

# Report of the Accreditation Visit to the University of California, Berkeley

## Professional Services Division

October 15, 1999

### Overview of this report

This report provides background about the University of California, Berkeley and its credential programs, information about the COA visit that took place on April 25-28, 1999 and October 4-6, 1999, and the report and accreditation recommendation of the team that conducted the visit on behalf of the Committee on Accreditation. The report of the team presents the findings based upon the Institutional Self-Study, review of supporting documentation, and interviews with representative constituencies. Lead Consultant, Margaret Olebe, and Team Leader, Barbara Merino, will present the report. Representing the University of California, Berkeley will be Eugene Garcia, Dean of the Graduate School of Education.

### Accreditation Recommendations

1. The team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for the University of California, Berkeley and all its credential programs:

#### ACCREDITATION WITH A TECHNICAL STIPULATION

The stipulation is:

The institution is required to provide evidence of continued efforts to improve cohesiveness of leadership and coordination across all credential programs, especially as related to Common Standards One and Four.

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

- Designated Subjects Credential  
Adult Education  
Vocational Education
- Multiple Subject Credential  
Basic (Developmental Teacher Education)  
CLAD Emphasis Internship (California Urban Partnership)
- Single Subject Credential  
Basic (MACSME)  
CLAD Emphasis (English)
- Pupil Personnel Services  
School Psychology  
School Psychology Internship

School Social Work  
Child Welfare and Attendance

- Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential
2. The team recommends that University of California, Berkeley provide evidence to Commission staff about the actions in response to the above stipulation within one year of the date of this action, in the form a written report.
  3. The staff recommends that:
    - The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
    - University of California, Berkeley be permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation to the Committee on Accreditation.
    - University of California, Berkeley be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2004-5 academic year for a COA visit.

## **Background**

Berkeley is the original campus of the University of California, founded in 1855 as the College of California, and established at Berkeley in 1866. The Graduate School of Education, founded over 107 years ago, has been widely regarded for its research, teaching, and influence on the practice of education. It is the home of two national research centers, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, and the National Writing Project. The school is also the recipient of extensive external funding for various research and development efforts. The Graduate School of Education's mission is to provide leadership in advancing the theoretical base of education, tackling issues of fundamental importance, both inside and outside of school settings, analyzing the complex social settings of education, and promoting the improvement of educational practice. The outreach mission is to provide leadership and to promote the improvement of educational practice with the goal of achieving high standards of learning and development for all students.

Credential programs are offered in three separate arms of the university. The Graduate School of Education has five teaching credential programs enrolling approximately 135 students altogether. The Multiple Subjects Credential Program, Developmental Teacher Education (DTE), enrolls 40 students per year, in cohorts of 20, and combines the credential with a Master of Arts Degree. The Masters and Credential in Science or Mathematics Education (MACSME) offers Single Subject Credentials in science and mathematics, and is similarly structured, and enrolls similar numbers of students. The Single Subject CLAD Emphasis - English program is somewhat smaller, enrolling 12 - 16 students in each cohort, and also offers a credential and Masters degree. The Reading Specialist Credential, called the Advanced Reading and Language Leadership Program, is combined with a Masters degree in a two-year course of study that enrolls approximately 24 students per cohort. The School Psychology Program has about 28

students enrolled, and awards 4 - 6 credentials each year through its internship and regular programs.

University of California, Berkeley Extension houses two credential programs. A Multiple Subjects CLAD Emphasis credential is offered through California Urban Partnership Intern Program (CalPIP) in collaboration with Berkeley, Oakland and San Francisco school districts. Currently 49 interns are enrolled. The Designated Subjects Credentials, Adult and Vocational Education, enroll approximately 75 students in the part-time and full-time program options.

Two credentials, Social Work and Child Welfare and Attendance, are offered through the School of Social Welfare. The School of Social Welfare is one of the oldest social work schools in the country, and continues to be regarded nationally as an outstanding institution. Approximately 9 credentials are awarded annually in these programs.

### **Preparation for the Accreditation Visit**

The Commission staff consultant was assigned to the institution in Fall, 1997 and met formally with the Dean and members of the Teacher Education Committee in December, 1997. Agreements about team size, configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, and logistical and organizational arrangements were made at that time based on discussions with the dean and faculty representatives. A coordinator for the visit was identified in February, 1998 and subsequent telephone, e-mail, and regular mail communications were maintained by the staff consultant and institutional representative on an ongoing weekly basis. The Team Leader, Dr. Barbara Merino, was selected in August, 1998.

