

UC Berkeley Biennial Report

Section A Reports

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| Multicultural Urban Secondary English | 2 |
| Single Subject-Math and Science | 17 |
| Multiple Subject | 33 |
| Designated Subjects | 46 |
| Administrative Services | 56 |
| <u>Section B</u> | 67 |



COMMISSION ON
TEACHER CREDENTIALING
Ensuring Educator Excellence

Institution: University of California, Berkeley

Date report is submitted: _____ **Date of last Site Visit:** _____

Program documented in this report: Teacher Education Program

Name of Program: Multicultural Urban Secondary English (MUSE)

Credential awarded: Single Subject English Teaching Credential

Is this program offered at more than one site? Yes No

If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered:

Program Contact: Christine Cziko

Phone # (510) 301-3625

E-mail: ccziko@berkeley.edu

If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART I. Contextual Information - Program Description:

The Multicultural Urban Secondary English Program (MUSE), results in a Preliminary Single Subject Teaching Credential in English. MUSE is a small, cohesive program with approximately 20 students.

Some unique program features include:

1. Teacher candidates in the program begin during the summer session and end the program at the same time forming a strong cohort where members support, share, and inform each other throughout the credential.
2. In their first year of teaching they continue to meet bi-weekly on campus to work on a teacher research project that will meet the final requirement of a MA in Education. Students are advised by faculty during this period and give feedback to each other as they interpret and write their findings.
3. Teacher candidates acquire teaching knowledge, skills, and dispositions in an integrated manner that interweaves basic theoretical foundations courses, methods courses, on-site observations, and brief teaching sessions to final complete teaching take-over of classes. All methods courses are taught by instructors who have had significant experience teaching in urban settings. Each instructor of the 3 key methods courses has taught in urban public schools for over 25 years.
4. Instructors and supervisors in the program communicate frequently with each other and make concerted efforts to address the developmental levels of each teacher candidate. Supervisors also have on-going conversations with both Cooperating teachers and teacher candidate at their school placement site.
5. Instructors get to know the teacher candidates well and they get to know each other well in both curricular and extra-curricular activities.
6. Teacher candidates teach in two different schools, and often in 3 or 4 different classes. Student candidates teach in both middle and high schools and are expected to take over the teaching of at least one class each semester.
7. Teacher candidates are supervised in two different ways; by their cooperating teacher who supervises the teacher candidate on a daily basis in the classroom and their site supervisor who observes on a weekly basis at the school site. As a result, teacher candidates obtain more than one perspective of their teaching skills.
8. All MUSE supervisors have had significant experience teaching English or ESL in urban middle or high school. As a result they are able to act as resources as well as supervisors for the teacher candidates.

9. Teacher candidates meet weekly throughout the entire year with their cohort and university supervisor to share their weekly written reflections as well as their personal stories of teaching and learning.
10. Teacher candidates are placed in schools and with cooperating teachers who support the MUSE Program. The majority of our teacher candidates are working with MUSE alumnae. Others are with Teacher Consultants from the Bay Area Writing Project.
11. In order to better understand the communities in which they will work, during the summer teacher candidates participate in Community Events, from neighborhood tours, to performances of Spoken Word, to museums etc. This kind of “out of school experience” (teacher candidates must attend these activities with at least two others from the cohort) help begin to form strong personal and professional bonds within the cohort.
12. Teacher candidates are integrated into the rest of the Graduate School of Education through participating in course work that often includes students from other UC Berkeley credential/MA programs as well as students in the PhD programs. A number of courses that the teacher candidates take are taught by tenured faculty in the Graduate School of Education.

MUSE Program Specific Candidate Information

| MUSE Program Specific Candidate Information | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| Academic Year | Number of Candidates | Number Graduated |
| 2007-08 | 1 st year: 15 2 nd year: 18 | 19 (includes one returning student) |
| 2008-09 | 1 st year: 21 2 nd year: 15 | 14 |

PART II
EXAMPLE OF CANDIDATE ASSESSMENT INFORMATION
(Single Subject English Credential Program)

Response to Part II Section A,

The chart below displays the various evaluation instruments the Multicultural Urban Secondary English Credential Program uses to evaluate candidate progress/performance and program effectiveness. The chart below lists all the assessments.

| Evaluation Instrument | Frequency | Description | Data Collected | Use |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| TPA Assessment: Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) Teaching Event See www.pacttpa.org for all PACT materials. | Once during final semester of student teaching Placement #4 | A comprehensive performance assessment of Planning, Instruction, Assessment, Reflection, and Academic Language Instruction | Evidence of skill in TPEs. Each event is evaluated by a set of common rubrics assessing a candidate's achievement in Planning, Instruction, Assessment, Reflection, and Academic Language Instruction | <i>Primary Use:</i> Summative Assessment of Teaching <i>Secondary Use:</i> Program improvement data |
| Evaluation of Student teacher by Supervisor | Bi-weekly class observations of each student teacher and debrief with student teacher, supervisor often including Cooperating Teacher following observation | Supervisor shares and discusses notes on observation with student teacher in order to improve student teacher's instruction and set learning goals for the following weeks | Collaborative and formative assessment of all aspects of the supervision seminar (EDUC 390C) | Ongoing record of student teaching development. Also used as the basis for weekly site reports by supervisors which are discussed in supervisor meetings |
| Formal observations by supervisor and Cooperating teacher | Twice during each student teaching placement | A tool for supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers to assess student progress and set future goals | Assessment by both supervisor and Cooperating Teaching based on a formal observation after which student teacher reflects on the lesson and discusses feedback given by supervisor and Cooperating Teacher | Use in conference with candidates on areas of strength and need. |
| Ratings of Student Teaching Competencies Based on CA TPEs | Formatively at the end of the first semester of student teaching and Summatively at the end of the second semester of student teaching | A comprehensive examination of candidate's ability to implement the CA TPS's. | Same evaluation form is used twice by Cooperating teacher in consultation with supervisor. A 5-point scale is used based on the PACT assessment scale." | <i>Primary Use:</i> Summative Assessment of Teaching <i>Secondary Use:</i> Program improvement data |
| Teacher Education Program Graduate School Survey | | Graduate Survey return rates have been very low in recent years, resulting in unreliable findings. | The program is in the midst of revising the graduate surveys while also working to post surveys on the web to increase return rates. | Program improvement |

DATA SUMMARIES

1. TPA – The PACT Teaching Event

Collection Process

Candidates have completed their PACT Teaching Events in their 2nd student teaching placement in the third semester of the program (approximately May).

Data Summary

| PACT TEACHING EVENT IN SINGLE SUBJECT ENGLISH | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| | | PLANNING Rubrics 1-3 Mean Score | INSTRUCTIO N Rubrics 4-5 Mean Score | ASSESSMENT Rubrics 6-7 Mean Score | REFLECTION Rubrics 8-9 Mean Score) | ACADEMIC LANGUAGE Rubrics 10-11 Mean Score |
| 2.84 | 2008 SS English | 2.94 | 2.67 | 2.47 | 2.53 | 2.53 |
| | | | | | | |

A passing score on the PACT Teaching Event requires a minimum of no more than two scores at Level 1 across the five categories.

Evaluation of Student teacher by Supervisor (participant/observer)

These are used in a strictly formative fashion unless there is a major concern about a student's continuation in the program. To date, 98% of students have received satisfactory ratings.

Ratings of Student Teaching Competencies Based on CA TPEs

Candidates are given 2 opportunities over two semesters to identify and improve any areas that do not receive the passing score of 3 on a 3-point scale. 98% of our candidates receive passing scores.

Since MUSE is a small program, students are well known to the entire supervisory staff. Students submit weekly student teaching reflections to their supervisors and in their responses, supervisors address issues across the range of the TPEs.. A typical supervisory load for a supervisor is from 3 to 6 students. Each student has 2 different supervisors over the 2 semesters of the program and is observed a minimum of 20 times in the classroom, each one requiring a post-observation conference. By the time they graduate, MUSE students have been observed and evaluated by 4 experienced teachers (2 cooperating teachers and 2 supervisors). They also

observe 5 other teachers at their school sites who teach a variety of grade levels as well as a variety of subjects.

Supervisors who evaluate MUSE students collaborate in the supervision process. All supervisors write weekly site reports that are shared on-line and uses as the basis for discussion at the two hour weekly supervisors meeting. The other half of the meeting is devoted to program issues and changes to respond to a constant flow of student feedback collected from journals, “supe group” meetings, individual conversations and weekly comment cards from the supervision seminar. Supervisors also report on informal meetings with school administrators as appropriate. Informal notes are kept at staff meetings to keep a record of discussions and to generate “to do” lists for post-meeting follow-up. This entire process is organic, ongoing and the sample size is small, so data is kept in the form of individual notes on the staff meeting agendas.

There is only one section of the MUSE methods course per year, so it is a simple matter to adjust syllabi mid-semester in response to student input or instructor observations. This is routinely done when changes are in order. Course grades are another indicator of student competence.

PART III:

| |
|---|
| MUSE Teacher Education Program Graduate Survey prepared by Evaluation Unit |
|---|

STUDENTS - END OF PROGRAM SURVEY

During the Spring 2008 semester, the twenty-one candidates who were at the end of the first year of the MUSE program (completed the teacher credential requirements) were asked to complete an electronic form of the program evaluation. Each survey was given a unique identifier in order to keep track of those who had already responded. The Evaluation Unit followed up with phone calls and emails as reminders to those who did not complete surveys. Reminders were sent throughout the summer. For those candidates who did not submit the electronic survey, paper surveys were sent to candidates’ local and permanent addresses, if different. A total of 9 out of the 21 (43%) End of Program Surveys were completed and returned. The results of this survey are presented next.

Effectiveness of Program Preparation (TPE ratings)

Each candidate was asked to rate how effectively he or she felt the program was in preparing students in each of the TPE areas (ratings ranged from: 1= not at all prepared, 4 = adequately prepared, 7 = extremely well prepared). The candidates were also asked to provide general feedback on the program’s strengths and weaknesses. Space was also provided for additional comments.

Students at the end of the MUSE program indicated that they were at least adequately prepared for 29 out of the 30 competency areas questioned. Mean responses ranged from 3.88 to 6.44; see Table 1 for a complete listing of rating frequencies and means.

| |
|--|
| Table 1: Student Respondents at End of Credential Requirements - Item Means and Distributions |
|--|

| |
|---|
| AREA 1: MAKING SUBJECT MATTER COMPREHENSIBLE TO STUDENTS |
|---|

| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Plan instruction and scaffold learning in English/language arts/humanities to help students master skills and knowledge (Mean = 5.55) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Use instructional techniques in English/language arts/humanities to promote critical thinking and problem solving (Mean = 6.25) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| AREA 2: ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Determine student progress toward the state-adopted academic content standards (Mean = 4.12) | (9) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Use assessments to pace instruction and to check for common misunderstandings (Mean = 5.11) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Understand, interpret, and use a variety of assessments to determine student progress and plan instruction (Mean = 5.22) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Understand, interpret, and use information from a variety of sources including family, community, and school to design instruction and support student learning (Mean = 5.44) | (9) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Communicate to students and their families about the student's academic progress (Mean = 5.22) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| AREA 3: ENGAGING AND SUPPORTING STUDENTS IN LEARNING | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Incorporate various instructional strategies to address academic content standards (Mean = 6.00) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| Prioritize and sequence essential skills and strategies (Mean = 4.88) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Develop student skills in using academic language and reading (Mean = 6.00) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|-------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Understand and communicate instructional objectives to students in order to facilitate effective time management (Mean = 5.12) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| Ensure active and equitable participation of all students (Mean = 5.77) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Use Community resources, student experience and background, and applied learning activities to make instruction relevant to students (Mean = 6.11) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| Build on student understandings and support students who lack skills (Mean = 5.55) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| Design instructional activities commensurate with student development (Mean=4.88) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Help students develop learning strategies and increase responsibility (Mean = 5.44) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| Apply pedagogical theories, principles, and instructional practices for English Language Learner instruction (Mean = 3.88) | (9) | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Draw on information about students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds and life experiences to inform instruction (Mean = 6.00) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| AREA 4: PLANNING INSTRUCTION AND DESIGNING LEARNING EXPERIENCES | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Draw on adolescent development, student assessments, and a variety of information from school, community, and family sources to learn about student needs (Mean = 5.55) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Establish goals and plan comprehensive instruction in accordance with content standards (Mean = 4.77) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Use a variety of instructional practices to connect academic content to students' needs and interests (Mean = 5.77) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Select a variety of strategies, activities, and materials to meet students' cultural and linguistic needs and interests (Mean = 5.77) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| AREA 5: CREATING AND MAINTAINING EFFECTIVE ENVIRONMENTS FOR LEARNING | | | | | | | | | |

| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Allocate and manage instructional time to inform teaching practice (Mean = 5.33) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Reflect on the use of instructional time to inform teaching practice (Mean = 5.88) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| Develop and maintain clear expectations for academic and social behavior (Mean = 5.66) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| Understand the importance of a social learning environment (Mean = 6.44) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| Establish a positive learning environment for all students and their families (Mean = 5.88) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 |
| AREA 6: DEVELOPING AS A PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Understand and enforce professional, legal, and ethical obligations during teaching practice (Mean = 6.00) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| Evaluate teaching practice on a continual basis to improve instruction, subject specific content knowledge, and student achievement (Mean = 6.00) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Engage in cycles of planning, teaching, reflecting, discerning problems, and applying new strategies (Mean = 5.88) | (9) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 |

Overall, candidates at the end of their course work rated their preparation as more than adequate and their comments supported these ratings.

EMPLOYERS

MUSE graduates were asked for their employment information in order to obtain feedback from their employers (principals, department heads, etc) about how effectively the program had prepared them to teach. Employment information was reliant upon student/graduate response, thus the response rates from the graduates (and their willingness to share employment information) consequently limited the number of employers the Evaluation Unit was able to survey. Of the 18 MUSE graduates, 5 responded to the Evaluation Unit's requests to participate in the evaluation. Four of these five graduates provided employment data.

