COMMISSION ON
TEACHER CREDENTIALING
Ensuring Educator Excellence

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report 2014
Academic Year 2013-2014

Institution University of San Francisco_____

Date report is submitted _9/15/2014_   **Date of last Site Visit** _4/22-24/2002_

NOTE: USF submitted a Biennial Report in September 2013 covering 2 years: 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. Since we have a COA Site Visit in March 2015, we are submitting a 1-year "Biennial" Report covering the year 2013-2014 to provide the Site Visit Team with current information. This was done in consultation with the CTC staff.

Name of Program	Credential Awarded	Program Site(s)	Page Numbers
Multiple Subject with or without Bilingual Authorization (Spanish) Option and with or without Intern Option (after completion of 1 semester of coursework including ELL preparation)	Preliminary	San Francisco, Pleasanton, San Jose, Santa Rosa, Sacramento	2-63
Single Subject with or without Bilingual Authorization (Spanish) Option and with or without Intern Option (after completion of 1 semester of coursework including ELL preparation)	Preliminary	San Francisco, Pleasanton, San Jose, Santa Rosa, Sacramento	2-63
Reading	Certificate	San Francisco	64-73
Special Education: Mild Moderate with or without Bilingual Authorization (Spanish) Option. This is an Intern Only program	Preliminary	San Francisco	74-97
School Counseling (PPS)	Clear	San Francisco	98-148
Administrative Services	Preliminary	San Francisco	149-163
Institutional Plan of Action			164-168

Program Contact: _Christopher Thomas_____

Phone # _415-422-2042_____

E-Mail _cnthomas@usfca.edu_____

1

If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:

Name of Program	Preparer of Report	Phone	Email
Multiple/Single Subject	Anne Cahoon (TPA)	415-422-5487	**atcahoon@usfca.edu**
	Sandi Fenderson	415-422-5639	**safenderson@usfca.edu**
	David Maduli	415-422-6481	**dmadull@usfca.edu**
Reading	Helen Maniates	415-422-5917	**hmaniates@usfca.edu**
Special Education: Mild/Moderate	Aisha Bolds	415-422-5622	**arbolds@usfca.edu**
	Kevin Oh	415-422-2099	**koh2@usfca.edu**
Administrative Services	Chris Thomas	415-422-2042	**cnthomas@usfca.edu**
School Counseling (PPS)	Christine Yeh	415-422-2347	**cjyeh@usfca.edu**
Institutional Plan of Action	Chris Thomas	415-422-2042	**cnthomas@usfca.edu**

Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Program
Optional Bilingual (Spanish) Authorization

Section A—Credential Program Specific Information
I. Contextual Information

The University of San Francisco (USF) is a private, Jesuit institution located in the urban environment of San Francisco (Hilltop Campus) with additional branch campuses in Santa Rosa, Sacramento, Pleasanton, and San Jose. USF strives to provide its undergraduate and graduate students with a global perspective and has a university-wide focus on social justice issues. The university enrolls approximately 10,000 students per year.

The Teacher Education Department in the School of Education offers a combined credential and master's program for candidates who wish to pursue either the Multiple Subject or the Single Subject credential. Once candidates have completed their credential requirements, they can then go on to finish one of five master's degree options.

The Bilingual Authorization (Spanish) option is available for either credential. Candidates in the Bilingual Authorization emphasis complete two additional courses (Language & Culture of Emphasis- 2 units; Methods & Materials in Language of Emphasis- 2 units) taught in the language of emphasis, as well as a full-time student teaching placement in a bilingual setting. Currently the number of students in our Bilingual Authorization emphasis is very small, and we have just begun separating their data from the general credential population in terms of program completion.

Occasionally, teacher candidates at USF work as interns. If they have not completed 120 prerequisite hours composed of first semester coursework, they teach under a provisional permit provided by the school district. Once prerequisite hours are completed, USF recommends them for an intern credential. During 2013-2014, there were only 7 candidates with intern credentials (SF campus: 3 Multiple Subject/2 Single Subject; Pleasanton Campus: 1 Single Subject; San Jose Campus: 1 Single Subject).

Multiple Subjects Candidates	2013 - 2014 Enrolled	2013 - 2014 Completed
Pleasanton	17	7
Sacramento	14	4
San Francisco	58	36
San Jose	15	6
Santa Rosa	20	10
Total	124	63

Single Subjects Candidates	2013 - 2014 Enrolled	2013 - 2014 Completed
Pleasanton	13	6
Sacramento	8	3
San Francisco	29	22
San Jose	20	10
Santa Rosa	9	5
Total	79	46

A table indicating candidates enrolled in the Bilingual Authorization program for 2013-2013 appears below

Bilingual Authorization Candidates	2013 - 2014 Enrolled	2013 - 2014 Completed
Multiple Subjects	8	6
Single Subjects	4	4
Total	12	10

Note: Some students considered in multiple categories (ex: Bilingual Authorization and Dual Degree) as students may pursue multiple credential and program options simultaneously.

The San Francisco campus also offers a Dual Degree in Teacher Preparation program in which undergraduates admitted to the Dual Degree program take Teacher Education graduate courses while pursuing their undergraduate degrees in the College of Arts and Sciences. Upon graduating, they apply to the School of Education for admission to Teacher Education program. They finish their credential program and master's degree in the year following completion of their undergraduate degree.

Dual Degree (Undergraduate) Students

Dual Degree Students	2013 - 2014 Enrolled	2013 - 2014 Completed
Multiple Subjects	110	19
Single Subjects	32	6
Total	142	25

Note: Some students considered in multiple categories (ex: Bilingual Authorization and Dual Degree) as students may pursue multiple credential and program options simultaneously.

The Teacher Education program at USF has had no major changes to its required courses or student teaching placements since the approval of its SB2042 credential in 2002. Some departmental changes that have taken place are as follows:

- San Francisco Teacher Residency: After extensive discussion, to address the challenges of teacher quality and retention in San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), a partnership was formed between SFUSD, USF School of Education, the San Francisco Ed Fund, Stanford University, and the United Educators of San

Francisco to form the San Francisco Teacher Residency (SFTR) as an alternative route to a P12 teaching credential. The program recruits candidates in critical subject areas, such as math, science, and Spanish-bilingual subjects, and combines a yearlong apprenticeship with targeted master's level coursework. Upon successful completion of the residency, graduates are given priority placement for open teaching positions with SFUSD. This program began in fall 2010 as a direct result of ongoing discussions with stakeholders that identified specific needs within the SFUSD.

USF SFTR Program Candidates*	2013 - 2014 Enrolled	2013 - 2014 Completed
Multiple Subjects	10	10
Single Subjects	7	7
Total	17	17

Note: Some students considered in multiple categories (ex: Bilingual Authorization and Dual Degree)
as students may pursue multiple credential and program options simultaneously.

*These candidates are included in the data for SF Campus Enrolled/Completed table above.
This table simply identifies the number of individuals in the SFTR program by credential.

- Implementation of PACT as the TPA for the San Francisco Teacher Residency (SFTR) Program; the CalTPA remains the TPA used for all other candidates.

Part II - Candidate Assessment and Program Effectiveness Information

A. The Teacher Education Department uses course assignments and activities, course evaluations, Cooperating Teacher, Master Teacher, and supervisor evaluations during student teaching, a Teaching Performance Assessment (either California Teacher Performance Assessment [CalTPA] or Performance Assessment for California Teachers [PACT]), the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA), and exit surveys to evaluate candidate competence and program effectiveness.   In spring 2010, the program began to survey graduates who had graduated the previous year (2009). In 2011paper surveys were sent out to 2009 and 2010 graduates. Since spring of 2012, all surveys are submitted to graduates electronically. In addition, graduates were asked to provide a survey to their principal and Induction Support Provider. For the purposes of the Biennial Report we are focusing on the following assessments:
1. Evaluation of Student Teachers by Classroom Teachers
2. CalTPA/PACT
3. RICA
4. Candidate and Graduate Surveys

1. Evaluation of Student Teachers by Classroom Teachers

Cooperating Teacher Evaluations of candidates in Student Teaching I (96 classroom hours minimum): Cooperating Teachers rate to what degree the teacher candidate working in their classrooms has met the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE's) on a scale of 1 (low) to

5

5 (high). Two evaluations are submitted during the semester. A summary of final evaluations is reported on the following pages by campus (alpha order) and by year (2011-2012; 2012-2013).

2013– 2014 Cooperating Teacher Final Report/Student Teaching I—Pleasanton Campus
Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Observed (N/O)

	Single Subject n=4						Multiple Subject n=5					
	5	4	3	2	1	N/O	5	4	3	2	1	N/O
TPE 13												
Demonstrates openness to suggestions for improvement	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates self confidence	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates sound judgment	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	80%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates initiative in assuming responsibilities	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates willing to implement suggestions to improve	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Attendance is regular and punctual *	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 1, 4, 6												
Techniques/strategies which promote thinking skills	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Teaching reading in the content areas	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	40%	20%	0%	0%	0%	40%
TPE 1, 4, 6, 10												
Planning lessons and instructional activities	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 5, 11												
*Building rapport/mutual respect with students	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 5, 8, 11												
Techniques/strategies for motivating students	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 4, 5, 9, 10												
Classroom management techniques and	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	0%

	5	4	3	2	1	N/O	5	4	3	2	1	N/O
strategies												
TPE 4, 7, 8, 9 ,11												
Exhibits a positive attitude towards students, their language, and culture	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
BLCAD Candidates only												
Use of Spanish as a medium of instruction	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

2013– 2014 Cooperating Teacher Final Report/Student Teaching I—Sacramento Campus

Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Observed (N/O)

	Single Subject n=3						Multiple Subject n=4					
	5	4	3	2	1	N/O	5	4	3	2	1	N/O
TPE 13												
Demonstrates openness to suggestions for improvement	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates self confidence	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates sound judgment	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates initiative in assuming responsibilities	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates willing to implement suggestions to improve	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	75%	0%	25%	0%	0%	25%
Attendance is regular and punctual *	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 1, 4, 6												
Techniques/strategies which promote thinking skills	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Teaching reading in the content areas	67%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	25%	0%	25%	0%	0%	50%
TPE 1, 4, 6, 10												
Planning lessons and instructional activities	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 5, 11												
*Building rapport/mutual respect	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%

7

	5	4	3	2	1	N/O	5	4	3	2	1	N/O
with students												
TPE 5, 8, 11												
Techniques/strategies for motivating students	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 4, 5, 9, 10												
Classroom management techniques and strategies	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 4, 7, 8, 9 ,11												
Exhibits a positive attitude towards students, their language, and culture	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
BLCAD Candidates only												
Use of Spanish as a medium of instruction	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

2013 – 2014 Cooperating Teacher Final Report/Student Teaching I—San Francisco Campus

Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Observed (N/O)

	Single Subject n=16						Multiple Subject n=24					
	5	4	3	2	1	N/O	5	4	3	2	1	N/O
TPE 13												
Demonstrates openness to suggestions for improvement	81%	19%	0%	0%	0%	0%	96%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates self confidence	81%	19%	0%	0%	0%	0%	54%	46%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates sound judgment	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	79%	21%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates initiative in assuming responsibilities	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates willing to implement suggestions to improve	81%	13%	6%	0%	0%	0%	88%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Attendance is regular and punctual *	94%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	96%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 1, 4, 6												
Techniques/strategies which promote thinking skills	69%	31%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%

	5	4	3	2	1	N/O	5	4	3	2	1	N/O
Teaching reading in the content areas	50%	19%	0%	0%	0%	31%	50%	38%	0%	0%	0%	13%
TPE 1, 4, 6, 10												
Planning lessons and instructional activities	88%	6%	0%	0%	0%	6%	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 5, 11												
Building rapport/mutual respect with students	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	96%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 5, 8, 11												
Techniques/strategies for motivating students	69%	31%	0%	0%	0%	0%	58%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 4, 5, 9, 10												
Classroom management techniques and strategies	50%	25%	13%	0%	0%	13%	42%	58%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 4, 7, 8, 9 ,11												
Exhibits a positive attitude towards students, their language, and culture	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
BLCAD Candidates only												
Use of Spanish as a medium of instruction	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

2013– 2014 Cooperating Teacher Final Report/Student Teaching I—San Jose Campus

Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Observed (N/O)

	Single Subject n=8						Multiple Subject n=3					
	5	4	3	2	1	N/O	5	4	3	2	1	N/O
TPE 13												
Demonstrates openness to suggestions for improvement	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates self confidence	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates sound judgment	87.5%	12.5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates initiative in assuming responsibilities	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates willing to implement suggestions to improve	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Attendance is regular and punctual *	87.5%	12.5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 1, 4, 6												
Techniques/strategies which promote thinking skills	87.5%	12.5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Teaching reading in the content areas	75%	12.5%	0%	0%	0%	12.5%	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 1, 4, 6, 10												
Planning lessons and instructional activities	87.5%	12.5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 5, 11												
*Building rapport/mutual respect with students	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 5, 8, 11												
Techniques/strategies for motivating students	87.5%	12.5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 4, 5, 9, 10												
Classroom management techniques and strategies	87.5%	12.5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 4, 7, 8, 9 ,11												
Exhibits a positive attitude towards students, their language, and culture	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
BLCAD Candidates only												
Use of Spanish as a medium of instruction	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

2013– 2014 Cooperating Teacher Final Report/Student Teaching I—Santa Rosa Campus

Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Observed (N/O)

	Single Subject n=1						Multiple Subject n=7					
	5	4	3	2	1	N/O	5	4	3	2	1	N/O
TPE 13												
Demonstrates openness to suggestions for improvement	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates self confidence	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Demonstrates sound judgment	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	72%	28%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates initiative in assuming responsibilities	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates willing to implement suggestions to improve	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Attendance is regular and punctual *	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 1, 4, 6												
Techniques/strategies which promote thinking skills	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Teaching reading in the content areas	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	86%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%
TPE 1, 4, 6, 10												
Planning lessons and instructional activities	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	72%	28%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 5, 11												
*Building rapport/mutual respect with students	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 5, 8, 11												
Techniques/strategies for motivating students	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	72%	28%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 4, 5, 9, 10												
Classroom management techniques and strategies	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TPE 4, 7, 8, 9 ,11												
Exhibits a positive attitude towards students, their language, and culture	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
BLCAD Candidates only												
Use of Spanish as a medium of instruction	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

<u>Master Teacher evaluations of candidates in Student Teaching II/III (18 weeks of full-time student teaching):</u> Master Teachers rate to what degree the teacher candidate working in their classroom has met the TPE's on a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high). Evaluations are submitted on a monthly basis. Final evaluations are reported here:

2013 - 2014 Student Teaching II/III Final Reports—Pleasanton Campus
Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Observed (N/O)

Section I Student teacher's appearance, behavior, & affect	Single Subject n=4					Multiple Subject n=6				
	4	3	2	1	N/O	4	3	2	1	N/O
Personal dress and appearance (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Punctuality and regularity of attendance (TPE13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Speech is clear and appropriate (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Exhibits self-confidence (TPE 13)	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates sound judgment (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to be flexible and adaptable (TPE 4,5,7,8,13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Willingness to seek assistance (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Evidence of personal growth and self - assessment (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Single Subject n=4						
Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Yet Demonstrated (N/D)						
Competency	5	4	3	2	1	ND
Overall long-term planning (TPE 3, 4, 9)	25%	75%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses methods to promote thinking skills (TPE 1,4,6)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Well-prepared for each class (TPE 13)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates skill in the use of technology (TPE 1,4,6)	25%	75%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Motivates student interest (TPE 5,8,11)	25%	75%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Provides for individual differences (TPE 7,8,9)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Presents ideas and instruction in a clear and meaningful way (TPE 1,4,9)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Varies teaching method (TPE 1,4,9)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to teach students who are different from candidate (TPE 4,7,8,9)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses appropriate evaluation techniques (TPE 1,2,3,6,8)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Builds rapport/mutual respect with students (TPE 5,11)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Acts as an appropriate role-model for students (TPE 5, 13)	0%	100	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maintains accurate records (TPE 2,3,13)	0%	100	0%	0%	0%	0%
Management of learning activities (TPE 4,5,9,10)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Promotes student self-discipline (TPE 8, 11)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Encourages positive interactions (TPE 7,8,11)	25%	75%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates kindness, compassion, understanding, and justice (TPE 5, 6, 11, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Cooperates with adults and grows professionally through collegial interaction (TPE 12, 13)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Knowledge of and adherence to school policies (TPE 12, 13)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Multiple Subject n=6						
Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Yet Demonstrated (N/D)						
Competency	5	4	3	2	1	ND
Overall long-term planning (TPE 3, 4, 9)	67%	16.6%	16.6%	0%	0%	0%
Uses methods to promote thinking skills (TPE 1,4,6)	83.4%	0%	16.6%	0%	0%	0%
Well-prepared for each class (TPE 13)	83.4%	16.6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates skill in the use of technology (TPE 1,4,6)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Motivates student interest (TPE 5,8,11)	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Provides for individual differences (TPE 7,8,9)	83.4%	16.6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Presents ideas and instruction in a clear and meaningful way (TPE 1,4,9)	83.4%	16.6%	0%	0%	0%	0%

13

Varies teaching method (TPE 1,4,9)	83.4%	16.6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to teach students who are different from candidate (TPE 4,7,8,9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses appropriate evaluation techniques (TPE 1,2,3,6,8)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Builds rapport/mutual respect with students (TPE 5,11)	83.4%	16.6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Acts as an appropriate role-model for students (TPE 5, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maintains accurate records (TPE 2,3,13)	83.4%	16.6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Management of learning activities (TPE 4,5,9,10)	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Promotes student self-discipline (TPE 8, 11)	83.4%	16.6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Encourages positive interactions (TPE 7,8,11)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates kindness, compassion, understanding, and justice (TPE 5, 6, 11, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Cooperates with adults and grows professionally through collegial interaction (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Knowledge of and adherence to school policies (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

2013 - 2014 Student Teaching II/III Final Reports—Pleasanton Campus Bilingual Authorization
Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Observed (N/O)

	Single Subject n=0					Multiple Subject n=1				
Section I Student teacher's appearance, behavior, & affect	4	3	2	1	N/O	4	3	2	1	N/O
Personal dress and appearance (TPE 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Punctuality and regularity of attendance (TPE13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Speech is clear and appropriate (TPE 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

14

Exhibits self-confidence (TPE 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates sound judgment (TPE 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to be flexible and adaptable (TPE 4,5,7,8,13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Willingness to seek assistance (TPE 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Evidence of personal growth and self - assessment (TPE 12, 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Single Subject n=0						
Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Yet Demonstrated (N/D)						
Competency	5	4	3	2	1	ND
Overall long-term planning (TPE 3, 4, 9)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses methods to promote thinking skills (TPE 1,4,6)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Well-prepared for each class (TPE 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates skill in the use of technology (TPE 1,4,6)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Motivates student interest (TPE 5,8,11)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Provides for individual differences (TPE 7,8,9)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Presents ideas and instruction in a clear and meaningful way (TPE 1,4,9)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Varies teaching method (TPE 1,4,9)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to teach students who are different from candidate (TPE 4,7,8,9)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses appropriate evaluation techniques (TPE 1,2,3,6,8)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Builds rapport/mutual respect with students (TPE 5,11)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Acts as an appropriate role-model for students (TPE 5, 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maintains accurate records (TPE 2,3,13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Management of learning activities (TPE 4,5,9,10)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Promotes student self-discipline (TPE 8, 11)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Encourages positive interactions (TPE 7,8,11)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates kindness, compassion, understanding, and justice (TPE 5, 6, 11, 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Cooperates with adults and grows professionally through collegial interaction (TPE 12, 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Knowledge of and adherence to school policies (TPE 12, 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Multiple Subject n=1						
Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Yet Demonstrated (N/D)						
Competency	5	4	3	2	1	ND
Overall long-term planning (TPE 3, 4, 9)	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Uses methods to promote thinking skills (TPE 1,4,6)	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Well-prepared for each class (TPE 13)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates skill in the use of technology (TPE 1,4,6)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Motivates student interest (TPE 5,8,11)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Provides for individual differences (TPE 7,8,9)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Presents ideas and instruction in a clear and meaningful way (TPE 1,4,9)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Varies teaching method (TPE 1,4,9)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to teach students who are different from candidate (TPE 4,7,8,9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses appropriate evaluation techniques (TPE 1,2,3,6,8)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Builds rapport/mutual respect with students (TPE 5,11)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Acts as an appropriate role-model for students (TPE 5, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maintains accurate records (TPE 2,3,13)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

16

	4	3	2	1	N/O	
Management of learning activities (TPE 4,5,9,10)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Promotes student self-discipline (TPE 8, 11)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Encourages positive interactions (TPE 7,8,11)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates kindness, compassion, understanding, and justice (TPE 5, 6, 11, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Cooperates with adults and grows professionally through collegial interaction (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Knowledge of and adherence to school policies (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

2013 - 2014 Student Teaching II/III Final Reports—Sacramento Campus

Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Observed (N/O)

Section I Student teacher's appearance, behavior, & affect	Single Subject n=2					Multiple Subject n=4				
	4	3	2	1	N/O	4	3	2	1	N/O
Personal dress and appearance (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Punctuality and regularity of attendance (TPE13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Speech is clear and appropriate (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Exhibits self-confidence (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates sound judgment (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to be flexible and adaptable (TPE 4,5,7,8,13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Willingness to seek assistance (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Evidence of personal growth and self -	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

assessment (TPE 12, 13)										

Single Subject n=2						
Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Yet Demonstrated (N/D)						
Competency	5	4	3	2	1	ND
Overall long-term planning (TPE 3, 4, 9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses methods to promote thinking skills (TPE 1,4,6)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Well-prepared for each class (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates skill in the use of technology (TPE 1,4,6)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Motivates student interest (TPE 5,8,11)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Provides for individual differences (TPE 7,8,9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Presents ideas and instruction in a clear and meaningful way (TPE 1,4,9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Varies teaching method (TPE 1,4,9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to teach students who are different from candidate (TPE 4,7,8,9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses appropriate evaluation techniques (TPE 1,2,3,6,8)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Builds rapport/mutual respect with students (TPE 5,11)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Acts as an appropriate role-model for students (TPE 5, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maintains accurate records (TPE 2,3,13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Management of learning activities (TPE 4,5,9,10)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Promotes student self-discipline (TPE 8, 11)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Encourages positive interactions (TPE 7,8,11)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates kindness, compassion, understanding, and justice (TPE 5, 6, 11, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Cooperates with adults and grows professionally through collegial interaction (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Knowledge of and adherence to school policies (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

18

Multiple Subject n=4						
Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Yet Demonstrated (N/D)						
Competency	5	4	3	2	1	ND
Overall long-term planning (TPE 3, 4, 9)	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses methods to promote thinking skills (TPE 1,4,6)	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Well-prepared for each class (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates skill in the use of technology (TPE 1,4,6)	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Motivates student interest (TPE 5,8,11)	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Provides for individual differences (TPE 7,8,9)	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Presents ideas and instruction in a clear and meaningful way (TPE 1,4,9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Varies teaching method (TPE 1,4,9)	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to teach students who are different from candidate (TPE 4,7,8,9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses appropriate evaluation techniques (TPE 1,2,3,6,8)	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Builds rapport/mutual respect with students (TPE 5,11)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Acts as an appropriate role-model for students (TPE 5, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maintains accurate records (TPE 2,3,13)	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Management of learning activities (TPE 4,5,9,10)	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Promotes student self-discipline (TPE 8, 11)	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Encourages positive interactions (TPE 7,8,11)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates kindness, compassion, understanding, and justice (TPE 5, 6, 11, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Cooperates with adults and grows professionally through collegial interaction (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Knowledge of and adherence to school policies (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

2013 - 2014 Student Teaching II/III Final Reports—San Francisco Campus

Four point scale: Four (4 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Observed (N/O)

	Single Subject n=13*					Multiple Subject n=30				
Section I	4	3	2	1	N/O	4	3	2	1	N/O

19

Student teacher's appearance, behavior, & affect										
Personal dress and appearance (TPE 13)	85%	15%	0%	0%	0%	90%	10%	0%	0%	0%
Punctuality and regularity of attendance (TPE13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	87%	13%	0%	0%	0%
Speech is clear and appropriate (TPE 13)	92%	8%	0%	0%	0%	93%	3%	3%	0%	0%
Exhibits self-confidence (TPE 13)	77%	23%	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates sound judgment (TPE 13)	92%	8%	0%	0%	0%	97%	3%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to be flexible and adaptable (TPE 4,5,7,8,13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Willingness to seek assistance (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	93%	7%	0%	0%	0%
Evidence of personal growth and self - assessment (TPE 12, 13)	92%	8%	0%	0%	0%	93%	7%	0%	0%	0%

Single Subject n=13*						
Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Yet Demonstrated (N/D)						
Competency	5	4	3	2	1	ND
Overall long-term planning (TPE 3, 4, 9)	54%	38%	8%	0%	0%	0%
Uses methods to promote thinking skills (TPE 1,4,6)	62%	38%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Well-prepared for each class (TPE 13)	62%	38%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates skill in the use of technology (TPE 1,4,6)	54%	46%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Motivates student interest (TPE 5,8,11)	54%	46%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Provides for individual differences (TPE 7,8,9)	62%	31%	8%	0%	0%	0%

	5	4	3	2	1	ND
Presents ideas and instruction in a clear and meaningful way (TPE 1,4,9)	54%	46%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Varies teaching method (TPE 1,4,9)	54%	46%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to teach students who are different from candidate (TPE 4,7,8,9)	62%	38%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses appropriate evaluation techniques (TPE 1,2,3,6,8)	54%	38%	8%	0%	0%	0%
Builds rapport/mutual respect with students (TPE 5,11)	62%	38%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Acts as an appropriate role-model for students (TPE 5, 13)	69%	31%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maintains accurate records (TPE 2,3,13)	54%	38%	8%	0%	0%	0%
Management of learning activities (TPE 4,5,9,10)	54%	38%	8%	0%	0%	0%
Promotes student self-discipline (TPE 8, 11)	46%	31%	23%	0%	0%	0%
Encourages positive interactions (TPE 7,8,11)	62%	38%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates kindness, compassion, understanding, and justice (TPE 5, 6, 11, 13)	69%	31%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Cooperates with adults and grows professionally through collegial interaction (TPE 12, 13)	77%	23%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Knowledge of and adherence to school policies (TPE 12, 13)	62%	23%	15%	0%	0%	0%

Multiple Subject n=30						
Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Yet Demonstrated (N/D)						
Competency	5	4	3	2	1	ND
Overall long-term planning (TPE 3, 4, 9)	27%	67%	3%	3%	0%	0%
Uses methods to promote thinking skills (TPE 1,4,6)	47%	50%	3%	0%	0%	0%
Well-prepared for each class (TPE 13)	43%	53%	3%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates skill in the use of technology (TPE 1,4,6)	47%	47%	3%	0%	0%	3%
Motivates student interest (TPE 5,8,11)	43%	53%	3%	0%	0%	0%
Provides for individual differences (TPE 7,8,9)	43%	53%	0%	0%	0%	3%
Presents ideas and instruction in a clear and meaningful way (TPE 1,4,9)	40%	53%	6%	0%	0%	0%
Varies teaching method (TPE 1,4,9)	43%	50%	6%	0%	0%	0%

Demonstrates ability to teach students who are different from candidate (TPE 4,7,8,9)	50%	47%	3%	0%	0%	3%
Uses appropriate evaluation techniques (TPE 1,2,3,6,8)	30%	60%	10%	0%	0%	0%
Builds rapport/mutual respect with students (TPE 5,11)	67%	27%	7%	0%	0%	0%
Acts as an appropriate role-model for students (TPE 5, 13)	37%	23%	7%	0%	0%	0%
Maintains accurate records (TPE 2,3,13)	40%	53%	7%	0%	0%	0%
Management of learning activities (TPE 4,5,9,10)	33%	57%	10%	0%	0%	0%
Promotes student self-discipline (TPE 8, 11)	37%	53%	10%	0%	0%	0%
Encourages positive interactions (TPE 7,8,11)	47%	53%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates kindness, compassion, understanding, and justice (TPE 5, 6, 11, 13)	70%	27%	3%	0%	0%	0%
Cooperates with adults and grows professionally through collegial interaction (TPE 12, 13)	67%	27%	3%	0%	0%	3%
Knowledge of and adherence to school policies (TPE 12, 13)	63%	30%	7%	0%	0%	0%

***Two final reports were submitted for one student who had master teachers for two different subject areas at their placement. Thus, the sample size reflects 13 reports for 12 students.

2013 - 2014 Student Teaching II/III Final Reports―SFTR―San Francisco Campus
In the 2013-2014 year, SFTR piloted a new quarterly evaluation system for student teacher performance, aligned with the CSTPs. Residents were evaluated three times in the course of the year, Fall (November), Winter (March) and Spring (May). This chart reflects the Spring evaluations. Moving forward, in the 2014-2015 year, SFTR will be fully implementing this evaluation process and expect 100% response rate from cooperating teachers..

Four point scale: Four (4 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Observed (N/O)

	Single Subject n=2					Multiple Subject n=7				
CSTP Standard 1: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning	4	3	2	1	N/O	4	3	2	1	N/O
Uses knowledge of students to engage them in learning (CSTP 1.1)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%
Connects learning to students' prior knowledge, backgrounds, life experiences, and	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	71%	14%	14%	0%	0%

	4	3	2	1	N/O	4	3	2	1	N/O
interests (CSTP 1.2)										
Connects subject matter to meaningful, real-life contexts (CSTP 1.3)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	71%	14%	14%	0%	0%
Uses a variety of instructional strategies, resources, and technologies to meet students' diverse learning needs (CSTP 1.4)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%
Promotes critical thinking through inquiry, problem solving, and reflection (CSTP 1.5)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%
Monitors student learning and adjusts instruction while teaching (CSTP 1.6)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%
CSTP Standard 2: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning	4	3	2	1	N/O	4	3	2	1	N/O
Promotes social development and responsibility within a caring community where each student is treated fairly and respectfully (CSTP 2.1)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%
Creates physical or virtual learning environments that promote student learning, reflects diversity, and encourage constructive and productive interactions among students (CSTP 2.2)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%
Establishes and maintains learning environments that are physically, intellectually, and emotionally safe (CSTP 2.3)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	57%	29%	14%	0%	0%

	4	3	2	1	N/O	4	3	2	1	N/O
Creates a rigorous learning environment with high expectations and appropriate support for all students (CSTP 2.4)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%
Develops, communicates, and maintains high standards for individual and group behavior (CSTP 2.5)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	86%	14%	14%	0%	0%
Employs classroom routines, procedures, norms, and supports for positive behavior to ensure a climate in which all students can learn (CSTP 2.6)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	57%	29%	14%	0%	0%
Uses instructional time to optimize learning (CSTP 2.7)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%
CSTP Standard 3: Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning	4	3	2	1	N/O	4	3	2	1	N/O
Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter, academic content standards, and curriculum frameworks (CSTP 3.1)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%
Applies knowledge of student development and proficiencies to ensure student understanding of subject matter (CSTP 3.2)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%
Organizes curriculum to facilitate student understanding of the subject matter (CSTP 3.3)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%
Utilizes instructional strategies that are appropriate to the subject matter (CSTP 3.4)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%
Uses and adapts resources, technologies, and standards-aligned instructional materials,	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%

	4	3	2	1	N/O	4	3	2	1	N/O
including adopted materials, to make subject matter accessible to all students (CSTP 3.5)										
Addresses the needs of English learners and students with special needs to provide equitable access to the content (CSTP 3.6)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%
CSTP Standard 4: Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students	4	3	2	1	N/O	4	3	2	1	N/O
Uses knowledge of students' academic readiness, language proficiency, cultural background, and individual development to plan instruction (CSTP 4.1)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%
Establishes and articulates goals for student learning (CSTP 4.2)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	57%	14%	29%	0%	0%
Develops and sequences long-term and short-term instructional plans to support student learning (CSTP 4.3)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%
Plans instruction that incorporates appropriate strategies to meet the learning needs of all students (CSTP 4.4)	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	14%	71%	14%	0%	0%
Adapts instructional plans and curricular materials to meet the assessed learning needs of all students (CSTP 4.5)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%
CSTP Standard 5: Assessing Students for Learning	4	3	2	1	N/O	4	3	2	1	N/O
Applies knowledge of the purposes, characteristics, and uses of different types of assessments (CSTP 5.1)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%

25

Collects and analyzes assessment data from a variety of sources to inform instruction (CSTP 5.2)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%
Reviews data, both individually and with colleagues, to monitor student learning (CSTP 5.3)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%
Uses assessment data to establish learning goals and to plan, differentiate, and modify instruction (CSTP 5.4)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	57%	14%	29%	0%	0%
Involves all students in self-assessment, goal setting, and monitoring progress (CSTP 5.5)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	71%	29%	0%	0%
Uses available technologies to assist in assessment, analysis, and communication of student learning (CSTP 5.6)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	14%	43%	14%	0%	29%
Uses assessment information to share timely and comprehensible feedback with students and their families (CSTP 5.7)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	14%	43%	14%	0%	29%

CSTP Standard 6:* Assessing Students for Learning	Level 2	Level 1	Level 2	Level 1
Reflects on teaching practice in support of student learning (CSTP 6.1)	100%	0%	100%	0%
Establishes professional goals and engages in continuous and purposeful professional growth and development (CSTP 6.2)	100%	0%	100%	0%
Collaborates with colleagues and the broader professional community to support	100%	0%	100%	0%

teacher and student learning (CSTP 6.3)				
Reflects on teaching practice in support of student learning (CSTP 6.6)	100%	0%	100%	0%
Establishes professional goals and engages in continuous and purposeful professional growth and development (CSTP 6.7)	100%	0%	100%	0%

* Standard 6 is about the Resident's personal growth, so a different scale is used. Level 1 = Needs attention; Level 2 = Performance is developing appropriately.

