

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

Professional Services Division

June 2012

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at the University of California, Los Angeles. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

**Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For all Programs Offered by the Institution**

	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1) Educational Leadership		X	
2) Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	X		
3) Resources	X		
4) Faculty and Instructional Personnel	X		
5) Admission	X		
6) Advice and Assistance	X		
7) Field Experience and Clinical Practice	X		
8) District Employed Supervisors	X		
9) Assessment of Candidate Competence	X		

Program Standards

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject, with Internship	19	19		
Single Subject, with Internship	19	18	1	
Preliminary Education Specialist: M/M, with Internship	22*	22		
Added Authorization, Autism Spectrum Disorder	3*	3		
Added Authorization, Emotional Disturbance	3*	3		

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
General Education (MS/SS) Induction	6	3	1	2
General Education (MS/SS) Clear	6	3	1	2
Clear Education Specialist Induction	7	3	1	2
California Teachers of English Learners	10	10		
Reading Certificate	11*	10	1	
Reading and Language Arts Specialist	9** Inactive			
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	32	15		
Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work	25	25		
Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance	8	8		
Preliminary Administrative Services	15	15		
Clear Administrative Services, Standards based	9** Inactive	**		

* The site team has made a finding on all standards using the sampling process of onsite interviews and document review. For each of these programs, a standard by standard document will be reviewed through program assessment one year after transitioning. This process will complete the program review and accreditation process for these programs.

**These programs are inactive and were not reviewed due to inability to interview constituencies and anticipation of withdrawal.

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report**

Institution: University of California, Los Angeles

Dates of Visit: May 20-23, 2012

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with 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. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards

The decision of the team regarding the nine Common Standards is that Common Standards 2 through 9 were **Met**. Common Standard 1 was **Met with Concerns**.

Program Standards

For the fourteen credential programs reviewed, the team found that all program standards were **Met** with the following exceptions:

- **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**

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of program documentation, evidence provided at the site, additional information provided by program administration and faculty, and interviews with candidates, program completers, faculty, administrators, employers and other stakeholders. Due to the finding that all Common Standards were met with the exception of one standards identified as **Met with Concerns**, and based on the evidence that oversight of implementation as per program documents was uneven in several UNEX programs with five program standards **Met**

with Concerns and six program standard **Not Met**, the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

Stipulations

1. That the institution provide within one year of COA Action, evidence that it has fully implemented its new leadership structure so that this 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.
2. That the institution provide oversight of the General MS/SS Clear Credential program, the Induction Program and the Educational Specialist Clear 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.

On the basis of this recommendation, 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
Education Specialist Clear

Education Specialist Added Authorizations
Autism Spectrum Disorder
Emotional Disturbance

California Teachers of English Learners

Reading Certificate
Reading/Language Arts Specialist (inactive)

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

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

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- University of California, Los Angeles be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- University of California, Los Angeles continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

Team Leader:

Barbara Merino
University of California, Davis

Common Standards Cluster:

Michael Kotar
California State University, Chico

Cheryl Forbes
University of California, San Diego

Programs Cluster:

Sandra Fenderson
University of San Francisco

Judy Mantle
National University

Jose Lalas
University of Redlands

Carry Tillery
Corona-Norco USD

Christine Zeppos
Brandman University

Staff to the Visit:

Paula Jacobs, Consultant
Gay Roby, Consultant

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog
Common Standards Report
Course Syllabi
Candidate Files
Fieldwork Handbooks
Follow-up Survey Results
Needs Analysis Results
Program Assessment Feedback

Biennial Report Feedback
Field Experience Notebooks
Schedule of Classes
Advisement Documents
Faculty Vitae
College Annual Report
College Budget Plan
TPA (PACT) Data

Interviews Conducted

	Common Standards Cluster	Program Sampling Cluster	TOTAL
Candidates	17	108	125
Completers	52	95	147
Employers	17	74	91
Institutional Administration	29	39	68
Program Coordinators	53	53	106
Faculty	56	82	138
Adjunct Faculty	16	56	72
TPA Coordinator	2	8	10
Advisors	46	12	58
Field Supervisors – Program	36	59	95
Field Supervisors - District	8	18	26
Credential Analysts and Staff	27	17	44
Advisory Board Members	61	71	132
Totals	420	692	1112

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background information

The University of California has a long and rich history. In 1882, the precursor to the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) was a teacher education institution. In 1919, California's Governor William D. Stephens signed legislation establishing the Southern Branch of the University of California. The Vermont Avenue campus opened on September 15, 1919 offering two-year undergraduate programs to 260 Junior College students and 1,078 students in the Teacher Training program, under the direction of Ernest Carroll Moore. In 1923, the Southern Branch conferred its first degrees, awarding the Bachelor of Education to 28 students, and in 1924, third and fourth years were added to the Letters and Science curriculum. In 1925, the first Bachelor of Arts degrees in the College of Letters and Science were awarded to 100 women and 24 men. Also in 1925, the UC Regents chose a 384-acre parcel of the Wolfskill Rancho in Westwood as the new site for the Southern Branch campus--declining site proposals from Burbank, Pasadena, Fullerton and Palos Verdes. In 1929, following two years of construction, classes began on September 23 with 5,500 students enrolled at the Westwood UCLA site which remains the home of UCLA.

Today, UCLA, one of ten UC campuses, is hailed as one of the foremost public research and teaching universities in the world. There are almost 40,000 students at UCLA with roughly 27,000 undergraduates and 13,000 graduate and professional students. The student body is diverse both in cultural and economic terms. As many as 36% of UCLA undergraduates receive Pell Grants, given to students whose family income is typically less than \$50,000. International

students account for 17% of graduate students and 5% of undergraduates. U.S. undergraduate ethnicity includes 4% African American, 15% Hispanic, 33% White and 38% Asian/Pacific Islander.

UCLA's core mission can be expressed in just three words: education, research, service. UCLA is guided by the following comprehensive mission statement:

UCLA's primary purpose as a public research university is the creation, dissemination, preservation, and application of knowledge for the betterment of our global society. To fulfill this mission, UCLA is committed to academic freedom in its fullest terms: we value open access to information, free and lively debate conducted with mutual respect for individuals, and freedom from intolerance. In all of our pursuits, we strive at once for excellence and diversity, recognizing that openness and inclusion produce true quality. These values underlie our three institutional responsibilities.

UCLA is an institution that is firmly committed to the betterment and benefit of the Los Angeles community. UCLA endeavors to integrate education, research and service, so that each enriches and extends the others. This integration promotes academic excellence and nurtures innovation and scholarly development.

Education Unit

UCLA offers fourteen different credential or certificate programs. Credential programs are offered in two different schools, the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies (GSEIS), and the Luskin School of Public Affairs (LSPA) and through the UCLA University Extension (UNEX) Education Department. In order to unify all programs offering credentials approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, in 2011 UCLA created the UCLA CTC-Accredited Professional Educator Programs (UCAP) Unit. The UCAP Unit at UCLA believes in its common mission of promoting social justice, building an ethic of caring, fostering individual responsibility, and committing to underserved communities. The unit leadership and program directors developed a targeted Unit Mission to guide all educator preparation efforts at UCLA. As part of UCLA as an institution, UCAP Unit educator preparation programs in the GSEIS, as well as preparation programs housed in UNEX and the LSPA are guided by each division's own mission statements. For example, GSEIS supports the overall *vision and mission* of inquiry, the advancement of knowledge, the improvement of professional practice, and service to the education and information professions. Programs are committed to the development of future generations of scholars, teachers, information professionals, and institutional leaders. The GSEIS mission and vision stem directly from the overall mission of the University of California, Los Angeles.

Programs within GSEIS are also provided direction for their courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability by the following values statement:

Programs are delivered through the teaching and advising efforts of a mix of tenure line, academic administrators, adjuncts, and lecturer appointments. Retention, Tenure and Promotion policies ensure that faculty hold a terminal degree (tenure-line) and/or professional certification (non-tenure-line) and that they demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service to the university, college and profession.

**Table 1
Program Review Status**

Program Name	Location	Number of program completers (2010-11)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (11-12)	Agency Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject	<i>GSEIS</i>	33	50	CTC
Multiple Subject with Internship	<i>UNEX</i>	10	4	CTC
Single Subject	<i>GSEIS</i>	94	82	CTC
Single Subject with Internship	<i>GSEIS and UNEX</i>	30	24	CTC
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild-Moderate with Internship	<i>UNEX</i>	30	28	CTC
Added Authorization, Autism Spectrum Disorder	<i>UNEX</i>	0	40	CTC
Added Authorization, Emotional Disturbance	<i>UNEX</i>	0	1	CTC
General Education (MS/SS) Induction	<i>UNEX</i>	0	11	CTC
General Education (MS/SS) Clear	<i>UNEX</i>	0	40	CTC
Clear Education Specialist Induction	<i>UNEX</i>	0	44	CTC
California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) Certificate	<i>UNEX</i>	123	22	CTC
Reading Certificate	<i>UNEX</i>	2	3	CTC
Reading and Language Arts Credential	<i>UNEX</i>	0	0	CTC

Program Name	Location	Number of program completers (2010-11)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (11-12)	Agency Reviewing Programs
(inactive)				
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	<i>UNEX</i>	0	8	CTC
Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work (SSW)	<i>LSPA</i>	7	6	CTC
Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance (CWA)	<i>LSPA</i>	7	6	CTC
Preliminary Administrative Services	<i>GSEIS</i>	34	44	CTC
Clear Administrative Services Credential Standards-based (inactive)	<i>GSEIS</i>	2	2	CTC

The Visit

The Accreditation Site Visit took place Sunday through Wednesday as is typical for Commission accreditation site visits. A team of eight accreditation team members convened at 12:30 Sunday May 20, 2012 for orientation to the institution, its programs and the interview schedule. The Education Unit Head is the Dean of the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies (GSEIS). She provided a warm welcome, an overview of the organizational structure of the UCLA CTC-accredited Professional Educator Programs Unit (UCAP), and an orientation to credential and certificate programs, faculty, staff and advisory committees. Team members were then provided an opportunity to begin interviewing constituencies. The attention to detail in prior planning provided for multiple opportunities for team members to gather information. Team meetings were held during lunch Monday and Tuesday as well as each evening. Interviews and data collection continued through Tuesday evening with team members conferring with one another frequently. On Wednesday morning, consensus was reached on all standard findings and on an accreditation recommendation. The Exit Report was held on campus at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday May 23rd, 2012.

This visit was unique in that there were various delivery models and many fairly new programs with limited information on implementation available for team members. For ten of the fourteen active programs reviewed, there was no *Preliminary Report of Findings* from Program

Assessment, and for six of the active programs, no completers. Three of the fourteen programs had internship options. Other than numerous daily schedule changes and the complications of phone conference interviews, there were no unusual circumstances affecting this site visit.

