

# Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at University of California, Irvine

## Professional Services Division

April 2014

### Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at University of California, Irvine. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self- Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

### Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions For all Programs offered by the Institution

	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1) Educational Leadership	X		
2) Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation		X	
3) Resources	X		
4) Faculty and Instructional Personnel		X	
5) Admission	X		
6) Advice and Assistance	X		
7) Field Experience and Clinical Practice	X		
8) District Employed Supervisors	X		
9) Assessment of Candidate Competence	X		

### Program Standards

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Multiple Subject	21	21		
Preliminary Single Subject	21	21		
Reading Certificate (Added Authorization)	5	4	1	
Preliminary Administrative Services	15	13	2	
Professional Administrative Services	9	7	2	

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
Committee on Accreditation  
Accreditation Team Report**

**Institution:** University of California, Irvine

**Dates of Visit:** February 3-5, 2014

**Accreditation Team**

**Recommendation:** Accreditation

**Rationale:**

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards—

The decision of the team regarding the nine Common Standards is that Common Standard 2 and 4 were **Met with Concerns**. This decision was based on documentary evidence and interviews of a cross-section of stakeholder groups. The team found that the three credential programs housed in university extension had some elements of both standards which were not fully met. The same concerns caused the team to find that corresponding program standards and guidelines were Met with Concern also. All other Common Standards were Met.

Program Standards –

For the five programs reviewed, the recommendations follow:

- Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs-- all standards were met.
- Reading and Literacy Added Authorization--all standards met except for Program Standard 1: Program Design which is Met with Concerns.
- Preliminary Administrative Services--all standards met except for two standards: Program Standard 8: Guidance and Feedback, and Program Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence – which are met with concerns.
- Professional Administrative Services--all guidelines met except for two – Guideline 2: Evaluation of Program Quality and Guideline 6: Mentor Qualifications and Assignment – both of which are Met with Concerns.

Overall Recommendation –

The team recommends **Accreditation** with a 7th year report chronicling changes made to address the team's findings.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

<b>Initial/Teaching Credentials</b>	<b>Advanced/Service Credentials</b>
Multiple Subject	Administrative Services
Multiple Subject	Preliminary
	Professional
Single Subject	Reading Certificate
Single Subject	

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- University of California, Irvine be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- University of California, Irvine continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

#### **Accreditation Team**

<b>Team Leader:</b>	<b>Mel Hunt</b> Saint Mary's College
<b>Common Standards Cluster:</b>	<b>Cheryl Forbes</b> University of California, San Diego
<b>Basic/Teaching Programs Cluster:</b>	<b>Mimi Miller</b> California State University, Chico
<b>Advanced/Services Programs:</b>	<b>Justin Heard</b> Touro University California
<b>Staff to the Visit:</b>	Wayne Bacer Gay Roby

#### **Documents Reviewed**

Common Standards Report	Program Assessment Feedback
Course Syllabi	Research Posters
Candidate Files	Biennial Reports
Evaluation Instruments	Curriculum Materials from Program Courses
Fieldwork Handbooks	Biennial Report Feedback
Follow-up Survey Results	Field Experience Notebooks
Needs Analysis Results	Schedule of Classes
Program Posters	Student Handbooks
Program Assessment Documents	Student Work Samples

Advisement Documents  
Faculty Vitae  
College Budget Plan

TPA Data  
Minutes of Advisory Committees  
Notes from Evaluation Committees

### Interviews Conducted

	Team Leader	Common Standards Cluster	Program Sampling Cluster	TOTAL
Candidates	8	30	83	121
Completers	12	14	17	43
Employers	12	13	14	39
Institutional Administration	14	6	14	34
Program Coordinators	4	10	10	24
Faculty	9	22	5	36
TPA Coordinator	0	4	0	4
Advisors	6	0	15	21
Field Supervisors – Program	5	16	18	39
Field Supervisors - District	3	16	19	38
Credential Analysts and Staff	6	0	0	6
Advisory Board Members	8	4	16	28
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>433</b>

*Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.*

### Background information

The University of California, Irvine (UCI) is a public research university located in Irvine, California, and one of the ten general campuses in the University of California system. UCI, in central Orange County, is the fifth-largest campus in the University of California system, with over 28,000 students, 1,100 faculty members and 9,000 staff. It is the second-largest employer in Orange County with over 21,800 employees.

UC Irvine offers 80 undergraduate degrees and 98 graduate and professional degrees. In 2012, the University of California, Irvine granted a total of 8,443 degrees. UC Irvine became a member of the Association of American Universities in 1996, and is the youngest university to hold membership. The university also administers the UC Irvine Medical Center, a large teaching hospital; the UC Irvine Health Sciences system in the City of Orange; the University of California, Irvine, Arboretum; and a portion of the University of California Natural Reserve System.

UCI was one of three new UC campuses established in the 1960s to accommodate growing enrollments across the UC system. A site in Orange County was identified in 1959, and in the following year the Irvine Company sold the University of California 1,000 acres of land for one dollar to establish the new campus. President Lyndon B. Johnson dedicated the campus in 1964. UC Irvine will celebrate its 50th anniversary in 2015.

## Education Unit

The University of California, Irvine houses five programs within their School of Education.

- Preliminary Multiple Subject Program
- Preliminary Single Subject Program
- Reading Certificate Program
- Preliminary Administrative Services Credential
- Clear Administrative Services Credential

Approximately 735 candidates were enrolled in the education unit during the 2012-13 school year. Approximately 235 candidates were program completers. The UCI School of Education faculty is comprised of 24 senate faculty, 16 full time lecturers and 30 adjunct faculty.

UCI's Teacher Education Programs (TEP) are designed to contribute to the University of California's mission of teaching, research, and public service and the commitment to its vital role in the recruitment, preparation, and continuing professional development of California's teachers and administrators. UCI partners with numerous (currently 27) regional school districts each year, building relationships and models of research-based teacher preparation that meets district and school needs. The combined Credential and Master of Arts Degree in Teaching (MAT) is a 15-month program (two summers and an academic year) that combines graduate-level coursework with student teaching. Each year, approximately 80 Multiple Subject and 100 Single Subjects student teacher candidates enroll in post-baccalaureate programs.

UCI's Reading Certificate Program is designed to equip professional, reflective educators to use current, confirmed literacy research to plan, implement, and refine balanced reading instruction in a variety of contexts to maximize literacy development for all students.

University Extension's Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (Preliminary ASC) program is designed to develop candidates' skills and attitudes, guiding them toward mastery of the California Professional Standards for Educational Leadership (CPSEL) and building upon candidates' experiences as education professionals.