As preparations for the visit were being made, one particular credential program area (the Designated Subjects Credential offered by the University of California Extension) was inadvertently omitted from the planning. Only after all of the plans for the visit had been finalized (just one week before the visit) staff and institutional personnel realized that the Designated Subjects Credential programs should have been a part of the visit. Since it was too late to make the changes necessary to include the program, the decision was made to go on with the visit, as scheduled, and convene a Specialized Credential Program Team for the Designated Subjects Credential program as soon as it could be arranged in the Fall. Under those circumstances, the team prepared an interim report based upon its findings during the April 25-28 visit. However, the final results of the visit were delayed until the Specialized Credential Program Team conducted its visit on October 4-6, 1999. The entire team was brought back together in October and prepared the final accreditation team report and recommendation.

### **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 programs and for the institution 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 eight 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 eight consisting of a Team Leader, and seven 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*. The team was organized into three clusters: Common Standards, Basic Credentials, and Pupil Personnel Services Credentials.

A Specialized Credential Program Team was added for an October visit. It consisted to two members and was responsible for reviewing the Designated Subjects Credential programs.

### **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 institutional responses to the Common Standards and the Program Standards. The on-site phase of the review began on Sunday, April 25, 1999. The team arrived on Sunday afternoon and began its deliberations. The team meeting included a review of the accreditation procedures and organizational arrangements for the COA team members.

On Monday and Tuesday, April 26 and 27, 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 discussing findings 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.

The mid-visit report took place at 1:00 PM on Tuesday. The team raised questions and concerns about the Common Standards and various Program Standards going into 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 to make decisions about standards, 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 interim report. The team presented its interim report on credential programs to the faculty and administration at 2:00 p.m. Wednesday afternoon.

The presentation of the Common Standards report and the accreditation team recommendation was delayed until after the Specialized Credential Program Team visit and report. The Specialized Credential Program Team gathered information on October 4 and 5 and discussed findings about all Designated Subjects Program Standards. On Tuesday evening, October 5, the entire team reconvened to hear the results of the Specialized Credential Program Team about the Designated Subjects Programs. The team then made final decisions about each of the Common Standards and each of the Program Standards and prepared its final report on Wednesday, October 6.

### **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.
- 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

programs they were reviewing. After the report was drafted, the entire team met on Wednesday morning, April 28, for a final review of the interim report. The team prepared to present the program findings for later that day, with the understanding that the final report would not be concluded until after the Specialized Credential Program Team made its report in the Fall. On October 5, the team discussed the report of the Specialized Credential Program Team and made a tentative accreditation decision. On Wednesday, October 6, the team prepared its final report and made its accreditation recommendation.

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 with a Technical Stipulation.**" The recommendation for "Accreditation with a Technical Stipulation" was based on consensus of the team. The team felt that the stipulation would demonstrate the seriousness of its concerns related to Common Standards One and Four.

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

**Institution:** University of California, Berkeley

**Dates of Visit:** April 25 – 28, 1999 & October 6 - 8, 1999

**Accreditation Team  
Recommendation:** ACCREDITATION WITH A TECHNICAL STIPULATION

Following is the technical stipulation:

Within twelve months of this action, the institution is required to provide written evidence of continued efforts to improve cohesiveness of leadership and coordination across all credential programs, especially as related to Common Standards One and Four.

**Rationale:**

Based on the review of the self-study documents, interviews with administrators, faculty, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the institution, as well as additional supporting documents made available during the visit, the team unanimously recommends a finding of ACCREDITATION WITH A TECHNICAL STIPULATION. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about professional education at the University of California, Berkeley. This decision was based on the following:

