

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at**

**University of Southern California**

Professional Services Division

February 2022

**Overview of this Report**

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **University of Southern California**. The report of the team presents the findings based upon a thorough review of all available and relevant institutional and program documentation as well as all supporting evidence including interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** is made for the institution.

**Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions  
For All Commission Approved Programs Offered by the Institution**

<b>Common Standards</b>	<b>Status</b>
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	<b>Met with Concerns</b>
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	<b>Met with Concerns</b>
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	<b>Met</b>
4) Continuous Improvement	<b>Met with Concerns</b>
5) Program Impact	<b>Met</b>

**Program Standards**

<b>Programs</b>	<b>Total Program Standards</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject	6	6	0	0
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate	22	22	0	0
Preliminary Administrative Services	9	6	0	3
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	5	5	0	0
Bilingual Authorization	6	6	0	0
Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work and Child Welfare and Attendance	5	5	0	0
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	5	5	0	0

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 Documentation and Evidence

- 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 Southern California (USC)

**Dates of Visit:** October 17-19, 2021

**Accreditation Team Recommendation:** Accreditation with Stipulations

**Previous History of Accreditation Status**

<b>Accreditation Reports</b>	<b>Accreditation Status</b>
<u>February 11, 2014</u>	<u>Accreditation</u>

**Rationale:**

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel. The team 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:

Preconditions

All general preconditions and preconditions for all credential programs were **met**.

Program Standards

All program standards for the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs were **met**.

All program standards for the Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate credential program were **met**.

All program standards for the Preliminary Administrative Services credential program were **met**, except for Program Standards 2, 7 and 8 which were **not met**.

All program standards for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorizaion Program were **met**.

All program standards for the Bilingual Added Authorization Program were **met**.

All program standards for the Pupil Personnel Services School Social Work and Child Welfare and Attendance credential programs were **met**.

All program standards for the Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling credential program were **met**.

#### Common Standards

Common Standards 3 and 5 were **met**. Common Standards 1, 2 and 4 were **met with concerns**.

#### Overall Recommendation

Given the above findings on preconditions, common standards and program standards, the review team recommends an accreditation status of **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

The review team recommends that the following stipulations be placed on the institution:

1. That the institution presents quarterly reports to the COA to address each area below.
2. That the institution provides evidence of a comprehensive system for all Commission-approved preparation programs to be involved in decision making at the unit level, and for feedback from candidates and completers (as stakeholders) in all programs within the unit to be communicated to unit leadership and considered for potential action.
3. That the institution provides evidence that Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all Commission-approved preparation programs.
4. That the institution provides evidence that the unit is monitoring the credentialing office and staff to ensure they have the resources and capacity to effectively advise candidates in all programs of the requirements for completing the credential process, and to efficiently complete the credentialing process.
5. That the institution provides evidence of a candidate centered process to identify barriers to entry and retention in the profession for candidates from diverse backgrounds.
6. That the institution provides evidence of specific information and personnel within all programs who are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements.
7. That the institution provides evidence of inclusion of all programs in the unit's continuous improvement and assessment processes.
8. That the institution provides evidence of effective operations within the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program in the following areas:
  - a. Consistent stakeholder input and decision making authority within the program.

- b. Monitoring of candidate field experience placements to ensure all candidates have experiences in diverse school settings, and that a process is in place to provide additional placement experiences for candidates that are not in diverse school settings.
- c. A process for candidates to evaluate all field experiences and supports.
- d. A process for candidates to receive ongoing complete, accurate, and timely feedback, including constructive suggestions for improvement.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to offer the following credential programs and to recommend candidates for the appropriate and related credentials upon satisfactorily completing all requirements:

Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject  
Preliminary Education Specialist – Mild/Moderate  
Preliminary Administrative Services  
Pupil Personnel Services – School Counseling  
Pupil Personnel Services – School Social Work and Child Welfare and Attendance  
Bilingual Authorization  
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization

In addition, staff recommends that:

- University of Southern California’s response to the preconditions be accepted.
- University of Southern California be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- University of Southern California 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 Lead and Common Standards:

Christine Zeppos  
Educational Consultant

### Common Standards:

Robert Williams  
California State University, East Bay

### Staff to the Visit

Miranda Gutierrez  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Jake Shuler  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

### Programs Reviewers:

Dennis Eastman  
Biola University

James Mitchell  
California State University, East Bay

Raeanne Lopez Little  
Orange Unified School District

Paul Brazzel  
San Diego State University

Jessica Bogunovich  
University of Massachusetts Global

### Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission  
Program Review Submission  
Common Standards Addendum  
Program Review Addendum  
Course Syllabi and Course of Study  
Candidate Advisement Materials  
Accreditation Website  
Faculty Vitae  
Candidate Files

Assessment Materials  
Candidate Handbooks  
Survey Results  
Performance Expectation Materials  
Precondition Responses  
TPA Results and Analysis  
APA Results and Analysis  
Examination Results  
Accreditation Data Dashboard

### Interviews Conducted

<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Candidates	61
Completers	37
Employers	14
Institutional Administration	14
Program Coordinators	23
Faculty	73
Adjunct Faculty	17
Performance Assessment Coordinator	4
Admissions and Support Staff	10
Data and Assessment Staff	22
University Field Supervisors	52
Site Based Field Supervisors	30
Credential Analysts and Staff	16
Advisory Board Members	14
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>387</b>

*Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed more than once due to multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.*

## Background Information

The University of Southern California (USC) is considered one of the world’s leading private research universities. It is also deemed to be an anchor institution in Los Angeles and a global center for arts, technology and international business. As such, USC’s diverse curricular offerings provide extensive opportunities for interdisciplinary study and collaboration with leading researchers in highly advanced learning environments.

USC first opened its doors to 53 students and 10 teachers in 1880, when the newly founded “city” still lacked paved streets, electric lights, telephones and a reliable fire alarm system. Today, USC is home to 46,000 students and 4,700 full-time faculty, and is located in the heart of one of the most vibrant and diverse cities in the world.

In its comprehensive 2021 ranking, The Wall Street Journal and Times Higher Education ranked USC 19th among more than 1,000 public and private universities. Among all California institutions — public and private — only USC, Caltech, and Stanford University ranked within the top 20. Of the 150 universities surveyed in the western United States, USC ranks number 3 among the top 25 schools; USC ranked number 5 in engagement, which measures student sentiment on how their education prepares them for the real world.

## Education Unit

The mission of the USC Rossier School of Education (RSOE) is to prepare leaders to achieve educational equity through practice, research, and policy. RSOE works to improve learning opportunities and outcomes in urban settings and to address disparities that affect historically marginalized groups. There are seven educator preparation programs in the unit. The Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, and Administrative Services programs, the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling program, and the Bilingual and Reading and Literacy Added Authorization programs are housed in RSOE. The Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work program is the only program not included within the RSOE and is housed in the Suzanne Dworak-Peck School of Social Work.

**Table 1: Program Review Status**

<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Number of Program Completers (2020-21)</b>	<b>Number of Candidates Enrolled (2021-22)</b>
Multiple Subject	88	127 online + 96 in person = 223
Single Subject	72	122 online + 79 in person = 201
Education Specialist M/M	63	36 online + 55 in person = 91
Bilingual Authorization	12	15 online + 22 in person = 37



<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Number of Program Completers (2020-21)</b>	<b>Number of Candidates Enrolled (2021-22)</b>
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	10	151 online only
PPS Social Work	25	62 online + 53 in person = 115
PPS School Counseling	80	160 online only
PPS Child Welfare and Attendance	25	62 online + 53 in person = 115
Preliminary Administrative Services Credential	45	36 online only

### **The Visit**

The visit was conducted as a joint accreditation site visit with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). The [final CAEP report](#) is provided on the USC Accreditation Website for reference.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this site visit was conducted virtually. The team and institutional stakeholders were interviewed via technology.

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

## PRECONDITION FINDINGS

After review of all relevant preconditions for this institution, all have been determined to be met.

## PROGRAM REPORTS

### **Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject and Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate**

**Note:** USC's Dual Credential program design is reflected here in a single program report that describes the dual credential program delivery model while ensuring that the standards are reviewed for each type of credential.

#### Program Design

Leadership for the program is shared by the RSOE and the Masters in Teaching (MAT) program faculty. The RSOE Dean and the Associate Dean of Academic Programs participate in the decision making related to resources, personnel, and accountability with the MAT program chair. The program chair is guided by course coordinators (leads from each content area and clinical experience), as well as MAT governance – a board of six faculty, one from each of the credential areas: Single Subject (SS), Multiple Subject (MS), Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate (M/M), and Bilingual and clinical experiences.

The RSOE Dean has the final responsibility for all decision making and is supported by an executive council with representatives from finance, research and faculty affairs, faculty council, equity and inclusion, academic programs, and communications. Each of these areas has an organizational chain to define decision making and governance. Many parts “talk” to each other. Committee members represent groups that they gather input from and offer program-wide feedback in which they provide analysis for a specific topic. Course coordinators (i.e. all 13 full-time faculty) meet monthly to make any curriculum changes and decisions. Candidate evaluations also play a role. Guiding teachers at school sites communicate weekly with the faculty members who supervise placements via a classroom observation sheet that is sent to the department.

Communication flows through the sharing of each of these groups' meeting notes and multiple school and program emails, publications, and meeting agendas (ex., all faculty and staff meeting). Program development documents and communications are kept on file and available to all faculty.