As with the Field Supervisors, the Evaluation Unit sent emails and hardcopy mailings of the instructions to fill out the survey on line. Each survey was given a unique identifier in order to keep track of those who had already responded. Hardcopies of the survey were sent to supervisors who did not complete the electronic form. The Evaluation Unit followed up with phone calls and emails as reminders to those who did not return surveys. Reminders were sent throughout the summer. Three out of four (75%) of the Employer surveys were returned. The results of these surveys are presented next.

Effectiveness of Program Preparation (TPE ratings)

Each of the employers was asked to rate how effective they felt the program was in preparing graduates in each of the TPE areas (1= not at all prepared, 4 = adequately prepared, 7 = extremely well prepared). The employers were also asked to provide general feedback on the program’s strengths and weaknesses. Space was also provided for additional comments.

| Table 5: Employer Ratings – Item Means and Distributions | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|-------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| AREA 1: MAKING SUBJECT MATTER COMPREHENSIBLE TO STUDENTS | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Plan instruction and scaffold learning in English/language arts/humanities to help students master skills and knowledge (Mean = 5.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Use instructional techniques in English/language arts/humanities to promote critical thinking and problem solving (Mean = 5.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| AREA 2: ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Determine student progress toward the state-adopted academic content standards (Mean = 5.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Use assessments to pace instruction and to check for common misunderstandings (Mean = 4.33) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Understand, interpret, and use a variety of assessments to determine student progress and plan instruction (Mean = 5.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Understand, interpret, and use information from a variety of sources including family, community, and school to design instruction and support student learning (Mean = 6.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|--|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Communicate to students and their families about the student's academic progress (Mean = 5.33) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| AREA 3: ENGAGING AND SUPPORTING STUDENTS IN LEARNING | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Incorporate various instructional strategies to address academic content standards (Mean = 5.66) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Prioritize and sequence essential skills and strategies (Mean = 5.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Develop student skills in using academic language and reading (Mean = 5.33) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Understand and communicate instructional objectives to students in order to facilitate effective time management (Mean = 5.33) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Ensure active and equitable participation of all students (Mean = 5.33) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Use Community resources, student experience and background, and applied learning activities to make instruction relevant to students (Mean = 6.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Build on student understandings and support students who lack skills (Mean = 5.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Design instructional activities commensurate with student development (Mean = 5.66) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Help students develop learning strategies and increase responsibility (Mean = 5.66) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Apply pedagogical theories, principles, and instructional practices for English Language Learner instruction (Mean = 4.33) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|-------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Draw on information about students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds and life experiences to inform instruction (Mean = 5.66) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| AREA 4: PLANNING INSTRUCTION AND DESIGNING LEARNING EXPERIENCES | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Draw on adolescent development, student assessments, and a variety of information from school, community, and family sources to learn about student needs (Mean = 5.33) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Establish goals and plan comprehensive instruction in accordance with content standards (Mean = 5.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Use a variety of instructional practices to connect academic content to students' needs and interests (Mean = 5.66) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Select a variety of strategies, activities, and materials to meet students' cultural and linguistic needs and interests (Mean = 5.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| AREA 5: CREATING AND MAINTAINING EFFECTIVE ENVIRONMENTS FOR LEARNING | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Allocate and manage instructional time to inform teaching practice (Mean = 5.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Reflect on the use of instructional time to inform teaching practice (Mean = 6.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Develop and maintain clear expectations for academic and social behavior (Mean = 5.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Understand the importance of a social learning environment (Mean = 5.66) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Establish a positive learning environment for all students and their families (Mean = 6.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| AREA 6: DEVELOPING AS A PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Understand and enforce professional, legal, and ethical obligations during teaching practice (Mean = 6.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Evaluate teaching practice on a continual basis to improve instruction, subject specific content knowledge, and student achievement (Mean = 7.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Engage in cycles of planning, teaching, reflecting, discerning problems, and applying new strategies (Mean = 6.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

A brief analysis of the data presented for the three evaluation tools in section II is presented below.

Analysis of PACT Assessment

Scores for TPA Tasks 1, and 2 are strong, indicating students are prepared to accomplish these tasks.

Scores for TPA 4 and 5 are only slightly lower than tasks 1 and 2 indicating that feel confident in these areas with additional teaching experience.

Scores for TPA 3 are lowest and indicate that candidates are not as confident or prepared for TPA 3.

Analysis of First Year Teacher Survey (End of Program)

Overall data indicates students are performing well in implementing the Teaching Performance Expectations in their first year of teaching.

The areas of weakness that students identified are:

- Use assessments to pace instruction and to check for common misunderstandings
- Understand, interpret, and use a variety of assessments to determine student progress and plan instruction

These areas related to assessment of student learning, coincide with the area indicated in the PACT evaluation

- Communicate to students and their families about the student's academic progress
- Apply pedagogical theories, principles, and instructional practices for English Language Learner instruction

There may be a connection between students' abilities to communicate to students and their families and confidence in their instructional practices with English Language Learners

Analysis of First Year Teacher Employer Surveys

- In general, the employers felt that the MUSE program's graduates were well prepared in the various competency areas. Employers' mean responses ranged from 4.33 to 7.00, with most ratings falling in the 5 to 6 range. See Table 5 for a complete listing of rating frequencies
- Employers indicated that MUSE graduates were especially well prepared to reflect on their professional practice. They effectively engaged in cycles of planning, teaching, reflecting, discerning problems, and applying new strategies
- All students were rated "adequately prepared" in all areas. The weakest area, however, was the ability to apply pedagogical theories, principles, and instructional practices for English Language Learner instruction. This is an area also identified by students themselves

PART IV: Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

Programs indicate how they use the data from assessments and analysis of that data to improve candidate performance and the program. If proposed changes are being made, please link the proposed changes to the data that support that modification as related to the appropriate Program and/or Common Standard(s). If preferred, programs may combine responses to Sections III (Analysis of the Data) with Section IV (Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance) so long as all the required aspects of the responses are addressed.

As a result of the data presented and analyzed in previous sections, the MUSE has set several objectives to be accomplished in the next year. The following chart exhibits the objectives and the implementation course to accomplish these objectives.

| Area of Weakness | Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made | Data Source |
|---|--|---------------------------------|
| The ability to apply pedagogical theories, principles, and instructional practices for English Language Learner instruction | <p>Additional Methods course aimed at working with English Language Learners, taught by an experienced ESL teacher</p> <p>Insure that all student teachers have a teaching placement in an ESL class</p> | Student surveys and PACT scores |
| The ability to determine student progress toward the state-adopted academic content standards | Emphasis on state-adopted academic standards in methods course and student teaching placements | Employer surveys |
| Assessment of student work | <p>Emphasis on assessment in methods and student teaching placements</p> <p>Add more differentiation strategies for assessing students to coursework</p> | PACT |
| Communicate to students and their families about the student's academic progress | <p>Require that all student teachers attend parent/conferences at their school site</p> <p>Require students to make calls to students' parents to report to them on student progress</p> | Student surveys |



COMMISSION ON
TEACHER CREDENTIALING
Ensuring Educator Excellence

Institution: University of California, Berkeley

Date report is submitted: March 2009 **Date of last Site Visit:** ?

Program documented in this report: Math and Science

Name of Program: MACSME

Credential awarded: Single Subject Teaching Credential

Is this program offered at more than one site? Yes No

If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered:

Program Contact: Daniel Zimmerlin

Phone # (510) 642- 4206

E-mail: danz@berkeley.edu

If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION 1 page

I. Contextual Information - Program Description:

The M.A. and Credential in Math and Science (MACSME) teaching credential program at UC Berkeley a small, cohesive two year master's and credential program in Mathematics or Science (Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience, Physics) with yearly cohorts of 10 – 12 students. Some unique program features include:

1. Teacher candidates in the program begin and end the program at the same time and form strong cohorts (program wide, at school sites, and in subject matter content) where members support, share, and inform each other throughout the two years, and often beyond the program years.
2. Teacher candidates acquire teaching knowledge, skills, and dispositions in a carefully sequenced program that combines a progression of field experiences across the 4 semesters and coursework with the doctoral students in our sister program Education in Math Science and Technology (EMST) providing a solid grounding in educational theory, including content specific cognition (how people think and learn math or science in addition to general theories of thinking and learning), and deep involvement in educational research, including faculty research projects, culminating in a master's project and their Master of Arts in Education degree.
3. Teacher candidates have a series of at least 7 placements in different schools including both middle school and high school. These vary in duration from one month to whole semester, and level of involvement from working with individuals and small groups to team teaching and whole class take-over. A unique feature is a full take-over from Day 1 in the fall of the second year allowing each student teacher (who is ready) the experience of establishing routines and classroom culture in "their own" class, with the advise and support of an experienced cooperating teacher and a university supervisor.
4. Teacher candidates meet weekly throughout the two years with their content cohort and university supervisor(s) to share their personal stories of learning to teach in context. Further they meet in their content cohorts each week, for all 4 semesters, for a course in content specific Teaching Methods (EDUC 231) which supports the learning of content pedagogy, as well as general teaching methods, ranging from mechanics to performance assessment.
5. Teacher candidates are placed in schools that are part of a partnership where cooperating teachers and administrators support and encourage the gradual development of skills in teacher candidates.

| MACSME Program Specific Candidate Information | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| Academic Year | Number of Candidates | Number Graduated |
| 2007-08 | Math: 1 st year: 4 2 nd year: 6 Science: 1 st year: 8 2 nd year: 4 | Math: 6 Science: 4 |
| 2008-09 | Math: 1 st year: 3 2 nd year: 4 Science: 1 st year: 8 2 nd year: 8 | Math: 4 Science: 8 |

Changes Since Commission Approval of Current Program Document.

The most significant change in our Program was the implementation of the California Teaching Performance Assessment (PACT). PACT was integrated into our EDUC 231 Teaching Methods series first as a pilot in AY 2005-06 and later as a high stakes assessment. As a two year program, the students are first exposed to the assessment system in the first semester, as the 2nd year members of their content cohort (in the same course) prepare to do the Teaching Event. Later they see samples of PACT work in the second semester when volunteers from the 2nd year cohort present parts of their portfolios for discussion.

II. Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

a) The program submits information on how candidate and program completer performance are assessed and a summary of the data

Student Evaluation Procedures

Students in the MACSME Program are evaluated throughout the two years by Faculty Instructors, University Content Supervisors, University On-site Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers. These include academic performance via grades, field performance via Campus-Based Supervisor field observations, journal submissions, and Supervised Teaching Seminar discussions. There are two high stakes evaluations that are required of each candidate:

Evaluation Activities for the Single Subject Credential

| <u>Evaluation Activity</u> | <u>Semester</u> |
|---|--|
| Cooperating Teacher Evaluations | Spring of first year and Fall of second year |
| Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) | Carried out in the Fall of the second year, due beginning of Spring semester, second year. |

The following program assessments and evaluations were used in the Biennial Report for the Single Subject Teaching Credential Program:

| EVALUATION INSTRUMENT | DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Cooperating Teacher Evaluations | At the end of their “big” placements in the Spring of the first year and in the Fall of the second year, 2 nd and 3 rd semesters respectively, cooperating teachers fill out an evaluation of student progress on the TPEs. Although one might expect that the later semester would be the summative assessment, we feel that different placements give students different opportunities to demonstrate different skills. This is in part because typically students have one placement in middle school and one in high school, and in part because not all placements are equally easy for student teachers working in urban environments. Here we report the scores for the second placement, but note that it is not a complete picture. (We will elaborate on this in the analysis section.) |
| PACT | PACT is a performance assessment for teaching credential candidates. Credential candidates complete a "Teaching Event," which documents a teaching segment that is planned, taught, assessed, and reflected upon. Student teachers typically complete the teaching segment in Fall of the second year (3 rd semester), write up the PACT document over winter break and turn it in at the beginning of the final semester. |

As described above, a variety of formative evaluation data are collected over the course of the two years that credential candidates are in the program. For the purposes of this report, the summative data obtained from the two instruments are reported. As mentioned in the previous description, Cooperating Teacher Evaluation requires the students’ cooperating teachers to report the degree to which each student has met the competencies mandated by the CTC, the TPEs in math or science. Accordingly, these data provide direct commentary on the success with which the MACSME Program is meeting CTC expectancies for adequate practice preparation.

