CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY

DESIGNATION CODE: 2010-11 CAPR 7
DATE SUBMITTED: February 04, 2011

TO: The Academic Senate

FROM: The Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR)

SUBJECT: Five-Year Program Review for all Externally Accredited CEAS programs

PURPOSE: For Action by the Academic Senate

ACTION
REQUESTED: Acceptance of the Five-Year Program Reviews of the following College of Education and
Allied Studies (CEAS) programs and therefore their continuation without modification:
- the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential and the Single Subject Teaching Credential
- the Masters of Science (MS) in Education, Option in Reading Instruction (plus the Reading /Language Arts Certificate and Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential)
- the Masters of Science (MS) in Education, Educational Technology Leadership Option
- the Masters of Science (MS) in Education, Option in Curriculum
- the Masters of Science (MS) in Special Education, Mild-Moderate Option and Moderate-Severe Option (plus the Educational Specialist, Mild-Moderate Credential, Levels I and II and Educational Specialist, Moderate-Severe Credential, Levels I and II)
- the MS in Counseling, Clinical Child/School Psychology Option and School Counseling Option (plus the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Option and Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Option)
- the Masters of Science (MS) in Educational Leadership (plus the Administrative Services Credential and Level I Administrative Services Credential, Level II).

Each of these academic programs – degrees and their options, credentials, and certificates were accredited in 2010
(with conditions) by their accrediting bodies, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and the
National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The date of the next Five-Year review is
2016-2017 (aligned with the requirements of the accreditation bodies as stated in 08-09 CAPR 23 (revised)).

BACKGROUND

At its meeting on December 2, 2010, CAPR invited members of the College of Education and Allied Studies
(CEAS) to orally present the outcomes of their five-year review process which involved preparation of documents
for and participation in site-inspections by representatives of two external accreditation bodies; the California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education
(NCATE). Interim Associate Dean of CEAS, Dr. James Zarrillo, had previously supplied the Senate Office with a
full version of the program self-studies and review documents produced by CEAS for this accreditation process and
also had supplied the CAPR representatives electronically with a copy of the NCATE accreditation notification
letter, the CTC Committee on Accreditation minutes (their final action and thus the equivalent of their accreditation
notification), the NCATE Board of Examiners Report and the CTC Accreditation Report. As required by 08-09
CAPR 23 (revised), CEAS submitted summary reports on each of the accredited programs that covered the areas of
program changes, learning outcomes assessment procedures, curricular program statistics, recruitment, advising,
retention and growth potential, tenure track hiring needs, leadership and workplace climate, and academic resource
requirements. CAPR received these 5-8 page summaries of the larger five-year documentation bundled by
department and separated into allied degrees, credentials and certificates by curricular area a listed below in Table 1.

Table 1 Programs - degrees, credentials and certificates – (for which separate summary reports were received)

Department	Programs
Department of Teacher Education	Multiple Subject Teaching Credential Single Subject Teaching Credential
Department of Teacher Education	Masters of Science (MS) in Education, Option in Reading Instruction Reading/Language Arts Certificate Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential
Department of Teacher Education	Master of Science (MS) in Education, Educational Technology Leadership Option
Department of Teacher Education	Masters of Science (MS) in Education, Option in Curriculum
Department of Educational Psychology	Masters of Science (MS) in Special Education, Mild-Moderate Option Masters of Science (MS) in Special Education, Moderate-Severe Option Educational Specialist, Mild-Moderate Credential, Levels I and II Educational Specialist, Moderate-Severe Credential, Levels I and II
Department of Educational Psychology	MS in Counseling, Clinical Child/School Psychology Option MS in Counseling, School Counseling Option Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Option Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Option
Department of Educational Leadership	Masters of Science (MS) in Educational Leadership Administrative Services Credential, Level I Administrative Services Credential, Level II

Note that no five-year review was conducted or report received for the non-accredited Department of Teacher Education Online Masters of Science (MS) in Education, Option in Online Teaching and Learning. This program was subject to some confusion as to the appropriate five-year review process. According to a personal communication received from the Associate Vice President for Academic Programs and Graduate Studies, Dr. Sue Opp, though not subject to NCATE or CTC accreditation and offered through Continuing Education only, "..it is in the catalog; it's an academic degree and needs to be reviewed like any other degree program, regardless of the fact that it's offered via extension." Due to the lack of time to perform a review this academic year, it has been agreed that this program will be reviewed by CEAS as per the requirements for programs without accreditation in 2011-12 and the review documents will thus be evaluated by CAPR in Fall 2012 as per 08-09 CAPR 23 (revised). This program will therefore not be addressed further in this document.