Course coordinators meet regularly with faculty to assess candidate and faculty feedback. All RSOE personnel attend faculty meetings at the beginning of the year and monthly thereafter. Adjunct faculty are invited. Stakeholder meetings for non-faculty members (guiding teachers, administrators, and field-based partners) are held in September, December, February and April. Campus stakeholder meetings (all course coordinators, faculty, and candidates) are held every semester at a college retreat.

The three strands of credential programs (MS, SS, and dual MS/M/M or SS/M/M) were designed to connect to each other through shared content, foci of assignments, and the use of reflection as a developmental tool in each term. Some faculty teach more than one course in a term or across terms, which facilitates integration. Candidates in all three strands complete MS or SS coursework and the dual credential candidates take additional courses with an Education Specialist focus each term. Dual credential candidates also complete an additional 150 hours of clinical practice during their third term in the program.

The course sequence demonstrates how faculty members support and enhance each other for a more holistic and unified approach toward learning to teach. Standards framing the Preliminary Multiple/Single Subjects credential, Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate credential, and the Bilingual Authorization (BILA) are addressed through this integrated approach. The organization of clinical practice chart is found in the syllabi for the pedagogy/guided practice courses. Candidates also receive it in a guided practice handbook. The course sequence chart demonstrates how fieldwork is part of each course in the MAT program and how classes are aligned within each term.

Changes made to courses included integrating pedagogy/instruction and field experiences into one course that was scheduled for the first term. Candidates take another general introduction to curriculum and instruction course focused on affecting teaching and learning across disciplines, grade levels, and the different social contexts of schooling. A course on the theories and research related to curriculum design and instructional models serves as a prerequisite to a course on the development of professionalism and prospective teachers' abilities to implement and advocate for appropriate practices responsive to needs, interests, abilities of all K-12 students in all educational settings.

In Spring 2020, the final two courses were integrated into several of the MAT courses, through a redistribution of units, a broadening of content and assignments, and asynchronous module assignments. Additionally, in the third term, candidates pursuing the dual credential pathway take an alternate path to ensure the additional content and clinical hours required for the Preliminary Education Specialist credential. In Fall 2020, the MAT program implemented the dual credential pathway. The Education Specialist coursework prepares candidates for the Mild/Moderate credential with all program completers being eligible for both General Education and Education Specialist credentials. No additional coursework is required to meet this dual recommendation, as content meeting the standards and Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) for both credentials are embedded across the Education Specialist program's three terms.

Site-based partners attend meetings dedicated to their input and participate in fall and spring retreats. Partners who also serve as guiding teachers meet with core pedagogy and practicum professors each term to consult about candidates. Faculty, guiding teachers, and candidates meet three times each semester at the beginning, mid-point and end of the semester. Partners teaching as adjunct and part-time faculty attend course faculty meetings held every two weeks where they contribute to assessment and curriculum. Full-time faculty are frequently at schools

where local candidates are placed, to discuss ideas and consult with guiding teachers. 2U, an outside vendor, supports the online candidates in the placement and servicing of their field experience. 2U mirrors the activities of the RSOE and reports to program leadership. Course coordinator meetings and MAT governance meetings are part of the ongoing fieldwork outreach.

### Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

During the first term of the program, candidates complete a course on the curriculum and instruction affecting teaching and learning across disciplines, grade levels, and the different social contexts of schooling. A second course in the first term is an education specialist specific course that addresses issues of varying educational contexts, equity and access to quality educational experiences; it addresses a wide range of student characteristics, and begins a program-long critical conversation focused on reflection, discourse, culturally relevant pedagogy and strategies aimed at educating all children. A third course on language development presents candidates with the clear connection between language and learning in school across all curricular areas. Candidates learn about the focus on the role of language in schools as evidence of the role language plays in the academic success of all children. Additionally, by understanding that language is at the core of all learning, candidates learn how students access knowledge and information through language and in turn use language to communicate their learning.

The second term includes guided practice courses that integrate pedagogy and illustrate a gradual release toward independent teaching. Candidates begin with a co-teaching experience with their guiding teacher in week three, increasing the number of lessons taught every other week, to four sequential lessons a week in weeks 11-13. Candidates also complete a seminar course that explores instruction, differences in how students learn and how to address those differences in relation to school expectations, and challenges to equal access to learning. This course builds on earlier courses and proceeds with greater depth in examining the range of learners from typical students to those needing more support or challenge, presenting strategies to differentiate, scaffold, and assess fairly for high student outcomes. This course fulfills many of the Education Specialist standards. A second seminar course is designed to prepare teachers and prospective teachers in the application of a balanced, integrated, and interactive perspective to teaching reading/language arts in grades K through 8. The focus of the course is on the foundational skills and strategies needed in the developmental phase of "learning to read," which is essential to the next phase of "reading and learning for life." This course examines how to foster literacy learning and support student's ways of learning, including those with special learning needs; those from language backgrounds other than English; and those from diverse cultures and/or socioeconomic backgrounds.

During the third term, single subject candidates to complete a course that includes subject specific curriculum and pedagogy. This course is designed for candidates to progress the quality of their classroom teaching and apply content knowledge in their chosen discipline (e.g., Math, Science, English Language Arts, Social Science). Single subject dual credential candidates enroll in their content specific sections of this course, since enrollment precludes a separate course for each subject matter area. Single subject candidates split their guided practice between the

inclusion and special education classroom formats. An Education Specialist supervisor monitors this integration and the application and completion of all Education Specialist specific assignments (modules, Individualized Education Program (IEP) participation, assessment tools presentation, etc.). Multiple subject and dual credential candidates complete a core pedagogy and practicum course designed to apply integrated content knowledge with pedagogical practices responsive to the needs of diverse learners, focusing on those with learning differences. The major goals are to introduce and implement pedagogical models and practices that engage learners through the use of intentional strategies for differentiation, scaffolding, and modification.

There are specific learning assignments for both multiple subject and single subject dual credential candidates throughout the program, either through class work or supervisor coaching. These assignments focus on skills for teaching students with differences and address IEP mandates. Candidates take one course that focuses on opportunities for the candidate to experience teaching across a full range of educational needs and one courses designed for teacher candidates to design, implement, and evaluate technology-rich learning environments to customize and individualize learning opportunities and assessments for K-12 students.

Even though special education skills are not the primary focus for every course, integrating pedagogy and instruction for students with special needs is critical to all MAT course work. Placing candidates in inclusion classes, and learning and using pertinent skills from the beginning of the program is a priority across all credential options.

Offering both online and in-person learning formats, field experiences take place onsite in several states and in international settings. All placements, including out-of-state and international placements, are made in schools that meet specific criteria. Guiding teachers also meet specific criteria.

Pedagogy instructors teach classes of eight students, nine maximum, and they supervise the site-based field experiences via video observation. They work directly with guiding teachers and candidates. The pedagogy instructors serve as supervisors, reviewing candidates' teaching video submissions and provide extensive feedback as part of the reflective teaching event (RTEs) and reflective focus video assignments (RFVs). A rubric, aligning the TPEs and edTPA is used to provide candidates comprehensive feedback. Faculty observe six one-hour videos of a candidate's teaching event each semester, as well as any requests for "micro observations" that may address specific strategies being employed in the classroom. Faculty members meet with guiding teachers and candidates three times each semester (beginning, mid-point and end) and conduct six formal observations each semester. Faculty have expressed a desire to have at least one on-site video observation each semester, if possible, understanding that the online program does not currently allow for an on-site observation.

All candidates seeking the MS/SS and Education Specialist credentials simultaneously complete all MAT coursework and clinical expectations of the Multiple Subjects or Single Subjects course of study. All preconditions for those programs apply to both courses of study. In the first term

(prior to guided practice), coursework includes the introductory course for teaching students with differences and the introductory course for alternative methods for teaching students for whom English is not their first language. The USC MAT doesn't employ field-based supervisors, instead, pedagogy instructors work directly with guiding teachers and candidates.

Within the MAT and credential programs, emphasis is placed in the critical areas of inclusion and English language learner teaching throughout the course sequence, specifically in coursework that explores instruction, differences in how students learn and how to address those differences in relation to school expectations, and challenges to equal access to learning. Additional courses proceed with greater depth in examining the range of learners from typical students to those needing more support or challenge, presenting strategies to differentiate, scaffold, and assess fairly for high student outcomes. A subsequent course focuses on inclusion as an opportunity for candidates to experience teaching across a full range of educational needs. Their work in collaboration with each other might include co-teacher, consultant/resource teacher, curriculum specialist, tutor, behavior specialist, or any combination to these. In each of these roles, today's educators must have the collaborative skills to accomplish this, to make the curriculum accessible to all students. This course is intended to prepare candidates to develop effective educational interventions for all students through assessment, curriculum and instruction and classroom environment management. During term three, an education specialist coach provides instruction and feedback (assessment and IEP) in a series of five modules covering all standards are provided to education specialist candidates. While all teacher education candidates may not seek to become teachers of students with special needs, all teachers will have students who require differentiation.

Mutiple subject candidates experience both an upper and lower elementary grade placement. Single subject dual credential candidates experience more than one placement within their subject matter focus, including a placement under the guidance of an education specialist mentor teacher. The program ensures the 600 (typically 756 hours) clinical hours for general education and the 150 additional hours for education specialist eligibility requirements are met by requiring candidates to serve in classrooms during the second and third terms (four days a week, with university courses on Fridays) implementing a gradual release format towards teaching full time. The website states "During the program, you will have two guiding teachers. These two teachers will provide you with the opportunity to observe and teach in his or her classroom during the school year, as well as provide a different perspective on your growth as a teacher. You will gain diverse perspectives and support in lesson planning, feedback, classroom management and more."