2013 - 2014 Student Teaching II/III Final Reports—San Jose Campus

Four point scale: Four (4 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Observed (N/O)

	Single Subject n=6					Multiple Subject n=3				
Section I Student teacher's appearance, behavior, & affect	4	3	2	1	N/O	4	3	2	1	N/O
Personal dress and appearance (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Punctuality and regularity of attendance (TPE13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Speech is clear and appropriate (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Exhibits self-confidence (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates sound judgment (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to be flexible and adaptable (TPE 4,5,7,8,13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%

Willingness to seek assistance (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%
Evidence of personal growth and self - assessment (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%

Single Subject n=6						
Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Yet Demonstrated (N/D)						
Competency	5	4	3	2	1	ND
Overall long-term planning (TPE 3, 4, 9)	83%	0%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Uses methods to promote thinking skills (TPE 1,4,6)	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Well-prepared for each class (TPE 13)	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates skill in the use of technology (TPE 1,4,6)	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Motivates student interest (TPE 5,8,11)	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Provides for individual differences (TPE 7,8,9)	83%	0%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Presents ideas and instruction in a clear and meaningful way (TPE 1,4,9)	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Varies teaching method (TPE 1,4,9)	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to teach students who are different from candidate (TPE 4,7,8,9)	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses appropriate evaluation techniques (TPE 1,2,3,6,8)	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Builds rapport/mutual respect with students (TPE 5,11)	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Acts as an appropriate role-model for students (TPE 5, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maintains accurate records (TPE 2,3,13)	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Management of learning activities (TPE 4,5,9,10)	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Promotes student self-discipline (TPE 8, 11)	67%	17%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Encourages positive interactions (TPE 7,8,11)	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Demonstrates kindness, compassion, understanding, and justice (TPE 5, 6, 11, 13)	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Cooperates with adults and grows professionally through collegial interaction (TPE 12, 13)	67%	17%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Knowledge of and adherence to school policies (TPE 12, 13)	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Multiple Subject n=3						
Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Yet Demonstrated (N/D)						
Competency	5	4	3	2	1	ND
Overall long-term planning (TPE 3, 4, 9)	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses methods to promote thinking skills (TPE 1,4,6)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Well-prepared for each class (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates skill in the use of technology (TPE 1,4,6)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Motivates student interest (TPE 5,8,11)	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Provides for individual differences (TPE 7,8,9)	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Presents ideas and instruction in a clear and meaningful way (TPE 1,4,9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Varies teaching method (TPE 1,4,9)	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to teach students who are different from candidate (TPE 4,7,8,9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses appropriate evaluation techniques (TPE 1,2,3,6,8)	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Builds rapport/mutual respect with students (TPE 5,11)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Acts as an appropriate role-model for students (TPE 5, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maintains accurate records (TPE 2,3,13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Management of learning activities (TPE 4,5,9,10)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Promotes student self-discipline (TPE 8, 11)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Encourages positive interactions (TPE 7,8,11)	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates kindness, compassion, understanding, and justice (TPE 5, 6, 11, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Cooperates with adults and grows professionally through collegial interaction (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Knowledge of and adherence to school policies (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

2013 - 2014 Student Teaching II/III Final Reports—San Jose Campus
Bilingual Authorization
Five point scale: Five (4 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Observed (N/O)

	Single Subject n=0					Multiple Subject n=1				
Section I Student teacher's appearance, behavior, & affect	4	3	2	1	N/O	4	3	2	1	N/O
Personal dress and appearance (TPE 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Punctuality and regularity of attendance (TPE13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Speech is clear and appropriate (TPE 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Exhibits self-confidence (TPE 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates sound judgment (TPE 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to be flexible and adaptable (TPE 4,5,7,8,13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Willingness to seek assistance (TPE 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Evidence of personal growth and self - assessment (TPE 12, 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Single Subject   n=0

Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Yet Demonstrated (N/D)						
Competency	5	4	3	2	1	ND
Overall long-term planning (TPE 3, 4, 9)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses methods to promote thinking skills (TPE 1,4,6)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Well-prepared for each class (TPE 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates skill in the use of technology (TPE 1,4,6)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Motivates student interest (TPE 5,8,11)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Provides for individual differences (TPE 7,8,9)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Presents ideas and instruction in a clear and meaningful way (TPE 1,4,9)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Varies teaching method (TPE 1,4,9)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to teach students who are different from candidate (TPE 4,7,8,9)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses appropriate evaluation techniques (TPE 1,2,3,6,8)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Builds rapport/mutual respect with students (TPE 5,11)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Acts as an appropriate role-model for students (TPE 5, 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maintains accurate records (TPE 2,3,13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Management of learning activities (TPE 4,5,9,10)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Promotes student self-discipline (TPE 8, 11)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Encourages positive interactions (TPE 7,8,11)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates kindness, compassion, understanding, and justice (TPE 5, 6, 11, 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Cooperates with adults and grows professionally through collegial interaction (TPE 12, 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Knowledge of and adherence to school policies (TPE 12, 13)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Multiple Subject n=1						
Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Yet Demonstrated (N/D)						
Competency	5	4	3	2	1	ND
Overall long-term planning (TPE 3, 4, 9)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Uses methods to promote thinking skills (TPE 1,4,6)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Well-prepared for each class (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates skill in the use of technology (TPE 1,4,6)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Motivates student interest (TPE 5,8,11)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Provides for individual differences (TPE 7,8,9)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Presents ideas and instruction in a clear and meaningful way (TPE 1,4,9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Varies teaching method (TPE 1,4,9)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to teach students who are different from candidate (TPE 4,7,8,9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses appropriate evaluation techniques (TPE 1,2,3,6,8)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Builds rapport/mutual respect with students (TPE 5,11)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Acts as an appropriate role-model for students (TPE 5, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maintains accurate records (TPE 2,3,13)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Management of learning activities (TPE 4,5,9,10)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Promotes student self-discipline (TPE 8, 11)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Encourages positive interactions (TPE 7,8,11)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates kindness, compassion, understanding, and justice (TPE 5, 6, 11, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Cooperates with adults and grows professionally through collegial interaction (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Knowledge of and adherence to school policies (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

2013 - 2014 Student Teaching II/III Final Reports—Santa Rosa Campus
Four point scale: Four (4 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Observed (N/O)

	Single Subject n=5					Multiple Subject n=9				
Section I Student teacher's appearance, behavior, & affect	4	3	2	1	N/O	4	3	2	1	N/O
Personal dress and appearance (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Competency	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Punctuality and regularity of attendance (TPE13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Speech is clear and appropriate (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Exhibits self-confidence (TPE 13)	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates sound judgment (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to be flexible and adaptable (TPE 4,5,7,8,13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Willingness to seek assistance (TPE 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Evidence of personal growth and self - assessment (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Single Subject n=5						
Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Yet Demonstrated (N/D)						
Competency	5	4	3	2	1	ND
Overall long-term planning (TPE 3, 4, 9)	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses methods to promote thinking skills (TPE 1,4,6)	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Well-prepared for each class (TPE 13)	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates skill in the use of technology (TPE 1,4,6)	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Motivates student interest (TPE 5,8,11)	60%	20%	0%	0%	0%	20%
Provides for individual differences (TPE 7,8,9)	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Presents ideas and instruction in a clear and meaningful way (TPE 1,4,9)	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Varies teaching method (TPE 1,4,9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

	5	4	3	2	1	ND
Demonstrates ability to teach students who are different from candidate (TPE 4,7,8,9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses appropriate evaluation techniques (TPE 1,2,3,6,8)	60%	20%	0%	0%	0%	20%
Builds rapport/mutual respect with students (TPE 5,11)	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Acts as an appropriate role-model for students (TPE 5, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maintains accurate records (TPE 2,3,13)	60%	20%	0%	0%	0%	20%
Management of learning activities (TPE 4,5,9,10)	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Promotes student self-discipline (TPE 8, 11)	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Encourages positive interactions (TPE 7,8,11)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates kindness, compassion, understanding, and justice (TPE 5, 6, 11, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Cooperates with adults and grows professionally through collegial interaction (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Knowledge of and adherence to school policies (TPE 12, 13)	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Multiple Subject n=9						
Five point scale: Five (5 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest) or Not Yet Demonstrated (N/D)						
Competency	5	4	3	2	1	ND
Overall long-term planning (TPE 3, 4, 9)	77%	23%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uses methods to promote thinking skills (TPE 1,4,6)	89%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Well-prepared for each class (TPE 13)	89%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates skill in the use of technology (TPE 1,4,6)	89%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%
Motivates student interest (TPE 5,8,11)	89%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%
Provides for individual differences (TPE 7,8,9)	89%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%
Presents ideas and instruction in a clear and meaningful way (TPE 1,4,9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Varies teaching method (TPE 1,4,9)	77%	11%	11%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates ability to teach students who are different from candidate (TPE 4,7,8,9)	89%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%

34

Uses appropriate evaluation techniques (TPE 1,2,3,6,8)	89%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Builds rapport/mutual respect with students (TPE 5,11)	89%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Acts as an appropriate role-model for students (TPE 5, 13)	89%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maintains accurate records (TPE 2,3,13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Management of learning activities (TPE 4,5,9,10)	77%	11%	11%	0%	0%	0%
Promotes student self-discipline (TPE 8, 11)	77%	11%	11%	0%	0%	0%
Encourages positive interactions (TPE 7,8,11)	89%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Demonstrates kindness, compassion, understanding, and justice (TPE 5, 6, 11, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Cooperates with adults and grows professionally through collegial interaction (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Knowledge of and adherence to school policies (TPE 12, 13)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

2. Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA and PACT)

In Fall 2002, the School of Education at the University of San Francisco adopted the Teaching Performance Assessment model designed by Educational Testing Services and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. This model is called the CalTPA and is comprised of four distinct tasks, each evaluated on a task-specific rubric with four levels of performance. The four tasks are entitled Subject-Specific Pedagogy, Designing Instruction, Assessing Learning, and Culminating Teaching Experience. Credential candidates at USF complete the first and second tasks during their first semester of student teaching, which is part-time; they complete the third and fourth tasks during their second semester of student teaching, which is full-time. Trained and annually calibrated assessors score all tasks. The pass rates of first time attempts at each task are shown in the first chart below. Candidates who do not pass are matched with a coach and supported in the resubmission process.

In 2010, USF and Stanford University established a partnership in the San Francisco Teacher Residency Program (SFTR), an accelerated credential program that prepares future teachers to meet the specific needs of students in our city's hard to staff public schools. Teacher residents in the program complete coursework and credentialing requirements at either USF or at Stanford, and they student teach full-time in clusters at carefully selected "Teaching Academy" school sites in the San Francisco Unified School District, under the mentorship of "Demonstration Teachers". Stanford University, where the other state-approved Teaching Performance Assessment model was designed, requested that USF students in SFTR complete that model, known as the Performance Assessment for California Teachers

35

(PACT). This model asks candidates to complete one Teaching Event, comprised of several connected tasks: Context for Learning, Planning for Instruction and Assessment, Instructing Students and Supporting Learning, Assessing Student Learning, and Reflection on Teaching and Learning. An academic language component is woven throughout the tasks. The Teaching Event is submitted in the spring of the academic year. Like the CalTPA, it is scored on a detailed rubric.

CalTPA Task	Timeline for Submission
1. Subject-Specific Pedagogy 2. Designing Instruction	Student Teaching I (part-time)
3. Assessing Learning 4. Culminating Teaching Experience	Student Teaching II/III (full-time)

PACT Item	Timeline for Submission
1. Content Area Task: History-Social Science (Multiple Subject candidates) 2. Content Area Task: Science (Multiple Subject candidates)	Student Teaching I (full-time)
3. Content Area Task: Math (Multiple Subject candidates) 4. Teaching Event (all candidates)	Student Teaching II/III (full-time)

CalTPA Passing Standard
Trained and recalibrated assessors score each of the CalTPA tasks on a scale of 1 to 4.
Candidates are asked to revise and resubmit tasks on which they receive a score of fewer than 3. The passing score for the entire CalTPA assessment is 12. The one exception to this rule is in cases of a candidate having received a score of 4 on one of the first three tasks and a 2 on the last task (Assessing Learning). If the candidate totals 12 points, he or she is not required to resubmit the last task.

PACT Passing Standard
The passing standard for the Teaching Event is passing all six rubric categories. These are Planning, Instruction, Assessment, Feedback, Reflection, and Academic Language. To pass a category, the candidate must obtain at least half passing scores on the rubrics in the category, e.g. at least two scores of 2 in a category comprised of three rubrics. In addition, per the PACT Passing Standard, a candidate may not have more than two scores of 1 across the entire Event.

The passing standard for the Content Area Tasks is modeled after that of the PACT: candidates must obtain at least half passing scores on the rubrics for the CAT. For example, in a CAT with two rubrics, the candidate must pass both rubrics with scores of at least 2. In a CAT with three rubrics, the candidate must pass at least two rubrics with scores of at least 2.

Pass rates for first submissions are indicated below. The first chart indicates pass rates for the candidates at USF in the San Francisco Teacher Residency program completing PACT. This program is at the San Francisco campus only. Please note that the other charts indicating pass rates for CalTPA are newly separated by campus, task, and semester, for greater specificity in reporting and program review.

For all programs, the pass rates for candidates participating in USF's blended five year bachelor's and credential program (called the Dual Degree Program in Teacher Preparation) are included in the first row of data, then shown separately in the second row labeled "Dual Degree First Time Pass".

Performance Assessment for California Teachers: San Francisco Campus Only

2013-2014	Content Area Task 1: History Instruction	Content Area Task 2: Science Instruction	Content Area Task 3: Math Assessment	Subject-Specific Teaching Event
First time pass, all submissions	10/10 100.00%	10/10 100.00%	10/10 100.00%	17/17 100.00%
Dual Degree first time pass	N/A	N/A	N/A	2/2 100.00%

California Teaching Performance Assessment: San Francisco Campus

2013-2014 (summer, fall, spring)	SSP	DI	AL	CTE
First time pass, all submissions	29/29 100.00%	61/63 96.83%	64/67 95.52%	67/68 98.53%
Dual Degree first time pass	14/14 100.00%	15/15 100.00%	16/16 100.00%	15/15 100.00%

California Teaching Performance Assessment: Pleasanton Campus

2013-2014 (summer, fall, spring)	SSP	DI	AL	CTE
First time pass, all submissions	12/12 100.00%	12/12 100.00%	12/12 100.00%	12/12 100.00%
Dual Degree first time pass	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

California Teaching Performance Assessment: Sacramento Campus

2013-2014 (summer, fall, spring)	SSP	DI	AL	CTE
First time pass, all submissions	5/7 71.43%	7/7 100.00%	5/6 83.33%	6/6 100.00%
Dual Degree first time pass	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

California Teaching Performance Assessment: San Jose Campus

2013-2014 (summer, fall, spring)	SSP	DI	AL	CTE
First time pass, all submissions	11/11 100.00%	11/11 100.00%	13/14 92.86%	12/12 100.00%
Dual Degree first time pass	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

California Teaching Performance Assessment: Santa Rosa Campus

2013-2014 (summer, fall, spring)	SSP	DI	AL	CTE
First time pass, all submissions	17/17 100.00%	14/16 87.50%	15/16 93.75%	15/16 94.75%
Dual Degree first time pass	1/1 100.00%	1/1 100.00%	1/1 100.00%	1/1 100.00%

Number of Assessors, Assessor Initial Training and Recalibration, and Data on Reliability Related to Double Scoring

CalTPA

In the year represented in this report, the University of San Francisco has maintained a core group of 17-21 assessors (17 in 2011-2012 and 21 in 2012-2013). The assessors who score the CalTPA tasks are career educators having served diverse roles in the field, including master teachers, district administrators, school administrators, instructional coaches, teachers on special assignment, teacher educators in higher education, higher education administrators, student teacher supervisors, curriculum designers, and guidance counselors.

All assessors have attended the initial training for CalTPA scoring, called Foundations/Orientation, delivered at USF using the CTC's protocols and materials. As shown below, various assessors have successfully completed one or more of the task-specific trainings. Between the first academic year and second academic years shown below, one Assessing Learning assessor and four Culminating Teaching Experience assessors were added to the group through successful completion of training by our Lead Assessor. Recalibration is held annually in November.

2013-2014 Academic Year: CalTPA Assessors who successfully recalibrated and subsequently scored each task				
	SSP	**DI**	**AL**	**CTE**
Scored	13	16	14	18

The inter-rater reliability of assessors is calculated after each scoring session and is used to give assessors feedback on their level of accuracy within the cohort. Assessors are notified of their performance, level of agreement with their colleagues, and guided in a review of key tasks, official benchmarks, exemplary Records of Evidence, or particular rubrics. Assessors' inter-rater reliability is reported below:

2013-2014 Academic Year: CalTPA Assessor Agreement				
	SSP	**DI**	**AL**	**CTE**
M13				
Group	94.74%	95.24%	88.89%	100.00%
F13				
Group	96.05%	90.36%	89.17%	93.50%
S14				
Group	94.37%	97.22%	97.09%	95.45%

Group = Percentage of how many times individual assessors matched the
score of another individual assessor on a specific task

**Number of Assessors, Assessor Initial Training and Recalibration, and Data on
Reliability Related to Double Scoring**

PACT
USF held a training by an approved trainer of scorers on the Elementary Literacy Teaching Event in the first academic year of PACT implementation, 2010-2011. Since then, calibration of scorers has been held annually, using PACT Central protocols and materials in the February/March window each spring. This cadre of six scorers who successfully completed initial training and annual calibration score the Content Area Tasks and the Teaching Events in Elementary Literacy at USF. For the Secondary Math, Science, and History-Social Science Teaching Events, USF recruits existing scorers who were trained at PACT Central or at an approved institutional training of scorers, such as San Francisco State

39

University, or recruits new scorers and arranges for their initial training and calibration through a neighboring institution.

USF's scorers for PACT serve diverse roles in education and bring years of experience and multiple perspectives on effective teaching. All six are or have been classroom teachers. Three are also teacher educators in higher education, two are higher education administrators, and two are retired school administrators.

	CAT History-Social Science	CAT Science	CAT Math	Elementary Literacy Teaching Event
2013-2014 Academic Year: PACT Scorers who successfully calibrated and subsequently scored				
Scored	3	4	3	5

	CAT History-Social Science	CAT Science	CAT Math	Teaching Event
2013-2014 Academic Year: PACT Scorer Agreement *Among multiple evaluations, percentage of scorers agreeing with final pass/no pass decision:*				
Scored	92.31%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Modifications made to assessor selection, training, and recalibration

While no major modifications have been made to assessor selection, their ongoing training is determined by their performance within scoring sessions. The TPA Coordinator monitors multiple performance items: quantity and quality of evidence both cited and interpreted in the Record of Evidence (CalTPA) and the scoring rubrics (PACT), the rate of agreement with other scorers or assessors, and the clarity and specificity of the feedback provided to candidates.

In the small number of cases in which the score agreement of a particular assessor is low, or in which the quality or quantity of evidence and interpretation language is lacking on the ROE or scoring rubric, assessors are counseled individually to improve the relevant area. They are provided with the task in question, their ROE or scoring rubric, and an excellent and accurate ROE or scoring rubric for that task; they receive comments via an assessor scoring feedback letter to guide their review of these materials. They are then monitored closely during subsequent scoring to ensure that they are making the needed improvements. In the years reflected in this report, this type of work has been needed for scorers new to the

PACT system; ongoing models and reinforcement about how to connect evidence, interpretation language, and precise rubric language have been provided. In addition, as scorers have been trained on the Content Area Tasks, the institution is able to complete multiple scoring in greater volume than the required 15% and gather more meaningful data on inter-rater reliability in the Content Area Tasks.

3. RICA Scores

Multiple Subjects candidates are offered in-class and on-line preparation for the RICA. After they have taken the RICA, information regarding their pass rates is forwarded to USF by the testing agency. Pass rates are reported here.

Overall USF RICA Passing

Exam	Year	Overall # Takers	Overall # Passed	Pass %	Attempt #2	Attempt #3+
RICA-W	2013/2014	72	52	72%	5	5

Pleasanton Campus

Exam	Year	Overall # Takers	Overall # Passed	Pass %	Attempt #2	Attempt #3+
RICA-W	2013/2014	9	6	67%	0	1

Sacramento Campus

Exam	Year	Overall # Takers	Overall # Passed	Pass %	Attempt #2	Attempt #3+
RICA-W	2013/2014	6	4	67%	2	0

San Francisco Campus Teacher Education

Exam	Year	Overall # Takers	Overall # Passed	Pass %	Attempt #2	Attempt #3+
RICA-W	2013/2014	41	34	83%	2	3

San Jose Campus

Exam	Year	Overall # Takers	Overall # Passed	Pass %	Attempt #2	Attempt #3+
RICA-W	2013/2014	4	2	50%	0	1

Exam	Year	Overall # Takers	Overall # Passed	Pass %	Attempt #2	Attempt #3+
RICA-W	2013/2014	8	4	50%	1	0

4. Candidate and Graduate Surveys

Candidate Exit Survey
In addition to the assessments we have focused on above, in Spring 2007, the Teacher Education Department began asking each candidate who completed the program to respond to an exit survey. The surveys we are using are based on a series of surveys developed by Boston College and revised, with permission, by USF. The exit survey items collect information on the teacher candidates' own perceptions of their teaching abilities and their perceptions of the program and its effectiveness.

Spring 2014 Exit Survey --Pleasanton Campus
Four point scale: Four (4 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest)

Rate how well your teacher education program prepared you to teach students:	Multiple Subjects n=5				Single Subjects n=4			
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
with different ability levels in the same class	60%	0%	40%	0%	25%	50%	25%	0%
from different socio-economic backgrounds *	60%	20%	20%	0%	25%	50%	25%	0%
from diverse racial/ethnic/cultural backgrounds	60%	40%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
in an urban school system	60%	0%	40%	0%	25%	50%	25%	0%
with different linguistic backgrounds	60%	40%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
with different sexual orientations	60%	0%	20%	20%	50%	50%	20%	0%
with special needs	40%	20%	20%	20%	25%	75%	20%	0%

Your knowledge and understanding of:	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
multi-cultural issues and perspectives *	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	60%	75%	25%
social and political roles of schools in American society	40%	40%	20%	0%	75%	25%	0%	0%
legal and ethical responsibilities of teachers	60%	40%	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%	0%

	Multiple Subjects n=5				Single Subjects n=4			
My teacher education program prepared me to:	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
utilize an in-depth knowledge base in the subject area of my certification.	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
understand the concepts, principles, and reasoning methods of the subject areas I will teach (e.g. math, science, history, English, etc.).	60%	20%	20%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
develop an understanding of reading and language development to advance literacy and writing in all students.	60%	20%	20%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
use knowledge of writing processes to provide instruction and opportunities for writing across all content areas.	60%	20%	20%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Probably no	Definitely no	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Probably no	Definitely no
Looking back, would you still enroll in this teacher education program	80%	20%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
How do you rate your ability to make a significant difference in the learning of your students?	80%	20%	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%	0%
In your opinion, rate how well your Teacher Education Program at USF prepared you to teach	60%	40%	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%	0%

Spring 2014 Exit Survey (Bilingual Authorization) -- Pleasanton
(No Candidates Enrolled)

Four point scale: Four (4 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest)

	Multiple Subjects n=1				Single Subjects n=0			
Rate how well your teacher education program prepared you to teach students:	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
with different ability levels in the same class	60%	0%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
from different socio-economic backgrounds *	60%	20%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
from diverse racial/ethnic/cultural backgrounds	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
in an urban school system	60%	0%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with different linguistic backgrounds	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with different sexual orientations	60%	0%	20%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with special needs	40%	20%	20%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Your knowledge and understanding of:	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
multi-cultural issues and perspectives *	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
social and political roles of schools in American society	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

44

	legal and ethical responsibilities of teachers							
	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

	Multiple Subjects n=1				Single Subjects n=0			
My teacher education program prepared me to:	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
utilize an in-depth knowledge base in the subject area of my certification.	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
understand the concepts, principles, and reasoning methods of the subject areas I will teach (e.g. math, science, history, English, etc.).	60%	20%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
develop an understanding of reading and language development to advance literacy and writing in all students.	60%	20%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
use knowledge of writing processes to provide instruction and opportunities for writing across all content areas.	60%	20%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Definitely yes	**Probably yes**	**Probably no**	**Definitely no**	**Definitely yes**	**Probably yes**	**Probably no**	**Definitely no**
Looking back, would you still enroll in this teacher education program	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Excellent	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
How do you rate your ability to make a significant difference in the learning of your students?	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

45

In your opinion, rate how well your Teacher Education Program at USF prepared you to teach								
	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Fall 2013 Exit Survey – Sacramento Campus

Four point scale: Four (4 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest)

	Multiple Subjects n=3				Single Subjects n=3			
Rate how well your teacher education program prepared you to teach students:	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
with different ability levels in the same class	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
from different socio-economic backgrounds *	100%	0%	0%%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
from diverse racial/ethnic/cultural backgrounds	100%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%
in an urban school system	100%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%
with different linguistic backgrounds	100%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%
with different sexual orientations	100%	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%
with special needs	100%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%
Your knowledge and understanding of:	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
multi-cultural issues and perspectives *	100%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%
social and political roles of schools in American society	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
legal and ethical responsibilities of teachers	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%

46

My teacher education program prepared me to:	Multiple Subjects n=3				Single Subjects n=3			
	Excellent	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
utilize an in-depth knowledge base in the subject area of my certification.	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
understand the concepts, principles, and reasoning methods of the subject areas I will teach (e.g. math, science, history, English, etc.).	100%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%
develop an understanding of reading and language development to advance literacy and writing in all students.	100%	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%
use knowledge of writing processes to provide instruction and opportunities for writing across all content areas.	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Definitely yes	**Probably yes**	**Probably no**	**Definitely no**	**Definitely yes**	**Probably yes**	**Probably no**	**Definitely no**
Looking back, would you still enroll in this teacher education program	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Excellent	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
How do you rate your ability to make a significant difference in the learning of your students?	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
In your opinion, rate how well your Teacher Education Program at USF prepared you to teach	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%

Fall 2013 Exit Survey (Bilingual Authorization) -- Sacramento Campus
(No Candidates Enrolled)

Four point scale: Four (4 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest)

Rate how well your teacher education program prepared you to teach students:	Multiple Subjects n=0				Single Subjects n=0			
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
with different ability levels in the same class	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
from different socio-economic backgrounds *	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
from diverse racial/ethnic/cultural backgrounds	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
in an urban school system	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with different linguistic backgrounds	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with different sexual orientations	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with special needs	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Your knowledge and understanding of:	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
multi-cultural issues and perspectives *	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
social and political roles of schools in American society	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
legal and ethical responsibilities of teachers	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

My teacher education program prepared me to:	Multiple Subjects n=0				Single Subjects n=0			
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
utilize an in-depth knowledge base in the subject area of my certification.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

48

understand the concepts, principles, and reasoning methods of the subject areas I will teach (e.g. math, science, history, English, etc.).	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
develop an understanding of reading and language development to advance literacy and writing in all students.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
use knowledge of writing processes to provide instruction and opportunities for writing across all content areas.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Definitely yes	**Probably yes**	**Probably no**	**Definitely no**	**Definitely yes**	**Probably yes**	**Probably no**	**Definitely no**
Looking back, would you still enroll in this teacher education program	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Excellent	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
How do you rate your ability to make a significant difference in the learning of your students?	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
In your opinion, rate how well your Teacher Education Program at USF prepared you to teach	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

2013-2014 Exit Survey -- San Francisco Campus

	Multiple Subjects n=26				**Single Subjects n=12**			
Rate how well your teacher education program prepared you to teach students:	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**

49

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
with different ability levels in the same class	39%	27%	23%	8%	25%	17%	42%	17%
from different socio-economic backgrounds *	35%	39%	15%	8%	33%	33%	25%	0%
from diverse racial/ethnic/cultural backgrounds	46%	31%	19%	0%	42%	33%	25%	0%
in an urban school system	42%	27%	19%	8%	33%	58%	8%	0%
with different linguistic backgrounds	35%	42%	19%	0%	42%	33%	25%	0%
with different sexual orientations	27%	19%	27%	23%	33%	42%	17%	0%
with special needs	35%	35%	23%	4%	42%	33%	17%	8%
Your knowledge and understanding of:	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
multi-cultural issues and perspectives	50%	35%	12%	0%	42%	58%	0%	0%
social and political roles of schools in American society	42%	31%	23%	0%	58%	42%	0%	0%
legal and ethical responsibilities of teachers	35%	31%	31%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
My teacher education program prepared me to:	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
utilize an in-depth knowledge base in the subject area of my certification.	46%	42%	8%	0%	25%	42%	25%	8%
understand the concepts, principles, and reasoning methods of the subject areas I will teach (e.g. math, science, history, English, etc.).	35%	54%	8%	0%	25%	33%	25%	17%
develop an understanding of reading and language development to advance literacy and	54%	39%	4%	0%	25%	50%	25%	0%

	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Probably no	Definitely no	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Probably no	Definitely no
writing in all students.								
use knowledge of writing processes to provide instruction and opportunities for writing across all content areas.	42%	42%	8%	4%	25%	33%	33%	8%
	Definitely yes	**Probably yes**	**Probably no**	**Definitely no**	**Definitely yes**	**Probably yes**	**Probably no**	**Definitely no**
Looking back, would you still enroll in this teacher education program *	54%	27%	4%	0%	42%	33%	17%	8%
	Excellent	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
How do you rate your ability to make a significant difference in the learning of your students? *	65%	19%	0%	0%	25%	67%	8%	0%
In your opinion, rate how well your Teacher Education Program at USF prepared you to teach	50%	31%	4%	0%	42%	25%	17%	17%

Exit Survey 2013-2014 Bilingual Authorization San Francisco Campus

Four point scale: Four (4 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest)

	Multiple Subjects n=5				Single Subjects n=2			
Rate how well your teacher education program prepared you to teach students:	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
with different ability levels in the same class	20%	20%	60%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%
from different socio-economic backgrounds *	0%	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
from diverse racial/ethnic/cultural backgrounds	0%	60%	40%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%

51

in an urban school system	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
with different linguistic backgrounds	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%
with different sexual orientations	0%	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
with special needs	0%	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%
Your knowledge and understanding of:								
multi-cultural issues and perspectives	20%	60%	20%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
social and political roles of schools in American society	20%	60%	20%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
legal and ethical responsibilities of teachers	20%	60%	20%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
My teacher education program prepared me to:	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
utilize an in-depth knowledge base in the subject area of my certification.	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%
understand the concepts, principles, and reasoning methods of the subject areas I will teach (e.g. math, science, history, English, etc.).	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%
develop an understanding of reading and language development to advance literacy and writing in all students.	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%
use knowledge of writing processes to provide instruction and opportunities for writing across all content areas.	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%
	Definitely yes	**Probably yes**	**Probably no**	**Definitely no**	**Definitely yes**	**Probably yes**	**Probably no**	**Definitely no**

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Looking back, would you still enroll in this teacher education program *	20%	40%	40%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
	Excellent	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
How do you rate your ability to make a significant difference in the learning of your students? *	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%
In your opinion, rate how well your Teacher Education Program at USF prepared you to teach	0%	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%

Fall 2013 Exit Survey – San Jose Campus

Four point scale: Four (4 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest)

	Multiple Subjects n=3				**Single Subjects n=4**			
Rate how well your teacher education program prepared you to teach students:	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
with different ability levels in the same class	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	50%	25%	0%
from different socio-economic backgrounds *	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%	50%	25%	0%
from diverse racial/ethnic/cultural backgrounds	0%	33%	67%	0%	25%	50%	0%	0%
in an urban school system	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	75%	0%	0%
with different linguistic backgrounds	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	75%	0%	0%
with different sexual orientations	0%	67%	0%	33%	0%	25%	50%	0%
with special needs	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%	25%	50%	0%
Your knowledge and understanding of:	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**

