

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Claremont Graduate University

Professional Services Division

April 17, 2001

Overview of this report

This report provides background about the Claremont Graduate University (CGU) and its credential programs, information about the COA visit that took place on March 4 -7, 2001, and the team report and recommendations of the team that conducted the visit on behalf of the Committee on Accreditation. The report of the Team presents the findings based on the Institutional Self-Study, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. Lead Consultant, Margaret Olebe, and Team Leader, Judith Greig, will present the report. Representing CGU will be David Drew, Dean of Education, and Mary Poplin, Director of Teacher Education.

Accreditation Recommendations

1. The team recommends that, based on the Accreditation Team report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for CGU and all its credential programs:

ACCREDITATION

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

Administrative Services Credential
Professional

Multiple Subjects Credential
CLAD Emphasis Internship

Single Subjects Credential
CLAD Emphasis Internship

2. The staff recommends that
 - The institutions' response to the preconditions be accepted.
 - CGU be permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation to the Committee on Accreditation
 - CGU be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2006-7 year for a COA visit.

Background

A member of The Claremont Colleges consortium, the Claremont Graduate University was founded in 1925 as the Claremont Graduate School. It currently enrolls approximately 2000 full and part-time graduate students in degree programs in 21 fields. The majority of its students seek the PhD degree. Courses of study at CGU include art, education, humanities, social sciences, management and information science, all of which have received national recognition. While relatively small in size, the university benefits from membership in the consortium through sharing of faculty, facilities and resources. Its library system has over 2 million volumes.

As its credo CGU believes

- Superb instruction, innovative research, and practical experience are the keys to an excellent graduate education.
- Educational institutions have an obligation to become civically engaged in order to enrich and to better society.
- Institutions of higher education must be ethically vigilant, consciously exploring normative and moral issues.
- Knowledge consists of more than facts and has more than merely utilitarian ends; knowledge pursues and reflects values.
- Education is immeasurably enriched by the experience and insight of those outside the educational community.
- Human diversity is indispensable for improving the quality and texture of the educational experience.
- Ongoing education is a lifelong responsibility of the global community's leaders.
- Advanced education is essential for the well-being and future of an increasingly complex society. (Catalog, p.4)

Credential programs are housed in the School of Educational Studies under the leadership of Dean David Drew. There are 27 core academic faculty, 16 of whom are full professors. The school is committed to teaching and research about issues related to education in the broadest sense, including processes of learning and communication, school organization, policy, administration, lifespan learning and human development, teacher preparation and faculty development, educational philosophy and history, and pedagogy (p. 49)

CGU began preparing teachers for California in 1925 and adopted the teaching internship model in 1954 (p. 50). Currently it enrolls approximately 120 students annually in its Multiple and Single Subject Credential programs, with about two thirds of candidates seeking the Multiple Subject Credential. Credential candidates enroll simultaneously in a Masters Degree program and complete both the credential and degree programs over a calendar year and an additional summer session. Candidates may begin their programs either in Spring or Summer, and are move through the course of study for the credential in cohorts.

The cohort model is also used in the Urban Education Leadership Program. Begun in 1998, this program is specifically designed to meet the needs of scholar-practitioners who hold leadership positions in urban schools (p. 51). The Professional Administrative Services Credential is embedded with in the Ph.D degree program. Currently approximately 15 students are enrolled in the credential program, and only a small number of credentials, five, have been awarded.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant was assigned to the institution in Fall, 1999 and had telephone conversations with the Dean in preparation for a formal meeting with the dean and faculty representatives which was held in January, 2000. Subsequent meetings between the consultant and faculty, program directors and institutional administration were held in October and December 2000, and in February, 2001. In September 2000 the institution appointed a new Director of Teacher Education, Dr. Mary Poplin, who assumed responsibility for the completion of the self-study and internal organization for the visit. The Team Leader, Dr. Judith Greig, selected in September 2000, attended the December 2000 meeting as well. The initial meeting led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistical and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone, e-mail and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the Common Standards. These responses were developed in reference to the credential program and for the unit as a whole. This was followed by a separate response to the appropriate Program Standards for each credential program. The institution decided to use option one (California Program Standards) in the *Accreditation Framework* for all programs. The report was mailed to the commission consultant and team members approximately six weeks prior to the visit.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Dean, education faculty and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of five consisting of a Team Leader, and four team members. The Commission Consultant selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience, and, and training in the use of the *Accreditation Framework*. One team member withdrew two weeks prior to the visit and was replaced by another individual who served on the Basic Credentials Cluster.