The explicit knowledge of curriculum designs and instructional models is introduced in the first term and is intended to provide the foundation to assist educators in becoming "teacher leaders" within the classroom, school, district, and community/state/federal context. Candidates begin the second term with a co-teaching experience with their guiding teacher. Key assessments in the final term bring together both clinical experiences and coursework as applied assessments related to inclusive general education, students needing extra support, students who are second language learners and students who are advanced learners.

Each candidate has a team made up of a site-based guiding teacher, a university fieldwork instructor, an academic adviser, and the candidate. Other support personnel (education specialist coach) interact with the candidates throughout the fieldwork experience. Guiding teachers and university professors teaching the core pedagogy and instruction communicate directly. This format facilitates university/school-site communication. Review and feedback from instruction are exchanged through videotaped lessons for both the on ground and online programs through the use of the Edthena platform where faculty and peers can review and respond to lessons at the same online site. Candidates post their videos on Edthena, facilitating university/school-site communication by storing and archiving teaching videos and feedback for the candidate to share with both instructors and site-based mentors. Feedback of instruction is exchanged right on the site, aligned with the specific lessons. Faculty and peers can review and respond to lessons at the same online site. Faculty exchange emails with both guiding teachers and candidates frequently.

Faculty who are selected for guided practice supervisor positions must have a credential in the same area as the candidate as well as a doctorate and experience as field-based practitioners. Job postings are responded to and a committee of three examines the applications and interview potential candidates for supervision positions.

#### Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed throughout the program. At program admission, they are assessed on admission requirements. During the first and second terms, candidates are assessed through satisfactory course progress, involving multiple in-course assessments such as discussions, anchor papers, and submitted videos. They are also assessed on an ongoing basis during fieldwork observations, progress toward satisfying their second term final evaluation, and progress toward satisfactorily completing their final term courses and final evaluation, along with the successful passage of the edTPA.

Interviews during the site visit demonstrated an overall theme of candidate satisfaction with the program. Candidates were happy to be program members. There were some concerns regarding the power of candidate voice. Language centered around inclusion and implicit bias was raised as a concern for future program modifications.

Program completer survey results for 2020-21 indicated that over 95% of completers from the Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist programs agree that the program was effective or very effective at developing skills or tools needed to become a teacher.

All candidates are advised of how they are assessed through internal and external measures which are conducted during and after the completion of the MAT program. Guiding teachers conduct weekly observations of the candidates and submit written feedback to the faculty member for review.

The goal for the use of multiple methods of candidate assessment is to maintain reliability and validity through documentation of progress toward 1) meeting the Commission-adopted

standards and TPEs, 2) meeting the educational values of the domains document, which embodies the MAT conceptual framework, and 3) providing evidence of impact in K-12 classrooms. Advisement sessions before admission begin the process of assessment. Assessment advice for all three terms involves grading, course communications, Zoom availability, and final assessments. Candidates are informed via course communications, grades, discussion feedback, and video observations.

The edTPA coordinator in the Accreditation and Credentialing Office manages edTPA data and coordinates other matters with *Edthena* and *2U*. Once all credential requirements are met, candidates are recommended for the appropriate teaching credential(s); however, candidates indicated extended wait time for processing credential paperwork for recommendation to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission). The institution acknowledged during the visit that additional resources for the credentialing office would improve the timeframe for processing credentials.

#### Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Credential programs.



## Preliminary Administrative Services

### Program Design

The School Leadership Academy for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) is a preparation program that includes focused, authentic, and interrelated sequence of learning experiences that effectively prepare candidates as instructional leaders in a variety of public, parochial, and private schools, and school districts. The design of the program is based on a sound rationale informed by theory and research aligned to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL) and California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE) standards and measured by the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA). Coursework is aligned, to the CalAPA Leadership Cycles. Due to CalAPA requirements, in December 2019, the program removed both summative assessment requirements of the Fieldwork Showcase and School Leadership Study, and elected to keep the Fieldwork Showcase as a cohesive representation of the 15-month experience aligned to CAPE standards for the summative assessment. The School Leadership Academy program provides content and performance expectations within the coursework and fieldwork for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential in alignment with CalAPA.

The program consists of rigorous coursework and fieldwork facilitated by USC faculty who have significant experience as teachers and educational leaders. Designed to fit the schedules of working professionals, classes are held online including two two-hour interactive classes, in real time, per week. There is approximately eight to ten hours of homework per week. Each semester, candidates complete two courses and, during two semesters of the program, complete a fieldwork course requiring 200 hours of fieldwork experiences. Candidates submit coursework through a learning management system and communicate with administrators through the Brightspace/Desire2Learn credential document site, email, and telephone.

There have been various changes to leadership since the initial report was submitted for Program Review in fall 2020. Program leadership includes a fieldwork coordinator and a key assessment coordinator, and there is currently a vacancy for a program administrator. During interviews with administration, it was stated that the job description has been posted and they are beginning to identify qualified candidates who have applied. When these applicants are vetted, interviews with the team will begin. The current leaders of the program have stepped into various roles to cover different duties in the interim.

Until recently, there was no significant evidence of any consistent, formal type of communication within the program; however, informal communication takes place through informal discussions, emails, one-on-one meetings, and through the learning management system. The program administration did suggest that they recently implemented suggestions and feedback from the adjunct faculty to provide more whole group faculty meetings, which they indicated will begin to be implemented this school year. The field supervisor, the site supervisor, and the program director do have meetings at the end of the term where they discuss the evaluations and progress of candidates; however, interviews confirmed that this

occurs inconsistently or not throughout the entire fieldwork experience. In addition, interviews were unable to confirm that site supervisors meet with the candidate together (as a support team) to discuss action plans, strengths, areas of opportunities, or goals of the candidate. Identifying other stakeholders was challenging, as there was no direct evidence that “partners, such as advisory committees, school districts that facilitate field experiences, higher education institutions, community organizations, and other stakeholder groups establish productive working relationships, coordinate joint efforts, and communicate regularly and openly.”

The curriculum challenges candidates to critically examine contemporary issues confronting a variety of school types and contexts. During the 15-month online program, candidates draw from research, practice, and their own experiences as educators and work collaboratively to develop effective and sustainable strategies for school leadership. The curriculum is aligned to the CAPEs and is guided by “Gap Analysis”, an educational psychology problem-solving framework. Courses support candidates’ abilities to master the CAPEs and demonstrate the effective knowledge, skills, and dispositions to address the challenges and opportunities in leading California’s K-12 schools. The program is led by experienced and successful school administrators who have significant knowledge and skills not only in leading diverse school settings, but also demonstrating expertise in the CAPE areas, such as development and implementation of a shared vision, instructional leadership, management and learning environment, family and community engagement, ethics and integrity, and external context and policy.

Over the summer in 2021, the program was revisited and revised. There was a deep look into the course syllabi and objectives, as well as assignments relating to alignment of CAPEs and the CalAPA. There was also an Equity Framework created to help ensure faculty are purposefully implementing components of this into their classes, which is still being fine-tuned. On the leadership team’s radar, there are considerations being made about how to grade candidates, such as pass/fail or actual letter grades, and if there will be two start dates per academic year or just one in the spring.

An advisory board was recently formed that will play a role in delivering feedback and input, as well as giving program leaders suggestions on what program improvement changes could be implemented. Additionally, fieldwork supervisors have direct contact (at the end of the term and during orientation) with site supervisors to discuss the program and expectations. The overall monitoring of field placements and site supervisors is inconsistent based on evidence provided and stakeholder interviews. Most communication, feedback, and input comes from informal dialogue and conversations from those involved with the program. Candidates do not seem to have a way to communicate feedback relating to the program, as there are no qualitative questions on the end-of-course surveys, only scaled scores.

#### Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The program is a non-degree, professional development preparatory program that prepares candidates for the Preliminary Administrative Services credential or certificate of eligibility. Completion of the program earns candidates continuing education units (CEUs). A minimum of

200 hours of supervised apprenticeship experience is required at completion of two courses (approximately 100 hours per course). The competencies themselves account for 70-75 hours per course; however, individual candidate submissions may require additional hours.

The sequence of coursework is divided into two start times. Fall starts in August and Spring starts in January of each year. Courses are completed over 15 months. University site supervisor coordinators/fieldwork instructors meet with their candidates four times a semester as a class and four times individually (one-on-one) to discuss expectations for fieldwork. Coordinators meet with school site supervisors two times per semester: once at the beginning of each term, and once at the end of each term to review expectations for fieldwork experiences. While expectations are reviewed, there is limited to no evidence that “at least one field/clinical supervisor and at least one program supervisor provide complete, accurate, and timely feedback to the candidate, including constructive suggestions for improvement” on an ongoing basis. One-on-one meetings can be scheduled throughout the term as needed. Site supervisors meet with candidates and guide 200 hours of fieldwork experiences over two terms.

Candidates select the site at which they will complete their CalAPA work. This is generally the site at which the candidate already works, making it challenging to ensure the candidates “complete a range of activities in educational settings” that allow the candidate to: “4) create a learning culture that supports all students, and 5) understand and reflect socioeconomic and cultural diversity.” While there does not seem to be a verification process for quality assurance of the site supervisors for candidates working at their current school site, the selection of the site is subject to review and/or verification by the School Leadership Academy’s faculty advisor and the program manager if the site is not the site of employment for the candidate or if it is a nontraditional K-12 location such as a learning center, educational non-profit, or online setting. If candidates change school sites while enrolled in the School Leadership Academy, they must complete and submit a new form. The School Leadership Academy approves sites that allow students to complete their fieldwork experience hours over two courses.

