2024-2025

Degree or Program offered by the institution/organization	Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential granted by the state	Number of Candidates Enrolled in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 06/30/25)	Number of Completers in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 06/30/25)
<i>Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials</i>			
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials			
<i>Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators</i>			
Master of Arts	Educational Administration	29	28
	Educational Counseling	39	13

Preliminary Credential	Administrative Services	28	26
Clear Credential	Pupil Personnel Credential	39	13
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials		135	80
<i>Programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials</i>			
Total for programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials		0	0
<i>Programs that lead to credentials for specialized professionals or to no specific credential</i>			
Doctoral Program	Education Leadership	47	10
Total for programs that lead to specialized professional or no specific credentials		47	10
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs		182	90
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers		96	77

Added or Discontinued Programs

Any programs within the AAQEP review that have been added or discontinued within the past year are listed below. (This list is required only from providers with accredited programs.)

No programs were added or discontinued in AY 2024-2025. An authorization, the Child Welfare and Attendance Added Authorization was added to the School Counseling program as approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing in Spring, 2025.

3. Program Performance Indicators

The program performance information in Table 2 applies to the academic year indicated in Table 1.

Table 2. Program Performance Indicators

<p>A. Total enrollment in the educator preparation programs shown in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals earning more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.</p>			
96			
<p>B. Total number of unique completers (across all programs) included in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals who earned more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.</p>			
77			
<p>C. Number of recommendations for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.</p>			
54			
<p>D. Cohort completion rates for candidates who completed the various programs within their respective program’s expected timeframe and in 1.5 times the expected timeframe.</p>			
Program	Expected Timeframe	1.5 Timeframe	Total Completers
Educational Administration Credential 2 terms/ 3 terms	25	0	25
MA. Educational Administration 3 terms/ 5 terms	29	0	29
Pupil Personal Services 5 terms/ 8 terms	12	1	13
Doctoral Program 4 terms/ 6 terms	0	0	11

E. Summary of state license examination results, including teacher performance assessments, and specification of any examinations on which the pass rate (cumulative at time of reporting) was below 80%.

The [Educational Administration Services Preliminary Credential Program](#) is the only program in this annual report with a required state assessment for licensure. For the 2024-2025 school year, the program had a 96% pass rate averaged across the three cycles of the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA): 1) Analyzing Data to Inform School Improvement and Promote Equity (96% pass rate), 2) Facilitating Communities of Practice (93% pass rate), and 3) Supporting Teacher Growth (100% pass rate). Candidates who did not pass usually did so due to a condition code where a technical aspect of the assessment was not visible to the state-level assessors (e.g., a community of practice member not visible in a Cycle 2 video). Students are provided program support and guidance and may revise and resubmit their CalAPA.

F. Explanation of evidence available from program completers, with a characterization of findings.

CSUB utilizes a Unit Operations Survey (UOS) to gauge completer satisfaction with their program. Completers are asked to rate their satisfaction with the faculty, program preparation, and confidence in their ability to be an effective educational professional. Overall ratings for all three programs note an average mean score of 4 or above on a 1-5 Likert-type scale for all three areas.

During the 2024-2025 school year, the unit continued its transition to collecting data in the student information system, Watermark. This transition included moving the unit operations survey into Watermark which resulted in some program data not being collected. The unit is working to improve the system for this year. The links provide longitudinal data from the past several years.

[Unit Operations Survey, School Counseling](#)
[Unit Operations Survey, Educational Administration](#)
[Unit Operations Survey, Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership](#)

G. Explanation of evidence available from employers of program completers, with a characterization of findings.

Typically, the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership and Educational Administration programs hold regular Advisory Meetings that include discussion of program goals, processes, and progress in relation to completer needs to effectively enter the job market and serve their educational communities. However, in School Year 2024-2025, the programs took a different approach by scheduling meetings with educational leaders in their home offices located across our service regions.

In the spring of 2025, faculty from the EDAD felt that the Educational Administration Advisory Council (EAAC) needed to be reconstituted. While the membership of the EAAC has provided strong guidance and support through our continuous improvement journey since its inception in 2019, in the spring of 2025 several members of the EAAC were retiring from service. As such, the EDAD faculty felt that the time was right to onboard a fresh group of community partners to continue the continuous improvement work. The EDAD faculty are currently working to reconstitute the EAAC and expect to hold our next meeting in the spring of 2026. EDAD faculty realized that it would take some time and deep thought to reconstitute EAAC membership.

