

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

Professional Services Division

June 12, 2001

Overview of this Report

This report provides background information about University of California, Davis and its credential programs, information about the COA visit that took place on May 6 - 9, 2001, and the team report and 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 Reports, review of supporting documentation, and interviews with representative constituencies. Margaret Olebe, Administrator for Policy and Research, and Team Leader, Jon Snyder, will present the report. Representing University of California, Davis will be Jonathan Sandoval, Interim Director, Division of Education and Barbara Merino, Director of Teacher 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, Davis and all its credential programs:

ACCREDITATION

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

- Multiple Subjects Credentials
 - Multiple Subject Internship
 - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
 - Reading Certificate
 - Single Subject Credential
 - Single Subject Internship
 - Single Subject CLAD Emphasis
2. The staff recommends that:
 - The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.

- University of California, Davis to be permitted to propose new credential programs for initial accreditation to the Committee on Accreditation.
- University of California, Davis be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2006-2007 academic year for a COA visit.

Background

University of California, Davis is one of nine campuses of the University of California, which began as a land grant college in 1868. The Davis campus was started in 1908 as University Farm, where students from Berkeley learned about agricultural methods and technology. Today UCD has over 19,000 undergraduate and 5,100 graduate and professional students who come from all 50 states and 111 foreign countries.

The mission of University of California, Davis is to actively pursue its commitment to teaching and learning as a land grant institution, and as an institution entrusted with serving the needs of California and society. This mission is based on the Principles of Community adopted in 1990, which include:

We affirm the dignity in all of us, and we strive to maintain a climate of justice marked by respect for each other.

We affirm the right of freedom of expression within our community and also affirm our commitment to the highest standards of civility and decency towards all.

We confront and reject all manifestations of discrimination, including those based on race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation, religious or political beliefs, status within or outside of the University, or any of the other differences among people which have been excuses for misunderstanding, dissension or hatred.

We recognize that each of us has an obligation to the community of which we have chosen to be a part. We will strive to build a true community of spirit and purpose based on mutual understanding and respect.

The mission of the Division of Education at University of California, Davis is to exercise its tripartite professional responsibilities for research, teaching and public service through a distinctive, innovative array of programs and practices. The Division functions as an Academic Unit, a Professional School, and as a Force for Institutional Innovation. Within the Division the Teacher Education Programs have articulated their own vision. This vision is based on a commitment to prepare teachers for professional practice, challenge teacher educators to continuously examine and research their practice, and most importantly to provide innovative leadership for the multicultural context of schools. The teacher education programs are committed to preparing teachers with the professional knowledge and skills necessary to address the needs of the growing number of ethnically and linguistically diverse students in California's schools. They regard the preparation of teachers as a process designed to provide prospective teachers with the tools, experiences and theoretical perspectives necessary

to function as effective practitioners in culturally and linguistically diverse settings. Currently there are approximately 150 students enrolled in teacher education credential programs. This includes students enrolled in the joint UCD – CSU Sacramento Collaborative Multiple Subjects Program.

COA Accreditation Visit

The University of California, Davis accreditation team was composed of six members divided into three clusters: a Common Standards cluster consisting of two members, a Basic Credential Cluster consisting of three members that looked at all teaching credential programs, and a Specialist Credential Cluster of one member that looked at the Reading Certificate.

The assigned staff consultant to University of California, Davis, Ellen Venturino, was appointed in November of 1999 to facilitate the visit. A pre-visit was conducted with Interim Division Director Sandoval, Teacher Education Director Merino, program coordinators, and selected faculty.

Over the course of the next year, staff worked with faculty and administration regarding the decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, document development, and logistical and organizational arrangements for the visit. The COA team leader, Dr. Jon Snyder, was named in September 2000. The state accreditation team members were named in February 2001 and that information was transmitted to the Director at University of California, Davis.

In April 2001 the original consultant assigned to the visit resigned from the staff and Margaret Olebe was assigned to facilitate the visit.