During preliminary preparation, aspiring administrators learn how to engage family and community members in accomplishing the school’s vision of equitable schooling and continuous improvement that includes the academic, linguistic, cultural, social-emotional, mental and physical health, and/or other supports needed to succeed in school. This is highlighted throughout four courses. A new Equity Framework has been created to ensure equity, diversity, and inclusion are purposefully included in every course, although faculty seem to do this informally within each course. Because each faculty member is responsible for their own curriculum implementation, there is minimal consistency or cohesiveness across the program to verify that these critical areas are indeed being addressed.

One-on-one meetings with the USC fieldwork coordinator occur once a month. The purpose of the meeting is to review the candidate’s progress on meeting the CAPEs as evaluated on the Candidate Competency Record. There is limited evidence that there is triangulation that occurs between the fieldwork instructor, site supervisor, and candidate to discuss progress and/or evaluations.

### Assessment of Candidates

Each candidate's work is reviewed every semester by the instructor of the courses in which embedded CAPE aligned assignments, fieldwork reflections, and the summative assessment assignment take place. Additional ongoing review takes place by the university site supervisor coordinator. The faculty advisor approves the Competency Record at the end of the term. The embedded CAPE aligned assignments, fieldwork reflections and summative assessment contain a number of rubrics and criteria lists for candidates to ensure that their work is of the caliber necessary. The instructor utilizes these same criteria and rubrics in assigning grades while providing additional feedback to any candidate who needs to repeat portions or all of any activity.

During the program, candidates are guided and coached on their performance in relation to the standards of candidate competence and performance using formative assessment processes. Verification of candidate competence is provided by a representative of the program sponsor and at least one field/clinical supervisor. There was lack of evidence to show how this process works or how candidates receive support when and if necessary.

Prior to recommending each candidate for a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, one or more persons responsible for the program determine, on the basis of thoroughly documented evidence, that each candidate has demonstrated satisfactory performance on the full range of competency standards and performance in CAPE standards. Satisfactory performance is defined as achieving the competence expected for entry-level administrators. The required documents are uploaded into a portal, where requirements are signed off digitally. There is currently a backlog of 120 days for credentials processing which, through stakeholder interviews, it was stated that this has created several challenges for candidates, most notably employment delays.

### Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program except for the following:

#### **Standard 2: Collaboration, Communication and Coordination – Not Met**

There was no convincing evidence that "partners, such as advisory committees, school districts that facilitate field experiences, higher education institutions, community organizations, and other stakeholder groups establish productive working relationships, coordinate joint efforts, and communicate regularly and openly." While the team recognizes that an advisory board for the program was recently formed, evidence of the board's meetings and efforts for program improvement is not yet apparent.

There was no convincing evidence that "partners share responsibility for program quality; candidate recruitment, selection, and advisement; curriculum development; delivery of instruction; selection of field sites; design of field experiences; selection and preparation of field experience supervisors, and assessment and verification of candidate competence." While the

team understands that the majority of candidates in this program choose to complete their field experiences at their current site of employment, there was no convincing evidence that the program monitors the advisement from the field experience supervisors, take part in the selection of field sites and design of the field experiences, or share responsibility with the chosen field site to assess and verify candidate competence.

**Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences – Not Met**

There was no convincing evidence that candidates “complete a range of activities in educational settings” that allow the candidate to: 4) create a learning culture that supports all students, and 5) understand and reflect socioeconomic and cultural diversity. While the team recognizes that some candidates may be in a chosen placement that does serve a diverse population of students and communities, there was no convincing evidence that all placements were monitored to ensure this experience as required by the standards.

**Standard 8: Guidance, Assistance and Feedback – Not Met**

There was no convincing evidence that “at least one field/clinical supervisor and at least one program supervisor provide complete, accurate, and timely feedback to the candidate, including constructive suggestions for improvement.” While there was evidence that candidates were receiving guidance and assistance from program supervisors, there was no convincing evidence that field supervisors communicated with the program to provide complete, accurate and timely feedback to the candidate. Additionally, interviews with stakeholders revealed that a process for candidates to evaluate all field experiences and supports was not available.

## Reading and Literacy Added Authorization

### Program Design

The Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA) program is operated under the supervision of the USC Office of Professional Development in the Rossier School of Education. A full-time program administrator under the direction of the dean of professional development oversees program operations and communication with the K-12 districts. A full-time MAT faculty member serves as the faculty lead/literacy content expert for the program overseeing curriculum, courses, and faculty coordination and training. Although this leadership configuration is new for the program as of the fall of 2021, there is evidence of coordination among new program leadership for program oversight and continuous improvement.

The program administrator and faculty lead maintain regular communication. New adjunct faculty indicated that they did receive initial training from the university, as well as a structured course syllabus and assignments. These new faculty members have experienced varying levels of collaboration with other faculty. With the large increase in program size during the 2021-2022 school year, the program has created scheduled meetings and professional development to ensure consistent program understanding and implementation.

The program consists of four courses that span one academic school year. Candidates complete two courses concurrently in the fall semester and two in the spring semester. Each course is designed using a combination of asynchronous and synchronous online instruction. Courses are delivered through weekly modules. The program reports synchronous weekly or bi-weekly meetings used to engage discussions about field work/clinical practices; however, current candidates interviewed were inconsistent in reporting that these synchronous meetings were regularly offered in all course sections. Candidates did indicate that they liked the flexibility of the asynchronous program and also benefited from the personal connection made in live sessions.

The program is currently under new leadership and has undertaken a systematic review of programming based on stakeholder input and Commission feedback. They have developed a plan of action to strengthen RLAA standards implementation within the program, including additional readings related to equity, access, digital literacy, and research-based strategies for early, adolescent, and language learners; additional content related to professional development, peer coaching, and effective data based communication; and updates to the diagnostic profile including identifying the difference between language development concerns and reading disabilities.

Additionally, the program has aligned the syllabus and digital platform materials, developed protocols for addressing common concerns, and added opportunities for feedback and support for both candidates and faculty. Some of the issues addressed in the plan, such as student procedures for when case study students become unavailable, faculty guidance on consistent communication of expectations, and assistance to candidates in navigating digital and print resources, were also noted as areas of need by candidates interviewed.

Candidates' input and feedback is sought during synchronous coaching meetings and office hours. There is evidence that in 2021 program staff gathered trends from this communication and provided timely extra support to students and guidance to faculty. For example, candidate feedback initiated an optional live professional development session on navigating the online learning platform. Additionally, the program has recently created a mid-semester feedback survey for candidates in each course so that the program can make timely adjustments to meet candidate needs rather than waiting for the end of course evaluation data.

### Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The RLAA program is structured using an online asynchronous model with synchronous coaching meetings and office hours. Each course is organized in weekly and bi-weekly modules. Candidates also engage with their peers in discussions posted in the learning management system discussion board and live interaction opportunities. Additionally, each course also includes a set of key assessments. Feedback from current candidates indicated that some assignments would benefit from increased faculty support including clear rubrics and faculty guidance in helping students to identify areas from the reading and resources needed to successfully complete assignments.

Courses in the fall term provide candidates with theoretical understanding. In the Foundations of Reading Instruction course, candidates develop expertise in literacy research, pedagogy, policy and essential concepts of diversity and equity as they create comprehensive literacy instruction/curriculum accessible to all learners. In the Diagnosis of Reading Disabilities course, candidates focus on causes and classification of reading difficulties within school environments. Candidates work alongside two case study students to learn how to properly diagnose these students' literacy needs using a comprehensive approach. Candidates interviewed mentioned a heavy load of assessments in the first semester, and most did not yet see the "big picture" of how assessments would lead them to targeted instructional strategies to better meet their students' needs.

Courses in the spring term provide candidates further application and skills to develop literacy leadership. In the Teaching Writing: Research to Practice course, candidates explore the different stages of writing development including how students' home language, background and learner profile impact writing proficiency. Different writing methods, types of writing, modalities, and technologies are studied to help candidates create and implement a curriculum that embeds writing across the disciplines.

In the Remediation of Reading Disabilities course, candidates learn how to design instruction that is specifically tailored to students' literacy needs. Informed by the other three courses in the program, candidates also create a literacy leadership plan to address an identified need for their school/district. Completers of the program particularly praised the literacy leadership plan as a valuable tool which had helped them to progress their skills and impact in their instructional setting.

Candidates complete the fieldwork requirement by working alongside two case study students from two different levels of literacy development. In one course, each candidate identifies one student from their own classroom and selects a second case study student from a different grade level (e.g., K-3 and 4-12). Candidates who teach at an elementary school select a second case study student from their own school, whereas candidates who teach at a secondary school select a second case study student from a feeder school. The fieldwork for the program is embedded in the Diagnosis of Reading Disabilities and Remediation of Reading Disabilities courses where candidates work alongside their case study students on a weekly or bi-weekly basis throughout the duration of the program. Candidates are also advised on how to determine instructional recommendations, which are part of the diagnostic profiles, using knowledge gained from Foundations of Reading Instruction course. Feedback from candidates, completers, and the faculty indicated that the program is transitioning from a strong focus on individual diagnostics and toward a greater focus on research-based strategies to meet a variety of student needs.