Common Standards

Standard 1: Educational Leadership

Met with Concerns

The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability. The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution. The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Findings

UCLA, with its CTC-Accredited Professional Educator Program Unit (UCAP), has developed a Common Mission/Goals through a process that involved faculty, instructional staff, program administrators, faculty advisors and stakeholders from the Los Angeles community in articulating a common vision. This vision generally shapes and guides programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability. The UCAP unit believes in a common mission of “promoting social justice, building an ethic of caring, fostering individual responsibility and committing to underserved communities.” Review of mission statements for UCLA and the units in which the UCAP programs are housed revealed a high degree of congruence with these values.

UCAP leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs, and to represent the interests of each program within the institution. Interviews with the Chancellor, the Executive Vice-Chancellor and Provost showed that at the highest administrative levels programs in the professional schools are highly valued and supported. The Chancellor affirmed the role of UCLA as a public university with a “public mission” with civic responsibilities and noted the strong commitment to diversity and the development of innovative programs by the leadership in GSEIS in collaboration with University Extension (UNEX) and Luskin School of Public Affairs (LSPA) Deans.

UCAP articulates a compelling and cogent argument to support the need for educator preparation programs that adhere to these values, citing relevant scholarship targeting theoretical frameworks as well as empirical research exploring these ideas in culturally and linguistically diverse contexts. UCAP was developed as a cohesive unit to link all educator programs of the various delivery models under the leadership of the Dean of GSEIS in collaboration with the Deans of UNEX and the LSPA. It should be noted, however, that this organizational structure is a recent development. Through document review and interviews during the visit, the Team found that some aspects of the organizational structure and oversight functions are still evolving within the UNEX programs.

According to the organizational structure and documentation, UNEX and the UNEX Education Program Director participate in regularly scheduled UCAP meetings to share information and make collaborative decisions regarding the unit's credential programs. It was stated during interviews that the UNEX Director of the Department of Education also holds quarterly general session meetings with all UNEX Academic Coordinators, Program Managers, Program

Coordinators, and Program Assistants as well as special project meetings as needed. UNEX instructors and support providers meet with the Academic Coordinator during regularly scheduled meetings once per quarter and when necessary.

The program summaries provided for the team for each UNEX program outlined titles in UNEX. Those titles were not always consistent with those provided in the UCAP organizational chart. Some individuals, when introduced, had differing titles than those provided in documentation. For example, the program summary identified a program director by name, at the site visit when that individual was introduced, the title given was program coordinator, neither titles nor positions appeared in the UNEX portion of the organizational chart provided by UCAP. In the organizational chart it appears as “continuing educator.”

When team members interviewed the leadership as to responsibility for key functions such as oversight of new instructors, modification of course content and alignment of course and program content with Commission standards, different individuals provided conflicting information. The upper-level leadership assigned responsibility for these functions to the UNEX Director of the Department of Education. That individual owned the responsibility in some interviews; however, in later interviews another individual identified as a “lead academic coordinator” indicated that the lead academic coordinator was responsible for course oversight. In sum, this conflicting information, provided via documents and interviews with different constituencies, left the Accreditation Team unable to confirm how lines of unit authority actually function within the UNEX-sponsored programs.

Contributing to the confusion of different delivery models housed in UNEX, the accreditation team noted that UNEX also offered several certificate programs. Moreover, some candidates and completers shared that UNEX offers many certificate programs in education and that it is not always clear how CTC-approved program certificates differed from others that are not CTC-approved. For example, UNEX advertises a “General Education for Secondary School Students Certificate” granted by UNEX which, after its completion, leads to the CTC-approved Single Subjects Credential

Based on information attained in interviews with UNEX leadership, program development at UNEX often involves hiring consultants with expertise for short-term tasks such as development of a new program proposal to address Commission-adopted standards. These proposals are also shaped by the Director of the Department of Education and designated staff and the program director, who is identified as the ‘continuing educator’ on the organizational chart. According to the Associate Dean of UNEX, Deans’ review at UNEX targets general quality, viability and a uniform protocol used for all UNEX courses. The process at UNEX targets quarterly reviews of course evaluations by the Director, Department of Education and Program Academic Coordinators. The UNEX Associate Dean also monitors student feedback and some aspects of quality with rigor defined largely by grade distribution on a quarterly basis. When issues arise, instructors are given opportunities for additional development through some mini-courses provided by UNEX which target some aspects of pedagogy and most especially targets techniques for on-line instruction. The evidence cited above, unless otherwise noted, came from interviews with UNEX personnel.

Documentation provided by each of the programs offered through UNEX stated, “All the UNEX credential/certificate programs, courses and instructors are reviewed and approved by the appropriate UCLA GSEIS academic faculty under the unit’s leader, the GSEIS Dean”; some program narratives actually stated in their narratives that “all courses and faculty are approved by Dean of UCLA’s GSEIS”. However, interviews with faculty and administration did not substantiate this process. The Dean of GSEIS and the Chair of the Department of Education clarified for the team that course review for CTC credentials has operated under two different protocols: one for GSEIS and LSPA and a different review protocol for courses that operate through UNEX. Programs and courses offered within the GSEIS and LSPA followed the Academic Senate Review through each Unit’s courses committee. UNEX credential courses were reviewed by individual Academic Senate members in GSEIS through 2011; they were not reviewed by the GSEIS courses committee, and UNEX ‘programs were not reviewed. Under the leadership of the GSEIS Dean and the collaborating Dean in UNEX, course and program review and supervision have been recast. The new process will reflect the more systematic consultation process followed by the GSEIS faculty for its own CTC-accredited credential programs and courses. The process will involve the Chair of the Department of Education of GSEIS and the committee charged with curriculum review. For oversight of CTC-accredited programs and certificates, the Dean of GSEIS is the lead in a collaborative relationship with the Deans of UNEX and LSPA. It is worth noting that efforts have also been made to review UNEX courses established under the former protocol. A retrospective, expedited review was conducted under the auspices of the GEIS Chair of the Department of Education and the courses/curriculum committee of the GSEIS this academic year. Based on an interview with the GSEIS Chair of the Department of Education, close to 80 UNEX courses with links to credential programs were reviewed, with some requiring revision and resubmission.

Thus, through interviews with administration and faculty, the team found that the faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are, in general, actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs but not to the same degree in all delivery models. Interviews with Academic Senate Faculty leaders in GSEIS, and with the UCAP head and GSEIS Dean, conducted by multiple members of the Accreditation Team, revealed that the process of course approval and new program development has differed between the different pathways. Key functions have been addressed to a lesser degree during a period of rapid expansion in UNEX including several recently approved UNEX credential programs: Pupil Personnel: School Counseling and the Preliminary and Clear Education Specialist program. UNEX courses had limited input from Academic Senate Faculty in GSEIS, with less attention given to course review, feedback and key features of the curriculum and assessment protocols. Moreover, because the course review was not always situated within the context of the whole program and the accreditation standards and requirements, some essential elements such as links between program coursework and field work implementation were not always addressed.

The UCAP Deans, under the leadership of the GSEIS Dean (Unit head) and the Chair of the Department of Education, have worked collaboratively to develop a more systematic process for course and program review and oversight. The new process has been developed, is now articulated, and should be fully implemented in the coming year with future proposals for all UCAP programs, curricular revisions and new courses.

The institution and education unit have created and articulated a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. Generally, evidence of the vision is present in most credential programs but not consistently in those housed in UNEX. Interview data and document and artifact review revealed that in the Induction and Clear General Education MS/SS and in the Clear Education Specialist programs, several program standards, most prominently those related to Curriculum/Field Experience and Candidate Competence, were not fully addressed and were either not met, or met with concerns. Evidence of field supervision by qualified district-employed individuals as required by the program could not be documented from the available data. Evidence of the use of candidate assessment information for candidates to improve practice was not provided and the approach used for demonstration of knowledge and skills did not make the process transparent enough to judge its quality. In terms of implementation, issues of fidelity to the program design have arisen relative to some programs with candidates and some completers (i.e., Clear and Induction Programs and the Reading Certificate). Thus these programs did not provide sufficient evidence to insure that processes were in place to implement and monitor a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements. Based on interviews with upper-level leadership of the UNEX organizational structure, it appears that neither the Dean, nor the Associate Dean, given the number of UNEX programs that they oversee, attend to monitoring program implementation with this degree of detail, but both suggested that the Director of Education is charged with this task. Thus, it appears that within the UNEX structure it was not clear precisely how oversight and monitoring of these key functions are addressed. This was of particular concern as it relates to monitoring adherence to standards in courses that might be revised, and field supervision for some programs as specified by the program standards.

Rationale

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 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 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.

Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation

Met

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

Findings

A review of documents as well as interviews with unit leaders, program coordinators and faculty confirmed that UCLA UCAP has begun implementation of a unit-level assessment and evaluation system called the Unit Assessment and Evaluation System (UAES). The new system, stimulated by the 2009 Biennial Report, brings together existing measures in four thematic areas across credential programs: knowledge acquisition, demonstration of skills, final demonstration of competence, and program effectiveness.

UAES generally collects, analyzes and uses data on candidate and program completer performance across the unit. The team noted that there were inconsistencies evident in the systematic collection and analysis of data in some cases, particularly with regard to program completer performance in some UNEX programs. In addition, in some cases within GSEIS and UNEX programs that use a capstone portfolio to assess candidate competence, the use of grades as an analytic tool did not appear to allow UAES to use this assessment to inform unit operations as noted in the institution’s response to CTC feedback on the 2011 Biennial Report and confirmed in interviews with program and unit leaders. As a result, UAES plans to implement the use of common rubric scales to assess key coursework papers or projects, portfolios, and fieldwork performance.

Increased attention has been given to finding similar data across programs. Plans are underway for modifying current course syllabi and candidate assessments as well as program evaluation instruments to make the data directly comparable across programs. Although stakeholders, including candidates and program completers, generally reported that they received a great deal of support and guidance from faculty and program leaders, the use of common program evaluation tools in addition to course and instructor evaluations will assist unit leaders in responding quickly and effectively to candidate feedback. Given the scope and complexity of CTC-approved credential programs across GSEIS, UNEX and the Luskin School of Public Affairs, the UAES system promises to strengthen the effective implementation of ongoing unit evaluation. As evidenced in interviews with unit and program leaders, as well as in document review, specific areas that can be addressed by UCAP leadership across all levels of the system will be pinpointed for improvement. The next Biennial Report should include evidence of the progress in implementation of the UAES.

Standard 3: Resources

Met

The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management. Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.

Findings

UCLA provides the unit with a variety of resources for educator preparation. These include operating budgets for departments and schools offering credential programs, employment of qualified faculty and staff, and sufficient facilities to carry out the mission of the unit. University administrators expressed strong commitment to educator preparation and the development of innovative professional programs to serve the needs of children in California.

Classrooms utilized by programs are located on the UCLA campus, at off-campus locations managed by UNEX, and at area schools, churches and other community organizations and locations that are contracted by the unit. Classrooms and instructional spaces are appropriate; some are well-mediated and have up-to-date technology. Faculty and students reported that facilities are adequate for instruction and computer laboratories are available for developing instructional materials. Significant technology resources are also available for conducting research. The review team was able to confirm adequacy of facilities during the visit. Offices for staff and faculty are appropriate to meet the needs and mission of the unit. Support staff, including credential analysts, are available to provide services to candidates and monitor candidate progress through credential programs. Instructional technologists in the Educational Technology Unit of GSEIS, and other staff, are also available to support faculty work. Divisions offering teacher education programs have made a significant commitment to support administration of the state-mandated teaching performance assessment, PACT, despite the current financial situation.