Instead of waiting for decisions to be made about new membership for the EAAC and then seeking commitments of potential EAAC members, the EDAD faculty, in conjunction with the DPEL faculty, thought it would be wise to use the opportunity to seek input from *other* educational partners across our vast service area. Recognizing the opportunity, EDAD and DPEL faculty developed a set of open-ended questions to gain a better understanding of the perceptions educational leaders through focus group interviews. We sought to better understand these leaders' experiences with novice administrators and the insidious problems of practice they were grappling with locally.

Over the course of three months in the Spring of 2025, EDAD and DPEL faculty leveraged community relationships to recruit educational leaders from a diversity of educative contexts across our vast service area and hosted a series of six focus group interviews, each lasting about 60 minutes. First, we convened a group of superintendents from small, rural districts in the western and eastern locations of Kern County. Next, we met with a group of district advisors from the County Office of Education. Subsequently, we convened a group of assistant superintendents and directors from the largest urban elementary school district in Bakersfield, followed by another focus group comprised of the superintendent and assistant superintendents from a mid-sized elementary school district in Bakersfield. Another focus group was comprised of district leaders (superintendent and assistant superintendents) from one mountain community. Finally, we convened a group of superintendents from districts across the Antelope Valley region.

As expected, there was some variation expressed across focus groups. For example, superintendents from rural school districts talked more about the importance of broad training, as administrators in rural districts do not have the infrastructure to support myriad leadership roles for the nesting of jurisdictions within the organization. They talked about the import of forging informal networks across rural districts to share resources and ideas as well as relationships with leaders from larger districts. Leaders from mid-sized and urban districts talked more about the import of efficacy in matters related to instructional coaching (understanding grade-level specific curriculum maps, instructional rigor and having difficult conversations about instruction with teachers) and discipline; roles that were commonly associated with assistant or vice-principals. Nevertheless, there was much in common as well. For example, in all focus groups, participants discussed the import of understanding special education laws and processes, the import of relationships, and leaning into relationships with other leaders.

The EDAD and DPEL programs were able to identify some concrete next steps to guide continuous improvement efforts from these focus group interviews. For example, given the discussions about relationships with other leaders, the EDAD program

faculty has forged a new relationship with the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), a statewide administrators' association with bustling local activity. EDAD faculty joined ACSA as associate members and are working to develop a student charter. We envision this opportunity to allow our administrator candidates the chance to leverage ACSA to expand their professional learning network and forge relationships with other leaders across our vast service area before they matriculate into their first administrative role.

The Educational Counseling program continued its traditional approach of meeting with an advisory committee. A meeting in fall 2024 focused on the university program review process, the relationship and crossover between the accredited PK-12 serving school counseling program and the non-AAQEP accredited student affairs program, and prerequisites impacting student success for both programs. Some students complete the student affairs program and then enroll in the school counseling program, thus leading to the discussion of the programs' relationship and what is needed for both AAQEP and state level accreditation for our completers. One outcome of this ongoing program discussion includes the possibility of student affairs pursuing AAQEP accreditation. Meeting minutes are available here: [EDCS Fall 2024 Advisory Council Meeting Minutes](#).

H. Explanation of how the program investigates **employment rates for program completers**, with a characterization of findings. This section may also indicate rates of completers' ongoing education, e.g., graduate study.

Employment rates for program completers have been informally collected in each program. Faculty in Educational Administration generally hear from students who are moving from the certificate of eligibility to the preliminary credential when they have an administrative employment offer. Educational Counseling faculty also hear from students who have positions pending while in the program. The DPEL program director maintains close ties with most program completers through formal and informal means including participation on the DPEL advisory committee and requests to mentor and support current DPEL students and program faculty. Additionally, DPEL and its student lead Network maintain networking with graduates beyond their leadership journey [see [DPEL Alumni Stories](#)]

A key component of our continuous improvement plans specific to standard 4 for the full EPP is to better connect with program completers. CSU system-wide data is not available, and we have struggled to gather additional data in this area for several years. Our plan moving forward has several approaches that we believe will assist us with both employer and program completer data collection. The [CSU Chancellor's Office](#) has announced a system wide shift in focus from graduation rates to ensuring graduates have opportunities for careers. This new focus builds on the Graduation 2025 initiative and is designed to ensure we are tracking and supporting students after degree completion. This is anticipated to provide education programs in the system with additional resources to stay in touch with program completers.

In addition to the CSU Chancellor's initiative, the EPP has developed a new alumni tab in PeopleSoft to collect personal

email and contact information that will enable us to reach out on a more frequent basis and ensure we have the ability to stay in touch with completers. Using the revised alumni survey, we anticipate having a more robust understanding of employment and plans for program alumni. Data collected from the [alumni survey](#) will inform us regarding employers to contact for the [employer survey](#) (alumni survey sent each fall; employer survey sent each spring).