1. Common Standards - The Common Standards were reviewed one by one and then voted upon by the entire team. Six were judged to have been fully met, and two were judged to have been met minimally. The two standards judged to have been met minimally were based on a lack of cohesiveness in unit management/coordination across credential programs housed in the three schools - Graduate School of Education, University of California, Berkeley Extension, and the School of Social Welfare, and an overall inconsistency in the implementation of planned program evaluation activities.
2. Program Standards - Findings on Program Standards were presented by individuals reviewing each credential program. Following each presentation, the team discussed each program area. The team determined that all program standards were met in all program areas, although one standard was less than fully met with quantitative concerns. Specifically, additional attention needs to be given to field placements in the single subject programs so that opportunities to work with English learners are consistently available.
3. Overall Recommendation - The decision to recommend ACCREDITATION WITH A TECHNICAL STIPULATION is based on the fact that overall, consistently high quality was evidenced within all the credential programs, and that a high degree of institutional attention to the programs, including a strong infrastructure for the

direction and coordination of each individual program, small cohort size, and joint staffing by professional education and research faculty results in an outstanding educational experience for candidates. However, the technical stipulation is based on the findings related to the Education Leadership and the Evaluation Common Standards. While there is some evidence of improved inter-unit communication and collaboration, further efforts in this area are necessary and will enhance the future development and growth of all credential programs.

**Team Leader:** **Barbara Merino**  
University of California, Davis

**Common Standards Cluster:**  
**Carol Bartell**  
California Lutheran University  
**David Baker**  
Azusa Unified School District

**Basic Credentials Cluster:**  
**Pamela Bailis**  
University of California, Los Angeles  
**Andrea Guillaume**  
California State University, Fullerton  
**Kristi Kraemer**  
Sacramento County Office of Education

**Pupil Personnel Services Cluster**  
**Simon Dominguez**  
San Jose State University  
**Marcia Weill**  
Folsom-Cordova Unified School District

**Designated Subjects Cluster**  
**Collette Fleming**  
Grossmont Union High School District  
**Maida Hastings**  
University of California, Los Angeles Extension

**DATA SOURCES**

	<b>INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED</b>		<b>DOCUMENTS REVIEWED</b>
98	Program Faculty	X	Catalog
41	Institution Administration	X	Program Document
170	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
31	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
17	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbook
47	Supervising Practitioners		Follow-up Survey Results
6	Advisors	X	Needs Analysis Results
20	School Administrators	X	Information Booklet
5	Credential Analyst	X	Field Experience Notebook
17	Advisory Committee	X	Research Reports
		X	Faculty Vitae
		X	Student Portfolios & Logs
		X	Web Site

## Common Standards

### Standard 1 - Education Leadership

### Standard Met Minimally Qualitative Concerns

There is generally strong leadership in each school (Graduate School of Education, the School of Social Welfare, and UC Berkeley Extension) and in each program area within the schools. The Teacher Education Committee, designed to foster cohesiveness and to define common goals for teacher education within the Graduate School of Education, brings together only some of the credential programs of the institution.

Unit management/coordination, however, is uneven across credential programs. The Graduate School of Education, as the unit responsible for all credential programs, has not assumed sufficient oversight to develop a unified sense of teamwork among the leadership of all credential programs. The Teacher Education Committee, for example, does not represent or include the CalPIP Program (offered through Extension). Inter-unit communication on specific aspects of all credential program offerings, including enrollments, faculty, course sequence and content, and evaluation results, is insufficient and sometimes results in inconsistent attention to individual program quality. These conditions impact the overall administration and coordination of programs of the institution as a whole.

### Strengths

The university has made a significant commitment to supporting an expanded role of the university in outreach to k-12 schools as evidenced in the "Berkeley Pledge." A clear mission and vision statement guides overall program planning and development.

Extension courses and the qualifications of Extension faculty are subject to review by the Graduate School of Education. This is intended to assure quality and consistency of teacher education programs offered at the university.

Teacher education is strongly supported by the Deans and the Provost.

### Concerns

The role and responsibilities of the Teacher Education Committee and Teacher Education Director are not clearly defined in relation to program monitoring and program improvement across all credential programs.

Evidence of a fully articulated understanding of, and agreements on, the relationship of the Director of Teacher Education to the credential program directors, and the Teacher Education Committee was not found.

**Standard 2 - Resources****Standard Met**

Personnel resources are allocated in ways that allow for effective operation of each credential program. Credential programs have both directors and coordinators, assuring high support for both courses and field-based experiences.

**Strengths**

In all of the credential programs a strong resource is the faculty who teach, research, and are actively engaged in schools. Grants support and enhance individual credential programs and strengthen connections with schools.

The Dean of the Graduate School of Education has taken an active role in securing financial support for teacher education students.