SUMMARY OF THE REVIEW

To provide the necessary background for understanding CAPR's recommendations concerning these programs, it is appropriate to offer brief renditions and an overall analysis (conclusion) of the summaries of each program as presented to CAPR in the above-itemized reports. However, before doing that, it is pertinent to first address the issue of the outcome of the joint accreditation process by NCATE and CTC and in particular the finding that each of these listed programs, i.e. the entirety of degrees, credentials and certificates, have been re-accredited, but with conditions that apply at the unit (college) level as a whole. This means that the accreditation review process resulted in NCATE issuing the result of "accreditation with conditions," and CTC issuing the result of "accreditation with stipulations" for all seven sets of programs accredited within CEAS. In doing so, both bodies drew attention to NCATE Standard 2 – Assessment System and Unit Evaluation – with both review teams concluding that the unit (i.e. the CEAS organization as a whole) has failed to meet unit-level assessment goals. Note that this does not mean that the individual programs (e.g. MS in Education) have failed to meet assessment standards; in fact it appears that they each did so with only minor concerns.

The result of the accreditation review was that CSUEB must submit to a follow-up visit from NCATE to check on progress in bringing Standard 2 into compliance, to take place no later than Spring 2011. It was reported to CAPR by Dr. Zarrillo in CEAS' presentation of December 2nd, 2010 that steps are well under way to meeting the accreditation conditions and stipulations. A unit level assessment plan encompassing all seven accredited program areas was submitted in writing to the accrediting bodies in 2010 and was accepted. A review team will be visiting campus May 1st to May 3rd, 2011 to evaluate implementation of the plan. Dr. Zarrillo summarized that 90% of the

unit level assessment plan will be based on more effective aggregation of existing program data, and 10% will be based on new unit-level assessment measures and outcomes. Programs have been organized in clusters to assess progress toward assessment outcomes using rubrics. New mission statements/goals and a conceptual framework are being developed to go along with the unit level assessment procedures. It was noted in NCATE's letter of accreditation that the "actions that may be rendered by the Unit Accreditation Board include continuing accreditation or revocation of accreditation." Dr. Zarrillo and his colleagues assured CAPR that the efforts being made by CEAS will result in the continuation of accreditation.

It should also be noted here that one of the other concerns noted in accreditation in addition to unit-level assessment was the unit governance, in particular the lack of continuity of leadership and the high turnover of Deans. Asked about this at the December 2nd 2010 CAPR meeting, Dr. Zarrillo expressed his confidence that with the search underway to appoint a new permanent Dean, the issue of more consistent leadership will be addressed. This expectation has been confirmed by the appointment of former Interim Dean Carolyn Nelson to continue on as permanent Dean, and thus seems a clear sign that the unit is entering into a period of greater leadership continuity in line with the accreditation bodies' expectations.

One further issue that was raised at the overall unit level was the inconsistent use by faculty of the various software tools available for management, data collection and storage, assessment, and so forth namely Sharepoint and TaskStream. According to comments made at the December 2nd 2010 CAPR meeting by CEAS representatives, the observed inconsistencies and unfulfilled potential to use such administrative tools is being addressed as part of the unit-level improvements, with much greater use of such tools expected across the programs expected prior to the next accreditation review, for example, to conduct teaching performance assessment and other tasks.

PROGRAM REPORTS

Section I.C of 08-09 CAPR 23 (revised) requires programs with outside accreditation to provide a submission summarizing in no more than five (5) pages the entire report and which includes a Plan for the next five years that provides information on a) program changes (that have been made since the last review and which are planned over the period until the next review), b) curriculum and student learning (a summary of the learning outcomes assessment procedures, results derived from those procedures, institutional curricular statistics, and a discussion of recruitment, advising, retention and growth potential), c) faculty (a memo outlining and justifying hiring needs for the period until the next review and a discussion of leadership and climate in the program and workload and PTR concerns), and d) resources (brief summary of program needs for effective functioning as specified in the accreditation review or to meet the CSU and CSUEB's own standards). In addition, if the program requires more than 180 units for a BA or BS degree, this must be justified or a proposal provided to reduce the number to 180. Finally, the program must provide the full outside review documentation and a copy of the guidelines, etc. used by the accreditation body.

