

Recommendation by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at University of San Francisco

Professional Services Division

May 13, 2002

Overview of this Report

This agenda item includes the findings of the April 21-24, 2002, Accreditation Team visit conducted at University of San Francisco. This visit was the second accreditation visit conducted using SB 2042 Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs for Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credentials. Additionally, the visit was conducted prior to submission of program proposals for review by the SB 2042 Panel and the Panel's initial accreditation recommendation to the Committee on Accreditation. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Report, program documents, advisement materials, the university catalog and interviewing candidates, graduates, full- and part-time faculty, university staff, coordinators, institutional administrators, k-12 site supervisors, teachers and administrators and additional documentation requested from institutional administrators while on site. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

Accreditation Recommendation

(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 San Francisco and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION**

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

- Multiple Subject Credential
- Single Subject Credential
- Education Specialist Credential - Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II
Mild/Moderate
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
School Counseling
- Administrative Services Credential
Preliminary
Professional Clear

(2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's responses to the preconditions be accepted.
- The University of San Francisco be permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- The University of San Francisco be placed on the schedule of accreditation visit for the 2007-2008 academic year.

Background

The University of San Francisco is a private, Catholic, Jesuit university with a long history of educating adults since 1855. Throughout its history, the institution has remained faithful to the Jesuit mission of developing men and women to their fullest potential so that they can become leaders in their communities and workplaces.

The University of San Francisco has identified its vision as being internationally recognized as a premier Jesuit Catholic, urban University with a global perspective that educates leaders who will fashion a more human and just world. The University Mission statement is as follows.

"The core mission of the University is to promote learning in the Jesuit Catholic tradition. The University offers undergraduate, graduate and professional students the knowledge and skills needed to succeed as persons and professionals, and the values and sensitivity necessary to be men and women for others.

The University will distinguish itself as a diverse, socially responsible learning community of high quality scholarship and academic rigor sustained by a faith that does justice. The University will draw from the cultural, intellectual and economic resources of the San Francisco Bay Area and its location on the Pacific Rim to enrich and strengthen its educational programs."

The School of Education was founded in 1972. The mission statement for the School of Education is aligned with the university mission statement and includes a commitment to the university's Jesuit core ethical values of social justice and service, and the improvement of the human condition. The mission statement is included below.

"The School of Education offers credential and graduate programs designed to meet the needs of aspiring and practicing educators, counselors and leaders. Marked by its urban setting, the School reaches out and contributes to the several communities served.

By valuing the individuals, the School provides a caring, interactive and academically challenging climate through:

- Instilling a passion for knowledge, wisdom and justice.
- Fostering a desire to celebrate a modern, multicultural world.

- Building a commitment to creativity and compassion.
- Heightening ethical standards.
- Developing the intellect.
- Enhancing professional skills.

To these ends, the University of San Francisco fosters a community marked by the commitment of the Jesuit, Catholic urban university to issues of justice and intellectual rigor. The university maintains a community that supports faculty, students, staff, alumni and friends in accomplishing their lifelong learning goals."

The University offers Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs for candidates both on the University's 55-acre main campus and through six regional sites. The Regional Campus Teaching Credential programs are designed to provide the same quality of instruction, advisement, and other program services that are offered on the main campus. The regional sites are located in Cupertino, Sacramento, San Ramon, Santa Rosa, Saint Ignatius College Preparatory High School in San Francisco and the Headlands Institute in Marin County. Two of the programs were specifically developed, in collaboration with other agencies/programs, to provide a credential program to meet the needs of a specific audience. One program, St. Ignatius, was designed for Catholic School teachers who are also seeking California teacher certification. The program offered at the Headlands Institute was designed for environmental educators seeking a California credential but who are currently working in the non-profit sector. The schedule of courses for the regional programs has been developed to allow candidates to pursue their credential while balancing the demands of job and family. Candidates attend class one evening a week and, on average, two Saturdays per month.

The main campus enrolls over 146 candidates per year in a fifth-year Multiple Subject/Single Subject credential program. An additional 220 students are enrolled in eight cohort programs at the six regional campus sites. A total of 109 freshman are currently enrolled in a five-year "Dual Degree" program. This program was designed to serve individuals admitted to undergraduate programs who have already selected teaching as a career based on their past educational experiences, service to the community, and work with children.