The Clear Administrative Services Credential (Clear ASC) is a two academic year program that is designed for full-time school administrators who hold the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and now need to clear that preliminary credential.

**Table 1**  
**Program Review Status**

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of program completers (2012-2013)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (2013-2014)	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject	Initial	44	77	CTC
Single Subject	Initial	115	139	CTC
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	Advanced	21	54	CTC
Preliminary Administrative Services	Initial	16	41	CTC
Clear Guidelines-based Administrative Services	Advanced	36	205	CTC

### **The Visit**

The visit took place on the campus of the University of California, Irvine on February 3rd through 5<sup>th</sup>, 2014. A team of six, including two state consultants, conducted the review of the University's educator preparation programs.



## Common Standards

### Standard 1: Educational Leadership

**Met**

The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability. The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution. The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

The UC system has always had an emphasis in research and the UCI School of Education (SOE) is representative of that tradition. Senate faculty are actively engaged in on-going research that has generated significant grant funding for the unit. Candidates, completers, employers, district-employed supervisors as well as advisory members all confirmed that the faculty research was integrated into the SOE credential programs.

The administration, program directors and the faculty are not only committed to ensuring that the state standards and frameworks are used as the foundation for the curriculum, but work proactively to anticipate change. Interviews with candidates, completers, employers and district-employed supervisors established that the SOE began in 2011 to integrate the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) into the methods curriculum of all the teaching credential programs. In addition, evidence from the candidates, the program directors and coordinators demonstrated that the new leadership in the Administrative Services programs placed an emphasis on making the program's links to the revised California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) evident.

Educator preparation at UCI occurs in three distinct units: in the graduate SOE (supporting fifth year teacher preparation programs), in the School of Biology and the School of Physical Sciences in cooperation with the SOE (supporting the blended Single Subject program), and in the University Extension (UNEX) unit (supporting the Administrative Services Clear and Preliminary programs and Reading Certificate program).

The SOE Dean acts as the lynchpin that centers these offerings through a complex but effective array of committees that include SOE, undergraduate department and UNEX administrators, Senate faculty, lecturers and staff so that all programs continue to be aligned with the CTC's Common and Program Standards. The team found evidence from interviews with the full range of committee members and from the minutes of the committee meetings that process worked as it was designed to coordinate a wide range of activities.

The committee structure is particularly effective in allowing the integration of many elements into the organization and coordination of the programs. Interviews with participants and minutes of meetings verified that membership in the committees strategically blends administration, faculty, staff and external stakeholders so that all have a voice in the process. Primary responsibility for the governance of the programs rests with the Senate faculty and the SOE

administration, though the perspectives of the other members of the community are heard through the committee structure.

With the creation of the SOE in 2012, the University established a framework that allows the centralized coordination of the educator preparation programs that are spread across three segments of the University. Interviews with Dean and key leaders across campus confirmed that the SOE has not only the support of the UCI leadership, but also the support of the Office of the UC President, as is confirmed by the partial direct funding of the Blended Math/Science Cal teach program by the UC President's Office.

The institution-developed Teacher Education Integrated Information System (TEIIS) supports effective and comprehensive collection of data required for candidate records and program evaluation in the SOE programs. Interviews with SOE staff confirmed that while elements of the TEIIS system have been integrated into the operations of the programs housed in UNEX, Extension is not yet able to access the full system. Interviews with the UCI credential analysts, the program directors and other staff, as well as a review of credential student documentation, verified that only candidates who have completed every credential requirement are recommended for a document. The unit is taking steps to expand the number of credential analysts with signature authority to better serve the full range of programs. The unit supports the professional development of the analysts to ensure that currency with Commission policies and requirements is maintained.

#### **Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation**

#### **Met with Concerns**

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completion performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.
--

Through interviews with the Dean, the faculty, the staff and advisory board members, the team confirmed that SOE has instituted a coordinated system of program and unit evaluation that includes all the stakeholders in the unit as well as educators from the community who serve on advisory boards. Through a grid of pre-determined activities, the administration, faculty, and staff not only make sure that data is used to evaluate program standards but that it is also used to evaluate the unit's performance on the Common Standards.

That the TEIIS system is used by the teacher preparation programs to systematically collect data at parallel points in each SOE program was confirmed by interviews with staff and examination of documents. Data is collected in TEIIS on candidates at pre-determined points from admission through completion and recommendation for the credential for the SOE programs. Through interviews with the UNEX administration and staff the team determined that the TEIIS system has not yet been fully integrated into the data system of UNEX. Admissions and credential requirements are tracked in TEIIS but the evidence from Signature Assignments of individual candidates cannot yet be aggregated for use in program evaluation.

As confirmed by the SOE's most recent Biennial report and interviews with stakeholders throughout the unit's faculty, staff and external stakeholders, all the available evidence is

effectively used for program and unit evaluation and improvement. For example, one of the conclusions of the 2012 report was the need to improve assessment instruments across all the programs in the unit so that the quality of the data collected could be improved. This effort included creating wherever possible a unified set of questions across programs so that the data could be more effectively used across programs by the unit. In addition, a senior staff member coordinates an annual cycle of report generation spanning several program cycles from the SOE program's TEIS data and provides the administration, faculty and staff with regular data summaries that are clear and concise and highlight data points that are statistically significant.

### **Rationale:**

The team found that in general the unit had developed an effective process for data collection to support program and unit evaluation in the SOE's fifth year and blended programs. However, interviews with staff, program coordinators and directors of the programs housed in UNEX established that while the UNEX programs recorded data that fully established individual candidate competence, especially that related to the programs' Signature Assignments and program effectiveness at the individual candidate level, the individual data could not be aggregated for evaluation at the program or unit level.

### **Standard 3: Resources**

### **Met**

The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management. Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.

The three segments of educator preparation at UCI have distinct strands from which their revenue is derived. The SOE is funded not only from fees collected from students but also from funds derived from the UC system. The Blended undergraduate program is supported in part by funding from the Governor and the UC President's office, as well as from grants. The programs in the UNEX are funded entirely by student fees. Interviews with the administration, program directors, Senate faculty, and other full-time faculty confirmed that the unit consistently receives the funding necessary to operate and staff the unit's program.