**Concerns**

Some concerns were raised about the access to technology, since the hours the lab is open do not extend into the evening. Some students had limited opportunities to practice applying technology in instructional settings.

Additional growth will be difficult without additional resources, including faculty and space.

**Standard 3 - Faculty****Standard Met**

Both full and part-time faculty are extremely well-qualified and deeply committed to professional preparation of educators. Supervisors are selected for their classroom knowledge and expertise and their ability to effectively guide developing educators. All faculty and supervisors are evaluated on a regular basis and adjust their practice based on those evaluations.

**Strengths**

World renowned faculty provide intellectual leadership, teach in the credential programs, and conduct research in K-12 schools. Doctoral level graduate students who are knowledgeable about the program help to guide the development of credential students in their field settings. There is an ongoing effort to recruit and retain a diverse faculty. Within the extension programs, students noted a high calibre of instruction.

**Concerns**

There are no full time faculty in the extension programs, and there has been significant turnover in leadership in several credential programs. This condition has negatively impacted program-level planning and evaluation. Students in some programs express a desire for more exposure and access to the "regular" faculty and the many outstanding guest lecturers and visitors who come to campus.

Faculty development in CLAD strategies has been limited.

**Standard 4 - Evaluation****Standard Met Minimally  
Qualitative Concerns**

Overall, systematic program evaluation is in place. All programs engage in some form of program evaluation, although their approaches are somewhat idiosyncratic and not always consistently applied. In some instances, low response rates have impacted the ability to achieve good feedback that can be useful for program development and improvement. There is minimal evidence that evaluation data are being used to make substantive improvements across all credential programs.

The internship program in CalPiP, and the Vocational Education and Adult Education programs are not yet systematically collecting evaluation data from participating districts or graduates.

### **Strengths**

An intensive self-study has helped to articulate and focus the commitment to teacher education in the Graduate School of Education.

Courses are all evaluated on a regular schedule and there is evidence that faculty use evaluation findings to improve their own courses.

An active research agenda on teacher development informs the design and evaluation of the programs. Dissemination of findings in Developmental Teacher Education has helped to inform the practice of teacher educators at other institutions.

### **Concerns**

The mechanisms to ensure regular, systematic and summative evaluation procedures were not evident across all programs.

## **Standard 5 - Admissions**

### **Standard Met**

The institution consistently attracts a large pool of well-qualified, diverse candidates. Multiple measures are employed in making selection decisions and a variety of processes are used to assess personal characteristics. Each candidate admitted to the advanced credential programs meets institutional standards for graduate study.

### **Strengths**

Commitment to the teaching profession and, in particular, to urban education are examined during the admission process.

### **Concerns**

None noted

## **Standard 6 - Advice and Assistance**

### **Standard Met**

Candidate advisement is generally strong, and students are advised about their academic and professional development. Interviews with students indicate strong support throughout their programs at the institutional and program levels.

### **Strengths**

The quality of assistance from Student Affairs and the Credential Analyst Offices was consistently noted by students as a strength. Practitioners contribute in a variety of ways to advise and assist in program decisions,

Students experiencing difficulty are counseled appropriately, given help or discontinued from the program as appropriate.

**Concerns**

Some students had difficulty gaining advisement from faculty.

Some program handbooks are dated.

Some students in the Designated Subjects program had difficulty ascertaining credential requirements.

**Standard 7 - School Collaboration**

**Standard Met**

Strong collaborations with schools foster a well-planned, thorough sequence of clinical experiences for students. These connections also foster strong field-based research opportunities for faculty and students.

**Strengths**

Early field experiences in all programs help to ground students in the reality of urban school settings. These field experiences begin in the undergraduate minor.

The number and variety of field experiences offer multiple opportunities to students.

**Concerns**

The processes for school collaboration are under development for the nascent Designated Subjects program, and will need continued support.

**Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors**

**Standard Met**

Each program effectively selects, orients, and trains district-based field supervisors. Their performance is evaluated on a regular basis.

**Strengths**

Handbooks and guidelines for supervisors help to inform school-based supervisors.

**Concerns**

Not all district supervisors were reported as being well versed in strategies for supporting English Language Learners.

Master teachers/coaches express a need for more recognition and a closer affiliation with the university.