Table 1: Frequencies and mean ratings by cooperating teachers of how well the MACSME program has prepared Science candidates graduating in 2008 in the TPEs (Rating 1= Poor, 7= Excellent)

2008 Science Graduates

| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| 1. Specific Pedagogical Skills for Science Instruction (Mean = 6.00) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 2. Monitoring Student Learning during Instruction (Mean =5.75) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 3. Interpretation and Use of Assessments (Mean = 5.75) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Making Content Accessible (Mean = 6.00) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 5. Student Engagement (Mean = 5.75) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 6. Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices (Mean =6.25) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 7. Teaching English Language Learners (Mean = 5.50) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 8. Learning about Students (Mean = 5.75) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 9. Instructional Planning (Mean = 6.00) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. Instructional Time (Mean = 5.75) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 11. Social Environment (Mean = 5.50) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 12. Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations (Mean = 6..50) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 13. Professional Growth (Mean = 6.50) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |

Table 2: Frequencies and mean ratings by cooperating teachers of how well the MACSME program has prepared Math candidates graduating in 2008 in the TPEs (Rating 1= Poor, 7= Excellent)

2008 Math Graduates

| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| 1. Specific Pedagogical Skills for Science Instruction (Mean = 6.33) | (6) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| 2. Monitoring Student Learning during Instruction (Mean = 5.66) | (6) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 3. Interpretation and Use of Assessments (Mean = 5.16) | (6) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 4. Making Content Accessible (Mean = 6.00) | (6) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 5. Student Engagement (Mean = 5.83) | (6) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 6. Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices (Mean = 5.83) | (6) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 7. Teaching English Language Learners (Mean = 5.00) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 8. Learning about Students (Mean = 4.25) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 9. Instructional Planning (Mean = 5.33) | (6) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 10. Instructional Time (Mean = 5.16) | (6) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 11. Social Environment (Mean = 5.83) | (6) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |

| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| 12. Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations (Mean = 5.66) | (6) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| 13. Professional Growth (Mean = 6.16) | (6) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |

Table 3: Frequencies and mean ratings by cooperating teachers of how well the MACSME program has prepared Science candidates graduating in 2009 in the TPEs (Rating 1= Poor, 7= Excellent)

2009 Science Graduates

| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| 1. Specific Pedagogical Skills for Science Instruction (Mean = 5.86) | (7) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| 2. Monitoring Student Learning during Instruction (Mean = 6.00) | (7) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| 3. Interpretation and Use of Assessments (Mean = 5.86) | (7) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| 4. Making Content Accessible (Mean = 6.00) | (7) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 5. Student Engagement (Mean = 5.86) | (7) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 6. Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices (Mean = 5.86) | (7) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 7. Teaching English Language Learners (Mean = 5.00) | (6) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 8. Learning about Students (Mean = 5.5) | (6) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 9. Instructional Planning (Mean = 5.57) | (7) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| 10. Instructional Time (Mean = 6.00) | (7) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 11. Social Environment (Mean = 6.29) | (7) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 12. Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations (Mean = 6.33) | (6) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| 13. Professional Growth (Mean = 6.00) | (7) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 |

Table 4: Frequencies and mean ratings by cooperating teachers of how well the MACSME program has prepared Math candidates graduating in 2009 in the TPEs (Rating 1= Poor, 7= Excellent)

2009 Math Graduates

| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| 1. Specific Pedagogical Skills for Science Instruction (Mean = 6.25) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| 2. Monitoring Student Learning during Instruction (Mean = 5.75) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Interpretation and Use of Assessments (Mean = 5.50) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Making Content Accessible (Mean = 5.25) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 5. Student Engagement (Mean = 5.25) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| 6. Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices (Mean = 4.75) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. Teaching English Language Learners (Mean = 5.00) | (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 8. Learning about Students (Mean = 5.00) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 9. Instructional Planning (Mean = 4.50) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. Instructional Time (Mean = 5.25) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 11. Social Environment (Mean = 4.5) | (4) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 12. Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations (Mean = 6.75) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 13. Professional Growth (Mean = 6.25) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |

The data from second instrument, PACT, is reported below in Tables 5-8. These data inform about the performance of individual students, but collectively inform about the performance of the program in preparing student teachers to teach.

Table 5: Frequencies and mean ratings of PACT scores on how well the MACSME program has prepared Science candidates graduating in 2008 in the TPEs (Rating 1= Needs Improvement, 2 = Prepared, 3 = Superior, 4 =Superlative)

2008 Science Graduates

| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| S1 Planning: Balanced Instructional Focus (Mean = 2.75) | (4) | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| S2 Planning: Making Content Accessible (Mean = 2.5) | (4) | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| S3 Planning: Designing Assessments (Mean = 2.5) | (4) | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| S4 Instruction: Engaging Students in Learning (Mean = 2.00) | (4) | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| S5 Instruction: Monitoring Student Learning (Mean = 2.25) | (4) | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| S6 Assessment: Analyzing Student Work (Mean =2.25) | (4) | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| S7 Assessment: Using Assessments to Inform Teaching (Mean = 2.00) | (4) | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| S8 Reflection: Monitoring Student Progress (Mean = 1.75) | (4) | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| S9 Reflection: Reflecting on Learning (Mean = 2.25) | (4) | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| S10 Academic Language: Understanding Language Demands (Mean = 2.00) | (4) | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| S11 Academic Language: Supporting Language Development (Mean = 2.25) | (4) | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |

Table 6: Frequencies and mean ratings of PACT scores on how well the MACSME program has prepared Math candidates graduating in 2008 in the TPEs (Rating 1= Needs Improvement, 2 = Prepared, 3 = Superior, 4 =Superlative)

2008 Math Graduates

| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | |
|---|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| M1 Planning: Balanced Instructional Focus (Mean = 2.66) | (6) | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| M2 Planning: Making Content Accessible (Mean = 2.00) | (6) | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| M3 Planning: Designing Assessments (Mean = 2.16) | (6) | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| M4 Instruction: Engaging Students in Learning (Mean = 2.00) | (6) | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| M5 Instruction: Monitoring Student Learning (Mean = 2.33) | (6) | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| M6 Assessment: Analyzing Student Work (Mean =2.16) | (6) | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| M7 Assessment: Using Assessments to Inform Teaching (Mean = 1.83) | (6) | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| M8 Reflection: Monitoring Student Progress (Mean = 2.00) | (6) | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| M9 Reflection: Reflecting on Learning (Mean = 2.00) | (6) | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| M10 Academic Language: Understanding Language Demands (Mean = 2.00) | (6) | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| M11 Academic Language: Supporting Language Development (Mean = 1.83) | (6) | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 |

Table 7: Frequencies and mean ratings of PACT scores on how well the MACSME program has prepared Science candidates graduating in 2009 in the TPEs (Rating 1= Needs Improvement, 2 = Prepared, 3 = Superior, 4 =Superlative)

2009 Science Graduates

| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| S1 Planning: Balanced Instructional Focus (Mean = 2.875) | (8) | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| S2 Planning: Making Content Accessible (Mean = 2.375) | (8) | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| S3 Planning: Designing Assessments (Mean = 3.00) | (8) | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| S4 Instruction: Engaging Students in Learning (Mean = 2.25) | (8) | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| S5 Instruction: Monitoring Student Learning (Mean = 2.625) | (8) | 0 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| S6 Assessment: Analyzing Student Work (Mean =2.65) | (8) | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| S7 Assessment: Using Assessments to Inform Teaching (Mean = 2.375) | (8) | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| S8 Reflection: Monitoring Student Progress (Mean = 2.25) | (8) | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| S9 Reflection: Reflecting on Learning (Mean = 2.125) | (8) | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| S10 Academic Language: Understanding Language Demands (Mean = 2.25) | (8) | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| S11 Academic Language: Supporting Language Development (Mean = 2.125) | (8) | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 |

Table 8: Frequencies and mean ratings of PACT scores on how well the MACSME program has prepared Math candidates graduating in 2009 in the PACT evaluation criteria (Rating 1= Needs Improvement, 2 = Prepared, 3 = Superior, 4 =Superlative)

2009 Math Graduates

| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| M1 Planning: Balanced Instructional Focus (Mean = 2.50) | (4) | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| M2 Planning: Making Content Accessible (Mean = 2.50) | (4) | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| M3 Planning: Designing Assessments (Mean = 1.75) | (4) | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| M4 Instruction: Engaging Students in Learning (Mean = 2.00) | (4) | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| M5 Instruction: Monitoring Student Learning (Mean = 2.50) | (4) | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| M6 Assessment: Analyzing Student Work (Mean = 2.00) | (4) | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| M7 Assessment: Using Assessments to Inform Teaching (Mean = 2.25) | (4) | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| M8 Reflection: Monitoring Student Progress (Mean = 2.25) | (4) | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| M9 Reflection: Reflecting on Learning (Mean = 2.00) | (4) | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| M10 Academic Language: Understanding Language Demands (Mean = 2.00) | (4) | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| M11 Academic Language: Supporting Language Development (Mean = 2.00) | (4) | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

b) What additional information about candidate and program completer performance or program effectiveness is collected and analyzed that informs programmatic decision-making?

The following assessments and evaluations were collected to inform us about program completer (Graduate) performance and program effectiveness.

Data to Inform Programmatic Decision Making

| Type of Data | Description |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Graduate Evaluation | <i>Graduate Questionnaire</i> distributed by the Evaluation Unit of the Berkeley Graduate School of Education to assess program effectiveness |
| Employer Evaluation | <i>Employer Questionnaire</i> distributed by the Evaluation Unit of the Berkeley Graduate School of Education to employers of students who obtained the credential three years earlier to assess graduate performance |
| Campus-Based Supervisor Evaluation | A <i>Faculty Instructor/Supervisors Evaluation</i> was distributed to the campus-based supervisors in the Spring of 2008 to assess graduate performance. |

GRADUATES

During the fall 2007 semester, the 7 students who had graduated in May 2007 were sent electronic and paper forms of an information form requesting current mailing addresses and current employer information. Hard copies of the Graduate survey were sent to the graduates whose current addresses were confirmed during the Spring 2008 semester. Emails with links to the online version of the survey were sent to all graduates, regardless of their initial response. Each survey was given a unique identifier in order to keep track of those who had already responded. The Evaluation Unit followed up with phone calls and emails as reminders to those who did not return surveys. Reminders were sent throughout the summer. Paper surveys were

sent to all graduates' local and permanent addresses, if different. A total of 4 (57%) of the Graduate Surveys were completed and returned. The results of this survey are presented next.

Effectiveness of Program Preparation (TPE ratings)

As with the End of Program Survey, each graduate was asked to rate how effectively they felt the program had been in preparing them in each of the TPE areas (ratings ranged from: 1= not at all prepared, 4 = adequately prepared, 7 = extremely well prepared). The graduates were also asked to provide general feedback on the program's strengths and weaknesses. Space was also provided for additional comments.

Table 9: Frequencies and mean ratings of MACSME graduates reporting on their preparation (ratings: 1= not at all prepared, 4 = adequately prepared, 7 = extremely well prepared)

| GRADUATE RESPONDENTS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Area A: Specific Pedagogical Skills for Science Instruction (Mean = 5.66) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Area A: Specific Pedagogical Skills for Math Instruction (Mean = 6.00) | (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Area B: Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction (Mean =5.50) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Area C: Interpretation and Use of Assessments (Mean =4.75) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Area D: Making Content Accessible (Mean = 5.50) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Area E: Student Engagement (Mean = 5.25) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Area F: Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices (Mean = 5.75) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Area G: Teaching English Language Learners (Mean = 3.75) | (4) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Area H: Learning About Students (Mean = 5.00) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Area I: Instructional Planning (Mean = 5.50) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Area J: Instructional Time (Mean = 5.00) | (4) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Area K: Social Environment (Mean = 5.75) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Area L: Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations (Mean = 5.25) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Area M: Professional Growth (Mean = 5.75) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |

FACULTY INSTRUCTORS/SUPERVISORS

The third group of respondents sampled was the UC Berkeley based supervisors. These supervisors served as course instructors and field placement supervisors to MACSME students. Electronic versions of the Faculty Instructor/Supervisor Survey were sent to MACSME supervisors during the Spring 2008 semester. Reminders were also sent via email as necessary. Three of the 3 (100%) instructors/supervisors completed and returned the survey.

Table 10: Frequencies and mean ratings of Instructors/Supervisors reporting on MACSME students' preparation (ratings: 1= not at all prepared, 4 = adequately prepared, 7 = extremely well prepared)

| FACULTY INSTRUCTORS/SUPERVISORS RESPONDENTS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Area A: Specific Pedagogical Skills for Science Instruction (Mean = 6.50) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Area A: Specific Pedagogical Skills for Math Instruction (Mean = n/a) | (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Area B: Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction (Mean =5.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Area C: Interpretation and Use of Assessments (Mean =5.50) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Area D: Making Content Accessible (Mean = 7.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Area E: Student Engagement (Mean = 6.50) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Area F: Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices (Mean = 4.50) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Area G: Teaching English Language Learners (Mean = 5.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Area H: Learning About Students (Mean = 5.50) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Area I: Instructional Planning (Mean = 6.50) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Area J: Instructional Time (Mean = 5.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Area K: Social Environment (Mean = 5.50) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Area L: Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations (Mean = 3.50) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Area M: Professional Growth (Mean = 5.00) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

EMPLOYERS

MACSME graduates were asked for their employment information in order to obtain feedback from their employers (principals, department heads, etc) about how effectively the program had prepared them to teach. Employment information was reliant upon student/graduate response, thus the response rates from the graduates (and their willingness to share employment information) consequently limited the number of employers the Evaluation Unit was able to survey. Of the 7 MACSME graduates, 4 responded to the Evaluation Unit's requests to participate in the evaluation. All four of these graduates provided employment data.

As with the Field Supervisors, the Evaluation Unit sent emails and hardcopy mailings of the instructions to fill out the survey on line. Each survey was given a unique identifier in order to keep track of those who had already responded. Hardcopies of the survey were sent to supervisors who did not complete the electronic form. The Evaluation Unit followed up with phone calls and emails as reminders to those who did not return surveys. Reminders were sent throughout the summer. Four out of 4 (100%) Employer surveys were returned. The results of these surveys are presented next.

Effectiveness of Program Preparation (TPE ratings)

Each of the employers was asked to rate how effective they felt the program was in preparing graduates in each of the TPE areas (ratings ranged from: 1= not at all prepared, 4 = adequately prepared, 7 = extremely well prepared). The employers were also asked to provide general feedback on the program's strengths and weaknesses.

Table 11: Frequencies and mean ratings of Employers reporting on MACSME graduates' preparation (ratings: 1= not at all prepared, 4 = adequately prepared, 7 = extremely well prepared)

| EMPLOYER RESPONDENTS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Evaluation Criteria | (n) | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |
| Area A: Specific Pedagogical Skills for Science Instruction (Mean = 6.33) | (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Area A: Specific Pedagogical Skills for Math Instruction (Mean = 6.00) | (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Area B: Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction (Mean =5.25) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Area C: Interpretation and Use of Assessments (Mean =6.25) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Area D: Making Content Accessible (Mean = 5.75) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Area E: Student Engagement (Mean = 5.50) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Area F: Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices (Mean = 5.75) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Area G: Teaching English Language Learners (Mean = 5.66) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Area H: Learning About Students (Mean = 5.25) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Area I: Instructional Planning (Mean = 5.66) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Area J: Instructional Time (Mean = 6.00) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Area K: Social Environment (Mean = 5.75) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Area L: Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations (Mean = 6.75) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Area M: Professional Growth (Mean = 6.50) | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |

III. Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data 1-3 pages

Each program provides an analysis of the information provided in Section II. Please do not introduce new types of data in this section. Note strengths and areas for improvement that have been identified through the analysis of the data. What does the analysis of the data demonstrate about: a) candidate competence and b) program effectiveness?

