Report of the Accreditation Revisit to
University of California, Los Angeles
June 2013

Institution:	**University of California, Los Angeles**
Dates of Revisit:	**April 8-10, 2013**
Prior COA Decision:	**Accreditation with Stipulations**
Accreditation Re-Visit Team Recommendation:	**Accreditation**

The team recommends that:

1. The stipulations from the 2012 accreditation site visit be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from **Accreditation with Stipulations** to **Accreditation**.

Rationale:
The recommendation of **Accreditation** is based upon the institutional response to the stipulations and a thorough review of the institutional self-study, additional supporting documents available during the visit, interviews with institutional administrators, program coordinators, advisory committee members, faculty, instructors, candidates, support providers/mentors and local school administrators, and additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation.

Below are listed the stipulations approved by the COA after the site visit in 2012 followed by information from the 2013 institutional response. Next are listed the revisit team findings and recommendations. After this section, the revisit team findings on the Common Standards and Program Standards are included. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards
The team reviewed Common Standards One, which was found to be **'Met with Concerns'** at the initial site visit. Based on the information collected from University leadership, administrators, the advisory board, program leadership, faculty, and review of documentary evidence all Common Standards are now **Met.**

Program Standards

The team reviewed the ten program standards that were found to be less than fully met at the initial site visit. The Reading Certificate Program has expired and is no longer an accredited program leaving nine program standards to be reviewed. Based upon compelling evidence from all stakeholders and review of documentary evidence, the team finds that all the program standards are now **Met.**

Revisit Team Findings

Based upon constituent interviews and review of documentary evidence the revisit team found that UCLA has provided evidence that all Common and Program Standards are now **Met.**

Credentials

On the basis of these findings, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

Initial/Teaching Credentials

Multiple Subject
- Multiple Subject
- Multiple Subject Internships

Single Subject
- Single Subject
- Single Subject Internships

Education Specialist
- Mild Moderate Disabilities Internship

Advanced/Service Credentials

General Education (MS and SS) Induction
General Education (MS and SS) Clear
Clear Education Specialist Induction

Education Specialist Added Authorizations
- Autism Spectrum Disorder
- Emotional Disturbance

California Teachers of English Learners

Administrative Services
- Preliminary Administrative Services
- Standards-Based Clear (inactive)

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

University of California, Los Angeles
April 8-10, 2013

Revisit Accreditation Team

Team Members:	**Barbara Merino, Team Lead** University of California, Davis
	Carry Tillery Corona-Norco USD
Staff to the Visit:	**Paula Jacobs,** Consultant **Gay Roby**, Consultant

Documents Reviewed

Minutes of UCAP Meetings
Minutes of Advisory Council Meetings
Committee on Degrees, Admissions and Standards (CDAS) Chart
CDAS Procedures for review of courses, programs, instructors for all UCAP programs
UNEX Course Sequence Grids
UNEX Internal Credential Approval Process
Reading Closure Report
Individual Induction Plans for MS/SS
Academic Coordinator Email communications
Handbooks (Site Administrator/Support Provider/Candidate)
Support Provider Reassignment Policy
Ed Specialist SP assessment data report – Fall 2012
UCAP Organizational Chart
Departmental Organization Charts
Course Syllabi
Mini-Pact
Lesson Plans/ Unit Plans
Lesson Observation Feedback
Candidate/Support Provider Assignments
Mentor Teacher online training
Faculty Vitae
Mentor Teacher/SP Assessment
Ed Specialist Transition Plan
Matrix of Enrollment
Meeting Agendas and Minutes
-UNEX Advisory Board
-Credential Team meetings
UNEX Formative Assessment Documents
Flowchart for UNEX program approval process

Interviews Conducted

	Common Standards	Program Standards	TOTAL
Candidates		78	**78**
Employers		23	**23**
Institutional Administration	7	3	**10**
Program Coordinators	4	5	**9**
Part-Time Instructors		9	**9**
Instructors	5	5	**10**
Advisors	8	8	**16**
Field Supervisors – Program	8	8	**16**
Field Supervisors - District	20	20	**40**
Advisory Board Members	24	12	**36**
Totals	76	171	**247**

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

The Revisit

The University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) revisit began on Monday, April 8, 2013 at the University Extension Office. The team met briefly for a lunch team meeting to discuss the interview schedule and questions in preparation for constituent interviews. The Unit Head who is also the Dean of the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies (GSEIS) accompanied by the Interim University Extension (UNEX) Dean provided a brief overview of administrative changes since the team visited in May 2012. Faculty, staff and constituent interviews and data review and collection activities began at 2:00 pm and continued through Day 2.