The Education Specialist and Administrative Services Credential Programs are offered through the main campus only. The Education Specialist Program enrolls 50 Level 1, Level II and Internship candidates per year while the Administrative Services Program includes and total enrollment of 18 Level I and Level II candidates. The total enrollment for the Pupil Personnel Services Program is 20-22 candidates per year.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant, Marilyn Fairgood, was assigned to the institution in Spring 2001 and met with institutional leadership in March 2001. In September 2001, Mary Vixie Sandy, Director, Professional Services Division, notified the institution of implementation of the Reading Standard Study and informed the institution that a reading expert would be added to the team to conduct the reading study during the accreditation visit. In fall 2001, the University of San Francisco became an early adopter in implementing SB 2042 Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs for Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credentials. On February 8, 2002, an additional consultant staff meeting with program directors and institutional administration was held. These meetings led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study reports, logistical and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone and email communication was maintained between the staff Consultant and institutional representatives. The team Leader, Dr. Jeanie Milliken, was selected in November 2001. Dr. Milliken had the opportunity to meet with institutional administration during the February 8, 2002 meeting.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study

The institutional self-study was prepared beginning with a response to the Common Standards. The institution's decision to use the new SB 2042 Standards for its Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential programs proved a challenge to those preparing the report. The institution presented the SB 2042 documents as a transition plan, relying on the effectiveness of their CLAD Emphasis and BCLAD Emphasis programs to provide evidence in meeting the elements of the standards. The institution decided to use Option One (California Program Standards) in the *Accreditation Framework* for the Education Specialist, Pupil Personnel Services and Administrative Services Credential Programs.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Dean of the Education Department, institutional administration, the team leader and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of ten consisting of a Team Leader, two members for the Commons Standards Cluster, three members for the Basic Credential Cluster and three members for the Advanced Credential Cluster (Education Specialist, Pupil Personnel Services and Administrative Services). Because the institution was part of the implementation of the Reading Standard Study, a reading expert was also selected as a team member. The team's reading expert served as a fourth member of the Basic Credential Cluster and participated fully in fact-finding, sharing of evidence gathered and the accreditation recommendation made by the team. The Commission Consultant and Accreditation Administrator selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and training in the use of the *Accreditation Framework*.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the institutional self-study reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The COA Team Leader and members examined the institution's responses to the Common Standards and the Program Standards.

Approximately one week prior to the visit the Team Leader and Commission Consultant e-mailed each Basic Credential Cluster member with a strategy intended to facilitate the SB 2042 review process. The Team Leader and Consultant emphasized the fact that cluster members were required to judge each standard at the element level and encouraged them to develop key questions and ways to check documents for consistency and support.

The on-site phase of the visit review began on Sunday, April 21, 2002, with the team, including the Team Leader. The team members arrived on Sunday afternoon for a full-team orientation to accreditation activities, training on SB 2042 Standards and the Reading Study. Written protocols, developed by the Professional Services Division Accreditation Administrator, for spring accreditation visits was distributed. The Reading Study, SB 2042 Decision Options for findings on the standards and the interview schedule were also discussed. During the orientation it became evident that all team members had thoroughly read each self-study document and had developed a list of questions related to the standards. The orientation and training was followed by a reception sponsored by the University of San Francisco. An institutional overview was presented by the President, and program directors and coordinators at that time.

On Monday and Tuesday, April 22 and 23, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. The institution arranged to transport members of the team to various local school sites used for collaborative activities as well as to a couple of the Regional Centers. Lunch and dinner on Monday and Tuesday were spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. On Tuesday afternoon the team leader, cluster leaders and reading expert met with institutional leadership for a mid-visit status report. This provided an opportunity to identify areas in which the team had concerns and for which additional information was being sought. Institutional personnel promptly provided additional materials arising from concerns voiced during the mid-visit status report. Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning were set aside for writing of the team report. There was extensive consultation among the team members with sharing of information, particularly with the Commons Standards Cluster. During those sessions cluster members met to share their findings and reported out to the entire team.

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 used the decision options of "Meets the Standard," "Meets the Standard Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative concerns or "Does Not Meet the Standard". The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard, provided a finding or rationale for its decision, and then outlined perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard.

For the Multiple Subject and Single Subject program areas, the team judged each standard at the element level and then prepared a narrative report about the program standards using the Decision Options for SB 2042 Standards approved by the Committee on Accreditation in January 2002. Those options are “Meets the Standard,” “Meets the Standard with Concerns,” and “Does Not Meet The Standard.” Because the Reading Study was a part of the accreditation visit specific comments related to Multiple and Single Subject Program Standards 7A and 7B are included in the narrative.

For all other program areas, and pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework* and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards which pointed out any standards that were not met, met minimally or met with concerns including a rationale for their findings. The team included specific Strengths and Concerns related to each program area.

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.

An additional written product resulting from the Reading Standard Study is to be presented to the Reading Study Technical Advisors Panel. The report presents findings on each element of Standard 7A and 7B. During the Accreditation Team’s concluding activities the report was presented to the Chair of the Education Department.

Accreditation Decisions by the Team

After the accreditation report was drafted, the team met Wednesday morning for final review of the report and a decision about the results of the visit. The team discussed each Common Standard and each Program Standard and decided on the basis of interviews and program documents that one Common Standard was Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns, One Multiple Subject Program Standard was Met with Concerns, and three Single Subject Program Standards were Met with Concerns.