While the funding sources for the three types of programs are distinct, interviews with program directors, coordinators, faculty and staff as well as documents describing the budget system confirmed that each program does have the personnel needed to meet the needs for the operation of the program and to support the candidates in the classroom and in the field. Staff are assigned to support each program so that candidates receive information that is specific to their needs. Faculty in the SOE teach in both the fifth year and Blended program courses. While the funding of the programs in the UNEX is fee based, the revenue collected is sufficient to support staff and faculty necessary to operate the programs.

Interviews with faculty, staff, candidates and completers confirmed that the information resources provided to the SOE fully support the operation of the credential programs. A segment of UCI Information Services provides dedicated support to the SOE programs and candidates. Both faculty and candidates have effective support for information research and for the

implementation of curriculum in both the classroom and labs located across the campus. Candidates and completers confirmed that the hybrid and online programs housed in UNEX were uniformly fully operational and that there were no serious technical issues that hampered their ability to participate in and complete the programs.

All educator preparation programs at UCI SOE are included through the unit's extensive committee structure in the determination of the resource needs for each program. Interviews with the administration and the faculty confirmed that when circumstances change, such as increases in enrollment or new requirements are imposed, funding changes in response to the new demands. Interviews with the administration confirmed that the unit has long range plan for growth that includes the addition of several Senate faculty lines in the near future.

#### **Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel**

#### **Met with Concerns**

Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program. Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution provides support for faculty development. The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

The quality of the faculty in all UCI credential programs is of the highest caliber. Teacher preparation faculty includes senate faculty, lecturers, and supervisors of student teaching in the School of Education (SOE). The UCI Extension Department of Education and Business Programs (DEBP) hires and manages faculty for the Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services Credentials (ASC) and the Reading Added Authorization Program. A review of program documents affirms that senate faculty members hold appropriate terminal degrees and engage in relevant, cutting-edge research and extensive service related to their teaching. Lecturers, instructors and supervisors across all programs also hold appropriate degrees, credentials and subject matter expertise, and have strong records of practical experience in the educational setting authorized by each credential program. Based on interviews with candidates, completers, and district-employed supervisors, the team found that in some instances, program field supervisors were not provided in clinical experiences.

Candidates, program completers and P-12 personnel alike enthusiastically noted their appreciation during interviews of the ways in which all faculty members, including senate faculty, lecturers, instructors and supervisors, modeled the very best in teaching practices. A strong and reciprocal relationship between research and practice was evident in reviews of course syllabi and documents across all programs, as well as in activities described by field-based mentors, candidates and program completers. Practical application of research conducted by SOE faculty was cited by multiple P-12 stakeholders as well as candidates and alumni during interviews, and in turn, senate faculty provided numerous examples of ways in which interaction

with local P-12 students and practitioners as well as teacher candidates informed their research agendas.

UCI programs employ faculty, instructors and supervisors reflecting a range of backgrounds who promote and value diversity in public schools. Clinical faculty and supervisors in the SOE as well as instructional personnel in the DEBP are experienced P-12 educational professionals, and program administrators verified that they are screened for the language skills, cultural knowledge and sensitivity needed to prepare candidates to work with students from diverse linguistic, ethnic and socioeconomic background as well as with students with differing abilities. Senate faculty who are involved in the design and oversight, as well as instruction, of credential courses study important diversity and equity issues, including the impact of schooling practices on students from diverse groups including ways in which teachers can promote equitable outcomes. Faculty, candidates and program completers, as well as P-12 personnel, provided numerous examples during interviews of ways in which research-based perspectives on issues such as discourse in mathematics classrooms and gender equity in STEM fields influenced their practice and understanding of diversity.

The impact of the UCI research-practice nexus in helping to prepare the field for the implementation of the California Common Core State Standards (CCSS) was particularly strong and deserves recognition. Employers from districts across the region stated that not only had UCI faculty and graduates been providing professional leadership in CCSS-related content and pedagogy for some time, but that candidates themselves demonstrate exemplary and innovative practices aligned with CCSS that influence their school sites. Faculty and candidates also described examples illustrating understanding of the impact of accountability systems on practice, including study of new technologies employed in systems such as Smarter Balanced to be used in the implementation of the Common Core State Standards.

Individual faculty members collaborate regularly with regional P-12 colleagues and the broader professional community through a variety of activities. Senate faculty members often obtain grants supporting school-based study, as noted by a variety of stakeholders during interviews. All clinical personnel, supervisors and instructors engage in regular professional participation in public schools, which is monitored by each program. Systematic collaboration is ensured through program and unit advisory committees as well as by collaboration in the placement, supervision and evaluation of SOE teacher candidates in the field, as confirmed by interviews with faculty and P-12 personnel. The team did not find evidence, however, that systematic collaboration in the mentoring by field supervisors was provided for candidates in the programs offered by UNEX.

Faculty members have multiple opportunities for professional development. Faculty in the SOE confirmed during interviews that funding is available for attending conferences or purchasing instructional materials from a variety of sources. Instructional personnel in DEBP programs described professional learning opportunities, particularly coursework and technical support related to the effective implementation of hybrid or online instruction. In addition, a UC Irvine Distance Learning Center is available to all employees, offering nearly 2,000 courses on a wide range of relevant topics.

Interviews with faculty members and program administrators confirmed that an evaluation system is in place to recognize excellence and to ensure that all instructional personnel continuously demonstrate effectiveness. In the SOE, supervisors are evaluated annually by program coordinators using multiple measures, including shared observations of a student teacher as well as formal evaluations by candidates and mentor teachers. Lecturers are evaluated by candidates at the end of each course and are observed at least once each year by the program director. Lecturers and supervisors who have demonstrated excellence are reappointed depending on need and may reach continuing status after 18 quarters and may then be eligible for merit reviews every three years. Senate faculty are evaluated based on research productivity as well as on the effectiveness of their teaching, mentorship and service. Instructors in credential programs offered by University Extension are evaluated by candidates at the end of each course. Course evaluations are then reviewed by program directors, who decide whether or not to rehire each instructor and who arrange for assistance if needed for improvement. Interviews confirmed that Advisory Council members also provide input on instructor effectiveness. Several faculty members in the SOE have received University Outstanding Teaching Awards, and instructors in University Extension are honored at an annual recognition event.

**Rationale:**

While overall the unit's faculty is strong, based upon interviews with candidates and district-employed supervisors, the team did not find evidence that qualified university mentors were assigned to supervise field-based experiences in the three programs housed in UNEX.

**Standard 5: Admission**

**Met**

In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.

