

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

2016-2017 Unit Improvement Plan

2016-2017 Unit Improvement Objectives

Our analysis of the relevant data resulted in the adoption of two 2016-2017 Unit Improvement Objectives (approved by the Accreditation CEAS Team on 01-11-2017). Our experience dictates that for the process of continuous improvement to work, a limited number of Unit objectives should be defined. Achievement of the Unit Improvement Objectives will result in improved Unit operations. More complete information about the Objectives, including the data sources that serve as their foundation, can be found at the end of this document. The objectives are:

1. Unit Improvement Objective 16-1

All University supervisors will observe and/or support their candidates at a level consistent with the relevant program policy.

UAO-16-6: Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice (CTC Common Standard 3)

2. Unit Improvement Objective 16-2

Each program will: (a) identify categories of California's population that are currently underrepresented in the program; and (b) develop and implement a plan to recruit and admit candidates from those underrepresented categories.

UAO-16-5: Candidate Recruitment and Support (CTC Common Standard 2)

Status of All Unit Assessment Outcomes

In this section a brief expectation will be provided on the status of all eight Unit Assessment Outcomes.

UAO-16-1: Equitable Learning Outcomes

The Unit ensures that candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions aligned with professional standards to implement universal design and research-based programs to achieve equitable learning outcomes.

Our review of the relevant data shows that we meet this UAO and have several notable strengths in this area.

Data Sources: Candidate Performance Data, PACT, RICA, CTC Surveys, CSU Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ) Surveys, Cal State East Bay Surveys.

UAO-16-2: Equitable Environments

The Unit ensures that candidates demonstrate the ability to create environments, systems, and practices in which all individuals are treated with respect, dignity, trust, and fairness.

Our review of the relevant data shows that we meet this UAO and have several notable strengths in this area.

Data Sources: Candidate Performance Data, CTC Surveys, CSU CTQ Surveys, Cal State East Bay Surveys.

UAO-16-3: Working Collaboratively

The Unit ensures that our candidates will work collaboratively with students, parents, and professional colleagues to achieve equitable learning outcomes and equitable environments.

Our review of the relevant data shows that we meet this UAO and have several notable strengths in this area.

Data Sources: Candidate Performance Data, CTC Surveys, CSU CTQ Surveys, Cal State East Bay Surveys.

UAO-16-4: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation (CTC Common Standard 1)

The Institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs.

Our review of the relevant data shows that we meet all elements of this UAO (and Common Standard) and have several notable strengths in this area. Please see our *2017 Common Standard Response* for more information about our status for this UAO.

Previously, in our *2014 Unit Improvement Plan*, we identified a Unit Improvement Objective on financial support for Unit faculty development and implementation of an eLearning initiative. Since 2014, Unit faculty have continued to receive \$1500/year from either the College of Education and Allied Studies or the College of Arts, Letters, and Social Sciences (Speech/Language Pathology) to travel to academic conferences. Some faculty receive additional support from Department and external sources. The eLearning Initiative operated for two years and greatly increased the ability of Unit faculty to use computer-based resources in their teaching. The Initiative was not continued, however, because of the high level of support offered at the University level, especially the Office of Faculty Development.

Data Sources: Unit Mission/Vision/Values statements, *Research Base for Mission/Vision/Values* narrative, program handbooks, program websites, CEAS RTP document, Cal State East Bay RTP document, College and Department budgets, ACT meeting minutes and roster, Campus Committee meeting minutes and roster, program advisory council meeting minutes and rosters, records of faculty receiving professional development support, lecturer position descriptions, tenure track position

descriptions, candidate evaluations of instructors and supervisors, annual periodic reviews of lecturers, RTP recommendations, data maintained in the Credential Student Service Center.

UAO-16-5: Candidate Recruitment and Support (CTC Common Standard 2)

Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.