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 as areas of strength. The team further decided that, although one Common Standard was Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns and four Multiple Subject and Single Subject Program Standards were met with Concerns, there were numerous compensating strengths in the School of Education. The team then decided on an accreditation decision for the institution. The options were: “Accreditation,” “Accreditation with Technical Stipulations,” “Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations” “Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations,” or “Denial of Accreditation.” After thorough discussion, the team decided to unanimously recommend the status of “**Accreditation.**”

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

Institution: University of San Francisco

Dates of Visit: April 21-24, 2002

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: Accreditation

Rationale:

The team recommendation for Accreditation was the result of a review of the Institutional Self Study Reports, a review of additional supporting documents available during the visit, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the unit. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the unit was based upon the following:

1. Common Standards - The Common Standards were first reviewed one-by-one and then voted upon by the entire team. The team voted unanimously on each Common Standard and determined that seven Common Standards were judged to be fully met. One Common Standard, Common Standard 8, was met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns.
2. Program Standards - Findings about program standards were presented to the team by the Cluster Leaders, assisted by the Cluster members (for additional clarification). The accreditation team findings on standards for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Programs were based upon the SB 2042 Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs. The team discussed each program standard at the element level and found that Multiple Subject Program Standard 16 was Met with Concerns and Single Subject Program Standards 8B, 15, and 16 were Met With Concerns.

Findings on standards for the Education Specialist Credential Program: Mild/Moderate, including Internship, Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program: School Counseling, including Internship, and the Administrative Services Credential Program, Preliminary and Professional Clear, were based on current professional preparation program standards. The team discussed each program area and determined that the program standards for these credential programs were fully met.

3. Overall Recommendation - The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus that all Common Standards were Met although one Common Standard was Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns. When judging the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Programs the team found that all standards were met with one Multiple Subject Program Standard Met with Concerns and three Single Subject Program Standards Met with Concerns. Program standards for the Education Specialist, Pupil Personnel Services and Administrative Services Credential Programs were all fully met. The team noted the

concerns about the one Common Standard and four program standards that were less than fully met but concluded that these concerns did not affect the overall quality of the graduates. The team further concluded that a stipulation should not be placed on the institution because of compensating strengths. Those strengths include university leadership, the priority placed on teacher education, high-quality programs that effectively integrate theory and practice, and the attention provided to all professional preparation program candidates resulting in caring, competent and effective educators. The team unanimously decided that the evidence clearly supported the accreditation recommendation.

Team Leader: **Jeanie Milliken**
Point Loma Nazarene University

Common Standards Cluster:
William Watkins, Cluster Leader
National University (Retired)
Marian Reimann
Los Angeles Unified School District

Basic Credential Cluster:
Jody Daughtry, Cluster Leader
California State University, Fresno
Patricia Carrillo-Hurtado
Fresno Unified School District
Priscilla Walton
University of California, Santa Cruz
Roxanne Higgins
Sacramento County Office of Education

Advanced Credential Cluster :
Mary Williams, Cluster Leader
University of San Diego
Barbara Wilson
Education Research Consultant (Retired)

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- University Catalog
- Institutional Self Study
- Course Syllabi
- Candidate Files
- Fieldwork Handbooks
- Follow-up Survey Results
- Information Booklets
- Field Experience Notebooks
- Schedule of Classes
- Advisement Documents
- Faculty Vitae
- Program/Faculty Evaluations
- On-line Instructional Materials
- Student Portfolio
- Student Projects
- Curriculum Resource Center

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Commons Cluster	Basic Cluster	Ed Specialist Level I and II M/M	Pupil Personnel Services	Admin Services Prelim and Professional	TOTALS
Program Faculty	16	43	12	9	14	94
Institutional Administration	13	20		2	4	39
Candidates	18	157	40	15	9	239
Graduates	13	27	19	13	11	83
Employers of Graduates	20	4	9	3	4	40
Supervising Practitioners	24	11	12	7	4	58
Advisors	34	10	4	1	6	60
School Administrators	39	7	6	3	24	160
Credential Analyst	120		1	1	2	15
Advisory Committee	11	2	5	3	6	46
Chair/ Program Coordinators	30					
Budget Officer	1				1	2
Graduate Recruiter	1					1
Regional Center Coordinator	1	1				2
Administrative Assistant	2					2

GRAND TOTAL 839

Common Standards

Standard 1 - Education Leadership

Standard Met

In the past year and one half, since the current University President took office, a new vision and mission statement have been adopted. This prompted the School of Education to pursue, develop and approve a similar document which is aligned with that of the University as a whole. The mission of the University of San Francisco as a whole and the mission of the School of Education in particular, are aligned and linked to the same core values inherent in their joint commitment to the issues of social justice, intellectual rigor and teaching. The University has supported the creation of a Leadership Team made up of the deans of the various schools and colleges, the associates and vice-presidents of the college who meet monthly in a collegial atmosphere to discuss the University's responsibilities to the educational and global community that it serves, and how it can best respond to those needs. The leadership clearly understands the role of the School of Education in the wider community and acknowledges that the School of Education is the University's graduate presence in the community.

