

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

Professional Services Division

June 19, 2000

Overview of this report

This report provides background about University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) and its credential programs, information about the COA visit that took place on May 7 – 10, 2000, 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, Jesus Cortez, will present the report. Representing UCLA will be Aimee Dorr, Dean of Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, and Robert Lapiner, Dean of University Extension.

Accreditation Recommendations

1. The team recommends that, based on the Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for UCLA 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
- Designated Subjects Credential
Adult Education
Vocational Education
- Multiple Subjects Credential
CLAD & BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish, Korean) – Center X
CLAD & BCLAD Emphasis Internship (Spanish, Korean) – Center X
CLAD Emphasis Internship – University Extension
- Single Subject Credential
CLAD & BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish, Korean) – Center X
CLAD & BCLAD Emphasis Internship (Spanish, Korean) – Center X

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

2. The staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- UCLA be permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation to the Committee on Accreditation.
- UCLA be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2005-6 academic year for a COA visit.

Background

The University of California, Los Angeles was founded as the Los Angeles Branch of the State Normal School in 1882. With the rapid growth of the city of Los Angeles in the next three decades, Los Angeles became the home of the first branch of the University of California in 1919. The university moved to its present site in Westwood in 1927. Today UCLA is a large and complex undergraduate and graduate institution devoted to scholarship, research and public service, with one college and 11 professional schools serving over 35,5000 students. Known for its academic excellence, UCLA is one of the outstanding research universities in the country, and students have multiple opportunities to engage with outstanding scholars in their fields. With more than 7.1 million volumes, the university library is among the finest nationally.

Within the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies (GSEIS) is the Department of Education and the Teacher Education Program. Internationally recognized for its research centers in evaluation, higher education, child development and urban education, it offers credentials, masters and doctoral degrees that ground students with a strong understanding of educational theory and tested practice. Of the 173 students in the Teacher Education Program, 112 are working towards Multiple and Single Subject Credentials. These credential programs are situated in Center X, "where research and practice intersect for urban school professionals."

The purpose of Center X is "to change the dismal status quo of urban schooling by bringing together UCLA, the public schools and the diverse communities of Los Angeles to demonstrate that schools and teaching for low-income minority children can become rich, rigorous, socially just, and caring learning communities where all children learn extraordinarily well." Primary among its goals is a social justice agenda. Based in the belief that the racial, cultural and linguistic diversity of Los Angeles is an asset, the Center encourages teachers to approach curriculum, teaching, and learning from socio-cultural and constructivist perspectives to make content knowledge accessible to all students. It supports bilingual education and the use of primary language to as a way of providing equity and access for all students, and schools' efforts to help children obtain the social supports they need to learn and achieve. The Center collaborates with professional developers in the California Subject Matter Projects, offering a wide range of summer institutes; and partners with other university programs, school districts and

local agencies in school reform efforts that span traditional institutional boundaries. Its candidates remain affiliated with UCLA during their initial year of teaching, engaging in coursework and other university supported activities leading to a Master's degree. Center X is also the home of the initially accredited but not yet implemented Teach LA Intern Program.

Among the 82 students in the Educational Leadership Program, 15 students are pursuing the Professional Administrative Services Credential. Also housed in GSEIS, the Educational Leadership Program embeds the Professional Administrative Credential within a Ph.D. Program. The Adult and Vocational Education Designated Subjects Credential Programs, with approximately 2000 candidates, are housed in University Extension, as is the Multiple Subjects Urban Intern Program with 40 candidates currently enrolled. Social Work and Child Welfare & Attendance credentials are offered through the Department of Social Welfare in the School of Public Policy and Social Research. There are currently 20 candidates in the program.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant was assigned to the institution in Fall, 1998 and had telephone conversations with the Co-Director of Center X in preparation for an initial meeting on campus with the Dean and faculty representatives. A new Dean, Dr. Aimee Dorr, was appointed in December, 1999. Additional meetings were held between the consultant and faculty, program directors and institutional administration as needed. 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. The team leader, Dr. Jesus Cortez, was selected in August 1999. Approximately two weeks prior to the visit, on April 21, 2000, the staff consultant and team leader made a final visit to the institution to finalize all arrangements for the visit with the institutional coordinator and program directors.