The Team Lead and Commission staff presented the Mid-Revisit Status Report to the Unit Head/GSEIS Dean and the Associate Dean of UCLA on Tuesday morning. Faculty, staff and constituent interviews and data collection and review continued throughout the remainder of the day. On Tuesday evening, the team met to discuss all standards and stipulations. The team consensus is that all standards are met, and the team recommends the removal of all stipulations. Consensus was reached to recommend the change of accreditation status from *Accreditation with Stipulations*, to ***Accreditation***. The report draft was prepared and reviewed by the Revisit Team. The UCLA accreditation revisit Exit Report was held on Wednesday, April 10 at 11:15 a.m.

Findings on Stipulations:

Stipulation #1 (2012)
"That within one year of the COA action, UCLA provide evidence that it has fully implemented its new leadership structure so it ensures faculty involvement in the organization, coordination and governance of all preparation programs and that the infrastructure is in place to ensure that the institutional leadership can support and monitor all credential programs."

Institutional Response (2013)
UCLA, under the guidance of both the exiting and the current Dean of GSEIS and the Interim Dean of UNEX, in collaboration with the Dean and Chair of the Luskin School of Public Affairs (LSPA) launched a unit-wide effort to fully implement procedures for oversight of its credential programs through UCAP (UCLA CTC- Accredited Professional Educator Programs). This systemic initiative was designed to provide meaningful oversight of all credential programs in transparent ways so that all constituencies could collaborate effectively in the development, implementation and evaluation of all elements of the authorized credentials with adherence to the CTC common and program standards.

Lead changes and investments noted by UCLA included a clear mandate for oversight of all credential programs under UCAP to the GSEIS Dean/UCAP Unit Head, the appointments of a new Associate Dean for GSEIS and the Interim Dean for University Extension to work with the faculty and administrators of all CTC-credential programs with the mandate to develop new procedures for joint leadership and oversight that can leverage the strengths of each in collaborative partnerships. In addition, the Deans expanded the oversight of the Committee on Committee on Degrees, Admissions and Standards (CDAS) to formally review new course proposals and instructors within a programmatic review, making the process more transparent and clearly delineated. These procedures now apply to both GSEIS and UNEX course and program proposals. UCAP has also implemented jointly-developed surveys as part of an initiative for joint assessment across all credential programs.

Revisit Team Finding (2013)
Evidence that the UCAP leadership structure has been expanded to provide more substantive oversight was found through a review of agendas and minutes for UCAP, and the advisory boards for UNEX and UCAP, interviews with all deans, directors, coordinators, instructors and staff. For example, the Deans' consistent attendance at regularly scheduled UCAP meetings shows sustained engagement with ways to address the development of common procedures for program, course and instructor reviews in UNEX and GSEIS. Minutes demonstrate that deans, faculty, coordinators and directors actively participate in co-constructing solutions and developing workable approaches to address complex issues. For example, the former GSEIS Dean outlined problematic issues in the development of new program proposals from UNEX and enlisted GSEIS Department Chair and CDAS to spearhead a more transparent process for course, program and instructor review and approval. The current GSEIS Dean/UCAP Head has made addressing the stipulations a top priority and has taken a hands-on approach, attending almost all UCAP meetings and tracking the design and implementation of changes in procedures jointly developed through the UCAP subcommittee charged with preparing the Revisit Documentation Report. The appointment of the former Director of Teacher Education for GSEIS as UNEX

Accreditation Adviser has been instrumental in facilitating the sharing of expertise across the unit. UCAP minutes show evidence of candor and focused follow-up on the CTC Accreditation review stipulations and recommendations.

Revisit Team Recommendation (2013)
Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation.