The School of Education itself gives voice to its faculty constituency through the Committee of Chairs and the Curriculum Committee. Everyone in the School of Education who serves in key positions and those who are in field and support positions understand and have internalized the University's Jesuit core ethical values of social justice and service and the improvement of the human condition. There are clear lines of communication between departments and the School of Education leadership. There exists an attitude and environment in which respect for diversity is valued and honored and this is evident in the make-up of the student body. School of Education needs are addressed as necessary with attention to time and budget priorities and constraints. During the visit, staff and faculty of all departments responded to requests for additional information and/or documentation in a timely and collegial manner.

Strengths

None noted.

Concerns:

None noted

Standard 2 - Resources

Standard Met

The facilities offered by the University, both on- and off-site, are impressive and the support system in the School of Education is evident; each program has a coordinator and an administrative assistant to support the daily operational needs. As needs surface, there are vehicles in place to address those needs either immediately or by means of strategic action plans for future implementation. The Library and media resources and the University web presence and technological capabilities have been well-capitalized. Technology and library services are readily available and are of the high quality. Library materials are available not only on the main campus, but also on the internet and by mail or courier service. The University has been very supportive of technology and library services, and this support is reflected in the availability of up-to-date equipment and library resources.

There is a Curriculum Resource Center specifically providing hands-on materials for students to access the latest in school based instructional materials and instructional delivery system implementation. There exists multiple computer laboratory settings and extensive library services, both electronic and hard copy. The need for a budget-supported position for student recruitment and admissions to market the various programs in the School was recognized, and with the financial support of a portion of the budget allocated to the Dean of the School, was actualized this year.

The School of Education has actively and aggressively pursued grant funding for several programs, as well as the wise utilization of a decentralized budget for the School to do the following.

- Respond to the needs of the working professional by offering reduced tuition rates and regional programs within easy reach of students in the field.
- Offer fellowships for students of the underrepresented minority population for advanced studies which translate into bringing minority faculty into the University family to be trained, and in many cases, eventually move on to other institutions of higher learning or other key positions in the educational community.
- Place excellent technological resources and support in the hands of students, staff, and faculty as well as support an impressive and evolving web presence for the School of Education.
- Hire the services of an expert in graphic design and marketing to assist every program in the areas of student recruitment and admissions.
- Provide a vehicle to revisit budget priorities and utilize an action planning approach in an open and collegial atmosphere, to capitalize worthwhile projects.
- Establish the Center for Teaching and Social Justice.

The University has supported the efforts of the School of Education by strategic planning efforts and collaborative decision-making. Under the aegis of the University President and Deans, grant funds and University resources are carefully allocated to support program needs. A plan is under way to provide a contingency fund to capitalize under-funded programs, i.e. the Regional Programs and the Pupil Personnel Services Program, or new initiatives such as the Public Relations position that presently has no budget.

Strengths:

None noted.

Concerns:

None noted.

Standard 3 - Faculty

Standard Met

The School of Education hosts a full-time faculty that is made up of individuals who possess an earned doctorate, are fully qualified to teach the courses assigned to them, and represent a superior cross-section of the educational community. All adjuncts are required to hold at least an appropriate Masters degree, however the team found that most of the adjunct faculty also hold doctoral degrees. The University actively seeks faculty who “reflect and are knowledgeable about human diversity” in all its forms. Meaningful professional development activities are encouraged and faculty members work with the Dean to plan programs for individualized

development based on mutually agreed upon themes. Monthly forums highlight faculty research and teaching.

Strengths:

None noted.

Concerns:

None noted.

Standard 4 - Evaluation

Standard Met

The team found evidence that the institution involves program participants, graduates and local practitioners in evaluation of the quality of courses and field experiences. This evaluation process occurs in each department within the School of Education and is well-documented in each professional preparation program. Through interviews and review of documentation the team found hard core data that is used to inform decision-making policies related to program improvement. Currently, the SUMMA evaluation instrument is being utilized by the Deans in assisting full-time faculty in establishing goals related to their assignment. The School is in the process of developing a comprehensive, university-wide assessment model for all programs. It is anticipated that this will be completed by Fall 2002.

Strengths:

None noted

Concerns:

None noted.

Standard 5 - Admissions

Standard Met

The team found that candidates are admitted on the basis of a well-defined admission criteria and process. Criteria include overall GPA, letters of recommendation and an admission interview. Admission requirements are published and shared in informational brochures, catalogs, handouts and are included on the institution's web site. The university offers courses during the day as well as in a weekend and evening format for those credential candidates who work during the day but want to realize their dream of teacher certification. All candidates are aware of timelines required for admission to each credential program and certification requirements. It is evident that there is consistent effort to admit and retain quality candidates that represent the diversity of the community at large. Consequently, the diversity of the student population is laudatory. Although the standard is met with clearly identified areas of strength, interviews with staff and members of the Dean's office revealed some concern regarding the lag time in processing admission applications. The university acknowledged that the process used in past years was one that accomplished a more expeditious result and informed the team that there are plans to expedite the admission process.