53

multi-cultural issues and perspectives *	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	75%	0%	0%
social and political roles of schools in American society	33%	67%	0%	0%	50%	25%	0%	0%
legal and ethical responsibilities of teachers	67%	33%	0%	0%	25%	25%	25%	0%

My teacher education program prepared me to:	Multiple Subjects n=3				Single Subjects n=4			
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
utilize an in-depth knowledge base in the subject area of my certification.	0%	33%	67%	0%	25%	25%	25%	0%
understand the concepts, principles, and reasoning methods of the subject areas I will teach (e.g. math, science, history, English, etc.).	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	50%	25%	0%
develop an understanding of reading and language development to advance literacy and writing in all students.	33%	33%	33%	0%	25%	50%	0%	0%
use knowledge of writing processes to provide instruction and opportunities for writing across all content areas.	33%	0%	67%	0%	0%	50%	25%	0%
	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Probably no	Definitely no	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Probably no	Definitely no
Looking back, would you still enroll in this teacher education program	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%	25%	50%	0%
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor

How do you rate your ability to make a significant difference in the learning of your students?	33%	33%	0%	0%	25%	50%	0%	0%
In your opinion, rate how well your Teacher Education Program at USF prepared you to teach	0%	33%	33%	0%	0%	50%	25%	0%

Fall 2013 Exit Survey (Bilingual Authorization) -- San Jose Campus

Four point scale: Four (4 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest)

Rate how well your teacher education program prepared you to teach students:	Multiple Subjects n=1				Single Subjects n=0			
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
with different ability levels in the same class	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
from different socio-economic backgrounds *	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
from diverse racial/ethnic/cultural backgrounds	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
in an urban school system	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with different linguistic backgrounds	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with different sexual orientations	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with special needs	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Your knowledge and understanding of:	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
multi-cultural issues and perspectives *	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
social and political roles of schools in American society	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

legal and ethical responsibilities of teachers	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

	Multiple Subjects n=1				Single Subjects n=0			
My teacher education program prepared me to:	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
utilize an in-depth knowledge base in the subject area of my certification.	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
understand the concepts, principles, and reasoning methods of the subject areas I will teach (e.g. math, science, history, English, etc.).	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
develop an understanding of reading and language development to advance literacy and writing in all students.	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
use knowledge of writing processes to provide instruction and opportunities for writing across all content areas.	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Definitely yes	**Probably yes**	**Probably no**	**Definitely no**	**Definitely yes**	**Probably yes**	**Probably no**	**Definitely no**
Looking back, would you still enroll in this teacher education program	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Excellent	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
How do you rate your ability to make a significant difference in the learning of your students?	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
In your opinion, rate how well your Teacher Education Program at USF	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

56

prepared you to teach								

Spring 2014 Exit Survey -- Santa Rosa Campus

* Four point scale: Four (4 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest)

Rate how well your teacher education program prepared you to teach students:	Multiple Subjects n=6				Single Subjects n=0			
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
with different ability levels in the same class	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
from different socio-economic backgrounds *	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
from diverse racial/ethnic/cultural backgrounds	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
in an urban school system	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with different linguistic backgrounds	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with different sexual orientations	33%	50%	16%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with special needs	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Your knowledge and understanding of:	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
multi-cultural issues and perspectives *	33%	50%	16%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
social and political roles of schools in American society	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
legal and ethical responsibilities of teachers	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

My teacher education program prepared me to:	Multiple Subjects n=6				Single Subjects n=0			
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor

57

utilize an in-depth knowledge base in the subject area of my certification.	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
understand the concepts, principles, and reasoning methods of the subject areas I will teach (e.g. math, science, history, English, etc.).	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
develop an understanding of reading and language development to advance literacy and writing in all students.	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
use knowledge of writing processes to provide instruction and opportunities for writing across all content areas.	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Definitely yes	**Probably yes**	**Probably no**	**Definitely no**	**Definitely yes**	**Probably yes**	**Probably no**	**Definitely no**
Looking back, would you still enroll in this teacher education program	67%	16%	0%	16%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Excellent	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
How do you rate your ability to make a significant difference in the learning of your students?	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
In your opinion, rate how well your Teacher Education Program at USF prepared you to teach	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Spring 2014 Exit Survey (Bilingual Authorization) – Santa Rosa Campus
(No Candidates Enrolled)
Four point scale: Four (4 - Highest) to One (1 - Lowest)

	Multiple Subjects n=0				Single Subjects n=0			
Rate how well your teacher education program prepared you to teach students:	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
with different ability levels in the same class	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
from different socio-economic backgrounds *	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
from diverse racial/ethnic/cultural backgrounds	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
in an urban school system	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with different linguistic backgrounds	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with different sexual orientations	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with special needs	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Your knowledge and understanding of:	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
multi-cultural issues and perspectives *	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
social and political roles of schools in American society	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
legal and ethical responsibilities of teachers	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

	Multiple Subjects n=0				Single Subjects n=0			
My teacher education program prepared me to:	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
utilize an in-depth knowledge base in the subject area of my certification.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

understand the concepts, principles, and reasoning methods of the subject areas I will teach (e.g. math, science, history, English, etc.).	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
develop an understanding of reading and language development to advance literacy and writing in all students.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
use knowledge of writing processes to provide instruction and opportunities for writing across all content areas.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Definitely yes	**Probably yes**	**Probably no**	**Definitely no**	**Definitely yes**	**Probably yes**	**Probably no**	**Definitely no**
Looking back, would you still enroll in this teacher education program	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Excellent	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Excellent**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**
How do you rate your ability to make a significant difference in the learning of your students?	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
In your opinion, rate how well your Teacher Education Program at USF prepared you to teach	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Part III - Analysis and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

1. Teaching Performance Assessment
- The pass rates remain consistent with previous years; number of students requiring remediation has declined on the whole.
- CalTPA passing scores for the branch campus programs have come up and are equivalent with the San Francisco Campus. Scores in SSP and AL at Sacramento and DI at San Jose remain lower than the other campuses.

60

- Dual Degree candidate pass rates remain consistent or higher than the five campus programs.

2. Student Teacher Evaluations (Cooperating and Master Teacher Reports)
All candidates
- The evaluation scores candidates received from their cooperative teacher and master teachers were consistent with the previous two years.
- Areas for growth identified in full-time student teaching include long term planning, technology, and management of learning activities.
- Candidates showed improvement in evaluations from cooperating teachers (ST I) to master teachers (ST II/III).

Single Subject Candidates
- Review and strengthening of the Academic Literacy and Single Subject Curriculum and Instructions courses continues to be needed to improve teaching reading in content areas.
- Continued emphasis and practice is needed to development of skills in the areas of long term planning, asking higher-level questions in the classroom to promote higher level thinking, providing for individual differences in planning and teaching.

Multiple Subject Candidates
- Continue to assist candidates in identifying and applying management skills learned in coursework
- As indicated by RICA pass rates, examine and strength instruction in Early Literacy and Reading and Language Arts.

SFTR Candidates
- While consistently high, the evaluations (based on CSTP) for Single Subject candidates were higher than those for Multiple Subject candidates in several areas.
- Review and strengthen of instruction for Multiple Subject candidates in articulating goals, use of assessment to establish learning goals, and involving all students in self-assessment.

4. Candidate Surveys
- In their exit surveys Multiple and Single Subject candidates rated the program equally, the majority either excellent or good.
- The majority of candidates would enroll in the program again and feel well prepared to teach.
- There are areas in the survey rated as "fair" that indicate a need to examine more deeply the program as a whole.

61

Program Effectiveness

- Data from the TPA and student teaching evaluations indicate the majority of our students are meeting the TPEs.
- Assessor inter-rater reliability remains consistently high.
- Candidate Feedback Form has received positive comments from both candidates and assessors.
- When in their student teaching placements, the cooperating and master teachers indicate our students exhibit professional behaviors, willingness to implement master and cooperating teacher suggestions, and show enthusiasm for teaching.
- Review courses that prepared candidates for the RICA examination; Review material assessed on RICA and encourage all candidates to participate in review provided. Provide test-taking strategies.
- Significant changes in staff during the year resulted in putting the Graduate, Principal, and Support Provider surveys on hold. With new stability in staff beginning Fall of 2014, the surveys will again be sent out.

Part VI Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

Over the past few years the department has been striving for greater communication and sharing of candidate feedback data among full time and adjunct faculty, as well as more involvement by adjunct faculty in the review and development of course content. In fall 2010, the program brought together all full time and adjunct faculty to participate in a program review. Faculty teaching similar courses met together to review course content in light of the CTC Program Standards. They then worked to develop a common syllabus to use across all courses that would provide consistency in terms of course readings, assignments, and assessment. These course groups have continued to work throughout the years to continue to review and further refine their course content.

We have noted that Single Subject candidates have consistently been less satisfied with their teacher training and have been rated slightly lower than the Multiple Subject candidates by their Cooperating and Master Teachers. The faculty members are continuing to analyze and adjust the curriculum and instruction course content and other classes offered for the Single Subject candidates. We believe that they will contribute to a stronger training program for the Single Subject candidates and we will continue to monitor evaluations and exit surveys from Single Subject candidates to determine whether or not these numbers improve.

The department continues to increase the diversity of the adjunct faculty pool. We will continue to work toward this as a goal and feel that it will give our teacher candidates a more balanced view of classrooms and education and assist them in successfully addressing issues of diversity and social justice. A better system for orienting new adjunct faculty is constantly being refined. The School of Education provides a yearly Adjunct Academy, which all adjuncts are encouraged to attend. In addition, the Associate Directors work closely with newly hired adjuncts to provide an overview of the program, an orientation to their

62

responsibilities, and a list of on-campus resources that can provide training (e.g. Blackboard, Smart Classrooms) to support their teaching.

The School of Education provides opportunities for university supervisors who observe all candidate field placements to assemble and share best practices. Over the past year, university supervisors who supervised the branch campus candidates attended a professional development meeting with supervisors in the special education program. Together they brainstormed best practices in the areas of effective feedback to candidates.

As we move forward the department would also like to take the assessment data and use it to analyze the program to determine ways to:
- increase candidates' ability to teach in diverse classrooms and to differentiate instruction for English Language Learners and students with different sexual orientations and with students with special needs. The need for this is indicated in TPA submissions, exit and graduate survey results.
- improve classroom management skills for teacher candidates as indicated in student teaching evaluations, exit interviews, and graduate surveys.
- improve the use of technology among teacher candidates at school sites, if possible, as indicated in student teaching evaluations.

In addition to analyzing program content, the department also needs to:
- develop more detailed rubrics for cooperating teachers and master teachers to use when evaluating teacher candidates
- provide continued communication about the TPA with full-time and part-time faculty to better align curriculum and instruction as a means to achieve more consistent rates of passage on TPA tasks at all campus sites.
- revise the exit survey questions to clarify question content and to match more closely our program's goals and objectives.
- revise the exit survey to increase student completion of all questions
- improve procedures for obtaining teacher candidate evaluations from cooperating teachers and master teachers
- improve procedures for obtaining surveys from graduates, their support providers and principals.
- investigate why candidates at different campuses achieve different rates of passage on the CalTPA tasks
- increase candidates' repertoire of skills for fostering safe classroom and school environments for LGBTQ students and families

USF Reading Certificate Program
Biennial Report 2014

Section A—Credential Program Specific Information

PART I. Contextual Information

Overview: The Reading Certificate (Reading and Literacy Added Authorization) program is designed to prepare K-12 teachers for specialized teaching of reading language arts to diverse populations of students and for curriculum and instructional leadership in the field of language and literacy at the school level. The program prepares candidates to review and critically analyze current reading research, assess students' reading proficiency, and plan and provide appropriate and responsive reading instruction and interventions based on assessment. Program candidates are also prepared to lead and assist teacher colleagues in these areas.

Courses are taken in a cohort format. Candidates typically complete the program in four semesters. The program requires 16 semester units of graduate coursework, with three graduate pre-requisite courses. The program includes three onsite practicums arranged through local schools. Most candidates combine the Reading Certificate program with USF requirements for the Master of Arts in Teaching Reading program and receive both the certificate and MA upon completion of the program. Other candidates are already credentialed teachers who are returning to the university setting.

Multiple and Single Subject Prerequisite Course Requirements
- TEC – 621   Early Literacy (3 units) or TEC 625 Adolescent Development (3 units)
- TEC – 612   Reading And Language Arts (3 units) or TEC 622 Academic Literacy (3 units)
- TEC – 616 or 660   Student Teaching I (2 units)

Reading Certificate Courses (16 units)
- TEC – 661   Assessment and intervention with Struggling Readers (3 units)
- TEC – 662 Tutoring Practicum Primary (1 unit)
- TEC – 663 Tutoring Practicum: Intermediate (1unit)
- TEC – 664 Developing Fluent Readers (2units)
- TEC – 668 Teaching Comprehension Strategies (3 units)
- TEC – 670 Research in Reading (3 units)
- TEC – 671 Reading Practicum (3 units)

Program Specific Candidate Information
Site: Main Campus

2012-13		2013-14	
Number of Candidates	Number of Completers	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers
9	8	21	19

Changes Since Last Biennial Report (2013)

Feedback from CTC	Changes Made
Data, analysis, and program modifications were provided, clearly presented, and well linked. Data and analysis supported proposed program modifications.	While there were no major recommendations for modifications. We further strengthened the program by making the following modifications: - introduced 5 competency assessments to candidates on the first day of their course sequence - revised and pilot rubric and implemented rubric for supervisor observations in all supervisor visits (3 competency assessments) - further developed partnership with staff of community-based organization to include assistant teaching under candidates' leadership - increased requirements for student assessment in Case Study and Reading Assessment Portfolio competency assessment

PART II. Candidate Assessment and Program Effectiveness Information

a) Five key competency assessments are:

1. Case Study and Reading Assessment Portfolio (4-point rubric)
2. Literature Review (checklist of required elements)
3. Supervisor Observations of 1:1 lesson (pass/retry)
4. Supervisor Observations of small group lesson (4-point rubric)
5. Supervisor Observations of whole group lesson (4-point rubric)

The range of response options on the rubrics is 4 points:
      4 = exceeds standard
      3 = meets standard
      2 = below standard, must repeat observation

1 = unacceptable

b) Additional information use to assess candidates

	Information Used to Assess Candidates		
Course	Competency Development & Assessment	Formative Assessment	Summative Assessment
TEC-664_Developing Fluency	"Word Study Activity Box" of teaching tools to support phonemic awareness, phonics, orthography, morphology & grammar;10 activities organized by stages of development	x	
TEC-664_Developing Fluency	"Text Library" – bibliography of anchor texts (predictable books, transition chapter books, young adult books, non-fiction texts)	x	
TEC-664_Developing Fluency	Presentation of read aloud lesson plan that demonstrates fluency	x	
TEC-664_Developing Fluency	Fluency strategy presentation	x	
TEC- 668_Teaching Comprehension Strategies	Design & presentation of 3 comprehension Strategy & Text Structure lessons (fiction and informational text); contribution to Class Compendium	x	
TEC-662_Tutoring-Primary	Case Study & Reading Assessment Portfolio (student profile, assessments & analysis, intervention, reflection & next steps)	x	
TEC-661_Assessment & Invention	Review & presentation of an intervention program; checklist of required components	x	
TEC-661_Assessment & Invention; TEC-662_Tutoring-Primary	Case Study & Reading Assessment Portfolio (student profile, assessments & analysis, intervention, reflection & next steps); graded on a rubric		X
TEC-663_Tutoring - Intermediate	Supervisor observation of 1:1 lesson with intermediate student; graded on a rubric based on program standards		X
TEC-670_Research in Reading	Submission of required elements in stages on a time schedule; instructor feedback	x	
TEC-670_Research in Reading	Literature review that shows understanding & application of reading research; graded on a checklist of required elements		X

TEC- 671_Reading Practicum	5-Week Unit overview; 5 weekly lesson plans; instructor feedback using a checklist of required elements	x	
TEC- 671_Reading Practicum	Submission of assessment data on high frequency words, Spelling Inventory (Bear et al) and running records (Fountas & Pinnell)	x	
TEC- 671_Reading Practicum	Supervisor observation of small group lesson; graded on a rubric based on program standards		X
TEC- 671_Reading Practicum	Supervisor observation of whole group lesson; graded on a rubric based on program standards		X

Tools used to assess student performance and effectiveness of the program:
1. Entrance survey
2. Exit survey

c) Aggregated data for 5 instruments described in (a) and (b) above:

Aggregated Data from Competency Assessments						
Tool	2012-13			2013-14		
	% assessed	*% passed 1st try*	*% passed 2nd try*	*% assessed*	*% passed 1st try*	*% passed 2nd try*
1. Case Study & Reading Asmnt Port	100	100	N/A	100	100	N/A
2. Literature Review	100	100	N/A	100	100	N/A
3. Observation 1:1	100	100	N/A	100	100	N/A
4. Observation - Small Group	100	100	N/A	100	100	N/A
5. Observation - Whole Group	100	100	N/A	100	100	N/A

The following tables show results from rubrics for supervisor observations that used prompts based on new program standards for Reading and Literacy Added Authorization. Candidates receive narrative comments and are rated on a 4-point scale (1= unacceptable, 2= below standard, 3= at standard, 4= exceeds standard).

Distribution of Responses to Categorical Prompts: Percentage and number of candidates scoring at each score point on supervisor observation of **small group lesson** 2012-13, N=9 2013-14, N=20								
	4		**3**		**2**		**1**	
	2012-13	2013-14	2012-13	2013-14	2012-13	2013-14	2012-13	2013-14

67

	4		3		2		1	
Establishes culture of literacy	55% 5	10% 2	44% 4	90% 18	0	5% 1	0	0
Demonstrates ability to work w diverse populations	11% 1	5% 1	88% 8	90% 18	0	5% 1	0	0
Demonstrates ability to assess student learning	0	5% 1	100% 9	85% 17	0	10% 2	0	0
Plans & implements formal literacy instruction	44% 4	10% 2	55% 5	85% 17	0	5% 1	0	0
Demonstrates ability to reflect & evaluate lesson	44% 4	60% 12	55% 5	40% 12	0	0	0	0

Distribution of Responses to Categorical Prompts: Percentage and number of candidates scoring at each score point on supervisor observation of **whole group lesson** 2012-13, N=9 2013-14, N=20								
	4		**3**		**2**		**1**	
	2012-13	2013-14	2012-13	2013-14	2012-13	2013-14	2012-13	2013-14
Establishes culture of literacy	22% 2	25% 5	66% 6	70% 14	11% 1	5% 1	0	0
Demonstrates ability to work w diverse populations	22% 2	25% 5	44% 4	55% 11	33% 3	44% 4	0	0
Demonstrates ability to assess student learning	11% 1	45% 9	66% 6	50% 10	22% 2	5% 1	0	0
Plans & implements formal literacy instruction	22% 2	35% 7	77% 2	55% 11	0	10% 2	0	0
Demonstrates ability to reflect & evaluate lesson	77% 2	85% 17	22% 2	10% 2	0	5% 1	0	0

1) Number of Assessors

Number of Assessors		
Tool	2012-13	2013-14
1. Case Study & Reading Asmnt Port	2	2
2. Literature Review	1	3
3. Observation 1:1	2	1
4. Observation - Small Group	1	2
5. Observation - Whole Group	1	2

2) Assessor Initial Training and Recalibration

Number of Assessors Completing Training and Recalibration				
Tool	2012-13		2013-14	
	Training	Recalibration	Training	Recalibration
1. Case Study & Rdg Asmnt Port	2	0	2	0
2. Literature Review	1	0	3	0
3. Observation 1:1	2	0	1	0
4. Observation - Small Group	1	0	2	0
5. Observation - Whole Group	1	0	2	0

3) No data is available on reliability because recalibration was not done.

In 2013-14, a new "Reading Specialist Candidate Evaluation of University Supervisor" was introduced. Eleven candidates completed the form in response to the supervisor that conducted their whole group and small group teaching observations.

Percentage Ratings of University Supervisors, 2013-14 (N=19)					
	Superior	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor
Dependability & punctuality during scheduled visits	74% 14	21% 4	5% 1	0	0
Availability for assistance outside of the visits	67% 12	33% 6	0	0	0
Knowledge of multiple teaching strategies & practices	84% 16 10	5% 1	11% 2	0	0
Sense of enthusiasm for teaching	79% 15	16% 3	5% 1	0	0
Helpfulness in assessing my strengths	84% 16	11% 2	5% 1	0	0
Helpfulness in assessing my needed areas for growth	84% 16	11% 2	5% 1	0	0
Helpfulness in expanding my teaching competencies	72% 13	17% 3	11% 2	0	0
Ability to communicate and relate to me	72% 8	28% 5	0	0	0
OVERALL RATING	89% 16	5% 1	5% 1	0	0

4) A new supervisor was added for whole group and small group observations. She was trained by an experienced supervisor on our observation rubric and checklist. These tools

69

reflect the standards for reading specialist certificate. Two readers joined the instructor evaluating the Literature Reviews and were trained by that instructor.

Program Effectiveness

Exit Survey data for reading specialist candidates was compiled for 2012-13 from the general USF Exit Survey (N=8). Eight out of the 9 total graduates responded to the questions specifically directed to the reading specialist program. Percentages and number in each response category are reported below. Results for Exit survey for 2013-14 have not yet been collected because culminating course of program will not be completed until after the deadline for this report.

Exit Survey Question: Please tell us about the MATR (reading specialist certificate) faculty.

	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
were available outside of class to meet with you for concerns, feedback and/or advising.	0	0	0	100% 8
made careful judgments about the quality of work that I did.	0	0	12.5% 1	87.5% 7
enabled me to evaluate and reflect upon my practice to improve instruction.	0	0	12.5% 1	87.5% 7
assesses my progress in relation to professional standards for the teaching of reading.	0	0	12.5% 1	87.5% 7
taught in ways similar to the practices they advocate.	0	0	12.5% 1	87.5% 7
structured their courses around real problems of teaching reading.	0	0	12.5% 1	87.5% 7
spent time helping me achieve my goals and do well in the program.	0	0	0	100% 8

Exit survey question: If you entered a classroom today as a teacher of reading, how confident are you that you could perform the following tasks?

	Not at all confident	Somewhat confident	Confident	Very confident	Completely confident
Use knowledge of phonemic awareness, phonics and word identification, and how they are	0	0	62.5% 5	37.5% 3	0

integrated in fluent reading.					
Use knowledge of teaching strategies for supporting students to develop fluency.	0	0	50% 4	50% 4	0
Use knowledge of vocabulary and comprehension strategies, and how they are integrated in fluent reading.	0	0	50% 4	50% 4	0
Use a wide range of instructional materials, approaches and methods, for learners at different stages of development and from differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds.	0	12.5% 1	62.5% 5	37.5% 3	0
Use instructional grouping options (individual, small group, whole class) as appropriate for accomplishing given purposes.	0	0	62.5% 5	37.5% 3	0
Use a wide range of assessment tools and practices including both individual and group informal classroom assessment strategies.	0	0	62.5% 5	37.5% 3	0
Plan for a wide range of learners at different stages of reading and writing and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds.	0	12.5% 1	50% 4	37.5% 3	0

Exit survey question: How do you rate your ability to make a significant difference in the learning of your students?	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	25%	2
Good	75%	6
Fair	0	0
Poor	0	0

Exit survey question: Would you recommend the USF MATR program to other prospective teachers?	Response Percent	Response Count
Definitely yes	37.5%	3
Probably yes	50%	4
Probably no	12.5%	1
No	0	0

PART III. Analysis and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

a) Candidate competence

In 2012-13, the cohort was comprised on 9 candidates. In 2013-14, the cohort more than doubled to 20 candidates. Because of the small numbers in 2012-13, one candidate represented 11% of the cohort making generalizations problematic. The 2012-13 cohort was observed in small group and whole group instruction by one supervisor. In 2013-14, a second supervisor was added.

In 2012-13 and 2013-14, 100% of candidates passed all five competency assessments on the first try. We attribute this to the quality and number of formative assessments provided by faculty to candidates throughout the program (see IIb). For example, candidates receive feedback on a tutoring and assessment portfolio in TEC 662 as a formative experience for the portfolio that serves as a competency assessment in TEC 663.

In both 2012-13 and 2013-14 passed their five competency assessments on the first try. In supervisor observations of small group lessons in 2012-13, all candidates scored at levels 3 (meets standard) or 4 (exceeds standard) on all indicators. In 2013-14, 90% of the candidates met or exceeded standard on all indicators. This could be attributed to variability due to the larger cohort size, the addition of a new supervisor, and/or increased scrutiny by supervisors compared to the previous year. In the case of lower scores, one 1 or 2 candidates scored at level 2.

In supervisor observations of whole group lessons, a higher percentage of candidates in 2013-14 scored at level 4 (exceeds standard) on all indicators than in 2012-13. Approximately the same percentages of candidates scored at level 3 or 4 in both cohorts on all indicators, with 1 or 2 outliers at level 2.

b) Program effectiveness
A supervisor evaluation form was introduced in 2013-14. Candidates rated the two supervisors as superior or excellent in at least 88% of responses.

On the 2012-13 exit survey, all candidates responded that faculty in the reading specialist certificate program were available outside of class to meet around concerns, feedback and/or advising. All but one candidate responded that faculty made careful judgments about quality of work, enabled them to evaluate and reflect on practice, assessed candidate progress using professional standards, taught in ways similar to practice they advocated, structured their courses around real reading problems and spent time helping candidates to achieve their goals.

When candidates were asked about their confidence levels as a teacher of reading in specified tasks, seven out of eight felt "confident" or "very confident" on all areas. One candidate felt only "somewhat confident" using a wide range of instructional materials, approaches and methods, for learners at different stages of development and from differing cultural and

72

linguistic backgrounds and planning for a wide range of learners at different stages of reading and writing and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. More candidates felt very confident to support students to develop fluency, vocabulary and comprehension than in other areas. This could be because of courses specifically focused on these topics.

All candidates rated their ability to make a significant difference in the learning of their students as excellent or good. Only one candidate probably would not recommend USF to other prospective teachers.

PART IV. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate & Program Performance
As mentioned in Section I, we made several modifications to strengthen our candidates and their experience in the program.
- introduced 5 competency assessments to candidates on the first day of their course sequence
- revised and pilot rubric and implemented rubric for supervisor observations in all supervisor visits (3 competency assessments)
- further developed partnership with staff of community-based organization to include assistant teaching under candidates' leadership
- increased requirements for student assessment in Case Study and Reading Assessment Portfolio competency assessment
We will have this new data to add to our future reports as we realized we needed more nuanced assessment and experiences for our students and program. We highlight to higher level issues we are working on to strengthen in terms of overall assessment below.

Data Source	Plan of Action or Proposed Change	Applicable Program or Common Standard
Number of assessors trained & recalibrated	1) Conduct training of all new assessors 2) Conduct recalibration of veteran assessors	Common Standard 2, 6, 9
Exit survey	Improve response rate to reading specialist questions on the USF Teacher Education Exit Survey by requiring response as a condition for completing the program	Common Standard 2

Section A—Credential Program Specific Information

PART I – Contextual Information

The University of San Francisco Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Internship Credential Program was developed to prepare candidates who work in inner-city, multi-cultural and multi-linguistic schools teaching students with mild-to-moderate disabilities in a range of settings. The possible settings include special education classes and resource specialist programs in elementary, middle, and high schools.

The USF Mild/Moderate Program is a two-year program that began in 2002 and is delivered through a cohort model. In response to changes in CTC standards and beginning with the cohort graduating in 2012, the program has changed to an Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Preliminary credential program that continues to be delivered through an internship and cohort model. Candidates are required to complete 16 courses during a two-year period. See Table 2 for a listing of these courses.

Our coursework is taught in modules that spiral throughout the Mild/Moderate program coursework. We design it this way in order to meet our candidates' needs. In the summer before intern employment we teach the beginning competencies in order to prepare candidates for fall employment. Then, in fall, we teach the competencies that they need first on the job. Because our candidates are employed as special education teachers or resource specialists after the first summer of the program, their "fieldwork" runs continuously. Everything taught in class is applied on the job, revisited again in class, and then refined on the job in a continuous process. This process is also part of our teaching spiral.

Table 1 - Candidates Entering and Completing Program 2011-2014

Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Program Candidate Information		
Year	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/Graduates
2011 - 2013	13	11
2012 - 2014	13	9*
2013 - 2015	18	

As of 7/15/14, 9 out of the 13 have completed all coursework and fieldwork requirements, including passing the RICA. 2012-2014 candidates are taking the RICA and submitting final fieldwork requirements over the summer.

Changes since last Biennial Report submitted 9/15/13

- *We no longer use the Evaluation of Professional Competency form; the 3-Way Evaluation form serves as the fieldwork supervisor's summative evaluation of candidates' cumulative progress throughout the program.*

Table 2 provides an overview of the courses and types of assignments within the Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Credential Internship Program as of July 15, 2014.

Table 2: Course Requirements within the Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Credential Internship Program

Course Number	Course Title	Quizzes	Short Assignments	Group Assignments	Signature Assignments	Other
TEC 604	Math and Science	No	Yes	No	Unit Outline with Single-Concept Sequence and Lesson Plan (27% of grade)	
TEC 621	Early Literacy	No	Yes	No	No	
TEC 642	Health Education	No	Yes	No	No	
L&I 622	Assistive Technology	No	Yes	Yes (13% of grade)	Assistive Technology Report (50% of grade)	Teacher Website (17% of grade)
L&I 631	Curriculum & Instruction	Yes	Yes	No	Content Area Unit (50% of grade)	
L&I 633	Assessment	Yes	Yes	No	Assessment Report and IEP (50% of grade)	
L&I 636	Educational Practices for a Learning Specialist	Yes	Yes	Yes (12% of grade)	Classroom Management Plan and First Days of School Group Presentation (33% of grade)	
L&I 637	Teaching Diverse Learners	No	Yes	No	Questions Related to Developing a Behavior Management Plan using IRIS website (17% of grade)	
L&I 639	Fieldwork 1	No	Yes	No	No	TPE & fieldwork supervisor evaluations
L&I 640	Fieldwork 2	No	Yes	No	Critical Thoughts and Beliefs paper (15% of grade)	TPE & fieldwork supervisor evaluations
L&I 659	Collaboration/ Consultation	Yes	Yes	No	Collaboration Research Paper (24% of grade)	Audiotape assignment of problem-solving interaction (15% of grade)
L&I 665	Legal and Educational Foundations	Yes	Yes	Yes	This course is combined with L&I 636	
L&I 675	Data-based Instruction	No	Yes	No	Reading Portfolio (69% of grade)	
L&I 676	Behavior Management	No	Yes	No	Functional Behavior Assessment Report (53% of grade)	
L&I 678	Fieldwork 3	No	Yes	No	Individualized Transition Plan (30% of grade)	TPE & fieldwork supervisor evaluations
L&I 679	Fieldwork 4	No	Yes	No	No	TPE & fieldwork supervisor evaluations

Table 3 list projects that require reflection. As part of the program, candidates reflect on their teaching experiences, development of teaching philosophies, use of resources and knowledge, and on their perceptions of their strengths and needs in a series of projects. Self-reflection is an important component of the program and is embedded throughout the courses in the program.

Table 3: Progress-Monitoring and Data-based Projects or Papers that Require Reflection

Course Number	Project
L&I 622	Assistive Technology Report
L&I 631	Content Area Report
L&I 640	Critical Thoughts and Beliefs Paper
L&I 659	Collaboration Project / Research Paper
L&I 675	Reading Portfolio
L&I 676	Functional Behavior Assessment Report

PART II – Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information
a. Below these data from key assessments for the Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Credential Program are used to make critical decisions about candidate competence prior to being recommended for a credential.

Program Components 1: Intern Teaching Experience & Fieldwork Courses

Knowledge and Skills. Prior to being recommended to the CTC for a Mild/Moderate Preliminary Education Specialist Credential, candidates must complete all required fieldwork courses with a minimum overall GPA of 2.75 and a grade of C or better in each course. The grades for fieldwork courses are based on completion of all coursework in the fieldwork classes and of all fieldwork requirements including lesson observations, university fieldwork supervisor and principal evaluations, candidate self evaluations and required submissions to the electronic portfolio demonstrating progress in the TPEs. During the first year of the program, candidates complete TPE formative assessment goals, which are scored on a rubric and revised until the requirement is met for each goal. These goals help the candidate plan how they are going to show progress toward mastery of each TPE as evident in the artifacts in their portfolios. Candidates' work on completing the portfolio throughout the two years of the program with their progress monitored by the fieldwork coordinator and the fieldwork course instructor during and at the end of each semester, using a rubric showing whether the candidates are meeting the competencies and objectives set in the various courses.

An important goal of the program is to provide experiences to assist new special education teachers in transforming research-based knowledge into practical professional best practices. It is based on the belief that on-the-job training provides credential candidates with realistic classroom preparation and is more learner-responsive than traditional approaches. As such, candidates become skilled practitioners who are highly experienced with diverse special education populations and can provide effective instruction and supervision of students. Fieldwork is designed to meet the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) professional

standards and aligned with the requirements of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs).