Each program includes multiple measures within well-defined admission criteria and procedures that include all Commission-adopted requirements as verified through a review of documents and interviews with candidates, program completers and program administrators and staff. Quantitative measures include GPA and relevant test scores for SOE teacher preparation programs. Programs in the DEBP include documentation of professional experience and required certification. Qualitative measures document personal characteristics and communication skills. Applicants to SOE programs submit letters of recommendation, and applicants to all programs submit personal history or statement of intent essays, and according to interviews with program directors.

These multiple measures encourage and support applicants from diverse populations through bringing a range of perspectives to bear on the decision to admit individual candidates, and providing candidates from diverse populations with an opportunity to describe economic or cultural situations in their own lives that influenced their educational pathways and informed their decision to apply to each program. In addition, SOE staff participate in a variety of recruitment efforts at colleges and universities that have a large number of underrepresented

students throughout the region, as affirmed by interviews with candidates and program staff. University Extension EDBP programs employ email and web campaigns in a concerted effort to recruit candidates from diverse background, as evidenced by program documents.

The comprehensive application process employed by UC Irvine credential programs ensures that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences, personal characteristics and academic skills for most programs. However, interviews established that while the Preliminary Administrative Services credential program admission process confirmed that each candidate met the CTC minimum requirements for participation in the program, there was no systematic evaluation of an applicant's general suitability to serve as an administrator; the inclusion of which would strengthen the admission process. Employers and other P-12 stakeholders confirmed the high quality of UCI program completers, providing evidence that admitted candidates possess these characteristics.

#### **Standard 6: Advice and Assistance**

**Met**

Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist each candidate's professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

UCI credential candidates benefit from advice and assistance that is highly personalized according to interviews with candidates and program completers across programs. The School of Education (SOE) supports a Student Affairs unit in the Education Building where courses for Multiple and Single Subject candidates take place, and another near the Biological and Physical Sciences Building where SS Blended courses occur. University Extension DEBP program staff support candidates in the Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services (ASC) and Reading Certificate programs. Candidates in these programs also have access to a Distance Learning Center for technical support for any issues that may arise in online or hybrid courses.

During interviews, candidates and program completers reported that information is readily accessible through multiple formats. Candidates in SOE programs attend orientation sessions to learn about program requirements. They receive in-person guidance from program coordinators and advisors at several points during each program as evidenced by counseling sheets and other documents reviewed. They also have access to handbooks and other materials available online. Given the fact that candidates in programs offered by the DEBP are typically full-time professional educators, e-mail and phone contact as well as the availability of online resources are the preferred methods of advisement.

Candidates are supported throughout each program in a variety of ways that provide opportunities for formative feedback on their performance, according to interviews with faculty, candidates and program administrators. In the event that candidates are not making progress according to these multiple benchmark measures, they receive explicit guidance in the form of counseling by program staff or faculty as evidenced by documents reviewed and interviews with

program administration. In the rare event that candidates do not make acceptable progress after receiving support, they are dismissed from the program, as verified by interviews with program faculty, administration and P-12 stakeholders.

UCI credential programs use a variety of measures in a comprehensive and continuous system of advice and assistance. These measures include evaluations from supervisors and field-based mentors as well as course-embedded assessments in the SOE teacher preparation programs and performance on signature assessments in programs offered by DEBP.

#### **Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice**

**Met**

The unit and its partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.

According to interviews with a variety of stakeholders and a review of program documents, UCI and its P-12 partners design, implement and regularly evaluate a sequence of planned field-based and clinical experiences. Particularly given the emphasis on content knowledge and pedagogical skills aligned with the implementation of CCSS reported by stakeholder groups during interviews, the knowledge and skills developed by candidates effectively support all P-12 students in meeting state-adopted academic standards.

The unit collaborates with its partners to select school sites and clinical personnel in a variety of ways across the region. Across programs, advisory council members provide input on site and mentor selection. A variety of survey instruments are used to solicit program feedback from stakeholders including candidates, site mentors and employers according to interviews and documents reviewed.

Clinical experiences in UCI credential programs include careful selection of school sites as well as site-based personnel who have demonstrated success in improving the learning of students from diverse backgrounds, as reported by candidates, program completers and P-12 site administrators in interviews. Program documents, including program narratives, course syllabi and candidate work samples, indicate that candidates have extensive opportunities to engage in clinical practice and practice research-based strategies. Multiple stakeholders confirmed the effectiveness of these research-based pedagogical practices across the program, particularly related to the implementation of Common Core State Standards. In addition, stakeholders such as mentor teachers and employers enthusiastically described innovations employed by individual programs, such as the paired student teaching experience in the Multiple Subject program.

#### **Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors**

**Met**



District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.
---

UCI credential programs ensure that District-employed supervisors are certified and have relevant professional experiences through a variety of measures. Documents, including handbooks, reviewed for each program clearly delineate required qualifications. Interviews with stakeholders confirmed the high quality of District-employed mentors within this system.

District-employed supervisors in all programs are required to be knowledgeable about the academic content standards according to guidelines included in handbooks for mentors and candidates. The process for selecting district-employed mentors is overseen by the Dean of the School of Education and includes collaboration between program coordinators and P-12 personnel to identify effective mentors in SOE programs. In the ASC and Reading Certificate programs, candidates receive guidelines and identify site-based mentors appropriate to their needs. In all cases, nomination of mentors is followed by review and confirmation by University personnel before mentors are selected. Interviews with multiple stakeholders verified that this process is in place and ensures the selection of effective mentors.

Once selected, mentors are trained in supervision and oriented to their roles through a variety of activities. In SOE teacher preparation programs, mentor teachers participate in orientation meetings prior to the placement as well as professional development during the course of the placement, as described by program administration and site mentor teachers during interviews. Mentor teachers consistently reported during interviews that they received on-going personalized support on a consistent basis via e-mail and in person contact from University supervisors as well as program coordinators and directors. In the ASC and Reading Certificate programs, mentors are provided with handbooks and online support, including training, as indicated by mentors and other stakeholders during interviews. Candidates in all programs verified that they provide feedback on mentors through a variety of formal and informal means. According to interviews, program coordinators and directors gather information about mentor effectiveness through candidate feedback as well as through communication with University supervisors in the case of SOE student teaching programs. Site-based mentors across programs reported during interviews that they are recognized through a variety of means, including stipends, letters or certificates of recognition, and invitation to professional development events, and expressed a high degree of satisfaction with their experiences with UCI credential candidates and personnel.