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 there would be a team of eleven consisting of a Team Leader, and ten team members. The Commission Consultant selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience, and training in the use of the *Accreditation Framework*.

The team was organized into four clusters: Common Standards, Basic Credentials, Specialist Credentials and Services Credentials. The team leader participated as a member of the Common Standards Cluster, and the Basic Credentials Cluster, as well as leading team deliberations and decision-making.

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, May 7, 2000. 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, May 8 and 9, 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. Interview schedules included local site visits in each of the credential programs.

The mid-visit report took place at 1:00 PM on Tuesday. The team had questions and concerns about the Common Standards and various Program Standards going into the mid-visit report. Both faculty and administration worked very hard 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," 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 team rooms 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 reaffirm 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.

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

Institution: University of California, Los Angeles

Dates of Visit: May 7 – 10, 2000

**Accreditation Team
Recommendation:** ACCREDITATION

Rationale:

The overall quality of programs at University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) is extremely high in the judgement 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, guiding teachers and mentors, agency field instructors, school administrators and employers; program documents; advisement materials; university catalog, and other Graduate School of Education and Information Studies (GSE&IS), School of Public Policy and Social Research, and UCLA Extension documents.

The team reached a consensus decision to recommend Accreditation. It found that seven Common Standards were fully Met, and one Common Standard, Standard 8, District Field Supervisors, was Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns. Interviews and documentation revealed inconsistent evidence on the efficacy of guiding teachers in the Center X Multiple and Single Subjects CLAD/BCLAD programs, and on the sufficiency of mentor teachers in the University Extension Multiple Subjects Intern Program.

Findings about program standards were presented to the team by the Cluster Leaders, assisted by the Cluster members. Following their presentation, the team discussed each program area and determined that all program standards were met in all program areas; however a few were not fully met. The team then discussed in detail each program standard that was less than fully met. In the Center X Multiple Subjects Program, Standards 4a and 9 were Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns. In the Center X Single Subject Program, Standards 4b and 9 were Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns. In the University Extension Multiple Subjects Intern Program, Standard 9 was Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns. While there are 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: **Jesus Cortez**
California State University, Chico

Common Standards Cluster:
Irv Hendrick Cluster Leader
University of California, Riverside

Felicia Bessent
Elk Grove Unified School District

Basic Credential Cluster:
Lu Chang, Cluster Leader
College of Notre Dame

Mark Baldwin
California State University, San Marcos

Wanda Baral
Ocean View Unified School District

Alice Bullard
Newark Unified School District

Specialist Credential Cluster :
Philip Lucero, Cluster Leader
Anaheim Union High School District

Colette Fleming
Grossmont Union High School District

Services Credential Cluster:
Nancy Brownell, Cluster Leader
Institute for Education Reform,
California State University

LaVerne Aguirre
Alum Rock Unified School District

DATA SOURCES

	INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED
60	Program Faculty	X	Catalog
36	Institution Administration	X	Program Documents
117	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
56	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
33	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbooks
34	Supervising Practitioners	X	Follow-up Survey Results
20	Advisors	X	Budgets
52	School Administrators	X	Information Booklets
8	Credential Analyst	X	Field Experience Notebook
26	Advisory Committee	X	Candidate Portfolios
		X	Faculty Vitae
382	GRAND TOTAL	X	Faculty Publications

Common Standards

Standard 1 - Education Leadership

Standard Met

UCLA programs in educator preparation enjoy strong leadership and support from the central campus administration, as well as the appropriate leaders of Graduate School of Education & Information Studies, the School of Public Policy & Social Research, and from UCLA Extension. Campus programs in professional education are supported and sustained by a culture that is hospitable to the work of preparing professional educators. Within each school, organizational support for teacher education programs is evidenced by highly qualified program directors and coordinators, as well as support personnel, for credential program.

Strengths

The Graduate School of Education and Information Studies has taken a national role in research on teachers and teaching in urban environments. It conscientiously applies its research findings in the credential programs, including the institutionalization of a social justice agenda in Center X.