Candidate Competence

Results from the surveys of cooperating teachers of MACSME student teachers graduating in 2008 and 2009 indicated that overall candidates were well prepared to begin their teaching duties. Mean scores on each of the areas surveyed, which were in fact the State TPEs, were above the middle (low of 4.25) and ranged as high as nearly excellent (6.75.) Particular areas of strengths were not consistent between groups but included Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations; Professional Growth; and Specific Pedagogical Skills for Instruction. There were occasional areas of weakness in individual candidates, but these were not consistent across candidates. There were a few areas in which more than one student performed less than adequately, though typically not in the same cohort. These included Instructional Planning; Learning About Students; and Social Environment. The candidates as a group were at least Adequately Prepared, but typically rated better, leaning toward Extremely Well Prepared.

In addition to the above areas of possible weakness, there were some other areas of concern raised by the data from cooperating teachers. First, it is worrisome that several of the cooperating teachers marked “NA” on Teaching English Language Learners. Since we happen to know that at least some of those classes included children whose home language is not English, we assume that there were no *identified* English Language Learners led to the NA ratings. We see this as a concern both in terms of evaluation and in terms of student learning. We will need to explore this (see below) to ensure that students are addressing the language needs of the students in their classes whether they are identified English Language Learners, not identified, or even native speakers who are developing academic language. Another area of concern is Instructional Planning. It is apparent that some student teachers are relying too heavily on the planning of their cooperating teacher in teaching their classes and are not demonstrating their ability to plan independently. This is not seen as a problem in the preparation of students as other students demonstrate their planning more than satisfactory. We see this as a failure to guide our students to perform independently. Other areas of individual low performance, including Social Environment and Learning about Students suggest that while the candidates may be ready to begin teaching, there are still areas where the program needs to support students more.

Results from the PACT for students graduating in 2008 and 2009 further support the candidates’ competence to teach. There were a very few areas of weakness reported in the

results. Individuals performed unsatisfactory (score of 1) in several different areas, but no trend suggesting weak preparation by the program was noted. Overall, MACSMEs showed themselves to be prepared to teach. They also showed some areas of real strength with occasional flashes of brilliance.

Similarly, the evaluations of our graduates from 2007 supported our candidates' competence. In all areas but one, the candidates evaluated themselves to be well prepared. The mean scores in those areas ranged from 4.75 to 6.0. The one area of real concern is Teaching English Language Learners where 2 candidates thought they were less than adequately prepared and the mean score was 3.75. With that exception, addressed below, the data suggest the program has done a good job preparing students across the competency areas. Graduates were identified as being strong in the areas of content and pedagogy, with a strong focus on reflective practice.

Program Effectiveness

Program effectiveness can be inferred from the summative data on candidates in the program, from the data on graduates who are teaching, and by the evaluations of program effectiveness from Faculty Instructors/Supervisors and Employers. As noted above, the cooperating teacher evaluations of student teachers suggests that overall the program is doing a very good job of preparing candidates to teach. There are some areas of concern that the program will need to address (see below) and there were naturally some individuals who struggled in some areas. The PACT data on our candidates also suggests that the program is doing a good job of preparing candidates. There were a few weak scores that will need to be evaluated, but these were more than adequately balanced by other strengths that support the program's effectiveness. The report on our programs' performance by our strongly supports program effectiveness with the exception of Teaching English Language Learners.

The program faculty (Supervisors) who evaluated the program effectiveness were, again with one exception, also supportive of the program. Their ratings of program effectiveness ranged from 4.5 to 7.0 across all areas except Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations. In that area the Supervisors felt that the program was not doing an adequate job of preparing students and assigned a mean rating of 3.5. This is of concern and will be addressed (see below.) It is also notable that the Supervisors thought that the program was doing an excellent job of preparing candidates Making Content Accessible with a mean score of 7.0.

The group that most supported the program effectiveness was the Employers of our graduates. They saw no areas of weakness in the graduates' preparation and rated the program effectiveness as uniformly high. They assigned mean ratings between 5.25 and 6.75, all well above Adequately Prepared to teach. It is interesting to note that the area of particular strength was in Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations with a mean score of 6.75. Given the Supervisors concern about this area, it is reassuring that the Employers felt that the graduates were well prepared in this area.

With the exception of a few areas of concern, the program is clearly doing a good job of preparing its candidates to teach.

IV. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance **1-2 pages**

Programs indicate how they use the data from assessments and analysis of that data to improve candidate performance and the program. If proposed changes are being made, please link the proposed changes to the data that support that modification as related to the appropriate Program and/or Common Standard(s). If preferred, programs may combine

responses to Sections III (Analysis of the Data) with Section IV (Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance) so long as all the required aspects of the responses are addressed.

Data from the various sources, taken together, give a picture of a strong program that is doing a good job of preparing candidates to teach. Particular strengths are our graduates' content and pedagogical knowledge. They engage their students and make content accessible. MACSME graduates tend to grow in their profession and are professional/ethical.

Considering the multiple sources of information on candidate performance and program effectiveness (above) has given us a number of areas to consider for program improvement. The appropriate responses for program improvement vary depending on the area for improvement. Three categories of response have been identified: Monitor Candidate Progress, Meet to Discuss Practices, and Enhance Practices.

Monitor Candidate Progress

Naturally, the program continually monitors student progress in all of their classes and supervised teaching. Cooperating teacher data (above) showed areas of weakness for individuals that are not necessarily indicative of a larger problem in the program. However, it is not clear that the program is doing all that it could to monitor candidate progress and to use this information to support student growth. In particular, we collect cooperating teacher evaluations from both of the candidates' "take-over" placements, during 2nd and 3rd semesters, though only the summative assessment at the end of the 3rd semester is reported here. Beginning in AY 2009-2010, we will institute a process to use the cooperating teacher data from 2nd semester to target support for candidate development in the 3rd semester. The details of this process will be worked out during the Fall, to be implemented in the Spring. These will no doubt include identifying areas of weakness and communicating with both the student teacher and the 3rd semester cooperating teacher of goals for development. Examples of this were discussed above in Section III. It is clear to us that we need to discuss with both the cooperating teachers and the candidates the language needs of students in student teaching placements whether they are identified as English Language Learners or not. Similarly, candidates, and to a lesser degree cooperating teachers, need to be aware of the need to demonstrate independent planning. Other areas for monitoring and possible discussion will be identified by analysis of 2nd semester cooperating teacher evaluations, similar to the analysis above that revealed weaknesses in Learning About Students and Social Environment. This analysis should also reveal if there are larger trends indicating program weakness.

Similarly, an analysis of individual weakness revealed in PACT data will be undertaken in AY 2009-2010. Anecdotally, we know that some areas of weakness in PACT are "writing problems." That is, occasionally candidates fail to adequately describe in writing the practices that they actually employ in teaching. However, comparison of PACT data and Cooperating Teacher Evaluations could reveal deeper problems where the program has failed to adequately support student teachers. This monitoring should give us information about problem areas that would allow us to undertake ongoing program improvement.

Meet to Discuss Practices

The data above suggest several areas which require examination of current practices, with an eye to improvement. In particular, the Faculty Instructor/Supervisor Evaluations indicated a concern among supervisors whether the program is adequately addressing the Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations of teaching. As we have hired a new batch of supervisors as well as revamping our course on Teaching Methods for AY 2009-2010, it is the perfect time to examine current practice to ensure it is adequate.

The situation with Teaching English Language Learners is a much broader issue. This will require meetings with several different groups to examine current practices and develop plans for improvement. First, the Supervisors of Teacher Education will need to meet together to identify what is being done to support candidates in dealing with language issues in their student teaching placements. Similarly, meetings with Cooperating Teachers, that occur at the beginning and end of each placement, will need to address the language demands of the public school classes and strategies for supporting candidate efforts. Meetings with various faculty, including faculty teaching Teaching Methods, Teaching Cultural and Linguistic Minority Students, and Reading will need to address issues of text types and language demands in math and science learning, as well as teaching strategies for developing student language skills.

Enhance Practices

It is clear that we are not doing enough to provide candidates with the strategies necessary to deal with English Language Learners in their classrooms once they graduate. While there was some indication of difficulties evident in the Cooperating Teacher Evaluation data and in the PACT scores, our Graduate Evaluations (mean score 3.75) indicate that Teaching English Language Learners is an area in which our graduates feel the least prepared. While we have made some progress in this area since our last CTC review, it is clear that we need to do more to enhance these. The information gathered from the planned meetings with supervisors, cooperating teachers, and faculty should give us a good basis from which to build better practices. Then, based on consultation with language learning specialists, we will implement new strategies in the various university classes to address language, including understanding the language demands of tasks, and lesson planning utilizing specific strategies to support language development. It should be noted that this forms a cycle of review in which we monitor student progress, meet to discuss practices and implement improvements, after which we continue the cycle creating ongoing program improvement.

Institution: University of California, Berkeley
Date report is submitted: October 2009 **Date of last Site Visit:** 1999
Program documented in this report: Multiple Subject
Name of Program: Developmental Teacher Education
Credential awarded: Multiple Subject Teaching Credential and M.A. degree
Is this program offered at more than one site? No
Program Contact: Dr. Della Peretti
Phone # (510) 642-4201
E-mail: dperetti@berkeley.edu

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

I. Contextual Information - Program Description:

The Graduate School of Education at the University of California, Berkeley offers the 2042 Preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential with an M.A. degree. The Developmental Teacher Education Program (DTE) is a small, cohesive two-year program with approximately 25 students per cohort (reduced to 11 for the class of 2011 for budgetary reasons), which provides the knowledge and experience in theory and practice needed to begin a teaching career. It also requires the completion of an M.A. degree in order to be recommended for the credential. Some unique program features include:

- Teacher candidates in the program begin and end the program at the same time and form a strong cohort where members support, share, and inform each other throughout the 2 years, and often beyond graduation as well.
- DTE generally has a pool of approximately 90 applicants. A thorough admissions process consisting of individual interviews by the program Director, Coordinator, a supervisor and a local school administrator ascertains that we have diverse and stimulating cohorts that will meet the staffing needs of local schools.
- Teacher candidates acquire teaching knowledge, skills, and dispositions in an integrated and recursive developmental progression with theory and practice being melded over the course of the entire program. Until the last 5 weeks of the program, when candidates write their M.A. papers, they are concurrently in field placements and taking classes on campus. Each semester, they have a supervision seminar, a course in developmental theory, and at least one methods course. In addition they take courses meeting all state requirements for the credential and all university requirements for the M.A. degree. The university coursework actively engages candidates in the process of learning to teach. Assignments and supervisory visits provide candidates with opportunities to examine and apply the theory they learn to their actual work with children in classrooms.

- All candidates complete 5 field placements in a variety of settings, spanning most grade levels and demographic characteristics of the diverse San Francisco Bay Area. The first two are short participant/observer placements, the 3rd is full student teaching with a 3-day solo, the 4th student teaching placement includes a 10-day solo.
- The 5th placement is unique to DTE and consists of an extensive focused experience in teaching English learners. In pairs, candidates take full responsibility for planning and teaching an 8-week after school program for 10-15 children identified by their schools as needing extra support in order to succeed in English-only classrooms. In addition to supervisor observations, there are two required peer observations during the placement.
- Field Supervisors are a combination of program graduates and current doctoral students. All have elementary teaching experience. The program coordinator regularly supervises in field placements as well. The staff meets weekly for 2 hours with the program director and coordinator to discuss both programmatic issues and the progress of individual candidates. Supervisors work as a team to bring their particular areas of expertise to bear on situations to address the specific needs of individual teacher candidates.
- University supervisors provide candidates with individual feedback and support through weekly response journals and monthly observations (16 total) and post-observation conversations. They also facilitate goal setting conversations between candidates and cooperating teachers.
- Cooperating teachers are recommended by principals, DTE grads and other cooperating teachers. They are screened by current supervisors via classroom visits and are oriented to the program in participant/observer placements before having candidates in full student-teaching placements. Teacher candidates are placed in schools where cooperating teachers and administrators support and encourage the progressive development of their skills.
-
- The arts are an integral part of the DTE Program. Generous grants from the Ford and Heller Foundations have permitted DTE to work towards integration of the visual and performing arts into much of our coursework. Candidates are then required to apply what they learn in their student teaching placements. In conjunction with Guitars in the Classroom, all candidates learn to play the guitar and to write songs to enhance their curriculum. We have hired an atelierista at 20% who will continue to be employed if budget conditions permit. Program faculty participates in arts in-service education to improve their ability to integrate the arts into their coursework.
- A 4-semester sequence of advocacy assignments is required of all students to encourage them to become advocates for the children they teach. Included are: letter to the editor, visit to an elected official, original submission to media outlet, and a grant proposal.
- Course instructors are drawn from university faculty and lecturers, advanced doctoral students, program graduates and local teachers.
- Candidates must pass the Performance Assessment for California Teachers(PACT) as required by State law.
- All candidates complete an original M.A research paper investigating selected aspects of the teaching process.

- Collegiality and peer learning are vital components of the program. Many courses incorporate group projects and opportunities to learn from one another. Teacher candidates meet every other week throughout the year with their supervisor and supervision group (4 to 8 students) to process their placements and link theory with practice.

| DTE Program Specific Candidate Information | | |
|---|--|---|
| Academic Year | Number of Candidates | Number Graduated |
| 2007-08 | 1 st year: 23 2 nd year: 20 | 19 (one graduated in 09 due to health issues) |
| 2008-09 | 1 st year: 21 2 nd year: 22 | 23 (including returning student above) |

Changes Since Commission Approval of Current Program Document.

The most significant change in our Program was the implementation of the California Teaching Performance Assessment (PACT). Our students take EDUC 393, which prepares them for the completion of PACT. We have also added two EDUC 392C 1-unit arts courses in the first and last semesters of the program as part of our response to grant funding from the Ford and Heller Foundations to help us infuse the visual and performing arts throughout the program. We have a new program-wide focus on documentation and assessment beginning in the 2009-2010 academic year.

**SECTION A. PART II.
EXAMPLE OF CANDIDATE ASSESSMENT INFORMATION
(MS Credential Program)**

Response to Section A, Part IIa

The chart below displays a selection evaluation instruments used in the Developmental Teacher Education Program to evaluate candidate progress/performance and program effectiveness. Examples of DTE's documents used can be found on the program's web site and attached to this document.