For this UAO, we defined one Unit Improvement Objective, 16-2: *Each program will: (a) identify categories of California's population that are currently underrepresented in the program; and (b) develop and implement a plan to recruit and admit candidates from those underrepresented categories.*

Please see the information on Unit Improvement Objective 16-2 at the end of this document. Our program coordinators and faculty are committed to diversifying the K-12 education workforce. Some of our programs have been quite successful. It should be noted that for candidates entering in the Summer and Fall of 2016, 39.8% are one of the following: Asian, Hispanic/Latino, Two or more races, Black/African American, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, or American Indian/Alaska Native (see Appendix 16-2). This is good, but we can do better. We will continue to gather data on the ethnicity and gender of our candidates. As part of this objective, during the Spring Quarter 2017, each program will consider other categories of California's population that are underrepresented in that program (e.g., second language status).

Our review of our status in regards to UAO 16-5 (Common Standard 2) revealed that some programs do have partnerships with districts, use grant funds, or use some other strategies to increase candidate diversity. No program, however, had a formal plan. We will develop those during the 2016-2017 academic year.

Our review of the relevant data shows that we meet all other elements of this UAO (and Common Standard) and have several notable strengths in this area. Please see our *2017 Common Standard Response* for more information about our status for this UAO.

Data Sources: Program handbooks, program websites, CSSC website, program admission advisement/orientation schedules, program candidate orientation schedules, struggling candidate improvement plans, data on diversity of program candidates.

UAO-16-6: Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice (CTC Common Standard 3)

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.

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 and effective practice.

Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.

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.

For this UAO, we adopted one Unit Improvement Objective:

Unit Improvement Objective 16-1: *All University supervisors will observe or support their candidates at a level consistent with the relevant program policy.*

Please see the information on Unit Improvement Objective 16-1 at the end of this document. Results of the 2016 CTC Survey of our Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Administrative Services Preliminary Credential Programs Program Completers revealed a lack of consistency in the number of times our supervisors observed and/or supported our candidates. Each program will establish a minimum number of times each candidate is observed or supported. Depending on the nature of field experience, some programs will require a minimum number of site observations, while others will require a minimum number of supportive contacts (field visit, phone calls, emails), and others will require a minimum number of both observations and supportive contacts

Data Sources: Candidate Performance Data, PACT, RICA, CEAS Program Completer Surveys, CTC Surveys, CSU CTQ Surveys, Cal State East Bay Surveys, candidate evaluations of course instructors and supervisors, annual periodic lecturer evaluations, RTP recommendations, faculty evaluations of candidate course performance, program handbooks, and program websites, program advisory council meeting minutes and rosters.

UAO-16-7: Continuous Improvement (CTC Common Standard 4)

The education Unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at the Unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and Unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.

Our review of the relevant data shows that we meet all elements of this UAO (and Common Standard) and have several notable strengths in this area. Please see our *2017 Common Standard Response* for more information about our status for this UAO.

Data Sources: Candidate Performance Data, PACT, RICA, Cal State East Bay Surveys, CTC Surveys, CSU CTQ Surveys, candidate evaluations of course instructors and supervisors, annual periodic lecturer evaluations, RTP recommendations, faculty evaluations of candidate course performance, program handbooks, and program websites, program advisory council meeting minutes and rosters, ACT meeting minutes and rosters, program advisory council meeting minutes and rosters, Unit level assessment documents, *Multi Year Unit Assessment Cycle, 2016-2017, 2016-2017 Unit Improvement Objectives, 2016-2017 Unit Improvement Plan*, Program level assessment documents.

UAO-16-8: Program Impact (CTC Common Standard 5)

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. 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.

This is new Common Standard, and we are just beginning to develop a plan to gather, analyze, and use appropriate data to meet the standard. Please see our Common Standard Response for more information about our status for this UAO.

Data Sources: CTC Surveys, CSU CTQ Surveys, Cal State East Bay Surveys, Anecdotal Evidence of Program Impact, *Description of Positive Program Impact*

Unit Improvement Objective 16-1

All University supervisors will observe or support their candidates at a level consistent with the relevant program policy.

UAO-16-6: Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice (CTC Common Standard 3)

Explanation/rationale:

While the quality of field experience across programs is excellent, results of the 2016 CTC Survey of Program Completers revealed too much variation in how often candidates are observed or supported by University Supervisors (Administrative Services Preliminary, Multiple Subject Preliminary, Single Subject Preliminary Programs). Multiple Subject and Single Subject candidates were asked how often they were observed. Administrative Services candidates were asked how often they were supported. There are possible explanations for why some candidates were observed or supported more often than others:

1. CTC regulations require interns to be observed more frequently, and 8 of 45 Multiple Subject respondents were interns; 22 of 52 Single Subject respondents were interns.
2. Those candidates struggling with field experience should be observed or supported more frequently.