The team was organized into three clusters: Common Standards, Basic Credentials, and Administrative Services Credential. The Team Leader participated as a member of the Common Standards Cluster, as did the team member assigned to the Administrative Services credential.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The COA Team Leader and members examined the college responses to the Common Standards and the Program Standards. The on-site phase of the review began on Sunday, March 4, 2001. The team arrived on Sunday afternoon and began their deliberations with one another. The team meeting included a review of the accreditation procedures and organizational arrangements for the COA team members.

On Monday and Tuesday, March 5 and 6, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. There was extensive consultation among the team members with much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Tuesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. On Tuesday morning the Team Leader and Commission Consultant met with the Director of Teacher Education and administrative staff to review the team's findings at the end of the first day, and to request additional information and documentation related to program and common standards. The resulting documentation was then shared during the Tuesday lunch discussion.

The mid-visit report took place at 1:00 PM on Tuesday. By that time the institution had provided most of the information requested in the morning, and this had been shared with the entire team. The team then conveyed its abbreviated list of concerns about the Common Standards and various Program Standards in the mid-visit report. Both faculty and administration worked Tuesday afternoon to obtain and present additional information for the team. Tuesday evening was set aside for cluster meetings and a full team meeting, as well as the writing of the team report. The team met again on Wednesday morning to confirm its decision-making process of the previous evening and to finish writing the report. The team presented its report to the faculty and administration at 2:00 p.m. Wednesday afternoon.

Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met" or "Standard Not Met." The team had the option of deciding that some of the Common Standards were "Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns. The Common Standards Cluster then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale

for its decision and then outlining perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard.

For each credential area, the team prepared a narrative report that summarized all standards judged as “Met.” The bulk of the narrative focused on program standards judged as “Met Minimally” or “Not Met” and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team highlighted specific Strengths and Concerns related to each program.

The team included some "Professional Comments" at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

Accreditation Decisions by the Team

The team used a consistent decision-making process during its meetings. The purpose of this process was to: a. provide the framework for the written narrative for the Common Standards and each credential area; b. achieve team ownership of the entire contents of the report; and c. assist team members in coming to an accreditation decision.

The team met in the conference room at the hotel Monday and Tuesday evenings. Each evening, the team leader led a discussion on evidence related to each of the Common Standards. Salient findings were then recorded on a wall chart. Next, each credential program being reviewed was presented by the cluster leader or individual responsible, and then discussed by the team as a whole. This process provided team members with the opportunity to participate in the development of the narrative for the Common Standards, and to receive comments and feedback from fellow team members on the credentials they were reviewing. After the report was drafted, the entire team met on Wednesday morning for a final review of the report and to confirm its decision about the results of the visit.

The team made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Framework*. In its deliberations, the team decided that several standards in both Common and Program sections were worthy of being noted in areas of strength and in some cases, areas of concern. Although areas of concern were noted in the team report related to both Common and Program Standards, the overall quality of individual programs mitigated the majority of the concerns. After thorough discussion, the team decided to recommend the status of "**Accreditation.**" The recommendation for “Accreditation” was based on consensus of the team.

**COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION-ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

Institution: Claremont Graduate University

Dates of Visit: March 4 – 7, 2001

**Accreditation Team
Recommendation:** ACCREDITATION

Rationale:

The overall quality of the program and of the candidates and graduates of the programs at Claremont Graduate University is judged to be outstanding. This judgment is based on findings identified through examination of the institutional self study; interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, university administrators and staff, faculty associates (university supervisors), district cooperating teachers and mentors (district field supervisors), school administrators/employers, and advisory committee members; and examination of the university catalog, advisement materials, and other program documents provided by the institution.

The team reached a consensus decision to recommend Accreditation. Two Common Standards were judged to be Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns: Common Standard 4 - Evaluation and Common Standard 8 - District Field Supervisors. Documentation revealed lack of systematic processes for the collection of data from all participants regarding all aspects of the program and lack of consistency in systematic reporting and use of data collected. Documentation also revealed lack of systematic attention to the selection, training, support, and evaluation of district field supervisors.