The Accreditation Visit

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Sunday, May 6, 2001. The Team Leader and the state accreditation team arrived for its organizational meetings on Sunday afternoon. Team members agreed on who would focus on individual programs with the assigned credential areas. The institution provided a presentation and reception for the team on campus Sunday evening to orient them to the institution, its mission and goals.

On Monday and Tuesday, May 7 & 8, 2001, the team conducted interviews with all major stakeholder groups, reviewed documents from the exhibits room, and visited field sites used by the various credential programs. The team lunched together each day on campus and met informally throughout the day. On Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday evening, the team members dined together at the hotel and used the time to discuss findings and observations. Following dinner Monday evening, the team held a group meeting to discuss the Program and Common Standards, and to discuss emerging themes and concerns. Throughout the visit, the team shared information across programs as appropriate. The Team Leader served as over-all coordinator for

the team and checked with team members regularly to ensure that standards for every credential program were being reviewed.

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 arrived at a specific finding of "Standard Met" or "Standard Not Met," and the team wrote specific comments about each standard. The team had the option of deciding that a Common Standard could be "Met Minimally" with either "Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns."

For each credential area, the team prepared a narrative report that summarized all standards judged as "Met." The bulk of the prepared narrative focused on those standards judged as "Met Minimally" and any judged as "Not Met." In these cases, the team wrote explanations that provided the evidentiary basis for its decisions. At the very end of the team report, clusters were offered the opportunity to make "Professional Comments" to the institution. These comments are not part of the formal recommendation of the team report and represent only the opinions of the team members. They are intended to be suggestions or items for institutional consideration.

Accreditation Decision Making Activity

A collaborative decision-making activity designed to: 1) provide the framework to write the narrative for the Common Standards and narrative for each credential program area, 2) achieve team ownership of the contents of the full report, and 3) assist teams in coming to a single accreditation decision was used throughout.

Large chart paper was posted on the walls of the conference room at the hotel each evening. As a group the team discussed findings for each program led by the team member assigned as lead for the program. For each program and Common Standard, team members reviewed evidence collected and evidence still needed to come to a decision on Monday evening, and during the lunch meetings each day. This process was used to focus subsequent activities. On Tuesday evening, comments were organized in the following categories:

Findings - A summary of all standards less than fully met including a rationale for each decision and data used to reach the decision. Cluster members were asked to review the decision guidelines in the Accreditation Handbook during the activity.

Strengths - Clusters may note area(s) of commendation specific to a program.

Concerns - Clusters may note area(s) of weakness specific to a program.

Professional Comments - Recommendations or observations for consideration that are not binding on the institution.

Due to the small team size the whole team engaged in discussions of all credential programs.

Accreditation Decision Process

After the team thoroughly reviewed all the findings on the Common Standards and the various credential programs, the accreditation team recommendation options outlined in the Accreditation Handbook were reviewed along with the operational implications of each.

The activity engaged the entire group as suggestions were made and the team moved toward a unit accreditation decision. This activity was concluded on Wednesday morning. After considerable discussion, the team decided on "Accreditation.". The information on the charts was then used to develop the rationale for the decision.

The staff consultant compiled the cluster reports into one document, and the team report was shared with the Directors on Wednesday at 1:00 PM, while copies were being made for the team and for faculty and staff who would attend the presentation of the team report. The report was presented to the assembled faculty, staff, and administration at a Wednesday afternoon meeting by the state accreditation team leader, Dr. Jon Snyder and the team members.

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

Institution: University of California, Davis

Dates of Visit: May 6-9, 2001

**Accreditation Team
Recommendation:** ACCREDITATION

Rationale:

The overall quality of programs at University of California, Davis (UCD) is high in the judgment of the team based on its findings. The findings were identified through interviews with candidates, graduates, ladder and clinical faculty, university administrators and staff, university supervisors, university field supervisors, coordinators, cooperating teachers, school administrators and employers; program documents; advisement materials; university catalog, and other documents.

The team reached a consensus decision to recommend Accreditation. It found that seven Common Standards were fully Met, and one Common Standard was Minimally Met with Qualitative Concerns.