First Year Documents: <http://www-gse.berkeley.edu/program/dte/educ390c1styear.html>

Second Year Documents: <http://www-gse.berkeley.edu/program/dte/educ390c2ndyear.html>

| Evaluation Instrument | Frequency | Description | Data Collected | Use |
|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------|
|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| TPA Assessment: Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) Teaching Event See www.pacttpa.org for all PACT materials. | Once during program. Opportunities to re-take in the event of non-passing scores. | A comprehensive performance assessment of Planning, Instruction, Assessment, Reflection, and Academic Language Instruction | Evidence of skill in TPEs. Each event is evaluated by a set of roughly <u>common rubrics</u> assessing a candidate's achievement in Planning, Instruction, Assessment, Reflection, and Academic Language Instruction | Summative Candidate Assessment <i>Secondary Use:</i> Program improvement |
| DTE Ratings of Participant/Observer | Twice during semester #1 of the program – at the end of each participant/observer placement. | A form for Cooperating Teachers to use at the end of P/O placements. Designed to give early warning of problem areas prior to the beginning of formal student teaching. | TPE-based formative scores plus narrative evaluations filled out by cooperating teacher. 5-point scale from 1 (not yet) to 5 (consistently and thoroughly) plus narrative comments. | Formative Candidate Assessment prior to beginning formal student teaching. |
| Ratings of Student Teaching Competencies Based on CA TPEs | Used 3 times during the program once semester 2 and twice in semester 3. | A comprehensive evaluation of candidate's ability to implement the CA TPE's plus additional DTE competencies | Two practice evaluations in semester 2 and 3 of the program and finally a high stakes evaluation at the end of semester 3. Checklist plus narrative. . 3-point scale (1 = emerging ability, 2 = competent to teach with supervision, 3 = competent to teach in own classroom) | Formative candidate assessment (2x) Summative candidate assessment (1x) <i>Secondary Use:</i> Program improvement |
| DTE Teacher Education Program Graduate Survey conducted by Evaluation Unit | One year after graduation. | Surveys of Graduates regarding classroom effectiveness | Surveys with quantitative and qualitative responses. 7-point scale. | Program improvement |
| DTE Teacher Education Program Graduate Employer Survey conducted by Evaluation Unit | One year after graduation. | Surveys of employers (principals) regarding classroom effectiveness. | Surveys with quantitative and qualitative responses. 7-point scale. | Program improvement |

DATA SUMMARIES

TPA – The Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) Teaching Event www.pacttpa.org

The DTE program has been directly involved with the development of the PACT Teaching Events since the consortium's inception. The coordinator and Director both worked to develop the initial prompts and rubrics for PACT, while supervisors assisted in the development of score training procedures and materials. One member of the Graduate School of Education is a trainer of trainers for the math portion. Based on strong

validity and reliability evidence (see Pecheone & Chung, 2006), the PACT Events have been approved for use as an alternative TPA. We anticipate using PACT as long as a Teaching Performance Assessment is required. A passing score on the PACT Teaching Event requires a minimum of no more than two scores at Level 1 across the five categories.

Collection Process

Candidates have completed their PACT Teaching Events in their 4th student teaching placement in the third semester of the program (approximately November). Until now there has been an Academic Coordinator hired to coordinate all PACT activities. This position has been eliminated due to budgetary constraints. PACT work will be absorbed by remaining DTE staff, supplanting other duties. Since the inception of the 3 additional mini-PACTS, both student teachers and cooperating teachers have complained that the workload in the 3rd semester of the program is excessively burdensome.

| PACT Teaching Event Elementary Math 100% pass rate | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| MULTIPLE SUBJECT | PLANNING Rubrics 1-3 Mean Score (Standard Deviation) | INSTRUCTION Rubrics 4-5 Mean Score (Standard Deviation) | ASSESSMENT Rubrics 6-7 Mean Score (Standard Deviation) | REFLECTION Rubrics 8-9 Mean Score (Standard Deviation) | ACADEMIC LANGUAGE Rubrics 10-11 Mean Score (Standard Deviation) |
| 2008 | 3.02 (0.59) | 2.71 (0.63) | 2.71 (0.73) | 2.97 (0.63) | 2.79 (0.51) |
| 2009 | 2.88 (0.48) | 2.57 (0.76) | 2.57 (0.56) | 2.61 (0.56) | 2.17 (0.44) |

DTE Ratings of Participant/Observer by Cooperating Teacher

Almost all students are given positive evaluations and glowing commentaries on their two 8-week participant- observer placements. This is not surprising as admissions are very competitive and all candidates have substantial classroom experience prior to joining the program. The instrument, however, is important as it serves as an early warning in the case of students who need extra support or counseling (most commonly in the area of professional dispositions). Students are rated on a 5-point scale from 1 (not yet) to 5 (consistently and thoroughly) plus a narrative. In the few cases where students are given a score of 2 or 3 on a 5-point scale, it is generally in the categories of: punctuality, keeping the work environment organized, assessment, or contributing resources to the classroom. There was one student in DTE 2008 who received multiple 2s and 3s and this served as an early warning that she would need more support throughout the program, which she received.

Ratings of Student Teaching Competencies Based on CA TPEs

Cooperating teachers rate their student teachers on 21 different elements based on the TPEs and additional elements considered important to DTE. Candidates are given 3 opportunities over two semesters of student teaching to identify and improve any areas that do not receive the passing score of 3 on a 3-point scale. (1 = emerging ability, 2 = Competent to Teach with Supervision, 3 = Competent to Teach in Own Classroom) On the 3rd and final high-stakes version, all students must receive all 3s or they are required to continue student teaching until they raise all their scores to “a level of competency to teach in their own classroom. Students who are unable to achieve this level are not recommended for a credential. This has not happened in several years. Of the 42 students who graduated in 2008 and 2009, (50%) received all 3s from their cooperating teachers on the formative version of the ratings form. The other half of the class received one or more scores below 3 on elements of the formative versions of this assessment. By the end of the 3rd semester 100% of students were certified to be competent to teach in their own classrooms in all elements of the evaluation by receiving all 3s.

| Total Number of Scores below 3 on Formative versions of Ratings of Student Teaching Competencies Based on CA TPEs Classes of 2008 and 2009 combined N = 21 | | | | |
|---|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
| score | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 |
| frequency | 14 | 8 | 128 | 35 |

Formative scores of less than 3 were spread across all elements of the Ratings of Student Teaching Competencies Based on CA TPEs. The range of students receiving less than 3 on any given element was from 3 students (developmentally appropriate practices for K-3) to 16 (monitoring student learning during instruction. By the time the summative evaluation was administered, 100% of students had raised their scores to a passing level (3s on all 21 elements)

| Number of Scores Below 3 on each element of the Ratings of Student Teaching Competencies Based on CA TPEs and DTE Elements DTE 2008 and 2009 N = 42 | | |
|--|--|--|
| Element | # (%) of Students scoring below 3 on formative assessment | # of Students scoring below 3 on summative assessment |
| | 0 | 0 |
| Developmentally Appropriate Practices Grade K-3 (TPE 6A) | 3 (7%) | 0 |
| Developmentally Appropriate Practices Grade 4-8 (TPE 6B) | 4 (10%) | 0 |
| Making Content Accessible (TPE 4) | 4 (10%) | 0 |
| Science (TPE 1C) | 4 (10%) | 0 |

| | | |
|--|----------|---|
| Professional Commitment (DTE 15) | 5 (12%) | 0 |
| Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations (TPE 12) | 6 (14%) | 0 |
| Professional Growth (TPE 13) | 7 (17%) | 0 |
| Reading/Language Arts (TPE 1A) | 7 (17%) | 0 |
| Visual and Performing Arts (DTE 1E) | 7 (17%) | 0 |
| Teaching English Learners (TPE 7) | 7 (17%) | 0 |
| Building Relationships (DTE 11a) | 7 (17%) | 0 |
| Professional Communication (DTE 14) | 8 (19%) | 0 |
| Mathematics (TPE 1B) | 8 (19%) | 0 |
| Social Science (TPE 1D) | 8 (19%) | 0 |
| Social Environment (TPE 11) | 8 (19%) | 0 |
| Student Engagement (TPE 5) | 9 (21%) | 0 |
| Instructional Planning (TPE 9) | 9 (21%) | 0 |
| Learning About Students (TPE 8) | 10 (24%) | 0 |
| Instructional Time (TPE 10) | 10 (24%) | 0 |
| Interpretation and Use of Assessments (TPE 3) | 13 (31%) | 0 |
| Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction (TPE 2) | 16 (38%) | 0 |

While 100% of students are deemed competent to teach in their own classrooms across all elements of the evaluation by the end of the 3rd semester of the program, it is still worthwhile to analyze the elements which present the greatest challenges to our students in the formative stages and to focus upon them in our supervision seminars, classroom observation visits, and methods classes.

Response to Section A, Part IIb

Additional assessments are used to ascertain program effectiveness as perceived by graduates. These are designed and administered by the Evaluation Unit.

DTE Teacher Education Program Graduate Survey prepared by Evaluation Unit

GRADUATES/ FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS AND THEIR EMPLOYERS

Program graduates from the Spring 2008 cohort who were employed as teachers were invited to take the on-line First Year Graduate Follow-Up Survey. A total of 5 (29%) of the 17 active teachers responded to our request for program evaluation. Every DTE graduate was asked to rate and

comment on the effectiveness of the program in preparing them in each of the TPE areas. In addition, graduates were asked to rate and comment on primary DTE program components. For both rating scales, a score of 1 represented that the program was *Not At All Effective* and a score of 7 represented that it was *Extremely Effective*. DTE graduates were also asked to provide general feedback on the Program's strengths and weaknesses, as well as basic information about their first-year teaching placement and their experience as a first-year teacher.

Effectiveness of Program Preparation

The Program received positive ratings in terms of overall effectiveness from the recent graduates. Mean average ratings ranged from 4.80 (assess student learning) to 6.60 (field supervision), showing considerable improvement over last year's ratings. There was an overall average effectiveness rating of 5.77 compared with last year's overall rating of 4.46. A 5.77 overall rating suggests that graduates thought their preparation in the DTE Program was highly effective. The TPE area rating means are presented below.

Effectiveness of Program Competencies

Mean ratings of program competencies by graduates N = 5

| <u>Evaluation Question/Criteria</u> | |
|--|---------------|
| <i>How effective was the DTE preparation you received to:</i> | |
| Plan instruction and design learning experiences for students | (Mean = 6.40) |
| Create and maintain adequate environments for student learning | (Mean = 5.40) |
| Engage and support students in learning | (Mean = 5.60) |
| Assess student learning | (Mean = 4.80) |

Effectiveness of Program Components

Mean ratings of program components by graduates N = 5

| <u>Evaluation</u> |
|---|
| <u>Question/Criteria</u> |
| <i>How effective was the DTE program's:</i> |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Sequence of courses | (Mean = 5.20) |
| Field experience | (Mean = 6.20) |
| Field supervision | (Mean = 6.60) |
| Mentor Teachers/Mentorship | (Mean = 5.25) |
| Collegial relationships | (Mean = 6.00) |
| Master's project | (Mean = 5.00) |
| Program philosophy | (Mean = 6.40) |
| Coordinator/Coordination | (Mean = 6.40) |

Additional Comments

Reflecting on their teaching experience during their first year, graduates cited a wide variety of areas of the program that were especially helpful, including their student teaching experiences, and the inclusion of the visual and performing arts. When asked what areas could be improved, graduates cited the need for a more practical approach to teaching English learners, a more attention to socioeconomic issues, including parent communications.

DTE Teacher Education Program Employers' Evaluation prepared by Evaluation Unit

At the end of the Spring 2009 semester, Supervising Employers of recent graduates were invited to complete a survey evaluating the effectiveness of DTE program graduates in each of the TPE areas. A score of 1 represented that the graduate was *Not At All Effective* and a score of 7 represented the DTE graduate was *Extremely Effective*.. Employer respondents included 6 principals (35%) out of a possible 17 who supervise graduates currently teaching.

Mean ratings of program competencies by school supervising employers N = 6

Evaluation Question/Criteria

How effective was our graduate in her ability to:

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Plan instruction and design learning experiences for students | (Mean = 5.50) |
| Create and maintain adequate environments for student learning | (Mean = 5.33) |
| Make subject matter comprehensible to students | (Mean = 5.33) |
| Engage and support students in learning | (Mean = 5.50) |
| Assess student learning | (Mean = 5.16) |
| Develop capacity as a professional educator | (Mean = 5.83) |

Employers reported that their first-year teachers were effective in their work with students and with other professionals at the school as evidenced by the fact that all ratings are above 5.16. As with the graduates' surveys, the lowest area was assessment of student learning but employers (5.16) rated it higher than graduates (4.8). Comments from employing supervisors show that they are pleased with the preparation their first-year teacher received. Some of the particular strengths mentioned included: being highly motivated, dedicated, enthusiastic, hardworking, thoughtful and determined, extraordinary novices.