- I. Explanation of how the **staffing capacity** for program delivery and administration and quality assurance system monitoring have changed during the reporting year, if at all, and how capacity matches the current size of the program.

Technically, if viewed through staffing and full-time equivalent (FTE) metrics, the unit did not experience any staffing changes during the school year 2024-2025. However, the metrics alone do not tell the full story. California State University, Bakersfield, is experiencing an overall contraction with reductions in workforce to address long-standing structural deficits. These university reductions are in addition to reductions from the state and federal levels. There remains uncertainty regarding the full extent of these financial implications. In the school year 2024-2025, a long-awaited additional tenure-track line for the Educational Counseling program was officially cancelled. Furthermore, Dr. Debbie Meadows, Director of Assessment and Accreditation, announced her retirement. The university has not filled the position heading into this school year, and there are no plans to fill the position in the foreseeable future. This formerly full-time administrative role has been transitioned to faculty through release time, but the release time only constitutes about half of the former time allocation. The time allocation is further diluted when considering faculty's heavy teaching, scholarship, and other service responsibilities. The transition, including transferring institutional knowledge and the need to accomplish the same amount of work product in half the allocated work time units, is showing signs of slowing further progress that will be experienced more fully as the school year 2025-2026 progresses.

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

Tables 3 and 4 report on select measures (3 to 5 measures for each standard) of candidate/completer performance related to AAQEP Standards 1 and 2, including the program's expectations for performance (criteria for success) and indicators of the degree to which those expectations are met.

Table 3. Expectations and Performance on Standard 1: Candidate and Completer Performance

Provider-selected measures (name and description)	Criteria for success	Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation																																				
<p>As this fall is the first time we have been able to extract usable and reportable data from our new Watermark system, we are focusing on AAQEP Standard 1a for all three programs. Providing this narrow focus allows us to begin exploring and utilizing Watermark for further improvement.</p> <p>Educational Administration identified three classes with three signature assignments across the program addressing AAQEP Standard 1a: Demonstrate proficiency in the knowledge and skills required for effective practice in their anticipated professional role.</p> <p>Results from EDAD 6100 Visionary Leadership and EDAD 6200 Instructional Leadership, and focus on reflexive reflections regarding the candidate’s experience in simulated case studies.</p> <p>EDAD 6890 Culminating Activity in Education focuses on the candidate’s final presentation of their literature review addressing a problem of practice in their school.</p>	<p>The credential courses EDAD 6100 and 6200 use a four-point rubric ranging from a high of Exceeds Expectations to a low of Needs Substantive Revision. The reflexive reflection is used in conjunction with simulated case studies, requiring candidates to make leadership decisions and then reflect upon those decisions for continuous improvement. Success is defined as both Meets and Exceeds expectations.</p> <p>EDAD 6100 Rubric EDAD 6200 Rubric</p> <p>The EDAD 6890 Culminating Activity course also utilizes a rubric to assess the candidate’s final presentation of their research-based plan to address a problem of practice in their school. The rubric is a three-point rubric with success defined as both Meets and Exceeds expectations.</p> <p>EDAD 6890 Rubric</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="1333 365 1858 779"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Standard Met/Not Met</th> <th>N</th> <th>Rubric mean</th> <th>Standard Deviation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">EDAD</td> <td rowspan="2">6100</td> <td>Met</td> <td>15</td> <td>15</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Met</td> <td>0</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">EDAD</td> <td rowspan="2">6200</td> <td>Met</td> <td>24</td> <td>14.17</td> <td>1.13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Met</td> <td>1</td> <td>14</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">EDAD</td> <td rowspan="2">6890</td> <td>Met</td> <td>29</td> <td>28.59</td> <td>1.27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Met</td> <td>0</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The data indicate Educational Administration candidates are meeting the success criteria for Standard 1a.</p> <p>The response rate in 6100 is low; however, this class was the first to utilize Watermark for signature assignment reporting. One instructor utilized the old system and will be using Watermark moving forward for this signature assignment.</p>			Standard Met/Not Met	N	Rubric mean	Standard Deviation	EDAD	6100	Met	15	15	0	Not Met	0	n/a	n/a	EDAD	6200	Met	24	14.17	1.13	Not Met	1	14	n/a	EDAD	6890	Met	29	28.59	1.27	Not Met	0	n/a	n/a
		Standard Met/Not Met	N	Rubric mean	Standard Deviation																																	
EDAD	6100	Met	15	15	0																																	
		Not Met	0	n/a	n/a																																	
EDAD	6200	Met	24	14.17	1.13																																	
		Not Met	1	14	n/a																																	
EDAD	6890	Met	29	28.59	1.27																																	
		Not Met	0	n/a	n/a																																	