Stipulation #2 (2012)
"That UCLA provide oversight of the General Education (MS/SS) Clear Credential program, the Induction Program and the Clear Educational Specialist Credential program in the form of leadership to ensure that all components of the program are implemented as specified in the CTC-approved program documents and in alignment with program standards"

Institutional Response (2013)
The personnel described in the response for Stipulation 1 provide regular oversight over all that occurs in UCAP including the General MS/SS Clear Credential program, the Induction Program and the Clear Educational Specialist Credential program. All flow charts delineate procedures that were refined and developed during UCAP meetings. During UCAP meetings, participants were able to ask and answer questions about their work in an effort to ensure triangulation within the UNEX Induction and Clear credential programs. These programs are currently offered exclusively through UNEX. During UCAP meetings, the review of the Induction and Clear documents and the participation of the UNEX Academic Coordinators provided opportunities for explanation of procedures as well as an avenue for suggestions for UNEX to clarify those procedures. For example, there were questions raised by the CTC about credentialing procedures. As a result, UNEX created course sequence grids for these programs.

Following CDAS procedures is one way to achieve UCAP's goal of implementing academically rigorous programs, which are clearly aligned to CTC standards, getting advice from the UCAP Advisory Council is another.

Revisit Team Finding (2013)
Interviews with all constituents indicated that oversight has functioned effectively from the perspective of all participants (leadership to instructors to candidates). All instructors receive communication through the newly implemented leadership structure to ensure that these programs are implemented according to the CTC-approved program documents and in alignment with program standards for the General Education MS/SS Clear Credential program, the General Education MS/SS Induction Program and the Clear Educational Specialist Credential program. Additional details are provided in the discussion of each of these programs below.

Revisit Team Recommendation (2013)
Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation.

Stipulation #3 (2012)
"That a follow-up site visit to the University takes place within one year of COA action."

Institutional Response (2013)
UCLA prepared for and hosted a re-visit April 8-10, 2013.

Revisit Team Finding (2013)
The revisit took place April 8-10, 2013.

Revisit Team Recommendation (2013)
Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation.

Stipulation #4 (2012)
"That UCLA Extension (UNEX) not be permitted to propose new credential programs to the Commission until all stipulations have been removed by the COA. A follow-up site visit to the University takes place within one year of the COA action."

Institutional Response (2013)
UCAP has established procedures for programs interested in initiating new credential programs. UNEX has not proposed any new credentials to UCAP or CDAS.

Revisit Team Findings (2013)
UCLA has submitted no new programs; and withdrew one that had been submitted; in addition, leadership confirmed that there are no new programs in the proposal stages. The unit head indicated that there is an intentional pause; UCAP and CDAS are implementing the leadership structure for review of current programs, courses and instructors, and UCLA is in the search process for a new University Extension Dean.

Revisit Team Recommendation
Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation.

Additional Information Requested by the COA
In August 2012 the COA approved the Intern Option for the existing PPS: School Counseling Program. In approving the option, the COA asked that a report on the number of candidates who have completed the program in 2012-13 be submitted to the Commission as well as the plan for this delivery option in 2013 and beyond.

UCLA reported that there are no candidates currently participating in the intern delivery model. Five candidates are enrolled and active in the traditional delivery model and are expected to complete all program requirements by June 2013. Two additional candidates who completed coursework during the 2011-12 academic year will return in fall 2013 to begin their fieldwork; both candidates took a one year hiatus from the program.

UNEX did not accept any new students into the PPS School Counseling Program for the fall 2012 term. After the fall 2013 cohort completes practicum and coursework, they will be provided the option of either an intern or traditional fieldwork placement beginning fall 2014. UCLA Extension has developed protocols and systems for oversight of both delivery models.

Common Standards

Findings on the Common Standards 2012

During the May 20-23, 2012 accreditation visit, the accreditation team found Common Standards 1 Met with Concerns. A summary of the 2012 visit findings is presented in the left hand column below. The UCLA Progress as found in the 2013 Revisit is presented in the right hand column.