**Multiple Subjects Credentials**  
**Basic - Developmental Teacher Education (DTE)**  
**CLAD Internship - California Urban Partnership (CALPIP)**

**Findings on Standards**

All program standards for the Multiple Subject and Multiple Subject CLAD Intern Programs are fully met. The team recommends that DTE continue as a basic (not CLAD) program.

**Strengths**

This section of the report discusses program strengths found in the CALPIP and DTE programs. Employers and cooperating teachers remark uniformly on the well-developed professional perspectives of program candidates and graduates. Further, candidates' orientation to equity in both CALPIP and DTE is a notable strength. Candidates in both programs have course and field experiences that support equitable practices.

Other strengths for individual programs follow.

CALPIP

1. The team applauds the fact that the concept and design of CALPIP originated through field practitioners' concerns and ideas and was developed in collaboration with GSE faculty.
2. The program serves a vital need in the State of California by preparing greater numbers of teachers, and specifically by preparing teachers with thorough preparation for the urban environment. A number of candidates note that, without CALPIP, they would not have had access to the teaching profession.
3. The integration of theory and practice is directly related to the urban experience. Candidates appreciate the immediate application of course concepts in their own classrooms.
4. Candidates report feeling well supported by peers, site coaches, CALPIP program administrators, and university supervisors.

Developmental Teacher Education

1. Candidates, graduates, employers, and supervising teachers value the developmental approach of the program. The rationale and approach are reflected both in the selection and sequence of experiences for candidates as learners and in the theoretical approach and content mastered by the candidates for teaching elementary students.
2. Multiple site placements are prized for the opportunity they afford candidates to work with children of different ages and experiences, in varied settings, and with many models of effective teaching.

3. Candidates, graduates, and employers note that the program affords regular opportunities to draw connections between theory and practice. Such links help develop clear habits of mind that support teaching as inquiry. There is overwhelming evidence that DTE graduates are reflective, thoughtful practitioners.

### **Concerns**

1. Early CALPIP candidates' concerns about program relevance and cohesiveness appear to have been addressed for later cohorts.
2. Although the DTE program offers thorough preparation for Multiple Subjects candidates, it does not yet meet the CLAD specifications for approval as a CLAD emphasis credential program. There is a good theoretical framework on language acquisition, structure of the language, and program models, but there is insufficient evidence of attention to methods and techniques within different areas of the curriculum as they apply to English language learners. For example, when do candidates have the opportunity to conduct language assessments for English language learners and discuss those assessments and appropriate classroom methodologies? The Professional Comments section of this report gives suggestions for moving toward approval as a CLAD emphasis program.
3. In DTE, attention to curriculum embedded use of technology is limited and students experiences are widely varying. It is not clear that all students become familiar with the use of curriculum embedded technology through the program itself. Resources are limited as is access to the computer lab.

## **Single Subject Credentials**

### **Basic - MA and Credential in Science and Mathematics (MACSME) CLAD Emphasis - English**

#### **Findings on Standards**

The team finds all standards are fully met except Standard 19, which is Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns.

Standard 19: Based on interviews and documentation, the team finds that both programs do not consistently give specific attention to addressing the needs of English language learners. In the CLAD Emphasis - English program some field placements with linguistically diverse populations are not consistently available. In MASCME, both course content and fieldwork placements do not consistently provide candidates with learning opportunities about and with culturally and linguistically diverse students.

The team recommends that MACSME continue as a basic (not CLAD Emphasis) program.

## **Strengths**

This section of the report notes strengths, first in joint strengths, and then by programs: English CLAD (ECP) and MACSME.

### CLAD Emphasis and MASCME

1. Both MACSME and the CLAD Emphasis include multiple placements in culturally diverse settings, along with course experiences, that prepare candidates to work with a culturally diverse groups of students.
2. In both programs, the Urban Education course is consistently viewed as highly influential in candidates' shifting perspectives and exploring issues of human equity.
3. Candidates, graduates, and employers universally remark on candidates' ability and eagerness to design effective instruction and to use multiple resources to enhance their instruction.

### MACSME

1. The design of the MACSME program includes a strong link between theory and practice, with research groups of teachers and student researchers at all levels working together. The team applauds the efforts of this experimental program with carefully conducted research in that it informs the educational community about effective practices.
2. MACSME has a particular strength in fostering candidates' abilities to teach high-interest, engaging lessons focused on problem solving and active learning.