Strengths:

The University has a program to subsidize tuition and other costs of needy students seeking a credential.

With the additional hire of a public relations specialist to market the various programs, the enrollment of students in all programs should increase in number.

Concerns:

None noted.

Standard 6 - Advice and Assistance

Standard Met

Information regarding credential program requirements is provided in written form, during orientation meetings and is reviewed often with individual candidates by the Credential Analyst. Candidates reported that the university provides a supportive environment in which faculty and staff are readily available while on the main campus and each Regional Center. In every program in the School of Education faculty and staff were praised for the personal interest and concern demonstrated in admission, class selection and credential processing. Special assistance is available in a variety of ways for those who need it. Candidates have access to the Curriculum Resource Center which provides a broad array of curriculum materials. The resources in this center is used extensively by candidates from the main campus and Regional Centers. Candidates experiencing personal problems have access to the services of the Counseling and Psychology Department. Support through the Career Center is also provided. Because of the individual care and attention provided to all candidates the University of San Francisco faculty and staff know their candidates very well and retain only those who are suited to entry into the education profession.

Strengths:

No additional noted.

Concerns:

None noted.

Standard 7 - School Collaboration

Standard Met

The University of San Francisco has established working relationships with the local public schools as well as other educational agencies. Representatives from numerous educational organizations and agencies meet with university faculty and staff to collaborate on program improvement and educational activities for candidates. Partner organizations and agencies include San Francisco and South San Francisco Unified School Districts, the Bay Area Coalition of Equitable Schools, the Bay Area Writing Project, the Bay Area Reading Project and the Exploratorium, San Francisco's museum of science and education. The team found that the university, its programs, and its graduates are held in high esteem by district partners. For each credential preparation program, the School of Education collaborates with local school and district personnel in selecting suitable school sites and effective clinical personnel for guiding candidates. The sites and personnel have been reviewed to ensure that personnel hold appropriate credentials or certification authorizations as well as a student population that reflects the diversity of the area. As there is an emphasis on program growth the School of Education is assertive in seeking collaboration with additional local school districts. The institution's newly re-designed SB2042 program includes establishment of a Teacher Education Advisory Council. This Council will include 20 educators representing a variety of educational agencies including individuals from four local school districts, a separate institution of higher education, as well as student representatives and alumni.

Strengths:

None noted.

Concerns:

None noted.

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

The team found that most field supervisors are carefully selected, trained in supervision and evaluated. All are certified and experienced in the subjects listed on their credential or they are performing the service authorized by the credential. Training in supervision is provided by program coordinators and faculty. University of San Francisco faculty supervisors are helpful in informal evaluations of the quality of the supervisors at the individual schools. There is evidence, where appropriate, that most field supervisors are evaluated. Students have an opportunity to give informal input about the program and their site supervisors (orally) during exit interviews, and in written surveys about the program

Although there is evidence the majority of district-employed supervisors are evaluated, the team found that this is inconsistent across all programs. Through interviews with candidates and field supervisors the team found that some district-employed supervisors were not evaluated. The University is aware of this inconsistency and has recently developed handbook which is intended to support the development of a systematic evaluation process for all district-employed field supervisors and clinical field supervisors.

Strengths:

None noted.

Concerns:

None noted.

Multiple Subject Credential Program

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Multiple Subjects Program except for Standard 16, which is Met with Concerns. Included below is the rationale for the standard that was judged to be less than fully met. Also included are specific comments related to Multiple Subject Program Standard 7A.

Standard 16, Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualification of Field Supervisors (elements e and f). While there are some grant funded professional development opportunities currently available to interested master teachers, there is no on-going, institutionalized process for providing professional development for the program's cooperating and master teachers.

Standard 7A, Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts – Multiple Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction in English.

The School of Education at the University of San Francisco seeks to balance the research, teaching, and service dimensions of the School's programs to prepare its students to make a significant impact in the educational community. This goal is framed in the belief that learning is a lifelong process that reflects personal, moral, social, spiritual, and academic domains.

Within the academic domain, the implementation of the Reading Standards 7A and 7B of the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs were examined through the lens of SB2042 since the School is an early adopter of these standards. Emphasis was placed on how the institution provided systematic reading, writing, and related language arts instruction to pre-service candidates and to candidates already in the field.

Based on pertinent data gathered from the institutional self-study report, additional supporting documentation, and interviews with faculty, candidates, employers, graduates, and a district administrators, the team finds that the University of San Francisco has implemented the Commission's standard for Reading, Writing, and Related Language Arts Instruction in both the Multiple Subject credential program and the Single Subject credential program through a focused commitment to literacy development. Candidates have many opportunities to develop and deepen their understanding of methodology, the structure of the English language, comprehension, and standards-based and assessment-driven instruction. Furthermore, the quality of faculty leadership in literacy development enhances learning of literacy-based strategies and skills among candidates.