2012 Accreditation Finding	2013 Revisit Findings
Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership	
Met with Concerns After careful deliberation of the evidence addressing program and Common Standards, the leadership structure and, in particular, how this was implemented in the development and monitoring of many new educator programs developed within a short period of time in UNEX, the Team determined that a clearer articulation of lines of responsibility within UNEX in the monitoring of implementation and course development and refinements is essential. Unit leadership concerns within UNEX have played a role in raising issues in Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance. Here the team was concerned that some UNEX programs did not provide sufficient evidence to confirm that an effective system was in place to implement and monitor a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements. The team thus concluded that several program standards in some UNEX credential programs be declared as "Not Met" or "Met with Concerns." Given the number of UNEX delivery models, as well as proposed plans to expand in even more substantive ways, the Accreditation Team felt that the leadership structure needs to be clearly delineated to provide oversight and adherence to program standards. It is also worth noting that the use of multiple and evolving titles for personnel unique to UNEX make it even more critical to outline the duties and responsibilities of each and to indicate the relevance of the professional preparation of each to the title assigned. The distinction	**Met** 1. The Dean of GSEIS has received a clear mandate from the Executive Vice Chancellor to oversee and assume final responsibility and authority over UCAP and the CTC credential programs within it. Interviews with the leadership in UCAP, the Executive Vice-Chancellor/Provost and with instructors, coordinators, directors, and Deans demonstrated a common understanding of the duties and responsibilities of each member across the unit. In the words of the Unit Head and GSEIS, "We are all UCLA." 2. CDAS in collaboration with the GSEIS Associate Dean and UNEX Interim Dean, the GSEIS Department Chair and in consultation with faculty have developed a streamlined and clear process for course, program and instructor proposals, review and approval. 3. Collaborative discussions among faculty, directors and coordinators combined with flowcharts, checklists and rubrics to scaffold the development and review of course proposals have facilitated the enhancement, revision and development of course and program proposals. 4. Over the past two years 242 UNEX courses have undergone review to integrate both university and CTC expectations; 41 have been initially denied, then revised and approved upon revision, 15 were rejected in resubmission.

between a UNEX certificate and a CTC certificate needs to be clearly delineated to the candidates. As UCLA moves forward under the new UCAP organizational structure, the process for course and program review is designed to address these issues. The team commends the Dean of GSEIS in collaboration with all the Deans as well as the Chair of the Department of Education in GSEIS for developing a new process for review. The team also commend the faculty, instructional staff, and leadership (including the Director of Education in UNEX), for ongoing dedication to serving the needs of the broader educational community through innovative programs.	A high level of engagement and participation by key constituent groups in the accreditation process was seen at all levels across programs and units. Interviews and document review showed evidence of shared understandings on key program features (course/program development, duties and responsibilities of key positions across the unit, and protocols for addressing issues of concern to students, instructors, advisory board members, field supervisors and TPA coordinators).

2013 Revisit Team Findings on the Program Standards

During the May 2012 visit the team found that five Program Standards were **Met with Concerns** and six program standards were **Not Met**.

- **Single Subject with Internship**. Standard 7B - Single Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction: **Met with Concerns**
- **Reading Certificate**. Standard 1 - Program Design, Rationale and Coordination: **Met with Concerns**
- **General Education (MS/SS) Induction, MS/SS Clear, and Clear Education Specialist Induction**.
    - Standard 1 - Program Rationale and Design, **Met with Concerns**
    - Standard 2 - Communication and Collaboration, **Not Met**
    - Standard 3 - Support Providers and Professional Development Providers, **Not Met**

A summary of the 2012 visit findings is presented in the left hand column below; language quoted directly from the standard is italicized. UCLA's progress in addressing each standard less than fully met for each of the six programs is provided in the right had column. The three Induction/Clear programs were grouped together as a program cluster in the initial visit and report; although the program issues are similar, the revisit report below addresses these three programs separately to clarify any situations that may be different.

2012 Visit Findings	2013 Revisit Findings
Single Subject with Internship	
Standard 7B - Single Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction	
Met with Concerns Although the program provides research-based content literacy instruction, it is not clear that it effectively prepares each candidate to teach content-based reading and writing skills to a full range of students including struggling readers, students with special needs, English learners, speakers of non-standard English, and advanced learners. Candidates indicated that they felt underprepared to teach academic language in the content area during student teaching/internship experiences. Program coordinators, adjunct faculty and program field supervisors confirmed the candidates' perspective of their performance in this area.	**Met** Review of syllabi, protocols for lead assignments and assessments, samples of lesson plans for courses targeting Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction with links to academic discipline methods courses revealed a systematic approach to enhancing the visibility and impact of coursework and field experience on candidates' understandings of literacy development in the content areas. Interviews with directors, academic coordinators, instructors and candidates provided evidence of sustained attention to this issue. Among the notable institutional efforts to address these concerns are: 1. Additional professional development for all faculty on reading & writing strategies with a clear identification and development of 8 high leverage practices to highlight throughout the program, methods classes as well as foundational courses and field placement supervision.

