

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

Professional Services Division

April 2015

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at the University of San Francisco. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self- Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation of **Accreditation with Required 7th Year Report** is made for the institution.

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

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

Program Standards

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject	19	19		
Single Subject	19	19		
Bilingual Authorization	6	6		
Education Specialist: MM	22	19	3	
Preliminary Administrative Services	15	15		
PPS: School Counseling	32	30	2	
Reading Certificate (Added Authorization)	5	5		

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

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

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

Institution: University of San Francisco

Dates of Visit: March 22-25, 2015

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: Accreditation

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** with a required 7th Year Report, was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, advisory members, and local school personnel, and additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team agreed they obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards

Site visit team members reviewed the nine Common Standards to determine if the standards were met, met with concerns, or not met. The team found that all Common Standards are **Met** with the exception of Common Standard 2, which was **Met with Concerns**. For Common Standard 2, the team found that USF has developed a unit assessment with many aspects of the system in place, but the complete system will not be implemented until the 2015-2016 academic year.

Program Standards

The University of San Francisco offers eight credential/certificate programs: a Multiple/Single subject program with internship, an Education Specialist Mild/Moderate internship program, a Bilingual Authorization program, a Preliminary Administrative Services program, a Pupil Personnel Services Program: School Counseling with internship program, and a Reading Certificate Added Authorization program. Based on the team's review, all program standards for these programs were found to be fully met with the exception of the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate internship program, with three program standards which were **Met with Concerns**, and the Pupil Personnel Services Program: School Counseling, with two program standards which were **Met with Concerns**.

Overall Recommendation

Due to the finding that one Common Standard was Met with Concerns, three program standards in the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate program were Met with Concerns, and two program standards in the School Counseling program were Met with Concerns the team

unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation** with a Required 7th Year Report for the University of San Francisco and its programs.

7th Year Report

At the time of the site visit, the University of San Francisco had designed a comprehensive program evaluation system but had not yet fully implemented its unit evaluation system. The timeline for complete implementation is for the 2015-16 academic year. In addition, the two programs with standards that were less than fully met are in the process of addressing all concerns that the team found. Therefore, the team recommends that a 7th Year Report, demonstrating implementation of their unit evaluation system and addressing the issues in the two programs.

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

Initial/Teaching Credentials	Advanced/Service Credentials
Multiple Subject	Administrative Services
Multiple Subject	Preliminary
Multiple Subject Internships	
	Pupil Personnel Services
Single Subject	School Counseling w/ Internship
Single Subject	
Single Subject Internships	Bilingual Authorization
Education Specialist Credentials	
Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internships	Reading Certificate

Staff recommends that:

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

Accreditation Team

Team Leader:

Chris Hopper
Humboldt State University

Common Standards Cluster:

Anne Weisenberg
CSU Stanislaus

June Hetzel
Biola University

Basic/Teaching Programs Cluster:

Paula Carbone
University of Southern California

Nanette Fritschmann
National University

Advanced/Services Programs Cluster:

Cartha Tennille
La Sierra University

Carol Robinson-Zanartu
San Diego State University

Staff to the Visit:

Geri Mohler
CTC Consultant

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Report
Course Syllabi
Candidate Files
Fieldwork Handbooks
Follow-up Survey Results
Needs Analysis Results
Program Assessment Feedback
Biennial Report Feedback
Field Experience Notebooks
Schedule of Classes
Advisement Documents

Faculty Vitae
School of Education Strategic Plan
School of Education Budget Plan
TPA Data
Application and Admission Packets
Preconditions
Program Assessment Documents
Marketing Brochures
Advisory Board PowerPoint and Minutes
Faculty Meeting Minutes
Electronic Exhibit Video Introductions

Interviews Conducted

	Team Leader	Common Standards Cluster	Program Sampling Cluster	TOTAL
Candidates		36	94	130
Completers		43	76	119
Employers	8	13	13	34
Institutional Administration	6	7	4	27
Program Coordinators	3	23	16	42
Faculty		10	61	71
TPA Coordinator		1	1	2
Advisors		10		10
Field Supervisors – Program		13	31	44
Field Supervisors - District		1	28	29
Advisory Board Members	6	10	2	18
Credential Analysts and Staff	3	1		4
Other		5	1	6
			TOTAL	536

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

Background Information

The University of San Francisco (USF) is one of 28 Jesuit Catholic colleges in the country and the oldest university in San Francisco. USF is located in the urban environment of San Francisco (Hilltop Campus) with additional branch campuses in Santa Rosa, Sacramento, Pleasanton, and San Jose. The university enrolls approximately 10,000 students per year. The goal of USF is to provide a rigorous education to prepare leaders in all fields who will work to create a more humane and just world. USF's five schools/colleges offer over 100 degree programs at the graduate and undergraduate level to a diverse student body. Jesuit values are central to the academic life at USF and encourage students to: strive for excellence beyond grades; promote critical inquiry that encourages questioning, exploring and engaging in reflection; pursue diversity in faculty, staff, and students that welcomes all as full partners in the educational enterprise; instill leadership in service that exposes students to the voices of the underserved, the disadvantaged, and the poor and provides opportunities to participate in service experiences; and promote justice through providing students a place to develop talents and skills that they can use to create a better world now and in the future.

Education Unit

The USF School of Education (SOE) offers credential and graduate programs designed to meet the needs of aspiring and practicing educators, counselors, and leaders to assume leadership

roles in public, private, and independent schools, colleges, and universities, human services and government agencies, and corporate settings. The SOE consists of a Dean, three Associate Deans, 25 staff, 44 full-time faculty members all of whom hold doctoral degrees, and a Master Teacher in Residence. There are currently 1,069 candidates enrolled in the School of Education programs.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of program completers (2013-14)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (2014-15)	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject w/ Internship	Initial	92	169	CTC
Single Subject w/ Internship	Initial	59	118	CTC
Education Specialist M/M Internship	Initial	9	15	CTC
Bilingual Authorization	Advanced	10	14	CTC
Reading Certificate (Added Authorization)	Advanced	19	14	CTC
Preliminary Administrative Services	Advanced	6	11	CTC
PPS: School Counseling w/ Internship	Advanced	29	51	CTC

The Visit

The accreditation site visit to the University of San Francisco (USF) began on Sunday, March 22, 2015. On the first evening, the USF President, the Dean and an Associate Dean of the School of Education welcomed the team and other faculty and staff and gave a brief introduction and overview of the unit, followed by a number of interviews with various constituents. Data collection and interviews by the seven-member team continued on Monday, March 23rd and Tuesday, March 24th with the School of Education leadership team, faculty, candidates, completers, employers, advisory committee members, and District-Employed Supervisors. A mid-visit report was provided to the School of Education Dean, and selected SOE staff on Tuesday morning. Consensus was reached on all standard findings and the accreditation

recommendation. The visit concluded with an exit report at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, March 25, 2015.

Common Standards

Standard 1: Educational Leadership

Met

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

As a Jesuit Catholic University, the vision and mission of the university form the foundation upon which programs and courses are built. The goal of USF is to provide a rigorous education to prepare leaders in all fields who will work to create a more humane and just world. The USF School of Education (SOE) offers credential and graduate programs for educators, counselors, and administrators to assume leadership roles in public, private, and independent schools. All programs emphasize the responsibility of all candidates in their own learning experience and help candidates define what it means to work, both as an individual and as a member of a community, for social justice in the world. The SOE has recently developed a Strategic Plan to help guide their program development activities.

The School of Education's credential programs are designed to prepare educators to work in California's diverse P-12 schools, with a particular focus on urban schools. The SOE currently offers nine credential/certificate programs along with 14 Master of Arts and five Doctoral degrees. All credential programs are linked with MA degrees, with the Administrative Services credential also linked with a doctoral degree (Ed.D.) in the Department of Leadership Studies. Basic credentials offered include the Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist Mild/Moderate programs, all of which can be combined with a Bilingual Authorization in Spanish. Advanced programs include School Counseling, Preliminary Administrative Services, and the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization. Candidates in preliminary credential programs are provided with a solid foundation in the adopted academic content standards and frameworks specific to the credential for which each candidate is being prepared.

A research-based vision is evident across all programs within the School of Education. Programs are informed by research aimed at preparing candidates to promote equity, diversity and social justice in P-12 schools. This research includes sociocultural theories of learning and development and critical theories of inequality in schools and society. Faculty are engaged in scholarship that makes explicit connections among research, policy, and practice.

The School of Education (SOE) Credential Programs Advisory Board includes stakeholders from the University, community, county offices of education, and local districts/schools who offer guidance and support in program development, review, and continuous improvement. The Advisory Board members from local public school districts includes a principal, a school counselor, a teacher, a special education teacher, and a bilingual teacher, as well as educators from private and Catholic school communities served by the USF School of Education credential programs. The Advisory Board also includes SOE faculty, staff, and students. A school-wide Advisory Board allows for collaboration and review across credential programs that share common goals and standards.