Concerns

None noted

Standard 2 - Resources

Standard Met

As diverse as are the campus programs contained in this review, and as diverse are the funding sources and mechanisms that support them, all programs reviewed receive adequate resources. Through the support of the Chancellor and Executive Vice-Chancellor, the School of Education and Information Studies enjoys a higher faculty to student ratio than other professional schools at UCLA. Programs housed in University Extension, and the School of Public Policy and Social Research, also have a strong resource base that translates into academic support for candidates at each stage of their preparation.

Strengths

The University's commitment to research, teaching and public service often results in normal state and fee based support for programs being augmented by extramural grants from public and private agencies.

The University's commitment to, and provision for, training of its students in computer and other technologies and their applications in schools is strong. Computer labs, as well as technical support and training, are readily accessible for extended hours daily. The University Research Library is an outstanding resource for candidates in all credential programs.

Concerns

None noted.

Standard 3 - Faculty

Standard Met

UCLA ladder faculty members are well qualified, highly recognized distinguished researchers at the national and international levels. Clinical faculty are equally well qualified, bringing to the credential programs deep and extensive experiences in multiple and diverse school settings.

Strengths

Evidence shows that both clinical and ladder faculty possess advanced degrees; have extensive and appropriate educational experience; and have demonstrated knowledge of the needs of students from diverse backgrounds; and are involved in ongoing professional activities.

Concerns

The Center X program involves the participation of faculty with several kinds of appointments, requiring close articulation between UCLA instructional personnel and field supervisors. Interview evidence from students and graduates of the program indicates that clear articulation is not present on a consistent basis. This sometimes results in an uneven delivery of quality instruction and unclear expectations for students.

Standard 4 - Evaluation

Standard Met

The great diversity in type and structure of programs reviewed included evidence of extensive evaluation activities. Systematic program evaluation involving a full range of stakeholders is in place for each credential program.

Strengths

Both formal and informal forms of evaluation are employed across the programs. These include the gathering of data concerning program effectiveness from students, graduates, employers and field personnel, as well as peer evaluation by faculty of their colleagues. Extensive use is made of advisory committees. The research nature of the University encourages and supports experimentation and introspection, including the writing of scholarly papers about credential programs. The institution collaborates on national research efforts on the quality of its teacher education programs.

Concerns

The team obtained anecdotal information through interviews with students, graduates, and staff that over the past four years, program modifications have occurred in the Center X program based on evaluation feedback. Individual faculty had initiated some of these changes. The lack of written evidence made it difficult for the team to consistently identify specific mechanisms associated with a systematic process for continuous program improvement.

Standard 5 - Admissions**Standard Met**

Admission criteria and procedures for all programs are clearly defined and available to students. Descriptive printed materials are available to prospective students. Multiple measures, including grade point average, transcripts, writing samples, letters of recommendation, personal interviews, and applicable standardized test performances are considered in admission decisions.

Strengths

UCLA academic staff members maintain rigorous admission standards. At the same time credential students also reflect the cultural, ethnic, and linguistic diversity of the Los Angeles area. Students admitted to the BCLAD Multiple and/or Single subject programs are required to pass a Spanish language proficiency exam.

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. Candidates receive clear advice that allows them to complete their programs in a timely manner. Program and advisement materials are clearly wittten and easily available.

Strengths

When problems arose in courses or in school placements, they were addressed quickly and effectively in most credential programs. Conferences, email and telephone calls are used effectively to support students throughout the programs. Students had very positive things to say about the quality of advisement information from program faculty. University advisers are accessible to students during their credential programs.

Concerns

While overall advisement was effective, some specific concerns emerged relative to the Center X program. Some students indicated that advisement from university field supervisors was inconsistent, with some receiving excellent advice, and others limited or unclear advice. Clear and consistent articulation among the faculty advisors, mentors, and university field supervisors was missing.

Standard 7 - School Collaboration**Standard Met**

UCLA credential program faculty members and program directors have developed strong collaborative processes with local school districts and agencies. School representatives of many district/agencies meet regularly with UCLA staff in all credential programs. Agreements for intern programs are in place and are regularly updated.