UCLA has twelve libraries. The Educational Psychology Library is housed in UCLA's main library, the Charles E. Young Research Library. It provides research-level collections and services in humanities, social sciences, education, public affairs, government information, and more. The Young Research Library houses more than five million volumes, including textbooks, research papers, educational journals, and a teacher resource area with materials useful to candidates.

Financial resources for instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, assessment management, and faculty professional development are determined through a budgeting process that involves consultation and negotiation among deans, business managers, chairs, and program directors to ensure that resources are adequate to meet programmatic needs. Deans, business managers and department chairs manage a range of financial operations during any given fiscal year. Interviews revealed that some flexibility is allowed for transferring funds, personnel lines, or other expenses across state-support, self-support and grants and contracts so that needs are met. Faculty reported that they recognize limits resulting from reductions in the State's annual allocation to UCLA, and that budget meetings are scheduled. These meetings will provide information about the current and upcoming budget, and solicit questions, ideas and

comments from faculty and staff. Examples of resource items the budget covers to provide program support include assigned time for program directors, student services, faculty advisors, and credential analyst support; stipends for district employed field supervisors; and professional development funds as well as training opportunities for senate and non-senate faculty.

Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel

Met

Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program. Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution provides support for faculty development. The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

Findings

Faculty include tenure-line professors, adjuncts and lecturers. Personnel policies require that tenure-line faculty hold a terminal degree; non-tenure-line faculty hold professional certification. Reviews of curricula vitae indicate that most faculty have had teaching and/or administrative experience in P-12 schools. Faculty are productive in scholarship related to the missions of UCLA, the GSEIS, and UNEX, and the knowledge generated is applied to enriching instruction and experiences for candidates. Diversity in culture, ethnicity, gender, and languages spoken is evident among faculty, and faculty are knowledgeable of the variety of forms of K-12 student diversity.

Faculty and staff are committed to a mission that advocates for social justice, access, and equity, as well as the development of community. Faculty are involved in local, national, and international efforts to strengthen communities through education and information studies. They have developed expertise and practices focused on education for a diverse underserved urban society. Extensive evidence exists in the publications faculty have authored and in the many grants and projects they direct focused on the unit mission and underserved populations. Course syllabi include learning activities and assignments that require candidates to learn about and make use of academic content standards and curriculum frameworks. Candidates and completers across programs talked about their own learning through credential programs in regard to assessment of students and the effects of public school accountability systems.

Collaboration with P-12 colleagues is exemplified through: faculty work with area schools and districts many research and service projects being conducted, including the UCLA Principals' Center directed by the Principal Leadership Institute; and involvement with the LAUSD Institute of Higher Education Consortium through which Los Angeles basin universities and the Los Angeles Unified School District share information and articulation. GSEIS operates one demonstration school, the UCLA Lab School and collaborates with a Los Angeles Unified School District Pilot School, "UCLA Community School" that also serves demonstration school purposes for UCLA. Faculty also serve on the boards of charter schools and share research,

consulting and professional development activities with P-12 colleagues.

Professional development for faculty is available through the UCLA Office of Instructional Development, University Extension programs and through research centers and institutes within GSEIS. An annual faculty development account is provided for tenure-line and non-tenure line faculty in the Multiple and Single Subject credential programs and Administrative Services credential programs in GSEIS for professional development activities such as attendance and participation at the American Educational Research Association conference and other research focused conferences. Each faculty member is awarded \$900 and can apply for additional funds. Workshops and training sessions through University Extension are available free of charge to UNEX instructors. Faculty were pleased with unit efforts to continue professional development in times of budget reductions.

Faculty evaluation for credential program faculty is comparable across programs under the three Deans but has some unique features, particularly in UNEX and Center X. Tenure-line faculty performance is reviewed through the tenure decision and beyond, following established personnel policies. Evaluations focus on research, teaching excellence and service to the profession. For non-tenure-line faculty, teaching performance is of primary importance. Course instructors and field supervisors are evaluated each quarter using student questionnaires. Personnel committees or program directors are charged with the review of individual faculty evaluation summaries. In UNEX, the Associate Dean also reviews student evaluation summaries. Summaries are shared with the instructor and the Dean. Evaluations are used to improve instruction, for advancement, and for non-tenure-line faculty to justify subsequent employment decisions. In UNEX, instructors are hired quarterly, whereas in Center X, most non-tenure-line faculty, particularly those in lead roles, have longer-term appointments.

Standard 5: Admission

Met

In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.

Findings

UCLA credential programs use a variety of venues for recruiting highly-qualified applicants who are committed to the unit mission of social justice and advocacy for students and community members in underserved areas of Los Angeles. As described by faculty, candidates, completers, program coordinators and student affairs staff members, outreach activities are varied and target a variety of community organizations and local newspapers as well as the use of internet and social media. In addition, a strong network of program completers is actively involved in outreach in several programs. Admission criteria and procedures for all programs are explicit in print and electronic materials and include all Commission-adopted requirements. A new unit-level UCAP website provides a central portal containing links to credential programs where specific admissions requirements can be found.

The admissions process across programs includes a comprehensive review of multiple measures, as evidenced in document review and confirmed in interviews with multiple stakeholders. These measures include letters of recommendation, essays or personal statements, individual or personal interviews, transcripts, and resumes. The comprehensive review process encourages and supports highly qualified applicants from diverse populations.

The candidate selection process provides multiple opportunities for faculty and program leaders to ensure that admitted candidates have the academic preparation, pre-professional experiences, and personal characteristics that suggest a strong potential for effectiveness and commitment to the explicit social justice values of UCLA credential programs. Personal statements, individual or group interviews, and contact with program faculty, alumni and staff help ensure that all candidates possess effective communication skills and sensitivity to California's diverse population.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Met

Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist each candidate's professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

Findings

UCLA UCAP candidates receive a great deal of personalized attention from program faculty and staff, according to interviews with candidates and program completers across programs. In the vast majority of cases, candidates and completers indicated that their faculty and staff advisors were highly qualified in their areas of expertise, in keeping with the institution's status as a world-class research university, and greatly appreciated the degree and quality of the support they received. Because of the strong clinical component of the professional preparation programs within GSEIS, candidates and completers expressed overall satisfaction with the professional placement through the networks established during their fieldwork experiences.

For the most part, candidates and completers stated that they were appropriately informed about all program requirements, which were also delineated in printed and online materials reviewed. In those programs with a capstone portfolio project, particularly within UNEX online programs, some candidates and completers indicated that requirements were not always clear, especially in the absence of face-to-face orientation sessions.

Program coordinators, faculty, and advisors described multiple measures provided to support and assist candidates throughout their experience across programs. Candidates and completers also described timely feedback and intervention in the majority of cases when problems were encountered, and the majority enthusiastically endorsed the assistance they received from the point of application through their participation in the program and completion of credential requirements. In the rare cases where candidates did not meet program requirements, a clear process of advisement was in evidence through document review and verified through interviews with program coordinators, student affairs staff, and faculty.

Overall, candidate progress and performance is used to guide advisement and assistance in UCLA UCAP programs. Particularly notable was the appreciation for meaningful connections between coursework and fieldwork expressed by candidates and program completers in preliminary professional preparation programs where faculty also supervised fieldwork in both GSEIS and UNEX.

Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

Met

The unit and its partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.

Findings

The unit, along with its partners, places candidates in each program in field experiences and clinical practice settings that offer authentic situations for candidates to perform the responsibilities associated with their fields and to be assessed on their abilities. Field experiences are planned, supervised and evaluated similarly across all programs. While all programs frequently communicate with districts and schools, program advisory committees also provide sources of input and consultation to maintain the efficacy of field experiences.

Each program has structured field experiences. Teacher education programs offer field experiences from observation and participation in classrooms through student teaching across three courses that are taken sequentially in fall, winter and spring quarters. Depending on the program, candidates are required to serve in up to three settings in regard to grade level or subject area. Candidates for teacher credentials become familiar with the California Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs), begin practicing the TPEs, and develop competence that is assessed by both their guiding teacher (district employed field supervisor) and university supervisor.

Preliminary Administrative Services candidates also complete a three-course sequence of structured field experiences at their own school sites through an academic year. Candidates are expected to participate in a variety of real-life administrative experiences that are authentic and of value to their schools. Candidates in Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) credential programs complete structured field experiences over two years. PPS field experiences are designed as a laboratory for course work and as an integrative component of the programs. Through field experiences, candidates practice essential skills of the profession and have exposure to different aspects of either school social work or school counseling. Candidates also meet clock hour experience requirements for licensure.

Programs work with many school districts, charter schools and agencies. Through on-going interactions, programs collaborate with partners regarding criteria for the selection of sites, clinical personnel, and site-based supervisors. So that candidates understand the nature and culture of the populations they will serve, a key criterion for site selection for UCLA programs is

the diversity of the student or client population served by the school or agency.

Fieldwork provides opportunities for candidates to understand and address issues of diversity and develop research-based strategies for student learning. In Teacher Education Programs, candidates learn how theory is translated to practice in various settings and how their approach to education aligns with the experiences of a diverse population of students from low-income schools and communities. Candidates uncover these understandings by keeping field notes on interactions and experiences in urban classrooms, including those that show differences in teaching styles and student developmental levels. In the Preliminary Administrative Services Program, candidates, with the agreement of their site supervisor, complete tasks based on the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders. Tasks related to Standard 13: Working with Diverse Families and Communities, and Standard 15: Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Understanding, are emphasized. The PPS programs focus on field experiences related to courses and encourage candidates to consider interventions that are culturally appropriate in providing clinical services, making referrals, and connecting to community services. When needed, program coordinators make special placements so that candidates are assured of having sufficient experiences with English learners and culturally diverse populations.

Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors

Met

District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.

Findings

Each credential program has established minimum qualifications for district or agency-employed supervisors that include degree and/or certification or licensure requirements, length of experience, characteristics indicative of ability to support credential candidates, and other program-specific qualifications. For example, guiding teachers (district-employed field supervisors) for teacher credential candidates demonstrate knowledge of state-adopted content standards, practice in a manner that reflects strong subject matter pedagogy, and possess an additional authorization for working with English learners.

Selection of district or agency-employed supervisors is similar across programs. District, charter, and site administrators often assist in identifying and recruiting supervisors. University supervisors also assist in recruiting and selecting district-employed supervisors. Individuals identified as prospective supervisors complete information forms to provide evidence of their qualifications that is verified by program directors or coordinators. For those who meet qualifications, some programs observe and/or interview the prospective supervisor. The interview also serves to inform the prospective supervisor of expected roles and responsibilities.