#### **Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence**

**Met**

Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards.
---

Candidates in all SOE teacher preparation programs are repeatedly assessed at several stages through their course of study on the TPE. In addition, the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in Math and English Language Arts have been integrated into the programs so candidates are also systematically assessed on the CCSS as well. The SOE uses the PACT as the summative

assessment of candidate competence; Multiple Subject candidates take the PACT teaching event in Math and Content Area Tasks in literacy, science and social science/history while Single Subject candidates do the Main Teaching Event in their specialization.

Interviews with candidates, completers and district-employed mentors confirmed that candidates in the Preliminary Administrative Services program are assessed first by signature assessments based upon the CPSEL in each of their courses and by district employed supervisors during their two fieldwork activities. In the Clear Administrative Services program, interviews with candidates, completers and district-employed mentors verified that the candidates are assessed by an individualized set of goals based upon the candidate's employment context and the CPSEL. During the two-year program a district-employed mentor makes at least six assessments of the candidate's progress, which are reported to program faculty and leadership.

In the Reading Certificate program a course-by-course Signature Assignment process is also used, based upon the Reading Certificate (Added Authorization) standards. Interviews with candidates, completers and district-employed mentors and employers established that the candidate's ability to integrate theory into practice is measured most accurately in the reading practicum in which the district-employed mentor conducts the key evaluations, and when candidates submit a comprehensive Signature Project based upon their fieldwork.

Interviews with program directors, program coordinators, credential analysts, program counselors and additional staff established that each program fully tracks each individual candidate's progress in competing both UCI program requirements as well as Commission requirements. The results of culminating events such as the PACT, the Signature Assignments, and the evaluation of field placements confirm that each candidate has met all competency requirements before being recommended for the credential.

Throughout the visit the team heard from the full range of stakeholders, including employers, induction program administrators and field-placement site supervisors of the success both the fifth year and blended credential programs had in integrating the CCSS into their curriculum and into their candidates performance in the K-12 classrooms in which they were placed. CCSS is embedded in curriculum that is not only housed in the SOE, but also in the Schools of Biological and Physical Science. In addition, the CCSS literacy and math elements have been infused across the full range of content authorizations, including physical education, music and the visual arts. Interviews with district-based stakeholders confirmed that the reading certificate program and the administrative services credential candidates also brought significant elements of the CCSS to their field placements.

As a result of this coordinated and deliberate effort by the education unit, several K-12 administrators from the main local districts confirmed that UCI candidates were both taking a leadership role at their school sites and assisting their veteran faculty in developing curriculum accommodations based upon materials produced by the UCI faculty for use in UCI preparation courses.

# **Program Standards**

## **Multiple Subject Credential Single Subject Credential**

### ***Program Design***

UCI offers two initial teacher credential programs. The Multiple (MS) and Single Subject (SS) programs admit students who hold baccalaureate degrees into a full-time, three-quarter credential program. The Single Subject Undergraduate Blended pathway for Math and Science (SSB) allows candidates to complete requirements for a single subject credential while earning a bachelor's degree in a math or science discipline.

The Dean of the School of Education provides oversight, coordination, advice, and assistance to assure program quality. The SOE Director of Teacher Education reports to the dean and oversees faculty communication, data collection and program improvement across programs and pathways. Coordinators in each program are responsible for placement of candidates, maintaining district and school partnerships, and the training of field supervisors. Coordinators report to the Director of Teacher Education. The Dean, the Director of Teacher Education, and the Director of Admissions and Student affairs work together to ensure student support and collaborate for program design, staffing, and curriculum. Interviews with a variety of stakeholder groups confirmed that the program design outlined by the unit is effectively implemented.

The Single Subject Blended pathway is jointly offered with the School of Biological Sciences and the School of Physical Sciences, and it includes additional leadership. An SOE Co-Director has responsibility for day-to-day management of the program and works collaboratively with the members of the program's Leadership Council, which includes the Dean of Education, the Deans from Biological Sciences and Physical Sciences, and faculty. Two advisors provide counseling support specific to candidates in SSB.

Interviews with directors and coordinators confirmed ongoing communication among SOE leaders including monthly meetings between the dean and directors and bi-monthly meetings between the SOE directors and program coordinators. Program faculty verified that they communicate regularly via email and on-campus meetings. In addition, directors described the Committee on Professional Education Programs (CPEP). This group, composed of stakeholders in the educational process across university units, focuses on the implementation and assessment of teacher education programs. CPEP has met once and will be meeting twice annually.

Interviews with community stakeholders confirmed the involvement of a vibrant Credential Program Advisory Committee, consisting of school district and site administrators, county administrators, teachers, teacher association representatives, community representatives, and program alumni. The council meets twice each academic year to advise program leaders and faculty on issues such as district employment needs, program design and curriculum, and current education issues.

In the MS and SS programs, candidates confirmed that cohorts engage in coursework and field experiences throughout the program, with experience in the classroom increasing throughout

consecutive quarters. In addition, MS and SS candidates can opt to complete a MAT with an additional two quarters of graduate study. In the BSS program, undergraduate coursework blends an introduction to pedagogy and early classroom field experiences with math and science subject matter. A sequence of successively more advanced credential program courses and clinical experience in the final two years culminates in a two--quarter student teaching experience, similar to that of the SS program.

Over recent years, there have been no major program modifications.

### ***Course of Study***

Teacher education programs in the SOE are designed to ensure research-into-practice, and interviews with candidates, syllabi and candidate work confirmed this theme throughout courses and fieldwork. Mentors and supervisors reported that candidates bring the latest research-based best practices into their fieldwork classrooms. When interviewed, mentor teachers and advisory board members described the key role that UCI candidates play in helping schools and districts transition to Common Core State Standards. Candidates reported taking leadership roles in sharing Common Core best practices with faculty at school sites.

Candidates reported that coursework also emphasizes the instruction of diverse learners, including best practices for teaching English learners. Candidates from both programs reported using the newly revised English Language Development Standards in lesson planning and teaching.

Experience in the classroom increases throughout each program, with student teaching occurring in the last two quarters of the program (four days per week in the winter and five days per week in the spring for multiple subject, five days per week for single subject). Candidates may be placed one-on-one with mentor teachers or two candidates may be placed with a mentor teacher using a Paired Collaborative Model. Candidates, mentors and supervisors spoke positively about both models. Interviews with coordinators and supervisors confirmed that mentors are carefully selected based upon recommendation of school site administrators and their alignment with program goals. For example, this year candidates were only placed with mentors who were committed to using the Common Core State Standards. Mentor teachers reported participating in orientations and engaging in ongoing professional development with the university, and candidates reported a consistency between what they were learning in coursework and what they were seeing in their field placements.