Table 4: Summary of results of completed TPE Portfolio for candidates graduating in 2013 and 2014

Program Completion Date	Number of Candidates	Candidates Who Completed TPE Portfolio	Pass Rate
2013	11	11	100%
2014	13	10*	77%

Candidates may continue to work on completing their TPE Portfolio during the summer following their final semester of the program prior to being recommending for Preliminary Ed Specialist Credential.

Credential candidates work towards developing mastery in the 13 TPEs as they progress through the program. The fieldwork supervisor observes the progress of the candidate who is teaching or performing other responsibilities of a special education teacher such as conducting an Individual Education Plan (IEP) meeting. These observations occur a minimum of five times during the first semester and three times each during the subsequent three semesters. Each observation lasts at least one class period, an average of 50 minutes, followed by an additional 20 to 30 minutes of discussion. The fieldwork supervisor completes a report that provides a rating of the candidate on each of the 13 TPEs that were observed, using a 4-point Likert scale where a one is low and a four is high. The supervisor also makes comments on the observation and conference report and orally discusses these with the candidate after each observation. Below is data from the first and final observation report in Table 5.

Table 5a: Fieldwork Supervisor First (Fall 2012) and Final (Spring 2014) Observation Reports for 2014 Graduates

Four point scale: One (1 - Basic) Two (2 - Developing) Three (3 - Proficient) Four (4 - Advanced) or Not Observed (N/O)

	First Semester n =12					Final Semester n = 12				
	1	2	3	4	N/O	1	2	3	4	N/O
TPE 1 Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction	15%	62%	15%		8%	8%	17%	42%	33%	
TPE 2 Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction	15%	62%	23%				8%	42%	50%	
TPE 3 Interpretation and Use of Assessments	31%	8%	15%		46%		17%	42%	17%	25%
TPE 4 Making Content Accessible	15%	46%	15%	8%	15%		8%	42%	50%	
TPE 5 Student Engagement	15%	46%	31%		8%			50%	50%	
TPE 6 Developmentally Appropriate Practices	15%	46%	23%		15%		17%	50%	33%	
TPE 7 Teaching English Learners	23%	31%	15%		31%		25%	33%	8%	33%
TPE 8 Learning about Students	31%	31%	15%	8%	15%		17%	58%	8%	17%
TPE 9 Instructional Planning	15%	46%	15%		23%			58%	33%	8%
TPE 10 Instructional Time	15%	54%	23%		8%	8%		50%	42%	
TPE 11 Social Environment	8%	38%	38%		15%	8%		50%	42%	
TPE 12 Professional, Legal and Ethical Obligations	8%	23%	15%		54%	8%		42%	25%	25%
TPE 13 Professional Growth	8%	31%	8%		54%	8%		50%	8%	33%

Table 5b: Fieldwork Supervisor First (Fall 2013) Observation Report for Continuing 2015 Graduates

Four point scale: One (1 - Basic) Two (2 - Developing) Three (3 - Proficient) Four (4 - Advanced) or Not Observed (N/O)

	First Semester n =17				
	1	2	3	4	N/O
TPE 1 Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction	11%	72%	17%		
TPE 2 Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction	11%	39%	50%		
TPE 3 Interpretation and Use of Assessments	6%	50%	6%		39%
TPE 4 Making Content Accessible	11%	61%	28%		
TPE 5 Student Engagement	11%	61%	28%		
TPE 6 Developmentally Appropriate Practices	6%	50%	44%		
TPE 7 Teaching English Learners		39%	6%		56%
TPE 8 Learning about Students	17%	61%	6%		17%
TPE 9 Instructional Planning	11%	39%	44%		6%
TPE 10 Instructional Time	11%	50%	39%		
TPE 11 Social Environment	11%	50%	33%	6%	
TPE 12 Professional, Legal and Ethical Obligations	17%	11%	28%		44%
TPE 13 Professional Growth	17%	28%	6%		50%

*Data shown above may contain a margin of error +/- 1%

At the end of each semester, a three-way evaluation is completed by the fieldwork supervisor, the site supervisor (usually the principal or principal designee), and the candidate. The principal and fieldwork supervisor's Three-way evaluations serve as the final evaluation for the candidates' cumulative progress demonstrated throughout the program provided in Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6a: Principal Final Evaluation (Spring 2014) for 2014 Graduates

Four point scale: One (1 - Basic) Two (2 - Developing) Three (3 - Proficient) Four (4 - Advanced) or Not Observed (N/O)

	n =13				
	1	2	3	4	N/O
TPE 1 Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction		23%	31%	46%	
TPE 2 Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction		15%	38%	46%	
TPE 3 Interpretation and Use of Assessments		23%	54%	23%	
TPE 4 Making Content Accessible		8%	38%	54%	
TPE 5 Student Engagement		15%	23%	62%	

	1	2	3	4
TPE 6 Developmentally Appropriate Practices		15%	38%	46%	
TPE 7 Teaching English Learners		15%	31%	38%	15%
TPE 8 Learning about Students		23%	38%	38%	
TPE 9 Instructional Planning		23%	31%	46%	
TPE 10 Instructional Time		15%	38%	46%	
TPE 11 Social Environment		8%	15%	77%	
TPE 12 Professional, Legal and Ethical Obligations		23%	38%	38%	
TPE 13 Professional Growth		15%	46%	38%	

*Data shown above may contain a margin of error +/- 1%

Table 6b: Principal Final Evaluation (Spring 2014) for Continuing 2015 Graduates

Four point scale: One (1 - Basic) Two (2 - Developing) Three (3 - Proficient) Four (4 - Advanced) or Not Observed (N/O)

	n =16				
	1	2	3	4	N/O
TPE 1 Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction		50%	38%	13%	
TPE 2 Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction		44%	38%	6%	13%
TPE 3 Interpretation and Use of Assessments		44%	38%	6%	13%
TPE 4 Making Content Accessible		25%	69%	6%	
TPE 5 Student Engagement		38%	50%	13%	
TPE 6 Developmentally Appropriate Practices	13%	38%	44%	6%	
TPE 7 Teaching English Learners		31%	19%	13%	38%
TPE 8 Learning about Students		38%	50%	6%	6%
TPE 9 Instructional Planning		38%	56%	6%	
TPE 10 Instructional Time		31%	63%	6%	
TPE 11 Social Environment		19%	31%	50%	
TPE 12 Professional, Legal and Ethical Obligations		25%	44%	31%	
TPE 13 Professional Growth	6%	6%	56%	25%	6%

*Data shown above may contain a margin of error +/- 1%

Table 7a: Fieldwork Supervisor Final Evaluation (Spring 2014) for 2014 Graduates

Four point scale: One (1 - Basic) Two (2 - Developing) Three (3 - Proficient) Four (4 - Advanced) or Not Observed (N/O)

	n =13				
	1	2	3	4	N/O
TPE 1 Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction		15%	54%	31%	
TPE 2 Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction		8%	46%	46%	
TPE 3 Interpretation and Use of Assessments		15%	69%	8%	8%
TPE 4 Making Content Accessible		15%	38%	46%	
TPE 5 Student Engagement		8%	31%	62%	

	1	2	3	4
TPE 6 Developmentally Appropriate Practices		8%	46%	46%	
TPE 7 Teaching English Learners		23%	54%	23%	
TPE 8 Learning about Students		8%	69%	23%	
TPE 9 Instructional Planning		8%	38%	54%	
TPE 10 Instructional Time		8%	38%	54%	
TPE 11 Social Environment		8%	23%	69%	
TPE 12 Professional, Legal and Ethical Obligations		23%	38%	31%	8%
TPE 13 Professional Growth		15%	31%	54%	

*Data shown above may contain a margin of error +/- 1%

Table 7b: Fieldwork Supervisor Final Evaluation (Spring 2014) for Continuing 2015 Graduates
Four point scale: One (1 - Basic) Two (2 - Developing) Three (3 - Proficient) Four (4 - Advanced) or Not Observed (N/O)

	n =15				
	1	2	3	4	N/O
TPE 1 Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction		47%	53%		
TPE 2 Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction		18%	71%	6%	6%
TPE 3 Interpretation and Use of Assessments	6%	41%	35%		18%
TPE 4 Making Content Accessible		35%	53%	12%	
TPE 5 Student Engagement		30%	47%	24%	
TPE 6 Developmentally Appropriate Practices		35%	65%		
TPE 7 Teaching English Learners		59%	6%	6%	30%
TPE 8 Learning about Students		35%	53%	6%	6%
TPE 9 Instructional Planning		35%	59%	6%	
TPE 10 Instructional Time		53%	35%	12%	
TPE 11 Social Environment		41%	35%	24%	
TPE 12 Professional, Legal and Ethical Obligations	6%	24%	53%		18%
TPE 13 Professional Growth		35%	53%		12%

*Data shown above may contain a margin of error +/- 1%

Each semester teacher candidates complete a 4-point Likert scale self-evaluation, in which they rate themselves on each of the TPEs. Data from the self-evaluations are in Table 8. During this process candidates reflect on their growth by comparing changes from earlier self-assessments.

Table 8a: Candidate Final Self Evaluation (Spring 2014) for 2014 Graduates
Four point scale: One (1 - Basic) Two (2 - Developing) Three (3 - Proficient) Four (4 - Advanced)

	n=13			
	1	2	3	4
TPE 1				

Instructs students with disabilities in the core academic curriculum at the grade levels and in the service delivery modes of legal assignment		15%	62%	23%
Demonstrates knowledge of the disabilities of students in the assignment and the effects of the disability on learning, skills development, and behavior		8%	38%	54%
Implements appropriate accommodations for assessment and instruction as describes in the IEP		8%	54%	38%
Demonstrates the ability to adapt, modify, accommodate and supplement instruction when appropriate		15%	46%	38%
TPE 2				
Uses progress monitoring based on each student's IEP at key points during instruction to determine whether students are progressing adequately toward achieving the state-adopted academic content standards for students	8%	8%	70%	15%
Paces instruction and reteaches content based on evidence gathered using assessment strategies such as questioning and examining student work samples		23%	46%	31%
Checks for and addresses common student misconceptions and misunderstandings		8%	54%	38%
TPE 3				
Understands and uses a variety of informal and formal, formative and summative assessments to determine student's progress and plan instruction, including use of statewide assessments.		15%	77%	8%
Uses different types of diagnostic instruments as well as information from families as part of multiple measures to assess student knowledge, skills, and behaviors		23%	62%	15%
Knows when and how to use specialized assessments based on student needs		15%	70%	15%
Uses Informal classroom assessment appropriately to analyze progress and inform instruction		15%	46%	38%
Teaches students how to use self-assessment strategies to encourage independent thinking		38%	46%	15%
Familiarizes students with standardized tests; appropriately administers standardized tests; provides accommodations for students with special needs	8%	15%	54%	23%
Interprets assessment data to identify the level of proficiency of English language learners in English and in their primary languages		38%	46%	15%
Communicates assessment results, progress summaries, and how to achieve the curriculum to students.		8%	62%	31%
Knows requirements for appropriate assessment and identification of students whose cultural, ethnic, or linguistic differences may be confused with manifestations of disability		15%	70%	15%
TPE 4				
Able to develop and implement IEP goals with content standards and effective for the student's inclusion in the general education core curriculum with appropriate supports and procedures.		8%	46%	46%
Incorporates specific strategies, teaching instructional activities, procedures and experiences that address state-adopted academic content standards for students in providing a balanced and comprehensive curriculum		8%	70%	23%
Prioritizes and sequences essential skills and strategies in a logical manner using instructional materials to reinforce state-adopted academic content standards		15%	62%	23%
Varies instructional strategies according to purpose and lesson content		23%	46%	31%
Explains and reinforces content in multiple ways, such as use of written and oral presentation, manipulatives, physical models, visual and performing art, diagrams, non-verbal communication and computer technology.		8%	54%	38%
Provides opportunities for adequate time for students to practice and apply what they have learned.		8%	62%	31%
Models active listening in the classroom and takes additional steps to foster access and comprehension for all learners			54%	46%
TPE 5				
Communicates instructional objectives to students and ensures the active and equitable participation of all students		8%	62%	31%
Ensures students understand what they are doing during instruction and monitors student progress toward academic goals		8%	54%	38%
Uses strategies to re-engage students who are struggling and off-task			54%	46%

Uses community resources, student experiences and applied learning activities to make instruction relevant		23%	46%	31%
Encourages students to share and examine points of view during lessons and stimulate the quality of student thinking through meaningful questioning and response		23%	54%	23%
Provides students with developmentally and functionally appropriate opportunities to participate, practice self-determination, and engage in academic pursuits and pragmatic and social interactions		8%	70%	23%
TPE 6				
Demonstrates the ability to set student expectations based on their knowledge of typical and atypical development		8%	62%	31%
Demonstrates the ability to use developmentally appropriate teaching practices that support students' mastery of grade-level state-adopted content standards		8%	70%	23%
Develops and implements behavior support plans, goals, and accommodations that promote successful inclusion for students within the general education setting as well as plans that are specific for age appropriateness and severity of the disability		8%	62%	31%
TPE 7				
Applies pedagogical theories, principles and instructional practices for English Language Development leading to comprehensive literacy in English		38%	54%	8%
Implements an instructional program that facilitates English language development that progresses to the grade level reading/language arts program for English speakers		31%	54%	15%
Assesses students levels of literacy in English and in primary language to provide instruction differentiated to students' language	8%	31%	54%	8%
Selects instructional materials and strategies to develop student's abilities to comprehend and produce English.		23%	62%	15%
Applies pedagogical theories, principles and instructional practices for the development of academic language, comprehension, knowledge in the subject of the core curriculum		38%	46%	15%
Understands when and how to collaborate with specialist and para-educators to support English language development.		15%	54%	31%
Makes learning explicit and allows students to express meaning in a variety of ways		8%	54%	38%
TPE 8				
Understands patterns of child and adolescent development to better plan for students' developmental levels			77%	23%
Assesses students' prior mastery of academic language abilities, content knowledge, and skills, and maximizes learning opportunities for all students.		8%	77%	15%
Encourages parents to become involved and support their efforts to improve student learning.	8%	15%	31%	46%
Understands how multiple factors, including gender and health can influence behavior, and understand the connection between student's health and their ability to learn.			62%	38%
Identifies students needing specialized instruction, including students whose physical disabilities, or health status requiring instructional adaptations			54%	46%
TPE 9				
Plans instruction that is comprehensive to the subject matter to be taught and in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students.	8%	8%	62%	23%
Establishes clear long term and short-term goals for student learning based on state and local standards for student achievement and student's current level of achievement.		15%	54%	31%
Uses explicit teaching methods such as direct instruction and inquiry and plans how to explain content and make abstract concepts concrete and meaningful to help students meet or exceed grade level expectations.		15%	54%	31%
Understands the purposes, strengths and limitations of a variety of instructional strategies and improves successive uses of strategies based on experience and reflection		23%	31%	46%
Selects or adapts instructional strategies, grouping strategies, and instructional material to meet student learning goals and needs.		8%	62%	31%
Connects the content to be learned with students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, experiences, interests, and developmental learning needs to ensure instruction is comprehensible and meaningful		15%	54%	31%

Differentiates instruction to accommodate varied student abilities.	31%	31%	38%
TPE 10			
Allocates instructional time to maximize student achievement in relation to state-adopted academic content standards for students, instructional goals, and scheduled academic tasks.	23%	54%	23%
Establishes procedures for routine tasks and manages transitions to maximize instructional time	8%	54%	38%
1Adjusts the use of instructional time to optimize learning opportunities and outcomes for all students based on reflection and consultation.	8%	62%	31%
10. Coordinates and communicates effectively with other special education service providers for useful instructional activities.		62%	38%
TPE 11			
Knows and uses a variety of strategies and methods for promoting positive behavioral and social skills for constructive relationships		54%	46%
Develops and maintains clear expectations for academic and social behavior		54%	46%
Promotes student effort and engagement and create a positive climate for learning.		46%	54%
Knows how to write and implement a student discipline plan.	8%	70%	23%
Establishes rapport with students and their families for supporting academic and personal success	8%	38%	54%
Helps students to learn to work responsibly with others and independently		54%	46%
Recognizes how well the social environment maximizes academic achievement for all students and makes changes based on observation of students and consultation with other teachers.		46%	54%
TPE 12			
Takes responsibility for student academic learning outcomes		46%	54%
Aware of personal values and biases and recognizes ways in which these values and biases affect the teaching and learning of students		31%	70%
Manages professional time spent in teaching responsibilities to ensure that academic goals are met	15%	46%	38%
Understands important elements of California and federal laws and procedures pertaining to the education of English learners, gifted students, and individuals with disabilities, including implications for their placements in classrooms		77%	23%
Identifies suspected cases of child abuse, neglect, or sexual harassment and carries out laws and district guidelines for reporting such cases		77%	23%
Understands and implements school and district policies and state and federal law in responding to inappropriate or violent student behavior	8%	62%	31%
Understands and honors legal and professional obligations to protect the privacy, health and safety of students, families and other school professionals.		54%	46%
TPE 13			
Evaluates own teaching practices and subject matter knowledge based on the state-adopted academic content standards for students and student learning		62%	38%
Improves teaching practices by soliciting feedback and engaging in cycles of planning, teaching, reflecting, discerning problems and applying new strategies	8%	38%	54%
Develops appropriate plans for professional growth in subject matter knowledge and pedagogy and accesses resources such as feedback from professional organizations, and research describing teaching, learning and public education	8%	54%	38%
Uses reflection and feedback to formulate and prioritize goals for increasing subject matter knowledge and teaching effectiveness	8%	54%	38%

*Data shown above may contain a margin of error +/- 1%

Table 8b: Candidate Final Self Evaluation (Spring 2014) for Continuing 2015 Graduates

Four point scale: One (1 - Basic) Two (2 - Developing) Three (3 - Proficient) Four (4 - Advanced)

	n=18			
	1	2	3	4
TPE 1				
Instructs students with disabilities in the core academic curriculum at the grade levels and in the service delivery modes of legal assignment	44%	50%		44%
Demonstrates knowledge of the disabilities of students in the assignment and the effects of the disability on learning, skills development, and behavior	44%	44%	6%	44%
Implements appropriate accommodations for assessment and instruction as describes in the IEP	44%	50%		44%
Demonstrates the ability to adapt, modify, accommodate and supplement instruction when appropriate	39%	50%	6%	39%
TPE 2				
Uses progress monitoring based on each student's IEP at key points during instruction to determine whether students are progressing adequately toward achieving the state-adopted academic content standards for students	6%	67%	17%	6%
Paces instruction and reteaches content based on evidence gathered using assessment strategies such as questioning and examining student work samples	6%	44%	44%	
Checks for and addresses common student misconceptions and misunderstandings		44%	44%	6%
TPE 3				
Understands and uses a variety of informal and formal, formative and summative assessments to determine student's progress and plan instruction, including use of statewide assessments.	6%	56%	28%	6%
Uses different types of diagnostic instruments as well as information from families as part of multiple measures to assess student knowledge, skills, and behaviors	6%	50%	33%	6%
Knows when and how to use specialized assessments based on student needs	6%	39%	50%	
Uses Informal classroom assessment appropriately to analyze progress and inform instruction	6%	33%	50%	6%
Teaches students how to use self-assessment strategies to encourage independent thinking	11%	61%	22%	
Familiarizes students with standardized tests; appropriately administers standardized tests; provides accommodations for students with special needs	17%	44%	33%	
Interprets assessment data to identify the level of proficiency of English language learners in English and in their primary languages		67%	28%	
Communicates assessment results, progress summaries, and how to achieve the curriculum to students.		61%	33%	
Knows requirements for appropriate assessment and identification of students whose cultural, ethnic, or linguistic differences may be confused with manifestations of disability	11%	61%	22%	
TPE 4				
Able to develop and implement IEP goals with content standards and effective for the student's inclusion in the general education core curriculum with appropriate supports and procedures.		33%	56%	6%
Incorporates specific strategies, teaching instructional activities, procedures and experiences that address state-adopted academic content standards for students in providing a balanced and comprehensive curriculum		39%	50%	6%
Prioritizes and sequences essential skills and strategies in a logical manner using instructional materials to reinforce state-adopted academic content standards		44%	44%	6%
Varies instructional strategies according to purpose and lesson content		39%	50%	6%
Explains and reinforces content in multiple ways, such as use of written and oral presentation, manipulatives, physical models, visual and performing art, diagrams, non-verbal communication and computer technology.		33%	56%	6%
Provides opportunities for adequate time for students to practice and apply what they have learned.		50%	39%	6%
Models active listening in the classroom and takes additional steps to foster access and comprehension for all learners		33%	50%	11%

TPE 5				
Communicates instructional objectives to students and ensures the active and equitable participation of all students		33%	56%	6%
Ensures students understand what they are doing during instruction and monitors student progress toward academic goals	6%	44%	39%	6%
Uses strategies to re-engage students who are struggling and off-task		22%	61%	11%
Uses community resources, student experiences and applied learning activities to make instruction relevant		33%	56%	6%
Encourages students to share and examine points of view during lessons and stimulate the quality of student thinking through meaningful questioning and response		33%	56%	6%
Provides students with developmentally and functionally appropriate opportunities to participate, practice self-determination, and engage in academic pursuits and pragmatic and social interactions		39%	50%	6%
TPE 6				
Demonstrates the ability to set student expectations based on their knowledge of typical and atypical development	6%	39%	44%	6%
Demonstrates the ability to use developmentally appropriate teaching practices that support students' mastery of grade-level state-adopted content standards	6%	44%	39%	6%
Develops and implements behavior support plans, goals, and accommodations that promote successful inclusion for students within the general education setting as well as plans that are specific for age appropriateness and severity of the disability		33%	56%	6%
TPE 7				
Applies pedagogical theories, principles and instructional practices for English Language Development leading to comprehensive literacy in English	17%	44%	33%	
Implements an instructional program that facilitates English language development that progresses to the grade level reading/language arts program for English speakers	22%	39%	33%	
Assesses students levels of literacy in English and in primary language to provide instruction differentiated to students' language	22%	44%	28%	
Selects instructional materials and strategies to develop student's abilities to comprehend and produce English.	11%	33%	44%	6%
Applies pedagogical theories, principles and instructional practices for the development of academic language, comprehension, knowledge in the subject of the core curriculum	17%	39%	33%	6%
Understands when and how to collaborate with specialist and para-educators to support English language development.	11%	39%	39%	6%
Makes learning explicit and allows students to express meaning in a variety of ways		33%	56%	6%
TPE 8				
Understands patterns of child and adolescent development to better plan for students' developmental levels	11%	39%	33%	11%
Assesses students' prior mastery of academic language abilities, content knowledge, and skills, and maximizes learning opportunities for all students.		56%	33%	6%
Encourages parents to become involved and support their efforts to improve student learning.	6%	44%	44%	
Understands how multiple factors, including gender and health can influence behavior, and understand the connection between student's health and their ability to learn.		28%	56%	11%
Identifies students needing specialized instruction, including students whose physical disabilities, or health status requiring instructional adaptations		22%	61%	11%
TPE 9				
Plans instruction that is comprehensive to the subject matter to be taught and in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students.		44%	44%	6%
Establishes clear long term and short-term goals for student learning based on state and local standards for student achievement and student's current level of achievement.		61%	33%	
Uses explicit teaching methods such as direct instruction and inquiry and plans how to explain content and make abstract concepts concrete and meaningful to help students meet or exceed grade level expectations.		50%	39%	6%

Understands the purposes, strengths and limitations of a variety of instructional strategies and improves successive uses of strategies based on experience and reflection		44%	39%	11%
Selects or adapts instructional strategies, grouping strategies, and instructional material to meet student learning goals and needs.		28%	61%	6%
Connects the content to be learned with students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, experiences, interests, and developmental learning needs to ensure instruction is comprehensible and meaningful	6%	33%	50%	6%
Differentiates instruction to accommodate varied student abilities.	6%	28%	61%	
TPE 10				
Allocates instructional time to maximize student achievement in relation to state-adopted academic content standards for students, instructional goals, and scheduled academic tasks.		44%	44%	6%
Establishes procedures for routine tasks and manages transitions to maximize instructional time		28%	67%	
1Adjusts the use of instructional time to optimize learning opportunities and outcomes for all students based on reflection and consultation.	6%	28%	61%	
10. Coordinates and communicates effectively with other special education service providers for useful instructional activities.	6%	28%	56%	6%
TPE 11				
Knows and uses a variety of strategies and methods for promoting positive behavioral and social skills for constructive relationships		22%	67%	6%
Develops and maintains clear expectations for academic and social behavior		17%	78%	
Promotes student effort and engagement and create a positive climate for learning.		11%	61%	22%
Knows how to write and implement a student discipline plan.	11%	33%	39%	11%
Establishes rapport with students and their families for supporting academic and personal success		22%	50%	22%
Helps students to learn to work responsibly with others and independently	6%	22%	67%	
Recognizes how well the social environment maximizes academic achievement for all students and makes changes based on observation of students and consultation with other teachers.		22%	56%	17%
TPE 12				
Takes responsibility for student academic learning outcomes		17%	72%	6%
Aware of personal values and biases and recognizes ways in which these values and biases affect the teaching and learning of students		33%	44%	17%
Manages professional time spent in teaching responsibilities to ensure that academic goals are met		39%	44%	11%
Understands important elements of California and federal laws and procedures pertaining to the education of English learners, gifted students, and individuals with disabilities, including implications for their placements in classrooms		50%	33%	11%
Identifies suspected cases of child abuse, neglect, or sexual harassment and carries out laws and district guidelines for reporting such cases	28%	22%	33%	11%
Understands and implements school and district policies and state and federal law in responding to inappropriate or violent student behavior	17%	33%	33%	11%
Understands and honors legal and professional obligations to protect the privacy, health and safety of students, families and other school professionals.	6%	33%	44%	11%
TPE 13				
Evaluates own teaching practices and subject matter knowledge based on the state-adopted academic content standards for students and student learning	6%	44%	39%	6%
Improves teaching practices by soliciting feedback and engaging in cycles of planning, teaching, reflecting, discerning problems and applying new strategies		50%	39%	6%

Develops appropriate plans for professional growth in subject matter knowledge and pedagogy and accesses resources such as feedback from professional organizations, and research describing teaching, learning and public education	6%	44%	39%	6%
Uses reflection and feedback to formulate and prioritize goals for increasing subject matter knowledge and teaching effectiveness		39%	50%	6%

*Data shown above may contain a margin of error +/- 1%

These data are used by the fieldwork coordinator and the program instructors to determine candidates' strengths and weaknesses throughout the program, tailor instruction and supports to improve candidates' performances, and make determinations about how to improve areas of the program to strengthen every candidate's achievement of all TPEs. The fieldwork coordinator reviews these documents and discusses the ratings with the fieldwork supervisors when the candidates' performance is rated as a one or two or if the candidate appears to need extra support. If the candidate continues to be rated at a level one in the classroom based on either the fieldwork supervisor observations or the school administrator's evaluation for two consecutive semesters, the candidate will be counseled out of the program.

Table 9: Average Scores on TPE's by Instrument Used for Candidates Graduating in 2013
*(*Data provided in 9/15/13 Biennial Report)*

Students Who Completed Program in 2013

TPE	1st semester Observations	Final Semester Observations	1st semester Professional Competency	Final Professional Competency	1st semester 3-Way Evaluation	Final 3-Way Evaluation	1st semester Self-Evaluation	Final Self-Evaluation
1	2.85	3.55	2.82	4.09	2.57	3.41	2.39	3.25
2	2.92	3.64	2.91	4.23	2.70	3.36	3.10	3.22
3	3.14	3.26	2.27	3.91	2.26	3.36	2.45	3.08
4	2.71	3.58	2.73	4.36	2.67	3.50	2.59	3.19
5	2.85	3.53	2.82	4.36	2.68	3.45	2.65	3.28
6	2.98	3.70	2.86	4.18	2.64	3.42	2.49	3.06
7	2.31	3.48	2.36	3.91	2.18	3.08	2.31	2.86
8	2.88	3.59	2.55	4.00	2.71	3.50	2.74	3.30
9	2.93	3.68	2.82	4.09	2.43	3.31	2.50	3.07
10	2.79	3.59	2.73	4.18	2.54	3.34	2.68	3.11
11	2.89	3.67	2.73	4.45	2.94	3.67	2.85	3.34
12	2.75	3.63	2.64	4.09	2.86	3.70	3.00	3.27
13	2.66	3.46	2.95	4.27	2.78	3.55	2.95	3.37
Column Means	2.82	3.57	2.71	4.16	2.61	3.43	2.67	3.18

In Table 10 the knowledge, skills, and assessments used in the intern teaching experience and fieldwork courses is summarized.

Table 10: Intern Teaching and Fieldwork Courses Summary of Knowledge, Skills, and Assessments

Intern Teaching Experience & Fieldwork Courses	Knowledge	Skills	Evaluation/Assessment
	• Classroom management • Lesson planning • Curriculum design • IEP and ITP • Legal and ethical issues in special education • Early literacy instruction (theory and practice) • Theory and practice of teaching diverse learners • Consultation and collaboration strategies	• Progress monitoring • Formative and summative assessment • Implementing behavior support strategies • Differentiated instruction • Multisensory instruction • Creating IEPs and ITPs • Facilitating IEP meetings • Collaborating and consulting with staff and parents • Data collection and analysis of student progress	• Self-evaluation at end of each semester • Successful completion of electronic TPE portfolios as evidenced by rubrics • TPE supervisor observations • 3-Way evaluations at the end of each semester • Implementation lesson plans and reflection on student achievement as evidenced in conference with fieldwork supervisor • Teaching style reflection relating to diverse learners in their classrooms • Completion of Exit Survey • Completion of transition plan • Completion of two school years teaching in special education setting • Cumulative GPA of 2.75 with no grade lower than C in all fieldwork assignments

Program Components 2: Coursework

Knowledge. Candidates complete 175 hours, 14 semester units of pre-service coursework, during the summer preceding their first teaching position. This is required to obtain the Education Specialist Intern credential needed to work as a teacher of record with students with mild/moderate disabilities. This pre-service coursework includes over 45 hours of instruction on working with English language learners. Then, during the next two school years, candidates must complete an additional 22 semester units of coursework related to teaching students with mild/moderate disabilities. During the completion of coursework, candidates must demonstrate their understanding of culturally responsive pedagogy; pedagogy related to the instruction of students with autism spectrum disorder, learning disabilities, and behavior problems; early intervention; classroom management; instruction for English learners; and curriculum design. Grades are based on classroom participation and course assignments (e.g. portfolios, presentations, papers, and reports), which are linked to the measured outcomes of this program. Candidates must complete all assignments with a "C" or better before being allowed to move on to the next semester. All candidates met this requirement for their coursework.

Skills. As shown in Table 11, various skills requirements are used to evaluate student-learning outcomes through assignments and the electronic portfolio. The assignments include the Reading Portfolio and Content Area units, which contain a series of lesson plans and

activities that are implemented in the classroom and based on data. They also include the technology portfolio, which demonstrates the use of classroom technology by the creation of artifacts using these technologies. In addition assignments include an IEP, an Individual Transition Plan (ITP), and an assessment report, which demonstrate the candidate's skills as a developing special education teacher. Furthermore, they include at least one research paper that demonstrate the candidate's proficiency at accessing research literature and applying research-based practices in the classroom. Candidates also develop portfolio artifacts in class or as homework that are used in determining TPE achievement. Grading on all written assignments relies on rubrics for completion and appropriate content.

When candidates apply for a Preliminary Education Specialist Credential, the credential office reviews completion of program requirements, including a program letter of completion, passing RICA score, and a cumulative GPA of 2.75 with no grade lower than a C in all credential courses. Candidates will also be required to complete the exit survey prior to graduation, which provides candidates perceptions of their knowledge and skills as beginning special educators.

Table 11:Measures used to Assess Completion of Student Coursework

Coursework	Knowledge	Skills	Evaluation/Assessment
	• Lesson planning • Curriculum design • Culturally responsive pedagogy • Early intervention • Classroom management • Technology Portfolio • Content Area Unit • Consultation and collaboration/co-teaching • Accessing research on educational issues • IEP/Assessment Report • ITP • Behavior Modifications • Assistive Technology • Health Education • Pedagogy related to Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) and learning disabilities (LD)	• Using SDAIE and differentiated instruction to teach ELL students • Appropriately selecting assessments and instructional strategies for culturally and linguistically diverse students • Progress monitoring • Designing and writing lessons for the Reading Portfolio • Designing a content area unit • Use of assessment data to inform instruction • Writing at least one research paper • Use of technology as an instructional tool • Functional Behavior Assessment • Appropriately selecting assistive technology • Appropriately selecting assessments and instructional strategies to use with students with ASD, LD, and behavior problems.	• All coursework completed • Cumulative GPA of 2.75 with no grade lower than C in all coursework

b. Additional Information about Program Effectiveness

Several measures are used to assess program effectives beyond the measures used to determine each candidate's attainment of the necessary knowledge and skills necessary to complete the Preliminary Education Specialist Credential. These instruments include an exit survey, an evaluation of the number of candidates who were able to pass the RICA, fieldwork supervisor evaluations completed by candidates, and an evaluation of the students' ratings of the course and the instructors on the University of San Francisco end-of-semester course evaluation form. In Table 12a the results of the exit survey from 2013 are summarized. The exit survey used a 4-point Likert scale where one is a low score and four is a high score. The exit survey for 2014 was changed and the results were given in Table 12b. Table 13 presents the results of the RICA for candidates who graduated in 2013 and 2014. In Tables 14a and 14b, the ratings from the evaluations completed each semester for the fieldwork supervisors are summarized. The fieldwork supervisors were evaluated using a 4-point Likert scale where 1 was a low score and 4 was a high score. Supervisors who receive evaluations with lower scores meet with the fieldwork coordinator. If poor evaluations continue, they are not rehired as a fieldwork supervisor.