<p>The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPEL) has identified four signature assignments across three research-focused classes that address AAQEP Standard 1a: Demonstrate proficiency in the knowledge and skills required for effective practice in their anticipated professional role.</p> <p>The EDLD 6090 Research Concepts and Design class utilizes two rubrics for two related but different signature assignments: a conference paper proposal and a conference proposal presentation.</p> <p>EDLD 6040 Advanced Applied Quantitative Methods likewise utilizes a signature assignment assessed by a rubric focusing on a research proposal.</p> <p>EDLD 6070 Applied Qualitative Research Methods has a signature assignment also focusing on a research paper assessed with a rubric.</p> <p>Moreover, course specific data reflect high percentages across the board that the first standard and its respective aspects are more than met given the keen interplay and alignment across layers standards such PLOs, ULOs and AAQEP aspects.</p>	<p>The four signature assignments for the EDLD 6090, 6040, and 6070 classes all utilize a four-point rubric ranging from a high of Exceeds Expectations to a low of Needs Substantive Revision. Success is defined as both Meets and Exceeds Expectations.</p> <p>EDLD 6090 Conference Paper Proposal Rubric</p> <p>EDLD 6090 Conference Proposal Presentation Rubric</p> <p>EDLD 6040 Research Proposal Rubric</p> <p>EDLD 6070 Research Paper Rubric</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Standard Met/Not Met</th> <th>Assessment Count</th> <th>Rubric mean</th> <th>Standard Deviation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">EDLD</td> <td rowspan="2">6090 proposal</td> <td>Met</td> <td>14</td> <td>27.07</td> <td>0.62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Met</td> <td>0</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">EDLD</td> <td rowspan="2">6090 presentation</td> <td>Met</td> <td>13</td> <td>19.54</td> <td>0.52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Met</td> <td>0</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">EDLD</td> <td rowspan="2">6040</td> <td>Met</td> <td>14</td> <td>17.79</td> <td>1.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Met</td> <td>1</td> <td>15</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">EDLD</td> <td rowspan="2">6070</td> <td>Met</td> <td>14</td> <td>3.38</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Met</td> <td>6</td> <td>3.07</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The data indicate Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership candidates are meeting AAQEP standard 1a; however, the EDLD 6070 class might benefit from adjustments to instructional approaches that might improve candidate success.</p> <p>Also, there are variations in reporting in the rubric mean with some rubrics reported based on the four-point scale and other rubrics reported by the point value in class. A next step to standardize reporting is needed.</p>			Standard Met/Not Met	Assessment Count	Rubric mean	Standard Deviation	EDLD	6090 proposal	Met	14	27.07	0.62	Not Met	0	n/a	n/a	EDLD	6090 presentation	Met	13	19.54	0.52	Not Met	0	n/a	n/a	EDLD	6040	Met	14	17.79	1.25	Not Met	1	15	n/a	EDLD	6070	Met	14	3.38	n/a	Not Met	6	3.07	n/a
		Standard Met/Not Met	Assessment Count	Rubric mean	Standard Deviation																																											
EDLD	6090 proposal	Met	14	27.07	0.62																																											
		Not Met	0	n/a	n/a																																											
EDLD	6090 presentation	Met	13	19.54	0.52																																											
		Not Met	0	n/a	n/a																																											
EDLD	6040	Met	14	17.79	1.25																																											
		Not Met	1	15	n/a																																											
EDLD	6070	Met	14	3.38	n/a																																											
		Not Met	6	3.07	n/a																																											