While these important concerns were noted and weighed carefully, the team nevertheless recommends Accreditation. On balance, the areas of concern are mitigated by the overall high quality of the institution and the candidates. Employers were overwhelmingly enthusiastic regarding the preparation and success of CGU graduates, and the institution is held in extremely high regard within the educational community of this region and beyond. In addition, the institution was honest and forthcoming about these concerns during the visit and shared plans already being implemented in these two areas. The changes underway were confirmed in interviews with recently admitted and continuing candidates, and through evidence in the documents room. The responsiveness and integrity of program directors, in particular, and the preponderance of the evidence led the team to its conclusion.

Team Leader: **Judith Greig**
College of Notre Dame

Common Standards: **Judith Greig**
College of Notre Dame

Nancy S. Brownell
Institute for Education Reform
California State University

Basic Credentials Cluster: **John Yoder**
Fresno Pacific University
Cluster Leader

Janet Bonney
Sweetwater Union
High School District

Barbara Black
San Juan Unified School District

Administrative Services: **Nancy S. Brownell**
Cluster **Institute for Education Reform**
California State University

DATA SOURCES

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
34	Program Faculty	X	Catalog
21	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
64	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
33	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
16	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbook
16	Supervising Practitioners	X	Follow-up Survey Results
15	Advisors	X	Institutional Web Page
36	School Administrators	X	Information Booklet
2	Credential Analyst		Field Experience Notebook
		X	
16	Advisory Committee	X	Schedule of Classes
2	Program Directors	X	Advisement Documents
		X	Faculty Vitae
		X	Candidate Portfolios

COMMON STANDARDS

Standard 1 – Educational Leadership

Standard Met

The Education unit at Claremont Graduate University is housed in the School of Educational Studies, under the leadership of the Dean. The Teacher Education program, which offers both Multiple and Single Subject CLAD Intern Credential programs, is led by a Director, who has newly assumed responsibilities for the program as of September, 2000. The Professional Administrative Services Credential program is an option within the Ph.D. program in Urban Educational Leadership, and is led by the Director of that program. Each director reports to the Dean.

Program directors have a clear transformative vision for the preparation of professional educators, which emphasizes the quality and character of the teacher and/or administrator in order to affect the performance of students, particularly in economically challenged urban contexts. Both programs are built on the importance of experience in the educational process; internship has been a central component of the CGU program design for decades.

The campus administration is knowledgeable and supportive of the importance of the work of teacher education. This institutional support can be evidenced in the recent moving of the Teacher Education program to a spacious location closer to the center of campus.

The directors of both programs are highly involved with candidates, reflect on their successes and needs, and get a great deal of institutional support in order to coordinate needed changes. Both programs have gone through significant change in the year just preceding the visit. The MS/SS program has changed directors and had transition in some staff support personnel. The first cohort of PASC candidates is in the process of completing the program, and the second cohort has recently begun. Suggestions from the first cohort are in the process of being implemented.

Strengths

Both Directors are highly qualified and highly respected. Their energy, dedication, and responsiveness are commendable.

Concerns

The institution has been through a major time of transition; now time is needed for consolidation and systematization.

Standard 2 – Resources

Standard Met

Claremont Graduate University has a wealth of resources to support the operational needs of the program and the educational needs of the candidates. Library and computer resources and support personnel are generous. The main university library

houses over two million volumes; subscriptions to over 100 education journals are maintained; and ERIC and other databases are available in the library and online. The Stone Library makes children's literature available to teacher candidates. There are two university computer labs updated on a two-year cycle available for student use. Bibliographic and software training courses are offered free of charge to students on a regular basis. The teacher education program office is staffed with six full-time personnel in addition to the Director.

The campus administration, the Dean, and the Director of Teacher Education have been negotiating the past several months to reorganize resources available in teacher education. Within the last few years, the compensation of faculty associates was increased by 50%. A second tenure-line faculty position in teacher education is currently in the search process. Two clinical faculty positions have been added to the budget.

Strengths

Elective courses, lectures by Claremont professors and other national leaders, and access to an extraordinary collection of print and on-line materials make Claremont an intellectual feast for students.

Most students report having received some sort of financial assistance, with the active help of the University, to off-set the high cost of tuition.

Concerns

For only one (and soon two) of thirteen tenure line positions in the School to be dedicated to Teacher Education is inadequate; the University needs to continue to evaluate the equity in its allocation of resources.

Standard 3 – Faculty

Standard Met

Full-time faculty in the School of Educational Studies are outstanding, internationally known for their scholarship and expertise. Full-time faculty are highly respected and go through a rigorous advancement, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review process.