2012 Visit Findings	2013 Revisit Findings
	2. Review of course syllabi document that faculty across programs give careful attention to the development of literacy broadly conceived, targeting TPEs in the approach to scaffolding unit lesson plans within a framework of social justice and close analysis of the linguistic demands of tasks. Explicit effort is seen over and over again in drawing candidates' attention to the rationale and use of the strategies with rich examples to illustrate each combined with multiple opportunities for students to develop expertise in their use through strategic "rehearsal" and implementation in the field. The sample of observations provided, including candidates lesson plans, demonstrate understanding of ways of slicing down complex concepts to make these accessible (e.g. an English candidate's lesson targeting understanding of irony through acting out a short scenario is set up through prompts with cues to analyze quotes for uses of irony.) Center X (CX) observation notes target TPE review with questions to scaffold suggestions for ways of enhancing group work and the use of strategic modeling. CX candidate unit plans across the content areas show the progression in the development of complex concepts and the commitment to integrating social justice perspectives in ways that are meaningful to students. (e.g. The geography of Africa and the emergence of trade empires are presented through using visual discovery to analyze maps and the information they convey, size for example). 3. Candidate interviews documented deep understanding of how they learned about the strategies and how they had adapted them to meet a variety of student needs, most notably English learners. Candidates in GSIES and UNEX classes shared elaborate examples of how to link concept development through a variety of strategies, highlighting many of those also stressed in instructor/faculty interviews. Through interviews during visits

2012 Visit Findings	2013 Revisit Findings
	with multiple program classes targeting literacy development in the content areas, candidates displayed understanding of the various ways that researchers have addressed academic literacy. 4. Candidates, faculty, adjunct faculty, advisors, field supervisors, advisory board members and institutional administrators all reported strong commitments and understanding of the social justice mission of the Teacher Education Programs (TEPs) across the unit. Candidates cited examples of techniques to analyze the language demands of academic tasks, explaining procedures used in math problem solving or on building understanding of complex science concepts through authentic inquiry in science. Candidates gave short accounts of how they had designed instruction in ways that used scaffolding via a variety of techniques to build background knowledge and deeper understanding of a range of genres and text types across content areas. 5. Advisory board members, some who are also employers, reported specific examples illustrating how GSEIS and UNEX programs have made an impact in their contexts. They identified key examples of the contributions of program graduates/completers to their schools. Many of the examples cited targeted initiatives to develop literacy, to promote home-school connections, and to enhance student performance across the content areas.
Reading Certificate	
Standard 1 - Program Design, Rationale and Coordination	
Met with Concerns Although the original narrative document addresses the requirement, "*Each program of professional preparation is coordinated effectively in accordance with a cohesive design that has a cogent rationale*," low numbers of participants has led to multiple entry points, negating the cohesive design.	**Program Closed** Effective July 1, 2012, UCLA Extension stopped accepting applications for the Reading Certificate program. After conferring with representatives from CTC, UCAP provided UCLA Extension authorization to discontinue offering courses for the Reading Certificate at the end of the summer quarter 2012. The program has subsequently been discontinued.

2012 Visit Findings	2013 Revisit Findings
General Education (MS/SS) Induction	
Standard 1 - Program Rationale and Design	
Met with Concerns *"The Induction Program collaborates with P-12 organizations to integrate induction program activities with district and partner organizations professional development efforts."* The review team could not find any evidence that collaboration for professional development existed for these programs.	**Met** The General Education Induction Program has established and is nurturing a variety of collaborative relationships to provide rich professional development opportunities for its candidates. Candidates are required to include district professional development training on their *Individual Induction Plan* for each inquiry. The academic coordinator initiates and maintains contact with school site administrators to ensure that professional development plans in each district/charter organization are integrated with UCLA's induction activities, working with mentor teachers and support providers to ensure that district professional development requirements are met. The academic coordinator, site administrators, support providers, mentor teachers and candidates confirmed this process, describing multiple opportunities for candidates to engage in trainings and workshops at their schools sites that supported the candidates' work in induction. Professional development offerings specified during the interviews included the following: training on Common Core State Standards, professional learning communities, analysis of student data, trainings on poverty and equity, workshops on closing the achievement gap, on-going trainings on balanced literacy, SIOP, and college and career readiness. Additionally, UCLA's academic coordinators share professional development opportunities with school sites, support providers and instructors to create a collaborative partnership between the districts/charter schools and the university. Site administrators, support providers and candidates confirmed this process during the interviews.
Standard 2 - Communication and Collaboration	
Not Met *"The induction program articulates with preliminary teacher preparation programs and P-12 organizations in order to facilitate the transition from teacher preparation to induction and build upon and provide*	**Met** UCLA currently provides explicit training in the inquiry process for all candidates. During the program orientation, *Action Research through the Inquiry Process* is a focus of instruction. Further support for learning about the inquiry process is