<p>The School Counseling program in Educational Counseling is accredited by both AAQEP and, as a credential program, by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). School Counseling identified four signature assignments in the two practicum courses, School Counseling Practicum I and II, to address AAQEP Standard 1a.</p> <p>Both classes, EDCS 5210 and 5220, utilized a student self-evaluation and a separate competency evaluation completed by the site supervisor.</p>	<p>The four signature assignments in EDCS 5210 and 5220 all utilize three-point rubrics ranging from a low of Beginning to a high of Proficient.</p> <p>Because similar rubrics are used by both the student and the site supervisor, the assessments provide two angles of assessment in the spirit of a 360 degree review.</p> <p>Success is defined as both developing and proficient.</p> <p>Note that the practicum classes are designed as a growth area to introduce beginning counseling students to essential counseling concepts.</p> <p>EDCS 5210 Practicum I Student Self-Assessment</p> <p>EDCS 5210 Practicum I Competency Evaluation</p> <p>EDCS 5220 Practicum II Student Self Evaluation</p> <p>EDCS 5220 Practicum II Competency Evaluation</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="1335 183 1869 508"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Standard Met/Not Met</th> <th>N</th> <th>Rubric mean</th> <th>Standard Deviation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">EDCS</td> <td rowspan="2">5210</td> <td>Met</td> <td>35</td> <td>10.97</td> <td>1.65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Met</td> <td>13</td> <td>9.23</td> <td>1.59</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EDCS</td> <td>5220</td> <td>Met</td> <td>15</td> <td>12.4</td> <td>1.12</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Not Met</td> <td>10</td> <td>11.4</td> <td>1.58</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The data indicate the majority of school counseling practicum students are meeting the standard.</p> <p>However, two areas of growth are also apparent. First, the N in the second semester EDCS 5220 is lower than the fall semester's 5210 class suggesting better instructor use of Watermark is needed. Second, while a significant minority of students did not meet the standard in both semesters suggesting adjustments to instructional approaches to improve student success are needed.</p>			Standard Met/Not Met	N	Rubric mean	Standard Deviation	EDCS	5210	Met	35	10.97	1.65	Not Met	13	9.23	1.59	EDCS	5220	Met	15	12.4	1.12			Not Met	10	11.4	1.58
		Standard Met/Not Met	N	Rubric mean	Standard Deviation																									
EDCS	5210	Met	35	10.97	1.65																									
		Not Met	13	9.23	1.59																									
EDCS	5220	Met	15	12.4	1.12																									
		Not Met	10	11.4	1.58																									

Table 4. Expectations and Performance on Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence and Growth

Provider-selected measures (name and description)	Criteria for success	Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation																										
<p>As this fall is the first time we have been able to extract usable and reportable data from our new Watermark system, we are focusing on AAQEP Standard 2a for all three programs. Providing this narrow focus allows us to begin auditing and utilizing Watermark for further improvement.</p> <p>The Educational Administration (EDAD) program identified two signature assignments to address AAQEP Standard 2a: Communicate and foster relationships with families, guardians, and/or caregivers, and engage in the wider school community.</p> <p>Both signature assignments are from EDAD 6400 Family and Community Engagement class. The assignments have student reflecting on their leadership positionality in relation to the educational contexts in which they serve.</p>	<p>Both Educational Leadership Positionality Reflections utilize Milner’s (2007) framework for critical self-reflection with a series of questions to address different perspectives on one’s racial and cultural awareness, consciousness, and positionality. The assignments are both assessed using a four-point rubric, ranging from Exceeds Expectations to Needs Substantive Improvement. Success is defined as both Meeting or Exceeding Expectations.</p> <p>Educational Leadership Positionality #1 Rubric</p> <p>Educational Leadership Positionality #2 Rubric</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="1339 329 1871 646"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Standard Met/Not Met</th> <th>N</th> <th>Rubric mean</th> <th>Standard Deviation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">EDAD</td> <td rowspan="2">6400 Pos #1</td> <td>Met</td> <td>26</td> <td>18.28</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Met</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">EDAD</td> <td rowspan="2">6400 Pos #2</td> <td>Met</td> <td>26</td> <td>18.73</td> <td>0.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Met</td> <td>2</td> <td>17</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The data suggest that EDAD candidates are meeting Standard 2a.</p>			Standard Met/Not Met	N	Rubric mean	Standard Deviation	EDAD	6400 Pos #1	Met	26	18.28	0.75	Not Met	0	0	0	EDAD	6400 Pos #2	Met	26	18.73	0.6	Not Met	2	17	0
		Standard Met/Not Met	N	Rubric mean	Standard Deviation																							
EDAD	6400 Pos #1	Met	26	18.28	0.75																							
		Not Met	0	0	0																							
EDAD	6400 Pos #2	Met	26	18.73	0.6																							
		Not Met	2	17	0																							
<p>The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPEL) identified four signature assignments across three classes to address AAQEP Standard 2a: Communicate and foster relationships with families, guardians, and/or</p>	<p>Both rubrics for the signature assignments in EDLD 6020 Educational Reform contain four levels ranging from Exceeds Expectations to Needs Substantive Revision. Success is defined</p>	<p>The DPEL opted to roll candidates into the new Watermark based system for data collection. Hence, students starting with Cohort 9 and later would have rubric data collected in Watermark. Cohort 9 started in Fall 2024. However, the classes</p>																										