Faculty, staff, and SOE administrators meet regularly with a wide range of school districts, Induction program personnel, and Intern Advisory Groups as a means of connecting program design to the current needs of K-12 education. These bi-monthly, quarterly, or bi-annual meetings coordinate school district and SOE planning to ensure that candidates receive instruction in the latest research-based interventions.

The School of Education’s leadership team consists of a Dean, three Associate Deans, 25 staff, 44 full-time faculty members all of whom hold doctoral degrees, and a Master Teacher in Residence. In addition, a pool of part-time/adjunct faculty, who are practitioners and hold credentials in the content area in which they teach and the majority of which hold at least a masters’ degree, are assigned to teach classes and/or supervise credential candidates on recommendation of Department Chairs.

The Credential Office at the University of San Francisco is managed by the credential analyst who provides support services to the students, faculty, and administration of the USF School of Education. A full-time Credential Analyst provides a systematic procedure for tracking the progress of candidates. Services include providing assistance with reviewing and processing credential paperwork, and submitting formal recommendations to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) for program completers. The USF School of Education Credential Office ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all program requirements.

Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation

Met with Concerns

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

The School of Education (SOE) utilizes a variety of direct and indirect evidence for regular, ongoing unit and program evaluation. The SOE has a Unit Wide Assessment Matrix that includes unit and program data sources. According to the matrix, assessment sources are from surveys, course evaluations, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) learning outcomes,

and Self-Study. Programs collect data from sources such as surveys, Field Practicum evaluations, signature assignments, and GPAs. More specific program assessments include California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA) data, surveys, course evaluations, Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) results, Competency Checklists, and rubrics. A review of documents revealed some evidence of the use of assessment results.

In the last year, the SOE has strategically added positions to support unit-wide assessment. These positions will contribute to the alignment of unit assessment with the strategic plan and mission of the SOE and thus far has supported the creation of a culture of assessment within the school. An accreditation work group has been established to review Program Assessment and Biennial Report feedback from CTC and develop a unit-wide assessment. Interviews with program coordinators and assessment coordinators confirmed that the evaluation system is in development and will include on-going assessment of unit level performance. A timeline was reviewed for the full implementation of the unit assessment that is planned for AY 2015-16. Monthly activities include developing learning outcomes and assessment flow charts, an SOE exit survey, an assessment webpage, the development of impact reports, and purchasing a school-wide data collection system to assist with the plan.

Currently, the unit-wide assessment includes the Graduation Exit Survey administered by the University and the SOE Exit Survey. These surveys contain questions common across all programs and the unit. Results of the Graduation Exit Survey were available for review but provided a more University-wide picture rather than SOE viewpoint. The SOE Exit Survey is being redesigned for implementation next year. A unit-wide Advisory Board was established and meets twice a year to discuss program improvement, receive stakeholder feedback, and review what may be needed in the field. Interviews with Advisory members revealed that their input is used to make program improvements. Further unit-wide assessments are being developed based on the SOE's Strategic Plan. These assessments will contribute to measuring the goals of the strategic plan with special emphasis on student/employer satisfaction, diversity, and learning outcomes.

Each program collects data and uses it in a variety of ways. The Multiple and Single Subject program uses competency exam scores, fieldwork evaluations, TPAs, and surveys. The Education Specialist program collects data from surveys, observations on Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), three-way evaluations, and self-assessments. The School Counseling Program uses course assessments, fieldwork evaluations, narrative evaluations, and competency attestation sheets and also tracks job placement and retention rates. The Administrative Services program collects data from fieldwork observations, projects, standards-based competency assessments, surveys, and interviews.

Data are summarized to determine program effectiveness and needed program improvements. Data are shared with Advisory Board members who also provide input on program effectiveness. Advisory board members confirmed that program data are shared and used for program improvement. During interviews, both candidates and faculty addressed the evaluation system and confirming documentation was found in program materials. Examples cited during interviews with completers and candidates revealed what program changes were

made based on data collection and analyses. Program faculty confirmed that data are reviewed in meetings throughout the academic year to make decisions about admissions, candidate competency, program completer performance, and program design/improvement. Interviews with coordinators and faculty confirmed that data are shared used to make program improvements. Coordinators and faculty indicated that as a result of this, data-driven process meetings now include adjunct faculty who contribute to changes in course content, program design, and delivery.

Rationale:

The self-study and its supporting documentation, including additional on-site documents provided to the accreditation team members and interviews with unit leaders, program coordinators, and faculty, indicated that the SOE’s unit assessment system is not yet fully operational. Currently, the SOE’s assessment and evaluation system generates substantial data on candidates at the program level; however, the SOE lacks sufficient assessment and evaluation of unit operations. The team found evidence that the SOE has begun efforts to build its unit assessment and evaluation system. They have a well-articulated timeline that places full implementation of the unit-wide assessment during the 2015-2016 Academic Year. Included in the timeline is a plan for ongoing evaluation of the unit assessment system. The SOE recognized the need for a more unified, unit-driven assessment and evaluation structure. The recent hiring of the associate dean and assistant director of assessment promises to bring a centralized focus to assessment and evaluation to ensure a cohesive unit level assessment and evaluation process by the end of the 2015-2016 school year.

Standard 3: Resources

Met

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

The USF Office of Planning, Budget, and Review prepares a budget in consultation with the Executive Officers and Leadership Team and feedback from a wide-range of unit administrators and personnel. Each unit in the University is provided with a base budget that includes all expenses for that unit: salaries, benefits, material resources, expenses for travel, professional development, and general operating expenses. The School of Education budget has line items for each program/department. The budget is shared each year with the Department Chairs. Chairs share the budget with their departments and it is the departments that determine how to allot non-restricted funds. If needed, adjustments are made to budget lines by the SOE Leadership Team.

Support is provided for admissions, scheduling and student services, marketing and recruiting,

technology, assistants, assessment, facilities, and credential analysts. During interviews, coordinators, faculty, and candidates all confirmed that the budget was adequate to prepare candidates effectively to meet standards for their programs. Interviews with budget personnel confirmed that there is a collaborative process that determines each of the program's needs and allots enough money for their effective operation. The budget process is very organized and transparent.

The School of Education budget provides resources for the operation of all SOE functions. Money is allocated to support full-time and adjunct faculty with professional development opportunities. Staff is also eligible for professional development money. Field-based supervisors are paid and some onsite supporters are compensated with stipends. Assessment management is supported and the TPA is fully funded and provided to all credential candidates at no additional cost outside of the purchase of a Taskstream account (\$69 for a two-year subscription). Interviews verified that the budget supports the successful operation of all programs and assessment.

A range of resources are available to candidates, faculty, and staff ranging from free counseling to career counseling to health services to computer training to lectures for professional and personal growth. A few of the primary resources are: Career Services, Center for Instructional Technology, Counseling and Psychology Center, Curriculum Resource Center, Library, Learning and Writing Center, Financial Aid, and Student Disability services. Branch campuses offer similar resources. During interviews, candidates confirmed that resources were readily available and contributed to their success. Candidates indicated they felt faculty members were accessible and personal connections between themselves, SOE staff, and faculty were common. Candidates mentioned that it would be helpful to have more money available for scholarships, especially for diverse candidates. During interviews, candidates suggested that an addition of a field placement support person would assist with more timely placements.

Faculty confirmed that resources were excellent. Many have successfully applied for a variety of grants to support travel, professional development, research, and scholarship. Faculty also commented on the dean's fundraising efforts to secure more resources for the school. They are hoping that additional money will help fund more scholarships for candidates.

Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel**Met**

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

All full-time faculty in the School of Education have earned doctorates and are assigned to teach courses for which they are fully qualified through their P-12 experience, scholarship, and teaching. Adjunct faculty are hired by departments to teach specific courses for which they are qualified and require P-12 experience. The process for hiring University Supervisors for field-based/clinical experiences is identical to that used for hiring adjunct faculty. Faculty mentioned that they “actively seek engaged scholars.” A review of vitae indicates that faculty and adjunct faculty have expertise and experience relevant to their assigned duties. Interviews with coordinators, faculty, and candidates indicated that adjunct faculty are all practicing or retired educators and very knowledgeable in their field. In interviews with candidates and program completers, faculty were commended for their deep knowledge of their field of study and for their ongoing commitment to staying current in their fields and working towards social justice. Candidates and completers acknowledged a strong connection between theory and practice in all of their coursework.

As was evident in the vitae of full-time faculty, all have a background as practitioners in their credential/program area of focus prior to entering higher education as a professor/instructor in that credential program. All are active in professional organizations from the local to the national level. Further documents reviewed indicated that faculty are very involved in P-12 research and service. Numerous projects reflect the collaborative efforts of faculty within and beyond the university such as co-teaching, co-planning, induction consortiums, research, and supervision. Advisory Board members and candidates confirmed these collaborative efforts and praised the SOE faculty for their authentic community involvement.