Table 12a: Summary of results from exit survey May 2013

Category	Mean Score - 2013
Scholarly Excellence	3.38
Environment for Learning	3.55
Faculty Concern for Students / Faculty Quality	3.60
Faculty available outside of class to meet with students	3.82
Faculty taught in ways similar to that advocated	3.55
Fieldwork Supervisors Concern for Students/Quality	3.73
Perceptions of Preparation	3.48
Applicability of Program	3.02
Would you still enroll in USF?	3.72
Would you recommend the program at USF	3.54
Satisfaction with teaching while in the program	3.55
Satisfaction with being in a cohort group	4.00
Perception of ability to make a significant difference in students' learning	3.45

Table 12b: Summary of Results from Revised Exit Survey (2014 only)

What would your consider your skill level in the following areas (1= Little or No Knowledge to 4 = Excellent)

Statement	Average Score
Use specific pedagogical skills to teach subject matter.	3.15
Monitor student learning during instruction.	3.15
Use and interpret classroom and formal assessments to plan individualize instruction.	3.08
Use specific strategies and activities to make content accessible.	3.46
Engage and motivate students to participate in active learning.	3.54
Use developmentally appropriate teaching practices.	3.62
Meet the needs of individual students who are English Language Learners.	2.92
Learn individual students' needs and apply this knowledge to practice.	3.62
Plan instruction to meet learning goals and apply state standards.	3.00
Allocate and adjust instructional time to optimize learning opportunities.	3.08
Develop and maintain an appropriate social environment for learning.	3.77
Act professionally, legally, and ethically on the job.	3.77
Reflect, evaluate, and use feedback for professional growth.	3.62
Meet the needs of individual students with mild/moderate disabilities.	3.46
Ability to design instruction and meet the needs of students with autism.	2.85
Design and execute classroom research.	2.77
Use inquiry methods to create an effective learning environment.	3.15
Apply recent special education research and research-based interventions to improve learning and instruction.	3.00
Read, understand, and develop Individual Education Plans (IEP) to provide appropriate learning experiences for individual students.	3.46
Read and understand CELDT test scores and provide appropriate learning experiences for English Language learners.	2.46
Use direct instruction to create an effective learning environment.	3.46
Teach problem solving, conceptual understanding, and other aspects of higher-order learning.	2.85
Use and teach the use of technology for learning.	3.23
Teach strategies to improve student results and high stakes testing.	2.62
Ability to use Common Core State Standards to plan, implement, and assess instruction.	2.54
Would you recommend the program at USF? (4 =Yes)	3.77

On the exit survey given in May 2014, the graduating candidates were also able to make comments about what they perceive as the strengths and suggestions for improvement for the Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Credential Program at USF. Below is the summary of their comments:

Strengths:
- Eight out of the 13 students mentioned the supportive and knowledgeable faculty.
- Five out of the 13 students mentioned the intern model where they were able to work full-time while earning their credential.
- Other strengths mentioned were instruction applicable to jobs, fieldwork supervisors, resources, cohort model, and doctoral fellows.

Suggestions for Improvement:
- Four out of the 13 students mentioned that there should be more instruction on writing Individual Education Plans (IEPs) during the first semester.
- Four out of the 13 students wanted more instruction on dealing with behavior problems in the classroom and research-based behavioral interventions.
- Other suggestions included moving the transition planning assignment to the first year, more RICA support, and eliminating some of the assignments in the Consultation and Collaboration course. Two students also expressed a desire for more varied instructors. This cohort took eight out of 14 classes from the same instructor. That has changed and was a unique situation for this cohort.

Table 13: Summary of results of the RICA for candidates graduating in 2013 and 2014

Program Completion Date	Number of Candidates	Candidates Who Passed RICA	Pass Rate
2013	11	11	100%
2014	13	8*	62%

Candidates may take the RICA during the summer following their final semester of the program prior to being recommending for Preliminary Ed Specialist Credential.

Table 14a: Fieldwork Supervisor Evaluations Completed by Candidates
Four point scale: One (1 - Lowest) to Four (4 - Highest)

Supervisor	Minimum (2011-2013)	Maximum (2011-2013)	Mean (2011-2013)
Supervisor 1	2.95	4.00	3.58
Supervisor 2	3.87	3.96	3.97
Supervisor 3	3.83	4.00	3.91
Supervisor 4	3.83	4.00	3.95
Supervisor 5	2.17	3.74	3.14
Supervisor 6	2.96	3.45	3.26
Supervisor 7	2.50	3.87	3.30
Supervisor 8	2.73	4.00	3.80
Supervisor 9	3.91	3.91	3.91
Supervisor 10	3.38	4.00	3.69

* *Not a supervisor during this period*

Table 14b: Fieldwork Supervisor Evaluations Completed by Candidates (Spring 2014)
Four point scale: One (1 - Lowest) to Four (4 - Highest)

Supervisor	Minimum (2012-2014)	Maximum (2012-2014)	Mean (2012-2014)
Supervisor 1	3.91	4.78	4.23
Supervisor 2	4.78	4.83	4.81
Supervisor 3	4.00	4.00	4.83
Supervisor 4	3.74	4.96	4.42
Supervisor 5	3.00	5.00	4.74
Supervisor 6	4.70	4.91	4.80
Supervisor 7	3.00	4.00	4.35
Supervisor 8	4.31	4.48	4.39
Supervisor 9	4.22	4.00	4.62
Supervisor 10	4.70	4.00	4.90
Supervisor 11	3.48	4.13	3.88
Supervisor 12	4.13	4.00	4.57
Supervisor 13	3.00	4.00	4.70

c. Data Summary

Multiple means are used to evaluate the Mild/Moderate Education Internship Credential Program at the University of San Francisco. Overall the assessments indicate that candidates in the program are meeting the course requirements, are proficient on the TPEs (see Tables 5a, 6a, 7a, 8a, and 9), and are mastering the skills needed to pass the RICA (see Table 13). Although some students rated their fieldwork supervisors lower than satisfactory, in general the candidates rated the program, the fieldwork supervisors, and the instructors as being satisfactory or better (see Tables 12a, 12b, 14a and 14b). The program is meeting its objective in preparing candidates to work in a variety of settings with students with mild/moderate disabilities.

PART III – Analysis and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

Analysis of candidate assessment data indicates that education specialist candidates are assessed using multiple performance and other assessment measures. Program strengths and areas for improvement regarding candidate competence and program efficiency/effectiveness are discussed below.

Intern Field Teaching Experiences

Strengths
- From Table 1: In 2013, 84.6% of the candidates graduated from the program, and in 2014 as of July 15th, 69.2% of the candidates graduated from the program, indicating that most of the candidates successfully complete the program within two years. Four candidates who finished their coursework in 2014 still need to pass the RICA and three are finishing their TPE electronic portfolio over the summer, so the final completion number may be higher.

- From Table 2: Multiple measures are used to assess the knowledge (e.g. tests/quizzes, presentations, reflection papers on concepts and pedagogies) and skills (e.g., fieldwork and portfolio evaluation) of credential candidates during the intern practicum.
- From Table 3: Candidates' self-reflections on projects that involved progress monitoring and data-based interventions demonstrate their teaching experiences, development of teaching philosophies, use of resources and knowledge, and examination of their strengths and needs.
- From Tables 4, 5a, 6a, 6b, 7a, 8a, and 9: Satisfactory completion of TPEs by all candidates as monitored through multiple measures, including the review of artifacts submitted to the electronic portfolio, fieldwork supervisor observations, three-way evaluations that include the candidates supervisor from the school district, and candidate self-evaluations. No candidate had lower than a C in any fieldwork course.
- From Tables 14a and 14b: All of the fieldwork supervisors were rated at satisfactory or very satisfactory by most of the candidates they were supervising. All of the fieldwork supervisors received a mean score above 3.00.
- From Tables 5a, 6a, and 7a: Most candidates improved in their skills on all the TPEs during the two years they were in the program, with TPE 5 Student Engagement and TPE 11 Social Environment being rated highly on all the various measures.

Areas for Improvement
- No information is available about the candidates' satisfaction with the program after they have left the program. A follow-up survey is needed that will evaluate the candidates' satisfaction with the program one year after the candidates have graduated.
- The newly revised exit survey eliminated most of the questions that gave information about candidate evaluations of the program and instruction. The narrative comments made by the candidates do not give enough quantitative data to use for evaluation of the program and instruction.
- From Tables 5a, 7a, 8a, and 12b: Knowledge of TPE 7 Teaching English Learners was rated lower than the other TPEs.
- TPE 12 and 13 are not well defined for supervisors and often received a "not observed" rating.

Coursework

Strengths
- From Table 2: Candidates must take 14 units of pre-service coursework prior to beginning intern-teaching positions in the fall of their first year. These include Early Literacy, Curriculum and Instruction for Math and Science, Teaching Diverse Learners, Development of Legal and Ethical Foundations, and Educational Practices for the Learning Specialist. These courses are infused with over 45 hours of instruction on English Language Learners. These courses are designed to provide needed skills and knowledge for interns to begin their first year of teaching.
- From Table 2: Candidates must take an additional 22 units of coursework during the remaining two years of the program. Included are modules on pedagogy, formal and informal assessment, first and second language acquisition, reading and writing instruction, core content areas, classroom and behavior management, IEP development and implementation, collaboration and consultation, transition, instructional technology, health, multiculturalism, and additional instruction on English Language Learners. Theses

courses are fully integrated to help candidates acquire knowledge and skills as they become necessary in the interns' teaching positions.
- From Table 2: Candidates must produce a Reading Portfolio demonstrating ability to teach reading to diverse students with special needs.
- From Table 2: Candidates must produce a Subject Matter Content Unit, demonstrating ability to teach subject matter content.
- From Table 2: Candidates must produce a technology portfolio, demonstrating knowledge and skills with various classroom and assistive technologies.
- From Table 2: Candidates must develop at least one research paper that demonstrate problem solving, knowledge of the research literature in special education, and the ability to apply that knowledge to classroom situations.
- From Table 2: Candidates must produce an IEP/assessment report and if appropriate transition plan on special education students, demonstrating proficiency in assessment, data gathering and interpretation, appropriate use of standards, and if appropriate legal applications.
- From Table 3: Candidates must produce six belief papers that ask for reflection and demonstrate increasingly sophisticated knowledge and skills about teaching and teaching philosophies.
- From Table 4: Candidates must produce an electronic TPE portfolio containing artifacts that demonstrate achievement of the TPEs.

Areas for Improvement
- Upon review it was felt that grades did not provide enough information about the candidates acquisition of the required knowledge and skills, so rubrics need to be developed to document the acquisition of knowledge and skills related to the competencies for each course as shown by the signature projects for those courses. To this end, rubrics will be developed during the next year for the required courses in the program.
- The signature projects required need to be specifically tied to the program standards and TPEs. This information needs to be included in Table 2.

PART IV – Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

Most of the changes suggested for the program relate to data that are missing but would be useful to collect. Specific proposed changes include the following:

Table 15 – Proposed Changes in Intern Teaching Experiences based on Assessment Results

Data Source	Proposed Changes	Standards Addressed
Self-Evaluation	• Monitor results of self-evaluation to determine if the changes in the wording are in line with the rating of TPE mastery on other instruments used to assess TPE mastery.	• Program Standard 10: Preparation to Teach English Language Learners • Program Standard 13:

		• Curriculum and Instruction of Students with Disabilities • M/M Standard 3: Planning and Implementing M/M Curriculum and Instruction
TPE Ratings	• Candidate observations and conference schedule will be structured to focus on specific TPEs at certain checkpoints throughout the program with the electronic portfolio artifacts corresponding to targeted schedule.	• Program Standard 16: Assessment of Candidate Performance
Recent Graduate Survey	• Develop a follow-up survey in order to monitor the success of the program as measured by candidates' responses after graduation. • Implement with the cohort that graduated in 2013 • Monitor completion of data and follow up with graduates to submit missing data • Review and apply survey data to revise program structure and implement improvements recommended	• Program Standard 2: Professional, Legal and Ethical Practices • Program Standard 16: Assessment of Candidate Performance
Fieldwork Supervision	• Calibrated training for supervisors on how to observe the TPEs at key checkpoints throughout the program. • TPE rubrics provided to supervisors and students of what Level1-Basic, Level 2-Developing, Level 3-Proficient and Level 4-Advanced looks like for each TPE in the classroom at key checkpoints throughout the program. This will help provide clear performance benchmarks for supervisors and candidates.	• Program Standard 16: Assessment of Candidate Performance
Exit Survey	• Add questions to the new exit survey related to evaluation of the program and instruction. • Monitor if the information obtained is useful in the evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the program.	• Program Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale, and Coordination • Program Standard 2: Professional, Legal and Ethical Practices

Table 16: Proposed Changes in Coursework Based on Assessment Results

Data Source	Proposed Changes	Standards Addressed
Rubrics for Signature Assignments	- Develop rubrics for signature assignments - Provide rubrics to candidates and instructors - Collect completed rubrics from instructors - Summarize responses on rubrics and record data - Coursework competences and TPEs will be aligned with program standards and documented for each signature assignment	Program Standard 16: Assessment of Candidate Performance

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART I – Contextual Information

The School Counseling Program (SCP) at the University of San Francisco (USF) is a unique and innovative educational program preparing counselors to address the social, emotional, and academic needs of children, adolescents, and young adults in educational settings. The 49-credit SCP meets requirements issued by the California State Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) for those seeking a career in school counseling in K-12 schools. Graduates of the program obtain a Master of Arts (M.A.) degree in Counseling Psychology and are eligible for the Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) Credential. The USF SCP provides all candidates with both didactic and experiential learning. Students complete 600 hours of supervised fieldwork in a public school and are enrolled in courses at USF that are offered on Teaching Weekends and Summer Sessions. All candidates must fulfill specific school counseling competencies, which are related to the CTC standards and learning outcomes outlined in the SCP courses. These 15 competencies provide the SCP with realistic and meaningful experiences for candidates in an effort to meet all CTC standards that apply to the school counseling profession:

Competencies and CTC standards:
1. Counseling Theory and Skills **(Standards 3, 8, 14, 16, 21, 24, 25, 29)**
2. Professional Ethics and Legal Issues **(Standards 6, 9, 15, 17, 18, 21)**
3. Lifespan Developmental Counseling **(Standards 2, 3, 7, 11, 21, 23, 30)**
4. Cross Cultural Counseling **(Standards 3, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 21, 23)**
5. Prevention and Intervention in Schools **(Standards 2, 4, 5, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30)**
6. Group Counseling **(Standards 9, 14, 22, 26, 29)**
7. Assessment and the Counselor **(Standards 3, 4, 6, 9, 21)**
8. Consulting with Parents, Teachers, and Schools **(Standards 7, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29)**
9. Problem-Solving Counseling **(Standards 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 21, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30)**
10. Academic Counseling **(Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 14, 19, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29)**
11. Career Counseling **(Standards 3, 15, 19, 20, 23, 29)**
12. Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods **(Standards 4, 15, 30)**
13. Qualitative and Quantitative Interpretation and Analysis **(Standards 4, 15, 30)**
14. Advanced Multicultural Counseling **(Standards 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 14, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29)**
15. Trauma and Crisis Counseling in Urban and Multicultural Context **(Standards 2, 3, 9, 11, 13, 14, 19, 21, 25, 27, 28, 29)**

Program Specific Candidate Information
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported

	Cohort entering 2012		Cohort entering 2013	
Site (If multiple sites) Delivery Option	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates
San Francisco	29	29	27	TBD in 2015

Of the current 30 2nd year students (cohort entering in 2012 and graduating in 2014), there are 8 students enrolled in a 60-credit dual concentration program in School Counseling and Professional Clinical Counseling (see information about this program below). These students are taking the same courses the candidates in the 49-credit school counseling program are taking. Given the small number of students enrolled in the LPCC program, we are presenting their data aggregated with their peers in the program.

In the Fall of 2012, the program was changed from 48-credits to 49-credits to accommodate the following changes:

- **Academic Counseling** course: An Educational Psychology course was replaced with a course named Academic Counseling. Candidates and alums had reported that the Educational Psychology course lacked applied professional counseling content and that it overlapped with developmental/cognitive theories covered in the developmental counseling course. In addition, candidates provided feedback requesting more in-depth training in academic and college counseling, therefore, the course Academic Counseling was added into the course sequence to replace Educational Psychology. Academic Counseling is informed by CTC school counseling specialization standards, such as Academic Development (**Standard 19**) and Learning, Achievement and Instruction (**Standard 24**), among others. The units in Learning Theory, Instruction, and Educational Psychology (e.g., **Standard 11**) are also addressed in this course.
- **Career Counseling** course: The Academic and Career Counseling course was also replaced by a Career Counseling course. The Career Counseling course includes content on career and employability skills. It is based on the CTC school counseling standard of Career Development (**Standard 20**), among other standards, such as Technological Literacy (**Standard 15**) and Academic Development **(Standard 19)**.
- **Advanced Multicultural Counseling** course: The Summer Fieldwork/Traineeship course was replaced by an Advanced Multicultural Counseling course. Although candidates are not required to have a fieldwork placement during the summer, they were previously enrolled in a fieldwork course during the summer. The summer fieldwork course focused on counselor professional development, which is also addressed in other fieldwork sections and courses throughout the school counseling program curriculum. Therefore, based on candidate and faculty feedback and program need, we replaced this course with an Advanced Multicultural Counseling course to best address training needs of school counselors working with urban and diverse pupil populations **(Standard 3)**.
- **Consulting with Parents, Teachers, and Schools** course: Candidates and faculty expressed overlap and redundancy in the content among the two courses: Consulting with Schools and Consulting with Parents and Teachers. Therefore, a new course

that integrates both consultation courses was developed to replace the other courses: Consulting with Parents, Teachers, and Schools.

- **Trauma and Crisis Counseling in Urban and Multicultural Contexts** course; A new course was added: Trauma and Crisis Counseling in Urban and Multicultural Contexts to increase candidate's skills working in urban public school settings. This course addresses School Safety and Violence Prevention **(Standard 9)**.

Candidates entering the program in 2012 and on will complete the 49-credit program. Students will have the option to enroll in a 60-credit dual concentration masters program that focuses training in School Counseling *and* Professional Clinical Counseling.

School Counseling Program Course Sequence (49 credits) Effective Fall 2012

Year 1	Year 2
YEAR ONE: **27** credits	YEAR TWO: **22** credits
Semester 1 (Fall) (10 credits) **607** – Counseling Theory and Practice (3) **618** – Law and Ethics (3) **612** – Lifespan Developmental Counseling:(3) **619** – Fieldwork Practicum (1)	**Semester 4 (Fall)** (8 credits) **609** – Academic Counseling (3) **611** – Problem Solving Counseling (3) **621** – PPS Traineeship II (2) **or** **603** – PPS Internship III(2)
Semester 2 (Spring) (10 credits) **606** – Cross-Cultural Counseling (3) **608** – Prevention and Intervention in Schools (3) **620** – PPS Traineeship I (2) **or** **602 – PPS Internship I (2)** **624 –** Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods (2)	**Semester 5 (Spring)** (8 credits) **614** – Career Counseling (3) **623** – Trauma and Crisis Counseling in Urban and Multicultural Context **622** – PPS Traineeship III (2) **or** **604** – PPS Internship III (2)
Semester 3 (Summer) (7 credits) **613** – Group Counseling Skills (3) **621** – Advanced Multicultural Counseling (3) **625** – Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis and Interpretation (1)	**Semester 6 (Summer)** (6 credits) **615** – Assessment and the Counselor (3) **617** – Consulting with Parents, Teachers and Schools (3)

Students enrolling in the dual concentration in the Professional Clinical Counseling program for 60 credits will take the following additional 11 credits:

- Child, elder, and adult abuse (1 credit)
- Individual and family psychopathology (3 credits)
- Alcohol and substance abuse (1 credit)
- Additions counseling (2 credits)
- Human sexuality (1 credit)
- Clinical psychopharmacology (3 credits)

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART II – Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

a) The following measures are used to assess candidates:
1. Embedded Course Assessments
2. School Counseling Final Fieldwork Evaluation Form (competency performance)
3. Narrative evaluation of the candidate's performance in school counseling practicum by on site mentor counselors
4. Narrative evaluation of candidate's performance by university fieldwork supervisors
5. Narrative (self-report) performance evaluation by USF school counseling candidates
6. School Counseling Competency Attestation Sheets

The chart below describes the main assessments used to make important decisions about candidate competencies prior to recommendation for a credential:

ASSESSMENT	STANDARD	DESCRIPTION
Embedded Course Assessments	**Standards 1 to 32**	Assessments within each course assess student competencies as they relate to standards emphasized in each course. Each courses addresses school counseling competencies directly related to CTC Standards.
School Counseling Final Fieldwork Evaluation Form	**Standards 2 to 30** (as covered by each assessed competency)	This form provides a scaled assessment of the candidate's competency performance for each school counseling competency domain.

	Standard 32	
On-Site Mentor Counselor Evaluation	**Standard 16** **Standard 31** **Standard 32**	On-site Mentor Counselors provide written feedback on the candidate's performance at his or her own school site.
University of San Francisco Fieldwork Instructor Evaluation	**Standard 16** **Standard 31** **Standard 32**	On this form, fieldwork supervisors provide written, detailed feedback about the candidate's development towards the 12 competencies listed in Part I. Supervisors also discuss candidates' performance in fieldwork supervision meetings, case conceptualization, ethical issues, and professional development.
Candidate self-evaluation	**Standard 31** **Standard 32**	School Counseling candidates provide a detailed and descriptive evaluation of their own development and competencies as school counselors at their school site.
Competency Attestation Sheets	**Standard 32**	At the end of candidate's training, competency sheets are assessed by the USF fieldwork instructor and USF credential analyst to determine candidates competence in the 15 school counseling domains presented prior. Competency attestation sheets include 3-4 activities the candidate completed at her/his school site or during their tenure in the program to show competence in the skill domain. These activities are approved and signed off by the onsite mentor counselor, USF faculty, and/or the USF fieldwork instructor.

b) To assess program effectiveness, the following instruments are used:
1. School Counseling candidate's yearly Program Evaluation (2nd YR Exit Survey)
2. SUMMA course evaluations
3. Narrative course evaluations
4. Feedback from Adjunct faculty
5. Course review of assignments and activities
6. Job placement data
7. Retention data
8. Feedback from District administration and staff

ASSSESSMENT	STANDARD	DESCRIPTION
School Counseling candidate's yearly Program Evaluation Survey (2nd YR Exit Survey)	**Standard 1** **Standard 16** **Standard 31**	Yearly Program surveys are used to evaluate candidates' perceptions of the program, feedback about curriculum and faculty, fieldwork experiences, and other programmatic experiences. Findings are used to inform program improvements.
SUMMA	**Standard 1** **Standard 31**	SUMMA assessments are used to gather candidate feedback on individual credential courses. This data helps inform instructors and the program director about candidates' perception of their learning within each course.
Adjunct Feedback	**Standard 1**	Individual and group meetings with adjunct faculty in the School Counseling Program highlight overlap and gaps in the curriculum and help to identify areas of improvement.
Course Review of Assignments and Activities	**Standard 1** (+Assessment of standards covered in each course)	Course syllabi, assignments, and curricular activities are reviewed for overlap, assessment of program goals, and an evaluation of the standards in the Program.
Job placement	**Standard 1** **Standard 32**	Job placement survey data provides information regarding effectiveness of the program model in assisting candidates to secure school counseling positions.
Retention rate data	**Standard 1**	Data is tracked to assess the progress and completion rates of all students who enter the Program and make it past our initial census date.
Feedback from District administration and staff	**Standard 1** **Standard 31**	The Program Coordinator meets regularly with the Head Counselors, Support Services staff, counselors, Principals, and other District staff about our training program and goals to ensure SCP students are equipped to

		meet the expectations of school district staff.

c) Aggregated data:

1) Embedded Course Assessments: Course assessments are embedded throughout the program to measure both candidate competence and program effectiveness. Students are asked to demonstrate knowledge and skills associated with the fifteen competencies through completion of course assignments and projects (Standards 2 to 31). Courses include strong theoretical foundations, skills-based practical training, research and evaluation techniques, and applications.

SAMPLE COURSE	EXAMPLE ASSIGNMENT TO DEMONOSTRATE CANDIDATE COMPETENCY	EXAMPLE ACTIVITY TO DEMONOSTRATE PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS
Counseling Theory and Skills **(Standards 3, 8, 14, 16, 21, 24, 25, 29)**	Students write weekly Critical Analysis case study papers applying at least two counseling theories to a multicultural case in a school.	Students conduct weekly counseling sessions with a "mock" student and are observed during each session and provided with extensive written and oral feedback.
Lifespan Developmental Counseling **(Standards 2, 3, 7, 11, 21, 23, 30)**	Students conduct an extensive literature review and formal roundtable presentation of developmental issues from ecological and multicultural perspectives.	Students read, review, discuss, and apply developmental theories from early childhood through adolescence in class.
Qualitative and Quantitative Research **(Standards 4, 15, 30)**	Students complete an extensive literature review, collect and analyze data, and report findings of a program evaluation at their fieldwork site. They give two formal presentations about their theoretical framework, method, procedures, analysis, discussion, and dissemination.	Students learn about qualitative and quantitative methods, action research, program evaluation, and ethical issues in the conduct of research in schools. Students are given sample evaluation studies and must identify flaws, strengths, and ethics (such as confidentiality regarding student issues).
Group Counseling **(Standards 9,**	Students develop, implement, and assess a group counseling intervention and write a paper	Students learn various theories in group counseling, are evaluated based on their skills, and observe several group

14, 22, 26, 29)	about their group. They demonstrate their skills in front of their peers and instructors.	counseling interventions.
Law & Ethics for School Counselors (**Standards 6, 9, 15, 17, 18, 21**)	Students complete three papers based on readings in law and ethics. Students complete a literature review on ethical issues, discuss ethical procedures, and create a plan to enhance ethical standards.	Students actively learn about legal and ethical issues through intensive discussion of theory, cases, and role plays. Students complete weekly self-inventories addressing various legal and ethical topics.
Career Counseling (**Standards 3, 15, 19, 20, 23, 29**)	Students develop career/college counseling websites to counsel their students and disseminate information. Students write a career assessment report using the RIASEC career model.	Students use a career assessment tool (SDS) and online career exploration tools in class to counsel USF Upward Bound high school students.
Assessment and the Counselor (**Standards 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 21**)	Students research, present, and write about assessment tools used with pupils.	Students practice the use of assessment surveys and questions in class.
Cross-Cultural Counseling (**Standards 3, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 21, 23**)	Students conduct and write in-depth multicultural case conceptualizations with students they are working with.	Students present on counseling diverse populations and engage in self-reflection and cultural/racial fishbowls to further develop cross-cultural competencies.

2) School Counseling Final Fieldwork Evaluation Form: At the end of each academic year, mentor counselors supervising the work of USF school counseling candidates (200 hours of fieldwork per semester), rate the candidate's performance with respect to 19 school counseling competencies determined by the program. The mentor counselor also provides a general rating of the candidate's performance at their school counseling practice over the year. The ratings are provided on a 0-5 scale, where:

0 = not applicable or no opportunity to observe
1 = below level of performance, needs much improvement
2 = needs some improvement in the level of performance
3 = at expectation level

4 = above expectation level

5 = outstanding or exceptional level of performance

In the following pages, we present aggregated data by percentages of obtained candidates' ratings by academic year.

Final Fieldwork Evaluation Form Competency Performance Summary (2012-2013) (N= 29/29, second year students)

Table 1 Competency and Standards	5	4	3	2	1	0 (N/A)	Mean	SD
Applying law and ethics (Standards: 6; 17; 18)	41%	41%	10%	0%	0%	7%	4.03	1.30
Individual counseling skills (Standards: 25; 14)	55%	38%	7%	0%	0%	0%	4.48	0.63
Group counseling skills (Standard 26)	52%	38%	3%	0%	0%	7%	4.21	1.29
Cross cultural counseling skills (Standards: 3; 14; 8; 21; 23)	55%	34%	7%	3%	0%	0%	4.41	0.78
Consulting with teachers (Standards: 10; 27)	59%	28%	10%	0%	0%	3%	4.34	1.08
Consulting with parents (Standards: 10; 7)	34%	41%	10%	0%	0%	14%	3.69	1.63
Applying developmental theories (Standards: 2; 21)	38%	41%	14%	0%	0%	7%	3.97	1.30
Career and college counseling skills (Standards: 20; 19)	38%	14%	7%	3%	0%	38%	2.72	2.28
Implementing classroom interventions (Standards: 11; 24)	38%	34%	14%	0%	0%	14%	3.69	1.65
Assessment/testing skills (Standard 4)	24%	14%	10%	0%	0%	52%	2.07	2.25
Applying research/evaluation skills (Standard 30)	41%	24%	17%	0%	0%	17%	3.55	1.80
Consulting with school system (Standards: 10; 22; 23; 28)	59%	24%	3%	3%	0%	10%	4.07	1.58
Engaging in collaboration/coordination (Standard 27)	69%	21%	3%	0%	0%	7%	4.38	1.32
Linking with community resources (Standard 13)	31%	38%	14%	0%	0%	17%	3.48	1.74
Engaging in prevention activities (Standards: 5; 29)	41%	38%	7%	0%	0%	14%	3.79	1.66
Leadership or advocacy activities (Standards: 22; 23;	48%	31%	14%	0%	0%	7%	4.07	1.33

	5	4	3	2	1	0 (N/A)	Mean	SD
12)								
Coordination of student services (Standards: 13; 27)	45%	31%	7%	0%	0%	17%	3.69	1.81
Handling logistics & record keeping (Standards: 17; 18)	66%	17%	7%	0%	0%	10%	4.17	1.56
Responsiveness to feedback/supervision (Standard 16)	90%	7%	3%	0%	0%	0%	4.86	0.44
Overall evaluation of performance (Standard 32)	62%	34%	3%	0%	0%	0%	4.58	0.57

Final Fieldwork Evaluation Form Competency Performance Summary (2013-2014) (N= 28/29, second year students)

Table 2 Competency and Standards	5	4	3	2	1	0 (N/A)	Mean	SD
Applying law and ethics (Standards: 6; 17; 18)	46%	50%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4.32	0.98
Individual counseling skills (Standards: 25; 14)	64%	32%	4%	0%	0%	0%	4.60	0.57
Group counseling skills (Standard 26)	57%	21%	7%	4%	0%	11%	4.00	1.61
Cross cultural counseling skills (Standards: 3; 14; 8; 21; 23)	68%	21%	11%	0%	0%	0%	4.57	0.69
Consulting with teachers (Standards: 10; 27)	61%	29%	7%	0%	0%	4%	4.39	1.07
Consulting with parents (Standards: 10; 7)	68%	11%	18%	0%	0%	4%	4.35	1.16
Applying developmental theories (Standards: 2; 21)	39%	50%	4%	0%	0%	7%	4.07	1.27
Career and college counseling skills (Standards: 20; 19)	64%	14%	7%	0%	0%	14%	4.00	1.76
Implementing classroom interventions (Standards: 11; 24)	32%	29%	11%	4%	0%	25%	3.14	1.99
Assessment/testing skills (Standard 4)	29%	18%	21%	4%	0%	29%	2.86	2.01
Applying research/evaluation skills (Standard 30)	46%	18%	18%	4%	0%	14%	3.64	1.75
Consulting with school system (Standards: 10; 22; 23; 28)	61%	32%	4%	0%	0%	4%	4.43	1.03
Engaging in collaboration/coordination	71%	21%	7%	0%	0%	0%	4.64	0.62

(Standard 27)								
Linking with community resources (Standard 13)	43%	29%	21%	0%	0%	7%	3.93	1.36
Engaging in prevention activities (Standards: 5; 29)	39%	43%	11%	0%	0%	7%	4.00	1.31
Leadership or advocacy activities (Standards: 22; 23; 12)	50%	29%	7%	0%	4%	11%	3.89	1.64
Coordination of student services (Standards: 13; 27)	46%	39%	7%	7%	0%	0%	4.25	0.89
Handling logistics & record keeping (Standards: 17; 18)	71%	21%	4%	4%	0%	0%	4.61	0.74
Responsiveness to feedback/supervision (Standard 16)	79%	11%	7%	4%	0%	0%	4.64	0.78
Overall evaluation of performance (Standard 32)	75%	21%	4%	0%	0%	0%	4.71	0.53

Final Fieldwork Evaluation Form Competency Performance Summary (2012-2013)

3) On-Site Mentor Counselor Qualitative Evaluation – Standards 16, 31, and 32
The following tables summarize the themes and categories that emerged from the on-site mentor counselor evaluations. Data is presented by cohorts according to their year of entry into the program.