MS/SS candidates take 12 of the 36 units in the program with these full-time faculty. Currently one full-time faculty member, the Director, is dedicated to the MS/SS Teacher Education program. A second full-time tenure-track faculty person with expertise in language development is currently being sought.

Professional Administrative Services Credential (PASC) candidates, as doctoral students, take most coursework with the full-time faculty. The institution plans to add a full-time tenure-track faculty with K-12 administrative experience within the next year or so.

CGU has made a conscious decision to have the methods courses in the MS/SS program not taught by the full-time faculty, but instead by adjunct faculty with recent or ongoing K-12 classroom experience. The rationale for this decision is to increase the relevance and practicality of what candidates learn, particularly in the early phases of the program. Although most of these adjunct faculty are well commended by students, some unevenness in the quality is evidenced in student interviews. There is some evidence that only successful adjunct faculty are retained. The institution seeks adjunct faculty who reflect and are knowledgeable about cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity.

The CGU President has just given approval to a reorganization proposal from the Teacher Education program which includes two new clinical faculty positions. These are term appointments and include some administrative responsibilities. The addition of these individuals as teachers and/or administrators to the program will bring both outstanding scholarship and prior involvement in K-12 schools.

Strengths

The caliber of the full-time faculty is at the highest level nationally and internationally.

Generous professional development opportunities and financial support for them are available for all faculty, including adjuncts. The Director of the Teacher Education program is currently working with adjunct faculty to ensure that such funds are used in a way that updates their knowledge of recent changes in K-12 content standards and related areas.

Concerns

Adjunct faculty appear to be recruited primarily through a process described as “networking” or “word of mouth.” Although the institution appears satisfied with the efficacy of this approach, the team questions the equity and effectiveness of this procedure.

All faculty are evaluated through course evaluation forms. In interviews and examination of the written documentation, the team was unable to find evidence of how other sources of evidence are systematically used to judge the performance of adjunct faculty.

Standard 4 – Evaluation

Standard Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns

The institution conducts an internal and external program review process every ten years, linked to its WASC accreditation cycle. The School of Education was in the midst of completing this process.

Course evaluation is done by candidates consistently in every course. A mid-year evaluation of the program has recently been completed by current candidates; it appears that this process is new. Faculty advisors reflect on the program within

monthly meetings. Cooperating teachers are asked for feedback on the experience at the end of the pre-intern experience. A survey of graduates is conducted every 2 to 3 years. Members of the combined MS/SS Intern and PASC Advisory Council were recently surveyed for feedback on the program; the frequency of this activity is unclear.

Strengths

The current Directors of the programs are extremely open to suggestions regarding the program and are implementing changes with alacrity.

Concerns

Program evaluation needs to be executed in a more comprehensive and systematic fashion. Much information is collected; however, lack of consistency across all groups of participants was evidenced in documentation and interviews. In addition, low response rates for certain groups, particularly school administrators, was a concern expressed in interviews.

Documentation of both processes and use of the results of evaluation components is limited in scope and is needed so that a systematic feedback mechanism for qualitative program improvement is in place.

Standard 5 – Admission

Standard Met

CGU has clear and detailed admission procedures and criteria that are available in printed and electronic form; procedures are routinely followed. Multiple measures, including prior experience, GPA, CBEST, essay, letters of recommendation, and personal interview ensure high academic achievement and suitability for teaching.

Strengths

CGU has invested institutional commitment and funds into recruiting and admitting a diverse cadre of students.

Concerns

None noted

Standard 6 – Advice and Assistance

Standard Met

Faculty and staff are available to advise and assist candidates. Written information regarding program requirements are provided to each MS/SS intern in their Intern Handbook. Staff members are readily available to answer any questions candidates might have. Faculty associates provide candidates with much encouragement and constructive criticism, in dialogue and written form to facilitate their professional growth.

In the PASC program, adequate information is readily available to guide each candidate's attainment of all program and credential requirements. Following a fall orientation session, every prospective applicant meets with the Associate Director of the School who acquaints the individual with the registration process, timelines, and required forms. A description of the program requirements is included in the School of Educational Studies section of the CGU bulletin. Information pertaining to programmatic objectives, responsibilities, and evaluative measures is provided by the Faculty Advisor as the candidate progresses.

Strengths

The Graduate University's strengths are the quality of personal relationships between students, staff, and faculty members and a commitment to student success. Students report a very high level of support and assistance from the faculty advisors and the support staff, such as the Special Assistant and the Credential Analyst.