### CLAD Emphasis - English

1. The CLAD Emphasis - English program has strong components that emphasize the integration of practice and theory and cluster groups, and links to the Bay Area Writing Project.
2. The CLAD Emphasis - English program places students in clusters with exemplary teachers of English Language Arts who are frequently engaged in teacher research about their practice.
3. Students universally value the core faculty of the program as talented instructors with close links to the classroom.

## **Concerns**

1. In both the CLAD Emphasis - English and MACSME, candidates report needing additional help in addressing the needs of English language learners. Course work needs to address issues such as assessment for language proficiency as well as greater emphasis on methodologies such as ELD and SDAIE. Field placements need to be carefully selected in order to provide candidates with effective models of ESL/ELD/SDAIE instruction.
2. Although the MACSME program offers thorough preparation for Single Subject candidates, it does not yet meet the CLAD specifications for approval as a CLAD

emphasis credential program. The Professional Comments section of this report gives suggestions for moving toward approval as a CLAD emphasis program.

3. The reading course was perceived by some candidates and faculty as unbalanced. A stronger emphasis on reading methodologies for content area reading, especially for English language learners, as opposed to methodologies for emergent readers, is needed in their view.
4. CLAD Emphasis - English program faculty need to consider how feedback (evaluations) from the cooperating teachers becomes systematically integrated into determination of candidate competence. Further, care should be taken to systematically document CLAD placements, including teacher certification and use of effective methodologies for English language learners.
5. MACSME graduates report need for classroom management in the field placements, particularly in setting up classrooms for the first days of school. Many current students reported a need for focused mentoring on the practical uses of technology in secondary classrooms (Eg. web site design).

## **Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential**

### **Findings on Standards**

The ARLLP program clearly meets all of the prescribed standards. Interviews with students, graduates, employers, faculty, advisory committee members, and outreach personnel revealed consistent agreement that ARLLP students possessed deep understanding of not only assessment and instructional practice, but of the social, cultural, and developmental factors which affect student performance in reading. A review of the documents, including course syllabi and student work, reveals a rigorous and thoughtful academic program designed to provide an excellent basis of theory, research, and application.

### **Strengths**

Standards 4, 12, & 17: The thoughtful design and sequence of academic coursework and field experiences ensure that ARLLP students possess a profound understanding of reading assessment and instruction based based on theory, research, and the best practices of the field. Additionally, the development of leadership skills is exemplary, systematically embedding students' experiences in training and supervising tutors and volunteers, providing inservice for classroom teachers, and designing, providing, and evaluating programs throughout the first and second years.

Standard 7: ARLLP's outreach efforts are to be especially commended for providing a wide range of experiences and opportunities for credential students, as well as valuable services to students, schools, and communities. These efforts also result in a modicum of financial support for ARLLP students, increasing access to this program for students from a wide range of economic backgrounds.

**Concerns**  
None noted.

## **Pupil Personnel Services Credential**

### **School Psychology**

### **School Psychology Internship**

#### **Findings on Standards**

The School Psychology Credential Program was evaluated in response to the Generic Pupil Personnel Services Standards as well as the School Psychology Specialization Standards of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. On the basis of document review and interviews with faculty, field supervisors, employers, advisory committee members, recent graduates and currently enrolled students, the Team finds that all standards have been met.

#### **Strengths**

The preparation of current students and graduates of the School Psychology Program was highly rated by field supervisors and employers. Students were described as thoughtful, self-directed, mature and highly skilled. Graduates appeared to be especially well-grounded in healthy child development, theory-based consultation incorporating preventive intervention strategies, and abilities in applying research to improve educational opportunities for students. They recognized the importance of understanding early literacy and math programs in order to provide useful, practical assistance in classrooms.

Students grow in competence and confidence through early field work exposure as well as a two year internship, giving them time to reflect and integrate theory, research and practice. Field work supervisors noted that interns were adept not only in assessment and therapeutic skills but also valuable team members with skills in collaboration and effective communication with parents and other educators. Field supervisors appeared well-qualified and dedicated to helping students develop a wide range of skills. This small (approximately 28 students) program was coordinated effectively. Students were supported in their growth toward becoming responsible leaders in the field of school psychology.