**SECTION A. PART III.
Analysis of Candidate Assessment
SECTION A. PART IV.
Use of Candidate Assessment
(combined)**

III. Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

Each program provides an analysis of the information provided in Section II. Please do not introduce new types of data in this section. Note strengths and areas for improvement that have been identified through the analysis of the data. What does the analysis of the data demonstrate about: a) candidate competence and b) program effectiveness? 1-3 pages

IV. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance 1-2 pages

Programs indicate how they use the data from assessments and analysis of that data to improve candidate performance and the program. If proposed changes are being made, please link the proposed changes to the data that support that modification as related to the appropriate Program and/or Common Standard(s). If preferred, programs may combine responses to Sections III (Analysis of the Data) with Section IV (Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance) so long as all the required aspects of the responses are addressed.

| Evaluation Instrument | Analysis of the Data | Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance) |
|---|---|--|
| <p>TPA Assessment: Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) Teaching Event See www.pacttpa.org for all PACT materials.</p> | <p>DTE is satisfied with the performance of our students on the PACT Teaching Event. a) Candidate competence: Rounded to the nearest whole number, average scores on all Tasks were 3 on a 4-point scale except 2009 Academic Language. The overall average score for 2008 was 2.84 and for 2009 it was 2.56. The scores are all in an acceptable range for pre-service candidates. The strongest area is planning and the weakest is academic language.</p> <p>b) Program effectiveness: DTE could do a better job of supporting our candidates in the development of skills to teach English learners. The TPA is administered prior to</p> | <p>Perhaps the lower scores in teaching English Learners could be raised by modifying the content of the relevant course, EDUC 246A Teaching Linguistic and Cultural Minority Students to focus more on methods for teaching children whose first language is not English. As the regular instructor for this course is no longer with the university, we will make this a priority when we hire a new instructor.</p> <p>Alternatively, the PACT could be administered later in the program to reflect what the students learn in the 5th placement. As our students all received acceptable</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | the 5 th and final student teaching placement that is completely focused on English Language Development so the lower scores in this area may be a function of timing rather than a shortcoming of the program. | scores under the current schedule, there is no real reason to do this. |
| DTE Ratings of Participant/Observer by master teacher Used in Semester 1 of 4 | Virtually all students are given positive evaluations on their two 8-week participant- observer placements. This is not surprising as admissions are very competitive and all candidates have substantial classroom experience prior to joining the program. In the cases where students were given a score of 2 or 3, it was in the categories of: punctuality, keeping the work environment organized, assessment, or contributing resources to the classroom. There was one student in DTE 2008 who received multiple 2s and 3s and this served as an early warning that she would need more support throughout the program. | The instrument is important to the program as it serves as an early warning for students who may experience difficulties during formal student teaching in subsequent semesters. Such students are assigned to the most experienced supervisors and given extra attention, especially in the areas of concern. Students are not expected to be highly competent in the areas when assessed during the participant/observer portion of the program. |
| Ratings of Student Teaching Competencies Based on CA TPEs Used in semesters 2 and 3 of 4 3-point scale | By the end of the 4 th placement, 100% of students received the maximum score on these ratings so there is no area of grave concern that need immediate attention. On the formative versions of the ratings forms, the two lowest areas were Interpretation and Use of Assessments (TPE 3) and Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction (TPE 2) which is also part and parcel of the assessment process. | By administering the formative versions of the ratings forms two times, we are able to catch areas of difficulty early on and work with students to remedy them so that all students passed all elements of the ratings for by the end of the placement. However, given that assessment is the area that received the lowest scores across all of our evaluations, we have decided to make it a focus in the program. The program coordinator is taking a course on documentation and assessment in October and plans to implement reforms in DTE upon her return to campus. We have already included additional instruction in the creation and use of rubrics in several of our classes. |
| DTE Teacher Education Program Graduate Survey conducted by Evaluation Unit Used in the first year of teaching | Overall, the DTE Program was consistently rated above average to high in all areas by its graduates. The Program continues to improve upon its ratings from previous years. Program strengths include the quality and quantity of the teacher placements and field experience, the meaningful and relevant collegial relationships, the emphasis on reflective practice, developmental theory and progressive pedagogy. The lowest score was 4.8 on | Given that assessment is the area that received the lowest scores across all of our evaluations, we have decided to make it a focus in the program. The program coordinator is taking a course on documentation and assessment in October and plans to implement reforms in the program upon her return to campus. We have included additional instruction in the creation and use of rubrics in several of our classes. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | a 7 point scale and that was in the use of assessments. | |
| DTE Teacher Education Program Employer Survey conducted by Evaluation Unit Used in the first year of teaching | <p>Overall, the DTE Program was consistently rated above average to high in all areas by employers of its graduates. The lowest score was 5.16 on a 7 point scale and that was in the use of assessments.</p> <p>The next lowest score was on support for the M.A. paper.</p> | <p>Given that assessment is the area that received the lowest scores across all of our evaluations, we have decided to make it a focus in the program. The program coordinator is taking a course on documentation and assessment in October and plans to implement reforms in the program upon her return to campus. We have included additional instruction in the creation and use of rubrics in several of our classes.</p> <p>We are reconsidering whether there is sufficient funding available for a 2-year program with a fully-integrated M.A.. research project.</p> |

DESIGNATED SUBJECTS ADULT EDUCATION TEACHING CREDENTIAL

I. Contextual Information

The mission of the Education Department of UC Berkeley Extension is to serve professional educators and the general public by providing courses and programs that expand the knowledge and skills of those who work with children and adults in California classrooms. The Education Department currently offers over 150 courses each year and in 2007-08 had an enrollment of approximately 2,500 students. University-approved certificate programs are offered in College Admissions and Career Planning, Adult Education and Instruction, Vocational Education and Instruction, and Teaching English as a Second Language. In addition, specialized training and teacher development programs are offered under contract to individual school sites and districts.

The Education Department offers two programs approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing: DS Credential in Adult Education (DSAE); and DS Credential in Career Technical Education (DSCTE). Each program is overseen by an Advisory Committee comprised of program employers, instructors, graduates, and staff. The Education credential staff includes one program director (credential analyst), one program assistant (credential technician), and temporary part-time support as needed. Applicants are recruited through word of mouth and marketing to districts, counties, industry, and the public. Group information sessions are held twice annually and individual candidates are advised weekly. The department also offers courses applicable to clear Ryan credentials and has plans to offer a CLAD through CTCL program pending CTC approval.

The Department of Education provides:

- Administrative oversight and quality control
- Curricular decisions; e.g. course approvals and revisions
- Selection and evaluation of program faculty

University Extension provides:

- Marketing of programs
- Recruitment and admission of candidates
- Collection of tuition fees
- Remuneration of faculty
- Administration of student course evaluations
- Scheduling of courses and classrooms
- Recordkeeping and transcript services
- Tracking and monitoring student progress
- Student advising on credential requirements
- Credential application services

Teacher Credential Candidates for academic years 2007-08 & 2008-09

| Program | Number of Candidates | Number of Graduates |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Career Technical Education | 59 | 13 |
| Adult Education | 101 | 8 |
| Totals | 160 | 21 |

This table reflects the number of candidates with valid preliminary credentials ("Candidate") as of 7/1/2007, and the number of candidates who cleared their credential ("Graduates") between 7/1/2007 and 6/30/2009.

II. Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

The CTC trained credential analyst or credential technician interviews, advises, and evaluates every credential candidate. The following are the assessment criteria for the Preliminary DSAE and DSCTE Credential candidates:

- Official college transcripts verifying a Bachelor's degree from an accredited institution, and college level course work in appropriate subjects completed with a grade of C or better in minimum units per CTC standard requirements (academic subjects only)
- Satisfaction of approved U.S. History course or exam (full-time credential only).
- Official CBEST transcript indicating passing score (academic subjects only).
- Copy of LiveScan (or fingerprint card if appropriate) indicating submission to CTC.
- Signed CL 41-4, fee, and, if required, supporting documentation.
- Employer or Self Verification of Work Experience for appropriate years and recency requirement (vocational subjects only).

Once the Preliminary credential is recommended to the CTC, candidates begin work on the Professional Clear Credential starting with Level 1 courses.

Level I Courses

1. Successful completion (C grade or better) in the Standards-based program curriculum. There are five classroom courses comprising nine semester units. All courses are offered on the UCB campus.
2. Within each classroom course instructors include candidate assessment activities including, but not limited to, written assignments, student class presentations, group projects, and examinations.

Level I Completion

Upon finishing Level I coursework, students submit official transcripts and a letter indicating their candidacy for Level I completion. The student's transcript is evaluated by the Credential [Technician](#) and, upon demonstrated competency with at least five instructors' verification of passing grades, a letter verifying Level I completion is issued for the student and the employer.

Final Evaluation of Candidate Prior to Recommendation for the Credential

The recommendation for the Professional Clear credential requires a final evaluation as well as the Site Supervisor's Assessment of Teaching Competencies to determine the candidate's competence and qualifications. In addition, the Program Director uses this session to offer placement guidance as needed and to establish a file for follow-up

contact of the graduate.

The final evaluation of candidates includes the following information:

- Results of examinations and levels of performance in all professional program elements.
- Records of all interviews with the candidate conducted by district supervisors and administrators, institutional instructors, and the Program Director.
- Satisfactory Assessment of Teaching Competencies verified in writing by the Site Supervisor.

The evaluation is conducted by the Program Director. Course instructors and other professionals may be consulted as appropriate. If the candidate appears to be inadequately prepared in any area, additional readings, courses, tutoring, and/or field assignments may be assigned. Candidates whose performance in all areas is satisfactory will be recommended to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing for a clear Designated Subjects Adult Education Teaching Credential or Career Technical Education Credential as appropriate.

Candidates not recommended for a credential may file a request for re-evaluation. When a re-evaluation request is filed, the Chair of Extension's Education Department will appoint a three-member committee of credential program faculty to independently assess the candidate's competence and provide a recommendation. The faculty committee's recommendation is reviewed by the Credential Programs Committee, and a final decision is rendered.

Program Effectiveness

Credential candidates, program instructors, and employers are all involved in the ongoing assessment of the program. At the conclusion of each course, all candidates are provided the opportunity to evaluate the quality of course content and instructor performance. The evaluation instrument is structured to be anonymous and focuses on thirteen (13) areas of course content quality and eight (8) areas of instructor effectiveness [Appendix A]. All course/instructor evaluations are read by the Program Director and forwarded to the course instructor with the Program Director's comments. If the evaluations raise concerns about the quality of a course or instructor, a conference is held between the Program Director and the instructor to identify and address the problem. In the past, course syllabi have been modified and instructors have been counseled or replaced.

Course instructors meet annually to discuss program effectiveness and make recommendations to the Program Director. The Program Director collects input from employers on the final Assessment of Teaching Competencies (Appendix B) in addition to input that is solicited or provided ad hoc.

Program Effectiveness Data: 2007-08

Total Courses = 28, Total Enrollments = 350

| <i>Item Question</i> | <i>N Responses</i> | <i>Mean Average</i> |
|---|--------------------|---------------------|
| Course Content | | |
| The course content was up to date and reflected current developments in the field | 331 | 4.4 |
| Material was presented in a clearly organized fashion | 331 | 4.3 |
| Course followed the syllabus | 331 | 4.3 |
| Course requirements were made clear | 331 | 4.5 |
| Textbooks were useful and relevant to the course | 329 | 4.3 |
| Course materials were useful and relevant | 331 | 4.3 |
| Lectures helped me to learn the course material | 331 | 4.3 |
| Homework helped me to learn the course material | 331 | 4.2 |
| Group projects helped me to learn the course material | 331 | 4.2 |
| Papers and presentations helped me to learn the course material | 331 | 4.3 |
| Quizzes and exams helped me to evaluate my learning of the course material | 330 | 4.2 |
| My fellow students enhanced my learning of the course material | 331 | 4.4 |
| The course content met my expectations | 331 | 4.1 |
| Instructor Performance | | |
| The instructor was well prepared for each class | 331 | 4.5 |
| The instructor stimulated my interest in the subject matter | 331 | 4.5 |
| The instructor provided useful feedback on coursework | 331 | 4.4 |
| The instruction made effective use of class time | 331 | 4.3 |
| The instructor was responsive to question and suggestions | 331 | 4.6 |
| The instructor had a good theoretical knowledge of the subject | 331 | 4.6 |
| The instructor had a good practical knowledge of the subject | 331 | 4.6 |
| Rate the effectiveness of this instructor from 1-5 | 331 | 4.5 |

Note: Items are rated on a 5 point scale with the higher number representing a better evaluation (1= Strongly disagree; 5=Strongly agree).

Part III – Analysis of Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Data

Designated Subject Credential candidate assessment occurs in six to nine different classes, fieldwork, and a culminating comprehensive examination. Analysis of the data related to those assessments documents that the strengths of our candidates, as a group, include their academic skills, their writing skills (as manifested in coursework and the comprehensive examinations), and their excellent fieldwork experiences provided by employing districts (evaluations of their fieldwork experiences). Our candidates are highly motivated as evidenced by the quality of their work and the fact that they are in our program while concurrently being fully employed.

Examination of the data related to the content of the nine courses in the program reveals that the strongest area as rated by candidates in the 2007-08 and 2008-09 academic years was relevance of the material, clear student expectations, and quality of classmates. The weakest areas related to course content as evaluated by the candidates were related to the quality of assignments, usefulness of assessments, and content expectations.

Examination of the data related to instructor performance in the nine courses as rated by candidates in 2007-08 and 2008-09 shows the two strongest ratings were given to items measuring the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter and responsiveness to students. Other indicators of instructor performance also were rated very positively.

Overall, the Designated Subjects Credential candidates have a very high regard for both course content and instructor performance in the clear credential programs. Evidence of that high regard is seen in the fact that the mean rating for 7 out of each of the 21 prompts was closer to a 5 rating (*strongly agree*) than to a 4 (*agree*). Overall, only six courses scored an average rating below 4 (*agree*) regarding course content expectations (the weakest rating in the set). Among the nine instructors in the DSAE and DSCTE programs, one was rated below at 4 and has since been replaced. With that particular anomaly in mind, the ratings for the total program by the candidates can be seen as even more impressive.

Part IV – Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate Performance and Program Effectiveness

Since our last review in 2005, we have not observed nor have data revealed any substantive issues that need to be reviewed (other than the replacement of one instructor). However, with respect to generating more data regarding program and candidate effectiveness for future reports to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, we will do the following:

- We will develop a monitoring system for our Preliminary Credential holders to

improve communication and encourage them to complete Level I and Clear Credential requirements by the prescribed deadlines.

- We will develop a tracking system for Clear Credential completers to provide us with more information regarding success in obtaining a teaching position, job retention, promotions, and current relocation.
- We will develop a tool with which we can solicit employer feedback regarding the preparedness of our completers.

APPENDIX A



MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- Use #2 pencil or blue or black ink only.
- Make no stray marks on this form.
- Fill circles completely.