Strengths

- Teacher Education enjoys a position of status in the University because of the priority placed on teaching in the overall mission of the University.
- The social justice perspective and focus on urban teaching pervades the program. Faculty and students demonstrate a strong commitment to these missions.

- The School of Education should be commended for its highly qualified faculty. The program is further enhanced by the inclusion of experienced practitioners in a number of capacities, especially as adjunct faculty. Faculty model best teaching practices, including creative and sophisticated use of technology.
- The supportive environment provided by the institution is highly valued by the candidates. In particular, the availability of the faculty and their responsiveness to students personal and academic needs is exceptional.
- Candidates noted that all courses integrated theory and practice making them relevant to both their immediate and long term needs.
- District school site personnel noted that candidates from the program are well prepared academically, mature and committed to student success.
- The School of Education is assertive in seeking collaboration with local school districts and held in high esteem by them.
- The Curriculum Resource Center is well funded and supported. It provides a broad array of curriculum materials and it is used extensively by candidates from both the main campus and Regional Centers.

Concerns

None noted.

Single Subject Credential Program

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Single Subject Program except for Standards 8B, 15, and 16 which are Met with Concerns. Included below is the rationale for the standards that were judged to be less than fully met. Also included are specific comments related to Multiple Subject Program Standard 7A.

Standard 8B, Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject Candidates. Candidates in areas of Art, Physical Education, Languages Other Than English and Business Education are not consistently receiving subject-specific pedagogical knowledge and skills. The program sometimes inappropriately places candidates outside their subject areas because it cannot achieve a critical mass of candidates in their specific subject matter area.

Standard 15, Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork (element c). It is not clear how candidates will complete the required 2-week full day teaching assignment in the new program. Many candidates in the current program are teaching full-time under an emergency credential

and others voluntarily student teach for the full day. The new plan does not explain how all students will meet the full-day requirement in the future.

Standard 16, Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualification of Field Supervisors (elements e and f). The team found that there is a lack of institutionalized professional development opportunities for cooperating and master teachers. While there are some grant funded professional development opportunities currently available to interested master teachers, there is no on-going, institutionalized process for providing professional development for the program's cooperating and master teachers.

Standard 7B Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts – Single Subject Reading, Writing, and related Language Instruction in English,

The School of Education at the University of San Francisco seeks to balance the research, teaching, and service dimensions of the School's programs to prepare its students to make a significant impact in the educational community. This goal is framed in the belief that learning is a lifelong process that reflects personal, moral, social, spiritual, and academic domains.

Within the academic domain, the implementation of the Reading Standards 7A and 7B of the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs were examined through the lens of SB2042 since the School is an early adopter of these standards. Emphasis was placed on how the institution provided systematic reading, writing, and related language arts instruction to pre-service candidates and to candidates already in the field.

Based on pertinent data gathered from the program report, additional supporting documentation, and interviews with faculty, candidates, employers, graduates, and a district administrators, the team finds that the University of San Francisco has implemented the Commission's standard for Reading, Writing, and Related Language Arts Instruction in both the Multiple Subject credential program and the Single Subject credential program through a focused commitment to literacy development. Candidates have many opportunities to develop and deepen their understanding of methodology, the structure of the English language, comprehension, and standards-based and assessment-driven instruction. Furthermore, the quality of faculty leadership in literacy development enhances learning of literacy-based strategies and skills among candidates.

Strengths

- Teacher Education enjoys a position of status in the university because of the priority placed on teaching in the overall mission of the university.
- The social justice perspective and focus on urban teaching pervades the program. Faculty and students demonstrate a strong commitment to these missions.
- The School of Education should be commended for its highly qualified faculty. The program is further enhanced by the inclusion of experienced practitioners in a number of capacities, especially as adjunct faculty. Faculty model best teaching practices, including creative and sophisticated use of technology.

- The supportive environment provided by the institution is highly valued by the candidates. In particular, the availability of the faculty and their responsiveness to students personal and academic needs is exceptional.
- Candidates noted that all courses integrated theory and practice making them relevant to both their immediate and long term needs.
- District school site personnel noted that candidates from the program are well prepared academically, mature and committed to student success.
- The School of Education is assertive in seeking collaboration with local school districts and is held in high esteem by them.
- The Curriculum Resource Center is well funded and supported. It provides a broad array of curriculum materials and it is used extensively by candidates from both the main campus and Regional Centers.

Concerns

None noted.

Education Specialist Credential Program Preliminary Level I: Mild/Moderate, including Internship

Findings on Standards

Through interviews with candidates, graduates, doctoral student faculty, district support providers, fieldwork coordinators, USF faculty, employers, and review of institutional documents, the team has determined that the University of San Francisco has fully met all Level I Education Specialist Standards.

Strengths

- The faculty is to be commended for its initiative in implementing a very high quality special education credentialing program. The team found exemplary handbooks, guidance instruments, and sequential instructional program elements in place to train quality, well-prepared special education teachers.
- Ongoing informal and formal systematic evaluation of the program by the lead professors in conjunction with the doctoral students, field work supervisors, and advisory board is exemplary.
- The level of support for Tier I candidates was cited by those interviewed as reasons they were able to be successful in their teaching positions. The program coordinator, University professors, doctoral students, field work supervisors, and district support providers, gave candidates a support system that increased retention and professional growth.