District- and agency-employed supervisors are oriented and trained in supervision, both formally and informally. Each credential program has a handbook that provides details of the mission, design and operation of the program. Some programs have an additional handbook for supervisors to guide them in meeting their responsibilities. The PPS programs provide formal supervisor training conducted through various formats, including online courses. These programs

are part of a consortium of universities that have agreed to recognize supervision-training courses offered in Los Angeles basin universities. Another example of supervisor training is free-of-cost online workshops offered through the Induction Program that address program orientation, supervision techniques, standards and candidate assessments. Across programs, university supervisors provide one-on-one guidance and modeling of supervision techniques for district- or agency-employed supervisors.

Interviews with candidates confirmed that they have opportunities to complete evaluation forms about their supervisors. For example, for Teacher Education Programs, guiding teachers (district-employed field supervisors) are evaluated by candidates using the *MS/SS Guiding Teacher Assessment Form*, an open-ended questionnaire on strengths and areas of concern. Credential candidates are also provided with opportunities to give feedback on their field placements throughout the year. Some candidates reported on situations in which they were moved to another guiding teacher when feedback was not positive. The review team learned that guiding teachers for the MS/SS GSEIS programs are recognized at a reception and also receive a stipend. Interviews with district- employed field supervisors were inconsistently provided across programs.

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence

Met

Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards.

Findings

The UAES system within UCAP has identified major categories as transition points in determining the professional knowledge and skills of each candidate: candidate preparation, performance and dispositions assessed at entry, professional knowledge assessed throughout the program, skill proficiency assessed at specific points, and overall candidate competence assessed at the culmination of the program. Course syllabi and interviews with candidates, faculty, program completers and program coordinators verified that candidates have multiple opportunities to develop and demonstrate professional knowledge and skills to effectively support students in meeting state-adopted standards. Employers confirmed that graduates of UCLA educator preparation programs are generally well-prepared for assuming their professional responsibilities.

Documents reviewed onsite demonstrated that multiple measures, including the required RICA and Teaching Performance Assessment where applicable, are used across the unit to determine overall candidate competence in the majority of programs. Exceptions were noted and verified through interviews and onsite document review, particularly in those programs using a capstone portfolio assessment where course grades were used to determine competence. As noted in the institution’s response to the CTC feedback on the Biennial Report, the proposed use of common rubrics to assess comparable assessments including measures of fieldwork performance, course projects, and candidate portfolios will allow the unit to more effectively ensure that each candidate demonstrates proficiency on the full range of competency requirements as well as provide candidates themselves with more detailed information about their own progress. The next Biennial Report should include analysis of candidate competence data related to standard-

based assessments for those programs currently using a capstone portfolio assessment.

Teaching Credential Programs

Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs Multiple and Single Subject Internship Credential Programs

Delivery Models

GSEIS

- TEP 2-year Credential/Masters
- Joint Mathematics/Education (JMEP) and Science/Education (STEP) Programs
- IMPACT: Urban Teacher Residency Program
- Teach LA/Teach Compton Internship Programs

University Extension (UNEX):

- MS/SS Internship Programs

Program Design

The University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) hosts both traditional and Intern multiple subject/single subject (MS/SS) credential programs with multiple delivery models, all part of the UCLA CTC Accredited Professional Educator Programs “UCAP” Unit. Each program has at its center a mission to prepare teachers with the commitment, capacity, and resilience to promote social justice, caring, and instructional equity in urban schools for student populations traditionally underserved by high quality educational programs, especially low-income racially, culturally, and linguistically diverse students. The traditional program, called TEP (Teacher Education Program) is located in GSEIS at Center X. GSEIS TEP also allows for matriculation of candidates from the undergraduate program Joint Mathematics/Education (JMEP) and Science/Education (STEP) Programs as well as the IMPACT: Urban Teacher Residency Program. The TEP also included the former Bilingual/Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) Spanish emphasis option. Two additional intern programs, TeachLA/TeachCompton from GSEIS and the Intern Program through UCLA Extension Education Department (UNEX) complete the multiple and single subject credential program offerings.

In the undergraduate program, as described by a program coordinator, credential coursework begins during the fourth year of the candidate’s bachelor degree program. The following year, candidates are employed as full time teachers and begin work towards a master's degree in education. The TeachLA/TeachCompton from GSEIS and the Intern Program with UCLA UNEX function as two distinct program delivery models. All GSEIS and Intern credential programs, courses, and instructors are reviewed and approved by the appropriate UCLA GSEIS academic faculty under the unit’s leader, the GSEIS Dean. UNEX credential programs and course offerings are reviewed by the Director of Education and the Associate Dean of UNEX.

The structure of leadership that credential candidates view depends upon their attendance within the institution’s programs. All multiple/single subject credential candidates who attend a program through GSEIS are supported through an organizational structure that sees multiple/single directors, professors and tenure-line faculty reporting to the chair of the department. The chair reports to the Dean of GSEIS. However, through reviewer interviews, it became apparent that UCLA UNEX candidates are supported through the organizational

structure where program representatives and academic coordinators report to the continuing educator, who reports to the education director, who is overseen by the Dean of University Extension (UNEX).

Both organizational structures, UNEX and GSEIS, offer both formal and informal venues for communication, including: faculty meetings/retreats, administrative meetings, meetings between staff and faculty, and advisory boards. These meeting times take various forms throughout the calendar year to include monthly, quarterly, and semiannually. Evidence reviewed noted these meetings inform developing practices that impact departmental mission initiatives, instruction and program administrative practices.

Course of Study

Multiple Subject and Single Subject (MS/SS) Credential programs are available to candidates in multiple pathways over two levels: undergraduate and graduate. The scope and sequence of MS/SS courses are based on principles of teacher development informed by adult learning theory and research. Course syllabi, confirmed by both GSEIS faculty and administrative staff, are designed to provide a framework of interrelated coursework and field experiences that prepare candidates to teach effectively in urban public schools. UNEX course syllabi, confirmed by academic coordinators, are reviewed at the individual academic coordinator level. Academic coordinator collaboration, documented through team interviews, provide for course consistency of content instruction.

As evidenced during candidate interviews, candidates completing fieldwork requirements make connections between theory and practice and apply what they have learned. Participating fieldwork supervisors and faculty confirmed these connected events during field observations and class discussions. Although candidates reported general satisfaction with their district field supervisors, there were several instances where candidates reported some district field supervisors were not informed of the requirements involved in implementing the PACT.

Given the multiple pathways to credentialing, collaboration between and among program delivery models is essential to the success of the candidates' experiences as well as of the program. A snapshot of a course sequence includes: ED405A, Teaching in Urban Schools: Exploring Communities, ED406, Social Foundations & Cultural Diversity in American Education, ED360A, Novice Seminar, and Integrated Methods and Field Practicum coursework specific to credential type. Candidates reported that they felt adequately prepared to meet the challenges faced in their field experiences.

As evidenced in program documentation and confirmed through interviews with academic/program coordinators, candidates are exposed to research that informs instructional decisions that will develop literacy in all K-12 learners, including English learners and students with learning differences. Through research-based instruction, reading assignments, field experiences, reflection, and the use of technology, candidates learn how to teach basic reading skills. For single subject content areas, there are separate methods classes where candidates are afforded the opportunity to focus on subject-specific pedagogy. Faculty and differing levels of program administrators stated that candidates are provided opportunities to integrate various pedagogical techniques in their instruction. Although documentation indicated preparation for

literacy instruction, some candidates and completers reported that they experienced frustration in their competence of delivering academic language strategies to students.

Candidate Competence

Candidates progress through the program of sequenced coursework and supervised fieldwork with multiple formative measurements that illuminate their developing teacher competency embodied in the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Evidence of course pedagogical assignments that formally assess candidates' performance in relation to the TPEs were reviewed, as well as supporting evidence of continual TPE performance feedback in the form of field observation forms, progress reports of novice teaching, intern field notebooks, and interviews with the academic advisor. University appointed support providers evaluate candidate competence through multiple field observations.

Candidates struggling to meet course competencies are given multiple chances to succeed through varying levels of administrative and faculty support. Interviews confirmed that candidates receive advisement and coaching by a variety of supports—faculty, field supervisors and mentor teachers or district support providers. Interviews with candidates, field supervisors/faculty and academic coordinators revealed steps initiated to support candidate success.

Summative assessment of candidate competence is seen through the completion of the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). The PACT is completed during the final portion of the candidate's novice year of program instruction where support is given in lesson design, assessment, and modification of instruction. Each credential model provides the candidate with clear and accurate information about the nature of the pedagogical tasks and embeds opportunities for practice in coursework. TPA Coordinators affirmed the PACT implementation and collection process that was substantiated by candidates. Any candidate with unsuccessful performance is allowed remediation and a resubmission opportunity. TPA Coordinators delineated subsequent follow-up remediation support and alternative collection dates for candidates who did not receive passing scores. Both UNEX and GSEIS TPA Coordinators further substantiated program procedures to analyze candidate scores to assess the effectiveness of instruction that will lead to program improvement.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the Multiple and Single Subject programs with the exception of the following for the Single Subject Program:

Standard 7B: Single Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction 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. The team found Standard 7B to be **Met with Concerns**.

**Preliminary Education Specialist Credential Programs:
Mild/Moderate (MM) Disabilities with Internship
Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD)
Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance (ED)**

Program Design

Over the past two years, Special Education faculty members have written to CTC's recently adopted program standards relative to the following programs: (1) Preliminary Education Specialist Credential: Mild/Moderate Disabilities, (2) Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD), and (3) Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance (ED). All of these programs have been designed to reflect the mission of UCLA and the Education unit.

At this time, UCLA offers only the Intern program delivery model of the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities Credential program. This program has been designed and developed as a cooperative endeavor with local school districts, county offices of education, Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPA's), and the California Association of Private Special Education Schools (CAPSES). The design of the program focuses on social justice within its Special Education curriculum. District-based mentors and candidates themselves verified through the onsite interview process that candidates are prepared to successfully teach in contemporary urban Special Education settings where they are faced with a multitude of challenges. Faculty reported that the design of the program consists of four main components: 1) Admission and Advisement; 2) Coursework and Field Experience; 3) Candidate Assessment; and 4) Program Evaluation. The program design is based on several critical factors: (1) the programs are designed to be very practical in nature; (2) the sequence of courses moves from introductory to advanced, including graduated field experience performance expectations; (3) the programs respond to the demands of an extensive service area; and (4) programs support the practice of teaching and learning communities. Teacher leadership is also emphasized. Throughout the site visit, Program Coordinators and faculty clearly articulated features of the program design for the Intern credential and added authorizations.

An advisory board that meets twice a year provides a vehicle for UNEX personnel to stay grounded in school and district needs and to field recommendations that can serve to strengthen Special Education credential courses and programs. Membership on this board includes teachers, administrators, curriculum specialists, UNEX instructors, school mental health professionals, and community leaders with expertise in education, including Special Education. All advisory members interviewed endorsed the program design for all Special Education programs.