The SOE upholds the university’s mission/vision and a commitment as an “Equal Opportunity Employer dedicated to affirmative action and to excellence through diversity.” USF and the School of Education purposefully recruit staff and faculty, both full-time and part-time, who are representative of a diverse society. The SOE faculty represents the demographics of the various communities in the Bay Area and the schools they serve.

Faculty involvement in P-12 schools provides opportunities for faculty to see the application of

standards and accountability systems in the day-to-day operation of P-12 schools. A review of vitae and interview responses indicated that the SOE faculty and program coordinators maintain currency through involvement in local schools and their respective professional associations. SOE credential program faculty are actively involved on the local through national level working with colleagues in P-12 schools and institutions of higher education to continue to improve both their personal skills and program design to best prepare candidates for their professional roles. Advisory board members confirmed that SOE faculty have a collaborative relationship with P-12 school communities.

Each year USF provides professional development funds for all full-time and adjunct faculty. USF also has a Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) that develops, supports, and celebrates excellent teaching across all departments and schools/colleges. The Center offers programs and activities in a variety of areas. Many faculty participate in the CTE activities and are especially appreciative of the scheduled writing retreats. As indicated during interviews with the budget team and faculty, the SOE also contributes to faculty development by providing resources for materials, travel, teaching effectiveness, community engagement, and research.

All faculty are evaluated each semester using the SUMMA—a survey of student opinion of instruction—developed and used through a contract with SUMMA Information Systems, Inc. Coordinators and faculty confirmed that when faculty teaching performance is below average they are provided additional support. As learned through interviews with coordinators and faculty, support comes in the form of mentors, co-teaching/planning, professional development seminars and the Center for Teaching Excellence.

Standard 5: Admission

Met

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

In each credential or certificate program, qualified candidates are admitted on the basis of carefully defined admissions criteria and procedures. All credential/certificate programs require applicants to provide the same basic application documents. Interviews with SOE Admissions confirmed that all applications to the School of Education are first reviewed by the Office Assistant for Admissions (OAA) in the SOE Dean's Office who works directly with applicants to verify that all admissions documents have been received and each application packet is complete. Once an application packet is complete, it is submitted to department/program faculty. During interviews, candidates indicated that it was a streamlined process and the admissions office was extremely diligent in making sure packets were complete and forwarded to the correct departments. Each department/program has a specific review process that uses multiple measures to ensure candidates are well qualified. Document review and interviews

with coordinators defined the process in more detail. Any questions about appropriate credentialing requirements in the admissions process are directed to the Credential Analyst to double check before admittance. Candidates did express a concern about the length of time from application to notice of acceptance.

The SOE application packet provides programs with multiple measures that are used in the application process to admit candidates to the program. The SOE and the credential programs are committed to recruiting and training professional educators who represent a diverse P-12 population. Applicants can voluntarily provide demographic information but it is not used for admission decisions. Interviews with SOE program coordinators and staff articulated a commitment to recruiting a diverse candidate population. The process starts with an outreach team recruiting in a variety of places including Historically Black Universities, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, Tribal Universities, other universities in urban areas, and at diversity forums and conferences. A database is kept on prospective students and information on types of financial assistance is provided to under-represented groups in admission.

A review of documentation and interviews with staff and candidates confirmed that the SOE has established well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements, for each of its credential programs. Embedded within the admissions process is a series of writing prompts and interview questions. The application process provides the School of Education and credential programs with the initial information about each applicant's life experiences, personal characteristics, and potential for professional success working with the diverse populations in California's schools. Coordinators explained that each program has its own criteria of how to determine appropriate pre-professional experiences, personal characteristics, and effective communication skills. The most common ways were through interviews, reviewing letters of recommendations, and letters of intent. At any time during the process, if the admission team is unsure about a candidate's competence, a more in-depth, face-to-face interview is scheduled.

Once a candidate is admitted there is a process in place for the faculty of each program to monitor candidate progress in order to assure they are recommending the most qualified candidates for credentials. A comprehensive process is in place to help candidates who may be experiencing difficulties. Candidates are given every opportunity to address and correct problems prior to adverse actions being taken. Advisory board members commented that they prefer to hire graduates of USF's SOE because they are well-prepared, practice social justice by challenging the existing educational system, and view "education through the lens of equity."

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance**Met**

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

Administrators, directors, and coordinators confirmed that advisors are full-time faculty and that they provide a minimum of two hours per week for walk-in appointments with advisees. Advisors meet with their advisees, individually and in groups, prior to registration, in order to plan the next semester and review academic progress and status with respect to appropriate credential requirements. Advisors are available to candidates by phone, email, and in-person appointments. Candidates remain with the same advisor throughout the program, though candidates can request to change advisors, and minimally meet with their advisor one time per semester. These procedures have been verified through interviews with administration, faculty, and staff, along with reviewing advising protocols, advising calendars of faculty and staff, program advisement forms, and sample correspondence between advisors and advisees.

Interviews with field placement coordinators, employers, and program completers confirmed that candidates receive career guidance and assistance for preservice placements, intern placements, and employment opportunities as a result of the close working relationship between USF and district staff. Professional placement is also supported through the Career Services Center and career fairs. Additionally, the San Francisco Teacher Residency program (a partnership between Stanford University, University of San Francisco, and San Francisco Unified School District) provides additional employment opportunities for USF candidates who successfully complete their residencies.

Interviews with an associate dean, program directors, and faculty confirmed that advisors are trained for their academic advisory roles, though the structure for the advisor training varies from program to program. For example, in the Multiple Subjects/Single Subjects (MS/SS) programs, the Associate Dean of Credential Programs attends meetings to discuss advisory roles and the director explicitly discusses advisory roles with faculty each semester. In these meetings, best practices are shared for advising specific programs and populations (e.g., dual degree programs, special cases, struggling students, developing special plans). The MS/SS department conducts a mid-semester check-in with all instructors to record concerns (academic, social, etc.) and reflect on academic progress and fieldwork evaluations. Currently, there is a task force working on a more systematic review process, as it relates to frequency of advising, which will assist in mitigating some of the variable experiences that some MS and SS program candidates report.

As a second example, interviews with PPS administration, the program director, and faculty confirmed that the advising model is centered around guidelines from the American School Counselor Association: career development, academic progress, and social/cultural

dispositional development. Once per semester, candidate dispositions are holistically evaluated through mentor/counselor evaluations, fieldwork evaluations, and annual candidate performance reviews. In program meetings, the PPS committee focuses on advisement issues at least once per month, discussing ways to support candidates. Topics have included such things as how to support LGBTQ candidates, professional development, e-portfolios, discussions about job openings and career development, and characteristics that districts are looking for in candidates. Augmenting the PPS professor advisors, the PPS candidates are also mentored and advised through peer support (first year students paired with second year students). Peers meet two to three times per semester in a variety of contexts: socials, alumni panels, networking and support events, and in group advisement.

A review of program and fieldwork handbooks revealed that all programs provide advisement information. Department chairs and directors of all credential and authorization programs are responsible for the development of advising plans, handbooks, and ongoing training of advisors. Forms and handbooks are made available on *Canvas*.

Interviews with administration, directors, professors, field placement coordinators, and the credential analyst confirmed that the Associate Director of the Branch Campuses for Teacher Education and the Term Faculty Member provide advising for Branch Campuses that parallel that provided at USF's Hilltop campus. Interviews with administration, program directors, and credential analyst confirmed that the credential analyst provides advising related to meeting all state requirements for the credentials to all candidates via handbooks, websites, in-person meetings, and 1:1 appointments with the credential analyst at the completion of the program.

Interviews with administration, faculty, and staff confirmed that *Filemaker Pro*, *Banner*, and the *USF Connect* website are utilized to track each candidate's progress for purposes of advisement and program completion, though the new Director of Assessment has indicated that USF is working on one centralized database for advisors to access all data in one central location. Assessment of candidate documents by professors, field placement supervisors, cooperating teachers, and school supervisors are included in files. Supporting documentation confirmed that credential Program Advisement Forms used by advisors and candidates assist in tracking program requirements, grades, support activities, and evaluations.

Program documents, information materials on programs for potential candidates, and interviews with administration, faculty, and staff consistently confirmed that candidates must maintain a 3.0 cumulative grade point average in order to remain in the program. If a candidate falls below 3.0, the faculty advisor and Department Chair/Program Coordinator work with the candidate to develop a remediation plan. This remediation plan is built upon evidence collected over time. If candidates fail to progress at minimum standards after working through the remediation plan, they may be 1) advised to take a reduced load, 2) advised to take a leave of absence, or 3) counseled out of the program. An appeal process that starts with the department and moves to the Dean is available for those who wish to appeal.