Year of entry 2012: Evaluations conducted in 2013 and 2014
• Built a strong rapport with caseload
• Built relationships with students and staff
• Open to feedback and is always willing to take on new endeavors
• Fully utilizes the systems on campus
• Knowledgeable in facilitating student conflict mediations
• Establishing rapport with students, teachers, and staff
• Eager to learn and open to new experiences
• Risen to the need to balance prevention services with responsive ones
• Adept at identifying need and finding and applying appropriate resources
• Fierce advocate for all youth, while all along supporting the school system and staff to their finest function
• Considered irreplaceable
• Has had a tremendous impact on the school and on me, the mentor
• Truly cares about students and wants to celebrate their strengths
• Tries to learn about each individual student's cultural background
• Asks good questions and is open to feedback
• Always looking to improve practice

- Insightful, energetic, and thoughtful
- Conducts self with professionalism and drive
- Would be proud and happy to have this student on our counseling team any time
- Write ups are exceptional
- Has a wonderful demeanor with students- the kids truly benefitted!
- Knowledgeable, competent, and hard-working
- Highly skilled, culturally competent, knowledgeable, a team player, and has that values/beliefs that all students can succeed
- Has been an integral part of the team
- Organization and research skills are assets
- Has the ability to break down barriers and build bridges between students and the adults who teach and serve them
- Worked with students, teachers, and staff o meet the needs of a variety of students
- Professional, conscientious, empathetic, and thoughtful
- Will be a powerful school counselor and advocate for her clients
- Has taken an important leadership role
- A committed, team player who develops healthy and supportive relationships with staff and students alike

Year of entry 2013: Evaluations conducted in 2014

- Has heart and compassion for the students and their differing backgrounds, academic abilities and emotional needs
- Kind and diligent
- Has a positive attitude, open to feedback, and improving skills
- Has grown so much as a counselor since the beginning of the school year
- Compassionate and sensitive to students' needs
- Has a thirst for knowledge and is excited to build her caseload
- Has done a great job of orienting self within the school and community
- Has taken initiative in pursuing projects that will bring valuable experience
- Has been a tremendous addition to our Student Support Team
- Has been an incredible asset to our office
- Has stepped up and contributed to the team
- Rapport with students and staff is excellent
- Is very approachable and adaptable to situations as they arise
- Brings many resources to our office
- Shows initiative by asking for more responsibility
- Knowledgeable, competent, and hard-working
- Working on different types of issues with students such as academics, social, personal and academic career counseling
- Committed to the work
- Interacts readily and easily with the students

4) University of San Francisco Fieldwork Instructor Evaluation - Standards, 16, 31, and 32

The following tables summarize the themes that emerged from the Fieldwork instructor evaluations of the candidate's performance. Data is presented by cohorts according to their year of entry into the program.

Year of entry 2012	
Evaluation from 2013-2014 school year	**Evaluation from 2012-2013 school year**
- Thoughtful and measured individual - Able to assess situations and deliver appropriate and well-times programs and interventions - Intuitive, thoughtful, and cares deeply about students - Able to connect with students in ways that engender their trust and confidence - Was able to balance the needs of the students academically, socially, and emotionally in each grade level - Great insight - Always has the best interest of others in mind and is very dependable - Has been an excellent support for our students - Open and collaborative, always seeking information and new experiences to increase understanding of the field - Will be a strong asset to any school - Able to evaluate counseling strategies and is flexible to adapt or modify - Will surely be an asset in the profession - Provides high expectations for all students while building relationships - Provided a great deal of positivity - Puts heart and soul into every student, every moment of every day and cared for them all so much	- Shows insights in class while helping others see nuance issues more clearly - A natural leader whose compassion and commitment to students is clearly evident - Confident that the student is well on the way to making an important difference to kids - Inquisitive in the approach to uncover what might be at the heart of an issue - Use humor to keep perspective - Have a passion and commitment to help student remove barriers to their success - Exercises good judgment and flexibility in working with all stakeholders - Quick to grasp new ideas and recognize the nuances counselors must navigate - Able to translate theory into practice with compassion and a deep understanding of the variables and challenges of school counseling

Year of entry 2013: Evaluation from 2013-2014 school year
- Demonstrated good follow through   - Used supervision in a resourceful way   - Has a lot to offer and is truly passionate

- Has a calm sensibility coupled with an eagerness to learn
- Has strong reflective practices
- Has the innate qualities to become an excellent counselor and are making excellent progress to that end
- Has great passion about the work
- Got a great foundation this semester

5) Narrative (self-report) performance evaluation by USF school counseling candidates- Standard 32

The following tables summarize the themes that emerged from the students' self-evaluation. Data is presented by cohorts according to their year of entry into the program.

Year of entry 2012
- Was an advocate for students   - Collaborated with outside agencies   - Used social groups and individual counseling   - Collaborated with Pupil Services department   - Internship was crucial to my development   - Learned about working with students individually and in groups in both mental health and academic settings   - Have gained a wealth of knowledge that will arm me to continue to enhance my aptitude to work with educationally and economically disadvantaged students, parents, and families   - Gained a new set of skills, techniques, and methods on how to navigate complex issues with economically disadvantaged, English Language Learners, and migrant students   - Gained a lot of experience providing grief counseling and multicultural counseling   - Implemented many new ideas and programs that the school had not done before   - Pushed myself to be self-directed and multifaceted, capable of helping multicultural students with personal and academic success   - Growth in my leadership skills

Year of entry 2013

- Gained a lot of experience through observation and participation
- Learned how to apply knowledge from theory
- I have built the foundation
- I feel good about the relationships I built
- I continually challenged myself by pushing myself outside of my comfort zone
- I was able to make strong connections with students, teachers, and counselors alike
- Made a lot of opportunities for growth by embracing each task as it came
- I have created great bonds with the students
- This fieldwork experience has allowed me to grow as a professional and as a person as well

6) School counseling competency attestation sheets – Standard 32

As students entering the program in 2012 graduated in 2014, they submitted a portfolio with completed and signed Competency Attestation Sheets. Competency attestation sheets include 3-4 activities the candidate completed at her/his school site or during their tenure in the program to show competence in the skill domain. Mentor counselors, USF faculty and Fieldwork instructors signed these sheets to approve that the candidates have conducted activities effectively, showing that they met the following school counseling competency requirements for credential recommendation:

1. Counseling Theory and Skills (**Standards 3, 8, 14, 16, 21, 24, 25, 29**)
2. Professional Ethics and Legal Issues (**Standards 6, 9, 15, 17, 18, 21**)
3. Lifespan Developmental Counseling (**Standards 2, 3, 7, 11, 21, 23, 30**)
4. Cross Cultural Counseling (**Standards 3, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 21, 23**)
5. Prevention and Intervention in Schools (**Standards 2, 4, 5, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30**)
6. Group Counseling (**Standards 9, 14, 22, 26, 29**)
7. Assessment and the Counselor (**Standards 3, 4, 6, 9, 21**)
8. Consulting with Parents, Teachers, and Schools (**Standards 7, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29**)
9. Problem-Solving Counseling (**Standards 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 21, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30**)
10. Academic Counseling (**Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 14, 19, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29**)
11. Career Counseling (**Standards 3, 15, 19, 20, 23, 29**)
12. Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods (**Standards 4, 15, 30**)
13. Qualitative and Quantitative Interpretation and Analysis (**Standards 4, 15, 30**)
14. Advanced Multicultural Counseling (**Standards 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 14, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29**)
15. Trauma and Crisis Counseling in Urban and Multicultural Context (**Standards 2, 3, 9, 11, 13, 14, 19, 21, 25, 27, 28, 29**)

Examples of activities listed by the candidates in the Competency Attestation Sheets include:
- Career Counseling:
  - Conducted a career development curriculum (STEPS) with 9th graders to facilitate their transition into high school.
- Assessment and the Counselor:
  - Administered pre and post test surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of a bullying prevention program for 9th graders at the school site.

B) PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS DATA

1. School Counseling candidate's yearly Program Evaluation Survey

SCP candidates complete annual surveys about their experiences with each course and the program. For second year students, this is an **exit** survey with additional questions to assess their feedback about the SCP program. In this SCP Program Evaluation Survey, candidates rate their perceived level of training in school counseling competencies delivered in each of the courses in the program. In

addition, candidates provide qualitative feedback on their experience with each of their courses, fieldwork experiences, and overall training. We also ask for candidates to provide concrete suggestions and feedback for the program. Below we present charts summarizing the data by the graduating cohort in 2014 (entering class of 2012) (N=29). Data is presented in percentage of total responses.

Quality of Educational Instruction

Scholarly Excellence-Standard 1	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)	Average Rating
Faculty in my program held high expectations for my performance	0%	3.13%	46.88%	50%	3.47
My professors encouraged me to participate in professional organizations	0%	18.75%	43.75%	37.50%	3.19
Different scholarly points of view were encouraged	0%	9.38%	50%	40.63%	3.31
Faculty members prepared carefully for their courses	0%	0%	56.25%	43.75%	3.44

Environment for Learning-Standard 31	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)	Average Rating
Graduate students in my program were treated with respect	0%	0%	50%	50%	3.50
I had the opportunity to engage in collaborative work with faculty in my program	0%	18.75%	40.63%	40.63%	3.22
I had the opportunity to engage in collaborative work with fellow graduate students in my program	0%	0%	50%	50%	3.50

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)	Average Rating
My program fostered a sense of intellectual community	0%	6.25%	46.88%	46.88%	3.41
My program supported my professional goals	0%	6.25%	43.75%	50%	3.44
The academic advising that I received was timely and accurate	3.23%	3.23%	54.84%	38.71%	3.29
The amount of coursework required seemed appropriate	0%	3.13%	71.88%	25%	3.22
Courses were relevant from my intended profession	0%	9.38%	53.13%	37.50%	3.28
Courses addressed current developments in my field	0%	6.25%	59.38%	34.38%	3.28
My program was flexible enough to meet my needs	0%	15.63%	56.25%	28.13%	3.13

Faculty Concern for Students-Standard 1	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)	Average Rating
Faculty in my program served as positive role models	0%	6.25%	37.50%	56.25%	3.50
Faculty in my program were receptive to new ideas and ways of doing things	0%	12.50%	46.88%	40.63%	3.28
I received honest, useful feedback from faculty on my class performance	0%	3.13%	59.38%	37.50%	3.34
Faculty in my program were supportive of my academic interests	0%	0%	50%	50%	3.50

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)	Average Rating
Faculty in my program were accessible to me	0%	6.25%	53.13%	40.63%	3.34

Fieldwork Supervisors Concern for Students- Standard 31	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)	Average Rating
Fieldwork supervisors in my program served as positive role models	0%	0%	31.25%	68.75%	3.69
Fieldwork supervisors were receptive to new ideas and ways of doing things	0%	0%	37.50%	62.50%	3.63
I received honest, useful feedback from fieldwork supervisors on my class and fieldwork performance	0%	0%	34.38%	65.63%	3.63
Fieldwork supervisors in my program were supportive of my academic interests	0%	0%	34.38%	65.63%	3.66
Fieldwork supervisors were accessible to me	0%	0%	28.13%	71.88%	3.72

Perceptions of Preparation- Standards 1, 32	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)	Average Rating
I believe I am well prepared in my area of specialization	0%	9.38%	62.50%	28.13%	3.19
I believe I am well prepared to carry out my professional responsibilities	0%	9.38%	68.75%	21.88%	3.13
I believe I am well prepared to assume a leadership position	0%	18.75%	50%	31.25%	3.13

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)	Average Rating
I am confident in my ability to use appropriate technologies in my work	6.25%	15.63%	46.88%	31.25%	3.03
I have enhanced my critical thinking skills	0%	0%	59.38%	40.63%	3.41
I have enhanced my problem solving skills	0%	9.38%	46.88%	43.75%	3.34
I have enhanced my interpersonal skills	0%	3.13%	40.63%	56.25%	3.53
I believe I am well prepared to communicate my ideas in writing	0%	3.13%	50%	46.88%	3.44
I believe I am well prepared to communicate my ideas orally	0%	3.13%	62.50%	34.38%	3.31
I am confident in my ability to apply the knowledge that I have learned to my work	0%	6.25%	62.50%	31.25%	3.25
I believe I am well prepared to critically evaluate the literature in my field	0%	12.50%	56.25%	31.25%	3.19

Professional Qualities and Scholarly Dispositions- Standards 1, 32	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)	Average Rating

My graduate program and experience at USF served to foster…					
commitment to students	0%	0%	43.75%	56.25%	3.56
reflective thinking	0%	0%	43.75%	56.25%	3.56
ethical and professional conduct	0%	0%	40.63%	59.38%	3.59
professional responsibility	0%	0%	43.75%	56.25%	3.56
respect for diversity	0%	0%	31.25%	68.75%	3.69
desire to work collaboratively	0%	0%	43.75%	56.25%	3.56
a commitment to continuous professional improvement	0%	0%	43.75%	56.25%	3.56
self-directed learning	0%	3.13%	53.13%	43.75%	3.41
respect for multiple perspectives	0%	9.38%	31.25%	59.38%	3.50
commitment to social justice	3.13%	3.13%	28.13%	65.63%	3.56

Experience at USF	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
How satisfied are you with how applicable your USF education will be to your future career plans?	0%	6.25%	46.88%	46.88%
	Definitely No	No	Yes	Definitely Yes

	3.13%	9.38%	43.75%	43.75%
Looking back, would you still enroll at USF?	3.13%	9.38%	43.75%	43.75%
Would you recommend USF and/or your program to others who are looking to further their education?	0%	12.50%	43.75%	43.75%

Methods of Instruction- Standard 1	1 Poor	2	3	4	5 Excellent	Average Rating
On a scale from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent), please rate the following teaching techniques and methods of instruction used in the School Counseling Program						
Lectures/Discussion	0%	3.57%	10.71%	64.29%	21.43%	4.04
Demonstration and modeling	0%	7.14%	17.86%	42.86%	32.14%	4.00
Cooperative learning groups	0%	3.57%	10.71%	50%	35.71%	4.18
Peer group study/peer teaching	3.57%	3.57%	28.57%	39.29%	25%	3.79
Use of guest speakers	7.14%	0%	21.43%	35.71%	35.71%	3.93
Audio/visual support materials	0%	0%	28.57%	46.43%	25%	3.96

For quality of fieldwork (**Standards 31**) and overall quality of the school counseling program (**Standard 1**), data is disaggregated by second year students (cohort entering 2012) and first year students (cohort entering 2013).

Quality of Fieldwork- Standard 31	1 Poor	2	3	4	5 Excellent	Average Rating
On a scale from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent), please evaluate the quality of the fieldwork curriculum						

and instruction you received from your university fieldwork instructors (Cohort entering 2012)						
Overall quality of curriculum	0%	0%	3.57%	57.14%	39.29%	4.36
Overall quality of instruction	0%	0%	7.14%	53.57%	39.29%	4.32
Quality of skills learned	0%	7.14%	10.71%	46.43	35.71%	4.11
Materials, methods, techniques used	0%	3.57%	10.71%	50%	35.71%	4.18
On a scale from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent), please evaluate the quality of the fieldwork curriculum and instruction you received from your university fieldwork instructors (Cohort entering 2013)						
Overall quality of curriculum	0%	4.55%	22.73%	13.64%	59.09%	4.27
Overall quality of instruction	0%	0%	13.64%	36.36%	50%	4.36
Quality of skills learned	0%	4.55%	18.18%	22.73%	54.55%	4.27
Materials, methods, techniques used	0%	4.55%	22.73%	22.73%	50%	4.18
On a scale from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent), please evaluate the quality of the fieldwork supervision you received form your university fieldwork instructors (cohort entering 2012)						
Overall quality of supervision	0%	0%	7.14%	39.29%	53.57%	4.46
Frequency of supervision	3.57%	3.57%	7.14%	39.29%	46.43%	4.21
Quality of guidance and suggestions	0%	0%	7.14%	46.43%	46.43%	4.39

Materials, methods, techniques used	0%	3.57%	7.14%	50%	39.29%	4.25
On a scale from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent), please evaluate the quality of the fieldwork supervision you received form your university fieldwork instructors (cohort entering 2013)						
Overall quality of supervision	0%	9.09%	9.09%	27.27%	54.55%	4.27
Frequency of supervision	4.55%	0%	9.09%	31.82%	54.55%	4.32
Quality of guidance and suggestions	0%	0%	13.64%	22.73%	63.64%	4.50
Materials, methods, techniques used	0%	9.09%	18.18%	18.18%	54.55%	4.18
On a scale from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent), please evaluate the quality of the fieldwork supervision you received from your mentor counselors (cohort entering 2012)						
Overall quality of supervision	3.57%	7.14%	3.57%	35.71%	50%	4.21
Frequency of supervision	3.57%	7.14%	10.71%	39.29%	39.29%	4.04
Quality of guidance and suggestions	3.57%	7.14%	0%	32.14%	57.14%	4.32
Materials, methods, techniques used	3.57%	7.14%	3.57%	39.29%	46.43%	4.18
On a scale from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent), please evaluate the quality of the fieldwork supervision you received from your mentor counselors (cohort entering 2013)						
Overall quality of supervision	4.55%	4.55%	13.64%	31.82%	45.45%	4.09
Frequency of supervision	4.55%	9.09%	9.09%	36.36%	40.91%	4.00

	1	2	3	4	5	
Quality of guidance and suggestions	9.09%	0%	18.18%	22.73%	50%	4.05
Materials, methods, techniques used	9.09%	4.55%	13.64%	27.27%	45.45%	3.95

Quality of School Counseling Program- Standard 1	1 Poor	2	3	4	5 Excellent	Average Rating
On a scale from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent), please evaluate the quality of program coordination and advising you experienced and received this year (cohort entering 2012)						
Overall quality of program coordination	0%	14.29%	17.86%	28.57%	39.29%	3.93
Overall quality of program advising	0%	7.14%	17.86%	35.71%	39.29%	4.07
Quality of guidance and support	0%	7.14%	17.86%	28.57%	46.43%	4.14
On a scale from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent), please evaluate the quality of program coordination and advising you experienced and received this year (cohort entering 2013)						
Overall quality of program coordination	0%	4.55%	13.64%	40.91%	40.91%	4.18
Overall quality of program advising	0%	0%	18.18%	36.36%	45.45%	4.27
Quality of guidance and support	0%	4.55%	4.55%	31.82%	59.09%	4.45
On a scale from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent), please rate the following aspects of the School Counseling Program						
Practical application of coursework	0%	7.14%	17.86%	42.86%	32.14%	4.00

Quality of texts and reading material	0%	3.57%	25%	42.86%	28.57%	3.96
Class work correspondence to syllabus	0%	3.57%	7.14%	50%	39.29%	4.25
Quality of assignments/activities	0%	0%	10.71%	57.14%	32.14%	4.21
Course requirements and grading	0%	3.57%	14.29%	42.86%	39.29%	4.18
Credential information and resources	0%	10.71%	21.43%	35.71%	32.14%	3.89

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Overall, rate the satisfaction from the education and training you have received in the Counseling Psychology Credential Program (cohort entering 2012)	0%	7.14%	14.29%	46.43%	32.14%
Overall, rate the satisfaction from the education and training you have received in the Counseling Psychology Credential Program (cohort entering 2013)	0%	0%	27.27%	40.91%	31.82%

Qualitative Feedback – Standards 1, 31, 32

Strengths	2014 Cohort
Strengths of the program in terms of its	• Fieldwork starts rights away, course work is used to help with fieldwork classes • There is a devotion to diversity and advocating for students and their

curriculum	rights. I appreciate the structure of the curriculum and its dedication to school counseling
	• Cohort model, lots of experimental learning and self-reflection
	• Applicable to daily work
	• It is geared towards urban education, multicultural focused
	• Good classes
	• Innovative
	• Social justice
	• It challenges it's students to reflect on their thoughts and processes
	• The assignments that required interviewing people or creating websites and programs were the most engaging.
	• Its focus on social justice
	• The material was relevant to today's culture
	• Very strong journals and research articles. Great use of documentaries and real life material.
	• The applicability of the theories, concepts and techniques used in real case scenarios at schools
	• Theory based. Multicultural.
	• I feel that when it comes to the curriculum, the main strength that I really appreciated was the emphasis on multiculturalism and the importance placed on creating interventions that are accessible to everyone.
	• All curriculum is up to date and relevant to current standards
	• Overall the curriculum provided me with well rounded knowledge and education needed to become a counselor and forced me to look at myself, reflect, and grow as well.
	• All encompassing and focused on the needs of the school counseling credential
	• Variety of course offerings
	• Very relevant material that can be applied in school settings; multicultural approach and social justice advocacy
Strengths of the program in terms of quality of instruction	• Classes were applicable
	• The instructors are or have been school counselors themselves. This is a great contribution to the learning experience.
	• Great, dedicated staff working in the field in which we are discussing

	- Some great teachers who utilize different instruction modalities - Dynamic instruction. Combination of lectures, group work in the classroom, mock sessions. - Good instructors - Flexible - Applicable material, hands on, team work and discussion - Fieldwork, interactive and applicable activities (vs. theoretical papers) - The teachers who are able to connect and engage with the students were the most effective. I think in this profession, it was refreshing to have instructors who genuinely cared about us and our learning. - Some of the best professors I've ever had. - Quality instructors that care - Most of the professors were knowledgeable and passionate - Professors are very passionate and knowledgeable - The skills that translate into working with school officials, parents, community organizations and more importantly, students - Variety of instruction - I really appreciated the encouraged discussions, whether that was through group or lecture. There was also a lot of ways to learn, whether that was through PowerPoint, group projects, student teaching or other multimedia presentations. - The multiple teaching methods and strategies made sure everyone's style of learning was met - All of my professors were caring, well prepared, passionate and wanted us to succeed. The quality of instruction was great and motivated me to learn more and grow. - Very knowledgeable professors with experience in counseling in and out of schools - Professors who actively work in the field - The professors whose background served the description of the class and respected their students' varying levels of demands in their lives - Diverse instructors
Strengths of the program in terms of	The integration of having an internship and a class was great. Having the hands one experience as well as supervision. I think this is valuable to my learning experience.

fieldwork experience	- Great heads on experience working as a school counselor, finding a supportive mentor is key - Knowledgeable and experience… currently in the field working - Knowledgeable instructors - Loved having fieldwork - Placement in district - Smaller classes - Process group - The internship sites were the difference between a good and bad experience. I learned the most at my sites and think USF should send their students to the mentors who score the highest at being effective. - I had great mentors and it made all the difference. - Experienced instructors - It was our time to discuss any issues or concerns we were having. I really enjoyed the informal structure. - Great support by instructors. The instructors give great feedback. Having access to SFUSD is very helpful. - The ability to discuss the experiences one encounters at schools with the class, and in return, receive suggestion from the cohort and instructor - Peer assistance - There was a lot of support from the fieldwork instructors. I appreciated their level of experience and working knowledge (as they are all currently still in the field). - It was helpful to share experiences and receive feedback and support from colleagues - My internship sites were amazing and provided me with great experience and guidance. - Amazing connection to schools and effort to incorporate fieldwork problems into academic curriculum and conversation - Getting actual, in school experience - Loved my fieldwork class- such a great forum for processing our experiences and learning from others. Professors did this extremely well with lots of compassion. - Very applicable to school setting

Strengths of the program in terms of its overall structure	- Very organized, 2 year time - It seems as if there was an alignment with courses and the issues we were facing in schools. Each class synced to what was going on in classes and it helped tremendously. - Cohort model, caring professors, passionate students - Structure should improve… create a schedule and stick to it - Weekend classes - Neatly organized structure - Well structured - On weekends - The quality of the instructor made a huge difference on the course. The content was well received if the professor treated the students as equals. I also enjoyed the classes that challenged us to look within ourselves and think twice about what was said or thought about. These skills make us better people, and in the end, better counselors. - The weekend schedule is great though the dates need to be confirmed at the beginning of the program not during. - Flexibility - I really liked the cohort model. Although I didn't like the weekend classes. However, looking back, having it on the weekends was great. - Great to have social justice emphasis and a clear structure of classes. - For my point of view, it equipped me to increase my confidence in terms of educational leadership. As such, I have been more effective in serving the needs of our increasingly diverse student population - Start working in schools right away - I liked the open-ended nature of the program in terms of the freedom to learn and create. While there was definitely a lot of structure in terms of the actual classes, when it came to the homework, there seemed to be no wrong answers so much as areas to improve upon. I appreciated how professors allowed you to take an idea, for an assignment, and run with it. - Overall the program structure was well thought out and prepared - Really tries to be flexible for the full time working adult and the majority of professors were sympathetic to the lives of students - Fast program

	• Multicultural focus and social justice advocacy

Areas of improvement	2014 Cohort
Areas of improvement for the program in terms of its curriculum	• I thought the way the curriculum was outlined was logical and progressed along as our experience in the field grew. Would have liked the opportunity to learn more about crisis, trauma counseling rather than a heavier focus on academic counseling • More collaboration between all the courses. If I am doing one assignment in one course, it should not be the same assignment or a very similar one again in another course • Balanced urban education with rural education- some of our classmates live in rural areas and experience different issues • Reevaluate professors and classes • It's good! Keeping open the option for changes is always good • Academic counseling course was a repeat of other things we learned • Lots of repetitive assignments and readings • The readings need to be better tailored to the classes, as some readings/books were dry and difficult to be engaged with. • More practical applications and interventions • I think my only complaint is that we weren't really taught A-G, or how to evaluate transcripts/credit recovery. It was assumed that we would learn that for the most part within our fieldwork placements, so even with Academic Counseling we really didn't go over these areas. • I think more multiculturalism and cross cultural education is needed. I also believe it should be more focused on within other courses. • Curriculum could be more aligned with the problems with current districts. Paying too much attention to theories distracted from some practical knowledge, interventions, and realistic applications • The Advanced Multicultural Counseling course felt very repetitive. I think it has the potential to be an important class, but for me, I personally didn't get anything new out of it that I hadn't gotten the previous term in Multicultural Counseling. Additionally, the Prevention/Intervention and Problem Solving courses were very similar. I felt that the Problem Solving class in particular wasn't

	applicable to most counseling environments.
	• The LPCC should have been introduced at the beginning of the our program- even if it was still under construction it would have made a difference to know it may be a significant option
	• Academic counseling and career counseling should be combined; consulting with parents, teachers, and schools could have been incorporated in this curriculum as well
Areas of improvement for the program in terms of quality of instruction	• Having faculty that work in the school system or with schools- their knowledge on how to navigate in a school setting was very valuable
	• Decrease the amount of time spent lecturing. Also, we had a number of instructors who are not school counselors. They work in the mental health field, and are not aware of our work. More instructors who are school counselors would be more beneficial for our learning
	• Some instructors are too experimental and I particularly would like more lecture in order to have some theory for the practice we do
	• Some new professors
	• More interactive, keep students motivated to learn, less lecture
	• Keep the effective teachers teaching courses and have more quality interactive assignments instead of 5 hours of PowerPoints.
	• More modeling
	• Some instructors were never school counselors or had even worked with school counselors. Their perspective was valuable, but did not support the best insight for some of the subject matter
	• Cater to multiple learning styles
	• Please don't place clinical background professors in classes that need school based experience. In a graduate level program, having completely new professors is challenging. I am not paying this much and dedicating my time and needing this knowledge to be prepared for my field to be the "test" students for a new teacher
Areas of improvement for the program in terms of fieldwork experience	• Consistency of the supervisors. Getting more help in finding internships.
	• Loved the class and time it allowed us to process what was happening at our sites. My fieldwork experience was rich due to my fieldwork instructor as well as my mentor.
	• Start earlier for resume building, networking, etc…. make sure we

	have tangible products (classroom guidance lessons, handouts for back to school night) that we create and use in the future • More time should be allotted for supervision during class • Help us find placements outside of San Francisco • More guidance and plans for new interns. Check ins • Keep same instructor for each year rather than move around • It felt repetitive at times always addressing the highlights and challenges of the weeks • More coordination with on-site mentors • It would be great for the same fieldwork instructor to follow the cohort both years in the program • More guidance and help in finding fieldwork placement outside of SFUSD is needed. I did not feel supported in finding either of my internship sites as they were outside of SFUSD. • Many students working outside of SFUSD felt disconnected and frustrated because of the emphasis on USF's connections and involvement with SFUSD • More relationships with other school districts. I chose to do my fieldwork in SFUSD both years because USF had a relationship with the district, however, I was very dissatisfied with both of my placement sites. I received little to no supervision both years. • More focus on employability skills in the first semester of second year
Areas of improvement for the program in terms of its overall structure	• Going to class after graduation is extremely difficult. I feel that classes that take place in the second year summer should be done during winter intersessions. • None- I enjoyed the structure however this program really does not cater to working adults. No way one can actually hold a full time job without having a super flexible schedule • Create a schedule and stick to it • Fix structure of classes • Try to make it so students only have to do 1 day of fieldwork per week including the summer so that students can work regular jobs • Communication needs to be improved, especially regarding LPCC program. Some of the course sequence could have been changed as well to create a better flow within the program. Ex: mixture of

	academic based and culturally aware classes.
	• It would be nice, from one class to the next, if certain areas aren't covered twice (meaning that the instructors talk to each other to make sure they're not being redundant) and if the level (in terms of the amount) of work is consistent across classes.
	• Rethinking having summer classes after graduation would be helpful as it was hard to focus and retain information crammed into short sessions.
	• Some courses were not as useful depending on their placement in the program. The second year summer courses in particular could be more successful earlier in the course progression.
	• Do not market the program as one for working professionals. It is nearly impossible to hold down a part-time job, let alone a full-time job with the rigor of this program. I felt very deceived halfway through the program when I realized that I would not be able to work full-time and go to school, as advertised to me by USF.
	• More fair grading; enforce attendance policy
Please add any suggestion for improvement that have not ben covered in any of the sections above	• Would have loved more guidance in LPCC process and how we are going to apply for inter #, get jobs, internships, etc.
	• Availability to go into the SOE office during Saturdays to be able to submit paperwork, etc.
	• It would be nice if we had more multiculturalism represented within the facility, and also in terms of the guest speakers.
	• Being more mindful of the financial strain students are under by being in this program and not requiring textbooks or encouraging professors to post readings online

Program Evaluation Survey
Qualitative Feedback – Standards 1, 31, 32 – from first year students (cohort entered 2013)

What do you consider to be the strengths of the first year of the School Counseling Program of USF?
• I learned a lot in terms of how to create culturally sensitive and appropriate counseling interventions. I especially appreciate all of the resources I was given to this effect.
• Incredible introduction to the world of school counseling. Opened my eyes to the struggles and realities but also gave me tools to help advocate for students. Multicultural

counseling is definitely covered. I learned an amazing amount my first semester.

- My first semester at USF in SCP was amazing and it set a very high bar for what was to be expected as a student and also made me excited to go into the field. All the instructors were great and had a clear idea of how to get the students involved.
- The cohort style and the small amount of people in each group. Also, the relations you built with your professors.
- Small cohort; application of theories to fieldwork.
- Cohort model
- Some of the adjunct teachers are amazing and make learning fun and meaningfully connect to our school placements
- The arrangement of courses offered. Areas from each course complement learning from future and concurrent course material.
- The first semester of the program was one of the biggest strengths since it really laid the foundation for what we would be learning and experiencing throughout the year in our classes and internship. Most of the classes and lectures were very applicable at our internship and able to be used immediately.
- I thought the theory counseling class in the fall was very useful. Our professor did an excellent job teaching that class and presenting the materials. In general, I think that the class schedule in the fall is a great idea because it gives an overview of all the theories.
- The professors at USF are understanding and helpful. I have enjoyed the diversity offered in their instruction and the knowledge and skill they have passed down to us all.
- I think a major strength is being able to start the fieldwork experience from the first semester. It allows plenty of time to gain experience and also time to grow and improve.
- Fall semester classes were great! The professors were passionate and had a direction for the class.
- The theory and counseling class first semester. I have had a good advisor who is very engaged in the quality of my experience in school.
- Small cohorts, great support from classmates, knowledgeable professors, great 2nd year mentors. Group projects were really helpful in applying course material. I also love that this is a weekend program to be able to continue being employed.
- Strengths include small class room sizes/cohorts, faculty/professors/staff who are very knowledgeable in the field and who are easily accessible.
- Great coordinator, first semester went very smoothly.
- Some of the strengths I appreciated in the program are the commitment to students learning and understanding of key concepts, the emphasis in exploring personal values

and views and the encouragement to recognize strengths within diverse communities. I appreciated the emphasis on social justice and multicultural counseling. The support from the coordinator was and continues to be one of the most comforting and dependable components to the program.