The structure of the program and faculty were commendable in many areas. Students are afforded flexibility in “customizing” their programs, and they stated that faculty members were available to them and interested in their progress. Faculty members were praised for their practical guidance, accessibility and providing excellent role models for consultation and supervision. Yearly course evaluations resulted in changes to improve and update syllabi.

#### **Concerns**

The Team found that, while field supervisors and interns gave positive feedback about the high quality of the internship experiences and there was evidence of students meeting competencies at the end of their assignments, specific written criteria, monitored throughout the internship year, were not clearly articulated.

The Team saw evidence of previous meaningful changes made to the Program based on previous program evaluation data; however, the most recent program evaluation data, collected in Fall 1998, was not yet available.

**Pupil Personnel Services Credential**  
**School Social Work**  
**Child Welfare and Attendance**

**Findings on Standards**

The team finds that all standards are met.

The PPS/SSW program prepares School Social Workers quite well for practice in California public schools. The curriculum offers classes that are current and pertinent for social work practice with children and families in various settings. The PPS/SSW program is becoming re-established within the School of Social Welfare which is reflective of recent personal changes. The Director of Field Education has been appointed Coordinator of the PPS/SSW program and has the charge from the Dean to strengthen and further develop the program. A steering committee of faculty and students and an Advisory Committee of administrators, practitioners and alumni have been meeting to provide direction for the program. It is evident that the commitment to strengthen the program has been embraced by the Dean and the Faculty & Student Steering Committee. Advisory Committee members express enthusiasm about the renewed emphasis to strengthen the program and express various strategies to promote the program and its graduates in the community.

**Strengths:**

The established social work program at U.C. Berkeley produces sound, well educated social work professionals. Students and alumni express satisfaction with the quality of instruction and of the skills they attained in various exceptional field placements. Field instructors are experienced professionals, committed to social work education, and knowledgeable about the challenges of social work practice in school settings. Research instruction at the Masters level included computer technology with SPSS required of all students. The program computer center offers a variety of instructional modes, software, and technical assistance. The quality of research projects of the PPS/SSW students is noteworthy and outstanding research awards have been won by PPS/SSW students in the social work program in the past two years.

**Concerns:**

An over-all program assessment is underway by the faculty (steering committee) and by the Advisory Committee which needs to be completed to provide direction in the re-building of the program.

Other areas of concern include: recruitment of students into the PPS/SSW program must involve a more concerted effort, given the increase of ethnic minority students in California public schools, recruitment of ethnic minority, bi-lingual students for school social work is a critical manpower need (ethnic minority enrollment in the over-all MSW program is 35-40%); advisement of students at point of admissions into the program is well done, but a clear PPS/SSW program adviser is not clearly identified when students have questions during the academic year.

In addition, the field evaluation forms should be redesigned to provide clearer data on the required number of hours at two different educational levels, the minimum number of hours for the Child Welfare and Attendance authorization, or that a student did serve the minimum number of students from backgrounds different from their own. These requirements are mentioned in the evaluation narrative, but the number of hours, as required, is not separately tracked.

## **Designated Subjects**

### **Adult Education**

### **Vocational Education**

#### **Findings on Standards**

The Designated Subjects Adult Education and Designated Subjects Vocational Education Teaching Credential Programs meet all prescribed standards.

The DSAE and DSVE Credential Programs at the University of California Berkeley Extension are new credential programs, with approval granted by the CTC after the new standards were adopted in 1995. The former programs offered at UC Berkeley and conducted under the aegis of UCLA Extension concluded with the approval and implementation of the new programs and reflect the two-level structure of teacher preparation.

#### **Strengths**

The Chair of the Department of Education, Extension and the Program Coordinator have been recently hired. This new leadership is taking a proactive approach toward collaboration and program growth. In a short period of time, they have created a new vision for the program involving partnerships with schools and businesses which will provide significant opportunities for students, the university and the community at large. Also, there are plans to restructure the system of advisement incorporating additional opportunities for students to receive information at the earliest stage of their preparation program.

A review of the documents and interviews with students, instructors and advisory committee members reveal an extensive and rigorous preparation program. Students are moved through competencies from basic to advanced levels in a cohesive and meaningful fashion.

The quality of instruction was found to be exemplary. Student reports indicated outstanding modeling of appropriate strategies and delivery of relevant evaluation procedures to determine student competence. Evaluation of teacher effectiveness is timely with immediate feedback provided for professional growth.