Interviews with candidates, mentors and student teaching supervisors confirmed a consistent fieldwork evaluation and support process. In each program, a university supervisor visits a candidate at least seven times, once in early fieldwork, and three times during each quarter of student teaching. Supervisors observe lessons, conference with and provide oral and written feedback to candidates, meet with mentor teachers, and communicate frequently with Program Coordinators. Mentors and candidates verified that program coordinators also visit their fieldwork placement classrooms as part of yearly mentor evaluation and to support candidates.

Reviews of documents and interviews with university supervisors established that for each formal observation, supervisors rate candidate performance on elements of the California

Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE), and write observation comments that they upload to the Teacher Education Integrated Information System (TEIIS). University supervisors submit observations after each visit, and mentor teachers confirmed that they complete mid-term and final evaluations and submit them on TEIIS. Document review confirmed alignment of mentor and supervision observation forms across programs to provide consistent feedback for Teacher Performance Expectations.

### ***Candidate Competence***

Interviews and documents confirmed that throughout the program, candidate competency is measured by supervisor observations, mentor teacher quarterly midterm and final evaluations, a teacher performance assessment (PACT), successful completion of Content Area Tasks (MS only) and course grades (B or better in MS/SS and C or better in BSS).

All data related to student academic progress, assessment of milestone projects, observations, and PACT scores are entered into TEIIS. Candidates, faculty, and supervisors reported interacting with the system over the course of the program to enter data and to ensure students are effectively meeting standards. All reported receiving training and support in the use of the system.

Candidates reported accessing TEIIS to check progress in the program. In particular, candidates found it a valuable way to review supervisor and mentor observation notes. Candidates from all programs reported submitting post-observation reflections on TEIIS and said that the process helped them reflect and plan for how to teach in ways that best supported student learning.

### ***Findings on Standards:***

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and university supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are *Met*.

## **Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program**

### ***Program Design***

The University California, Irvine Extension Department, under the guidance of the School of Education, offers a standards-based preliminary administrative services credential program. This program is designed to support candidates in their mastery of the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL). This is achieved by a variety of instructional strategies, assessment protocols, guided feedback, coursework, and fieldwork. The program has a diverse community advisory committee made up of current district leaders, alumni, and instructors. The advisory committee assists with program design and feedback. Also, by in large, the instructors are active site or district public school administrators who hold valid administrative services credentials.

The program is eleven courses. Each course varies in units, ranging from two to four. The total number of units for the program is 36. The program can be completed in one year, however candidates are allowed to take two years as well. Depending on the specific course, it may be offered in a face-to-face, online, or hybrid format. Candidate recruitment, advising, admissions, course registration, and program coordination take place within the University Extension Department. When the candidate's course work and comprehensive exam are completed in adherence to the program standards and guidelines, the program coordinator works with the

School of Education's credential analyst to recommend the authorization of a certificate of eligibility or preliminary administrative services credential to the CTC. Interviews with completers and current candidates verify satisfaction with program coordination.

University Extension's Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (Preliminary ASC) program is designed to develop candidates' skills and attitudes, guiding them toward mastery of the California Professional Standards for Educational Leadership (CPSEL) and building upon candidates' experiences as education professionals. The program is designed to provide candidates a solid conceptual understanding of educational leadership, as well as the successful application of the concepts in an educational setting. This is accomplished through coursework extensive fieldwork, reflective activities, and a comprehensive exam.

Program completers and candidates report the application process and requirements are clear and understandable. Additionally, they stated the extension program's website is easy to navigate and all of the program elements are described.

The Director of University Extension oversees the program along with a Program Director. The current Program Director is full-time school administrator who provides leadership to the program by assisting in program design, student advising, selecting instructors, evaluation and teaching.

A review of the program's syllabi, key assignments, student work samples, instructional model, and the comprehensive exam show candidates are provided with a variety of activities that assess candidate competency on the CSPEL as well and program standards. Key assessments called signature assignments are identified in each class and candidates are given rubrics and guidance on the completion of these assignments. The assignments and their scores are stored in the Moodle course shell. As a result of interviews with program administrators, it was learned the data for signature assignments and the comprehensive exam from each candidate could not be aggregated for use in program and unit evaluation.

During face to face and phone interviews candidates reported assignments were clear and understandable and grading rubrics are used. Further, they enjoy the readings, videos, and discussions that take place in class. The visiting team reviewed numerous advising documents, handbooks, checklists, syllabi, candidate work, rubrics, course and instructor surveys and found them as described in the written response to the program standards.

The program requires candidates to participate in supervised administrative fieldwork while enrolled in two fieldwork classes titled Supervised Administrative Fieldwork. In those classes, the candidates select a site mentor, develop a fieldwork plan, and participate in educational leadership fieldwork. While enrolled in those courses, the instructor also serves as the university lead mentor for all candidates enrolled in the course. This course is delivered using an online format. In speaking to candidates and program leadership, it was learned that candidates also self-select district-employed site mentors and generally coordinate their own paperwork around fieldwork. Although there are guidelines and handbooks for site mentors, in interviewing site mentors, the visiting team determined that no formal mentor training takes place.

In regards to fieldwork, candidates report they are receiving ample opportunities to experience what it would be like to be a leader. Fieldwork elements are also described in classes other than fieldwork. In those classes candidates are required to interview a school principal regarding personnel issues, apply concepts of social capital and cultural competence to their school site, do a final project on practical issues at their school site, report on a school board meeting, meet with a site principal to discuss the school budget, and report on technology at their site in comparison to the International Society for Technology in Education standards for administrators. In interviews, candidates noted their appreciation for these activities. Additionally, while working with their site mentors, students are required to have actual hours of fieldwork verified and signed off on.

### ***Course of Study***

The site team confirmed that coursework and the program are designed in ways to promote understanding of the CPSEL standards. The course sequence allows candidates the opportunity to start the program at different times. Also, as a result of interviewing the advisory council and instructors, it is evident that there is a cycle of improvement in place for the program. Course instruction, course formats, key assignments, and fieldwork activities are assessed in twice a year meetings. In all of this work, various stakeholders reported the needs of the candidates are of primary importance. Although it is a rigorous program, candidates indicated they find it manageable.

As described in the previous section, there is an alignment between fieldwork and the other courses. In interviews with program leaders, candidates, the advisory committee, and alumni, the visiting team verified that UC Irvine provides a thorough and well-coordinated online program to candidates.