Concerns

Based on interviews and an examination of appropriate support documents, there is a limited process of documentation that verifies that each candidate has met all requirements for advancement to daily teaching. (See MS/SS Standard 8.) The team found documentation that interns meet with district mentors to discuss their professional development; however specific plans for follow up support were not clearly identifiable.

Standard 7 – School Collaboration

Standard Met

Pre-interns in the MS/SS program are placed in local schools by the Recruitment/Placement Coordinator; school site principals typically make the assignment of cooperating teachers.

As part of the CGU philosophy, candidates in the MS/SS and PASC programs seek their own (intern) placements. CGU facilitates this process by sponsoring recruitment fairs at which interns can interview with district personnel.

The two programs have this year combined Advisory Councils. The group is designed to offer feedback on the program and proposed changes.

Strengths

None noted

Concerns

Some current pre-interns, interns, and graduates report uneven experiences in pre-internships, particularly related to the suitability of cooperating teachers.

Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors

Standard Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns

The team found inconsistent evidence on the identification, orientation, and integration of district mentors in the intern program. The director of teacher education has recently revised memoranda of understanding with cooperating districts describing agreements and expectations for district mentors. At the time of the visit, implementation of the agreements was in the earliest stages and discussions with districts about new roles and relationships were underway. Candidates reported a wide range of experiences with district mentors, some of which were minimal. Documentation revealed a lack of consistent understanding about mentor expectations. The team found evidence that mentors are provided professional development, although these offerings are were not consistently available to all mentors.

PASC candidates are assisted by the university and the district in selecting a district mentor to guide their progress through the program. Interviews with candidates indicated that the process is meeting their needs and works well.

Strengths

The director of teacher education and administrative staff have vigorously worked during the short interval between the time of appointment and the accreditation visit to redefine relationships with local school districts and implement new policies related to the placement and supervision of intern teachers. This was evident in the documentation provided and confirmed through interviews.

Concerns

While CGU offers workshops at low cost to support and reward cooperating teachers and district mentors, the frequency of these activities is limited.

Multiple Subject/Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Internship Program

Findings on Standards

On the basis of the institutional self-study, the supporting documentation provided, and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and cooperating teachers, the team determined that all Standards are met with the following exception:

- Standard 8, Advancement to Daily Student Teaching Responsibilities is Not Met.

The team found that many of the candidates admitted to the intern program had not completed their subject matter competency requirement prior to the beginning of their full time classroom experience (internship) as required in Standard 8. The team found documentation that a few graduates were still on emergency permits two or more years after completing the program. In addition, candidates admitted prior to this year expressed confusion regarding the requirements for meeting Internship Credential requirements.

The team recognizes that the current program director has implemented new procedures to correct this problem, including a strict review of candidates' subject matter completion status at the time of admission. Those without subject matter completion are only provisionally admitted. Newly admitted students are uniformly aware of this requirement, and many had already completed it at the time of admission.

Strengths

- The Claremont Graduate University faculty and staff work consistently to deliver programs that effectively prepare teachers to work in low-income, racially and culturally diverse urban schools. There is a cohesive effort within the program to have students examine a series of conceptual principles of social justice, and to determine how these beliefs will emerge in their practices.
- All stakeholders praise the blending of learning theory to teaching practice as well as the learning-by-doing philosophy embedded in the curriculum. The program prepares beginning teachers who have a strong sense of social justice, strong understanding of learning theory and are competent, capable educators.
- The CGU Teacher Education Program staff make extraordinary efforts in working with and providing personalized attention to prospective students, candidates, graduates and neighboring school staff.
- The CGU Faculty Associates are highly dedicated in their work in supporting interns. This is evident in the overwhelming amount of documentation of numerous

classroom visitations, the pertinent and accurate information the interns report they receive, and the success of Interns at their school sites.

- The CGU Teacher Education Program faculty and staff recruits and admits candidates who demonstrate a high level of dedication, professionalism, leadership and a deep commitment to social diversity, justice and equity. The impact of these individuals can be seen years after their graduation through their sustaining leadership in positions of responsibility in schools, school districts and higher education.

The entire CGU Teacher Education Program faculty and staff demonstrates an extraordinarily high level of personal integrity and commitment to modeling the characteristics of respect for the individual and educational equity above and beyond the call of duty. In the words of many candidates, “They are always there for us.”