Strengths

There are many examples of informal collaborative meetings between University program personnel and field personnel. For example, in Center X, faculty in math and the sciences work collaboratively with professional teacher education personnel for the benefit of students. University Extension's Designated Subjects partnership with Hacienda, La Puente, and Los Angeles Unified School District is exemplary.

The Department of Social Welfare is commended for its collaboration with University of Southern California and California State University, Long Beach on field placements, the selection of field instructors, and field supervision training. UCLA has taken a national lead in this kind of consortium.

Concerns

None noted

Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors**Standard Met Minimally
with Qualitative Concerns**

The quality and quantity of appropriate field supervision in the credential programs appears to be inconsistent across programs. While evidence from some credential programs, such Professional Administration and Social Work/Child Welfare and Attendance indicated a very high quality of district field supervision, other evidence indicated that the quality of district field supervision in Multiple/Single Subject programs is uneven. In the University Extension Intern Program, evidence indicates there the ratio of interns to mentors is very high. In the Center X Multiple and Single Subjects program, the qualifications and training of guiding teachers varied widely.

Strengths

The selection process for Field Instructors in the Department of Social Welfare is exemplary. That process includes a rigorous application, approval of the agency, and commitment by Field Instructors to participate in 17 1/2 hours of training as a supervisor. Outstanding field instructors receive awards at an annual symposium.

Concerns

For Center X programs, the team finds no evidence of clear criteria for the selection district guiding teachers. Additionally, student interviews and evaluations reveal inconsistent guiding teacher support for candidates. Interviews with guiding teachers indicate that program information is not always shared in a timely manner. Interns in the Urban Teacher Program reported the mentor/mentee ratio was too high to receive quality advisement from their mentors.

Multiple Subjects Credential Programs (Center X) **CLAD & BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)** **CLAD & BCLAD Emphasis (Korean)**

Findings on Standards

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

Standard 4a is Met Minimally With Qualitative Concerns: Center X Multiple Subjects candidates report a range of experiences from excellent to poor in their preparation to implement reading strategies in the schools. Through interviews, the team determined that this discrepancy is rooted in the widely varying approaches of individual faculty to teaching the course.

Standard 9 is Met Minimally With Qualitative Concerns: In the Center X Multiple Subjects Program, guidance and assistance provided to candidates is inconsistent. While some candidates and graduates indicate that tremendous support is provided, others indicate a lack of support and lack of communication among supervisors and guiding teachers. Examples are: unclear expectations from the field supervisors, inconsistent frequency of visitation, inadequate process of providing feedback, and unclear expectations from guiding teachers.

The team was unable to find written criteria for selecting guiding teachers. Evidence indicated guiding teachers do not consistently receive the necessary training to help novices, nor are all guiding teachers qualified to assume their roles.

The team found no evidence of students currently enrolled in the BCLAD Korean Multiple Subjects Credential Program. The program is inactive at this time.

Strengths

- The faculty at Center X are to be commended for their effort in restructuring programs to effectively prepare teachers to work in low-income, racially and culturally diverse urban schools. As a result of such a concerted endeavor, 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.
- Students are well prepared to include ELD / SDAIE strategies and multicultural perspectives in their teaching.
- Candidates who are a part of the Early Start Option at Center X universally praised the grounding provided in the summer courses. They believe that their entire experience was enhanced by being part of this option.
- Student teachers and residents (first year teachers) consistently praised faculty advisors for their ability to help students find the link between courses and their field experiences. Students are also appreciative of the supportive role provided by faculty advisors.

- There is excellent collaboration between the credential programs and the local school districts. Candidates, graduates, school site administrators applaud the university's effort to connect theory and practice.
- The teacher teams at Center X provide strong support for candidates. Novice teachers report their designated faculty team advisor and peers are instrumental in their success. Since candidates in a teacher team go through the credential and masters program together over two years, they share their experiences, support each other and develop bonds that last beyond their student teaching and subsequent Masters degree requirements.