Interviews with administration, professors, and staff confirmed that each program has its specific progress monitoring approaches. For example, in the MS/SS department, candidate

progress is tracked through the following evidence: course grades, mid-semester check-ins with instructors, Cal-TPAs, evaluations from district employees, and evaluations from University Supervisors. Other programs, such as the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate credential program, monitor progress utilizing the Task Stream Online TPE Portfolio, Three-Way Evaluations, TPE Formative Assessment Goals, and TPE Summative Self-Assessment. While each program differs, each credential program or authorization provides a consistent plan using multiple measures to evaluate that the candidate has met well-defined criteria that guide advising and assistance efforts. These criteria are clearly delineated in each program’s advisement form and procedures have been verified through interviews with administration, faculty, and staff.

Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

Met

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

Program documents and interviews with administration, faculty, and staff indicated that the School of Education has a one-year to five-year Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with each of its P-12 partners, setting out the legal agreement for placing candidates in the field. A full-time Field Placement Director on the Hilltop campus and two part-time Field Placement Coordinators for the branch campuses work with placement sites, professors, and candidates to facilitate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences for all programs. Partners are provided information about the USF program, requirements for candidates during the placement, and evaluation forms to provide feedback on candidates’ ability to demonstrate the knowledge and skills required to complete their programs and be recommended for a credential. In some cases, such as the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate, interns are employed and take credential coursework one or two nights per week.

Interviews with administration, faculty, and staff, including the Field Placement Coordinator, Assessment Coordinator, and Credential Analyst, along with completers and district-employed personnel, indicate USF personnel work closely with school district personnel in the implementation and evaluation of candidates in the planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences. For example, in the Preliminary Administrative Services Program, USF personnel meet three times each semester with district-employed personnel in the field. In the PPS program, USF fieldwork instructors communicate directly with mentor counselors in the field, primarily through email or phone, for beginning introductions, mid-semester evaluation, and summative evaluations, and as needed throughout the semester. When USF fieldwork instructors are not also full-time district-employed personnel, fieldwork instructors generally

meet with the fieldwork mentors two to three times per semester. In the Reading Authorization program, there is at least one visit during the tutoring practicum and two supervisor visits for the small group and whole class reading observations in the final reading practicum. MS/SS candidates have USF supervisors visit P-12 campuses for observations six to seven times per semester for their second and third student teaching experiences. In the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate program, USF Supervisors visit candidates at the site eight times in year one and six times in year two.

Program documents and interviews with administration, faculty, staff, advisory board members, district-employed partners, candidates, and alumni indicated that the planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences assist candidates in developing and demonstrating the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all candidates effectively so that P-12 students can meet state-adopted academic standards. However, some interviews with program completers and district-employed mentors in the Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) program, along with 10% of program completers on the July 2014 exit survey, indicated variability in the quality of the PPS district-employed site mentors as support to the candidates in attaining program competencies. However, the PPS team has taken significant steps since the July 2014 exit survey to provide a more integrated developmental model of supervision and upgraded Fieldwork Evaluation to connect coursework and supervisory training in a coherent plan. Additionally, during interviews with candidates and completers in the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate program revealed a need for content area literacy instruction prior to their fieldwork. With the exception of these outliers, interviews with administration, faculty, and staff, including the Field Placement Coordinator, Assessment Coordinator, and Credential Analyst, along with curriculum and program forms, indicated that each credential program and authorization across the unit has a systematic plan for candidates to demonstrate appropriate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all candidates effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards.

While fieldwork placement processes vary across programs, particularly in the intern programs, interviews with administration, faculty, and staff indicated that each person responsible for field placement (full-time field placement employees or faculty members) in individual programs works collaboratively with the school site personnel to determine effective clinical and site-based supervising personnel, based upon clearly established criteria. Documents that support and verify specific placement criteria for each program include items such as the District Support Provider Contact Checklists, fieldwork manuals, and fieldwork handbooks. A model program for collaboration between the IHE and the local P-12 district is the San Francisco Teacher Residency (SFTR) Program—a collaboration between USF, Stanford, and the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD). In this program, candidates make a three-year commitment to teach in SFUSD. During the program, candidates experience a tightly integrated program with USF, Stanford, and SFUSD personnel; mentoring from coaches; weekly check-ins; every other Friday internal professional development; and every Friday supervisor meetings with teams of residents.

USF's programs prepare candidates to effectively work with diverse and urban P-12 students. Each program's sequence of courses include research-based, hands-on instructional strategies

and activities for working with culturally and linguistically diverse urban students, including strategies and activities that candidates practice in their courses and then use in their field placements.

Interviews with administration, faculty, staff, completers, and current candidates, as well as documentation, such as handbooks and syllabi, indicated that candidates are provided a wide array of experiences, knowledge, and skills in each program to prepare candidates for diverse populations in various Bay Area communities. For example, 1) extensive opportunity is provided in all programs for practice teaching, counseling, or administrative work in urban schools; 2) the education specialist credential program provides training for SDAIE authorization; and 3) the PPS program provides extensive opportunities for working with diverse students, parents, and school staff.

During an interview, a school leadership professor stated that: “We are in alignment with the larger strategic plan, looking at transformative leadership, creating institutional change, and not just measured benchmarks. Our research-based approach includes community input and culturally congruent approaches to evaluating success. Our students read and study researchers, such as George Theo Harris, Carolyn Shields, and Russell Skiba. Our students learn how to close the achievement gap. They don’t just look at numbers. They look at school climate, teacher support, and what is at the forefront of leadership theory all in the context of a diverse, urban setting.”

Course syllabi and interviews with professors from across credential programs indicated that there are shared readings across syllabi related to the research-based vision for each field (e.g., such as works from Pedro Noguera and Lev Vygotsky). Candidates read about socio-cultural views of learning, shared constructivist views, and demonstrate culturally-responsive practices. Candidates read articles by theorists that assist in building classroom community and caring environments, supporting the social justice mission and vision of the School of Education. Candidates spend significant time with P-12 youth and read research connected to the lived experience of students. Candidates learn to collaborate around the research, and are grounded by working with real kids in real schools. The research and service base are connected. Interviews with faculty confirm that USF approaches teaching and learning through an asset-based model (students, families, and community organizations), teaching empirically-based approaches for working with youth. Interviews with professors indicated that they teach candidates to think through a critical lens, identifying theories and research-based strategies to develop best practices for diverse populations, and finding solutions and interventions that work for diverse and marginalized populations.

Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors**Met**

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

Criteria for district-employed supervisors for each program are delineated in the District-Employed Supervisors Checklist. In teacher education, all cooperating teachers will have the appropriate MS or SS credential and be employed as the teacher of record. Supervisors of student teachers will also have a minimum of three years of teaching experience. All district-employed supervisors must be approved by their principal. Education Specialist Mild/Moderate and PPS Credential district-employed supervisors are required to have at least two years of experience, although interviews with administration, field placement supervisors, alumni, candidates, completers, and district-employed administrators indicated that all district-employed supervisors have three or more years of experience. The supervisor in the Administrative Services Credential must have a Clear Administrative Credential.

Supervisor selection processes vary from program to program. Each program has a defined process for selecting supervisors based upon standardized criteria that involves both district personnel and USF personnel. Defined criteria can be found in handbooks and faculty and staff interviews confirmed this process. An interview with the Credential Analyst revealed that USF holds 30-40 district agreements from which qualified personnel are selected through a collaborative process.

The only exception to this is in the intern programs. The District-employed Supervisor Orientation Packet guides the orientation process between the University Supervisor and the Student Teacher Supervisor at the school site. The Education Specialist Mild/Moderate program at USF does not orient its supervisors for the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate program; however, the district itself (the employer) orients the support providers. In the PPS credential program and the Administrative Services Credential Program, the supervisors are provided with a Fieldwork Manual.

Supervisors are systematically evaluated by university personnel and candidates. Sub-standard evaluations for particular supervisors mean that future candidates will not be assigned to these individuals. Interviews with field placement personnel and district-employed supervisors verified that thank you letters or emails go out to district-employed supervisors, recognizing their contribution. In addition, some programs have celebratory events, such as the MS and SS program, which holds a dinner celebration recognizing the contribution of Master teachers.

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence**Met**

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

The Assessment Evidence Matrix, developed by USF, describes how the USF School of Education team measures candidate competence of the professional knowledge and skills necessary to support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted academic standards. Candidates must pass all required examinations (i.e., CBEST, CSET, RICA, TPA as applicable to their programs) and specific formative and summative assessments as evaluated by classroom professors and field placement supervisors (district-employed and university-employed). For the MS/SS program, a Signature Assignment Chart captures an overview of key assignments. Additionally, candidates must earn course grades of a B- or better in all classes. In the Bilingual Authorization program, candidates demonstrate language proficiency through the same types of assessments and also through taking two bilingual courses, taught in Spanish, as well as passing the USF Bilingual Language Proficiency Examination. Additionally, all candidates are assessed by teacher disposition surveys as they move through the teacher education program to ensure that dispositions are an appropriate match with the teaching profession. The procedures described were confirmed through interviews with administration, directors, faculty, and staff, as well as reviewing online and on site program documents.