Our goal, however, is to have no candidate report that she or he is observed or supported fewer times that program policy requires. For example, current policy for Multiple Subject and Single Subject student teachers is that they be observed 8 times annually.

It should be noted that we do not have this type data for our other programs. However, all program completers will be asked this type of question on our 2017 Cal State East Bay Exit Survey of Program Completers.

See Appendix 16-1 below for the raw data.

Data Source:

a. 2016 CTC Exit Survey of Program Completers (Administrative Services Preliminary, Multiple Subject Preliminary, Single Subject Preliminary).

Evidence to be collected that will demonstrate that objective has been met:

a. 2017, 2018, 2019 CTC Exit Surveys of Program Completers (Administrative Services Preliminary, Multiple Subject Preliminary, Single Subject Preliminary)

b. 2017, 2018, 2019 Cal State East Bay Exit Survey of Program Completers

To be completed by:

a. Spring 2017. Interventions implemented this academic year should show immediate results.

Appendix 16-1 A: Relevant Data from CTC 2016 Program Completer Surveys

Preliminary Multiple Subject Credential Program Completer Survey – 2016

Item 28. How often did preparation program faculty or supervisors observe your classroom instruction and provide feedback during your clinical practice?

N = 45

1. Once or twice	2	4.4%
2. 3-5 times	9	20.0%
3. 6-10 times	24	53.3%
4. 11-15 times	4	8.9%
5. 16-20 times	2	4.4%
6. More than 20 times	4	8.9%

Note: Of the 45 respondents, 8 were interns, which may account for the responses to categories 4, 5, and 6

Preliminary Single Subject Credential Program Completer Survey – 2016

Item 26. How often did preparation program faculty or supervisors observe your classroom instruction and provide feedback during your clinical practice?

N = 52

1. Once or twice	0	0.0%
2. 3-5 times	4	7.7%
3. 6-10 times	28	53.8%
4. 11-15 times	10	19.2%
5. 16-20 times	8	15.4%
6. More than 20 times	2	3.8%

Note: of the 52 respondents, 22 were interns, which may account for responses to categories 4, 5, and 6

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program Completer Survey - 2016

Item 30. About how often did you receive support in the field from your program supervisor?

N = 15

1. Never or I do not have a program supervisor	0	0.0%
2. Less than once per month	6	40.0%
3. Once per month	3	20.0%
4. Twice per month	3	20.0%
5. Once per week	2	13.3%
6. 2-3 times per week	1	6.7%
7. Daily	0	0.0%

Note: Response rate is low: 15 responses from 125 program completers.

Unit Improvement Objective 16-2

Each program will: (a) identify categories of California’s population that are currently underrepresented in the program; and (b) develop and implement a plan to recruit and admit candidates from those underrepresented categories.

UAO-16-5: Candidate Recruitment and Support (CTC Common Standard 2)

Explanation/rationale:

Our focus is on the first part of Element 2 in Common Standard 2: *The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California . . .*. Program coordinators and faculty are committed to increasing the diversity of professional educators in California. Some programs have been successful. It should be noted that for our candidates entering programs in the Summer and Fall of 2016, 39.8% are one of the following: Asian, Hispanic/Latino, Two or more races, Black/African American, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, or American Indian/Alaska Native (see Appendix 16-2). This is good, but we can do better and we can look at the program level to determine if other categories of California’s population are underrepresented (e.g., second language status).

Some programs have received external grants to accomplish this goal and all programs have informal strategies to increase the diversity of our candidates. However, during a review conducted in October and November of 2016, we learned that no program has a formal plan to increase candidate diversity.

The diversity of our 2016 entry cohorts is included as Appendix 16-2.

Data Source:

- a. Sometimes the relevant data is something that doesn’t exist. Our October and November 2016 review revealed that no program had a formal plan to increase candidate diversity.
- b. Diversity data on our 2016 entry cohorts of candidates.