For each of the seven program areas accredited by NCATE and CTC within CEAS, a 7-8 page review plus institutional curricular statistics attachments were provided. Their contents are summarized below with respect to requirements a) through d). Institutional research statistics for the departments of Educational Leadership, Educational Psychology, and Teacher Education are summarized for the Fall quarters for the period 2005-2009 in Table 2.

Table 2 Summary statistics for CEAS programs 2005-2009 (Fall quarter)

Department	Educational Leadership	Educational Psychology	Teacher Education
Majors (2005, 2009, max/min)	99, 158, 192/96	171, 168, 184/156	139, 138, 222/138
Degrees (2005, 2009, max/min)	60, 56, 60/34	74, 72, 74/52	95, 162, 162/72
FTEF (2005, 2009, max/min)	11.5, 9.8, 13.3/9.8	16.8, 14.7, 18.6/14.7	38.4, 20.5, 68.2/20.5
SFR (2005, 2009, max/min)	9.8, 10.8, 11.3/9.7	11.6, 14.5, 14.5/11.6	13.6, 21.6, 21.6/8.8
No sections (2005, 2009, max/min)	42, 33, 46/33	64, 70, 74/64	195, 108, 202/108
Section size (2005, 2009, max/min)	18.6, 17.6, 21.2/15.9	17, 16, 17/14.8	23, 21.3, 23/19.1

1. **Department of Teacher Education - Multiple Subject Teaching Credential (MS) and Single Subject Teaching Credential (SS)**

a) Program changes

Notable program changes for the MS and SS credentials in the review period included a reduction in 2008 of unit requirements from 75 to 64, and various alignment steps to comply with changes in CTC teacher credentialing standards, also in 2008, in particular changes to Teaching Performance Assessment procedures. Starting in 2009-2010, candidates for the MS and SS were required to pass the CBEST exam and meet the subject matter requirement prior to program admission. Multiple Subject candidates meet the subject matter requirement by passing the relevant CSET exams; Single Subject candidates meet the subject matter requirement by either passing the relevant CSET exams or completing a CTC-approved undergraduate subject matter preparation program.

b) Curriculum and student learning.

Learning outcomes assessment procedures: Subject matter competency is demonstrated by passing CSET and CBEST and candidates are further evaluated against a standard set of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE) to assess field practicums and the CSU's Evaluation of Teacher Preparation (ETP). In the first half of the review period, students were assessed using a set of Signature Assignments for which rubrics were developed, but these were replaced in 2008 by state-mandated Teacher Performance Assessments (TPA). This outcome assessment data is compiled electronically using the TaskStream software. According to the results presented in the report, TPE values more or less across the board saw a slight decline from 2008-09 to 2009-10 for both placements. However, scores were in the mid to high 3.0's out of a possible rubric score of 1-4, with scores for the second placement higher than the first, indicating progress, positive outcomes, and adequate standards. With respect to the ETP, one-year after graduation, CSUEB credentialed students surveyed expressed a general satisfaction with their preparation, with between 92-98% indicating they felt well or adequately prepared to teach. However, the same survey showed only 55-56% of graduates felt well or adequately prepared to teach pupils with special needs. With respect to TPAs, students scored an average of around 3.2-3.3 out of 4 for each of the four assessments, easily exceeding the minimum acceptable score of 3 for each assessment and the cumulative score of 12, a slight increase from 2008-09 to 2009-10.

Recruitment, advising, retention and growth potential: Recruitment consists of monthly information sessions in Hayward and Concord from November through January, and bimonthly sessions in February-March. A website presence is maintained for this information and admissions are web-based for convenience. Recent budget difficulties resulted in changing advising practices from 2008 on. Cohort team-leaders were replaced with a credentialing coordinator who maintains candidates' files in a database accessible to faculty and staff. This is used to track and alert candidates concerning any missing requirements. It is expected that the push to promote STEM education will result in significant growth potential in the coming years. Projections of that growth were not provided. No data was provided in the report concerning the retention rate. Interim Associate Dean Zarrillo reported at the CAPR January 20, 2011 meeting that CEAS expects that the push to promote STEM education will result in significant growth potential in the coming years. That growth would be in the Single Subject Credential Program, but it is difficult to quantify the level of that growth because the number of future applications to that Single Subject Program depends on the job market in K-12 secondary schools. The Multiple Subject Teaching Credential Program, however, has experienced a sharp decline in enrollments because of the state budget crisis. The Department of Teacher Education, like all academic units at CSU East Bay, has received diminished resources the last two academic years. The Multiple Subject Program shrank because of a policy decision to allocate a larger percentage of the Department's resources to the Single Subject Program to support future science and math teachers. The Fall Quarter enrollments in the Multiple Subject Credential Program for the last three years are: Fall 08, 158 candidates enrolled; Fall 09, 134; Fall 10, 94.