Critical areas of reading instruction that address the needs of English Language Learners (ELL) are embedded throughout the program. Course lectures, assigned readings, critical reflective journals, assignments with case study students and additional videos/resources are provided to ensure candidates understand the progression of language acquisition and literacy development for ELLs. Candidates also use this knowledge as they select their case study students, administer plans, and teach reading lessons. The program has included differentiating between language acquisition challenges and reading disabilities as an area of emphasis in their planned program improvements.

Candidates spend 40 hours in semester one and 55 hours in semester two, about half of which are direct assessment and instruction with students with the remaining half is mentored clinical experience. Candidates receive guidance in selecting diverse students to meet standards requirements.

Supervised practice includes feedback on lesson plans, co-planning with candidates, coaching and mentoring on strategy selection, lesson delivery, reflective conversations, goal setting for candidates at least 15 hours per course in the fall and spring. With the large number of new candidates and adjunct faculty teaching courses, candidates did report some variability in the responsiveness of their professor for individual advice. The program has shown evidence that they are addressing these growth issues through their professional development plans and program communication.

#### Assessment of Candidates

Each course includes a set of key assessments that measure candidates' competency of knowledge and skills outlined in the program standards. Candidate assessment consists of proficiency in the progression of literacy development; data collection and analysis of diagnostic reading and writing assessments; analysis and critique of the research literature of reading instruction; diagnostic lesson planning and application of research-based instruction in reading and writing; and leadership in school/district wide-data analysis and curriculum design in



literacy. Current program leadership has divided the previously single summative assessment document into fall and spring formative assessments in order to keep everyone better involved and up to date on candidate progress toward the authorization.

A candidate checklist of requirements for the added authorization was updated this year, and a live information meeting is planned for candidates during the spring semester. Throughout the program, any candidate who does not meet course requirements is provided with one-on-one support by faculty. New program leadership is training staff to implement an “Early Warning System” which guides faculty to proactively reach out to provide support to candidates who are not keeping up with course work expectations. Candidates who do not meet expectations after immediate faculty support will be asked to meet with program advisors to help create a structured plan and schedule of improvement and/or remediation so that they can successfully meet program benchmarks.

#### Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization.

## **Bilingual Authorization**

### Program Design

The Bilingual Authorization (BILA) leadership team is integrated in the leadership of the Masters in Teaching (MAT) program and includes an advisory group that consists of two full-time MAT faculty who oversee the BILA program, and three field-based partners/adjunct faculty with a range of experiences working with English learners and bilingual settings. This team meets regularly with the broader MAT Advisory Team as well as separately to discuss the BILA program, as evidenced by the advisory board schedule and minutes.

Program faculty, supervisors, and district partners participate in fall and spring retreats and monthly after school programs with the MAT program. The BILA program was the subject of a whole leadership team professional development in September 2020. BILA faculty reported regular formal and informal collaboration amongst full time and adjunct USC faculty. Communication between the university and the guiding teachers serving in the program is reported to occur primarily through each candidates' MAT faculty advisor and the university placement coordinator.

Key learnings regarding language acquisition and culturally relevant teaching are embedded throughout the MAT coursework, and BILA candidates complete an additional reading focused on bilingual methodologies in terms one and three, and during term three an additional video observation and feedback cycle for a lesson delivered in Spanish. BILA candidates are placed in classrooms with English language learners for the duration of their field placement, and during term 3 are required to demonstrate teaching in the primary language (Spanish). As reported by interviewees, in the context of field placements at the secondary level it can be challenging to identify targeted groups of students to receive primary language instruction. The BILA fieldwork advisor works individually with candidates to plan how best to meet this requirement in the context of their placement.

As of September 2020, a stand-alone cultural course is no longer offered, and students now meet the cultural knowledge expectation by passing the corresponding CSET. This decision was made in part to relieve BILA candidates of the cost of an additional USC course. Based on interviews with candidates and completers, not all candidates were aware of the CSET requirements in time for them to make plans to take, or seek support for, the exams, and this did cause some candidates concern for their ability to successfully complete the BILA program along with their MAT cohort.

In an effort to strengthen the candidates' pedagogical knowledge of bilingual methodologies, in 2021 the program introduced an additional text for candidates. Based on interviews during the site visit, faculty are aware of this text, but are still in the process of determining how to utilize it to systematically advance student preparedness.

The BILA fieldwork guide was updated to include pre and post meetings with the BILA candidates to support their planning and reflection on Spanish language instruction and to

better evaluate that BILA candidates are meeting all BILA standards both in coursework and fieldwork. Based on interviews, it was unclear that the MAT advisors, BILA advisors, and credential support share a common understanding of how the document might be used to advise and support candidates.

Program completers and their employers are surveyed nine months into their initial employment. It was unclear whether this data is disaggregated for the BILA completers or how the BILA advisory board used this data in their improvement conversations. Faculty who were interviewed reported that there are a variety of informal communication channels in place for candidates and guiding teachers (GT) to provide feedback about BILA specific coursework and their fieldwork experience. University credentialing personnel reported that candidates are surveyed formally about their fieldwork experience, though a minority of candidates return this survey. It is unclear whether this formal feedback has impacted the BILA program in the continuous improvement process.

#### Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Instruction on standards for the bilingual authorization is integrated with coursework for the MAT. Courses with particular emphasis on the bilingual standards include the following: Introduction to Curriculum and Pedagogy in Urban Schools; Integrated Language Development Across the Curriculum; Integrating Social Studies, Language Arts and Guided Practice (multiple subject candidates); Applications of Curriculum and Pedagogy (single subject candidates). Fieldwork begins with a gradual release toward independent teaching, and BILA students may complete this in any setting. BILA candidates' third term fieldwork placement is either in a dual language classroom, or a school setting or that provides the candidate opportunities to observe and practice Spanish language instruction. If that is unavailable for their content area, the BILA field supervisor supports the candidate individually in finding an appropriate context to complete the primary language instruction video and observation cycle.

Key Assessments in each course bring together both clinical experiences and coursework as applied assessments. Students complete and receive feedback on a series of reflective videos which demonstrate their ability to utilize appropriate curricular materials and pedagogy to meet student needs. In the BILA program, candidates should have the opportunity to apply knowledge gained in the new reading on dual language instruction multiple courses in order to prepare them for their primary language instruction and observation cycle.

Coursework includes historical and pedagogical background on bilingual education, culturally relevant educational practices for multilingual learners, assessment of English proficiency and integrated language development strategies to meet the needs of emergent bilinguals. In the syllabus, the default perspective is instruction delivered in English rather than dual immersion or fully bilingual programs of instruction, however, faculty report that they integrate examples of primary language usage. Candidates learn general principles of effective curricular and pedagogical instructional design with an emphasis on meeting the needs of emergent bilinguals. Candidates complete videos of their instructional implementation and reflection.

Candidates are in the classroom in terms two and three, (four days a week, with university courses on Fridays) implementing a gradual release format towards teaching full time. The program ensures the 600 (typically 756 hours) clinical hours for General Education and the 150 additional hours for Education Specialist eligibility. The BILA standards are integrated into guided practice expectations as noted on the course matrix and syllabi.

Candidates become familiar with the BILA program through a USC credential support advisor who shares a promotional video and provides a formal question and answer session about the advantages and requirements for the bilingual authorization. There is a detailed BILA fieldwork guide describing the requirements and process for application provided to prospective BILA candidates. Once students declare their intent to complete the BILA program, a member of the credential support team tracks their progress in requirements toward the credential and advises candidates of exam requirements. To verify sufficient language proficiency, students are required to complete CSET Spanish subtest III before entering into bilingual fieldwork during their third term. Current candidates interviewed mentioned that the timing of this requirement was challenging and had created concern for them as to whether they would be able to complete the bilingual fieldwork according to their MAT schedule.

Students in the BILA program are concurrently enrolled in the MAT program and are assigned a faculty advisor from the MAT program as part of their term two and three fieldwork. This faculty advisor meets formally with the GT and the candidate three times each semester. The candidate receives weekly feedback from the GT, and feedback from the faculty advisor six times during the term as a part of a small cohort class. In their third term, students pursuing the BILA also work directly with a BILA field supervisor for an additional observation and feedback cycle conducted in Spanish. Completers interviewed reported that this BILA specific field advice was highly valuable.

#### Assessment of Candidates

Prospective BILA candidates are required to demonstrate passage of the corresponding CSET in World Languages for language competence before progressing to candidate fieldwork. Faculty from MAT courses verify components of candidate proficiency using the “Bilingual Authorization Fieldwork Competencies” form. For candidates seeking the BILA, the “Recommendation Packet” includes verification of all BILA requirements, including the official score reports for the corresponding CSET for World Languages. These requirements and primary language fieldwork competencies are verified by the BILA supervisor before passing it onto the credential analyst. Fieldwork competencies are also documented by the director of fieldwork and the BILA fieldwork adviser meets with students to document their BILA program of study.

A BILA fieldwork guide provides a detailed description of authorization benefits and requirements available to all candidates from program entry. The program reports that the candidate’s academic advisor and fieldwork supervisor are included in the initial application so that they can give appropriate guidance to program participants. However, candidates report that they would value more frequent and earlier BILA specific advice. In the third term, the BILA field supervisor provides individualized observation and feedback to candidates on Spanish

language instruction, and a member of the credential support team follows up with the candidate to ensure all testing requirements have been met. Current candidates represented in interviews indicated that they did not always know which staff to reach out to in order to receive BILA relevant, timely guidance and advice. Candidates also indicated that they would have value having an identified BILA advisor proactively check-in with them throughout the process to answer any questions.

#### Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Bilingual Authorization.

## **Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling**

### Program Design

The conceptual model of the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling program explores relevant challenges affecting today's schools, focusing on the well-being of the whole child which is aligned with the RSOE's broader mission of achieving educational equity. The curriculum is informed by professional competencies and standards put forth by the American School Counselor Association's (ASCA) National Model for School Counseling; Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP); and by critical research in the fields of counselor education, sociology, philosophy, education, and counseling and community psychology. Candidates in the program gain theoretical and hands-on knowledge needed to become a school counselor through the lens of modern school counseling techniques. Additionally, the directors of the program shared that the program provides training in restorative justice and trauma informed practices. Faculty, candidates, staff, and alumni engage in ongoing critical reflection, problem solving, and candid communication on behalf of K-12 students, families, and other stakeholders. Several stakeholders spoke about the support that is offered to students through "Courageous Conversation" events that are held to facilitate support, reflection on student experiences, and team building between the students and faculty.

At the school level, the RSOE Dean and the Associate Dean of Academic Programs oversee all decision making related to resources, personnel, and accountability with the master's program office chair. The master's program office chair works to lead the school counseling program with a program lead/curriculum coordinator who is a full-time associate professor of teaching. Program leadership indicated that they understand the complexity of the school counseling credential program and meet monthly. They also have informal communication when needed, on a weekly basis. Two other full-time school counseling faculty participate in the decision-making process and meet regularly for faculty meetings to discuss content and process the program. The faculty also meet monthly for master's program office (MPO) meetings to process program-level information and this includes the student advisor for the program.

As with all of USC's educator preparation programs, the RSOE Dean has the final responsibility for all decision making. He is supported by an executive council with representatives from finance, research and faculty affairs, faculty council, equity and inclusion, academic programs and communications. Each of these areas has an organizational chain to define decision-making and governance. School counseling faculty meet regularly during monthly faculty meetings to process program-level information and to further the "Dean's charge".

The school counseling program is a national, online program. It is designed around three key focus areas: college and career readiness, restorative justice, and trauma informed practice. Interviews with stakeholders also highlighted the program's inclusion of "systems of power" and working with students who have "marginalized backgrounds". Candidates can choose between full time or part time enrollment and can earn their degree in two to three years over a minimum of five semesters. Interviews and document review highlighted that courses contained asynchronous and synchronous components. Faculty use case studies, professional experiences,

and current events to “bring the text and course to life.” To support candidates in their field placements, recent alumni suggested that the program, although virtual, encouraged connection between the candidates. They shared they would “buddy up” with other candidates and learned to “reach out to peers for support, and lean on each other when needed.”

After two years of development, the school counseling program began its first cohort in summer 2018. As part of the program evaluation component of the comprehensive assessment plan, meetings were held with MPO, faculty, and the program advisory board (PAB) and no structural changes have occurred since that time. In the planning phase for structural changes over the next two years to add, delete, and modify a few courses while still maintaining the same unit and course load. In general, these changes include adding a substance abuse course and family counseling course, and absorbing key sections of politics of difference/portfolio courses into existing courses.

The program is advised by the PAB, who meets annually to collect and process input from community stakeholders. The members include faculty, site supervisors, community agents, and founding program members. Ongoing program review occurs as part of the comprehensive assessment plan. Further, candidates fill out a Qualtrics survey once a semester to provide feedback to the program on their experiences with the field supervisors.

#### Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Field experience courses engage candidates in a field experience that includes practicum and fieldwork. The field experience is designed to facilitate the application of theoretical concepts learned in coursework in school settings. The field experience also introduces the candidate to the major duties and responsibilities authorized by the school counseling pupil personnel services credential. A stakeholder meeting with recent graduates expressed that after the field experiences the alumni were prepared and “ready to go” for hiring.

The coursework is sequenced over five terms. Each term’s courses vary between six to ten units. To complete the fieldwork requirements, there are two practicum courses and three field work courses that are held over three terms. Interviews with graduates indicated that the “courses correspond with the PPSC experiences” and that the therapeutic experiences they were learning “happened concurrently with their supported experiences in the school.”

The field placement team oversees the entire field experience and is led by a staff member. Prior to the beginning of field experience, candidates are approved for placements in collaboration with the school counseling faculty, the master’s program office, and the field placement team. A contracted agency, 2U, was reported to place students in their internships. Interviews with completers indicated that placements were made for candidates considering their interest in working with specific developmental groups and the physical location and proximity to available internship sites. The fieldwork also included experiences in public K-12 settings with two developmental age groups. Candidates are required to have the following counseling hours among two of three placement settings of elementary, middle, and high school: 600 hours total following 100 practicum hours. Completers indicated that they had time in practicum to observe

and shadow practitioners and practice their skills once in their internships. Their experiences include 150 hours of counseling students of diverse backgrounds, 100 hours of social/emotional counseling, 100 hours of college/career counseling, and 100 hours of academic counseling.

Racial equity and inclusion are highly valued in the program; therefore, each course has specific learning outcomes/objectives they must meet in regard to their preparedness to work with racially diverse populations. In addition to these objectives, each course references Commission-adopted standards which are respectively linked to course assignments. Course assignments may require case study analysis, synthesis, application of and engagement with key concepts, and require candidates to engage in discussions and reflection activities to expand their own perspectives and promote ongoing examination and evaluation. The readings for each course aim to focus on racially, culturally, and linguistically diverse populations, as well as a range of topics pertaining to race. Required readings authored by scholars of color are also a part of each course. Additionally, interviews highlighted the coursework's focus on wellness and wellbeing. Specific school counseling program standards are introduced in specific coursework. These standards are then practiced in practicum and fieldwork one, and finally, assessed in fieldwork two.

The program has candidates in 244 different placements at elementary, middle, high schools in public, private, charter, and community sectors. Field experiences are supervised by an approved site supervisor and a faculty supervisor who is teaching the field experience course. The site supervisor completes an online evaluation at the end of each semester and that is then approved by the faculty supervisor as part of the field course.

### Assessment of Candidates

The program follows a comprehensive assessment plan that includes an assessment of candidates particularly in the program assessment phase. Specifically, candidates are assessed:

- In each course
- Via key program assessments
- Prior to their field experience
- At the end of each of the three field experience courses

For courses, a final course grade is computed from assignments listed in the syllabus of each course. There are also four key program assessment points in the program that are reviewed in the program evaluation phase from the comprehensive assessment plan for each candidate. At the conclusion of each field experience course, site supervisors assess each candidate's counseling development via an evaluation which in turn, is reviewed by the faculty site supervisor.

Candidates are advised on how they will be assessed/informed of assessment results at time of enrollment, at the beginning of each course, when offered a field experience placement, and at the beginning of each of the three field experience courses.



## Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling credential program.

### **Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work with Child Welfare and Attendance**

#### Program Design

The Pupil Personnel Services (PPS): School Social Work Credential with the Child Welfare and Attendance Specialization program is administered by the Suzanne Dworak-Peck School of Social Work (SDPSSW) and is embedded in its course curricula and field practicum. The graduate program is highly structured in accordance with accrediting standards of both the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing thus providing candidates the opportunity to simultaneously meet requirements for the Masters in Social Work (MSW) and the school social work with child welfare and attendance specialization program. The program is offered in person at the main campus, and statewide through an online synchronous format. All candidates in the program earn the School Social Work credential with the Child Welfare and Attendance specialization.

The Director of Social Work in Schools/School Social Work Programs provides oversight of the program. The director has served as the Director Of School Social Work for over a decade. The director has served as the Vice President of the California Association of School Social Workers, the Western Regional Representative of the School Social Work Association of America, and currently serves as the President of the American Council for School Social Work (ACSSW). The program is offered as both generalist and specialized experiences for students who select the Children, Youth, and Family Department. MSW students who complete the school social work program in their generalist internship are assigned a faculty member who, in consultation with the director, provides additional oversight of program delivery. This faculty member has served in this role for over four years and also sits on the ACSSW Board.

The director collaborates regularly with the director of accreditation and credentialing at the RSOE, which provides overall governance of all credential programs offered at USC. There is regular communication regarding candidate compliance, Commission regulations, and program updates. Additionally, the director is in periodic communication with Commission personnel who provide oversight of all service credentials. This communication is designed around program structure, compliance and urgent concerns impacting candidate learning. The director of the PPSC program was appointed to serve on the statewide committee to help craft the new standards and performance expectations (PE) in school social work and served as the school social work committee's liaison to the Commission. In this capacity, information and content was/is mutually shared with other committee members, the SDPSSW, and where necessary, the Rossier School of Education. Interviews with stakeholders highlighted that the director also helps facilitate the school social work roundtable, a group of southern California PPS educators who collaborate on issues related to school social work internships.

All school social work candidates enroll in the Children, Youth and Families (CYF) Department in the MSW program. This includes foundational curriculum with generalist practice coursework, advanced curriculum with specialized CYF coursework, and a minimum of 1,000 hours of field practicum experience, which includes 450 hours engaged in school social work activities and 150 hours engaged in child welfare and attendance activities. Interviews indicated that intern candidates may complete their school social work internship during their foundation or advanced year internship. Those candidates who wish to complete their school social work internship their foundation year need to complete an application process and be selected as there are a greater number of internship hours (600 versus the typical 450) completed to earn the credential. Candidates enroll in coursework and field education concurrently, so as to enrich the learning experience in field education by anchoring that learning with theoretical content and the use of evidenced based interventions. Two evidenced based interventions are taught to all candidates prior to or shortly thereafter the start of their field education experience: (1) Motivational Interviewing and (2) Problem Solving Therapy. Interviews with stakeholders highlighted that candidates “gain confidence for their field placements by understanding these interventions.”