2012 Visit Findings	2013 Revisit Findings
opportunities for demonstration and application of the pedagogical knowledge and skills acquired in the preliminary credential program. *Programs offer professional development for site administrators that emphasizes the importance of new teacher development, identifies working conditions that optimizes participating teachers' success and implementing effective steps to ameliorate or overcome challenging aspects of teachers' work environments, and the foundations and processes of induction, in order to effectively transition the new teacher from induction to the role of professional educator."* The review team could not find evidence that candidates participated in action research to support each of the three inquiries. The review team members could not find evidence of anyone who had completed site administrator training. Further, they were limited in their contact with site administrators who supported the professional development of participating teachers at their site.	also included in coursework, especially through the quarterly *Collaboration and Support* courses and the candidate handbook. During interviews, candidates were able to articulate the inquiry process as action research and explain how their self-evaluation, using the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), and the Continuum of Teaching Practice (COTP), forms the basis of their inquiry questions. During the interview process, course instructors and support providers specified that they play a major role in facilitating the inquiry process for candidates; they help refine the candidate's focus and oversee the implementation of the action research. Candidates also verified the importance of the support they receive and addressed how the academic coordinator, the support provider and the instructors provide procedural facilitation throughout the inquiry process. UCLA has formulated a more effective way to engage site administrators in training for the induction program. They have developed a site administrator handbook that includes roles and responsibilities, program policies, and procedures for the induction program. Site administrators reported that candidates make an appointment to deliver and discuss the handbook. The collaborative process of candidate and site administrator reviewing the handbook together has been noted, in interviews with candidates and site administrators, as an effective way to get to know each other and to share goals of the program. Site administrators also reported that they are able to connect more with candidates and learn about the coursework and the inquiries on which the candidate will be focusing during induction. In addition, site administrators reported a greater ability to recommend upcoming school site-based professional development that candidates may use. Candidates expressed confidence in sharing the handbook with their administrator, reporting that it provided an opportunity to connect on a personal level and discuss the requirements of the program.

2012 Visit Findings	2013 Revisit Findings
	Another opportunity for site administrator training is provided online and covers the program design and requirements. Most principals reported that they have not completed online training, and thus find the candidate meeting and the joint discussion of the handbook a more effective training for them. According to site administrators, candidates and support providers, the academic coordinator also emails professional development articles to each administrator that focuses on new teacher training and induction. Site administrators evaluate candidate portfolios and also engage in program assessment.
Standard 3 - Support Providers and Professional Development Providers	
Not Met *"Consistent with assigned responsibilities, program providers receive initial and ongoing professional development to ensure that they are knowledgeable about the program and skilled in their roles.* *The program has defined criteria for assigning support providers to participating teachers in a timely manner. Clear procedures are established for reassignments when either the participating teacher or support provider is dissatisfied with the pairing. The program leader(s) provides formative feedback to support providers and professional development providers on their work, retaining only those who meet the established criteria."* The review team could find no evidence that support providers receive organized professional development (both initial and ongoing) regarding mentoring skills. Assignment and retention criteria were not clear to program personnel or candidates that were interviewed. Support providers reported receiving no feedback regarding their work, including formative evaluations that would	**Met** Support providers are required to complete an online training module that provides information about their roles and responsibilities, the inquiry process, portfolio building, observations, and the process by which the support provider/mentor teacher will be evaluated by the candidates. Support providers also receive a handbook that relates what candidates need to know, including the CSTPs, information about the inquiry process and reassignment guidelines. Support providers reported that the online training is extremely helpful in learning their role in the program. They also valued a new pilot face-to-face training that was held in the fall which has allowed them to reinforce and review the same information from the online training, but also to engage in discussions about mentoring. During this training they were able to collaborate on how to best support their candidates. Support providers reported that they receive email communication from the academic coordinator that focuses on mentoring skills. They shared that their questions are answered in a timely way by the academic coordinator. Support providers also articulated that they would like to have access to the candidate's coursework in order to better