While similar to the above description, interns in the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate program includes participate in three-way evaluations, writing formative evaluation goals for achieving the TPEs, developing portfolios of evidence, and completing semi-annual self-evaluations in which candidates rate themselves on all of the TPEs. The summative results of these assignments assist the candidates in building an achievement record of the TPEs during their two-year program.

In the PPS credential program, candidates participate in embedded course assessments, site placement evaluations, receive narrative feedback on performance by site mentors and fieldwork instructors, engage in narrative self-assessment, and are evaluated through competency attestation sheets. Additionally, PPS candidates participate in surveys at the end of the first and second years of the program, demonstrating course learning outcomes tied to program standards.

Similar to the other credential programs, the Administrative Services program uses a wide array of assessments to determine that candidates can demonstrate standards-based knowledge and skills for the field in which they are entering. Specific assessments of demonstrated knowledge and skills include: coursework with a B- or better, six fieldwork observations with narrative feedback and ongoing coaching, Standards Based Competency Assessment, collaboration to determine areas of strength and areas for growth (used as a formative assessment tool), and mock interviews around the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs).

The School of Education at USF utilizes a Credential Checklist to ensure that all Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in program standards, are met prior to candidates applying for credentials. This includes all of the assessments required by CTC, such as CBEST, CSET, RICA, and CalTPA, along with the specific assessments required of each credential, such as the US Constitution; Infant, Child, Adult CPR; demonstration of bilingualism; and all program required competencies, such as key assignments, minimum GPA, field placement evaluations, portfolios, entry and exit surveys, dispositions evaluations, and/or mock interviews. At the end of each program, a final analysis is made to ensure that all Commission-adopted competency requirements have been met as specified in program standards. After ensuring all competencies are met, the Credential Analyst will submit a recommendation for the candidate for the appropriate credential.

Verification of the above processes has been confirmed through interviews with administration, faculty, and staff, including the Credential Analyst and Assessment Coordinator, and reviewing online and on site program documents.

Program Reports

Multiple/Single Subject Credential and Multiple/Single Subject Intern Credential

Program Design

The School of Education (SOE) at the University of San Francisco (USF) grants credentials in Multiple Subjects (MS) and Single Subjects (SS) through their Teacher Education Department (TED). There are several tracks through which a candidate may complete the coursework and Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) to earn a credential; all routes have the same requirements.

MS/SS programs require three terms of coursework; masters programs require additional coursework that varies depending on the program. The Hilltop Campus (main campus) and the branch campuses in Santa Rosa, Sacramento, Pleasanton, and San Jose have different entry points. The Hilltop program offers most course requirements in both the fall and winter terms; the branch campuses follow a cohort model and have a fall start date, offering courses sequentially. A Dual Degree program allows undergraduates to begin taking TED coursework along with their content-specific courses and fieldwork; upon graduation they begin their student teaching and additional required coursework. An Intern Program, available in the third term of study, allows candidates to work full time at a high-needs school while completing the credential requirements. Interviews revealed that due to new requirements for interns, this program has very few candidates. 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 P-12 teaching credential. The program also recruits candidates in critical areas (math, science, and Spanish bilingual classrooms) and combines a year-long apprenticeship with targeted masters/credential coursework at the main campus, blended into courses with candidates in the Traditional Program, and SFTR cohort specific coursework taught at a SFUSD school site. This program began in fall 2010 with the first cohort completing the program in spring 2011. Every year since then, a new cohort has been admitted.

Interviews with various constituents verified that communication pathways were clearly articulated. Communication between the credential programs and the institution takes place through the program directors, the associate deans, and the dean of the School of Education and the institution. Communication within the TED takes place between deans, program directors, full-time faculty, part-time faculty and field supervisors at yearly meetings. Courses have faculty leads who communicate regularly with other faculty through email, phone calls, and web-based sharing sites to discuss course design, course fidelity and signature assessments. During fieldwork, classroom mentor teachers, field supervisors, and student teaching faculty communicate in person, through email and phone calls, web-sharing sites, and use of detailed and comprehensive observation forms.

The structure of the fieldwork experiences is carefully planned for three student teaching events to ensure theoretical foundations are meaningfully integrated into practice. Interviews with constituents revealed a strong network of classroom mentor teachers and fieldwork supervisors, many who have worked together over several years. Candidates are placed in classrooms with a mentor (classroom teacher) at the beginning of Student Teaching I, and have a minimum of two visits from their field supervisor, as well as carefully coordinated observation assignments in their Student Teaching I course. Most candidates remain in the same primary placement for Student Teaching II and III, and also observe and participate in multiple classrooms to gain a variety of experiences. During Student Teaching II and III, candidates assume a gradual release of responsibility prior to daily responsibility for whole-class instruction. Supervisors visit a minimum of seven times, three of which include the mentor teacher directly. All constituents agreed that the fieldwork provides flexibility within the thoughtfully implemented structure for individualization to meet each candidate's needs.

Modifications over the last two years include the addition of a second content-specific methods course and implementation of *Standard 12: Preparation to Teach English Learners*. Currently enrolled candidates and completers shared during interviews how beneficial the additional methods course was in strengthening their practice. Through interviews with the Bilingual Authorization Coordinator/Course Lead for the language acquisition course in the program (*The Education of Bilingual Children: Theory and Practice, TEC 611*) the implementation plan for the revised standard was detailed; interviews with full-time and adjunct faculty teaching coursework in TED spoke of specific assignments and course content that implemented the new standard, and currently enrolled candidates and completers indicated that they were prepared to address the needs of English learners (ELs). Mentor teachers and administrators in classrooms and schools in which candidates are placed also unanimously noted how well

prepared student teachers and program completers from USF are to provide meaningful instruction to ELs.

Course of Study

The required classes include foundational, methods, and student teaching/fieldwork. The sequencing and coherence of the program was commended during interviews for the thoughtful preparation leading to the CalTPA and classroom practice. Constituents noted the sequencing built a strong understanding and application of the relationship between theory and practice.

Candidates complete foundations courses prior to study of methods and their student-teaching fieldwork experiences. The foundations courses emphasize the context of social justice in education; theory and pedagogy in teaching diverse learners; theories of learning and approaches to teaching; and using technology for instruction, assessment, routines of practice, and data collection and analysis to inform planning, instruction and assessment. Foundational literacy theory is also included in this category of fieldwork.

The sequence continues with required coursework in curriculum and instruction, content methods, literacy courses for both multiple subjects and secondary candidates on integrating literacies in content instruction, and instructional methods for ELs. Through interviews and document review, there was evidence of the coordination between coursework and fieldwork. While candidates are involved in their three student teaching placements, they make strong connections between theory and practice through the complimentary coursework and receive feedback from their field supervisors on practice teaching events. The Fieldwork Placement Coordinator at Hilltop and coordinators in the branches, are clear on the protocols and procedures when the rare intervention is necessary. Constituents, especially classroom mentors and fieldwork supervisors, noted how responsive and effective the Fieldwork Placement Coordinator was at the Hilltop campus.

Critical areas of preparation, such as teaching English Learners, integrating literacies and technologies into teaching and learning, and preparing candidates for student teaching and the CalTPA are well-planned, coherent across the program, and effective. During interviews, candidates expressed their confidence in being able to provide differentiated and appropriate instruction.

Based on interviews with classroom mentors and administrators, fieldwork placements are well paired. Special commendation was made from classroom mentors regarding good “fits” between candidates and mentors. Candidates and completers cited occasional issues but overall were happy in their placements and noted the value of the learning experience.

Candidate Competence

Candidates are assessed in each course with signature assignments, and in their fieldwork through observations and de-briefings with their mentors and fieldwork supervisors, with an added layer of support from professors in their program courses. Review of course syllabi indicated that the signature assignments align with the TPEs. Through interviews, faculty who

are course leads described developing the assignments collaboratively with all faculty who teach the course, and candidates and completers spoke knowledgeably about coursework theories and how they were integrated into their practice.

Signature assessments are described in syllabi. Through interviews and examination of syllabi, it was confirmed that the TPA is discussed during class starting in the first term and several courses have explicit assignments to support candidates with the TPA, which is completed during the three student teaching experiences. Constituents were clear that direct feedback is not provided to candidates on the TPA by instructors; scaffolding is used in unpacking the assessment and rehearsals of aspects of the TPA prior to the candidates' actual TPA assessment.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met**.

Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Program w/ Intern

Program Design

The University of San Francisco Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate (Intern) Credential Program was developed to prepare candidates who work full time 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 program is delivered through an internship and cohort model across a 2+ year academic program, and coursework is taught in modules that spiral throughout the Mild/Moderate program. Field experiences are supervised and supported throughout the candidates' internships.

The special education program is coordinated by full time associate professor of special education, Dr. Kevin Oh. Dr. Oh reported that the program works collaboratively with and between full-time and part-time faculty, clinical supervision, stakeholders and candidates in a cycle of continuous evaluation and improvement.