Changes over the last two years include:

- Course content, assignments, readings and sequencing launching September 2021
- 30 new school districts for field opportunities
- All candidates take a new course on Diversity, Social Justice and Culturally Competent Social Work Practice

The school social work round table was developed five years ago. Representatives provide input from Commission, national school social work associations, and recently identified content for performance expectations, activities candidates can engage in that are aligned with the performance expectations, re-entry into hybrid forms of field education, and impact of racial inequality in school communities. Also, the end of the year instructor’s survey, end of year candidate survey, and strengths, weaknesses, opportunities threats survey to candidates and field instructors provide input. Further, interviews with stakeholders indicated faculty has gathered many professionals from the field of school social work, a recently graduated graduate student, field instructors, and other university faculty to support this program.

#### Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Coursework emphasizes high impact prevention, early and sustained intervention across the developmental life spans, the translation of research into practice, and the development of creative leaders in social work practice, including school social work. Building on generalist practice knowledge in human behavior theory, clinical practice, the science of social work, and social policy and advocacy, students begin advanced training in the CYF department to deepen their knowledge and skills in micro, mezzo, and macro practice. Interviews with current candidates indicated that the field courses “taught me a lot, allowed me to be vulnerable in my learning, and gave access to other peer leaders who support.”

Fieldwork is focused on integrating knowledge of family centered social work practice utilizing an eco-systems perspective as a primary framework. As specified by Commission regulations, fieldwork for school social work candidates includes time in school-based settings, learning firsthand how to function cooperatively in a school system with teachers, staff, administrators and other mental health personnel as part of a multidisciplinary team to maximize pupil learning, growth and development. As part of the field course requirements, intern candidates are gaining experiences across multiple developmental stages and understanding the PPS credential requirements. Interviews uncovered that these intern candidates are also being placed in diverse school settings, gaining experience working with students who are different from the candidates themselves in race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, gender, gender expression, and sexual orientation.

School social work candidates are in generalist practice in the children, youth and family concentration. Candidates are required to take the Social Work Practice in School Settings course as one of these electives (the other two are candidate choice). Other relevant electives for school social work candidates include Social Work in Early Care and Educational Settings, School Violence, Social Work Practice with Transitional Youth, and Threat Assessment and Management. Interviews suggest that many of these courses are taught by licensed clinical social workers and some by credentialed school social workers. Many of the full time faculty and course leads expressed their views that the courses stress the realism of what the applicants will encounter in their employment and how the PPS credential standards and CSWE competencies guide their courses and how they are integrated into the courses. For example, one course related to engaging individuals and understanding development by learning expressive art therapy techniques and dance therapy techniques.

The program has candidates in over 300 different field placements in school districts, within a range of grades, in public and charter schools, and includes specialized populations like foster youth achievement, juvenile justice, and migrant education.

The schools or community-based agencies contracted with schools represent a complete range of social services and are approved based on the quality of their professional practice, their commitment to addressing educational and social problems, and their interest in participating in professional education. Guided by educational objectives, the field practicum seeks to validate, apply, and integrate the knowledge, theories, and concepts of social work practice being learned throughout the curriculum.

The field instructor/site supervisor provides site supervision in accordance with the Commission regulations and is visited by the field faculty liaison (in person/virtually/teleconference) at least two times per academic year to review progress and growth within the field education experience. Document review and interviews confirmed that all candidates have a field instructor/site supervisor and field faculty. Candidates are evaluated with two different measures. Both the CSWE's evaluation and a school social work evaluation. Interviews shed light on the evaluation process. Field instructors are filling out school social work evaluations at the end of every semester and comprehensive skills evaluations at the end of each semester.

Program completers also shared how they have advisers that are accessible and “have been supportive, hands on, held my hand through understanding the PPS requirements, and met three times over the summer.”

#### Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed through the instructional evaluation instruments indicated above and through the site visit with the candidate, field liaison and field instructor. Each evaluation instrument is thoroughly reviewed and signed by all parties.

Upon declaration of interest in the school social work program, candidates are invited to a meeting hosted by the director. Here, candidates are apprised of the candidate progress checklist, curriculum coursework, and the school social work agency list. Prior to the start of field education, candidates are invited to a second meeting to review the program requirements and the program evaluation in greater detail. Finally, at the completion of the MSW program, candidates are invited to a final meeting to verify all school social work requirements have been met and are provided a timeframe and instructions for the issuance of the PPS: School Social Work credential.

#### Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work with a specialization in Child Welfare and Attendance program.

## INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The credential programs at the University of Southern California are housed in both the Rossier School of Education (RSOE) and the Suzanne Dworak-Peck School of Social Work (SDPSSW). The unit head is the Dean of the RSOE with strong collaboration with the Dean of SDPSSW for the oversight and management of the PPSC in School Social Work with a specialization in Child Welfare and Attendance. While both deans are relatively new to their positions (less than 2 years), both were able to communicate a clear shared vision of academic quality, service to the community, and dedication to social justice.

The programs are grounded by a mission and Dean’s Charge which are well aligned with California’s adopted standards and curricular frameworks. The mission articulates a commitment to prepare leaders to achieve educational equity through practice, research and policy. The mission is infused throughout the preparation programs. The Dean’s Charge highlights central priorities in advancing the mission by focusing on the quality of programs, racial justice, retention/time to degree completion, and making necessary curriculum changes and alignment to the strategic plan accordingly. Faculty and staff are well qualified and are committed to following articulated processes to ensure that candidate outcomes are achieved and evaluated appropriately and the institution is deeply committed to hiring and retaining diverse faculty and recruiting diverse candidates.

There is an opportunity with new dean leadership to improve and systematize unit-wide relationships between programs to ensure consistency in the collection of, and use of, data for continuous improvement for all programs. In addition, there is an opportunity to ensure that each program has a voice in the unit operations, to assess the capacity of services provided by the credential’s office, as well as formalize the feedback mechanisms for all stakeholders, particularly candidates, to foster program improvement and candidate experience.

## COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

<b>Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:	<i>No response needed</i>
The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among, and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California’s adopted standards and curricular frameworks.	<b>Consistently</b>

<b>Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation.	<b>Consistently</b>
The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development/instruction, field based supervision and clinical experiences.	<b>Consistently</b>
The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	<b>Consistently</b>
The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. Qualifications of faculty and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service.	<b>Consistently</b>
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	<b>Inconsistently</b>

**Finding on Common Standard 1: Met with Concerns**

**Summary of information applicable to the standard**

The programs at the University of Southern California’s RSOE are grounded by a mission and dean’s charge which are well aligned with California’s adopted standards and curricular frameworks. The mission articulates a commitment to prepare leaders to achieve educational equity through practice, research and policy. The mission is infused throughout the preparation programs. The dean’s charge highlights central priorities in advancing the mission by focusing on the quality of programs, racial justice, retention and time to degree completion, and making

necessary curriculum changes and alignment to the strategic plan accordingly. Stakeholders who were interviewed (employers, administration, faculty, candidates, and completers) were able to articulate the importance of the unit mission and the dean's charge in guiding their work and personalized their commitment in many ways.

The unit is led by the RSOE dean; however, the PPS: School Social Work with a specialization in Child Welfare and Attendance is administered by the SDPSSW. It was confirmed in interviews with the SDPSSW dean, and the RSOE dean, that the RSOE dean is the unit head for all Commission approved programs and influences the hiring, budget, curriculum, and credential processes within the RSOE as needed to ensure adherence to Commission standards. While relatively new to their positions (less than 2 years), the deans highlighted the positive collaboration, trust and respect for each other which ensures successful collaboration in this organizational structure. The dean of SDPSSW confirmed her commitment to support systematic representation and resource allocation to ensure SDPSSW programs are meeting all Commission standards.

Document review and interviews with the administration, employers and faculty confirmed the unit involves faculty and relevant stakeholders in coordination and the decision-making for most educator preparation programs; however, the involvement is not regular or systematic, and is often informal, particularly involving the units involvement with the School of Social Work credential programs. In addition, interviews with faculty in the PASC program confirmed that they were not involved in the decision-making processes and did not hold faculty meetings. Similarly, feedback from candidates and completers in the PASC program and PPS: School Counseling program expressed programmatic concerns, but noted that feedback was not elicited to be able to express those concerns.

Interviews with stakeholders and document review confirmed best unit-wide practices of collaboration and subsequent feedback for improvement include the work of the faculty council in development of the "Future of the Faculty Report," work with the Neighborhood Academic Initiative, and the Deans Superintendent Advisory Group which garners specific feedback from these stakeholders for improvement and action. Interviews and document review confirm that the curriculum meetings, cross functional analysis meetings, and executive council meetings provide an opportunity to discuss and review data for potential action on recommendations in improving education. However, several of these meetings include stakeholders from the RSOE, but infrequent systematic representation from the SDPSSW representatives.

Document review and interviews with the Associate Vice Provost, deans, and faculty confirmed there are sufficient resources to administer the programs in the unit. However, questions arose about institutional support for the needs of PPS: School Social Work and Child Welfare and Attendance programs, PASC, and PPS: School Counseling programs systematically. Interviews with program directors, faculty, and staff confirmed that programs and processes in the RSOE and the Commission approved programs in the SDPSSW operate independently, yet with informal collaboration to ensure adherence to the Commission standards. Interviews with the deans confirmed a strong commitment to supporting educator preparation programs both

through resources and with their time to collaborate and plan jointly for credential program improvement. The dean of the SDPSSW confirmed a commitment to supporting the RSOE dean as the unit head both through appropriate resource allocation and personnel time to more systematically offer representation of SDPSSW at unit-wide meetings.