Course of Study

Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Intern Credential

Academic Coordinators explained that UNEX interns take a full complement of foundations, content-specific and seminar-based courses leading to the preliminary credential. Both courses and practica are intended to prepare teacher candidates to assume the responsibilities of the full-

time teacher of record in an urban public school. Academic Coordinators and faculty explained how candidates are given opportunities to learn and practice the skills, strategies and dispositions needed for successful completion of a university internship. The courses introduce interns to various perspectives on teaching and learning; the social, political and economic structures influence schooling in urban contexts; and the implications of teacher beliefs and pedagogy on student outcomes. The pre-service component provides a lens through which candidates come to understand classroom management and planning, developmentally appropriate teaching practices, reading/language arts, subject specific pedagogy, human development, and teaching English learners and special needs students. These topics are explored in greater depth as candidates progress through the program. Teaching Foundations B also provides teaching career information such as building the effective educator resume and interview skills, as well as hands-on exploration of the education field including assignments that require teacher and administrator informational interviews. Each course in the program sequence includes practical application-based, reflective assignments that necessarily relate to the candidate's practicum component. Courses are linked to TPEs as well as program standards. Therefore, based on discussions with faculty, candidates and completers, coursework and fieldwork are interconnected.

It was emphasized by the Academic Coordinator for the Mild/Moderate Disabilities program that further impacting the special educator's challenge is the fact that many urban K-12 students without effective or knowledgeable caregiver and community resources are often under-diagnosed or misdiagnosed for learning disabilities as well as autism and emotional/behavioral disabilities. These students with huge deficits in academic and social skills and knowledge are often placed in Special Education classrooms with teachers who have not been adequately prepared to properly assess their authentic academic status. The UNEX program's mission is to close this "teacher gap" through a program that includes teacher advocacy and leadership, as well instruction regarding response to intervention, differentiated instruction, culturally-inclusive positive behavior support, functional behavior assessments and intervention plans, effective communication and collaboration with all of the student's team (family, community, mental health providers, various service providers, and other relevant parties), Individual Education Plans for identified special needs learners, and formal/informal student academic assessments.

Field experiences are integral to the program design of each Special Education program. Academic Coordinators and faculty explained that in the Intern practicum, candidates are provided opportunities to demonstrate competence in all standards through the framework of the TPEs under the guidance and observation of their assigned support provider. Through the onsite interview process, district administrators stated that interns are placed as teachers of record (classroom teacher or resource specialist) in a public school setting which requires the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate credential. The length of their placement is determined by the timeliness of their progression through the program that is typically five quarters. Faculty reported that in Teaching Foundations B, candidates are also given opportunities for experience through guided observations in general education classrooms. Candidates and completers verified these practices.

It was reported by faculty and the Academic Coordinators during the onsite visit that the Internship seminar provides the interns with the opportunity to form an online community of learning that emphasizes self-reflection, peer mentoring, and direct accessibility to instructors, support providers, and Academic Coordinators on a 24/7 basis. Weekly seminar session topics

are based on the TPEs and specific quarterly credential coursework, yet are also driven by the interns' current needs. Candidates and completers verified that the online format provides a particularly effective method of support in that it serves as a medium for interns to get immediate assistance and information from a number of expert and peer resources with a variety of knowledge and experience. Faculty and Academic Coordinators reported that interns meet face-to-face quarterly in an on-ground day-long seminar session. This session is facilitated by the Program Director, Academic Coordinator, seminar instructor, and support providers. This session supplements the online sessions by providing direct instruction, group work, role-playing, and dynamic discussion of theories and strategies. The Internship practicum provides the framework for the classroom teaching experience within the intern program. Candidates and completers emphasized the value of the seminar sessions.

Added Authorizations(AA): Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) and Emotional Disturbance (ED)
Discussions with Academic Coordinators and faculty during the onsite visit revealed that both AA-ASD coursework and portfolio are intended to prepare teacher candidates to educate and support students with autism across the autism spectrum. Candidates are given opportunities to learn and practice the skills, strategies and dispositions needed for successful completion of the authorization. Candidates interviewed verified that this was a meaningful process.

Faculty and the Academic Coordinator communicated that the AA-ED program includes courses on 1) characteristics, 2) academic and behavioral strategies, 3) effective collaboration, and 4) a practicum module. Both courses and practicum are intended to prepare teacher candidates to educate and support students with emotional and behavioral disorders. Candidates are given opportunities to learn and practice the skills, strategies and dispositions needed for successful completion of the authorization. It was further explained by faculty that instruction also focuses on the importance of culturally-inclusive positive behavior supports.

The Program Coordinator verified that each course in the program sequence for either AA includes practical application-based, reflective assignments that necessarily relate to the candidate's practicum component. Further, it was stated that courses are linked to program standards. Candidates, completers and program faculty verified that coursework and practicum are interconnected.

Both AA-ASD and AA-ED candidates reported that they engage students with autism or ED respectively in their own classrooms and/or school sites. For AA candidates who do not have ready access to these students as per their specific AA program, Academic Coordinators and faculty reported that the program assists candidates in securing these opportunities.

Academic Coordinators and faculty explained that the portfolio provides the AA candidate with experiences that enhance knowledge, skills, and dispositions included in successful academic/instructional and social/behavioral learning environments for students with either ASD or ED, as appropriate for the candidate's program. Each course in the program sequence includes practical application-based, reflective assignments. Courses are linked to program standards. Candidates and completers verified that practice and stated that it was useful. Therefore coursework and portfolio are interconnected.

During the site visit, district administrators and field-based district supervisors praised the quality

of the Special Education programs as well as the quality of the candidates. Many noted the accessibility and quality of support provided by faculty and intern support staff at the main campus. Interns expressed appreciation for this support as well as the mentoring and coaching from their district-based intern mentors.

Assessment of Candidates

According to Program Coordinators and faculty, candidates and program graduates in all Special Education programs are assessed using multiple measures. They reported that various assessment points are targets for obtaining assessment data, producing information that informs faculty, administrators, and staff about decisions relative to candidate and program performance. Candidate assessment and performance is assessed at admission, followed by formative assessments throughout the program, and culminating in end of program assessments, some of which are evolving as part of an assessment system that is being refined. Candidates and completers substantiated this practice through the interview process.

Through the interview process, it was explained by the UNEX Director of Education that the Academic Coordinator has the responsibility to collect and compile all evaluation information received from the candidate, instructors, support provider, site mentor, Academic Coordinator, and Program Director in order to submit a summative narrative evaluation of the candidate. Each candidate has a Candidate Checklist that documents progress towards the credential in the candidate's folder. The checklist notes satisfactory completion of credential program requirements, as well as any concerns, unsatisfactory completion of coursework or practicum issues. The checklist is reviewed and updated during each advising session. When the candidate is ready to apply for a credential, the candidate meets with the Academic Coordinator for a culminating evaluation. The candidate also reviews the Candidate Checklist to verify that all course requirements and program requirements have been met. Candidates and completers verified this process during the onsite visit. Attention to advising and support provided to ensure student success across all aspects of each Special Education programs was a pervasive theme from among all constituencies throughout the site visit process.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, district and university supervisors, and advisory board members, the team determined that all program standards for the Preliminary Education Specialist Mild Moderate Credential Program, and the Added Authorization Programs in ASD and ED are fully **Met**.

Advanced/Service Credentials

General Education (MS/SS) Induction Program General Education (MS/SS) Clear Program Clear Education Specialist Induction Programs

Program Design

The General Education (MS/SS) Induction, the General Education (MS/SS) Clear, and the Education Specialist Clear programs are all housed in UCLA Extension (UNEX). They are administered by the Department of Education director and program director, who was also called a program coordinator. According to documentation and information provided by program leadership; following an internal review conducted through UNEX and subsequent review by a ladder faculty in GSEIS, the dean of UCLA's GSEIS grants final approval to all courses and instructors in the UNEX Clear and Induction programs. Interviews with the Dean and GSEIS leadership did not confirm this process. The Program Director (referred to in the UCAP org chart as the “continuing educator”) holds quarterly general session meetings with all Academic Coordinators, the Program Manager, Program Coordinators, and Program Assistants; additional special project meetings are also held as needed. Instructors and university support providers reported that they met with the Academic Coordinator for regularly scheduled meetings once per quarter, and when necessary, to collaborate with colleagues.

Twice per year, the Induction Advisory Board, a programmatic sub-committee, meets to discuss program innovation and modification. The Advisory Board is comprised of a broad sector of experienced educational professionals who convene on a voluntary basis to provide direction for the program, as well as to discuss how their respective organizations can support candidates’ needs through programs and professional development opportunities. The educational professionals who sit on the Advisory Board are representatives from local school districts and charter management organizations (CMOs) where candidates work. Agendas from these meetings indicated that the Induction/Clear programs have been a frequent topic of discussion. Members present at an interview confirmed that they discuss and endorse the programs.

The formative assessment system used by all three programs is purchased from the New Teacher Center and commonly referred to as NTC-FAS. It incorporates a rigorous, meaningful course of study for all candidates enrolled in the Induction and Clear credential programs. All courses required in the program are strategically aligned to the CSTPs and Induction Program Standards 5 and 6. The Clear Education Specialist Induction Credential is also aligned with additional program requirements in each Induction standard that explicate additional requirements specific to the program. Also added to the Clear Education Specialist Credential is Standard 7, which specifically addresses additional course-related requirements. All of the programs for Induction are designed to support the three inquiries at the center of the program. Candidates from each program, as well as completers of programs, reported their engagement in the local formative assessment system, which becomes a vehicle for the growth and self-reflection required of successful teachers in our state’s increasingly diverse classrooms.

During Induction, all candidates assess their current practice in relation to the context of students, the classroom, the school site, and the community. All courses in this online program are structured to assist candidates in implementing best practices in their classrooms with the

guidance of a mentor teacher (MS/SS Clear and Induction) or university support provider (Clear Education Specialist). In interviews with university support providers, it was highlighted that they are able to provide individualized support for each candidate through these program structures.

The program specifies that candidates are also dependent on their school site administrator to be knowledgeable about their program. The program document specifies that site administrators sign a document signifying that they accept their roles and responsibilities, including training, and verification of candidate portfolios at the end of the program. However, the review team was not able to substantiate that site administrators were actually a part of this process, as only one actual school site administrator (who wrote the documents for these programs and was also a member of the advisory board) was interviewed. All other administrators provided by UCLA to be interviewed as site administrators were in fact district-level administrators and had no direct contact with the candidates. Several of the support providers interviewed expressed difficulty in acquiring a collaboration of support with school site administrators, on behalf of their candidates. Based on the evidence, the review team was unable to verify any involvement of K-12 school site administrators in all of these programs.

Although the document describes selection, retention, and reassignment criteria, interviews with support providers and candidates indicated that they were unaware of the criteria, and unfamiliar with its implementation. Some candidates reported that they were dissatisfied with pairings, but did not know how to address the issue.

Because these programs are relatively new, there are few completers for General Ed (MS/SS) Clear and Induction, and no completers for the Clear Education Specialist Credential. Therefore, although they are gathering data in anticipation of future participation, the program has not participated in the Biennial Report process.