Findings about program standards were discussed regarding each program area and determined that all program standards were met in all program areas; however some were not fully met in relation to the UCD/CSUS Collaborative Program. The team discussed in detail each program standard that was less than fully met. In the UCD/CSUS Collaborative Program, Standards 4a and 10 were Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns. Standards 6 and 9 were Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns. While there are some other areas of concern noted in regard to Common and Program Standards, on balance, these are mitigated by the overall high quality of the institution, and compensating strengths within these credential programs when all sources of evidence are considered.

Team Leader: Jon Snyder
University of California, Santa Barbara

Common Standards: Jon Snyder
University of California, Santa Barbara

Beverly Young
The California State University Chancellor's Office

Basic Credentials Clara Chapala
California Department of Education

Cheryl Getz
University of San Diego

Robert O'Conner
ABC Unified School District, Retired

Specialist Credentials Carol Adams
Lompoc Unified School District

DATA SOURCES

	INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED
39	Program Faculty	X	Catalog
10	Institution Administration	X	Program Documents
62	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
30	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
7	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbooks
19	Supervising Practitioners	X	Follow-up Survey Results
5	Advisor	X	Budgets
9	School Administrators	X	Information Booklets
3	Credential Analyst	X	Field Experience Notebook
9	Advisory Committee	X	Candidate Portfolios
2	Other Staff	X	Faculty Vitae
X	Web Site	X	Faculty Publications
195 TOTAL			

Common Standards

Standard 1 - Education Leadership

Standard Met

UCD programs in educator preparation currently enjoy strong support from central campus administration. The Division of Education has not always received this level of support from the campus. Several factors within the Division have supported this change in institutional support: (a) the active commitment to and involvement of ladder faculty in professional education; (b) a division culture that reflects respect and understanding of the nature and value of the work of professional education; and (c) the ability of key division faculty and administration to represent the needs of the division to institutional decision-makers. that is hospitable to the work of preparing professional educators. Within the Division, organizational support for teacher education programs is evidenced by highly qualified program directors and coordinators for credential program.

The conceptual framework for teacher preparation programs is consistent across all programs, eloquently stated, based within a progressive values base, and continues to evolve within a research-based environment.

Responsibility and authority for the programs are distributed among a strong set of faculty who share the conceptual frame of the program and who collaborate well. As the need for changes become visible through the research and evaluation the program routinely conducts, the institution makes changes promptly.

Strengths

The team believes the transition from a Division to a School of Education this Spring is an example of the support of institutional leadership that will further enhance the caliber of their programs and the quality of their graduates. Both the more established and less idiosyncratic role of professional education on the campus as well as the generous addition of faculty will play a role in this enhancement. Interviews for a Dean of Education were underway during the visit.

The division's commitment to make certain the significant influx of new FTE have the will and the skill to work within the integration of ladder and clinical faculty within the school provide an opportunity to provide a model for the melding the strengths of academic research institutions with the strengths of quality professional schools.

Concerns

The design of the UCD/CSUS program makes it difficult for the program to fully meet all standards.

Standard 2 - Resources**Standard Met**

All programs receive adequate resources. Adjustments have been made by University Extension to provide additional credential analyst assistance to accommodate the addition of the Reading Certificate Program.

Strengths

In recent years the campus has significantly increased resources available to teacher education programs. These increases include the personnel and fiscal support necessary to transition to a full School of Education.

Concerns

None noted.

Standard 3 - Faculty**Standard Met**

The division's Academic Senate and Clinical faculty have the academic preparation and experiential background appropriate to meet the professional education needs of the division's candidates. The hiring practices reflect careful attention to selecting personnel who share the conceptual and value frame of the program's conceptual framework. Faculty are knowledgeable about and committed to cultural, ethnic, language and gender diversity. The division provides many opportunities for faculty at all levels to develop professionally. Course faculty evaluations are conducted on a systematic basis and are used to improve instruction, course materials, scholarship, and service.

Strengths

All constituency groups reported that the clinical faculty were exceptional and a key element leading to the caliber of the programs.

The high level of collaboration and communication among and between the ladder and clinical faculty suggests the division has been able to surmount the inherent status differences among those groups in research institutions.