The recruitment of diverse faculty, and the faculty development support of them, are best practices at USC. Document review, and interviews with deans, associate deans, program directors, and faculty interviews confirmed a true commitment to diversity and professional development support and an evaluation system which ensures only qualified personnel are retained. Document review and interviews with the associate deans and program directors also confirmed highly coordinated and systematic efforts to increase the diversity of faculty, which in recent efforts yielded 14 of the 15 hires from diverse backgrounds.

Document review and interviews with administration and staff confirmed the credential office leadership and staff has the responsibility for maintaining credential records for all programs in the unit. The credential analysts are the authorized representatives to recommend candidates for the credential by following a clear process (admission through recommendation) to ensure candidates have met all requirements for the credential. All requirements for each candidate are tracked and recorded in the credential database. While candidates, completers, staff and program directors all confirmed a need for additional support both in additional personnel and with streamlined technology to meet the high demand for credential office services; it was verified that at the conclusion of the program, only qualified candidates are recommended for the credential by the credential analyst.

### **Rationale for the Finding**

*1.2 The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.*

Interviews with faculty in the PASC program confirmed that they were not involved in the decision making processes and did not hold faculty meetings. Similarly, feedback from candidates and completers in the PASC and PPS: School Counseling programs expressed programmatic concerns, but noted that feedback was not elicited to be able to express those concerns.

*1.5 The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.*

Questions arose about institutional support for the needs of PPS: School Social Work and Child Welfare and Attendance programs, PASC, and PPS: School Counseling programs. In addition, interviews with program directors, faculty, and staff confirmed that programs and process in the RSOE and the Commission approved programs in the SDPSSW operate independently, yet with informal collaboration to ensure adherence to Commission standards. Stakeholders acknowledged the benefit to formalizing the collaboration to ensure consistency which the dean of the SDPSSW confirmed would be highly supported from her office.



1.8 The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Interviews with candidates, completers, institutional staff, faculty, and program directors confirmed that the institution has a credentials monitoring system, but noted the staffing capacity and technological resource allocation/support to handle the volume of credentials questions and paperwork processing is minimal.

<b>Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	<i>No response needed</i>
The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	<b>Consistently</b>
The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.	<b>Consistently</b>

**Finding on Common Standard 2: Met with Concerns**

**Summary of information applicable to the standard**

Interviews with staff, faculty, and candidates, and review of documents indicate the unit recruits and supports candidates in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success. Clear criteria for admission to each program based on multiple measures of candidate qualifications are communicated through application materials, information meetings held during each open application period, and on unit and program websites. Informational materials explaining programs, admission criteria, and the application process and forms are provided by the unit. The Associate Vice Provost, RSOE dean, and SDPSSW dean all articulated a strong commitment to recruiting and admitting candidates to diversify the educators prepared by USC. In interviews, employers reported appreciation of being able to hire program completers from USC who reflect the diversity of students in their classrooms, stating that these educators are a key to the success of their schools. However, clearly identified support personnel and systems of support were reported by candidates and completers as lacking. Candidates in multiple programs, though a very small N, expressed strong feelings of perception of bias, lack of program lead

support, and lack of field placement support in helping them to be retained in the profession. With the very limited number of candidate interviews available to the site visit team, contrasting opinions were not readily available to the team.

Interviews and document review confirmed that policies and requirements are communicated through handbooks, websites, and program personnel to guide and provide support to candidates. The support from program personnel varies in the level of effectiveness by program. Interviews with candidates and completers in the Bilingual Authorization, PASC, and PPS: School Counseling noted gaps in support and advice, late and incorrect faculty guidance, and overall concerns with candidate advising given the limited credential advisors available and the backlog of communication with credentialing office.

Processes for monitoring candidate progress through each professional preparation program are in place. The credentials office maintains databases for monitoring candidate progress, tracking completion of requirements and success in courses and field experiences. Program directors, faculty, and university-based supervisors also monitor candidate progress and provide assistance to ensure success. Candidates and completers confirmed the process for the credential recommendation and also stated the credential analyst do provide advice and assistance, yet noted the volume of workload of the office often led to delays in processing their credential and at times, impacted potential employment opportunities due to the delays. The institution acknowledged during the visit that additional resources for the credentialing office would improve the timeline for processing credentials.

For candidates who need additional assistance in successfully meeting program and credential requirements, an improvement plan process is available to help candidates focus on areas for improvement and support candidates. Interviews with program directors and associate deans revealed steps to ensure not only candidate success, but steps to counsel out of educator preparation should the candidate not achieve important benchmarks and standards.

### **Rationale for the Finding**

*2.2 The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.*

Candidates in multiple programs, though a very small N, expressed strong feelings of perception of bias, lack of program lead support, and lack of field placement support in helping them to be retained in the profession. With the very limited number of candidate interviews available to the team, contrasting opinions were not readily available to the team.

*2.3 Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements.*

Interviews with candidates and completers in the Bilingual Authorization, PASC, and PPS: School Counseling noted gaps in support and advice, late and incorrect faculty guidance, and overall

concerns with candidate advising given the limited credential advisors available and the backlog of communication with credentialing office.

<b>Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards.	<b>Consistently</b>
The unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.	<b>Consistently</b>
The unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites, as appropriate to the program.	<b>Consistently</b>
Through site-based work and clinical experiences, programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning.	<b>Consistently</b>
Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	<b>Consistently</b>
The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	<b>Consistently</b>
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	<b>Consistently</b>
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	<b>Consistently</b>
For each program the unit offers, candidates have significant experience in school settings where the curriculum aligns with California’s adopted content standards and frameworks, and the school reflects the diversity of California’s student and the opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards.	<b>Consistently</b>

**Finding on Common Standard 3: Met**

### Summary of information applicable to the standard

Candidates in each of USC’s preparation programs complete a clinical experience that is integrated with coursework. A review of unit documents and interviews confirm that the programs demonstrate an alignment between coursework and clinical experiences. Through interviews and document review, it is evident that there are partnerships between the unit and local school districts. These partnerships result in diverse placements and settings for candidates. Coursework in each program provides candidates opportunities to learn how to implement research-based strategies within their clinical experiences. Additionally, these partnerships result in the selection of guiding teachers that meet the criteria provided by the unit. While site based supervisors across programs are appropriately selected and trained, the PASC program would benefit from increased coordination with site based supervisors. Candidates complete their clinical practice in school settings that reflect the diversity of California students and at school sites that follow California academic standards. The unit consistently implements and evaluates clinical practice across all programs.

<b>Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.	<b>Consistently</b>
The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from key stakeholders such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.	<b>Consistently</b>

### Finding on Common Standard 4: Met with Concerns

#### Summary of information applicable to the standard

Evidence from documentation and interviews indicated that the unit and its programs regularly collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data and other data for continuous program improvement. The RSOE has a comprehensive assessment program that collects data from multiple stakeholders and from multiple sources of data, which are consistently used for program improvement.

The unit has a highly comprehensive and thorough assessment program that extends from the dean to departments and programs. This systematic program has identifiable deadlines for

review of data, and provides access to data from a central repository, which is managed by staff. In most instances, except where noted, programs use data to review, revise, and update their curriculum. Across all programs, candidate assessments are tied to diversity, equity, and inclusion, which is a major strength of the unit.

Guiding teachers are assessed in the teacher education programs based on candidate feedback. In all cases, an ongoing informal and formal assessment of guiding teachers and supervisors is in place. The team did not find evidence that the PASC program is fully integrated into the unit’s assessment of candidates and the program. Additionally, in the PPS: School Social Work with Child Welfare and Attendance program, there was inconsistent evidence that the program is integrated within the unit wide assessment plan for continuous improvement.

**Rationale for the Finding**

*4.1 The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.*

*4.2 Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completion data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.*

While there is evidence of a unit assessment plan for continuous improvement, there is inconsistent evidence that the assessment efforts of the PPS: School Social Work with Child Welfare and Attendance programs are integrated with the unit wide assessment for effectiveness. Also, there is limited evidence that a comprehensive and regular assessment process is in place for the PASC program, and that their assessment process is integrated with the unit’s process.

<b>Common Standard 5: Program Impact</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.	<b>Consistently</b>
The unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California’s students.	<b>Consistently</b>

**Finding on Common Standard 5: Met**

**Summary of information applicable to the standard.**

The USC educator preparation unit ensures that candidates are prepared to serve students. Evidence from documentation and interviews indicated that all candidates in all credential programs are trained and prepared in the knowledge and skills necessary to support students in meeting the state adopted academic standards.

The RSOE provided evidence of case studies to evaluate the impact of candidate teaching and learning in schools. The unit is implementing new protocols to obtain further evidence of impact on students from. Another source of data is the Los Angeles Educator Pathways Partnership (LAEPP). LAEPP collects data on graduates working in the Los Angeles Unified School District from eight teacher preparation programs in the Los Angeles Basin. One hundred fifty-four (154) MAT completers, with partial evaluation data, were identified as working in LAUSD between the years of 2012-16 (the most recent report). Full data was received and analyzed for seventy-six graduates. Four were rated highly effective, sixty-two were rated effective, seven were rated developing and three were rated ineffective.