

**Cal State East Bay
Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC)
Professional Education Unit**

Program Impact: Cohort 2015-92 Project

10/26/17 Draft

1. Overview

During the 2014-2015 academic year, Unit leaders considered additional data sources to measure the impact our program completers have on California's K-12 students. This document describes one initiative, the Cohort 2015-92 Project.

This Project was launched to provide more complete data than that yielded by surveys. We have survey data from the California State University Center for Teacher Quality, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and our own Cal State East Bay surveys. In the Spring of 2015, Unit leadership selected one cohort of exiting Multiple Subject Teaching Credential candidates to follow closely. The cohort is called "2015-92" because the candidates completed their program in the Spring of 2015. Our internal course scheduling system used "92" for all the cohort's class sections. Data would be gathered on cohort members during their first year out of the program (2015-2016), their second year out of the program (2016-2017), and their third year out of the program (2017-2018).

This would be an experiment, we could only speculate on the usefulness of the data generated by the project. Members of Cohort 2015-92 took all their courses at the Cal State East Bay's Concord campus in Contra Costa County. Kelly Moore, a faculty member who taught the cohort three program courses and served as the Multiple Subject Program Coordinator, was provided release time to gather data on Cohort 2015-92. Of all our exiting 2014-2015 cohorts, we selected Cohort 2015-92 because of Ms. Moore's close relationship to the cohort's members. The cohort was selected because we thought it had the greatest potential to yield usable data.

Ms. Moore maintained a database on the members of Cohort 2015-92, including phone numbers and email addresses. The original plan was to gather data on:

- (1) The members' employment status, including retention in the profession,
- (2) The members' teaching quality, and
- (3) The effectiveness of the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential Program.

Ms. Moore gathered data through:

- (1) Email inquiries in 2015-2016, 2016-2017, and 2017-2018;
- (2) Telephone calls, including in-depth interviews with three members at the end of their first year of teaching and at the end of the second year of teaching; and
- (3) Classroom observations of three members of the cohort during their first year of teaching.

To gather more complete employment data on the members of Team 92, another faculty member used online resources: Google searches, Facebook, and LinkedIn.

2. The Members of the Cohort 2015-92

There are 28 members of Cohort 2015-92. Here is the gender and ethnicity of the cohort:

Female:	27
Male:	1
White:	21
Asian:	1
Hispanic/Latino:	6

The members of the cohort do not reflect the overall diversity of our Unit’s programs. The 2016 entry cohorts were 39% non-White (Cohort 15-92 is 25% non-White). Again, the cohort was selected as a prototype because we thought it had the greatest potential to yield usable data.

3. Employment and Retention

a. Amount of Data

From all sources, we gathered employment data on 23 cohort members for 2015-2016, 22 members for 2016-2017, and 22 members for 2017-2018. This amount of data far exceeds that gathered in surveys (82% of the cohort in 15-16; 79% in 16-17 and 17-18). We had no data for three members, and partial data for three others (data for at least one year).

b. Findings

(1) High Level of Success in Finding Employment. Members of the cohort completed the Multiple Subject Credential Program in the Spring of 2015. All of the cohort members who wanted full-time employment as teachers were successful in finding jobs for the 15-16 school year (20/20). Of the three not working full-time, one chose to work part-time in an afterschool program, one moved to France, and one had a baby.

(2) High Rates of Retention. We gathered employment data on 22 members of the cohort for the 2017-2018 academic year. 18 were teaching full-time. Of the four not teaching full-time, two were staying home with small children and one was substitute teaching in Colorado. The fourth person not teaching full-time indicated she decided not to teach in 17-18. Thus, in the third year after program completion (17-18), we gathered data on 22 cohort members . . . and only one had “left” the profession.

Interestingly enough, of the 18 cohort members teaching full-time in 2017-2018, 11 were employed in the same school for all three years.

(3) They Stayed in California, Most in Contra Costa County. In 2015-2016, all 20 of the cohort members teaching full time taught in California. In 2016-2017, all 19 members of the team teaching full time taught in California. In 2017-2018, one of the 18 team members teaching full-time relocated to Colorado, the others were all in California.

In 2015-2106, 11 of the 20 cohort members teaching full time taught in Contra Costa County. In 2016-2017, 11 of 19 taught in Contra Costa, and in 2017-2018, 10 of 18 teaching full-time were employed in Contra Costa County. Over the last three years, other team members found jobs in the following California counties: Alameda, Butte, Santa Cruz, Marin, San Mateo, and Solano.