Through an examination of documents and evidence of fieldwork and coursework, it was confirmed that candidates are provided many opportunities to practice cultural proficiency and learn how to lead a school that supports the success of all candidates. This is done by having a dedicated course on *Cultural and Socioeconomic Diversity* as well as directed fieldwork activities. In meetings and interviews, candidates said they learned about cultural proficiency and leadership in all of their courses and appreciated this element of the program and the activities that take place in class.

According to program completers and candidates, the fieldwork activities provide a deep and meaningful learning experience that aligns theory and practice.

### ***Candidate Competence***

A review of documents verified that the program provides clear formative and summative assessment and transition points. These assessments include course grades, signature assignment scores, and feedback from site and program supervisors.

Candidates are monitored and evaluated on an on-going basis throughout the entirety of the program and provided appropriate assistance and support as needed. In addition to the formative and summative assessments implemented in each course, these components employ multiple measures of candidate competence and are designed to demonstrate that each of them has

successfully addressed the standards required by the program and that each of them is prepared to implement the knowledge and skills they have gained. At the conclusion of the program, candidates are evaluated on a comprehensive exam directly based upon the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL).

Documents and interviews of instructors and program leaderships show a comprehensive and sustained effort has been made by all faculty to engage in calibration activities to insure reliability in scoring signature assignments.

***Findings on Standards:***

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** with the exception of the following **3** which are **Met with Concerns**:

**Standard 8-Guidance, Assistance and Feedback- Met with Concerns**

*The program sponsor has an effective system by which the candidate's performance is guided, assisted and evaluated in each field experience. In this system, at least one field/clinical supervisor and at least one program supervisor provide complete, accurate and timely feedback including constructive suggestions for improvement to the candidate.*

**Rationale:**

Interviews with the Program Director, the Program Coordinator, candidates, completers and district-employed supervisors established that the program practice of using the instructor of the field courses as the program field supervisor for every course participant did not provide for timely and accurate feedback from the program perspective during the field placement.

**Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Performance Met with Concerns**

*Prior to recommending each candidate for a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, one or more persons responsible for the program determine on the basis of thoroughly documented evidence that each candidate has demonstrated a satisfactory performance on the full range of standards of candidate competence and performance in Standards 10 through 15 of Category III. Satisfactory performance is defined as achieving competence as expected for entry-level administrators. During the program, candidates are guided and coached on their performance in relation to the standards of candidate competence and performance using formative assessment processes. Verification of candidate competence is provided by a representative of the program sponsor and at least one field/clinical supervisor.*

**Rationale:**

Interviews with staff, the program coordinator and the director of the Preliminary Administrative Services credential program revealed that while the program collected data that established candidate competence at the candidate level, that individual data was not aggregated for use at the program or unit level.



## **Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential Program**

### ***Program Design***

The University California Irvine Extension, under the guidance of the School of Education, offers a guidelines-based professional clear administrative services credential program. This program is designed to support new administrators during their first two years in an administrative position and assist candidates in applying the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) at a professional level.

Candidate recruitment, advising, admissions, course registration, and program coordination take place within the University Extension Office. When the candidate's course work is completed in adherence with the program guidelines, the program coordinator works with the School of Education's credential analyst to recommend authorization of a professional clear administrative services credential to the CTC. Interviews with completers and current candidates verify satisfaction with program coordination.

Program completers and candidates report the application process and requirements are clear and understandable. Additionally, they reported that the extension program's website is easy to navigate and all of the program elements are described.

The visiting team reviewed the student handbook, course syllabus, and all candidate forms as well as conducted numerous interviews and determined there is a clear alignment of program goals and CPSEL standards in all coursework, mentor activities, and assessments.

The program is comprised of two three-unit courses with an emphasis on reflective coaching and induction. Given that the candidate is in their first administrative position, the program identified the mentor component as essential. The supporting mentor is selected by the candidate and together they develop goals and action steps. The supporting mentor's primary responsibility is to assist the candidate in his/her growth by providing coaching and ongoing feedback specifically related to the personalized, CPSEL-based action plan. Supporting mentors are selected by the candidate and approved by the university lead mentor/course instructor. Supporting mentors are required to review the supporting mentor training materials and expectations prior to starting the assignment.

During interviews with supporting mentors, they indicated that although training materials were provided they did not feel they participated in formal training. The visiting team determined that the university lead mentor has a limited role in selecting the site mentor.

The visiting team reviewed evidence and held interviews that showed the candidates and the supporting mentors work collaboratively to decide on relevant action plans and meet regularly to review the plans and make adjustments. Some program completers and current students described a high level of satisfaction with their program experience and stated that they frequently recommend it to colleagues.

The site team studied numerous advising documents, handbooks, checklists, syllabi, candidate work, rubrics, course and instructor surveys and found them as described in the written response to the program standards.

### ***Course of Study***

The program consists of two courses of three units each-six total units. The courses are delivered online. The first class is titled “Induction” and requires candidates to self-assess, identify goals and action steps, create actions plans and work with a site mentor. This occurs during the first year. The second course, taken in the second year, is titled “Final Evaluation” and requires candidates to complete a final self-assessment, collaborate with their mentor, revise their goals and action steps, participate in online discussion, gather evidence, and complete exit surveys. The program is completed in two years.

In speaking to program completers, current students, mentors, and the program director, the site team verified the course sequence was effective and promoted student learning and growth. Candidates are given opportunities to master the CPSEL and experience numerous and varied leadership activities at their sites and the mentor’s actively review student progress on all of the CSPEL.

The course syllabi and handbook show that the two required courses are aligned with the coaching component. Together all elements of the curriculum support the induction planning requirements for the clear credential. Interviews with candidates and program completers revealed satisfaction with the structure and implementation program, with specific acknowledgement of expertise of program mentors.

### ***Candidate Competence***

Throughout the program, candidates are assessed by the university lead mentor/course instructor, the supporting mentors, and by the candidate himself/herself. Both of the required courses are administered by the university lead mentor/course instructor who evaluates the individual candidate’s work. Additionally, the university lead mentor/course instructor collects evidence of practice, areas of growth, and those areas needing improvement as assessed by the candidate’s site mentor. This assessment documentation is organized through the candidate’s Action Plan and is collected and maintained within the online course site.

Program completers and current students indicate that the online portion of the program is clear and works well for discussion forums.

In meeting with program directors and coordinators it was determined that the data in regards to key assignments has yet to be analyzed, for it is currently stored in the online course site.