2012 Visit Findings	2013 Revisit Findings
improve their mentoring.	understand and meet the needs of the candidates who are their mentees. According to documentation, support providers are matched with candidates by the academic coordinator based on credential subject area, needs, support provider expertise, student population and school setting. Interviews with candidates, the academic coordinator and program director confirm that the assignment process and the process to follow if there are any concerns by the candidate or the support provider are outlined in their respective handbooks. Support providers are retained based on positive candidate evaluations, and their adherence to UCLA extension program practices and policies. The academic coordinator uses results of the candidates' evaluation of the support providers to determine needs for improvement, provide feedback, and determine reassignment or retention of support providers in the program. Individual results are shared with each support provider to provide feedback on his/her performance. Support providers reported that this process is positive and helps them improve their practice. They expressed that they feel they are learning a tremendous amount about mentoring and teaching in their role as mentors. According to both the documentation and the academic coordinators, aggregated results are also used to determine the focus for future trainings and program improvement.
General Education (MS/SS) Clear	
Standard 1 - Program Rationale and Design	
Met with Concerns *"The clear credential program collaborates with P-12 organizations to integrate induction program activities with district partner organizations professional development efforts."* The review team could not find any evidence	**Met** The process to establish and verify the collaboration for professional development is the same as the General MS/SS Induction program. The difference between the induction and clear programs is that the university assigns a support provider in the Gen Ed MS/SS Induction (the candidate is not employed) while the candidate

2012 Visit Findings	2013 Revisit Findings
that collaboration for professional development existed for these programs.	selects a volunteer mentor for the Gen Ed MS/SS Clear (the candidate is employed). In both programs, the support providers/mentor teachers facilitate professional development through the inquiry process, as well as the district offered programs (see Program Standard One response, Gen Ed MS/SS Induction program above for further explication of collaboration for professional development).
Standard 2 - Communication and Collaboration	
Not Met *"The clear credential program articulates with preliminary teacher preparation programs and P-12 organizations in order to facilitate the transition from teacher preparation to induction and build upon and provide opportunities for demonstration and application of the pedagogical knowledge and skills acquired in the preliminary credential program.* *Programs communicate with site/district administrators regarding the importance of new teacher development and working conditions that optimize participating teachers' success. In order to effectively transition the new teacher from induction to the role of professional educator the program communicates with site administrators regarding effective steps to ameliorate or overcome challenging aspects of teachers' work environments."* The review team could not find evidence that candidates participated in action research to support each of the three inquiries. The review team members could not find evidence of anyone who had completed site administrator training. Further, they were limited in their contact with site administrators who supported the professional development of participating teachers at their site.	**Met** Please see Program Standard 2 above for the explication of this process. There is no significant difference between the Gen Ed MS/SS Induction and the Gen Ed MS/SS Clear as it relates to this standard.
Standard 3 - Support Providers and Professional Development Providers	
Not Met *"The program selects, prepares, and assigns*	**Met** Mentor teachers are required to take part in an

2012 Visit Findings	2013 Revisit Findings
individual(s) to provide support to participating teachers using well-defined criteria consistent with the assigned responsibility in the program. The program provides initial and ongoing professional development to individuals supporting participating teachers to ensure they are knowledgeable and skilled in their roles. *The program has defined criteria for assigning support providers to participating teachers in a timely manner. Clear procedures are established for adjusting support when there is evidence from either the participating teacher or the program that support is ineffective.* *The program regularly assesses the quality of services provided by those who support participating teachers. The program leaders provide formative feedback on their work, retaining only those who meet the established criteria."* The review team could find no evidence that support providers receive organized professional development (both initial and ongoing) regarding mentoring skills. Assignment and retention criteria were not clear to program personnel or candidates that were interviewed. Support providers reported receiving no feedback regarding their work, including formative evaluations that would improve their mentoring.	online guided training module that provides information about their roles and responsibilities, the inquiry process, the portfolio, observations, and the process by which the mentor teacher will be evaluated by the candidate. Mentor teachers also receive a handbook that explicates what candidates need to know, including the CSTPs, information about the inquiry process and reassignment guidelines. Mentor teachers report that they are chosen by the site administrator or the candidate and must complete an application to be formally approved. Mentor teachers are retained based on positive quarterly candidate evaluations, as well as their adherence to UCLA Extension program practices and policies. This information is found in the program documents and confirmed by the academic coordinator. The academic coordinator uses the results of the candidate evaluations to design improvement, provide feedback, and determine reassignment or retention in the program. Individual results are shared with each mentor teacher to provide feedback on their performance.
Clear Education Specialist Induction	
Standard 1 - Program Rationale and Design	
Met with Concerns *"The induction program collaborates with birth to 22 special education services and agency organizations and P-12 to integrate induction program activities with district and partner organizations' professional development efforts."* The review team could not find any evidence that collaboration for professional development existed for these programs.	**Met** The program requires, and candidates confirm that a transition plan that informs the *Individualized Induction Plan* must be completed by all participants. Documentation and candidates described the program's requirement to meet with the academic coordinator to discuss and design the transition plan to include activities, research and application. The academic coordinator then initiates and maintains contact with school site