No two members of the cohort ever worked in the same school. Also, members were employed in a variety of school districts: Antioch, Benecia, Martinez, Mt. Diablo (4 members), Oakley (3), Paradise, Pajaro Valley, Pittsburg, San Lorenzo, San Rafael, San Ramon Valley (2), and South San Francisco. Two teachers taught in private schools, one teacher taught for one year in a Charter School.

A summary of the employment data is Part 7 of this document.

4. Interviews

a. Methodology

Ms. Moore conducted in-depth interviews with three members during their first year out of the program (15-16) and at the end of their second year of teaching (16-17). Each member was asked the same seven questions each year:

(1) How did the beginning of school go? Was there anything you wish we had taught you that would have made it easier?

(2) How well prepared do you feel with your math instruction?

(3) How well prepared do you feel with your reading instruction?

(4) How are you doing with your English Learners (ELs)?

(5) How are you doing with your students with special needs?

(6) What do you hope to improve most in the coming year?

(7) Do you have any additional comments?

b. Findings

(1) Positive about Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD) Training. During the first-year interviews, in response to the question about English Learners, all three members praised the effectiveness of the GLAD training they received in the credential program. They were pleased to be in schools that were using GLAD strategies.

(2) After Two Years, Good Attitudes. After two years of teaching, all three members' responses were upbeat – and all three were looking forward to their third year. All three were more confident than when they began teaching and felt they were improving as teachers. There was no evidence of “burn out.”

(3) Commercial Math and Reading Programs Were Challenges. During their first year, all three members commented on the challenges presented by the commercial math programs they were expected to use. After the second year, one teacher became a reading specialist (and did not teach math), one other member commented she was now comfortable with her program, while the third member is in a district selecting a new math program. Interestingly enough, during their first year, all three faced challenges because they were in classrooms/districts without a strictly mandated commercial reading program.

(4) Generally Pleased with the Quality of the Multiple Subject Credential Program/Different Areas of Need. The three members mentioned many positive aspects of their Credential Program. Over both sets of interviews, at least one member mentioned each of the following: Well prepared for the start of school, GLAD training, methods classes, classroom management class, student teaching experiences.

In each set of interviews, the three members responded differently when asked to name an area of improvement. After two years of teaching, one member wanted to improve in curriculum development, the second wanted to do better with Readers and Writers Workshop, and the third wanted to achieve better instructional integration among subject areas.

5. Classroom Observations

a. Methodology

Ms. Moore observed once each of the three team members who were interviewed during their first year of teaching.

b. Findings

(1) Good Classroom Organization. Classroom observations of three members revealed that each member's classroom was well organized. Each room had many places for students to work (centers, "home" seats), each with a clearly designated purpose.

(2) Efficient, Effective Teaching. Classroom observations revealed that all three members had good "command," of the classroom. Children were on task and transitioned smoothly from one activity to another. All three were positive in their interactions with students and had high expectations for their students.

6. Utility of the Project

The leadership of the Unit and the members of the Accreditation CEAS Team (ACT) will evaluate how useful the Cohort 92-15 Project was in measuring Program Impact. Issues to consider:

(1) The combination of personal follow up by phone and email, along with online resources, provided useful data on the members' employment status, far more than provided by surveys. .

(2) Online resources and/or social media have potential for tracking the employment status of our completers. A Facebook page might work?

(3) The interviews and the observations were problematic. The plan was to gather thick data on three members of the cohort. The obstacles, however, in conducting the interviews and observations were large. No two members taught in the same school. Beginning teachers are very busy. The amount of time required of our faculty member was more than we had planned. Thus, we ended the observations after one year, and ended the interviews after the second.

(4) We had originally thought we would try to collect K-12 student performance data from the K-12 students of a small number of members. This proved very difficult for a number of reasons.

We will learn from this experience and use it to help shape our Program Impact Data Collection Plan.

7. Employment Summary

	<u>15-16</u>	<u>16-17</u>	<u>17-18</u>
Data on	23/28	22/28	22/28
Full Time	20	19	18
California	20	19	17
Contra Costa Public	11	11	10
Private	2	2	1
Charter	1	0	0
Elementary	17	17	16
Middle School	3	2	2

15-92narrative20171026