Candidates complete 162.5 hours, 14 semester units, of pre-service coursework and fieldwork experiences during the summer preceding their first teaching position, including 45 hours of instruction directly linked to the support of English Language Learners (ELLs). This is required to obtain the internship credential needed to work as a teacher of record with students with mild/moderate learning disabilities. During the following two school years, candidates complete an additional 22 semester units of coursework related to teaching students with mild/moderate learning disabilities. Through the completion of coursework and the internship, candidates demonstrate understanding of the importance of culturally responsive pedagogy, early intervention, classroom management and curriculum design. Grades are based on classroom participation and course assignments (e.g., portfolios, presentations, papers, and reports),

which are linked to the measurement outcomes of this program. Candidates are also required to document that they have received a minimum of 144 hours of support and supervision per school year beyond their coursework. Candidates who do not have an English Learner Authorization are also required to document an additional 45 hours of support by a supervisor or mentor with a valid English Learner Authorization.

Through review of documentation and information relayed during interviews, education specialist faculty, community members, employers, and other district personnel, the team found that the Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Program represents a collaboration within the School of Education and coordination between USF teacher education faculty, USF education specialist faculty, selected doctoral students in the Learning and Instruction Department, community members, and several Bay Area school districts. The program has been developed and is informed by faculty from the School of Education with feedback from stakeholders, practitioners, advisory board members, and others in the field, and has passed successfully through the review and approval process stipulated by University policy.

There are three program modifications currently being implemented. The first includes enhancements to the pre-service program to incorporate specific preparation to teach English learners. The second includes modifications to specific EL support and supervision as well as the general support and supervision required for all interns. The third modification is related to the course sequence for the Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Program. Each of these modifications was detailed in the USF Intern Program Modification report.

Course of Study

Candidates and program completers reported that pre-service coursework, although meaningful, occurred with little candidate background knowledge (schema) with which to deeply understand the critical content. Several candidates commented that, after beginning their internship, they could have benefitted from more explicit preparation. One specific suggestion heard during candidate interviews was that *TEC 621 Early Literacy* and *TEC 604 Multiple Subject Curriculum and Instruction* would be more helpful if it occurred during the first fall semester. Additionally, candidates and completers reported that, although it is recommended by the program that the RICA be taken soon after completing *TEC 621 Early Literacy*, they believed that the timeframe between pre-service and internship was not a reasonable point within the program sequence to complete the assessment.

Candidates and program completers reported, upon reflection, that many of the field experiences should be more closely aligned with opportunities for application in their internships. There is some evidence that sequencing of courses to better match the first and second year experiences in the classroom.

The majority of the candidates and program completers placed in secondary sites reported a heavy emphasis on elementary level methods and experiences during the summer-intensive courses and in program courses during their internships, leaving candidates feeling less prepared than the elementary site placement interns. It was reported by all candidates that the

coursework and applied experiences related to ELs was adequate for their roles and various settings. Candidates reported a desire for more depth in the areas of overrepresentation in special education populations and the opportunity to meaningfully address social justice issues in all courses.

Candidates and program completers reported being satisfied with their placements, the facilitation of their placements, and their interactions with the fieldwork/supervision staff. Candidates and recent program completers (from the 2012 cohort onward) reported being satisfied with field supervision, advisement, and evaluation. Candidates reported that the frequency of visits (eight in Year 1, six in Year 2) were sufficient. Current candidates reported a desire for the program or University Support Providers to model demonstration lessons (they reported no model lesson demonstrations during placement), in addition to providing evaluation through the lesson observation to enhance their learning opportunities. Because of intern program requirements, interns are supervised by University Supervisors and supported on site by district-employed Onsite Support Providers (OSSPs). OSSPs interviewed reported that they understood their role in the intern's development and received related information from the USF fieldwork/supervision staff. The OSSPs reported relying on the intern to provide information related to upcoming program requirements and necessary documentation the OSSP would be required to submit (e.g., support hours documentation).

Candidate Competence

Based on candidate and program completer interviews, comments from employers, district personnel, fieldwork supervisors, program faculty and a review of current program documents, candidate assessment occurs throughout candidates' experience through the program signature assignments in coursework, requirements embedded in clinical supervision experiences, and required assessments (e.g., RICA, etc.). Additionally, candidates are required to demonstrate minimum competence in the 13 Teaching Performance Expectations (through embedded course requirements) and embedded primarily through the artifacts submitted through their culminating electronic web-based portfolio.

Candidates are provided with a Fieldwork Experience Handbook at the start of their program that provides information about the assessment process. The program provides candidates with information related to their assessment at multiple points in time: prior to program admission; during pre-service coursework and field experiences; and throughout program coursework and fieldwork supervision, experiences and seminars. The Fieldwork Experience Handbook provides complete information related to candidate assessment, including program and CTC requirements for credentialing. Personal advisement is provided by the program coordinator at the conclusion of each semester to provide an overview of candidate status and progress towards program requirements and successful completion. Course syllabi include course assessment information as well.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team

determined that all program standards are met with the exception of Program Standards 9 and 15, and Mild/Moderate Program Standard 5 which are **Met with Concerns**.

Program Standard 9: Preparation to Teaching Reading/Language Arts

Rationale: This standard is primarily addressed in the summer intensive course sequence prior to internship and during the third semester; however, candidates and program completers reported that the majority the focus is on elementary-aged students, and resources are primarily available for elementary level students. Candidates and program completers reported being underprepared for upper grades literacy instruction when placed in secondary settings (TPEs 1, 6).

Program Standard 16: Assessment of Candidate Performance

Rationale: The majority of this standard is being met adequately; however, it is less than fully met with regard to *thoroughly demonstrated satisfactory performance in the full range of Teaching Performance Expectations*, specifically in the area of *Developing as a Professional Educator* (TPE 15). Candidate suitability, professionalism, and professional dispositions are not objectively and/or directly assessed throughout the program based on candidate/program completer interviews, employers, support providers, and documentation reviewed.

M/M Standard 5: Specific Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Rationale: This standard is currently being addressed primarily in elementary settings. Although program documents reflect some application of the standard with secondary students and within secondary settings, candidates, program completers, employers, on-site support providers and course requirements do not reflect a range of K-12 application (TPEs 1, 6).

Bilingual Authorization

Program Design

The Bilingual Authorization Program (Spanish) is designed as an additional authorization for MS/SS credential candidates on the main campus (Hilltop) and the four branch campuses. Multiple and Single Subject Credential Candidates take coursework together in this Program. Candidates who opt for this authorization take two additional courses focused on the instructional needs of bilingual learners; the history, policies, programs, and research on the effectiveness of bilingual education and bilingualism in the United States; and developing the pedagogical skills to plan, develop, implement and assess standards-aligned content instruction in the primary and target language.

The program is housed in the Teacher Education Department (TED). A program coordinator with expertise in bilingual education leads the program and oversees all aspects of the program. An interview for candidates who are interested in the program is required to ensure

fluency in the target language, Spanish. The program coordinator also teaches the two required courses, while working closely with other TED faculty to integrate core concepts and pedagogical approaches in coursework across TED, and to coordinate the field placements. In addition, the coordinator administers and scores the language exam required as part of the authorization.

The differing routes to receiving a credential (the San Francisco Teacher Residency (SFTR), the Urban Education and Social Justice Program, and the Dual Degree) on the main campus or in branch campuses, all have the same requirements. Candidates in any of these routes are eligible to participate in the Bilingual Authorization Program through completion of the additional two courses and a fieldwork placement in a bilingual classroom for part of their student teaching experience.

Course of Study

In addition to the required foundations courses taken in the program, *Education of Bilingual Children* and *Education of Exceptional Children*, candidates in the program take two additional courses for authorization. Through interviews and document review, it is apparent that the courses in MS/SS and the Bilingual Authorization Program are carefully sequenced to prepare candidates in this program for work in bilingual classrooms.

Fieldwork placements for candidates are arranged by the program Coordinator, and are secured in bilingual classrooms for candidates' student teaching experience concurrent with their second and third student teaching placements. During student teaching, candidates receive support from their mentor teacher, the instructor of the Student Teaching courses, and a fieldwork supervisor who observes their teaching a minimum of seven times.

Candidate Competence

Interviews with current candidates enrolled in the program, as well as completers who were teaching in bilingual classrooms, indicated unanimously that all felt prepared and competent in addressing the needs of bilingual learners, P-12, through their planning, instruction, assessment, and reflection.

All assessments in the program are described in the course syllabi and in the Student Handbook provided to them, and discussed with instructors during class meetings. Assessments for the Bilingual Program are in addition to those which candidates complete in the MS/SS program. For admission to the program an oral exam is administered by the Program Coordinator, using a rubric. Candidates also complete a signature assessment in the required coursework for the program which is specifically designed to align with program learning outcomes.