Curricular statistics: Student and faculty statistical tables were provided as obtained from Institutional Research.

c) Faculty

Tenure track hiring needs, leadership and workplace climate: Tenure-track faculty are required to maintain the program given the push for STEM, the engagement of faculty in joint STEM research with the College of Science, and the FERPing of one science and one math educator. Faculty hiring needs for the coming review period (2010-2016) were projected to be six (6) new assistant/associate professors across a range of subject areas, assuming additional resources are allocated to the program. No specific observations were made about leadership or the workplace climate.

d) Resources

The summary stated that there are unique resource needs of the MS and SS teaching credential programs which include costs of field supervision, costs of travel reimbursement for field supervisors, and costs for the administration and assessment of the TPA. There are also additional costs in both faculty and staff time to maintain CTC and NCATE accreditation. No specific details on the size of these resource needs were provided.

2. Department of Teacher Education - Masters of Science (MS) in Education, Option in Reading Instruction, Reading/Language Arts Certificate, and Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential

a) Program changes

A thorough summary of changes since 2005 was provided. Highlights included the following: Modifications were made to the content of several courses – TED 6254, 6230 and 6251 were mentioned – along with a general retooling of courses to distribute the goals, objectives and products associated with Reading/Language Arts competency across a broader array of courses. Candidates can count 13 units of credit from their teaching credential, if obtained within the prior 7 years, toward the 45-unit MS graduation requirement. To promote greater access, the program's Reading Clinic has been offered at more sites, at more times, and over the summer and for courses where it is applicable, a standard hybrid model of 70% in-class and 30% online instruction has been adopted. It was noted that the reading credential option for the MS is currently in hiatus through 2011 due to low enrollment as school districts cut back on reading specialists.

b) Curriculum and student learning

Learning outcomes assessment procedures: For the MS in Education Option in Reading Instruction, all students must maintain a minimum GPA of 3.0 and earn a B- or higher for all classes if they are to continue (with the option of repeating a course up to 2 times to get a B- and stay in the program). Assessment addresses three professional dispositions, which are judged through a final synthesis class and through signature assignments and rubrics (scored 1-4) for core classes. TaskStream is used to manage student performance data and showed an average of 89% of students in 2007-08 scored higher than 3.5. Results from assessment has resulted in efforts to enhance competency in using APA, assign more short synthesis papers, and connect classroom practice to published academic research. Analysis of data for 2007-08 and 2008-09 showed mostly moderate improvements in highlighted outcome areas. Recruitment, advising, retention and growth potential: No specific discussion/summary of recruitment and advising was provided except to indicate that efforts to attract students were being made to be able to restart the credential. Retention (students graduating from the program) was listed as being better than 95%. Curricular statistics: Student and faculty statistical tables were provided as obtained from Institutional Research.

c) Faculty

Tenure track hiring needs, leadership and workplace climate: In the prior review period, one faculty member (literacy) resigned after entering FERP. Faculty hiring needs for the coming review period (2010-2016) were projected to be one (1) new assistant/associate professor in the language/literacy field if one of the current language/literacy faculty either retires or enters FERP. No specific observations were made about leadership or the workplace climate.

d) Resources

Academic resource requirements: The summary stated that there are unique resource needs of the reading programs include: Costs of field supervision, costs of travel reimbursement for field supervisors, staff costs for administration of TaskStream, acquisition of reading evaluation instruments for K-12 students, examples of K-12 instructional materials in the area of reading. There are additional costs in both faculty and staff time to maintain CTC and NCATE accreditation. No specific details on the size of these resource needs were provided.