- Candidates consistently praised the program coordinator for the personal care and attention given each candidate as they moved through the program.
- The cohort model program design and attention to working adult learners was mentioned by candidates as reasons for entering and staying in the program.
- The doctoral students interface with program candidates allows for a rich research, mentoring and instructional program model.

Concerns

None noted.

Education Specialist Credential Program Professional Level II: Mild/ Moderate

Findings of Standards

Through interviews with candidates, graduates, doctoral student faculty, district support providers, fieldwork coordinators, USF faculty, employers, and review of institutional documents, the team has determined that the University of San Francisco has fully met all Level II Education Specialist Standards.

Strengths

- The University provides a rich and supported educational learning environment for candidate success in pursuing the credential. Faculty are experts in special education disciplines, and are highly regarded by peers, graduates, employers, and candidates. All of the interviewed candidates expressed satisfaction with the quality and relevance of the curriculum and the learning activities presented to them, as well as the accessibility and professional commitment of the faculty and supervisors.
- Research practitioners with expertise in a variety of areas interface weekly with candidates to provide a support system.
- Leadership is to be commended for its commitment to the program through a collaborative leadership model that provides consistent mentoring and monitoring of all candidates as they move through the program.
- The faculty is to be commended for its initiative in implementing a very high quality special education credentialing program. The team found exemplary handbooks, guidance instruments, and sequential instructional program elements in place to train quality, well-prepared special education teachers.
- Ongoing informal and formal systematic evaluation of the program by the lead professors in conjunction with the doctoral students, field work supervisors, and advisory board is exemplary.
- The level of support for Tier II candidates was cited by those interviewed as reasons they were able to be successful in their teaching positions. The program coordinator, University

professors, doctoral students, field work supervisors, and district support providers, gave candidates a support system that increased retention and professional growth.

- Candidates consistently praised the program coordinator for the personal care and attention given each candidate as they moved through the program.
- The cohort model program design and attention to working adult learners was mentioned by candidates as reasons for entering and staying in the program.
- The doctoral students interface with program candidates allows for a rich research, mentoring and instructional program model.

Concerns

None noted.

Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program: School Counseling, including Internship

Findings on Standards

From a review of the documents and from interviews with Faculty, USF Administration, Candidates, Graduates, Employers, Supervising Practitioners, Advisors, School Administrators, and Advisory Committee members, the team found that the program fully met all of the standards.

Strengths

The program's strengths come from its excellent faculty, well-designed courses, and careful attention to the needs and capabilities of the students. The strong leadership of the program coordinator was praised by those interviewed as having been a significant component of the Pupil Personnel Services program in the past two years. Employers reported that the graduates were well prepared to begin work immediately as Counselors, with only minor additional training in the specific details of the local school district record keeping and scheduling systems.

Concerns

None noted.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program

Findings on Standards

After the review of the institutional self-study report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, USF administration, employers, advisory committee members, and field supervisors, the team has determined that the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program fully meets all the standards.

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program is cohesively designed: built upon the mission of the university which relates to academic excellence, diversity, ethics and justice, service to the community, and the impact of administrator performance on the outcomes for their students. School administrator candidates are prepared by school-site administrators and university faculty supervisors with diverse backgrounds and expertise in school administration theory and practice.

Candidates take courses related to the Over-Arching Competencies and have assignments within each course that require them to apply theory and research to their current work contexts. The field experiences provide opportunities for candidates to link theory to practice in planning, implementing, and evaluating projects on-site at school sites or district offices. The program culminates with professional portfolios prepared by students centered around the CTC competencies.

Diversity and ethics are recurring themes in every aspect of the program. Coursework and field experiences assignments are closely related and provide a dynamic and relevant link between theory and practice. In addition, a cohort model provides the attention, peer support, and faculty mentoring which are all key components to the candidate's success in this program.

Strengths

- Candidates and graduates of the program are able to articulate how the mission of the university and relevance of the courses to current educational issues in the field inform their work as aspiring professionals.
- The alternative format of the program coursework (weekends and online) are a program attraction.
- There is a seamless combination of theory and practice through the courses, field work and portfolio process, including the careful selection of course textbooks (ranging from Aristotle to Apple). The work products produced in the field are more field/practice oriented – similar to ‘action research.’ For example, one candidate’s field project related to teacher attitudes toward parent involvement in schools, and yielded a handbook for teachers and administrators.
- The leadership of the program is exceptional. The accessibility of the program faculty, the support provided to students, and the resources (technological, text materials, and financial) made available to students allow them to be successful in the program as they work full time. The availability of resources and support for full time and adjunct faculty allow faculty to be current and innovative.

Concerns

None noted.