Findings on Standards

After a review of the Bilingual Authorization Program documents, the biennial report, and other supporting documentation, and after conducting interviews of candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met**.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

Program Design

The School of Education (SOE) at the University of San Francisco (USF) operates the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) program. The program is housed in the Organization and Leadership (O&L) program in the SOE. Students in the Master of Arts in Organization and Leadership degree have the option of combining the course of study with the PASC. Admission to the program is in either the fall or spring semester and the credential can be completed within two years of fulltime study. It is a 27-unit program with 21 of those units earned in classroom courses and six units coming from two field experience courses. While each program has established coursework, candidates are able to take courses at their own pace. Classes meet nine times each semester (Friday evening and all day Saturday) to accommodate work schedules of the candidates. Currently, the PASC coursework is only offered at the main campus. The PASC program integrates research and practice in educational leadership for work in P-12 schools.

The leadership thread at USF begins with the President, and follows through to the Provost to the SOE Dean, three Associate Deans, various Department Chairs, and a Coordinator of each program. Department Chairs meet with the Deans twice a month and the Department of Leadership Studies meets bi-monthly for departmental and program issues. The program Coordinators meet monthly with the Associate Dean for action on credential issues. The Center for Teaching Excellence often provides professional development for the faculty and invites faculty to be presenters. Candidates, completers, adjuncts, and employers all complimented the open and two-way avenues of communication in the PASC program.

An Advisory Committee works with all departments within the SOE where data review is often on the agenda. PASC faculty is involved in professional organizations such as the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) and the California Association of Latino Superintendents (CALSA). The Associate Dean formerly served as the President of the California Professors of Educational Administration (CAPEA).

Each new candidate is assigned an advisor and attends a mandatory orientation. Coaching and support are provided by a university fieldwork supervisor who meets with the candidate at least six times during the field experience. In addition to advising and supervising by the fieldwork university supervisor, all candidates receive a Fieldwork Handbook. Occasionally, special programs are offered such as one on mock interviews.

Recent changes to the program include assessing candidates on case study activities and their ability to address interview questions appropriately; including Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) information into the *Budget and Finance* and *Education Law* classes; adding content on Restorative Practices into the *Schools, Community and Society* course; implementing a 90-day plan assignment in *Educational Leadership*; closing the Clear Administrative Services Credential program when all candidates had completed it;

hiring of two additional faculty members; and, planning to place the PASC program on hiatus in order to address the revised program standards and develop a cohort model.

Course of Study

The required classes involve earning 27 credits combined in three areas. In Credential Course Work candidates earn 21 credits in seven courses. A supervised Field Experience consists of two courses for six credits. Candidates earning the Master of Arts in Organization and Leadership must also complete the *O&L 650 Instructional Leadership* capstone course.

Fieldwork candidates are supervised by university personnel as well as a site mentor. Observation and feedback occur at regular intervals. Mentors, employers, university supervisors, program completers and candidates reported that the candidates are well prepared, ready to assume responsibility for administrative tasks, and are well rounded in their exposure to administrative issues surrounding human resources, budget concerns such as LCAP and LCFF, use of technology, analysis of data, and education laws. With the USF and School of Education vision on social justice, the needs of the English learners and special needs students are also emphasized in coursework and fieldwork.

Candidate Competence

Before acceptance into the PASC program at the University of San Francisco, applicants are required to provide the same documents as any candidate who seeks a California credential through USF. Signature assignments in courses are individual as well as group projects and many are school site-based with the coursework becoming increasingly more difficult throughout the semester. For example, a candidate who is initially asked to gather data on one classroom will be expected to analyze school-wide data by the end of the semester. PASC candidates are expected to complete 200 hours of field experience over two semesters. The California Professional Standards of Education Leaders (CPSELs) are utilized as model standards for the PASC program. The culminating standards-based portfolio is designed to document competency related to the CPSELs. Each candidate is expected to provide a School and Personal Needs Assessment; a Leadership Action Plan; Activities Hours Log with date and length of time related to CPSELs; worksite artifacts; and reflections focused on goals, activities, and leadership development related to the CPSELs.

Findings on Standards:

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

Reading Certificate (Added Authorization)

Program Design

The Reading Certificate is offered through the Teacher Education Department. Candidates can obtain the Reading Certificate in two ways. The first way is to enroll in the Multiple Subject or

Single Subject Credential Program for an MA in Teaching Reading (MATR). After the candidate completes the teacher credential program, and the Credential Analyst recommends the teaching credential, the candidate may then continue on to complete the MATR Reading Certificate courses. After completion of the coursework, the candidate provides evidence of three years of classroom teaching before the credential analyst recommends the Reading Certificate.

The second route to obtaining the Reading Certificate begins with the application for admission. A candidate who provides evidence of a valid California teaching credential at admission to the MATR, and verifies three years of successful teaching experience (excluding student teaching, internship teaching or teaching with an emergency credential), will be recommended for the Reading Certificate by the Credential Analyst upon completion of the required coursework. There are 14 active cohort candidates enrolled in the Reading Certificate program.

An Advisory Committee assists with the development and implementation of the Strategic Plan for the Reading Certificate program. The one full-time faculty member who is also the Coordinator is assisted by two part-time adjunct professors. The Coordinator oversees all aspects of the program and serves as the main contact for faculty, adjunct professors, and candidates. Over the past two years, syllabi have been revised based on Program Assessment feedback and the 2010 revision of the program standards. The Reading Certificate can be earned through 16 units of coursework as described below. A Master of Arts in Reading can be earned by completing 14 additional units.

The program begins with an eight-week summer session, followed by two courses in the fall semester, one of which is the Primary Tutoring practicum—the first of three practica. The spring semester mirrors the fall semester with one course and the second practicum—Intermediate Tutoring. The second summer session involves a third practicum in tutoring small and large groups.

Course of Study

Prerequisites for the Master of Arts in Teaching Reading degree are a preliminary credential or completing courses in the MS/SS program: *TEC 621 Early Literacy*, *TEC 612 Multiple Subject Curriculum and Instruction: Reading/Language Arts*, and either *TEC 616 Multiple Subject Student Teaching I* or *TEC 660 Single Subject Student Teaching I*. The Reading Certificate may be added through enrollment in coursework specific to the Reading Certificate which includes three courses and three field-based placements.

Candidates, completers, and employers all reported satisfaction with program delivery, quality of competencies acquired, collaboration, and avenues of communication. Documents revealed incorporation of revised Reading Certificate programs standards into the syllabi, and achievement of those standards was evident in candidate portfolios.

Candidate Competence

In the Reading Certificate program, candidates go through the normal admission process required of all credential candidates and demonstrate their competency for the Reading

Certificate in two ways: 1) Coursework: The objectives/learning outcomes for all required courses are measured by course assessments and are tied to program standards. A grade of B- or above is required in all required course work in order to be recommended for the credential. 2) Evaluations: The University Supervisor observes candidates during field practica.

Observation summaries of candidates which reflect growth over time, as well as recommendations to candidates for improving their skills, are reviewed with the candidate following each observation.

In addition, all candidates in the Teacher Education Department complete a set of surveys as they move through the program. These surveys assess candidates' dispositions, and the development and application of professional knowledge and skills from entry into the program to the first years of teaching. Surveys include an entry survey, exit survey, and first year of teaching survey. In addition to surveying graduates, surveys are also sent to their site administrator and induction coach.

Findings on Standards:

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

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling

Program Design

The University of San Francisco's Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling Program, a concentration within the M.A. in Counseling Psychology, is housed in the Department of Counseling Psychology in the School of Education. The Program Coordinator, Dr. Christine Yeh, serves under the direction of her Department Chair and Dean. The Department holds bi-monthly meetings to discuss programs, curriculum, community partnerships and other professional issues. Coordinators of the credential programs meet monthly with the Associate Dean to discuss program alignment with the standards and to receive support and guidance. Communication is facilitated by the relationships of faculty members in the program (full time and adjunct) attested to in interviews, and with candidates in meetings with an academic advisor, district-employed onsite mentor counselor, university fieldwork supervisor, and graduate student mentor. The faculty, adjunct faculty, university fieldwork supervisors, and candidates meet regularly throughout the academic year and summer, facilitating consistent stakeholder input.

The School Counseling Program is a two-year full time program (including summers following years one and two) in which candidates complete 49 credits. The program uses a cohort model and is structured in a format designed to allow candidates to work part time; the vast majority of candidates and completers interviewed reported this format as an asset of the program. Classes are held on weekends, primarily on Friday nights and Saturdays, in an every-other-

weekend format. Most classes use a face-to-face format, although one uses a hybrid format. In the first year, candidates complete foundational courses and core requirements and in the second year they take more advanced, specialized and practice-based classes. Candidates have a practicum in their first semester of the program, and complete fieldwork in each of the four academic semesters of the program; they are not in fieldwork sites during their two summers of program coursework. Interviews with fieldwork supervisors and school site counselor mentors indicated that candidates develop plans for their fieldwork experience that align with the competency requirements of the program. Those competencies align with coursework in the program. Based on interviews with candidates and completers, and a review of program assessment documents, that alignment appears to occur with some inconsistency, depending on the field site.