2012 Visit Findings	2013 Revisit Findings
	administrators in order to ensure that professional development plans in each district/charter organization, are integrated with Clear Education Specialist Induction professional development activities. Candidates and documents confirmed that the academic coordinator also works with support providers with matching credentials to ensure follow-through with planned professional development to ensure growth in areas specified in the candidate's transition plan. Candidates are required to include district professional development training in their *Individual Induction Plan* for each inquiry.
Standard 2 - Communication and Collaboration	
Not Met *"The induction program articulates with preliminary teacher preparation programs and P-12 organizations in order to facilitate the transition from teacher preparation to induction and build upon and provide opportunities for demonstration and application of the pedagogical knowledge and skills acquired in the preliminary credential program.* *Programs offer professional development for site administrators that emphasizes the importance of new teacher development, identifies working conditions that optimizes participating teachers' success and implementing effective steps to ameliorate or overcome challenging aspects of teachers' work environments, and the foundations and processes of induction, in order to effectively transition the new teacher from induction to the role of professional educator, and which also includes collaboration between general education induction and special education induction to allow for participating education specialist teachers to be part of the larger education community."* The review team could not find evidence that	**Met** Clear Education Specialist Induction candidates confirmed during the interview process that all candidates receive training on the inquiry process. Training includes the *Action Research through the Inquiry Process* training module, during the program orientation, as well as an explication of the inquiry process in the candidate handbook. Candidates are able to articulate the inquiry process as action research, and speak to how their self-evaluation, using the CSTPs, forms the basis of their inquiry question. Further support is provided through the quarterly *Collaboration and Support* courses. Education Specialist candidates make appointments with their site administrators to review their transition plan, a process described by candidates, site administrators and support providers. Candidates also meet with site administrators to share the handbook that includes roles and responsibilities concerning the program, and policies and procedures for the site administrator. The site administrator completes the checklist in the handbook and signs it to be returned by the candidate to the academic coordinator. Site administrators are also invited to take part in an online training. The academic coordinator emails professional

2012 Visit Findings	2013 Revisit Findings
candidates participated in action research to support each of the three inquiries. The review team members could not find evidence of anyone who had completed site administrator training. Further, they were limited in their contact with site administrators who supported the professional development of participating teachers at their site.	development articles to each administrator that focuses on new teacher training. Site administrators evaluate candidate portfolios and also engage in program assessment. As confirmed by site administrators, support providers, the academic coordinator and candidates, additional ongoing support is provided by the academic coordinator through weekly emails to candidates and support providers; these emails focus on mentoring and reflective conversations.
Standard 3 - Support Providers and Professional Development Providers	
Not Met *Consistent with assigned responsibilities, program providers receive initial and ongoing professional development to ensure that they are knowledgeable about the program and skilled in their roles. The program has defined criteria for assigning support providers to participating teachers in a timely manner. Clear procedures are established for reassignments when either the participating teacher or support provider is dissatisfied with the pairing. The program leader(s) provides formative feedback to support providers and professional development providers on their work, retaining only those who meet the established criteria.* The review team could find no evidence that support providers receive organized professional development (both initial and ongoing) regarding mentoring skills. Assignment and retention criteria were not clear to program personnel or candidates that were interviewed. Support providers reported receiving no feedback regarding their work, including formative evaluations that would improve their mentoring.	**Met** Program documentation shows that Education Specialist support providers have matching credentials with their candidate partner. According to the organizational map for the Education Specialist program, support providers are enrolled in a mandatory online support provider/mentor teacher training module. In addition, the Education Specialist academic coordinator co-leads a fall quarter optional face-to-face MS/SS/Educational Specialist support provider training session.