3. Department of Teacher Education - Master of Science (MS) in Education, Educational Technology Leadership Option

a) Program changes

Five new courses were added over the review period in response to market and student demand focusing on important subject areas such as web database design for educators. A new curriculum road map was implemented to better guide students through the MS program, grouping courses into initial, middle, pre-culminating, culminating

and final project categories. An exit survey was also implemented to develop feedback vital to improving the program and student experience.

b) Curriculum and student learning
Learning outcomes assessment procedures: Key assignments are identified across the curriculum that can be combined to assess student performance concerning the required in-depth knowledge of curriculum content defined by faculty. Rubrics have been developed and applied and data is collected and disseminated using TaskStream. The rubrics are based on Educational Technology Standards listed by the International Society for Teaching in Education and candidates are expected to score at the "accomplished" or "exemplary" level. The system conforms to NCATE unit assessment standards and feeds into this higher-level effectiveness assessment. Reports are provided to CEAS and faculty and the advisory council review results and suggest changes. An implementation plan was provided with this review summary report but no summary data was included in the body concerning actual assessment outcomes.
Recruitment, advising, retention and growth potential: No specific discussion/summary of this topic area was provided.
Curricular statistics: Student and faculty statistical tables were provided as obtained from Institutional Research.

c) Faculty
Tenure track hiring needs, leadership and workplace climate: No specific information was given concerning faculty hiring needs although mention was made about hiring needs being dependent on program expansion which, should it occur, would require specialist tenure-track faculty to replace lecturers. No hiring requirements were listed for 2011-2016. No specific observations were made about leadership or the workplace climate.

d) Resources
Academic resource requirements: The summary stated that the unique resource needs of the educational technology program are the necessity for acquiring current, state-of-the-art, technology hardware and software; and the staff costs of the administration of TaskStream. There are additional costs in both faculty and staff time to maintain CTC and NCATE accreditation. No specific details on the size of these resource needs were provided.

4.   **Department of Teacher Education - Masters of Science (MS) in Education, Option in Curriculum**

a) Program changes
A thorough summary of changes since 2005 were provided and several of them mirror those made in the Option on Reading Instruction previously discussed. For example, 13 units of credit from a candidates teaching credential, if obtained within the prior 7 years, can now be counted toward the 45 unit MS graduation requirement and for courses where it is applicable, a standard hybrid model of 70% in-class and 30% online instruction has been adopted. For this option, the four core course sequence was revised and having the same instructor teach that cohort's third and fourth core course enhanced cohort content continuity. Patterns were eliminated from the option in favor of a more generalist training although is it mentioned that a 25 unit specialization in Early Childhood Education is now offered. A cohort system was adopted in 2009 and starting 2010-11, a new large seminar class was instituted quarterly (for 50-100 students) although the core classes are capped at 25 and elective classes at 35. TED 6999 was created as a vehicle for faculty to pilot and test models that could later be proposed as regular courses.

b) Curriculum and student learning
Learning outcomes assessment procedures: For the MS in Education Option in Curriculum, all students must maintain a minimum GPA of 3.0 and earn a B- or higher for all classes if they are to continue (with the option of repeating a course up to 2 times to get a B- and stay in the program). Assessment addresses three professional dispositions that drive instruction and assessment. In order to achieve these goals, all students are required to take a series of electives and 4 common core courses: Advanced Curriculum, Advanced Educational Psychology, Advanced Research, and Synthesis. These classes are designed to promote the dispositions. Carefully designed signature assignments and rubrics were created for each core class. TaskStream is used to manage student performance data and showed an average of 89% of students in 2007-08 scored higher than 3.5. Results from assessment have resulted in efforts to enhance competency in using APA, assign more short synthesis papers, and connect classroom practice to published academic research. In the data most recently run after the changes were implemented, improvement was noted. For example the average score for the APA formatting was 3.174 and most recently was 3.5. Scores were reported to have risen in general for the competency areas addressed.

Recruitment, advising, retention and growth potential: No specific discussion/summary of recruitment and advising was provided. Retention (students graduating from the program) was listed as being better than 90%. Potential for growth exists especially in Early Childhood Education and in attracting students through a partnership program with Lawrence Livermore National Labs. Scholarship support has been obtained for 25 students for six quarters from First 5 of Alameda County, Every Child Counts with a quarterly stipend of $300 for books and supplies and it is hoped this will be continue in Fall 2011. The program also believes there will be demand for the minor in Early Childhood Education related to the recent passing of a new law dealing with the implementation of transitional Kindergarten. Demand will also likely increase resulting from the Noyce Foundation STEM grant that supports students to earn an MS degree.