- Fieldwork class provided great guidance. We were continuously reminded about competencies and the instructor was always available when we had questions. First semester classes were prepared well and provided us with a great understanding of the topics.
- The instructors in the first semester were able to provide me with basic knowledge and skills to go into my first school site as a counselor intern. The materials in class, the class experience, and their knowledge helped me to constantly reflect on my own skills and find ways to improve.

What do you consider to be the areas of improvement in the first year of the School Counseling Program of USF?

- This might have been due to the dynamics of all of my professors being new this semester, but my second semester was not as engaging and interesting as the first semester. I feel that a lot of the topics I learned in Prevention & Intervention were a duplication of what I was already learning at my school site. The teacher's methods could have helped improve my engagement with the course as well.
- Do not combine cohorts in an event there is a leave of absence from instructor. Hire a sub!
- The first and second semester did not flow the same way academically. We had some issues with teachers not being reliable and a lot of changes to the curriculum happened throughout the semester, which made it hard to focus and stay engaged.
- There is some confusion regarding forms for fieldwork class, as well as requirements for LPCC option.
- Our first semester we were able to receive feedback and get answers quickly regarding both our assignments and about the program in general. The second semester seemed a bit more chaotic since we were assigned a lot of busy work but we often were not sure about our grades, assignments and the expectations and requirements needed for the following year. Since time goes by so quickly, being able to be more connected with the requirements of this program would help me feel more secure that I am competing things correctly and on time.
- This year, the program had multiple new professors teaching. It was a somewhat difficult transition.
- Overall knowledge of LPCC track courses and the fieldwork classes.

- A checklist given at the beginning of the school so students can track what they have completed.
- Fieldwork classes could have been better organized. Mentor supervision help more accountable.
- Having all professors in the program give feedback and work back to graduate students in a timely manner.
- Two professors were not able to effectively teach a 5 hour class and were not good at engaging the class or imparting information. I did not learn much in one class specifically.
- New faculty members or changes in professors, and lack of communication about assignments (certain classes) made it very difficult to manage (time management).
- Some slight areas of improvement is having consistency with official fieldwork papers and consistency with fieldwork instructors for each section, so that students know how to fulfill competency requirements appropriately.
- Too many teacher switches and changes. Also, we had almost all new teachers at the school and that negatively affected a lot of questions we had about the state and program itself because they weren't in the know.
- I feel some of the instructors could have been more responsive to students' concerns and have facilitated a cohesive learning environment better. Communication and organization.
- The winter session and the qualitative research class could have been planned to include more time for students to complete their work.
- Communication with students. I feel like we expressed a lot of concern early on in the second semester, however, our concerns were never taken into consideration. Although some changes were made during the last week, it was too late because our semester was over.
- Second semester could improve on organization, coordination, and consistent communication between the instructors and the students.

What suggestions do you have for improving instruction, supervision, program coordination, advising or any other aspect of the program?

- Cultural competency is important, and I really enjoy the aspect of the program in which it is woven through all of our courses. However, within a couple of classes (that were not multicultural classes) I felt like this was all we focused on.
- Checklist at the beginning of the year outlining the next two years. More info on LPCC.
- I would just suggest to make sure not any one instructor is taking on more than they can

handle. This way they are able to give the instruction and feedback to students to help the learning process. Feedback was nonexistent in both Prevention and the Cross Cultural class, so it was hard to know how to grow in these topics.

- If a professor cannot work for the whole term they should take the semester off. Also if something happens and they have to leave half way through, then the program should provide that class with their own substitute, instead of combining classes mid-way through.

- I have expressed concern with faculty regarding student performance feedback, and these have been addressed to some degree. In terms of supervision, it would be helpful for fieldwork practicum to meet more often the first semester, and more partnership between our mentor counselors and fieldwork instructors. I would also suggest that the research methods course be longer than two weekends, with more support throughout the semester as we conduct our research.

- As a long-distance commuter, I find it difficult to make time during the week to come to school to meet with my advisor, or any other professor or staff member to ensure that I am doing well. Perhaps it could be helpful to have the option for Skyping or Google Chatting with students as a way of meeting with them.

- Mandatory meetings throughout the semester with advisor.

- More hours devoted to fieldwork/practicum class.

- Some professors were not responsive via email and did not return graded work in a timely manner. Assignments were not distributed when they were posted on the syllabus. This did not help me learn from their comments and edits during the course. I found it unprofessional.

- Research methods class can be a little longer, I felt that it was rushed since I did not really specifically study this in undergraduate program. I also think that Fieldwork class can be longer than 3 hours; Prevention & Intervention for almost 5 hours is a bit too long. I also think that Group Counseling can go the first year because many of us started running groups at our school sites during the first year without any coursework.

- Instructors should be getting back to students in a timely manner and providing feedback on papers and how we are doing in class.

- It would be helpful for students to receive some form of communication from the research instructor letting them know of what is expected of them for the following semester. Hopefully this could prompt them to explore possible research projects at their site in the fall semester so students are ready to take the class with a plan in mind. I hope the LPCC class schedule will be consistent and class dates don't change too much. Many students do plan around class schedule and it is challenging when the dates change on us.

- I would appreciate follow through from instructors. Some things were promised, like timely feedback, chance for revision, assignment changes.
- The order of classes should be reconsidered. I feel that we had a lot of pressure on us to run a group our first year, however, not having taken group counseling yet, I feel that I was not adequately prepared to do so.
- Instead of having one check-in between students and instructor towards the end of the semester, there should at least be two. Also, grades for assignments, papers, and exams should be given to us at an appropriate timeframe so that we are able to receive feedback.

Please make any final comments about faculty, supervisors, mentors, fellow students, courses, or any aspect of your experience in the program.

- I very much appreciate all that was done for me in terms of creating access while I was pregnant and then out on maternity leave. Having the support to continue to come to class helped me to stay in the program, and also feel like I didn't have to choose between being a good mother or a student; I could do both! In this respect I especially appreciate all that the staff did within the program to assist in this effort. I felt inspired and was made to believe that I do belong within this program although perhaps not the typical student. Thank you!!
- I think all instructors are doing a great job in developing us as school counselors and I appreciate the hard work and dedication they have to the program.
- More reflective responses/papers to apply knowledge of material learned.
- Staff have been very supportive and go out of their way to help you with registration or class mix ups.
- Despite the hiccups and bumps that we've had this past semester, I still very much enjoy the entirety of this program, what it teachers and how applicable everything is. I enjoy being in a cohort, but also love having opportunities to interact with the other cohort as well.
- My USF experience has been amazing, I have truly enjoyed the faculty and the way the cohorts were put together.
- I am VERY happy with my experience in the USF SCP program thus far, due to the amazing faculty, supervisors, and fellow students.
- This year has been incredible. I appreciate the instructors, mentors at my site, my peers, and my advisor for helping to facilitate learning, exploration and reflection. I am a fan of the cohort model and I truly believe this has helped me overcome fears so I am able to grow and learn.

Source	CANDIDATE COMPETENCE	PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS
2) SUMMA **Standard 1** **Standard 31**	**Strength(s):** This is a formal course evaluation implemented to all students in every class in the Program. Data from this assessment is used to evaluate a student's perceived learning, evaluation of instructor, readings, learning activities, and overall learning. Our SUMMA evaluations are among the highest at the University above the National Mean on all 21 items. This reveals great satisfaction and perceived learning in our curriculum	**Strength(s):** Based on the results of our SUMMAs, our program successful in promoting learning opportunities for students. Moreover, our Program faculty are successful in achieving primary learning goals and motivating students for academic success.
	Improvement(s): These are self-report forms that are subject to social desirability and students' perceptions at one point in time (end of semester).	**Improvement(s):** SUMMAs provide specific information and items that identify areas of improvement for each instructor. Each semester, the Coordinator reviews each SUMMA for all instructors with the Associate Dean and identifies areas of improvement for specific faculty, then discusses these issues with faculty.
3) Narrative Course Evaluations **Standard 1** **Standard 31**	**Strength(s):** Students provide online anonymous, detailed written feedback about strengths and challenges of each course. Our data generally reveal students appreciation of faculty commitment, discussions in class, dedication to social justice and learning.	**Strength(s):** Provides detailed and specific student input and feedback on course specific assignments, expectations, pedagogical styles, and learning goals. Our evaluations reveal (for the most part) that students feel they are achieving their learning goals. For the most part, the courses delivered in the 2011-2012 and 2012-

		2013 cycles had positive feedbacks about the courses.
	Improvement(s): It would be helpful to ask more questions about students work towards the competencies and objectives of each class, which we are in the process of designing. For instance, in 2011-2012, students enrolled in the Educational Psychology course, asked for more applied academic/school counseling content in the course. The program coordinator and faculty met to discuss ways to increase school counseling applications of this course	**Improvement(s):** For the 2012-2013 academic cycle, we identified areas of work for the courses Prevention and Intervention and Problem Solving. Specifically, students requested more integration of applied school counseling knowledge and ASCA. The program coordinator met with the instructors and assisted them in integrated applied school counseling content into the courses.

In addition, students have asked to increase program coordination to decrease overlap among different content. The department has implemented "Course Coordinator," in which faculty meets with professors to check the curriculum in each course within the program to reduce redundancy and coordinate the content students are learning through each of the courses in the course sequence. |
| **4) Adjunct feedback**

Standard 1 | **Strength(s):** Adjunct faculty and fieldwork instructors meet and talk regularly to discuss, review, and evaluate student performance. | **Strength(s):** Creates a space to discuss programmatic issues, redundancy and student competencies. |
| | **Improvement(s):** More regular meetings established in advance to accommodate differing schedules. Meetings take a long time due to depth discussions | **Improvement(s):** Increased communication with Adjunct faculty about Program effectiveness and goals. |

	about each candidate.	
5) Course review of Assignments and Activities **Standard 1**	**Strength(s):** Program coordinator reviews all syllabi, assignments, and activities to ensure they meet program goals, school counseling competency and standard. All courses are aligned with specific standards and competencies.	**Strength(s):** Through reviewing all course materials and assignments, the program coordinator ensures that the course sequence and school counseling curriculum meet candidates' developmental and training needs. First semester/year offers foundational training while first summer semester and second year are increasingly applied/problem solving.
	Improvement(s): We need to increase communication among faculty to continue to coordinate and reduce overlap in assignments. We will hold more faculty meetings to discuss curriculum delivery issues.	**Improvement(s):** In addition to holding faculty meetings, we will continue to share and make faculty aware of the major assignments used in each course. This awareness will help to reduce potential overlaps among courses and will be conducive to a more coordinated learning/training experience for students.
6) Job Placement **Standard 1** **Standard 32**	**Strength(s):** Following completion of the credential program, the majority of graduate obtain school counselor positions in K-12 public and private schools. A small percent obtain counselor positions at non-profits and community agencies. A small percent obtain higher level positions as Deans and Administrators at K-12 schools. Our students are successful in obtaining school counselor positions and demonstrate	**Strength(s):** Student success in obtaining jobs demonstrates Program effectiveness in school counselor training, achieving competencies, and a strong Program reputation. Candidates who graduated in 2013 are currently employed. The majority are employed in K-12 school counseling positions. Others are employed as counselors in non-profit community based organizations and/or institutions

	their competence in job performance.	of higher education. As for the candidates graduating in 2014, 12 (out of 29) already had been hired to work as K-12 school counselors/educators prior to graduating from the program.
	Improvement(s): We need to maintain our success and continue to structurally find ways to support our students.	**Improvement(s):** Implement more alumni networking opportunities. We have created an alumni database and listserv. We hope to host alumni network meetings on campus in the future.
7) **Retention Rate** **Standard 1**	**Strength(s):** Student demonstrate a strong commitment to completing their competencies and coursework.	**Strength(s):** Our data indicates that for the graduating class of 2014, 97% of the students who matriculated in the program graduated. As for the current candidates, 0 out of 28 candidates have withdrawn from the program.
	Improvement(s): More consistently perform exit interviews with students who leave the program to understand underlying issues.	**Improvement(s):** Students who have left the program in the past tend to do so due to financial and personal reasons or they are unable to meet our fieldwork requirements due to scheduling conflicts.
8) **Feedback from District administration and staff**	**Strength(s)** The Program Coordinator meets regularly with the Head Counselor, Support Services staff, counselors, Principals, and other District staff about our training program and	**Strength(s)** In meeting with program administrators, we discussed critical training needs for counselors working in urban settings. We also discussed ways to address these needs through

Standard 1 Standard 31	goals. They provide feedback and recommendations about areas of training and competencies our candidates need based on field needs. This past year, the head counselor offered specific training and recommendations for our candidates' employability skills.	fieldwork opportunities for our students.
	Improvement(s): It would be helpful to meet with Principals, Head Counselors, and Deans at various schools to diversify the feedback and assessment of the program	**Improvement(s):** A formal method that is standard/competency based would be beneficial to structure the feedback

PART III – Analyses and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data   1-3 pages

Each program provides analyses of the information provided in Section II. **Please do not introduce new types of data in this section**. Note strengths and areas for improvement that have been identified through the analyses of the data. Describe what the analyses of the data demonstrate about your program relative to: a) candidate competence; and b) program effectiveness.

The candidate and program data has been analyzed to look for main themes relative to a) candidate competence and b) program effectiveness.

A) Candidate Competence

In section 2, we present data on candidate competence based on the 15 competencies in the School Counseling Program. These competencies are listed below along with corresponding CTC standards:

1. Counseling Theory and Skills **(Standards 3, 8, 14, 16, 21, 24, 25, 29)**
2. Professional Ethics and Legal Issues **(Standards 6, 9, 15, 17, 18, 21)**
3. Lifespan Developmental Counseling **(Standards 2, 3, 7, 11, 21, 23, 30)**
4. Cross Cultural Counseling **(Standards 3, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 21, 23)**
5. Prevention and Intervention in Schools **(Standards 2, 4, 5, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30)**
6. Group Counseling **(Standards 9, 14, 22, 26, 29)**
7. Assessment and the Counselor **(Standards 3, 4, 6, 9, 21)**

8. Consulting with Parents, Teachers, and Schools (**Standards 7, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29**)
9. Problem-Solving Counseling (**Standards 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 21, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30**)
10. Academic Counseling (**Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 14, 19, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29**)
11. Career Counseling (**Standards 3, 15, 19, 20, 23, 29**)
12. Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods (**Standards 4, 15, 30**)
13. Qualitative and Quantitative Interpretation and Analysis (**Standards 4, 15, 30**)
14. Advanced Multicultural Counseling (**Standards 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 14, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29**)
15. Trauma and Crisis Counseling in Urban and Multicultural Context (**Standards 2, 3, 9, 11, 13, 14, 19, 21, 25, 27, 28, 29**)

Candidates in our program demonstrate successful completion of all 15 competencies as evaluated by individual instructors, fieldwork supervisors, and the Program Coordinator. Our data reveal that a primary asset of the Program is its training of students to be competent school counselors in the field. The students report that the Program has prepared them to use specific school counseling skills and apply specific knowledge as they relate to the 15 competencies. Students, fieldwork instructors, and mentor counselors consistently reported that our students are well prepared to enter the field as school counselors—especially in urban and culturally diverse school contexts. Students and mentors also shared that the candidates were well equipped to counsel students on a wide array of issues related to each of the 15 competencies.

We also analyzed the aggregated quantitative data for student performance on the 15 competencies. As you can see from the tables, across all of the 15 competencies, the vast majority of students were rated at or above "above expectations" in terms of being competent in the listed competency area. Fieldwork Evaluators scored SCP students especially high in their individual counseling skills, cross cultural counseling skills, ability to engage in collaboration and coordination, responsiveness to feedback and supervision, overall evaluation of performance.

Program Effectiveness

We also investigated our findings and themes as they related to program effectiveness. In terms of the curriculum in the program, students, mentor counselors, fieldwork supervisors all reported that the multicultural, social justice focus are a significant strength of the program. Students in particular felt strongly that there was a deep commitment to equity and social justice among the faculty and students. Candidates valued the strong multicultural focus in many of the courses and appreciated the diversity of the faculty that also underscored and represented these critical perspectives. Students consistently recognized their courses as theory based, noting that course materials were relevant to their current school contexts and professional needs. Furthermore, the students highly valued the structure of the program. This included the following format: (a) having a cohort model in which students progress through the program together. Students found this valuable and conducive to their learning; (b) the Teaching Weekend schedule. Students reported this allowed them to spending time during the week at their school fieldwork site and keep their jobs; and (c) small class sizes. This allowed for more in depth discussions, case analysis, and practice of specific school counseling techniques and skills. Students noted the availability, expertise, and professionalism of instructors as strengths of the program. In particular, students appreciated being able to progress through the program with the same group of people and ability to build strong relationships with students and faculty due to these small class sizes and cohort model. Students appear to be especially satisfied with their fieldwork practicum instructors who provided them with support and guidance, as well as expertise given that the instructors were practicing school counselors.

In terms of Program Effectiveness, students appreciated the practical and applied focus of our courses. Since the last report, SCP faculty has worked hard to further connect theory and practices in the curriculum. They have also added additional practical activities to connect students' experiences in fieldwork and in courses and reduce redundancies across courses. Students appreciated the strong connections to the local schools that faculty had and the opportunities to meet with local principals, counselors, teachers, and support staff through guest lectures and discussions. As mentioned, most students stated that their fieldwork class provided them with important support as they pursued their practicum. Students appreciated the opportunity to begin their fieldwork once they began the program and felt that this allowed them to more fluidly integrate the theories they were learning with their practical work. Students also seem to see an alignment between the course sequencing coupled with experiences through their progression at their internship sites.

b) Areas of Improvement

We analyzed the assessments to look for main themes in terms of areas of improvement. Candidates in the Program gave specific suggestions for how to improve the Program and its curriculum and fieldwork experiences. We analyzed the areas for improvement below.

Instruction:
- Need to work with new faculty on professionalism, professional conduct, timely responses to assignment, organization, responsiveness to email, and overall communication. First year students expressed strong concern about an instructor's ability to engage students, provide timely feedback, respond to students' questions and concerns. There were additional concerns related to professional behavior.
- More consistency in terms of the multicultural and social justice focus. Have faculty who are skilled in facilitating discussions about cultural diversity.
- Need instructors who are current school counselors and have experience teaching at the graduate level.
- Adjunct faculty need to be available outside of class to meet about coursework and assignments

Fieldwork:
- Fieldwork instructors need to be in close contact with the onsite mentor counselors. This was not consistently done.
- There needs to be more focus in fieldwork on professional development, credential competencies, professionalism, interviewing skills, and networking to help students make more of a transition into the job market and beginning this earlier than the Spring of their second year
- More clarity on where to turn fieldwork and practicum requirements (e.g., practicum site agreement forms; log-sheets, etc.) should be present. Fieldwork instructors need to be more organized in this regard.
- Increased coordination for internship opportunities outside of SFUSD. Strengthen relationships with school sites in Oakland, Berkeley, and other East Bay sites where many SCP students live.
- Consistency of supervisors

Courses/curriculum:

- Students want more engagement and stronger pedagogical skills in Cross Cultural Counseling. They want less redundancy in Prevention and Intervention and their Fieldwork class (in one of the sections).

Structure/general:
- Students also suggested that it would have been helpful to participate in an ongoing social justice project while being in the program.
- It was suggested also that increasing a practical focus, instead of theory focus, would have been helpful.
- More collaboration between courses so that assignments did not feel redundant
- More information about LPCC options earlier on

PART IV – Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

Data Source	Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made	Applicable Program or Common Standard(s)
Yearly Program Evaluation Survey (Exit for 2ⁿᵈ yrs), Narrative course evaluations, Course review	Improve faculty responsiveness to student concerns, improve faculty teaching and ability to engage students, improve faculty timeliness with grading and returning assignments. Make sure faculty return papers and assignments and give students about their standing in the course. <u>Decrease redundancy and add additional coursework in key areas</u>	**Standard 1, Standard 2, Standard 12, Standard 28**
Program Evaluation survey, Narrative course evaluations, Course review	Ensure adequate coverage when substitutes are hired to cover a course due to faculty personal leave. Hire faculty who are multiculturally competent and have training in multi-cultural counseling. Hire faculty with a strong dedication to student learning and feedback.	**Standard 1, Standard 2, Standard 3, Standard 12**
Exit survey, Narrative course evaluations, Course review	Hire faculty who are practicing school counselors and have previous graduate teaching experience	**Standard 1, Standard 16, Standard 31**
Exit survey, Narrative	Faculty need to provide timely and	**Standard 1, Standard**

course evaluations, Course review	detailed feedback to students. Faculty need to have provide students with enough time to complete assignments. Faculty need to engage with students professionally.	**28, Standard 31**
Exit survey, Fieldwork evaluation On-site mentor evaluation, Narrative course evaluations	Standardize fieldwork experience so fieldwork instructors are in close contact with the onsite mentor counselors.	**Standard 1, Standard 16, Standard 31**
Exit survey, Fieldwork evaluation On-site mentor evaluation, Narrative course evaluations	Increase focus in fieldwork on professional development, credential competencies, professionalism, interviewing skills, and networking to help students make more of a transition into the job market.	**Standard 1, Standard 2, Standard 12, Standard 31, Standard 32**
Exit survey, Fieldwork evaluation On-site mentor evaluation, Narrative course evaluations	Improve clarity on fieldwork and practicum requirements and forms (e.g., practicum site agreement forms; log-sheets, etc.). Improve Fieldwork instructors organizational skills.	**Standard 1, Standard 2, Standard 12, Standard 31, Standard 32**
Fieldwork competencies	Additional training in multicultural counseling skills	**Standard 1, Standard 2, Standard 3, Standard 31, Standard 32**
Exit survey, Narrative course evaluations, Course review	Additional training in trauma and crisis counseling	**Standard 1, Standard 2, Standard 3, Standard 31, Standard 32**

Below we discuss how we are using the Results of our various assessments to improve Candidate performance and Program Effectiveness. We also discuss specific changes we have already implemented made based on our assessment results.

Since receiving feedback from the CTC and since the submission of our last Biennial report, we have spent considerable time and effort trying to improve our Programmatic structures and systems so there is more open and transparent communication and dissemination of assessment findings. The Program Coordinator has met with the Associate Deans as well as other Department Chairs and Faculty in other Credential Programs to better understand current practices and successes in other Credentialed Programs. This has been incredibly helpful in developing our specific action plans.

Embedded Course Assessments: We reviewed all course syllabi for relevant activities and assignments that promote Candidate competency and Program effectiveness. We believe that these assignments are clearly aligned with specific competencies and Programmatic goals. There needs to be clearer and more direct communication between full-time, adjunct, and fieldwork faculty to reduce overlap in assignments and increase the diversity of learning experiences. We have increased the number of faculty and fieldwork meetings to improve communications. We also have yearly course reviews to reduce redundancy. We have also updated all of our syllabus so there is a Common syllabus with documented CTC standards aligned with Course Learning Outcomes.

USF School Counseling Final Fieldwork Evaluation Form: Each year, mentor counselors evaluate School Counseling candidates using pre-established criteria and competencies. These quantitative ratings were summarized in this report. It appears that in the majority of the competencies, students are receiving a rating of "above expectations" or "outstanding" while a smaller percentage receive a rating of "at expectation." There is typically a much lower of ratings of "needs improvement." However, some students received a rating of N/A in specific competencies. In these cases, the N/A rating may be a function of the nature of the competency and the grade-level or specific school the student was working at. For instance, if a student is rated with an N/A for the testing and assessment competency, this could be related to grade level or time of the year where there is not specific use of testing at the specific school. However, we need to investigate these ratings to better understand why the mentor counselor is not observing and evaluating these areas as they are an important part of our candidates' training.

To address this issue, we are currently improving our Fieldwork system so there is more communication between Fieldwork Instructors, Mentor Counselors, and students. This improvement may be further facilitated by having more Fieldwork Instructors who are practicing school counselors who are knowledgeable of the schools and districts that are students are in. For example, In San Francisco Unified School District (where the vast majority of students are placed in schools), we have met with the Head Counselors to plan professional development opportunities and training for students in specific areas. We need to improve having regular meeting times with Mentor Counselors and Fieldwork Instructors to facilitate more open communication about competencies. We have also hired a Fieldwork Instructor to work on these issues.

In the meantime, Fieldwork Instructors are now expected to contact Mentor Counselors at least once a month to insure open expectations about candidate performance on all competencies.

Summary of comments on school counseling performance per candidate (by on site mentor counselor, fieldwork instructor, and candidate self-report): We analyzed detailed qualitative data for each academic year on all candidates from three perspectives (mentor counselor, fieldwork instructor, and the candidate him/herself). The majority of the results indicate that from all three perspectives, the candidates are developing strong skills in counseling. Moreover, the program is effective in preparing counselors to work in the field and at a school site. There were some differences between the types of comments made by the three different people. For example, **candidates** tended to focus on their own improvement, confidence, comfort, in counseling as well as their learning at their school site. **Fieldwork Instructors** tended to focus their comments on the individual candidate's specific counseling skills (empathy, insight, etc) and traits (energetic, motivated, etc). Whereas, many of the **mentor counselor** comments tended to focus on how well the candidate integrated in to the school setting, teamwork, cooperation, relationship building, and working with staff, students, and parents at the school site. These different perspectives speak to the multidimensional aspects of being a school counselor but they also allow us to reflect on how our evaluations can be more integrated as well as complex.

Specifically, we need to have more opportunities for fieldwork instructors, candidates, and mentor counselors to interact around shared goals and expectations. We have revised our materials in 2012, 2013, and 2014 so our specific fieldwork expectations are directly communicated with the mentor counselor and with the fieldwork instructor. We have hired a Fieldwork coordinator who is working with a student to review, improve, edit, and rewrite all materials and regulations related to the Fieldwork experience (forms, handbook, etc). We are continuing to support our system in which fieldwork instructors must contact each mentor counselor at least 3 times a semester and discuss student's progress. As stated above, we are adding additional in person group meetings with mentor counselors and fieldwork instructors together to discuss the development of student competencies and program training goals. We are doing this structurally through the district so mentor counselors can attend these meetings during the work day. We have increased the number of meetings with fieldwork instructors to discuss candidate's progress. We have also completely reorganized and restructured the fieldwork orientation meeting with all incoming students so they meet for three hours during orientation week to discuss their learning, training goals, and expectations for supervision with the mentor counselor. We are also meeting with mentor counselors and Head Counselors of SFUSD to improve the assignment, placement and training of mentor counselors and candidates in their fieldwork experience. In addition, the fieldwork placement process is more formalized and begins earlier in the year to insure a smooth transition for everyone involved.

Program Evaluation Survey (2nd year Exit Survey) Data: Our data from the 2014 exit interview reveal many common themes and areas for improvement. Improve faculty responsiveness to student concerns, improve faculty teaching and ability to engage students, improve faculty timeliness with grading and returning assignments. Make sure faculty return papers and assignments and give students about their standing in the course. This was listed as a serious and recurring concern among first year students in their second semester. The Program Coordinator has been working closely with the new faculty and providing feedback and constructive feedback. The faculty member is working to complete all grading and provide student feedback by stated dates. The faculty member has also been asked to provide more information on assignments and more structure and organization in their teaching.

Decrease redundancy and add additional coursework in key areas: students reported that there was overlap across many of the courses. Hence, the Program Coordinator has been reviewing syllabi for common readings, themes, assignments and redundancy. When redundancies were identified she communicated with both instructors to insure there was a shared understanding of the overlap. Moreover, the core faculty met to discuss program curriculum and needed revisions. We outlined areas of redundancy and improvement. The Program Coordinator also facilitates communication between and across instructors of similar and different courses to reduce redundancy. For example, we combined the two Consultation courses into one course due to prior student feedback. The data also reveal that there was redundancy between Developmental Psychology and Educational Psychology. We have since replaced the Educational Psychology course and replaced it with Academic Counseling (which was needed). We also created a separate course in Career Counseling due to the importance of Career Counseling in schools. However, with these course changes, students continue to report feeling that assignments were redundant and curriculum was not always aligned with the current challenges of schools and districts. Reexamine course sequence: The core faculty have met to discuss course sequencing and are working to see what order of coursework is facilitates the best learning outcomes for students. We have improved our course sequence (see Course Sequence Table for specific changes). More information about college admissions and A-G requirements: As stated, we now have separate Academic Counseling and Career Counseling courses to address this concern and feedback. Students are now receiving more formal training in

A-G requirements, college admissions, financial aid, community colleges and certificate programs. <u>More advocacy and policy work</u>: The Program Coordinator has been meeting regularly with students and the student class representatives each year to identify a social justice goal/project for the whole program to engage in. We hope our future social justice project will help students understand and gain hands on experience in advocacy and policy issues related to school counseling. In addition, one faculty member became a nationally certified instructor to offer a Career Development Facilitator program from the National Career Development Association (NCDA). This certification is offered to nationally qualified instructors who train professionals to offer career development services to follow a standardized curriculum to address 12 critical Career Development/Counseling competencies as outlined by the NCDA

    <u>Instructors with multicultural school counseling experience and teaching experience at the graduate level:</u> The Program Coordinator is meeting with the Deans and Department Chair to discuss how to bring in Instructors who are current school counselors and also Instructors with graduate level teaching experience. We also need to bring in Instructors with Multicultural Counseling experience and expertise. We need to do a thorough evaluation of current instructors and improve our core and adjunct faculty.

    <u>Fieldwork Instructors and Mentor Counselors need to communicate and understand competencies</u>: As mentioned, we are reinforcing a system of communication between Fieldwork Instructors and Mentor Counselors and we have increased the number of meetings between Fieldwork Instructors and faculty and the Program Coordinator. The Program Coordinator is also in communication with Fieldwork Instructors several times a week to discuss student issues and competencies. Moreover, we have begun to schedule more meetings with Mentor Counselors to increase communication and shared vision for student training and our program effectiveness.

    <u>More professional and career development of candidates</u>: To address this area of improvement, we have been implementing Alumni Panels so recent graduates can offer tips and advice about finding a job. We have given students formal training on creating an electronic job portfolio and a separate training on creating and presenting summaries of their interventions and program evaluations in their job portfolio. Advisors are also meeting with the candidates about their job options and goals. We have also hired a Head Counselor from SFUSD to hold career workshops and individual support to graduates. We have implemented a system so Advisors are now required to meet with their mentees each semester to discuss the candidate's professional and career development and offer support. The Fieldwork instructors have implemented career panels with various professionals who interview and hire counselors (Principals, Deans, Head Counselors, etc). The Program Coordinator has regular meetings with the Head Counselors of SFUSD to provide learn more about how to offer interview tips, sample questions, sample resumes, and timelines for the job search for candidates. The Program Coordinator is also meeting with the Head Counselors of SFUSD to discuss desirable qualities and skills needed for graduating candidates. The Program Coordinator has created alumni networking sites on LinkedIn, Facebook and Twitter. We also have an Alumni network to help mentor current students in professional development. We have data on 100% of alumni since 2009.

    <u>Additional training in Multicultural Counseling and Trauma and Crisis Counseling</u>. To address changes in the field, our multicultural and urban focus, and feedback from students and professionals, we have added a course in Advanced Multicultural Counseling and a course in Trauma and Crisis Counseling. These courses have been improved by the curriculum committee at USF and provide additional training for students in our program. Because our students work almost entirely in urban and multicultural settings (often with high violence, trauma, and poverty), we believe these courses are aligned with our social justice vision.

We are also working with local Bay Area school districts to increase the number of fieldwork opportunities outside of SFUSD. We have been networking with alumni of our program who work in Oakland, Hayward, San Jose, and the Peninsula to offer additional internship/fieldwork opportunities for our candidates.

SUMMA and narrative course evaluations: To address low course evaluations, since 2011, we ask faculty with lower SUMMA and narrative evaluations to administer mid-term course evaluations to gain valuable feedback about their courses *before* it is over. We have also been mentoring and/or replacing Instructors with lower course evaluations. The Program Coordinator also works with the Associate Dean to develop professional development plans for faculty with low course evaluations.

Adjunct feedback: Based on our feedback from adjunct faculty we need more group meetings so faculty can understand what other instructors are covering in their classes. We also need different types of meetings to address specific issues (such as a meeting just for Fieldwork issues). We have been collaborating with other Departments and the Dean's Office to have an Adjunct faculty retreats (since June 2011). During this retreat, Adjunct faculty shared common issues, concerns, joys, and received day long training in various pedagogical, technological, and administrative issues. This retreat was well-attended an opportunity to build instructors' teaching skills and sense of community.

Job Placement: As discussed above, we are taking specific steps through advisement, coursework, fieldwork, and structural changes to offer candidates more specific opportunities to develop their careers and be successful in obtaining a job after graduation. We have also created an Alumni database in January 2011 to network more effectively with Alumni who are working as School Counseling in the area. We have social media sites for Alumni networks on Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter. We have panels with current school counselors and alumni to network.