Course of Study

The MS/SS Induction, the MS/SS Clear program, and Clear Education Specialist program all utilize the formative assessment system, NTC-FAS, that incorporates a rigorous, meaningful course of study for all induction candidates. All courses required in the program are strategically aligned to the CSTPs and Program Standards 5 and 6. The courses are designed to support the three inquiries at the center of the program. Each inquiry is aligned to two courses that assist the candidates in deepening their understanding and application of the core concepts. Candidates and support providers confirmed the value of the inquiry structure in improving their classroom practice.

The courses are also designed to coordinate with required fieldwork. During interviews, instructors were able to articulate the instruction they provided online for the candidates, including the design of the inquiry lessons. Candidates were somewhat knowledgeable about the self-assessment process using the CSTPs as the reflective lens during each of the three inquiries. However, confusion was evident on the part of many stakeholder groups, as the program documents specified that candidates would self-assess using the *Description of Practice* (based on the prior CSTPs,) as well as the *Continuum of Teaching Practice* (based on the current

CSTPs). Some program leaders and instructors who were interviewed were unable to articulate the difference between the two, or which tool was used for candidate self-assessment.

Candidates used the CSTPs and the Induction Standards 5 and 6, to guide the focus of their inquiry question on their Individual Induction Plans, in order to improve their practice. Interestingly, candidates could not articulate the actual inquiry process, but understood that they designed lessons around a standard. They also understood the value of differentiating instruction for a focus student during each of the inquiries that included an English learner, a student from a special population, and a student with a behavior issue.

Each candidate reported being supported by either a mentor teacher at their site (General Education. Clear) or a university appointed support provider (Induction and Clear Education Specialist). Since the main vehicle for ongoing participant support is the support providers/mentor teachers, they have the responsibility to guide candidates through the formative assessment system, as well as provide mentorship and moral support. The small number of candidates interviewed, substantiated the assistance they were given by their support providers or mentor teacher.

Although support providers discussed that they met together quarterly, they articulated that they were not provided with feedback about their performance working with candidates.

Candidate Competence

The MS/SS Clear, MS/SS Induction, and Clear Education Specialist Credentials all share the same coursework and require a comprehensive portfolio, which provides an in-depth, systematic learning experience for candidates. The portfolio utilizes the formative assessment model to support candidates' ongoing professional growth. This portfolio is a place for candidates to gather evidence of their inquiry work. It also provides new teachers with support in understanding the purpose and process of setting professional growth goals. Therefore, the portfolio provides a comprehensive process for the participating teacher to move beyond university-based teacher preparation requirements into job-embedded, performance-based activities under the supervision, guidance, and collaboration of a mentor teacher or university support provider. All candidates reported assistance from their support provider/mentor. Some candidates reported frustration with the portfolio and a lack of knowledge of the requirements for completion. In fact, several candidates were very close to completing the program and articulated confusion about the artifacts required for placement in the portfolio.

Some candidates and instructors were unsure of how the portfolio would be graded and how candidates would be recommended for the Clear Credential. However, the Program Director (continuing educator) specified that she would be recommending each candidate for their Clear Credential.

The UNEX Clear University Induction Program maintains the philosophy that learning occurs best when the candidate receives timely and on-going feedback on their performance. For assessments to be truly effective in increasing teacher performance they should be formative, in other words, identifying and addressing teacher's learning needs on an ongoing basis and providing teachers with data on the effectiveness of their teaching strategies. As this program

becomes more articulated and supported by all constituents prescribed in the program documents, candidates will be well served.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the MS/SS Induction, MS/SS Clear, and Clear Education Specialist Programs with the following exceptions:

Standard One: Program Rationale and Design

“The Induction 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 that collaboration for professional development existed for these programs. The team determined that the standard is **Met with Concerns**.

Standard Two: Communication and Collaboration

“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.”

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. The team determined that the standard is **Not Met**.

Standard Three: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers

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 Leaders provide 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. The team determined that the standard is **Not Met**.

California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) Certificate Program

Program Design

The aim of the California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) Program is to prepare currently employed teachers to work effectively with English learners. The CTEL program is designed for teachers holding Multiple Subject and Single Subject credentials to obtain the English Learner (EL) Authorization required for continuing employment in many California public schools. This online program was created in collaboration with the University of California San Diego (UCSD) and University of California, Riverside (UCR). A uniform set of course syllabi is used in these three campuses. According to documentation provided, “All the UNEX credential/certificate programs, courses and instructors are reviewed and approved by the appropriate UCLA GSEIS academic faculty under the unit’s leader, the GSEIS Dean”, however through interviews it was confirmed that courses are reviewed by a member of the faculty, however the Dean has not previously had signature approval, and programs have not been fully reviewed through the unit structure. According to the program summary, the course of study for CTEL was carefully crafted with input from faculty and extension staff. Interviews of UNEX and teacher education directors and coordinators confirmed the collaboration of faculty and extension staff; however, a lack of direct input from full-time faculty on curriculum content and delivery was also expressed.

Through a review of program assessment documents, biennial reports, and initial program assessment findings and by conducting site interviews, the team found that CTEL program candidates and certificate completers consistently and overwhelmingly expressed satisfaction with their experiences in the program, particularly with the highly interactive and engaging character of online instruction and faculty responsiveness.

Course of Study

The CTEL program offers candidates a set of carefully designed online courses that focus on culture, language development, assessment of English learners, literacy, and content area instruction. It is dedicated to social justice and provides candidates wide opportunities to deepen their understanding of culture and first and second language acquisition, the influence of culture and language on communication and learning, and the variety of pedagogical approaches and methods for inclusion of all students. Candidates have multiple opportunities to learn and practice theory and methods for assessment and instruction of English learners with a social justice perspective. During the interviews, completers and candidates mentioned the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model and several theorists who nurtured their instructional approach in teaching English learners with a social justice perspective such as Banks, Nieto, Ladson-Billings, and many others. They also shared their inquiry-focus assignments and how they compiled their best work in their portfolio.

The program consists of six courses for a total of 18 quarter units, beginning with an orientation and culminating with a summative assessment portfolio. The sequence of the course of study includes orientation, culture and inclusion, language and language development, assessment of English learners, foundations and methods of English language/literacy development and content

instruction, and CTET portfolio. The Department Director of the UCLA Extension Education Department, the Program Director (continuing educator) of UNEX, and the academic/program coordinators oversee the implementation and the on-going operation of the CTET program. In interviews, it appeared that a program coordinator has been designated to oversee the quality of all the syllabi and their implementation. According to this coordinator, a fact confirmed by the Department Director of the Extension Education Department, she functions as the “quality control” and that curriculum and instructional input from the Center X GSEIS faculty is lacking.

Candidate Competence

The team, through review of program assessment documents, preliminary findings, and biennial reports and interviews during the accreditation site visit, found that the design of the program, course of study, and assessment of candidate competence are rigorous and appreciated by the stakeholders, including the program completers. The following strengths of the CTET program were consistently mentioned during interviews of candidates and completers: practical, structured approach for working teachers, rigorous, research-based, involved reflection and critical thinking, accommodating faculty, challenging and interactive discussion board, standards-based and engaging lesson plans, and excellent portfolio summative project. In addition, program completers stated that the CTET program provided them with the appropriate and relevant skills and abilities in working with the growing number of English learners in their content area classes. Some experienced teachers admitted their lack of interest in enrolling in the online program but discovered how helpful the courses were and how they improved their approaches to teaching English learners. Samples of summative portfolios illustrated the ways in which candidates reflected on their work and applied what they have learned in planning activities including differentiated instruction for English learners. Data from the biennial reports, course grades, and other assessment tools showed candidates’ progress and how the results of formative and summative assessments guide program modifications.

One strength of the program was the consistent monitoring of the CTET program design and course content by the Academic and Program Coordinators. An Academic Coordinator has been assigned to ensure that the consistently high quality of instruction, course assignments, and technology components of the program is sustained. Although limited in number at interview sessions, candidates and completers commended the effectiveness of the program and consistently reported their satisfaction with the quality of instructors. They commented that instructors provided them with practical ideas that they could implement immediately in their field settings. Completers described the course on culture and inclusion as particularly reflective. Candidates shared that they were given ample opportunities to engage in interactive dialogues with each other through the online “Discussion Board”. They also reported how the courses on language and language development and foundations and methods clearly identified practical ways of helping English learners acquire academic vocabulary and gain access to academic content. Candidates and program completers reported that they are now more effective in teaching their subject matter as well as developing the language and literacy of their students who are English learners. Portfolios that were available reflected the candidates’ understanding of equity and diversity, language structure and use, and the influence of first and second language development on academic achievement. The course assignments included in the portfolio also demonstrate the candidates’ knowledge of assessment of English learners. Candidates acknowledged increased understanding of their own cultural backgrounds, family histories, and advocacy for social justice. Some candidates and program completers indicated during interviews

that they now saw themselves as advocates for children who are English learners in their schools.

Interviews with the Department Director, Program Director, and Academic Coordinators, revealed the coordinated efforts at the UNEX level. However, a lack of direct input on curriculum and instructional content and delivery from the teacher education faculty to academic coordinators/instructors of the CTEL program was reported.

Findings on Standards:

Based on careful review of the program documents, including the biennial reports, along with supporting evidence and documentation, and conducting multiple interviews with current candidates, program completers, faculty and program personnel, the team concludes that all program standards are **Met**.

Reading Certificate Program

Program Design

As stated in the program summary provided, the Reading Certificate program leadership lies with the Program Director of the UNEX who assumes the overall responsibility for the program and reports to the Department Director of the UNEX. The Academic Coordinator, Program Coordinator, instructors, and support providers report to the Program Director. During the site interviews, the Program Director identified in the summary was introduced as the Program Coordinator, a position not apparent on the UNEX portion of the organizational chart provided by UCAP; on the organizational chart, this person is identified as the “continuing educator”. Although the position was titled differently in documentation, evidence from interviews with the leadership of the UCLA Reading Certificate program indicated a structure for delineating responsibilities for the Reading Certificate program was in place. Program leadership indicated that the program was in transition to new standards and was experiencing low enrollment.

Programmatic interests are represented through advisory boards at UNEX. As explained in interviews with program leadership and verified in Advisory Board interviews, these groups provide arenas for interactive dialog and the sharing of various perspectives from the education community. Membership on this active board includes a TEP representative, local district and CMO leaders, assistant superintendents, school administrators and teachers, UNEX instructors, school mental health professionals, and community leaders with expertise ranging from early childhood education through adult and career technical education. Members of the Advisory Board interviewed attested to their impact on program development and their involvement with individual programs. Documents examined during the program review included agendas from meetings that verified the Advisory Board convenes regularly to inform all UNEX programs and that break-out agendas specifically include the Reading Certificate program.

The program narrative highlights that the overall design of the Reading Certificate is formulated with consideration to the interrelationship of instructional and administrative components of UNEX. When the document was written, admissions activities were sequenced, culminating in the selection of qualified candidates. Candidate advisement was offered both at the point of orientation and throughout programmatic stages. Candidate assessment occurred as an ongoing

process in connection with individual courses and, most extensively, in satisfaction of the fieldwork component. Program evaluation is designed to be interwoven throughout the instructional sequence, as well as predominantly featured at the termination of the academic year.