<p>caregivers, and engage in the wider school community.</p> <p>Two signature assignments are found in EDLD 6020 Educational Reform: 1) Planning for Change and 2) Local Reform Case Study EDLD 6080 also addresses standard 2a through the Philosophy of Action assignment.</p> <p>EDLD 6110 further explores standard 2a through the Educational Evaluation, Assessment, and Planning assignment.</p>	<p>as both Meets and Exceeds Expectations.</p> <p>EDLD 6020 Local Reform Case Study Rubric</p> <p>EDLD 6020 Planning for Change Rubric</p> <p>The signature assignment for EDLD 6080 also utilizes a four-point scale ranging from Exceeds Expectations to Needs Substantive Revision. Success is defined as both Meets and Exceeds Expectations.</p> <p>EDLD 6080 Philosophy of Action Rubric</p> <p>The signature assignment for EDLD 6110 also utilizes a four-point scale ranging from Exceeds Expectations to Needs Substantive Revision. Success is defined as both Meets and Exceeds Expectations.</p> <p>EDLD 6110 Educational Evaluation, Assessment, and Planning Rubric</p>	<p>involved in Standard 2a are not taken until 2025, after this report's data collection window. Looking ahead, there are already data for the EDLD 6020 Local Reform Case Study in Watermark awaiting reporting next year.</p>																						
<p>The School Counseling pathway of the Educational Counseling program identified four signature assignments from three classes to address AAQEP Standard 2a: Communicate and foster relationships with families, guardians, and/or caregivers, and engage in the wider school community.</p>	<p>The EDCS 5210 Practicum I class utilizes two rubrics with three points each ranging from a low of Beginning to a high of Proficient.</p> <p>Because similar rubrics are used by both the student and the site supervisor, the assessments provide two angles of</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Standard Met/Not Met</th> <th>N</th> <th>Rubric mean</th> <th>Standard Deviation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">EDCS</td> <td rowspan="2">5210 Self-Eval</td> <td>Met</td> <td>18</td> <td>10</td> <td>1.85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Met</td> <td>13</td> <td>9.23</td> <td>1.59</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Standard Met/Not Met	N	Rubric mean	Standard Deviation	EDCS	5210 Self-Eval	Met	18	10	1.85	Not Met	13	9.23	1.59						
		Standard Met/Not Met	N	Rubric mean	Standard Deviation																			
EDCS	5210 Self-Eval	Met	18	10	1.85																			
		Not Met	13	9.23	1.59																			

<p>The first two assignments are from the EDCS 5210 Practicum I class and focus on the student's self-assessment of their counseling skills and a supervisor's assessment of their counseling skills.</p> <p>The EDCS 5160 Theories in Educational Counseling class identified a case study application assignment.</p> <p>The EDCS 6290 Collaboration and Leadership in Schools identified a School Counseling MTSS Proposal Rubric.</p>	<p>assessment in the spirit of a 360 degree review.</p> <p>Success is defined as both developing and proficient.</p> <p>Note that the practicum classes are designed as a growth area to introduce beginning counseling students to essential counseling concepts.</p> <p>EDCS 5210 Practicum I Student Self-Assessment</p> <p>EDCS 5210 Practicum I Competency Evaluation</p> <p>The EDCS 5160 Theories in Educational Counseling case study assignment utilizes a three-point rubric ranging from Target to Needs Improvement. Success is defined as both Acceptable and Target.</p> <p>EDCS 5160 Case Study Application Rubric</p> <p>EDCS 6290 Collaboration and Leadership in Schools utilizes a School Counseling MTSS Proposal Rubric with a three-point scale ranging from Met to Not Met. Success is defined as both Met and Partially Met.</p> <p>EDCS 6290 School Counseling MTSS Proposal Rubric</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="1344 178 1879 259"> <tr> <td rowspan="2">EDCS</td> <td rowspan="2">5210 Competency</td> <td>Met</td> <td>17</td> <td>12</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Met</td> <td>0</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> </table> <p>The data suggest the majority of Educational Counseling students are meeting Standard 2a in the Practicum class. However, a significant minority of students self-evaluate that they are not meeting the standard suggesting further discussion regarding these skills between candidates and supervisors are needed.</p> <p>Data for EDCS 5160 is expected starting in Fall 2025. The course is offered in the Fall term only and the rubric was developed last Spring, 2025.</p> <p>Data for EDCS 6290 is expected starting in Fall 2025. The course is offered in the Fall term only and the rubric was developed last Spring, 2025.</p>	EDCS	5210 Competency	Met	17	12	0	Not Met	0	n/a	n/a
EDCS	5210 Competency	Met			17	12	0					
		Not Met	0	n/a	n/a							

5. Notes on Progress, Accomplishment, and Innovation

This section describes program accomplishments, efforts, and innovations (strengths and outcomes) to address challenges and priorities over the past year.