Candidates are provided with formal feedback of their progression within the program via multiple grades at specifically spaced periods throughout the course of the two year program. In addition to the formal grade, candidates receive written feedback from the university lead mentor/course instructor on their submitted work. The university lead mentor/instructor also communicates with candidates on their progress via email and telephone communication as needed.

A review of the program's syllabi, assignments, student work samples, and instructional model show that candidates are provided with a variety of activities that assess candidate competency on the CSPEL and program standards.

### ***Findings on Standards:***

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program guidelines are **Met** with the exception of the following 2 which are **Met with Concerns**:

### **Guideline 2- Evaluation of Program Quality-Met with Concerns**

*The program sponsor conducts ongoing evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of the program for the purpose of identifying needs for program improvement and to ensure that the program is providing mentoring, support and assistance of high quality that is targeted to meet individual candidates' needs. The program sponsor maintains records of services provided to candidates, candidate assessments and other documentation of program and candidate activities for use in external program assessment activities to be conducted by the Commission.*

#### **Rationale:**

Interviews with staff, program coordinator, and director of the Clear Administrative Services Credential program established that while the program collected data that verified candidate competence at the candidate level, the program has been unable to aggregate the individual data so it could be used at the program or unit level.

## **Guideline 6- Mentor Qualifications and Assignment-Met with Concerns**

*The program sponsor establishes specific qualifications for the selection of lead mentors\* and criteria to be used in determining the appropriate assignment of lead mentors to individual administrators served by the program. Qualifications for lead mentors include appropriate mentor training and experience. The program sponsor establishes an evaluation process for lead mentors and uses the evaluation results to amend mentor selection qualifications and/or training requirements, and to reassign or replace mentors as needed.*

### **Rationale:**

Due to the program design, the program director is unable to fulfill the full responsibilities of a lead mentor as outlined in the program guidelines. In interviews, district employed mentors, candidates, and program completers reported that most interactions with the mentor occurred in his role as instructor and less in his role as a lead mentor.

## **Reading Certificate (Added Authorization)**

### ***Program Design***

The Reading Certificate Program is a six-course, 18-unit, fully online program designed for educators who have at least three years of teaching experience. Offered through the University Extension, it is led by the Director of Education and Business Programs in University Extension. The director works collaboratively with School of Education administrators including the Dean of the School of Education and the Director of Teacher Education Programs in program planning and delivery. A program coordinator guides candidates through the program, providing advice and assistance.

In July of 2012 the program submitted a transition plan to align with the 2011 revised standards for the Reading Authorization. The revised program narrative will be submitted to the CTC in Spring 2014 at which time they will go through a Program Assessment review.

The revised program began its offerings in fall 2012, with the first cohort of graduates in fall of 2013. Administrators and faculty reported that this program revision involved extensive collaboration to develop new courses. Faculty described meeting in person and remotely in order to design new courses aligned with CTC standards and to build signature assessments. Meeting minutes show that the Reading Certificate Advisory Committee provided input into the newly revised program. The Advisory Committee, which meets biannually, includes various constituents such as school district administrators, reading and curriculum specialists and alumni.

The current program is offered in a six-course sequence, with courses designed to promote literacy practices consistent with current theories emerging from landmark research and case studies. The program is designed so that candidates may take five courses in any order, however the Reading Practicum course must be taken after the other five courses are completed. Candidates interviewed from the first cohort reported to finish in 15-18 months, usually completing one course per quarter. Candidates reported an appreciation for this flexible online format for the program.

### ***Course of Study***

Prior to the reading practicum, candidates complete a series of five courses: Promoting a Culture of Literacy; Foundations in Fluency; Assessment, Instruction and Intervention; Balanced Literacy and Strategy Instruction; and 21<sup>st</sup> Century Literacy. Candidates interviewed identified strengths of the courses including course assignments that promote deep thinking, informative course texts, and knowledgeable instructors. Syllabi reviewed showed an intention to be relevant to the current educational environment in diverse public schools, and candidates reported that the content was aligned with their needs and experiences as literacy educators. Candidates and faculty also noted the importance of online forums in building an online, collaborative learning community in which candidates had the opportunity to learn about the teaching contexts and practices of their peers.

In the Reading Practicum, candidates are required to identify a site in which to conduct a minimum of 45 hours of field experience. All candidates interviewed completed fieldwork at a site (where they were currently employed) that provided an opportunity for diverse experiences in teaching English language learners, beginning readers, and students with reading problems. A review of the practicum syllabus and candidate work provided evidence that candidates completed a signature assignment in which they assessed struggling readers at both early and intermediate levels, and taught small groups of struggling readers at two or more reading levels. Interviews with candidates confirmed that this assignment was an opportunity to apply assessment and intervention strategies learned in earlier coursework.

For support during fieldwork, candidates verified that they nominate a mentor at their site, following a listing of mentor qualifications provided by the program. The candidate and potential mentor complete an application and the candidate submits it to the practicum instructor. The practicum instructor checks the application to ensure that requirements are met and notify the candidate of their mentor's suitability.

Both mentors and candidates interviewed verified that mentors conduct observations and complete standard-based observation forms that are supplied by the candidate. The completed observation forms are then returned to the practicum instructor through a variety of means. Mentors and candidates confirmed that the candidate assumed the role of liaison with the program; the mentors had little to no contact with the program.

Mentors and candidates reported engaging in ongoing discussions about the candidate's practice during the practicum, and program finishers uniformly described that the relationship with the on-site mentor was valuable, often continuing after they completed the program. Additionally, candidates verified that the practicum instructor also served as a support, providing feedback to candidate reflections. Candidates commented that the practicum instructor was quick to respond to questions and provided useful resources as well.

### ***Candidate Competence***

Candidate competence is measured by performance in the six online courses, each of which includes multiple assessments and a standards-based signature assignment. Candidate progress in each course is monitored by the course instructor, who posts feedback and grades in the online

course environment. Candidates may access their course grades online. The program coordinator monitors course grades and if there is a problem notifies the Program Director and sets up a counseling session.

***Findings on Standards:***

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and on-site mentors, the team determined:

All program standards are **Met** with the exception of **Standard 1**, which is **Met with Concerns**.

**Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination—Met with Concerns**

*The program addresses the processes of admission, advising, program evaluation and improvement, as well as its coordination and communication with the PreK-12 public schools for field experiences.*

**Rationale:**

The team did not find evidence of processes for aggregating data from signature assignments for program evaluation and improvement. In addition, the team did not find evidence of systematic communication from the program faculty with site mentors regarding program requirements and field placements in public schools. The candidates themselves were providing communication to the mentor about his/her responsibilities.