Courses are provided at various locations throughout the service area. The prevalent weekend format meets the needs of the continuing education student.

#### **Concerns**

A few interviewees expressed some concern about overlap and repetition in the curriculum as they moved through the courses.

Two of the CTC approved Level One courses are currently being offered in an on-line format through the auspices of The Center for Media and Independent Learning. The program responsibility for the Designated Subjects Credentials lies with the Department of Education Extension, yet there appears to be minimal collaboration between CMIL and Education Extension regarding student demographics and progress.

## Professional Comments

### Common Standards

Inclusion of CalPiP, the internship program housed in Berkeley Extension, on the Teacher Education Committee may help to strengthen collaboration and coordination across Teacher Education Programs. All teacher education programs share commitments to and involvement in urban schools that could foster from a shared vision of educator preparation.

The Review Team found strong blending of research and practice supported by significant field experience in all programs, lending to a strong, dynamic model for educator preparation.

In order to foster greater cohesiveness in management, the role and function of Teacher Education Director needs to be clarified and supported by all administrative units.

Students consistently noted the sincere dedication and commitment demonstrated by the credential program coordinators.

The institution's commitment to finding effective ways to provide alternative routes (internships) to earning a credential should be commended. This experiment should be an opportunity for research to inform the education community about this growing option in teacher preparation.

Credential candidates are well-prepared to join the education community as contributing professionals. It is suggested that leadership consider expanding the size of credential programs to better meet the critical shortage of qualified educators.

In some programs, faculty development which addresses the needs of linguistically diverse students should be implemented.

Leadership needs to be given to address the use of systematic, summative evaluations across all programs.

### Multiple Subject Credentials

DTE master teachers are committed to the profession of teacher education. Those interviewed expressed novel ideas for greater inclusion in the community of teacher educators. For instance, some requested access to ongoing GSE faculty research, or small stipends to be spent on classroom materials. DTE faculty may wish to further explore ideas such as these with master teachers.

### Single Subject Credentials

Although focused attention is given to establishing a broad framework for understanding how language and culture impact student learning and models of exemplary practice are described and demonstrated, based on the evidence of CLAD sections of the MACSME program document and the course syllabi, there is still a need to address methods of teaching within a well articulated scope and sequence of how student teachers can design and implement instruction for English language learners.

For example, adaptation of assessment and instructional strategies to provide access to English language learners, instructional delivery for English language development and content instruction (ELD, SDAIE.) These elements should be addressed not only at the level of awareness in the coursework but also applied and practiced with focused feedback. Documents which may help to address these issues include the Content Outline for the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations with a focus on Test 2.

### **Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credentials**

While most field supervisors have long been associated with the ARLLP program, some expressed concern over the exact expectations and requirements of their role as field supervisors. The team recommends that a handbook or other form of consistent communication be developed to clarify this issue.

While ARLLP students are clearly confident and competent in their work with students in elementary self-contained school settings, many express reluctance about working in the departmentalized structure of secondary schools. Clearly, the needs at the secondary are profound as students struggle to comprehend academic text and language. The team recommends that the ARLLP program explore increased support for students' development of models for extending support to struggling secondary readers.

ARLLP students, like all professional educators, must have a deep understanding of how technology can assist student learning. While some efforts have been made to explore on-line environments for supporting literacy learning, access to computers and to software is severely limited. The team recommends that the ARLLP program explore ways in which students can be given adequate access to these tools to ensure effective evaluation and integration of existing software and on-line resources as well as resources that allow them design effective literacy environments.

### **Designated Subjects Credentials**

In an effort to strengthen the relationship among all teacher education programs, the Chair of the Department of Education at Extension should be regularly involved in collaborative efforts to promote the mission of the UCB.

There is great potential for the growth of the Designated Subjects Programs given the vision of the current leadership. It is important that sufficient resources, e.g. staff, technology, be available to the Designated Subjects Program in order to benefit UCB Extension's ability to provide outreach to the entire Bay Area community.

As the Designated Subjects Credentials Programs continue to grow, the focus on increased marketing strategies including linkages with adult education professional associations may provide new audiences for student recruitment. Continued emphasis on partnerships with adult schools and businesses as well as continued collaboration with the Development Officer of UCB Extension should provide new sources of revenue and opportunities for training.