All Programs

This past school year 2024-2025 reflect significant steps forward in sustaining programs quality and enhancing continuous improvements by creating rigorous datafication techniques and reporting systems. Learning the new Watermark system, choosing signature assignments, revising and developing rubrics, and correlating rubrics to specific standards for both AAQEP and our state accreditation standards have required significant systematic learning, discussion, and collaboration. This report marks the first use of drawing data implications from the system to inform reporting and continuous improvement efforts.

Educational Administration Credential and Master’s Degree Programs & Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

The EDAD program, in conjunction with the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership, conducted a multi-site visit with superintendents and other school leaders from across our service area, representing a cross-section of rural and urban, small and large, districts. We met with the school leaders to identify how we might better prepare our candidates for future employment, particularly looking for timely and relevant skills and knowledge. Further, we sought relevant problems of practice our students might address through both their state-credential required performance assessment, the master’s degree culminating activity, and doctoral dissertations.

EDAD and DPEL faculty representatives, Drs. Wisman and Szolowicz, joined the Association of California School Administrators. The new relationship allows insights through monthly meetings and newsletters regarding contemporary and local issues in educational leadership in addition to valuable networking opportunities.

Representing mainly the EDAD program but also carrying implications for the DPEL, Dr. Wisman initiated a student club chartered to and affiliated with the Association of California School Administrators. Initial start-up work occurred last year, and the first student members are joining this current school year.

Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership continues to operate the DPEL Network connecting students, faculty, and the community.

Educational Counseling

The school counseling program received approval from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to offer a Child Welfare Authorization. The CWA promises more robust preparation for future school counselors in addressing school policies and procedures that inhibit academic success, implementing strategies to improve student attendance, and promoting understanding and appreciation of factors that affect attendance of culturally diverse student populations.

The student affairs pathway in the Educational Counseling program has initiated steps exploring the possibility of future AAQEP accreditation.

Part II: Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth

AAQEP does not require public posting of the information in Part II, but programs **may** post it at their discretion.

6. Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth and Improvement

This section charts ongoing improvement processes in relation to each AAQEP standard and recent activities related to investigating data quality. Table 5 may focus on an aspect of one or two standards each year, with only brief entries regarding ongoing efforts for those standards that are not the focus in the current year.

Table 5. Provider Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement

Standard 1	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	While the Watermark system has for the first time provided useful data, there remains work to be done, including: ensuring all instructors are using Watermark for signature assignments, ensuring all standards and sub standards (e.g., 1a, 1b, 1c) are adequately represented in the data, and utilizing data to engage in data-driven dialogue for continuous improvement.
Actions	<p>As results for standard 1a were reported here, run similar reports for each standard 1a-1g and identify any standards with missing data. Follow up with instructors and staff as necessary to ensure data reporting.</p> <p>Utilize the above reports with instructors, including at program meetings, department meetings, and EPP meetings, to identify strengths and areas for instructional improvement based on data results (data-driven dialogue).</p> <p>AAQEP standards 1e and 1f regarding support for exceptional students and technology are not directly correlated to the old standards. We will engage in discussions in program, department, and EPP meetings regarding what we are already doing and what we could be doing to address these new standards. Instruction, along with signature assignments and accompanying rubrics, will be modified as necessary.</p>
Expected outcomes	We anticipate this alignment will allow faculty to better determine strengths and areas of growth in each program based on multiple data points that will offer faculty the ability to better gauge progress and be able to use these data in a timelier manner to quickly respond to continuous improvement efforts across programs and pathways.

Reflections or comments	We are excited that the Watermark system is now starting to feed us usable and reportable data and look forward to the data-informed dialogue and resultant program improvement.
Standard 2	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	While the Watermark system has for the first time provided useful data, there remains work to be done, including: ensuring all instructors are using Watermark for signature assignments, ensuring all standards and sub standards (e.g., 2a, 2b, 2c) are adequately represented in the data, and utilizing data to engage in data-driven dialogue for continuous improvement.
Actions	<p>As results for standard 2a were reported here, run similar reports for each standard 2a-2g and identify any standards with missing data. Follow up with instructors and staff as necessary to ensure data reporting.</p> <p>Utilize the above reports with instructors, including at program meetings, department meetings, and EPP meetings, to identify strengths and areas for instructional improvement based on data results (data-driven dialogue).</p> <p>AAQEP standard 2g regarding support for mental health and trauma is not directly correlated to the old standards. We will engage in discussions in program, department, and EPP meetings regarding what we are already doing and what we could be doing to address this new standard. Instruction, along with signature assignments and accompanying rubrics, will be modified as necessary.</p>
Expected outcomes	We anticipate this alignment will allow faculty to better determine strengths and areas of growth in each program based on multiple data points that will offer faculty the ability to better gauge progress and be able to use these data in a timelier manner to quickly respond to continuous improvement efforts across programs and pathways.
Reflections or comments	We are excited that the Watermark system is now starting to feed us usable and reportable data and look forward to the data-informed dialogue and resultant program improvement.
Standard 3	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	As indicated for Standards 1 and 2, continuing to implement, audit, and utilize the Watermark as an assessment system that is consistently implemented and utilized for effective internal quality control forms our key goal for Standards 3b, 3de, and 3f.