Evidence to be collected that will demonstrate that objective has been met:

- a. Unit's 2017 Candidate Diversity Recruitment Plan
- b. 2017 Program Candidate Diversity Recruitment Plans
- c. Diversity data on our 2017, 2018, 2019 entry cohorts of candidates.

To be completed by:

- a. Fall of 2018 – we think it will take some time for efforts to be productive, thus we should see some improvement for the Summer/Fall 2017 admitted candidates, but we expect real improvement for the Summer/Fall 2018 admitted candidates.

Appendix 16-2: Diversity Data on 2016 Entry Program Cohorts

Notes:

- (1) Candidates self report, data is stored in Unit Credential Program Database
- (2) TED/SPED candidates reported twice below, once for the Multiple Subject Credential Program and once for the relevant Special Education Program
- (3) Some respondents did not identify a gender, but did identify an ethnic group; and vice versa
- (4) Program and Unit totals and percentages of candidates who are not White are lower than actual, as all respondents selecting "No" were counted as White

- W White
- As Asian
- His Hispanic/Latino
- Two + Two or more races
- Bl Black/African American
- NA/PI Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander; and American Indian/Alaska Native
- No Not Specified

Administrative Services Preliminary Credential

Total Admitted = 126; Total responded= 106

Male	Female	W	As	His	Two +	Bl	NA/PI	No
30	76	47	11	15	5	6	1	21

Did not answer: 20

Total As + His + Two + Bl + NA/PI = 38/106 35.8%

Administrative Services Professional Credential

Total Admitted = 15; Total Responded= 14

Male	Female	W	As	His	Two +	Bl	NA/PI	No
3	11	3	0	1	0	3	0	7

Did not answer: 1

Total As + His + Two + Bl + NA/PI = 4/14 28.6%

Mild to Moderate Disabilities Specialist Credential

Total Admitted = 28; Total Responded=20

Male	Female	W	As	His	Two + Bl	NA/PI	No
5	15	8	2	2	2	1	3

Did not answer: 8

Did not complete: 1

Total As + His + Two + Bl + NA/PI = 8/20 40%

Moderate to Severe Disabilities Specialist Credential

Total Admitted = 8; Total Responded= 5

Male	Female	W	As	His	Two + Bl	NA/PI	No
2	3	4	0	0	0	0	1

Did not answer: 3

Total As + His + Two + Bl + NA/PI = 0/5 0%

Multiple Subject Teaching Credential

Total Admitted = 162; Total Responded =120

Male	Female	W	As	His	Two + Bl	NA/PI	No	
18	102	67	12	14	8	10	0	7

Did not answer: 42

Did not complete: 2

Total As + His + Two + Bl + NA/PI = 44/120 36.7%

Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling Credential

Total Admitted = 19; Total Responded = 14

Male	Female	W	As	His	Two + Bl	NA/PI	No	
1	13	3	5	4	2	0	0	0

Did not answer: 5

Total As + His + Two + Bl + NA/PI = 11/14 78.6%

Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology Credential

Total Admitted = 11; Total Responded = 10

Male	Female	W	As	His	Two + Bl	NA/PI	No
2	8	5	0	4	1	0	0

Did not Answer: 1

Total As + His + Two + Bl + NA/PI = 5/10 50%

Reading/Literacy Added Authorization

Total Admitted = 21; Total Responded = 20

Male	Female	W	As	His	Two + Bl	NA/PI	No
1	19	9	3	1	2	1	4

Did not answer: 1

Total As + His + Two + Bl + NA/PI = 7/20 35%

Single Subject Teaching Credential

Total Admitted = 130; Total Responded= 105

Male	Female	W	As	His	Two + Bl	NA/PI	No
54	51	55	20	10	8	8	3

Did not answer: 25

Total As + His + Two + Bl + NA/PI = 47/105 44.8%

Speech/Language Pathology Credential

Total Admitted = 14; Total Responded =13

Male	Female	W	As	His	Two + Bl	NA/PI	No
3	10	7	2	4	0	0	0

Did not answer: 1

Total As + His + Two + Bl + NA/PI = 6/13 46.1%

UNIT TOTAL: 170/427 39.8%

Unitimpplan20170214