The program's use of research as well as faculty portfolios are creative and effective mechanisms of faculty development.

The team views the influx of new FTE as an opportunity to enhance further the ethnic diversity of the faculty.

Concerns

The team found evidence that some programs were less consistent than others in their evaluation of supervisory personnel.

Standard 4 - Evaluation

Standard Met

There is evidence of substantial change in the UCD/CSUS Collaborative Program as well as the regular UCD programs over the last few years, in response to both formal and informal feedback from K-12 practitioners as well as from candidates and graduates.

Strengths

The research and evaluation the program does on its students and the program is thorough and sound methodologically. Evaluation studies based on this Standard have been ongoing and thorough. Extensive research reports on teacher education programs were strong evidence of this work. Perhaps more impressively, there was compelling evidence that program faculty use the data collected and the analysis done to enhance the quality of the program their students experience.

Concerns

Although changes have been made, there was only limited evidence available about the formal involvement of K-12 and community members program design and development. In particular, the UCD/CSUS Advisory Committee has only institutional representation and no other participation.

Standard 5 - Admissions

Standard Met

Admission criteria and procedures for all programs are clearly described and available to students. Students seeking entrance into UCD programs can readily get admission information from program faculty or from credential advisory staff. Admission into CSOE programs requires that students meet both university and state entry criteria.

In order to gain admission, all students must meet clearly specified criteria for post baccalaureate study, including appropriate degree, minimum GPA, subject and writing proficiency, basic skills, personal characteristics and prior experience. Interviews with program faculty and admissions office staff made it clear that admissions criteria were consistently and accurately applied and used multiple sources of evidence in coming to an admissions decision.

Interviews with current students and school personnel at sites where UCD students are serving consistently affirmed the personal, intellectual, and professional qualities that these students bring to the program. Students admitted to the BCLAD program are required to pass a Spanish language proficiency exam.

Strengths

None noted.

Concerns

None noted.

Standard 6 - Advice and Assistance**Standard Met**

Interviews of current students as well as graduates across the programs reveal the existence of strong and supportive advisement programs. When problems arose in courses or in school placements, these were addressed quickly and effectively in most credential programs, especially in more recent years. Students generally had very positive things to say about the quality of advisement information from program faculty. University advisers appeared accessible to students during their credential programs. The University also has a well-defined process in place to ensure that only suitable candidates are retained in the program and advance to credential status. There was demonstrated commitment to the importance of this process.

Strengths

None noted.

Concerns

None noted.

Standard 7 - School Collaboration**Standard Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns**

The unit as a whole has a commitment to extensive and quality field experiences as essential elements of the professional preparation of candidates. The field experience placements are the result of an ongoing system of communication and collaboration among and between K-12 and University-based educators. In general the field placements reflect the conceptual framework and the values of the program and provide candidate with experiences where they have opportunities to learn, practice, and access their development towards candidate standards. School personnel who work with candidates are generally effective in supporting the professional growth of UCD candidates.

Interviews and documentation revealed inconsistent evidence on this standard for the collaborative program. The team found unevenness in the selection of suitable field placement sites, placements for all candidates that allow development through a planned sequence of experiences, and the institution's plan and rationale for the sequence of field experience in each placement

Strengths

The classrooms and schools in which candidates complete their experiences provide culturally diverse settings and opportunities for experiences with children with exceptionalities.

The division has developed procedures for clinical and field based experiences and handbooks for student teachers and cooperating teachers.

Collaboration and communication with school-based educators characterize the programs' relationships with school-based educators. Of special note are the

opportunities school-based educators have to participate in directed inquiry through program-sponsored research as well as the efforts of the CRESS Center.

School-based educators reported consistently of their role and the value of the reading certificate program in meeting their needs.

Concerns

The joint UCD/SCUS program does not assure candidates suitable placements to meet program standards in two areas: “extended experience in a ... classroom where beginning reading is taught (Program Standard 4a); and “each student teaches students of diverse ages” (Program Standard 10).

Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors

Standard Met

Overall the quality and quantity of appropriate field supervision in the credential programs is consistent with this standard. District personnel are well selected and tend to establish long-term collaborative relationships with the university. In particular, the Single Subject Program demonstrated an exceptionally high quality of district field supervision.

Strengths

The selection process for District Field Supervisors is very clear. Criteria are in place and adhered to, and the University has developed a well-established pool of teachers to serve in a resident teacher role with a long history of this work and a positive connection to the University.

Concerns

For both the UCD and UCD/CSUS Collaborative Multiple Subject Programs, the team found some conflicting evidence related to the training and evaluation of all resident teachers.

Program Standards

Multiple Subjects CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis Credential Including Internship

Findings on Standards

Based on review of the Institutional Report and supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, district employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Multiple Subjects Program.

Strengths

The Multiple Subjects program is preparing teacher candidates with the knowledge, skills and theoretical perspectives needed to be effective teachers in culturally and linguistically diverse settings.

All candidates past and present reported that the Multiple Subjects program maintains a balance between theory and practice that results in practitioners who are reflective, investigative practitioners.

Cooperating teachers and administrators acknowledged the University supervisors' knowledge and skill in providing relevant support and feedback to their candidates.

Local administrators commended the effective preparation of Multiple Subjects candidates to teach and interact with the culturally and linguistically diverse students in their schools.

Candidates reported that the efforts to foster collaboration among the student cohort are meaningful and beneficial to their development as teachers.

In interviews, candidates praised the knowledge and ability of many faculty to provide appropriate instructional content in a language other than English.

Concerns

There was some mixed evidence, based on interviews with candidates and cooperating teachers, regarding the consistency of complete feedback to all Multiple Subject Candidates.

There was some mixed evidence, based on interviews with candidates and cooperating teachers, regarding the consistency of cooperating teachers ongoing involvement in the summative evaluation of multiple subject candidates.

UCD/CSUS COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM
Multiple Subjects CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis Credential
UC Davis/CSU Sacramento Collaborative Program

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional self-study, the documentation provided, and interviews with many constituents, the team determined that all program standards are met in the UCD/CSUS Collaborative Multiple Subjects credential program, with the following exceptions:

Standard 4

Minimally met with quantitative concerns – There was no program data available to indicate that all portions of this standard were met. Specifically, the single placement student teaching model does not provide candidates with experiences in classrooms where beginning reading is taught.

Standard 6

Met minimally with qualitative concerns – The team found inconsistent evidence with regard to the portion of the standard that indicates each candidate should have adequate opportunities to acquire knowledge and skills pertinent to standards 11 through 20 prior to assuming daily teaching responsibilities. In particular, the team had serious concerns about emergency permit holders who did not have adequate opportunities to gain necessary skills and knowledge prior to assuming daily student teaching responsibilities.

Standard 9

Met minimally with qualitative concerns – Data from interviews with candidates, graduates and mentor teachers suggested that complete, accurate and timely feedback was not consistently provided to all candidates. In addition, there was inconsistent evidence concerning the quality of supervision received, especially in remote locations.

Standard 10

Met minimally with quantitative concerns – There was no program data available to indicate that all portions of this standard were met. The single placement student teaching model does not provide each candidate with opportunities to teach students of diverse ages.

Strengths:

The team recognizes the value of UCD 's collaborative work with CSUS and their willingness to structure a unique model of delivery designed to provide credential opportunities for many non-traditional students.

Graduates expressed support for the condensed format and many were drawn to the program because of their unique needs. The attention given, particularly during the summer courses to issues of equity and diversity was also evident in the variety of responses made by candidates and graduates.

Graduates and candidates also acknowledged the quality of the faculty who taught in the program. In addition, graduates commented on the individual attention they received from UCD faculty and staff while they were involved in the program.

The team was also impressed with the careful candidate selection process.

Concerns

The design and structure of the student teaching portion of the program is not clearly articulated. Some graduates noted concern with the lack of opportunities to spend time in a variety of classrooms prior to assuming student teaching roles. The team found the program structure does not ensure all candidates had these opportunities.