Actions	<p>Run reports similar to those used for Standards 1a and 2a reported above for all Standards 1a-g and 2a-g.</p> <p>Utilize the above reports with instructors, including at program meetings, department meetings, and EPP meetings, to identify strengths and areas for instructional improvement based on data results (data-driven dialogue).</p> <p>Review and realign rubrics to new match new AAQEP standards. Discussion to be held in program, departmental, and EPP meetings.</p>
Expected outcomes	<p>We anticipate this alignment will allow faculty to better determine strengths and areas of growth in each program based on multiple data points that will offer faculty the ability to better gauge progress and be able to use these data in a timelier manner to quickly respond to continuous improvement efforts across programs and pathways.</p>
Reflections or comments	<p>We are excited that the Watermark system is now starting to feed us usable and reportable data and look forward to the data-informed dialogue and resultant program improvement.</p>
Standard 4	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	<p>AAQEP standard 4b, “Engages with local school partners to investigate and plan program improvements and innovations to ensure that preparation matches their needs,” is new to the 2025 standards. While our programs do already address this standard due to state credentialing needs, further discussion on how we might better approach this standard should further strengthen the programs.</p>
Actions	<p>Advise unit programs of the new standards.</p> <p>Discuss in program, department, and EPP meetings how we are currently meeting this standard, how the standard is documented in our data, and how we might strengthen both partner engagement and subsequent data reporting.</p>
Expected outcomes	<p>We anticipate stronger partner collaboration and data reporting.</p>

Reflections or comments	Community engagement is a key priority of the current California State University, Bakersfield President and workforce preparation is a key priority of the California State University system. While educator preparation programs already bring strong capacity to both of these areas, identifying areas for further engagement serves to further strengthen our students preparation, opportunities, and community impact.
--------------------------------	--

Update on Activities to Investigate Data Quality

Data quality investigations are essential to work across the standards. This section documents activities in the 2024-25 reporting year related to ensuring data quality.

The introduction of the AAQEP 2025 standards requires a review and revision of our existing rubric designations as some standards have new designations, others are combined, and still others are brand new. Our previous director of accreditation and credentialing left an annotated crosswalk identifying which standards new adjustment or introduction. Most of the work will lie in renaming identifiers on our rubrics and in the Watermark system. A few new standards require deeper discussion, which have been outlined in the goals section.

7. Evidence Related to AAQEP-Identified Concerns or Conditions

This section documents how concerns or conditions that were noted in an accreditation decision are being addressed (indicate “n/a” if no concerns or conditions were noted). If a condition has been noted, a more detailed focused report will be needed in addition to the description included here. Please contact staff with any questions regarding this section.

N/A

8. Anticipated Growth and Development

This section summarizes planned improvements, innovations, or anticipated new program developments, including description of any identified potential challenges or barriers.

There are no plans to develop new program pathways during AY 2025-2026 especially during the severe budget crisis the system is experiencing. A new Child Welfare Authorization (CWA) was approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

in Spring 2025 for implementation through the School Counseling program in Educational Counseling. Implementation efforts are underway during the school year 2025-2026. The authorization utilizes existing resources but would be further strengthened by developing stronger relationships with educational adjacent interdisciplinary partners (e.g., social services) to provide job shadowing opportunities.

9. Regulatory Changes

This section notes new or anticipated regulatory requirements and the provider’s response to those changes (indicate “n/a” if no changes have been made or are anticipated).

There are no regulatory changes from School Year 2024-2025. There are regulatory changes that are appearing as this report is written in November 2025, including: 1) updates to the state standards for Educational Administration, 2) a requirement for educational administration candidates to support teachers with the new literacy standards, 3) a new pathway to the preliminary administrative services credential for occupational and physical therapists. Adjustment and implementation efforts will begin in earnest during the next school year, 2026-2027.

10. Sign Off

Provider’s Primary Contact for AAQEP (Name, Title)	Dean/Lead Administrator (Name, Title)
Michael Szolowicz, Ph.D., Chair and Associate Professor, Advanced Educational Studies Department	Luis Vega, Ph.D. Interim Dean College of Social Sciences and Education Amy Gancarz Interim Associate Dean College of Social Sciences & Education

Date sent to AAQEP:	19 December 2025
---------------------	------------------