Concerns

- There was limited documentation in the document room at Center X providing evidence in support of program standards. Supporting information was found in 6 of the 21 program standards. Findings were based primarily on interviews and the self-study.
- Constituencies interviewed agree that graduates of this program demonstrate preparedness for professional responsibilities to work in urban schools. However, the same interviews reveal discrepancies in the implementation of stated instructional practices in the program itself. A gap appears to exist between the stated vision of the program and effective modeling of best practices from the faculty.

Single Subject Credential Programs (Center X) CLAD & BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish) CLAD & BCLAD Emphasis (Korean)

Findings on Standards

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

Standard 4b is Met Minimally With Qualitative Concerns: Center X Single Subject candidates report a range of experiences from excellent to poor in their preparation to implement reading strategies in the content areas. Through interviews, candidates and graduates indicate that they do not have a good understanding of how reading should be taught in the content area. They do not have consistent opportunities to observe effective strategies in teaching content-based reading skills. Through interviews, the team determined that this discrepancy is rooted in the widely varying approaches of individual faculty to teaching the course.

Standard 9 is Met Minimally With Qualitative Concerns: Guidance and assistance provided to candidates is inconsistent. While some candidates and graduates indicate that tremendous support is provided in the program, others indicate lack of support and lack of communication among the different individuals involved in their field experiences. Examples are: unclear expectations from the field supervisors, inconsistent

frequency of visitation, inadequate process of providing feedback, and unclear expectations from guiding teachers.

The team was unable to find written criteria for selecting guiding teachers. Evidence indicated that guiding teachers do not consistently receive the necessary training to help novices.

The team found no evidence of students currently enrolled in the BCLAD Korean Single Subject Credential Program. The program is inactive at this time.

Strengths

- The team commends faculty at Center X for their efforts in restructuring programs 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 social justice, and to determine how these beliefs will emerge in their practices.
- Students are well prepared to include ELD/SDAIE strategies and multicultural perspectives in their teaching.
- Candidates who are a part of the Early Start Option at Center X universally praised the grounding provided in the summer courses. They believe that their entire experience was enhanced by being part of this option.
- Student teachers and residents consistently praised faculty advisors for their ability to help students find the link between courses and their field experiences. Students are also appreciative of the supportive role provided by faculty advisors.
- There is excellent collaboration between the credential programs and the local school districts. Candidates, graduates, school site administrators applaud the university's effort to connect theory and practice.
- The teacher teams at Center X provide strong support for candidates. Novice teachers report their designated Faculty Team Advisor and peers are instrumental in their success. Since candidates in a teacher team go through the credential and masters program together in two years, they share their experiences, support each other and develop bonds that last beyond their student teaching requirements.
- The undergraduate joint math and science education program is an excellent way to identify early candidates for these critical need areas.

Concerns

- There was limited documentation in the document room at Center X providing evidence in support of program standards. Supporting information was found in 6 of the 21 program standards. Findings were based primarily on interviews and the self-study.

- Constituencies interviewed agree that graduates of this program demonstrate preparedness for professional responsibilities to work in urban schools. However, the same interviews revealed discrepancies in the implementation of stated practices. A gap appears to exist between the stated vision of the program and effective modeling of best practices by the faculty.

**Multiple and Single Subjects Internship Credential Programs
Multiple Subject CLAD Emphasis - Urban Intern Teacher Preparation –
(UCLA Extension), Multiple and Single Subjects Internship - Teach LA
Intern Program – (Center X)**

Findings on Standards

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

Standard 9 is Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns: Guidance and assistance provided to interns from mentors (district field supervisors) is inconsistent in the UCLA Extension Intern Program. Interns and graduates repeatedly report that they have had very little support from and contact with their mentors. The fact that very often mentors and mentees are not on the same site and that mentors have large numbers of mentees strongly contributes to this finding.

The Teach LA Multiple and Single Subjects Intern Program has been initially approved by the Committee on Accreditation. It had not yet begun implementation at the time of the visit.