Concerns:

At the beginning of their assignments, some candidates feel unprepared to meet the literacy needs of their students, particularly in the primary grades. A similar concern was expressed by candidates in regard to classroom management at all grades.

Professional Administrative Services Credential Program

Findings on Standards

The Administrative Services Credential Program meets all prescribed standards for the Professional Credential based on the self-study, documents reviewed and interviews.

The Professional Services Credential Program at Claremont Graduate University has been developed around a strong curriculum, specifically designed for the needs of working school administrators. It offers a comprehensive Tier II program that includes a combination of rigorous, scholarly theories, research and practical application skills and is embedded in the Urban Education Leadership Ph.D program to improve educational practice. Highly qualified, full-time faculty teach in the program. Numerous interviews produced evidence of faculty members who genuinely care about the candidates in the program and who devote quality time and energy to promote student success. A Tier II Administration Advisory Board provides a vehicle for discussion and feedback on design elements and recommendations for program improvement in both formal and informal ways. The Advisory Board is in the midst of a reorganization that will see it combined with the Teacher Education Advisory Board to better provide program analysis, guidance and feedback to faculty.

The major focus of Ed 535A is the development of the candidate's individual professional development plan, which guides the choice of activities and content for the fieldwork. Prior to recommending each candidate for a Professional Administrative Credential, the university advisor and the mentor verify that the candidate has met the expectations for excellence in candidate performance outlined in the induction plan and ED535D is specifically concerned with verification that a candidate has met the expectations. Candidates also are introduced to the mentoring process and select as mentors practicing administrators who meet defined criteria. A sound mentoring plan is a crucial component of the Professional Administrative Services Induction Plan process. It provides an ongoing and systematic partnership of professional support, advice, guidance, and planned experiences for the candidate as the latter expands his/her knowledge and skills as a school administrator. The candidate and mentor confer on a regular basis to reflect on progress in achieving the professional development objectives of the candidate and to ascertain professional needs of the candidate.

The CGU program is grounded in the practice of teaching candidates how to make sense out of the complexity of their jobs as administrators. A "sensemaking" approach to leadership signals CGU's dedication to building a program and offering courses in which candidates are able to design schools in which: (1) students understand their own work; (2) students are able to define success and what it requires; (3) teachers understand student learning; and (4) where school administrators understand the organizational conditions that foster good learning and teaching.

Strengths

- The program has a vision and structure in response to a public mandate for strong leadership to guide schools and colleges in a time of rapid change and high need for knowledgeable and responsive administrators who understand the complexities and diversity of California schools.
- The program faculty are approachable, knowledgeable and focused on balancing the need for a rigorous and thoughtful sequence of courses and the demands and needs of working administrators. Faculty should be commended for their dedication and commitment to students in the program and their timely responses to questions, concerns and requests for guidance and feedback.
- Processes for admissions, advisement and assistance to program participants are exemplary as evidenced in candidate interviews and faculty evaluations.

Concerns

- The reconfiguration of the Advisory Board seems unclear to some participants and the role they play on the Board is unclear to some members.

Professional Comments

(Professional Comments are not a part of the accreditation team report. They are provided as a professional courtesy by accreditation team members who have suggestions for consideration by the institution.)

Common Standards

- As retirements in the full-time faculty occur, CGU should consider additional tenure-track lines in Teacher Education and/or educational administration.
- Explicit criteria and process for the selection and evaluation of adjunct faculty and faculty associates should to be published and implemented.
- Tap the considerable expertise available in the CGU faculty to design a comprehensive program evaluation system.
- CGU could consider using the Advisory Council or sub-groups of that body to address specific tasks, such as the selection and evaluation of district mentors, the review of the new cooperating teacher handbook, and regular consideration of the content of district MOUs/contracts.

Multiple & Single Subject Credentials

The team encourages the school to consider:

- Including the primary grade level interns in the Literacy Practicums.
- Increasing the classroom management and ELL curriculum to include more practical, concrete strategies during the pre-internship phase.
- Providing increased literacy information at an earlier phase in the program.
- Reviewing the mixing of undergraduates with pre-interns in the TLP I experience. Some of the pre-interns expressed concern that the issues of relevance to the undergraduates were significantly different their own.
- Reviewing the compressed nature of the summer start. Some candidates beginning the pre-internship in the summer expressed an inability to adequately process and reflect upon the wealth of information and experiences provided.
- Considering the needs of interns serving year-round schools as courses and workshops are scheduled.