CORRECT MARK



INCORRECT MARKS



COURSE EDP

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

UC BERKELEY EXTENSION
STUDENT EVALUATION OF COURSE AND INSTRUCTION

Course Title: _____

Instructor: _____

Term: Spring Summer Fall Year: _____

Today's Date: _____

I. YOUR EVALUATION OF THIS COURSE

| | <i>Strongly disagree</i> | <i>disagree</i> | <i>neutral</i> | <i>agree</i> | <i>Strongly agree</i> | <i>not applicable</i> |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. The course content was <i>up to date</i> and reflected current developments in the field | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. The course material was presented in a <i>clearly organized</i> fashion | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. The course closely followed the <i>syllabus</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4. Course requirements and <i>students' responsibilities</i> were made clear | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5. The <i>required textbook</i> was useful and relevant to the course | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 6. Course materials <i>other than the textbook</i> were useful and relevant to the course | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 7. The <i>lectures</i> helped me to learn the course material | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 8. The <i>homework</i> helped me to learn the course material | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9. The <i>group projects</i> helped me to learn the course material | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 10. The <i>papers and/or presentations</i> helped me to learn the course material | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 11. The <i>quizzes and/or exams</i> helped me to evaluate my learning of the course material | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 12. <i>My fellow students</i> enhanced my learning of the course material | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 13. The <i>course content</i> met my expectations | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

II. YOUR EVALUATION OF THIS INSTRUCTOR

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 14. The instructor was <i>well prepared</i> for each class | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 15. The instructor <i>stimulated my interest</i> in the subject | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 16. The instructor provided <i>useful feedback</i> on coursework | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 17. The instructor made <i>effective use of class time</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 18. The instructor was <i>responsive</i> to questions and suggestions | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 19. The instructor had a good <i>theoretical</i> knowledge of the subject | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 20. The instructor had a good <i>practical</i> knowledge of the subject | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 21. Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall <i>teaching effectiveness</i> of this instructor? | Not at all effective | | Very effective | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

APPENDIX B

EMPLOYER ASSESSMENT OF
ADULT TEACHING COMPETENCIES

Candidate Name _____

SS # 000-00-_____

| STD | TEACHING COMPETENCY EXPECTATIONS | SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE | UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE | COMMENTS |
|------------|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|
| 10 | Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of diversity in students, communities, and the ability to teach students from diverse backgrounds. | | | |
| 11 | Demonstrate knowledge of and the ability to apply adult learning and developmental theories. | | | |
| 12: | Uses a variety of instructional techniques, strategies, activities, and materials that are appropriate for adults with diverse needs and learning styles. | | | |
| 13: | Uses a variety of instructional technologies including, but not limited to, computer-based technology and its applications in educational settings. | | | |
| 14 | Able to prepare course outlines that are well-defined and appropriate for adults and consistent with state statutes, regulations, and policies. | | | |
| 15 | Demonstrates the ability to implement a variety of evaluation techniques to measure student learning and teacher effectiveness. | | | |
| 16 | Demonstrates the ability to recognize personal and academic problems of students and to identify appropriate school or community service available to students. (full-time only) | | | |
| 17 | Awareness of community, legislative, and occupational relationships common to adult education. (full-time only) | | | |
| 18 | Demonstrates the ability to foster respect and to promote positive interpersonal relationships in the classroom, school, and community. | | | |

Supervisor Name _____ Phone _____ School Site Name _____

Supervisor Signature _____ Candidate Signature _____

APPENDIX C

EMPLOYER ASSESSMENT OF
ADULT TEACHING COMPETENCIES

Candidate Name _____

SS # 000-00-_____

| STD | TEACHING COMPETENCY EXPECTATIONS | SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE | UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE | COMMENTS |
|------------|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|
| 10 | Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of diversity in students, communities, and the ability to teach students from diverse backgrounds. | | | |
| 11 | Demonstrate knowledge of and the ability to apply adult learning and developmental theories. | | | |
| 12: | Uses a variety of instructional techniques, strategies, activities, and materials that are appropriate for adults with diverse needs and learning styles. | | | |
| 13: | Uses a variety of instructional technologies including, but not limited to, computer-based technology and its applications in educational settings. | | | |
| 14 | Able to prepare course outlines that are well-defined and appropriate for adults and consistent with state statutes, regulations, and policies. | | | |
| 15 | Demonstrates the ability to implement a variety of evaluation techniques to measure student learning and teacher effectiveness. | | | |
| 16 | Demonstrates the ability to recognize personal and academic problems of students and to identify appropriate school or community service available to students. (full-time only) | | | |
| 17 | Awareness of community, legislative, and occupational relationships common to adult education. (full-time only) | | | |
| 18 | Demonstrates the ability to foster respect and to promote positive interpersonal relationships in the classroom, school, and community. | | | |

Supervisor Name _____ Phone _____ School Site Name _____

Supervisor Signature _____ Candidate Signature _____

**Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report
Academic Year 2008-09**

Institution: University of California, Berkeley

Date report is submitted: June 2009 **Date of last Site Visit:** _____

Program documented in this report: Leadership Support Program

Name of Program: Leadership Support Program

Credential awarded: Professional Administrative Services Credential

Is this program offered at more than one site? Yes No

If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered:

East Bay: Berkeley High School

SF: Hillcrest School

Program Contact: Janette Hernandez

Phone # 415-806-6095

E-mail: janetteh@berkeley.edu

If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:

Name: Lynda Tredway

Phone #: 510-643-5783

E-mail: ltredway@berkeley.edu

Leadership Support Program

I. Contextual Information

A. Candidate completion and placement (2007-2009)

About 60% of our graduates overall elect to continue in the UC Berkeley induction and Professional Administrative Services Credential Program. This is a three-year program, as we contend that supporting candidates in the first three years of service is vital to their development as novice leaders. The cohorts that either completed or began during the 2007-09 time period are included. Obviously, persons enter the LSP when they obtain an administrative position; they do not always do that immediately. In general, however, they enter by PLI cohort.

There is a higher attrition in LSP than PLI because persons are sometimes overwhelmed by the position or they do not remain in administrative positions. Often, the candidates may take a year off from LSP and resume – thus, the “to complete” reflects persons who are in process of third year or completing the requirements (portfolio, standards reflection, or inquiry project).

| LSP Start Date | Completion Date (or expected completion date) | Admissions | Completions Or expected | To complete | Will not complete |
|----------------|---|------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Fall 2005 | June 2008 | 27 | 12 | 9 | 6 |
| Fall 2006 | June 2009 | 1+13 | 10 | NA | 4 |
| Fall 2007 | June 2010 | 23 | 21 | 3 | 2 |
| Fall 2008 | June 2011 | 23 | 23 | | |

B. Program Changes

Each year we refine the curriculum of the Leadership Support Program to meet the needs of novice leaders, based on feedback and input. The most substantive curricular changes have occurred in Year One and Year Three. In all three years, we have changed the documentation of leadership experience; the candidates use the CPSELS as a guide for monthly reflective journals, focusing on CPSEL 2, Instruction, each year. In year one, the participants reflect on one other objective + 2; in years 2 and 3 of LSP, they choose 2+ 2 other CPSELS. However, the important process for us is the reflection, and that 20-30 minutes of writing, an uncommon activity for novice administrators, is valuable.

Personnel changes have occurred in the program to better support all participants. Two leadership coaches (former elementary and former secondary principals) and a veteran administrator collaborate on Year One curriculum, The LSP coordinator is responsible for the Year Two curriculum and overall coordination. The PLI Coordinator facilitates and coordinates Year Three, but we are anticipating that the program will hire two leadership coaches to coordinate Year Three in 2009-2010.

Year One

The first year in LSP is designed to provide support for novice administrators as they transition from the pre-administrative training to the life of a thoughtful and equity-focused school administrator. Our focus is to extend, deepen and broaden first year administrators' learning by providing a safe and supportive atmosphere in which to discuss, reflect, read, and inquire. The major components of Year One are: (1) study groups on key issues and (2) being storytelling process¹ (telling and analyzing stories) .

While we know that a new administrator is faced with a myriad of issues, the study group focuses on four different areas: discipline, supervision/evaluation, having hard conversations and culture and climate. The discussions and work culminate in an exhibition and conversation in which each member of the cohort reflects on their year's learning by sharing with critical friends (a standard protocol used in the program) a piece of exemplary work they have done over the year

The responsibilities of new leaders are overwhelming and complex. The changes to the curriculum have focused on the areas of greatest need for support: (a) discipline; (b) maintaining a focus on instructional improvement through evaluation of teachers and evaluation/supervision practices of new leaders, and (3) having hard conversations with teachers, either in the equity domain or about their teaching.

The use of Fred Brill's book, *Leading and Learning*, which analyzed the 250 stories of LSP participants, has been a helpful addition to the curriculum for Years One and Two.

Year Two

Year Two process and projects are entitled "keep your eyes on the prize" as we are fully aware of the school contexts that administrators face, and how easy it is to be pulled to be a crisis management, "triage" specialist instead of keeping focused on the "right" work.

There are two major components to Year Two: (1) participants continue to tell leadership stories and analyze the stories for themes and learning; and (2) participants complete a project based on an instructional problem using a cycle of inquiry. Proceeding through the year, each month follows this process: use of cycle of inquiry to discuss parts of the process (needs analysis, action plan, reflection, recognition and revisions); analyzing

¹ The storytelling process is a key practice of LSP. Participants, grouped in trios, engage in reflective storytelling. Each month they respond to a prompt and ask reflective questions of each other. Stories are transcribed and analyzed by participants and by facilitators using a narrative inquiry process.

leadership readings for application to work and project; and use critical friends consultancy and tuning protocols.

These projects have become more tightly focused over the last two years with an emphasis on evidence-based practice. Participants bring evidence from observations, meetings, etc to the group for discussion and feedback in order to make decisions about next leadership action. Early in the process for example, a participant brought a protocol for observation. Later another participant brought notes from the school SST meetings to decide how to make those more effective, particularly in terms of follow-up in the classroom.

At the conclusion of the year, there are panels of sharing and group feedback. The participants then read their projects from Year Two at the start of Year Three to inform the next project, which is focused on creating systematic leadership actions to respond to identified needs and using time more effectively to set systems in place for how individual leaders approach the work.

Year Three

The site-based inquiry project in the original design had its merits, but over and over, the LSP candidates told us that they design a project and then lose track of developing and following the project.

Therefore, that curriculum is under revision. The pilot project for 2008-09 was the result of one administrator's project design that he shared with others. The idea was compelling, and the other persons in Year Three decided to take that project on. The third year administrators keep track of their work activities for two weeks in 15-minute intervals. They code these activities using the Covey quadrants -- for urgent and important, not urgent and not important -- and the MCREL responsibilities (Waters and Grubb, 2004), which have been revised to broaden and deepen the work of urban administrators and the focus on equity. After the analysis of the way they spend their days, discussion of research and a decision about an area of focus, each participant develops a two-month project to address one aspect of his/her "leadership system" that needs to change if he/she wants to be more effective as a leader. In the third month, a week of time charting is undertaken to determine if there is a change in the way time is spent and the types of coding that emerge. A second cycle is undertaken to make changes in the ways the leader is not only spending the time, but examining the content and result of his or her leadership actions on teacher practice.

At the conclusion, the participants present their leadership learning for the year in a presentation and paper, linked to research literature. Since project participants have the same project format, they are more likely to learn from each other's work. The discussions have the character of a theater masters class; while the time spent on one project discussion may vary each month, the learning is exponential in that individuals gain insight into their own leadership from hearing about a deep discussion of a colleague. The preliminary evidence suggests they make adjustments based on not just their projects, but from the group learning.

II. Assessments

Assessments are both summative and formative; the reflections on the CPSELS are both. Once all assessments are reviewed and approved, the LSP Coordinator sends a form to the credential analyst to approve recommendation for the Professional ASC.

| Summative Assessment: Year 3 Project | |
|---|--|
| Assessment Tool: Rubric | |
| Description | Process |
| <p>The project is a year-long analysis of leadership work and leadership actions related to school and personal goals, based on evidence collected and analyzed by the participant.</p> | <p>Candidates time code their leadership work for two weeks, analyze the data using three frameworks (Covey quadrants, McREL leadership responsibilities, and novice to expert continuum), and commit to a change in their leadership actions and use of time. Using research-based tools for examining leadership work and decisions, over a year they recursively examine the changes in their management of time, decision-making, and analysis of their work. After two months, they look at data for one week. They repeat the process in the spring term. At each monthly seminar, participants use research on leadership for discussion.</p> |
| Summative Assessment: CPSEL Reflection | |
| Assessment Tool: Journal (read by coordinator) | |
| <p>The process of reflecting on selected standards each year and then at each session has provided new administrators a quiet space that is illusive in the early years of leadership. This process (as distinct from the documentation of standards in PLI preparation) is less bureaucratic and more focused on learner needs at this career point.</p> | <p>Each year candidates reflect on Standard 2. In Year One, they choose an additional standard. In Year Two, they choose 2 and two others; in year Three, they choose Standard 2 and the final two standards. There is an allotted reflection period in each LSP meeting of 30 minutes. Candidates use either written or electronic form, and there are nine required reflections per year. They are read in years 1 and 2 by the LSP coordinator, and feedback on level of depth and relationship to standard is addressed. At the start of each year candidates reread those and highlight as a way to provide</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | direction for the upcoming year. At the end of three years, therefore, there are a minimum of 27 leadership reflections. |
| Summative Assessment: Portfolio and Conversations Assessment Tool: Rubrics for Paper and Presentation | |
| The portfolio is organized around the same four content areas used in PLI, which are aligned with the CPSELS, and is an electronic or print portfolio. The purpose of the portfolio is reflection on leadership experiences that demonstrate learning and competence in each program content area; it is aligned with the CPSELS. The portfolio includes a reflective narrative and at least three artifacts per content area that demonstrate leadership learning and growth. The narrative must use the artifacts as evidence of leadership growth. | The portfolio process begins in the spring term and candidates complete one of the four sections of the portfolio to share with colleagues and receive feedback. In June (or upon completion), candidates engage in portfolio conversations with 2-3 co-participants and program faculty. Candidates who do not satisfactorily meet the reflection levels required for analyzing leadership are asked to revise their portfolios until they meet the criteria |

At this writing, the program is in the process of application for an IES federal grant to support the revision of the LSP design and the assessment process, which is described in detail below.