Strengths

- The faculty at UNEX demonstrate strong dedication and commitment to meeting the needs of candidates. Interns and graduates consistently shared their appreciation for the faculty’s exemplary modeling of excellent teaching practice, sharing of their expertise, and willingness to spend extra time to provide assistance.
- Students are well prepared to include ELD/SDAIE strategies and multicultural perspectives in their teaching.
- Interns in the UNEX universally praised the foundational grounding provided in the Summer Institute at the beginning of the program. In particular, they mentioned that they are prepared in areas of classroom management and instructional strategies, and they have the opportunity to engage in discussions on issues they encounter during their first year of teaching.
- The Arts Institute offered by UNEX and the Los Angeles County Performing Arts Center is a unique strength of the intern program.
- The cohort model of the intern program at UNEX provides strong support. Since interns in a cohort go through the program together in two years, they share their

experiences, support each other and develop bonds that last beyond their intern experience.

- Members of the UNEX Program Steering Committee make exceptional efforts to monitor and adjust their program based on students' needs.
- UNEX participants praised the program for its excellent preparation and outstanding faculty.
- There is excellent collaboration between the intern program and the local school districts. In particular, the UNEX program offers most classes off campus on school sites, which provide unique first-hand experiences for its interns.

Concerns

- Portfolio is an important component of the UNEX intern program, yet there is a lack of specificity of what should be included. Candidates seem to have unclear understandings of the expectations for the portfolio.

Designated Subjects Adult Education Credential Program Designated Subjects Vocational Education Credential Program

Findings on Standards

On the basis of the institutional self-study, the documentation provided, and interviews with constituents, the Designated Subjects Adult Education Program and Designated Subjects Vocational Education Program meet all the standards for the specified teaching credentials. These UCLA programs are long-standing, dating back many years. After the new CCTC Standards were adopted in 1995, the adult education and vocational education programs were modified in consultation with instructors, employers and advisory committee members. These programmatic changes were approved by the CCTC in 1996. The current review of these programs found that there have been no significant changes in program content since the CTC approval. A review of the documents and interviews with students, instructors, employers, advisory committee members and administrators reveals an extensive and rigorous preparation program. Students move through competencies from basic to advanced levels in a cohesive, sequential and meaningful fashion. An outstanding feature of the UCLA programs is the blending of theoretical knowledge and innovative practices.

Strengths

The DSAE and DSVE Credential Program administration team selects and employs an extremely strong, effective and sensitive cadre of instructors. Students' comments are overwhelmingly positive. Students are very complementary regarding their instructors' knowledge of subject matter, modeling of teaching strategies, and motivational and presentation skills. Additionally, students report that the curriculum and techniques are relevant to their actual classroom experiences.

The entire administrative office staff of the DSAE and DSVE Credential Programs works as a team to provide superb attention to all details from marketing to assisting students in obtaining their credentials. Students, teachers, graduates and employers

indicated that program comment that that the support staff is helpful, kind and tenacious. The fact that there are nearly 2000 students enrolled in the programs makes this support even more remarkable.

The Designated Subjects Programs have formed successful partnerships with such entities as Los Angeles Unified School District and the Hacienda-La Puente Correctional Department. The extension program offers training to personnel from these entities in the credentialing process and flexibility and assistance in processing their candidates' documents.

Designated Subjects program staff has visited school districts to better understand the needs of districts and the candidates. Partner districts report that this collaboration enables the credentialing process to occur in an organized and efficient manner. They further report that the quality of instruction demonstrated by candidates who have completed the Designated Subjects Programs is exemplary.

Concerns

None noted.

Professional Administrative Services Credential Program

Findings on Standards

Based on a thorough examination of the institutional self-study, documents provided and interviews with constituents, the Administrative Services Credential Program meets all standards for the Professional Credential.

The Administrative Services Credential Program offers a comprehensive professional credential program that includes a combination of theoretical understanding and practical application skills and is embedded in the Educational Leadership doctoral program to improve educational practice. The faculty consists of highly qualified full-time and part-time members with recent administrative experiences in a variety of positions. 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 Professional 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 major focus of Ed 498 is the development of the candidate's individual professional development plan which guides the choice of activities and content for fieldwork. Candidates design and begin a field-based project based on a self-assessment and the total curriculum of the program. Courses are sequenced and clustered around four themes that are essential to the Educational Leadership Program: leadership, the changing environment, organizational design, and enhancement of student development. 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. 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 induction plan is designed so that changes in form, function and individual assignments can be readily made as new needs or changes in emphasis are realized by the candidate, the employer, the mentor and/or the University.