In some instances supervision was inadequate (usually in geographically remote placements) and there was little data to indicate that determinations of candidate readiness were consistently made. In particular, the team found mentor teachers needed to be more involved in summative assessments of candidates.

The portfolio is a strong component and effective tool for assessment, but candidates did not consistently express understanding of the purposes of the portfolio for their connection to their own learning.

Although the program has a written requirement to complete observations in other classrooms and of an array of school events during the student teaching experience, some graduates indicated that there was little accountability for the completion of this requirement.

Reading Certificate

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and the completion of interviews of candidates and faculty, the team finds that all program standards are fully met.

Strengths

- K-12 educational practitioners are authentically involved in the Reading Certificate Program through regional outreach and serve on the Reading Advisory Board, as faculty, and as field supervisors. Collaboration with county and district offices is a strong component of the expansion of this program throughout the UCD Extension Service Area.
- Faculty are extremely knowledgeable and well respected in their fields. They collaborate and tailor the Reading Practicum, particularly, to meet the individual needs of the candidates.
- Courses in the Reading Certificate Program are cohesively designed and help candidates move from a general understanding of reading development to more specific, in-depth considerations of theory and practice. A unifying theme of the courses is the centrality of ongoing assessment to inform teaching instruction and intervention.
- Fieldwork experiences and course assignments are focused on the needs of all learners-second language learners, struggling readers, older readers, beginning readers - in appropriate and practical ways.

Concerns

None noted

Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Credential (English, Mathematics, Science) Including Internship

Findings on Standards

On the basis of the institutional self-study, the documentation provided, and the interviews with many constituents, the team determined that all standards are met.

Strengths

- The team found that the single subject faculty at University of California, Davis structures its program to effectively prepare teachers to work in low-income, racially and culturally diverse urban schools. As a result of this concerted endeavor, there is a cohesive effort within the program to have students examine a series of conceptual principles of a social justice, and to determine how these beliefs will emerge in their practices.
- Students are well prepared to include CLAD strategies and multicultural perspectives in their teaching.
- The team found that the four principles of “Advocates for Educational Equity”, “Reflective Investigative Practitioners”, “Collaborative Professionals” and “Researchers on Practice”, are very effective in guiding the program design and curriculum for the single subject credential.
- Student teachers and residents consistently praised faculty advisors for their ability to help students find the link between course work and their field experiences. Students are also appreciative of the supportive role provided by faculty advisors and give the highest praise for their efforts.
- There is excellent collaboration between the credential programs and the local school districts. Candidates, graduates, and school site administrators applaud the university’s effort to connect theory and practice.
- The teacher teams at UCD provide strong support for candidates. Novice teachers report their designated Faculty Team Advisors and peer cohorts are instrumental in their success. Since candidates in a teacher team go through the credential program together, they share their experiences, support each other and develop bonds that last beyond their student teaching requirements.
- The undergraduate Blended Degree Program in Mathematics is an excellent way to identify early candidates for this critical need area.

Concerns

None noted.

Professional Comments

(These comments and observations from the team are only for the use of the institution. They are to be considered as consultative advice from team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.)

Common Standard 5

The team urges the institution to continue and expand specifically targeted efforts to recruit a diverse population of teacher candidates.

Single Subject Programs

Both cooperating teachers and student teachers in your single subject programs expressed a desire for student teachers to have more opportunities to become part of the "school" rather than just teachers of one class. As the nature of being a teacher involves being members of a school community, building such opportunities into the experiences of student teachers would be most beneficial -- to the student teachers as well as to the schools where candidates are placed.

Becoming a teacher also involves being a member of multiple communities of practice. While your single subject candidates certainly have that experience with their content cohort, they did not always feel they had that experience with members of the other content cohorts. It might be useful to grow opportunities for the different secondary content cohorts to work together on genuine tasks.

UCD/CSUS Collaborative

Faculty, administration, graduates and candidates articulated the rationale and purpose for the program design (orally and in writing) in a variety of ways. Continued discussion and clear articulation of the program, however, could lead to necessary changes in the overall structure and design.