Professional Administrative Services Credential Program

Findings on Standards

After the review of the institutional self-study report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, USF administration, employers, advisory committee members, and field supervisors, the team has determined that the Professional Administrative Services Credential Program fully meets all the applicable standards.

The Professional Administrative Services Credential Program is cohesively designed: built upon the mission of the university which relates to academic excellence, diversity, ethics and justice, service to the community, and the impact of administrator performance on the outcomes for their students. School administrator candidates are prepared by school-site administrators and university faculty supervisors with diverse backgrounds and expertise in school administration theory and practice.

Candidates begin the program with an induction seminar where they identify their professional goals and plan out their course of study for the successful completion of the credential requirements, with their program advisor. The Induction process provides an opportunity to outline a flexible and individualized path to program completion. Students have assignments within each course that require them to apply theory and research to their current work contexts. The internship provides opportunities for candidates to link theory to practice in planning, implementing, and evaluating projects on-site at school sites or district offices. The program culminates with professional portfolios prepared by students centered around the goals identified in the induction seminar.

Diversity and ethics are recurring themes in every aspect of the program. Coursework and induction projects are closely related and provide a dynamic and relevant link between theory and practice. In addition, a cohort model provides the attention, peer support, and faculty mentoring which are all key components to the candidate's success in this program.

Strengths

- Candidates and graduates of the program are able to articulate how the mission of the university and the courses are relevant to the courses to current educational issues in the field and inform their work as professionals.
- The alternative format of the program coursework (weekends and online) are a program attraction.
- There is personalization of the program and flexibility in the program requirements, along with a seamless combination of theory and practice that occurs through the courses, internship, and portfolio process. The coursework is highly relevant to the candidates' roles as promising administrators. Many candidates are also enrolled in the doctoral program in Organizations and leadership, and produce studies, such as: "Who Cares: An Ethic of Caring as Defined by Middle School Students" and "The Imaginative Capacities of High School Special Education Students."

- The leadership of the program is exceptional. The accessibility of the program faculty, the support provided to students, and the resources (technological, text materials, and financial) made available to students allow them to be successful in the program as they work full time. The availability of resources and support for full time and adjunct faculty enable faculty to be current and innovative.

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 Standards

The Assessment Committee should consider completing its assignment at the earliest possible date. The results of the Committee's work should be carefully analyzed and evaluated by all departments in the School of Education. The university should have a clearly defined systematic evaluation process that is in print and available to all field and/or clinical field supervisors.

When a key faculty member vacates a position, i.e. retirement, sabbatical, it is suggested a vehicle be in place to create a seamless transition, thus ensuring the continuation of a quality program.

Multiple Subject Credential Program

Although the text used in the Early Literacy class, *Phonics for the Teacher of Reading*, is based on self-paced work, students have reported that in some cases, this component is treated entirely as an "independent activity," with little or no discussion, modeling, or feedback involved, or in other cases, instructors focus on important phonetic components, model lessons, and expect students to do the same. This uneven approach regarding a significant early literacy issue needs to be addressed in a manner that is more equitable for all candidates.

Neither the Self-Study nor the syllabi for the Multiple Subject C & I: Early Literacy and Integrated Language Arts courses adequately reflected the attention that in reality is given to strategies for English Language Development. The materials and the strategies that are integrated into a number of the courses should be made explicit.

Candidates were satisfied with their student teaching placements. In general, the selection process results in quality placements, however; the program should carefully monitor this process to ensure that the quality of placement is consistent throughout the program.

The institution's proposed plan for orientation and professional development for cooperating and master teachers will contribute to the overall consistency and quality of the cooperating and master teachers and their participation in the community of learners.

Single Subject Credential Program

Candidates were satisfied with their student teaching placements. In general, the selection process results in quality placements, however; the program should carefully monitor this process to ensure that the quality of placement is consistent throughout the program.

The institution's proposed plan for orientation and professional development for cooperating and master teachers will contribute to the overall consistency and quality of the cooperating and master teachers and their participation in the community of learners.

Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program, including Internship

In interviews with the candidates and alumni, they suggested program changes that the team felt would be very useful for the program. They were:

- To have a personal interview in the initial enrollment process, rather than a telephone interview, and cover the program in detail.
- To have every student do a biography at the time of enrollment to share with all of their instructors so there is no time wasted at the beginning of each class with each student re-telling his/her history.
- Continue to seek out instructors who really catch your attention. The long stretches of the weekend courses require instructors who are good at keeping the attention of the class for hours at a time.
- That it would be helpful if the mix of faculty included practitioners as well as academicians.
- That instructors should understand the reality of the settings that the students work in.
- That evaluations of the faculty by the students should include space for comments.

Administrative Services

- The leadership of the program is exceptional, the team commends the Program Coordinator.
- The Advisory Committee works in an ad hoc fashion, and is called upon to provide advice and consultation to the program coordinator on projects of current relevancy to the preliminary credential program. It is recommended that Advisory Committee meetings are held at least semi-annually.