Professional Development: In addition to the job placement and professional opportunities listed above. We have designed our Program so students have the option of taking an additional 11 credits to be eligible for the Licensed Professional Counselor license in California (LPC). This is effective Fall 2012 and since that time, 30 students have begun taking these additional courses (24 in the cohort entering 2013). The LPC option has not compromised or altered our emphasis on school counseling. Rather, it has provided students with an additional option. We offer several meetings a year to discuss the new LPC option and related coursework.

Retention Rate: Each year, typically in the first semester, we lose1-2 students due to finances, personal events, health reasons, or lack of fit in the program. We have not recently lost any students due to poor performance or inability to succeed. Since Fall 2010, we have tried to conduct formal exit interviews with departing students. We were able to do this with all departing students. We have also changed our Admissions process and information meetings (beginning in Fall 2010) to offer more specific information about the structure of the program, costs, and describe the differences between the School Counseling field in comparison to other degrees (such as MFT, LPC, or School Psychology). The last change was implemented so students have a better opportunity to assess "fit" before entering the program. Beginning in March 2011, we have also added a separate informational fieldwork component to our Admissions process so every candidate meets with the Programs Coordinator about fieldwork expectations, placement, and requirements.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART I – Contextual Information
University of San Francisco

The University of San Francisco (USF) is a private, Jesuit institution located in the urban environment of San Francisco (Hilltop Campus) with additional branch campuses in Santa Rosa, Sacramento, Pleasanton, and San Jose. USF strives to provide its undergraduate and graduate students with a global perspective and has a university-wide focus on social justice issues. The university enrolls approximately 10,000 students per year.

Program Specific

The School of Education (SOE) at the University of San Francisco (USF) operates the preliminary administrative credential program. The program is housed in the Organization and Leadership program in the SOE. The preliminary credential is a 27-unit program with 21 of these units coming from classroom courses and six units coming from two field experience courses. While each program has established coursework, students are able to take courses at their own pace. All classroom courses are offered on teaching weekends and during summer session. Currently, credential coursework is only offered at the main campus.

O&L 615 Information Systems in Educational Management
O&L 621 Budget and Finance
O&L 624 Human Resources in Educational Management
O&L 630 Educational Leadership
O&L 652 Data Based Decision Making for School Leaders
O&L 654 Schools, Community, & Society
O&L 648 Field Experience I
O&L 649 Field Experience II

Recent Modifications or Improvements to Program

-We have closed our Clear Administrative Services Credential Program. All former candidates have completed program.
-We have begun two new assessments for the program that assess candidates on case study activity and on how they address interview questions. We had planned this assessment for the Summer, but had some Faculty changes and will be collecting this data in Fall 2014.
-We completed our Preliminary Administrative Services Transition document.
-All last report stated that we did not provide data for an Intern Credential Program. We do not offer an Intern program for the Preliminary ASC.
-Incorporated LCAP/LCFF into Budget & Finance Course as well as into Education Law course
-Incorporated more content on Restorative Practices into Schools, Community, & Society Course

-Incorporated content on PBIS into Data Based Decision Making for School Leaders course

Program Specific Candidate Information				
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported				
	2012-2013		2013-14	
Site (If multiple sites) Delivery Option	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates
	23	9	18	6

PART II – Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

a) What are the primary candidate assessment(s) the program uses up to and through recommending the candidate for a credential?

In order to assess the alignment of program content to CPSEL standards, the University of San Francisco collects data from credential students at several points over the course of the program, as well as following the program. The assessments conducted during the program are the entrance/exit survey and the standards-based competency assessment, which is based on fieldwork. The alumni surveys include the job readiness survey as well as the job placement survey.

Entrance and Exit CPSELs Self-Assessment Survey Data
Likert-scale, 1= lowest, 5= highest

During the entrance survey, students are asked to self-report how proficiently they feel that they meet the CPSEL standards. These data are then compared to the students' exit surveys, which see if the students are more confident in their competence in the CPSELs. The purpose of comparing the entrance and exit data are to ensure that students are progressing in their competencies and also to pinpoint areas that the program is exceling in, as well as if there are areas which should be reexamined in the program.

Standard 1: Vision of Learning

Question	Aggregate Entrance Average	Aggregate Exit Average	Aggregate Average Growth
Facilitate the development of a shared vision for the achievement of all students based upon data from multiple measures of	1.67	3.33	1.67

student learning			
Communicate and implement the shared vision so that the school community acts on the mission of the school as a standards-based educational system.	**1.33**	**3.33**	**2.00**
Leverage and marshal sufficient resources to implement and attain the vision for all students and subgroups of students.	**1.00**	**3.33**	**2.33**
Identify and address any barriers to accomplishing the vision.	**1.00**	**3.33**	**2.33**
Shape school programs, plans, and activities to ensure integration, articulation and consistency with the vision.	**1.33**	**3.67**	**2.33**
Use the influence of diversity to improve teaching and learning.	**1.67**	**3.33**	**1.67**

Standard 2: Culture of Student Learning and Professional Growth

Question	Aggregate Entrance Average	Aggregate Exit Average	Aggregate Average Growth
Create an accountability system of teaching and learning based on student learning standards.	**1.67**	**3.33**	**1.67**
Utilize multiple assessment measures to evaluate student learning to drive an ongoing process of inquiry focused on improving the learning of all students.	**1.67**	**3.33**	**1.67**
Shape a culture where high expectations for all students is the core purpose.	**1.00**	**3.67**	**2.67**
Guide and support the long-term professional development of all staff consistent with the ongoing effort to improve the learning of all students relative to the content standards.	**1.00**	**3.67**	**2.67**
Promote equity, fairness, and respect among all members of the school community.	**1.33**	**3.67**	**2.33**

Provide opportunities for all members of the school community to develop and use skills in collaboration, leadership, and shared responsibility.	1.00	3.33	2.33
Facilitate the use of appropriate learning materials and strategies (active learning, variety of strategies, reflection, inquiry, quality over quantity, use of technology, etc.)	1.67	3.67	2.00

Standard 3: Organizational Management

Question	Aggregate Entrance Average	Aggregate Exit Average	Aggregate Average Growth
Monitor and evaluate the programs and staff at the site.	1.67	3.33	1.67
Establish school structures, patterns, and processes that support student learning.	1.67	3.33	1.67
Manage legal and contractual agreements and records in ways that foster a professional work environment and secure privacy and confidentiality for students and staff.	1.67	3.67	2.00
Align fiscal, human, and material resources to support the learning of all students.	1.33	3.67	2.33
Sustain a safe, efficient, clean, well-maintained, and productive school environment that nurtures student learning and supports professional growth.	1.67	3.33	1.67
Utilize the principles of systems management, organizational development, problem-solving, and decision-making techniques fairly and effectively.	1.33	3.33	2.00
Utilize effective and nurturing practices in establishing student behavior management systems.	2.00	3.33	1.33

Standard 4: Community Collaboration

Question	Aggregate Entrance Average	Aggregate Exit Average	Aggregate Average Growth
Incorporate information about family and community expectations into school decision making and activities.	**1.33**	**3.33**	**2.00**
Recognize the goals and aspirations of diverse family and community groups.	**2.00**	**3.33**	**1.33**
Treat diverse community stakeholder groups with fairness and with respect.	**1.00**	**3.67**	**2.67**
Support the equitable success of all students through the mobilization and leveraging of community support services.	**1.00**	**3.67**	**2.67**
Strengthen the school through establishment of community, business, institutional, and civic partnerships.	**1.33**	**3.33**	**2.00**
Communicate information about the school on a regular and predictable basis through a variety of media and modes.	**1.00**	**3.67**	**2.67**

Standard 5: Modeling Ethics and Promoting Leadership

Question	Aggregate Entrance Average	Aggregate Exit Average	Aggregate Average Growth
Demonstrate skills in decision-making, problem solving, change management, and evaluation.	**2.33**	**3.67**	**1.33**
Model personal and professional ethics, integrity, justice, and fairness and expect the same behaviors from others.	**2.33**	**3.67**	**1.33**
Make and communicate decisions based upon relevant data and research about effective teaching and learning, leadership, management practices, and equity.	**2.00**	**3.67**	**1.67**

Reflect on personal leadership practices and recognize their impact and influence on the performance of others.	**1.67**	**3.67**	**2.00**
Encourage and inspire others to higher levels of performance, commitment, and motivation.	**1.67**	**3.67**	**2.00**
Sustain personal motivation, commitment, energy, and health by balancing professional and personal responsibilities.	**1.67**	**3.67**	**2.00**
Engage in professional and personal development.	**1.33**	**3.67**	**2.33**
Demonstrate knowledge of the curriculum and the ability to integrate and articulate programs throughout the grades.	**1.67**	**3.67**	**2.00**
Use the influence of the office to enhance the educational program rather than for personal gain.	**1.67**	**3.67**	**2.00**
Protect the rights and confidentiality of students and staff.	**1.67**	**3.67**	**2.00**

Standard 6: School Advocacy in the Larger Context

Question	Aggregate Entrance Average	Aggregate Exit Average	Aggregate Average Growth
View oneself as a leader of a team and also a member of a larger team.	**2.33**	**3.67**	**1.33**
Ensure that the school operates consistently within the parameters of federal, state, and local laws, policies, regulations, and statutory requirements.	**2.33**	**3.67**	**1.33**
Generate support for the school by two-way communication with key decision makers in the school community.	**2.00**	**3.33**	**1.33**
Work with the governing board and district and local leaders to influence policies that benefit students and support the improvement of teaching and learning.	**1.67**	**3.67**	**2.00**

Influence and support public policies that ensure the equitable distribution of resources, and support for all the subgroups of students.	**1.67**	**3.67**	**2.00**
Open the school to the public and welcome and facilitate constructive conversations about how to improve student learning and achievement.	**1.67**	**3.67**	**2.00**

Standards Based Competency Assessment Data

The second assessment is the standards-based competency assessment, which evaluates a candidate's performance in their fieldwork, based on the CPSELs. The candidate and the field mentor work together in completing this assessment, in order to get multiple points of view around the students' competence in exhibiting the CPSELs during fieldwork. This allows for discussion around areas of improvement and strengths that the candidate should continue to build upon.

1= lowest, 3= highest

Standard 1: Vision of Learning

Question	Aggregate Initial Average	Aggregate End of Program Average	Aggregate Average Growth
1.1 Facilitate the development of a shared vision for the achievement of all students based upon data from multiple measures of student learning and relevant qualitative indicators.	**1.60**	**2.60**	**1.00**
1.2 Communicate the shared vision so the entire school community understands and acts on the school's mission to become a standards- based education system.	**1.60**	**2.40**	**0.80**
1.3 Use the influence of diversity to improve teaching and learning.	**1.20**	**2.40**	**1.20**
1.4 Identify and address any barriers to accomplishing the vision.	**1.40**	**2.60**	**1.20**
1.5 Shape school programs, plans, and activities to ensure that they are	**1.20**	**2.40**	**1.20**

integrated, articulated through the grades, and consistent with the vision.			
1.6 Leverage and marshal sufficient resources, including technology, to implement and attain the vision for all students and all subgroups of students.	1.60	2.60	1.00

Standard 2: Student Learning and Professional Growth

Question	Aggregate Initial Average	Aggregate End of Program Average	Aggregate Average Growth
2.1 Shape a culture in which high expectations are the norm for each student as evident in rigorous academic work.	1.60	2.40	0.80
2.2 Promote equity, fairness, and respect among all members of the school community.	1.80	2.40	0.60
2.3 Facilitate the use of a variety of appropriate content-based learning materials and learning strategies that recognize students as active learners, value reflection and inquiry, emphasize the quality versus the amount of student application and performance, and utilize appropriate and effective technology.	1.20	2.40	1.20
2.4 Guide and support the long-term professional development of all staff consistent with the ongoing effort to improve the learning of all students relative to the content standards.	1.20	2.40	1.20
2.5 Provide opportunities for all members of the school community to develop and use skills in collaboration, distributed leadership, and shared responsibility.	1.20	2.40	1.20
2.6 Create an accountability system	1.00	1.60	0.60

grounded in standards-based teaching and learning.			
2.7 Utilize multiple assessments to evaluate student learning in an ongoing process focused on improving the academic performance of each student.	1.60	2.40	0.80

Standard 3: Organizational Management for Student Learning

Question	Aggregate Initial Average	Aggregate End of Program Average	Aggregate Average Growth
3.1 Sustain a safe, efficient, clean, well-maintained, and productive school environment that nurtures student learning and supports the professional growth of teachers and support staff.	1.80	2.60	0.80
3.2 Utilize effective and nurturing practices in establishing student behavior management systems.	1.60	2.60	1.00
3.3 Establish school structures and processes that support student learning.	1.80	2.60	0.80
3.4 Utilize effective systems management, organizational development, and problem-solving and decision-making techniques.	1.60	2.40	0.80
3.5 Align fiscal, human, and material resources to support the learning of all subgroups of students.	1.40	2.20	0.80
3.6 Monitor and evaluate the program and staff.	1.20	2.00	0.80
3.7 Manage legal and contractual agreements and records in ways that foster a professional work environment and secure privacy and confidentiality for all students and staff.	1.80	2.60	0.80

Standard 4: Working with Diverse Families and Communities

Question	Aggregate Initial Average	Aggregate End of Program Average	Aggregate Average Growth
4.1 Recognize and respect the goals and aspirations of diverse family and community groups.	1.40	2.80	1.40
4.2 Treat diverse community stakeholder groups with fairness and respect.	1.80	2.80	1.00
4.3 Incorporate information about family and community expectations into school decision-making and activities.	1.20	2.60	1.40
4.4 Strengthen the school through the establishment of community, business, institutional, and civic partnerships.	1.00	2.20	1.20
4.5 Communicate information about the school on a regular and predictable basis through a variety of media.	1.40	2.00	0.60
4.6 Support the equitable success of all students and all subgroups of students by mobilizing and leveraging community support services	1.00	2.00	1.00

Standard 5: Personal Ethics and Leadership Capacity

Question	Aggregate Initial Average	Aggregate End of Program Average	Aggregate Average Growth
5.1 Model personal and professional ethics, integrity, justice, and fairness, and expect the same behaviors from others.	1.22	3.00	1.78
5.2 Protect the rights and confidentiality of students and staff.	2.20	3.00	0.80
5.3 Use the influence of office to enhance the educational program, not personal gain.	1.80	2.80	1.00

Question	Aggregate Initial Average	Aggregate End of Program Average	Aggregate Average Growth
5.4 Make and communicate decisions based upon relevant data and research about effective teaching and learning, leadership, management practices, and equity.	**1.60**	**2.60**	**1.00**
5.5 Demonstrate knowledge of the standards-based curriculum and the ability to integrate and articulate programs throughout the grades.	**1.40**	**2.20**	**0.80**
5.6 Demonstrate skills in decision-making, problem solving, change management, planning, conflict management, and evaluation.	**1.40**	**2.40**	**1.00**
5.7 Reflect on personal leadership practices and recognize their impact and influence on the performance of others.	**1.40**	**2.60**	**1.20**
5.8 Engage in professional and personal development.	**1.80**	**3.00**	**1.20**
5.9 Encourage and inspire others to higher levels of performance, commitment, and motivation.	**1.60**	**2.60**	**1.00**
5.10 Sustain personal motivation, commitment, energy, and health by balancing professional and personal responsibilities	**1.80**	**3.00**	**1.20**

Standard 6: Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Understanding

Question	Aggregate Initial Average	Aggregate End of Program Average	Aggregate Average Growth
6.1 Work with the governing board and district and local leaders to influence policies that benefit students and support the improvement of teaching and learning.	**1.40**	**2.00**	**0.60**
6.2 Influence and support public policies that ensure the equitable distribution of resources and support for all subgroups of	**1.40**	**2.00**	**0.60**

students.			
6.3 Ensure that the school operates consistently within the parameters of federal, state, and local laws, policies, regulations, and statutory requirements.	1.20	2.00	0.80
6.4 Generate support for the school by two-way communication with key decision-makers in the school community.	1.20	2.40	1.20
6.5 Collect and report accurate records of school performance.	1.20	2.00	0.80
6.6 View oneself as a leader of a team and also as a member of a larger team.	1.40	2.60	1.20
6.7 Open the school to the public and welcome and facilitate constructive conversations about how to improve student learning and achievement.	1.20	2.00	0.80

Alumni Survey

The third assessment surveys alumni of the program. While the exit survey captures a student's confidence in their abilities, the alumni survey collects data from alumni working in the field, who have had time to reflect upon their preparation. This allows the University of San Francisco to see if the alumni in the field feel like they have been adequately prepared for the real-life challenges they are faced with, which might be a different perspective from that of students who were just finishing their program, as assessed in the exit survey

Scale of 1-4: 1=directed toward standard; 2= approaches the standard; 3= meets the standard; 4=exemplifies the standard

Standard	Aggregate Average
Standard 1: I have demonstrated the ability to shape school programs, plans, and activities to ensure integration, articulation and consistency with the vision	3.25
Standard 2: I have demonstrated the ability to be a critical consumer of research and	3.5

the ability to use research and site-based data to design, implement, support, evaluate, and improve instructional programs.	
Standard 3: I have demonstrated the ability to efficiently and purposefully manage organizational elements of the school (fiscal, facilities, safety, resources, legal, disciplinary, etc) in the service of teaching and learning outcomes for students.	2.75
Standard 4: I have demonstrated the ability to engage family and community stakeholders in student learning outcomes.	3.5
Standard 5: I have demonstrated the ability to be reflective with self and with peers, and to interrogate my own practices.	4
Standard 6: I have shown the ability to examine and address the complexities of diversity and equity in the classroom, the school, the community and in the society.	3.5

Job Placement Data

The fourth and final data point is that of students' job placement, to ensure that University of San Francisco students are able to secure the jobs that they want, and also to see what types of jobs they are choosing to move into following completion of the program. This allows the university to ensure that students from the program are able to find the types of jobs that they want, as well as to understand why they are choosing the roles that they are choosing.

2012-2014 Credential Graduates Choosing to Stay in Classroom	2012-2014 Credential Graduates Accepting Administration Offers	2012-2014 Credential Graduates Applying/Rejected for Administration Positions	2012-2014 Credential Graduates Currently taking roles outside of classroom or administration
9	8	2	2
43%	37%	10%	10%

b) What additional information about candidate and program completer performance or program effectiveness is collected and analyzed that informs programmatic decision making?

Signature Assignments for each course	**Assignments tied to CPSELs to help instructor to see if candidates are addressing standards and understanding course content**
Mock Interviews (local school leaders come and interview current students / they provide feedback to students but also to program director about student responses)	**Have an opportunity to support candidates in their growth. We also receive feedback from school leaders about what content, standards, issues candidates seem to have a strong grasp of and areas where the program needs to be strengthened**
Teacher created surveys	**Faculty use these surveys to determine areas of improvement needed in their own instruction, but also provides feedback on course content that may need to be modified for the future (i.e. Assessments for the Common Core)**
Fieldwork meetings with site supervisor	**A faculty member visits each candidates' school site 6 times during their fieldwork. He/she has opportunities to check in with site supervisor to see what student and program needs are at these times.**

PART III – Analyses and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

Analyzing our candidate data, we find that across our assessment tools that candidates are experiencing growth in the program in all areas. Based on the 4 Assessments shared above and the Signature Assignments for each course, we feel that our candidates have grown and advanced their knowledge on the CPSELs. However, there are still several areas that need strengthening based on our collected data and follow-up interviews with candidates. We must continue to strengthen budgeting opportunities for candidates. While they have the opportunity to create a budget and work with budgets as part of the Budget and Finance course we are still looking to create more opportunities for this in the Field Experience. We believe with LCAP/LCFF that we will now need to have students participate in this work at their school site/district. Another area the data is highlighting where we can continue to build opportunities is around school-wide opportunities in terms of visioning and accountability systems. Candidates are receiving numerous opportunities in these areas through coursework and field experience. We are strengthening this by moving the entire program to a 30 unit program in the Fall of 2015 which will incorporate a Capstone Experience that provide more opportunity for this and feedback for candidates in both areas. Currently, most of our candidates do take this Capstone course, but it has only been required for those candidates also completing their Masters with us.

In terms of program effectiveness, we feel confident that we are effectively addressing program standards. An area that our data does highlight and that we continue to work on is creating more assessments that provide us more data on our candidates and program. In

the next section we further discuss efforts that began last year and are still implementing. We feel as a program we want to create more frequent data points to provide candidates more substantial feedback outside the feedback they are receiving in coursework and during their field experience coursework.

PART IV – Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

In this section we return to the same focus that we had last year for our report. We stated that last year based on this analysis of the current assessment tools, the ASC credential program has endeavored to design and implement new tools and scoring protocols that will provide consistent, reliable, program-level performance data, starting with three instruments. While we have developed these tools during the 2013-2014 Academic Year, we were not able to implement all our efforts into practice. We highlight the work we will be doing this academic year based on our findings from the last two years.

The first assessment instrument is a CSPEL-based tool that will be used at key points during the program, called the "School Leader Descriptions of Practice Reflection Tool." ASC candidates will evaluate themselves on each component of the six CPSELs, using a detailed rubric called the "CPSEL Self-Assessment Rubric" adapted from the Merced County Office of Education. Candidates will collect and comment on artifacts that reflect their current level of performance in each component of the CPSELs, and present these to departmental faculty during the advising process, and at several key points during the program. Parallel to the self-evaluation, departmental faculty will evaluate the candidate on each CPSEL component. In addition to facilitating candidates' professional goal-setting, the tool will generate data that will provide insights into the extent to which the candidates perceive themselves as growing in the CSPELs throughout the course of the program. They will also provide comparative information showing the degree of alignment between the candidate's self-perfection and the faculty's assessment of the candidate's level of achievement.

The second tool is a detailed interview rubric based on professional standards for school leaders, adapted from the Denver Public Schools interview rubric used in hiring school administrators. Faculty will use this tool to evaluate candidates' performance in practice interview scenarios. Candidates will be provided both with feedback from faculty and professionals from the field including administrators and superintendents after the mock interview and with additional opportunities for practice as they progress through the program, so this assessment tool will serve a formative purpose. In addition, the scores on the rubric will be collected to serve as a point of triangulation and opportunity for pattern observation alongside the scores on the CPSEL Descriptions of Practice Reflection Tool. The pilot year of implementation and consultation from expert practitioners from local school districts will provide input for fine-tuning and concretizing this instrument. Additional work around validity and inter-rater reliability should be considered as well.

The third instrument that is still being finalized is a School Based Problem Assessment that groups of candidates will work to solve. Candidates will be given a scenario in which they will have to collectively work to solve. Candidates will be scored by observers based on CPSELs as well as on how they interact and work with their team.

It is the long-term strategy of the department to create a robust assessment framework and set of data sources that will provide the faculty with greater reliability, the candidates with a more meaningful assessment experience, and the department with more

influential findings to impact program improvement, particularly with regard to curricular and instructional mapping. The pilot and implementation of these three new tools are a step toward redefining our instructional priorities and institutionalizing the use of new instruments that will facilitate both data gathering and program improvement based on that data for future reporting years.

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART I – Contextual Information

University of San Francisco

The University of San Francisco (USF) is a private, Jesuit institution located in the urban environment of San Francisco (Hilltop Campus) with additional branch campuses in Santa Rosa, Sacramento, Pleasanton, and San Jose. USF strives to provide its undergraduate and graduate students with a global perspective and has a university-wide focus on social justice issues. The university enrolls approximately 10,000 students per year.

SECTION B

INSTITUTIONAL SUMMARY AND PLAN OF ACTION

This following tables reflect the USF School of Education's review of the reports from all USF Commission-approved educator preparation programs: Preliminary Multiple Subjects with or without a Bilingual Authorization (Spanish) and with or without Intern Option; Preliminary Single Subject Credential with or without a Bilingual Authorization (Spanish) and with or without Intern Option; Reading Certificate; Preliminary Education Specialist (Mild/Moderate) with or without a Bilingual Authorization (Spanish) Option; Preliminary Administrative Services Credential; Clear Administrative Services Credential; Clear School Counseling (PPS) Credential. The summary is submitted by Associate Dean Christopher Thomas.

1) USF Unit Wide Assessments Matrix

USF Assessments	Instrument	Evaluation Period	Evaluators	TED	READ	SPED	ASC	PPS
Petition to Graduation	Online Survey	End of Program	Graduating Candidates	X	X	X	X	X
Course/Faculty Evaluations	SUMMA	End of each course	Candidates	X	X	X	X	X
3-Year Program assessment Plan linked to WASC Learning Outcomes	Dept./programs select a section of curriculum map to review through survey, rubric, course assessments.	Yearly	Faculty	X	X	X	X	X
Program Review	USF Self-Study Template	Every 3-5 years	Outside Reviewers	X	X	X	X	X
SOE Assessments	Instrument	Evaluation Period	Evaluators	TED	READ	SPED	ASC	PPS
Entry Survey	Online Survey	Beginning of Program	Candidates	X	X	X	X	X

Exit Survey	**Online Survey**	**End of Program**	**Candidates**	X	X	X	X	X
Field Practicum Evaluations/Assessment (Standards and/or competency based)	**Survey, Competency Checklist, Rubrics, Written Response to Prompts**	**Throughout Field Practicum**	**USF Supervisors; District/Site Placement Employed Supervisors**	X	X	X	X	X
Signature Assignments; Embedded Course Assessments	**Course Assessments linked to specific program competencies**	**By Course**	**Faculty**	X	X	X	X	X
Cumulative Course Work	**GPA (minimum B average required)**	**Across program**	**Faculty**	X	X	X	X	X
Program Specific Assessments	**Instrument**	**Evaluation Period**	**Evaluators**	**TED**	**READ**	**SPED**	**ASC**	**PPS**
Teaching Performance Assessment	**CalTPA; PACT**	**During Student Teaching Practicum**	**Calibrated Assessors**	X				
Faculty feedback, e.g. Mid-Semester Check-In	**Written Response to Prompts**	**Throughout program**	**Faculty**	X		X		X
Graduate Survey	**Survey**	**Graduates 1-3 years after graduation**	**Graduates**	X			X	
Employer Survey	**Survey**	**Yearly or Bi-Yearly**	**Employers**	X				
Support Providers (Pilot 2013-2014)	**Survey**	**Yearly or Bi-Yearly**	**New Teacher Support Providers, USF Fieldwork Supervisors**	X		X		
Course Evaluation	**Narrative response to questions/prompts**	**End of each course**	**Candidates**	X	X	X		
RICA	**Written Examination or Video Performance Assessment**	**Prior to end of program**	**Calibrated RICA Assessors**	X	X	X		
3-Way Evaluation	**Survey, Competency Checklist, Rubrics, Written Response to Prompts**	**Each semester in field practicum**	**USF Supervisors; District/Site Placement Employed Supervisors**	X	X	X	X	
School Counseling Competency Attestation Sheet	**Competency Checklist w/ narrative**	**Throughout program**	**Candidate, Instructor, USF Field Work Supervisor, Site Supervisor**					X
School Counseling Final Fieldwork Evaluation Form	**Rubric linked to competencies; Written response to prompts**	**End of program**	**Site Placement Supervisors**					X

TPE Formative Assessment Goals	Rubric	Throughout Program	Fieldwork Coordinator, USF Fieldwork Supervisor			X		
Candidate TPE Self-Evaluation	TPE competencies using Likert Scale	End of each semester	Candidate			X		
Portfolio	Rubric linked to TPE competencies	Through out program; at end of program	Faculty (READ & SPED), Fieldwork Coordinator (SPED), USF Supervisor (SPED)		X	X		
Job Placement Data	Survey	Yearly	Chair/Program Coordinator				X	X
Mock Interviews	Interview with potential employers	End of Program	Potential Employers				X	

2) Documentation of Unit Assessment System Based on Analysis of Data 2011-12 and 2012-13

Action Taken	Date	Data Source(s)	Analysis Leading to Action
USF Petition to Graduate Survey Data	2011	Candidates must petition to graduate. To complete the petition process each candidate must respond to a survey (4-point Likert scale).	In writing the response to the Common Standards in 2011 as part of the new Bilingual Authorization, it was discovered that units could request and get data from the graduation survey, disaggregated to reflect only the graduates from the unit or specific programs within the unit. This survey, which had similar questions to a section of the exit surveys being used by most programs, provided additional support for the data analysis of those internal program surveys.
Formation of the SOE Assessment Committee: The group meets monthly during the academic year. Members include staff and faculty from all credential/licensure programs as well as the Credential Analyst, TPA Coordinator, and Associate Dean overseeing credential programs.	2011	Feedback from programs related to writing of Program Assessment documents; CTC Feedback on Biennial Report; Common Standards revision; feedback from USF BIR members	Programs were working independently on many of the same issues/addressing many of the same concerns. This was particularly challenging for small programs with just 1 or 2 faculty members. The Committee was formed initially to provide support. Through program presentations around assessment, the focus shifted to focus on collaborating to refine as well as develop assessment tools that are closely align across all programs, This is leading to better data for unit assessment and improvement that can also be disaggregated for program level assessment and improvement.
Alignment of Likert-scale definitions on field practicum evaluations	2013	Program presentations of field practicum evaluation forms at SOE Assessment Committee meetings	In reviewing field practicum evaluation forms, it became clear that better definitions of the Likert scales being used were needed to give those completing the forms a clearer picture of how programs defined candidate progress toward meeting the competencies set out for each program. It also became clear that it was possible to use the same Likert scale with identical definitions of each point across programs. Revisions are being reviewed by faculty with plans to implemented beginning in 2013-2014.
Entry and Exit Surveys	2011-2012	Program presentations of entry and exit surveys at SOE Assessment Committee meetings	In reviewing the entry and exit surveys as well as the methods used to complete these, it became clear that a unified online system could be developed. A Graduate Merit Scholar worked with the committee to set up an online survey system that collected all the

			common information and provided a system for candidates from specific credential/certificate programs to answer program specific questions.
Graduate Data Base	**2013**	**Program faculty; USF Alumnae Relations Office**	There is no system for collecting and keeping alumni information that is useful to the credential programs in reviewing and analyzing data from program graduates related to their employment, and self-assessment of preparation for the job. The lack of such a system also makes it difficult to contact a wide range of graduates' employers to get feedback on how our graduates are performing in their profession. After several years and multiple attempts to get a system in place through a variety of entities, the SOE Assessment Committee has elected to develop the database with the goal of having a database covering at least the past 2-3 years of graduates and employers completed by Fall 2014 as a way to begin a more systematic survey of these individuals for data for unit and program improvement.

3) Common Standard Implications Fall 2014

Identified Issue	Program(s) Involved	Area of Strength or Area to Improve	Applicable Common Standard
Database of Graduates and Employers	**All (TED,READ, SPED, ASC, PPS)**	<u>Area for Improvement</u>: The lack of a university-wide database that can be disaggregated by unit and program has been a deterrent to consistently collecting information from our graduates and their employers. An "in-house" database, specific to credential programs, will provide better data for use in unit and program assessment and improvement. Programs began in 2013-2014 to contact graduates and collect data through Linked In sites, including employer data. The data collection continues. In addition, in May 2014 programs actively asked candidates graduating to join the Linked In site for their program and informed them they would be contacted to update their employment status yearly.	**2**
Alignment of Likert scales used to assess candidate competence in field placements	**All (TED, READ, SPED, ASC, PPS)**	The use of Likert scales to evaluate candidate demonstration of competency in field settings has been a challenge. <u>Area of Strength</u>: First, the definition of each point on the Likert scale has varied from program to program. That has been/is being addressed. <u>Area for Improvement</u>: The next step is to more effectively orient District/Site Placement Employed Supervisors to these definitions and what each level "looks like" in practice as a way of both informing the program and the candidate of areas of strength and areas that need improvement.	**6, 9**
Exit Survey Data Collection	**All (TED, READ, SPED, ASC, PPS)**	<u>Area for Improvement</u>: When programs were collecting their exit survey in a paper, face-to-face, mode (typically in a last class), the return rate was extremely high. The decision to go to an electronic format was made for a wide range of reasons but has resulted in an inconsistent, and often lower rate of return. This is an issue that programs as well as the SOE Assessment Committee continue to examine.	**2**
Better assessment tools	**All (TED,**	<u>Area of Strength</u>: TED has an advantage in the assessment tool area due to the TPA.	**2, 6, 9**

that are valid and reliable	READ, SPED, ASC, PPS)	**Area for Improvement:** The challenge for the other programs is to find tools that provide a high level of valid and reliable data, similar to the TPA, as part of the program and candidate assessment. Data of this caliber would also provide solid unit-wide assessment data. Programs continue to investigate, develop, and refine data instruments that will provide better data for program review and improvement.	
SOE Assessment Group	**All (TED, READ, SPED, ASC, PPS), Dean's Office, Credential Analyst, TPA Coordinator**	**Area of Strength:** The establishment of this group and its ongoing work on assessment for unit and program improvement has had a profound impact on how we collaborate on program development.	**1, 2, 9**