According to interviews with the faculty, program leadership, and candidates who have completed the Reading Certificate, the program, in former years, adhered to the scope and sequence of the courses in order to provide scaffolding of knowledge as candidates built their repertoire of experiences in teaching reading, through the program's "five pillar" concept. However, with declining enrollment in this program, the structure has been compromised to allow for various entry points in the program, thus negating the program's initial sequencing. The decline in enrollment has also cost the program a more articulated shared knowledge of course content by instructors in the program, as was reported in their interviews.

Completers who were interviewed expressed pleasure with the program and articulated their disappointment that the next phase, the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential, was currently in the "inactive" stage. They expressed a feeling of "unfinished business" until the time that they could complete the credential.

Course of Study

All courses taught in the Reading Certificate program are currently offered exclusively online. Candidates, as well as instructors, report ease in navigation of the online configuration. The University provides each candidate and instructor with a course manager to act as a consultant and trouble-shooter for all technology access questions. Interviews with both the course manager and candidates/completers confirmed that this arrangement provides timely support and aids in the completion of the coursework.

Field assignments, consistent with content presented, are required in each of the Category 1 courses. Interviews confirmed that for the major portion of course-related assignments, employed candidates are able to implement an activity in their current classrooms. For assignments requiring variance in grade-levels or learner populations that are not represented in the assigned classroom, or for accommodation of the non-employed candidate, special placements must be arranged with the Field Coordinator.

Although the architecture of the Reading Certificate program is to provide a comprehensive course of study with a cohesive sequence of course offerings, interviews with stakeholders revealed that low enrollment has impacted the scope and sequence of the courses as well as the instructors' ability to build on prior knowledge and foundations through the sequence, thus creating possible redundancy throughout the coursework. Per the approved document, the instructional sequence was written to foster candidate understanding and enhancement of literacy and language arts pedagogy. The course of study was also designed so that the candidate proceeding through the Reading Certificate program would engage in topics from the basic, fundamental level, to the reflection stage in order to allow the learner to assimilate concepts by building on previous knowledge, and then to advance to topics that focused on higher level comprehension and thinking. The program now allows candidates in the program to enter at any point in the course of study because of the huge decline of candidates in the program (the program had hundreds of candidates in recent years, but only two in 2011-2012).

Candidate Competence

Candidates and completers reported that their demonstration of competence in reading instruction and assessment was accomplished through completion of a number of significant assignments that were then collected into a portfolio. For the preparation of the portfolio, candidates are responsible for demonstrating not only their progress toward completing the competency requirements, but also their overall progress toward the goal of becoming a well-prepared reading professional. The portfolio, initiated at the beginning of the Reading Certificate program, is an “in progress” collection that includes artifacts, essays, samples of lesson plans accompanied by reflective pieces, complete logs of fieldwork hours with precise descriptions of assignments and identified learners, as well as other products documenting teaching experience and classroom implementation of Reading Certificate Standards. The document serves as verification of candidates’ understanding of concepts, principles, and values that are embedded in the subject-matter preparation and their relationship to classroom performance, as well as their ability to describe ways in which instruction can be varied to meet the needs of diverse learners. Post-lesson assessments by candidates focusing on pre-planning decisions and their ultimate outcomes exemplify one form of written documentation for inclusion in the portfolio. Candidates are asked to reflect on and evaluate the many entries chosen for placement in the portfolio, as well as to share contents of the document with their cohort group and employer.

Completers who were interviewed for this program, although few, were highly enthusiastic about their progress and reported the outstanding strategies and resources gained from online colleagues, as well as instructors. When asked about the opportunities they had gained as a result of acquiring their credential, they expressed the invitation to present professional development at the school sites and at the district level to share the expertise they had gained. The completers interviewed stressed that they had signed up for the Reading Certificate to become better teachers and to meet the needs of diverse students, especially English learners, in their classrooms.

Interviews with the program and department director highlighted that the ultimate success of the Reading Certificate program in years past was derived from effectiveness of cooperative/collaborative endeavors of the University and participating school districts. Sections of the Common Standards speak to organizational structures that permitted and fostered administrative/faculty/staff interaction in the University, while the proposal itself evolved from enterprising conceptualization/decision-making sessions of the Planning Committee. Within the University, coordination of the Reading Certificate program is delegated to the Program Coordinator (continuing educator), while district administrators assign experienced and qualified teachers with reading expertise to monitor and observe candidates in field placement.

Because of declining enrollment in the Reading Certificate program, as well as the impending transition to new Reading Certificate standards by Fall of 2012, program leadership explained that the program has not been a priority for the institution. However, due to the impending significant changes, as articulated by the Program Coordinator and Department Director of UNEX, discussion has occurred with another UC campus to discuss a possible collaboration based on the new standards. The Program Director indicated enthusiasm in transitioning to a new program, based on new standards.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** with the exception of the following:

Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination

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. The team determined that the standard is **Met with Concerns**.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program Professional Administrative Services Credential Program*

Program Design

The Regents of the University of California established the *Principal Leadership Institute* (PLI) programs on the UCLA and UC Berkeley campuses in 2000 to address the shortage of well-prepared urban school administrators. Housed in the GSEIS, the PLI program grants a Master of Education degree and the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. Through a 15-month, 40-unit program, PLI graduates become instructional leaders who learn to promote rigorous, high quality learning. The coursework offers candidates a theory-to-practice approach and the content of all courses is aligned with the California Professional Standards for School Leaders (CPSELs). Candidates implement an Action Research Leadership Project at their fieldwork sites. Program completers indicated that this project proved to be very valuable in their learning and provided them with confidence as a leader, even as a teacher, in their current employment. Candidates engage in 12 units of fieldwork experiences to qualify for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and the Master of Education. Candidates attend evening classes in cohorts at UCLA while continuing to work in their schools and communities. Both candidates and program completers indicated that, while challenging, this structure provided minimal interference with their work schedule.

Stakeholder feedback mechanisms are strong in the PLI program as candidates participate in one-on-one meetings with the director at the beginning of the program to begin the communication process. Through interviews with the candidates and program completers it was evident that the Program Director and Faculty Co-Directors have a deep and personal relationship with each candidate and strive for open and transparent communication to achieve program learning outcomes at the highest levels. The commitment to social justice is not merely a stated goal, but is deeply woven into the fabric of the program.

The unit-wide UCAP Advisory Council meets twice a year and includes members of the local education community to discuss program elements and ensure currency of the program as well as to advise the direction of the program. In addition, alumni participate in every aspect of the program: recruitment, interviews, courses, and candidate oral presentations. Alumni have an opportunity to give feedback to the program directors on each of these activities. Interviews with program completers revealed that they not only appreciated the access and network to previous

PLI graduates for networking and support, but that now as alumni they are still encouraged to support the PLI program and are pleased to do so.

It was noted by many of the stakeholders interviewed that the program design and processes to ensure consistency and academic quality had greatly improved over the last three years due to the Program Director's leadership. During that time, mechanisms for formal program and course review for continuous improvement were put into place. Interviews with faculty fieldwork supervisors and faculty meeting minutes noted those structural changes. Furthermore, during this time an assessment system was put into place.

Course of Study

UCLA PLI candidates move through a rigorous 15-month program which includes ongoing review, discussion, and analysis of leadership issues. Throughout the program design, the emphasis on student learning and leadership through the social justice lens was evident. Interviews with candidates highlighted that this emphasis was what initially drew them to the program, even though they are not currently planning on entering administrative positions.

Curriculum is closely aligned to the CPSELs and interviews revealed that the program design and sequencing was a collaborative effort between the program leadership, faculty and input from Advisory Board members. Candidates/program completers indicated a thirst for greater time and attention spent in the area of finance and budgeting, particularly in light of the severe economic conditions in California. While social justice was certainly covered extensively in the program, candidates/program completers indicated that greater attention on general educational leadership theories and practices may benefit them as they relate to Standard 6: Opportunities to Learn Instructional Leadership. Candidates indicated that the workload is substantial and that program leadership should consider spreading out major projects so that major topics are able to be explored in greater depth. Candidates and program completers reported the cohort model provides strong support and assistance for all candidates throughout their tenure of the program. The strong network and institutional support between UCLA and high level educational leaders in the community was seen as a strength of the PLI program by both groups.

Program completers indicated that their fieldwork experience was an integrated and authentic field experience with a social justice focus at its core. Candidates worked closely with site supervisors in examining data, assisting with instructional tasks, working with student populations, meeting with the public, assessing student performance, supervising personnel and planning day-to-day school operations. It was noted several times in interview sessions that candidates were not to be given menial administrative tasks, but provided meaningful and high level administrative experiences. Meeting specific standards, working with a supervising principal and a university supervisor, and gaining varied experience in school leadership were important components of their preparation experience. The PLI field supervisors are experienced educational leaders who meet at least twice quarterly to discuss candidate progress on fieldwork assignments and fieldwork assessments.

Candidate Competence

While there is not a long history of systematic assessment in the program, assessment is now evident throughout the PLI program and candidates are assessed in a variety of ways. Formative and summative assessment is evident throughout coursework and fieldwork experiences. Faculty

utilize and model assessment as an instructional tool in the delivery of each course. Rubrics are evident in the evaluation of competencies; portfolios and self-assessments are utilized. The PLI holds quarterly faculty meetings where faculty fieldwork supervisors are present. At these meetings curriculum, candidate work, candidate assessments, and program assessments and evaluations are discussed; potential changes are proposed and/or adopted. Review of faculty meeting minutes as well as interviews with faculty and fieldwork supervisors confirmed that faculty meetings are seen as highly valuable for curricular improvement.

Candidates indicated that experiences vary per cohort and that “practitioner” faculty were not as qualified to assess their competence in courses as non-practitioner faculty. Candidates generally agreed that these courses were considered “easy A’s” and one candidate noted she completed no reading for a course and earned an A. In addition, fieldwork supervisors were not broadly aware of the new portfolio rubric that is to be utilized next month, thus scoring may be inconsistent unless training and calibration occurs prior to this assessment.

Several new program assessments were implemented for which progress on the implementation should be highlighted in the next Biennial Report. Specifically, 1) results from the Candidate Study Team which was implemented in 2011-12 to counsel and address issues with students who have not made satisfactory academic and/or professional progress in the program; 2) results from site supervisors/UCLA field supervisors co-created rubric for portfolio evaluation; and 3) results from the UCLA field supervisor survey that was deployed for the first time in January 2012.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, program summary, supporting documentation, and interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and other supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards have been **Met**.

***Note on the Professional Administrative Services Credential Program:** The Professional Administrative Services Credential Program (Tier II Program) is currently inactive, with the expectation of withdrawal of the program at the end of the term. The current candidates who were interviewed indicated that they are still receiving high quality support from the institution and will complete the program in June 2012. The program faculty also indicated that the program, while small, was highly effective. UCLA intends to develop a guidelines-based program for future Tier II candidates that will be housed in the GSEIS.

Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program School Counseling Program

Program Design

The Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) Credential Program with a specialization in School Counseling is a 14-course, 50-unit online program offered through UNEX. In addition, candidates must complete 10 units of practicum (100 hours) and 16 units of supervised fieldwork (600 hours). Coursework is designed to help credential candidates: develop, plan, implement, and evaluate a school counseling and guidance program that includes academic, career, personal, and

social development; advocate for the high academic achievement and social development of all students; provide school-wide prevention and intervention strategies and counseling services; provide consultation, training and staff development to teachers and parents regarding students' needs; and supervise a district-approved advisory program as described in Education Code Section 49600. Interviews with program leadership and advisory board membership confirmed that after the program was developed, there were multiple opportunities for stakeholders to provide input and curricular modifications were made accordingly.

The Director of the UCLA UNEX Education Department assumes the overall responsibility for the program with support from the Academic Coordinator, Program Coordinator, instructors, and input from support providers. These responsibilities include: direct supervision of the Academic Coordinator and indirect supervision of instructors and support providers; oversight coordination of all components of the pre-service training, research and development; and communication with school district and state officials regarding program and state policies, mandates, and procedures. As confirmed by the GSEIS unit dean, the Department Director and Program Director participate in regularly scheduled UCAP meetings to share information and make collaborative decisions regarding the unit's credential programs. However, the process for academic decision-making is unclear. Interviews with the GSEIS and UNEX leadership highlighted the fact that the specific lines of authority for program development, course approval and course revision are ambiguous, and potentially problematic. While program documentation states that UNEX credential programs, courses and instructors are reviewed and approved by the appropriate UCLA GSEIS academic faculty under the unit's leader, the GSEIS Dean, the execution and process for the approvals are not systematically implemented.

In addition, while the Program Director holds quarterly general session meetings with all Academic Coordinators, Program Managers, Program Coordinators, and Program Assistants as well as special project meetings as needed, specific roles and responsibilities are not clear. While clearly defined in program documentation, actual program responsibilities in practice do not appear to follow the document. Interviews with candidates, advisory board members and program administration revealed that lines of authority and oversight are blurred. While they indicated that the unit leadership is very responsive, there was lack of clarity as to specifically who is responsible for various tasks or issues.

Programmatic interests of the School Counseling program are represented through the UNEX Education general advisory board. Advisory Board members reported that they have encouraged UNEX to develop additional PPS programs and members confirmed that they have also provided feedback on the design and elements of proposed programs. The Advisory Board members indicated great support for the program.

Course of Study

The PPS School Counseling program is five quarters of coursework followed by 600 hours of supervised fieldwork. The first quarter focuses specifically on counseling theory, safe learning environment, positive behavior supports, and human development. The second quarter of coursework requires 11 units of traditional coursework, but two of these courses also require practica, which result in an additional 3 units of course credit. In the third quarter, candidates enroll in three courses for a total of 11 units of coursework and 3 units of practicum. During the fourth quarter, candidates enroll in three courses that continue to support practical application of

sound theoretical foundations and scholarly research. During the fifth quarter, candidates complete 4 units of coursework in Group Counseling Lab which is intended to provide practical application of PPS theory and scholarship through one 2-unit practicum that requires an additional 20 hours of service. After completing the coursework and practica requirements for the PPS credential during the first four to five quarters, candidates have to complete supervised fieldwork at both the primary and secondary levels totaling 600 hours, for which 16 academic units will be awarded. Candidates confirmed that the program curriculum and rigor were outstanding. Some indicated skepticism of being able to learn counseling practices fully online, but revealed that the constant online interaction has proven to be effective in understanding the curriculum.

Since the program is still in its first year of implementation at UCLA, candidates have limited experience, having only completed 3 quarters of coursework and the 100 hours of practicum. Candidates indicated a high level of satisfaction with the online platform and course delivery of the program; however, they did indicate a desire to have more face-to-face contact beyond the two program seminars per year.

Furthermore, during interviews, candidates indicated inconsistency of workload in some courses (particularly the technology course) as well as difficulty securing practicum sites on their own; however, candidates indicated high satisfaction with assistance from the university in securing practicum sites as well as with the quality of their practicum experiences. It was noted by program staff that as the program grows, coordinating practicum sites outside of the Los Angeles area will require additional assistance.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

Interviews with candidates and site supervisors confirmed that during 100 hours of practicum there is systematic evaluation and review of candidates outside of coursework. Formative and summative assessments are embedded in the curriculum. To complete program requirements, verified activities completed as course-related field assignments must be logged in the *Competency Verification Form*. Competencies for each specific standard must be demonstrated at an acceptable level and may be verified in each course as *achieved*, *in progress*, or *not yet addressed*. UNEX leadership has indicated that no candidate will be recommended to the Commission for the credential who does not demonstrate satisfactory performance with respect to all delineated standards. To date, there have been no candidates in the program for review at this stage, as they are in their first year of implementation.

At the completion of all courses and after the PPS Cumulative Portfolio submission, program leadership indicated that a summative assessment meeting will be conducted to determine candidate competency with respect to successful completion of all required coursework, satisfactory demonstration of competency in field activities, and appropriate development of an adequate PPS Cumulative Portfolio. It is expected that the exit interview will provide the Program Director with data to determine the final recommendation of the candidate to the Commission. Because the program is new, it is difficult to assess whether there is a systematic process for assessment review in an effort to foster continuous program improvement. Follow-up in a subsequent Biennial Report should be able to reveal the effectiveness of the system as it has been articulated.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, program summary, supporting documentation, and interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and other supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards have been **Met**.

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

Program Design

The Pupil Personnel Services School Social Work/Child Welfare and Attendance Services Credential Program (PPSC) is offered through the Department of Social Welfare in the Luskin School of Public Affairs (LSPA). The overarching mission of the Department of Social Welfare is to develop the empirical basis for social work practice and to train the next generation of leaders for the social work profession, including leaders in School Social Work (SSW) and Child Welfare and Attendance (CWA). Given the dual importance of School Social Work and Child Welfare and Attendance, all of the candidates are required to complete both credentials as part of the program at UCLA. The objectives of the Masters in Social Work (MSW)/PPSC program at UCLA are to train advanced social work practitioners who can analyze, intervene, and evaluate in ways that are highly differentiated, discriminating, and self-critical. The program strives to produce graduates who synthesize and apply a broad range of knowledge as well as practice with a high degree of autonomy and skill. It was clear through program completer and fieldwork supervisor interviews that the program produces graduates who are able to refine and advance the quality of their practice. These groups revealed that UCLA graduates were highly sought after professionals as their preparation was seen as superior compared to other local universities.

While the program operates in the LSPA, it is evident that there are lines of communication between the program leadership, leadership in the LSPA, and the leadership in the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies (GSEIS) to ensure that the program is meeting credential standards. However, interviews with LSPA leaders as well as program directors indicated that the channels of communication could be strengthened allowing the program to benefit from regularly scheduled and formalized communication with the unit leadership in the GSEIS.

There are extensive means for stakeholder feedback, including field liaison meetings with field supervisors, student feedback via weekly meetings with field supervisors, quarterly meetings with field liaisons, and meetings with PPSC Co-Directors twice during the program and as needed. Alumni surveys are utilized for program feedback, as well as input from numerous experts in the field who meet with students and offer support as guest lecturers. Candidates and program completers indicated that one of the great strengths of the program is accessibility to the program director as well as the outstanding network of community professionals that they were exposed to before, during, and after completing the program. They also indicated that networking with GSEIS peers periodically would be beneficial as they are likely to be colleagues in the school setting as well.

Course of Study

Candidates and program completers reported that course instructors were well-prepared and knowledgeable, and that course content is well-integrated with field practice. The two-year curriculum of the UCLA/MSW program includes foundation and advanced practice content. It is organized into two parts: (1) a foundation segment for social work practice from a generalist perspective, and (2) an advanced segment based on method and field of practice. The foundation segment incorporates basic knowledge, values and skills of the profession, covering social work ethics and values, diversity, social and economic justice, populations at risk, human behavior and the social environment, social welfare policy and services, social work practice, research, and field work. The advanced segment is organized around two concentrations based upon social work methods and a second category of “other advanced” courses that bolster both the methods of social work practice and the arenas in which social work is practiced. It is important to note that the curriculum for PPS in School Social Work and Child Welfare and Attendance are identical. The distinction in training comes as a result of the fieldwork experience and additional training that occurs as part of the Child Welfare and Attendance placement.

Interviews with current candidates and with program completers revealed that the program is rigorous, demanding, and relevant to their career goals in a variety of school settings. Candidates begin their field placements in early September and serve until May, 20 hours per week for a total of 650 hours. This is comprised of the CTC-required 450 hours for SSW and 150 hours for CWA. UCLA students exceed the combined 600 hours required for the credential. This allows the SSW-CWA/PPSC to join the school community and play an active role from beginning to end of the year. While effort is made to mirror school academic calendars, it was recommended by placement sites to further align the placement calendar with the academic calendar of schools to better support administration.

Candidates who require extra support and intervention during fieldwork are assisted by the program co-directors. Some candidates indicated that they felt overwhelmed with the program requirements and recommended ongoing encouragement of candidates to keep on pace throughout the quarter to minimize an influx of work at the end of the session. In interviews, employers and intern site supervisors consistently cited the depth of field experience and the high quality of preparation that program candidates/program completers bring to schools as something that sets UCLA graduates apart from graduates of other programs in the area. Candidates indicated that they would appreciate more time together as a cohort to dialog with peers about their placements.

Candidate Competence

In the beginning of the academic year, candidates meet with their Field Supervisors to create a Learning Agreement (LA), which acts as a MOU between the student, Field Supervisor/Agency, and UCLA. The LA will periodically be re-assessed by the Field Supervisor along with the SSW/PPSC candidate during supervision and at evaluation meetings with the Field Liaison. In addition, quarterly written evaluations by the Field Supervisor, which are reviewed with candidates before they are submitted to the Field Liaison, provide direct feedback about the candidate’s performance. Thus, there are numerous points where the candidate receives information, so that adjustments can be made and strengths supported. Interviews with program completers revealed that ongoing feedback from the program director, faculty and fieldwork

supervisors was one of the greatest strengths of the program that contributed to their professional growth.

In addition to the LA, which outlines program expectations for all second year MSW students, candidates outline activities and expectations in accordance with the PPSC Field Experience expectations, but they complete a SSW-CWA LA Addendum as well. In the Addendum, they outline all foundation and concentration/specialization course work, and SSW-CWA field activities which align with the PPSC Standards. The Addendum was noted by candidates as a very important component for success in the program as it clearly articulates expectations so that candidates are fully aware of program elements to be successful. Through weekly supervision sessions, quarterly written evaluations by the Field Supervisor, evaluation visits with the Field Liaison, and through the final Comprehensive Evaluation by the Field Supervisor, the candidates are continuously assessed.

Candidates and program completers reported feeling very well prepared to meet the challenges that face urban schools. In addition, placement sites indicated that candidates and program completers are highly knowledgeable about the needs of urban, multicultural students and families and well prepared to work effectively with them from their first day of employment.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, program summary, supporting documentation, and interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and other supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards have been **Met**.