A fourth assessment area specifically focused on two areas: views of district personnel about PLI graduates and Assistant Principals. The first evaluation was conducted by Joseph Flessa, Ph.D., of the University of Toronto, and analyzed district feedback from assistant superintendents, superintendents, and district level personnel who had direct contact with PLI graduates who were now in LSP in their novice years of service. The feedback from the districts reports that (1) the equity focus of PLI continues into the LSP years of service; (2) PLI graduates have more than one response to a problem; (3) PLI graduates are committed to urban districts. However, when the PLI graduates have difficulty, one issues is connected to building effective relationships with teachers, particularly they experience difficulty in effectively communicating equity lens, advocating for students and engaging teachers in that work. A second issue is the ability to put systems in place for operational management.

The evaluation of Assistant Principals was designed and conducted in conjunction with a USDOE grant for strategic leadership by the Institute for the Study of Knowledge Management in Education (IKSME), the evaluator on the federal grant. The methodology included a process of narrative capture with reflection and self-assessment of issues. The key objectives of this study were to shed light on the leadership

experiences, perceptions and practices of assistant principals in OUSD and SFUSD. The findings from this study, which are not a direct evaluation of the LSP and include all assistant principals in both districts (not only PLI graduates in LSP), do provide important information about needs of assistant principals and how LSP might accommodate those needs. The narratives supported the findings of the district interviews:

- New leaders made decisions based on intuition and did not have a well-developed decision-making framework
- They described instructional leadership challenges in the context of oppositional mindsets, structures, processes and practices at their school sites. They did not have a sense of how their leadership styles might be a cause of some opposition.
- New principals, however, were focused on teaching and learning as a cornerstone of their practice, and they were concerned about how to have conversations about teaching and learning with teachers.

The findings of this study suggest that assistant principals across both districts would benefit from increased support and additional structures to aid them in establishing ongoing constructive conversations with teachers. To help assistant principals abjure the authoritative and intrusive interactions with teachers, which characterized a significant number of the narratives captured and interpreted through this study, it may be necessary to shift the model of systems for teacher observation and interaction toward an even more collaborative approach. Assistant principals may require additional mentoring in the area of teacher interaction, as well as extensive opportunities to workshop collaborative interactions and non-intrusive processes for impacting teacher practices.

Formative Assessments

The formative assessments include the following:

- Coaching feedback
- Year One and Year Two projects as described in Part I
- CPSEL reflective journals for Years One and Two
- Storytelling and analysis – Years One and Two

These provide additional information that informs programmatic direction includes yearly feedback on coaching and monthly seminars. If candidates are coaching in districts with which UCB has coaching contracts (about 50% of LSP participants), then the coach and the candidate (new leader) complete a survey for the district. From that information we have information about the usefulness of coaches and the major topics of reflection and problem-solving in

The coaches send monthly emails to the participants/coachees, and these are monitored. If issues arise, the program coordinator and the coach discuss alternatives, which, in some cases, may require a coaching change. In most cases, these are often issues that new leaders encounter with respect to working with and managing adults (teachers and other staff). The LSP Coordinator often meets individually with LSP participants to troubleshoot issues. However, the rubric for leadership that is in development will be an important component of the ways that coaches assess LSP candidates, as there will be

specific observations and processes for rating and having conversations with candidates about their leadership development

Finally, the storytelling process and the analysis of the leadership stories provide research-based evidence to guide both PLI preparation and LSP curricular choices. The storytelling has informed the decisions to do the following:

- Include a unit of study in the fall course for PLI that focuses on discipline
- Focus year one of PLI on relationships, having hard conversations with teachers about teaching and management, and developing disciplinary systems.

III. Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

All assessments are designed to support novice leaders in their early years of service so that they will be able to develop as leaders. The goal is that they will remain in their positions through these early years, learn from their decisions, derive the knowledge and skill to develop, implement and sustain systems, and continue to develop as reflective leaders.

The series of **projects** over the three years is guided by the experiences from past leadership lessons from years 1, 2, and 3, offering a critical pedagogy model of problem-posing as a way of becoming and being a leader. The program has made a number of changes based on feedback and observation of these early years of service and needs of participants. They are based on the core beliefs that any professional development of leaders must be based on adult learning principles (experiential, reflective, based on choice, informal with enough structure to support their learning), the novice to expert continuum, the non-linear and often generative nature of leadership development, and the dynamic context of urban districts in which most of the leaders work. These projects are also based on a clear and sustained equity focus. Many of the issues that new leaders encounter is the disconnect between the equity lens they bring to the work, the need for their voices as student and family advocates, and the perceived or actual teacher lens. The work of these three projects is to move new leaders into a role of working with, coaching, and building capacity among adults.

The program uses a rubric for presentation and for assessing the paper. If papers do not fully meet the criteria on the rubric, they are returned for revision. **To be more systematic, the rubric will be revised to have scores, and documentation of those scores will be reported.**

The **CPSEL journal** intended to provide a regular and systematic venue for reflecting, for inculcating the leadership standards as a way of self-awareness and self-analysis. The journal is analyzed each year of the three years, and recommendations are made each year about the level of reflection. If candidate entries do not reflect the depth necessary for the reflection on the CPSELs, and that includes specific examples of the competency language and elements, as well as evidence of the standard, the journal is returned for completion.

In the future, the program will document the number of candidate journals that are returned with comments for deeper reflection.

The **portfolio** is designed for participants to reflect on their early years of leadership and compare that to leadership learning and development represented in the PLI portfolio. This process provides its own benchmark for candidates to analyze their development. In the spring of the third year, candidates bring one example of a portfolio section for consideration by the instructor and peers. That section is read, the rubric is used to respond to the candidate, so that he or she can improve that section and use it as a model for the final portfolio presentation and submission. Given this scaffolding and response, most candidates have portfolios that meet the standard by the final submission and presentation. If the portfolio does not meet the standard for reflection required by the program, the portfolio or a section of the portfolio is returned for revision.

In the future, the program will document the number of portfolios that are returned for revision.

Of course, these experiences with persons who complete LSP and the Professional ASC credential mean something more than assessments can capture. First of all, the program faculty has spent at least four and often more years with the candidates personalizing their learning, responding to their stories and needs, and building a community of learners that is a touchstone for their leadership. Therefore, the personal connections and peer learning are strong factors in the development of leaders. In addition, the level of interaction changes through the course of the three years, as the once novice leaders assume more collegial roles with each other and the program faculty. There is an intentional emphasis on “letting go” and letting the experiences of the learners direct the conversations. At the same time, the program faculty maintains consistency and rigor as a way of leading and modeling, offering LSP candidates the balance of structure and adult choice so necessary in the kind of critical pedagogical format which we have chosen as a program design attribute.

All PLI/LSP graduates stay connected through their PLI cohort, through professional relationships developed in LSP, through regular online communication to pose questions and ask for resources, and through UCB events.

To have a better comprehensive assessment of graduates/LSP candidates, the program is in the process of developing an assessment tool to assess candidate, program and supervisor perception of candidate performance. As a part of the strategic planning process of the Center for Urban School Leadership of which the Leadership Support Program is one program area, these will be the new content areas of the program on which candidates will be assessed:

1. Attitude and Presence
2. Identity and Relationships
3. Equity and Advocacy
4. Curriculum and Instruction

5. Organization and Systems
6. Change and Coherence
7. Assessment and Accountatibility

Outcomes (DRAFT)

URBAN SCHOOL LEADERS:

1. Exude a compelling presence that communicates a steadfast belief in the power of the possible
2. Know themselves deeply and nourish trusting relationships in a culturally and racially diverse learning organization
3. Advocate for equitable outcomes for students who have been historically underserved by society and schools.
4. Cultivate expectations of excellence and durable learning outcomes for students and adults
5. Align systems, structures and resources that supports a positive environment in the service of student achievement
6. Initiate and manage continuous improvement
7. Exhibit a persistent focus on student learning results

For each of these content areas, a rubric is being developed to assess candidates; the three levels of the rubric are **emerging, developing and practicing**. Therefore candidates in the LSP should be rated on the rubric as developing and moving from the developing leader level to the practicing level.

In addition, we expect to use the rubric for 360 degree feedback from the following: candidate, supervisor, coach and self assessment by candidate. The coach will then have a conversation with the candidate about goals at the end of each year of coaching.

IV. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

Candidate Progress

As stated, candidate progress, once they are in a leadership role, is not linear, but it is developmental. The combination of formative and summative assessments provides a direction for candidates so that can become self-directed learners who pose problems, analyze causes, make decisions, and use qualitative and quantitative evidence to look at school issues and their own leadership.

The deepest concern for their progress is that the leadership culture of district and school sites remains largely bureaucratic and hierarchical. Since one of the tenets of PLI and LSP is collective (distributed) leadership, the undertow of the school leadership waters is sometimes so strong that candidates are pulled to become more authoritarian. They sometimes do not build relationships effectively or, conversely, they are not authoritative in their decisions and interactions and then they often are seen as not progressing by their supervisors. In the interest of building relationships, they do not know how to navigate conflict or have hard conversations with the teachers for whom they are responsible. At

the secondary level, they can be pulled by disciplinary roles, and shortchange instructional leadership.

The LSP curriculum and the assessments are designed to mitigate these issues and assist candidates in moving their thinking and leadership actions to places of confidence and competence.

By linking the coaching to the leadership evaluation tool and providing 360 degree feedback to the candidate, LSP will have a more robust method for assessing candidate progress and areas of improvement. In turn, the program and the coach will be in a better position to differentiate and individualize support for candidates.

Program Performance

The program faculty in the form of the coordinator and PLI coordinator, along with the coaches, some of whom also serve as facilitators of Year One, offers a consistency of relationships, program history, and direction. The staff models a reflective and learner stance and has been adaptive. While the “territory” of preparation programs is well known, documented, and researched – providing evidence of what to do and what not to do in preparation, induction programs are less well researched. Therefore, the trial and error with feedback to inform direction has been an asset of this program

Because we have had systematic studies of PLI/LSP completers in the form of the PLI evaluation, because we are in touch with all the graduates of PLI and completers of LSP regularly (many return to PLI classes as co-teachers or panelists), and because we have an ongoing research agenda related to the leadership stories, the perspective of the program developers/coordinators is systematically informed by feedback, documentation and research.

Proposed Changes

At this writing, the program faculty with other UCB faculty are in the process of writing an IES (Institute of Educational Studies) research grant with a focus on LSP to sharpen the assessment of leaders *in situ*. It is clear we need to know more than leaders bring to the monthly seminars about what leadership looks like in urban schools so that we can funnel that knowledge into the programmatic structure and better support through coaching and seminars the induction of urban leaders.

Section B

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Dean David Pearson

Institutional Summary and Plan of Action

The University of California, Berkeley prepares professional educators through three academic departments which include the Graduate School of Education, the School of Social Work and the Department of Education of the UC Extension Program. These programs offer the following CCTC accredited credentials:

1. Multiple and Single Subject (Math, Science and English) Teaching Credentials
2. Preliminary Administrative Services Credential
3. Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential
4. Pupil Personnel Services Credential in School Social Work and Child Welfare and Attendance
5. Designated Subjects Credentials in Adult Education and Career Technical Education

Trends across Programs Identified in the Data

Candidates of the UC Berkeley credentialing programs feel well prepared and are very satisfied with the instruction and content of their programs. University and field supervisors, as well as employers of UC Berkeley graduates, rate them highly in terms of their commitment to students, their pedagogical skills and theoretical training. Employers and supervisors have noted that UC Berkeley candidates and graduates maintain a focus on equity and are motivated to see their students succeed. Candidates consistently score highly across most assessment criteria and are offered a variety of supports throughout their programs to ensure a high level of performance.

Though the credential programs are generally successful, UC Berkeley's commitment to ongoing programmatic improvement requires that we identify areas that can be strengthened across programs. While some of these areas are specific to each credential program, some have been identified as concerns across all or many of the programs. After looking at the data, it is clear that more measures for tracking candidate progress, particularly by adding and formalizing more formative assessments throughout the programs is a priority. In the teacher credentialing programs, strengthening candidates' abilities to teach English language learners is a focus, and in the teacher credentialing programs, as well as in the school psychology program, developing candidates' fluency in student assessment has been slated for improvement.

The PLI and LSP programs are in a more developmental stage in terms of tracking candidate progress than the other programs. They are currently working in a strategic planning team to develop ways of using rubrics and portfolios to systematically collect data going forward. This is essential work for the PLI/LSP programs to do in order to meet expectations for the next biennial report.

The School psychology and Social Welfare programs, like the teacher credentialing programs, are already collecting and using data to inform their program modifications. Some of their proposed modifications include developing candidates' skills to integrate their expertise with the challenges of their school sites. For example, Social Welfare aims to increase their candidates' knowledge of learning theory and educational psychology, while School Psychology hopes to expand their candidates' understanding of school law and logistics.

Improvement Agenda

The University of California, Berkeley CCTC accredited credential programs are committed to three long-term goals that draw on the information gleaned from this report. First, UC Berkeley prioritizes maximizing the long-term professional stamina of our credential program graduates in the field. Strategies to meet this goal include instituting more measures to track our candidates' performance after they earn their credential. This may include a 1-year, 5-year and 10-year follow up on our candidates during their careers. We also plan to integrate more professional networking into our credential programs, which would encourage our students to think and act like intellectuals, researchers and leaders in their fields.

Second, we plan to draw on the strengths of the credentialing programs, themselves, so that they may share their various forms of expertise. For example, PLI and LSP excel at maintaining their candidates' commitment to equity at their employment sites, as well as supporting their candidates' longevity in their educational careers. The teacher credentialing programs and the School Psychology and Social Welfare programs are more comfortable collecting and using data to inform their program modifications. We intend to develop venues for these programs to share these traditions and help one another implement new approaches to continuous programmatic improvement.

Third, the data clearly indicate that the teaching credentialing programs need to increase their candidates' understanding of and proficiency in teaching academic language to their students. It is a top priority to integrate more emphasis on academic language in course work, field placements and candidate assessments. All of the teacher credentialing programs have made plans to integrate this emphasis going forward.