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.

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 are dedicated and committed to students in the program and their timely responses to questions, concerns and requests for guidance and feedback are appreciated by candidates.

Processes for admissions, advisement and assistance to program participants are considered exemplary by candidates as evidenced in interviews and faculty evaluations.

Concerns

Some candidates expressed the need for faculty to review the sequence of coursework for coherence. Candidates reported inconsistent frequency of weekly meetings across the quarters. For example, some weeks included Mon., Thurs., and Sat. classes while other weeks may have had only a single evening class. Lastly, some program participants expressed a need for faculty to review assignment timelines so that assignment deadlines do not overlap. In some instances major assignments from different courses were due on the same day.

Pupil Personnel Services Credential Programs School Social Work & Child Welfare and Attendance

Findings on Standards

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

Strengths

The team found the Department of Social Welfare in the School of Public Policy and Social Research offers a high quality and effective academic program which prepares School Social Workers and Child Welfare and Attendance personnel to work in southern California schools.

Candidates and alumni praise the strong advisory system. They indicated they receive systematic guidance, assistance and feedback. The program director, faculty liaison, classroom professors, and school district field instructors are consistently and readily available.

Candidates and graduates praise the healthy balance of micro and macro theoretical frameworks along with multiple opportunities to practice and integrate knowledge and skills.

Interview evidence revealed that field instructors are committed and dedicated. They are held in high esteem by candidates, alumni, and university staff.

Employers are eager to hire UCLA School Social Workers and Child Welfare and Attendance personnel. They describe graduates as confident and skilled. New graduates understand school settings and are able to immediately and effectively work with students, families, and diverse school staff members. Employers also praise the “broad” perspective UCLA School Social Workers and Child Welfare and Attendance personnel bring in understanding communities and their capacity to mobilize human service resources.

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.)

Multiple & Single Subjects Credential Programs

- Candidates requested that a master's degree program be added to the UNEX intern program.
- Summary reports of the various data collected in Center X will be beneficial to facilitate program change and development.
- Social justice orientation is a central element of the Center X program. UCLA/GSE&IS participants in the program (faculty, supervisors, etc.) are encouraged to share effective strategies to actualize their clear vision through consistent practices in advising, supervision, and program evaluation.
- Center X is encouraged to continue their efforts in identifying and securing BCLAD guiding teachers for each of their BCLAD candidates at the secondary level.
- Candidates in the Center X Multiple Subject Program express concern about the scheduling / sequence of some methods classes. It is important to reexamine the sequence frequently to effectively prepare candidates for their field experience.
- The organization and display of program evidence in the UNEX document room was outstanding.
- The team strongly recommends that Center X review the process of identifying and selecting guiding teachers. There was no evidence of written criteria in this important aspect of preparing teachers for their work in urban schools. Candidates reflected often on their uneven experiences as a result of the program's lack of guiding principles in this area. While it is understood there is an ongoing conversation of the primary importance of sites versus guiding teachers, the absence of guidelines creates a burden on individual principals and faculty advisors to interpret the "intentions" of the program with regard to field experiences and coaching at this level by practicing teachers. Minimum criteria for the selection of guiding teachers would help provide some consistency to the experiences of novice teachers during their student teaching placements.

Designated Subjects – Adult & Vocational Credential Programs

Some students and instructors mentioned a desire for a field experience in order to provide on-going mentoring as the candidate progresses through the credential program, particularly during level I. Under the current system, the employing school district is responsible for monitoring the candidate and some candidates receive more assistance than others from their local site administrator. The mentoring element is perceived by the instructors to be more important for the non-educator who may not have had the opportunity for an academic experience at the college or university level prior to entering the Designated Subjects Program

Administrative Services

Consider offering the Action Research course earlier in year 1.