Based on interviews with candidates, alumni, and adjunct faculty, the Program Director and the vast majority of core and adjunct faculty in the School Counseling Program are very well regarded and respected by all constituents. Faculty members are regarded as competent, responsive and supportive; each is viewed as a model of the social justice philosophy they espouse. In addition, constituents reported that the program fosters a sense of belonging, collaboration, and mutuality of relationship highly consistent with the social justice mission, supporting a richly diverse group of candidates. Each faculty member brings strong expertise in areas related to the program. However, during interviews, candidates and alumni suggested that it would be helpful if more faculty members had experience as school counselors to the program and coursework, especially related to the practical issues, policies, and realities of school counseling and educational institutions, as well as in systemic issues, barriers and change in schools.

Interviews with the Program Coordinator, full time faculty members, and adjunct faculty demonstrated that the faculty has been responsive to feedback from candidates about the need to improve program sequences. In the last two years, program modifications included the addition of a fieldwork coordinator, a revised fieldwork manual, web-based access to resources for school counseling supervisors, greater access to work with underserved communities, and greater attention to college and career readiness. Additional coursework was added in advanced multicultural counseling to respond to candidate and alumni feedback requesting greater depth in this area. Finally, a course was added at the end of the program (following internship) designed to respond to the need for coursework in systemic school change, work with adult peers, and creation of a school climate that increases academic achievement. In addition, the syllabus for the same course indicates that candidates will learn to (a) assist teachers and parents with identifying and meeting instructional and developmental needs; (b) develop, implement, and evaluate a comprehensive school counseling program; (c) demonstrate effective leadership as an agent of change; and (d) learn strategies to build collaborative partnerships among school staff, parents, and community resources.

The program has active partnerships with school districts in which candidates are placed throughout the Bay Area. Through interviews with faculty, candidates, and alumni, the partnership with SFUSD was seen as especially strong because the district has an organized intern program. The program manager provides a list of potential fieldwork sites and mentor

contacts throughout the Bay Area to candidates seeking fieldwork and internships. Interviews with program faculty, candidates, and completers indicated that partnerships with districts other than SFUSD have often posed challenges in terms of finding and negotiating satisfactory internships, and in the consistency and quality of the field-based experience.

The program reports having an active alumni base and has created social media networks to facilitate those connections. In interviews, completers reported a continued sense of affiliation with the program and a desire for greater engagement with the program through ongoing professional development activities, possible mentoring roles, and access to resources such as research.

Course of Study

The program's coursework is sequenced to provide foundational courses prior to more advanced coursework over a six semester (two years and two summers) period of time. The course of study reflects the high value the program places on social justice; multicultural and social justice issues are infused throughout the curriculum. During interviews candidates and completers reported this as a strong asset of the program.

Fieldwork is offered from the first semester and every academic semester thereafter, with the exception of the summers, during which several courses are offered. This structure poses a potential challenge for candidates to demonstrate competencies in delivering services learned in those summer courses, especially the final summer. Candidates complete 100 hours of practicum and 600 hours of fieldwork experiences during enrollment in the program, consistent with Commission requirements. Over half the students are placed in SFUSD, but a variety of other districts offer placements as well. A fieldwork manual guides the placement and specifies the number of hours required in each experience, describes mentor counselor qualifications (must be experienced school practitioners who have held a valid PPS credential for at least two years), and provides generic guidelines. Sites must have signed Memorandum of Understandings with the Counseling program, and assure that caseloads and supervision are available. The fieldwork manual describes a one hour per week supervision requirement, although interviews with candidates and alumni indicate that often this minimum supervision requirement does not occur. In addition, candidates each have a fieldwork supervision class with a designated fieldwork supervisor. In interviews with candidates and completers, the majority of those interviewed reported that this experience was extremely useful, as those supervisors were school counselors. However, documentation from program review indicates that some 7% to 10% did not find that experience particularly helpful.

Interviews with fieldwork supervisors, the fieldwork coordinator, and counselor mentors indicated that communication with counselor mentors employed by the school occurs through periodic contact via email or phone with the university fieldwork supervisors, who are also district employees. Because these supervisors are full time district employees, face-to-face communication with counselor mentors rarely occurs. Guidance regarding fieldwork activities is provided via a fieldwork manual, copies of course syllabi, and a plan initiated during the fieldwork seminar. Candidates and alumni report inconsistent levels of effectiveness, as reported in the program annual survey and in interviews. The relatively newly-appointed

fieldwork coordinator (a full time faculty member) is responsible for communication with the supervisors. Once a semester, a college-wide advisory board meets to provide feedback, although no program-specific advisory board meets.

Although fieldwork is designed to complement and coordinate with candidate coursework, inconsistencies were reported by candidates and completers, especially in the area of group counseling. Many candidates reported being asked to engage in group counseling prior to instruction in the area. This may be a function of the wording in the fieldwork manual, which indicates work at individual and group levels is desired at all levels of fieldwork. In addition, the new course, CPSY 617, *Consulting with Parents, Teachers, and Schools*, which teaches candidates many school-related skills, is offered during the final summer, when candidates cannot demonstrate those skills in a field-based setting. The competencies on which the counselor mentors rate candidates (Practicum Performance Assessment and School Counseling Final Fieldwork Evaluation Form) are related directly to courses in the program; however, they do not always relate to the full extent of the standards. Both mentors and fieldwork supervisors sign off on those competencies through a fieldwork evaluation form.

Candidate Competence

Candidates receive information on the assessment processes via a meeting with their advisors in the first month of the program and in a two-day orientation. Six assessments inform candidate competence: (a) embedded course assessments, (b) School Counseling Final Fieldwork Evaluation Form (competency performance), (c) performance assessment (practicum) by on site mentor counselor, (d) performance assessment by university fieldwork supervisors, (e) performance evaluation by self-report; and (f) School Counseling Attestation Sheets (a portfolio of Activities demonstrating competence in fifteen areas). Rubrics have not yet been developed to guide evaluation of competence with the portfolio items (Attestation Sheets), which might better support the relationship of the competencies to practice. Each activity demonstrating competence is approved through the signature of an instructor and/or counseling mentor. Faculty members meet regularly to discuss the program, candidate issues and competence, and use both formal data from their assessments and informal data from candidates and faculty members to create program improvements.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation, and conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, mentor counselors, and fieldwork supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are met with the exception of Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling Specialization Program Standards 20 and 31, which are **Met with Concerns**.

School Counseling Program Standard 20: Career Development

Rationale: The standard requires the program *to provide candidates with the knowledge of the components of career development programs and provides them with opportunities to develop, implement and evaluate such programs in schools*. The program currently offers a graduate course in *Career Counseling*, CPSY 614, with a special emphasis on multicultural and

sociopolitical issues. As evidenced through interviews with faculty and written evidence provided about the course, the course provides candidates a strong grounding in components of a career development program, and a model of program implementation and evaluation. Candidates practice some components of the model through a service learning activity in which they work with local youth in Upward Bound, providing activities on such things as FAFSA completion, connecting school to career, interviews and role plays. Candidates administer a pre- and post-questionnaire to students. However, the program does not yet require candidates to demonstrate their ability to develop, implement and evaluate a career development program in schools. The program faculty is aware of this missing component of the standard, and is planning to assure that it occurs in the coming academic year, as they revise their requirements for the fieldwork and internship experiences of candidates.

School Counseling Specialization Program Standard 31: Fieldwork

Rationale: To develop competency in **all** areas of school counseling and guidance, Standard 31 requires candidates to *demonstrate knowledge and skills in applying the themes and functions of school counseling in school settings . . . and to demonstrate the knowledge of and skills in working with pre-K through adult pupils in the areas identified in the standards for school counseling in field experience*. Through a review of syllabi, and interviews with PPS faculty and adjunct faculty, the program demonstrated that faculty members offer rich theoretical grounding with some practical applications in most aspects of the requirements of school counseling through their required coursework. However, currently, the required assessments of candidate competence in the field experience and internship, as well as minimal face-to-face contact with counselor mentors have impacted the quality of the field-based experiences as a venue in which candidates can demonstrate all aspects of the professional standards. For instance, the current fieldwork evaluation form asks counselor mentors for limited information on candidate competence in the field. Candidates complete a portfolio of activities related to their classes that they have completed in the field. Many of these are related to the standard; yet, key aspects of the standard are not yet demonstrated in practice. The program faculty is aware of this, and has provided evidence that they have a comprehensive rubric in development which will guide future practice of the candidates in the field and be used by the counselor mentors and supervisors to evaluate the candidates. This new rubric, along with assurances that their counselor mentors supervise one hour per week, will allow candidates to demonstrate the skills enumerated in the rubric, and should fulfill the standard.