Curricular statistics: Student and faculty statistical tables were provided as obtained from Institutional Research.

c) Faculty

Tenure track hiring needs, leadership and workplace climate: In the prior review period, two faculty members resigned and two FERPed. Faculty hiring needs for the coming review period (2010-2016) were projected to be six (6) new assistant/associate professors across a range of specialties, one each year assuming additional resources are allocated to the program. No specific observations were made about leadership or the workplace climate.

d) Resources

Academic resource requirements: Unlike the other CEAS programs, the summary stated that there are few unique costs for the MS in Education, Option in Curriculum program. There are additional costs in both faculty and staff time to maintain CTC and NCATE accreditation. No specific details on the size of these resource needs were provided.

5. **Department of Educational Psychology - Masters of Science (MS) in Special Education, Mild-Moderate Option,, Masters of Science (MS) in Special Education, Moderate-Severe Option, Educational Specialist, Mild-Moderate Credential, Levels I and II and Educational Specialist, Moderate-Severe Credential, Levels I and II**

a) Program changes

A number of broad changes were listed since 2005 beginning with modifications that year to conform with SB 2042 standards. In 2007, changes were made to the Education Specialist Credentials to add the English Learner authorization. Changes with respect to the Pre-service Intern Hour requirements set by CTC were made in 2008 and it is expected that more changes will occur in the next two years, in particular in response to CTC authorizations in the areas of Students with Autism and Resource Specialists. In the Mild-Moderate Disabilities Programs course content has been revised to reflect current research, best practices and the needs of the field and fieldwork changes include the identification of exemplary fieldwork sites and development a formal procedure for candidates' placement and evaluation. In the Moderate/Severe Disabilities Programs, major changes have resulted from the 4-year (2008-12) $800,000 federal personnel training grant award that has provided student stipends, additional field training resources, and permitted modifications to program curricula and the development of model inclusive field training schools for student teaching experiences.

b) Curriculum and student learning

Learning outcomes assessment procedures: Candidates are assessed on entry using a variety of instruments, especially a faculty interview required of all candidates. In order to track progress and performance, in 2007 a process using multiple signature assignments and a rubric system was implemented using TaskStream designed to assess student competency in knowledge, skills and disposition. The assignments are distributed across a sequence of core courses for the Specialists (both levels) and for the Masters students. Performance in fieldwork is evaluated with the assistance of the cooperating teacher and fieldwork supervisor, and students maintain portfolios. Depending on the program, thesis work is also assessed and exit assessments performed at graduation. Scores presented for the Mild-Moderate Disabilities Programs indicate that standards were largely maintained from 2008-09 through 2009-10 and that scores using the 1-4 rubric were generally in the range 3.5-3.9 for all aspects although the value for Program Evaluation (5125) saw a decline from 3.9 to 3.2. This was the only noticeable difference year to year. Similar results were achieved for the Moderate/Severe Disabilities Programs, with scores generally averaging above 3.5 being largely similar over the two years (note some items are assessed out of 5 or 6 and had scores over 4.5 and 5.5). One again, the Program Evaluation score registered a dip over the two years. The meaning of these dips was not explained. Note that employer surveys are also used as an assessment tool. For example, surveys returned in

2008 from 12 principals in 10 area school districts across three counties showed a mean score of 3.62/4 (91%) for the Education Specialist: Moderate-Severe Disabilities programs indicating high satisfaction and thus the high quality of graduates from the previous 2 academic years.

Recruitment, advising, retention and growth potential: Candidates are recruited in several ways; monthly Credential Student Service Center (CSSC) Admission and Advisement Sessions, the EPSY and CSSC websites, program graduate referrals, and one to two annual specialist recruitment sessions per year as well as other varied efforts. In the Mild-Moderate Disabilities Programs advising takes place through group sessions at least quarterly, with individualized monitoring by the program coordinator. For the Moderate/Severe Disabilities Programs students are required to participate in as many advising sessions with faculty as are needed, at least one quarterly. Weekly cluster meetings are used to review student progress and discuss any needed support/intervention for specific students. Mentoring is employed with grant funds. With respect to program growth potential, school districts continue to need/ hire qualified Education Specialists. The new Education Specialist: M/M Disabilities Credential program began summer 2010 offered through the Alameda County Office of Education (ACOE) with 20 students and this kind of initiative can continue to grow enrollment.

Curricular statistics: Student and faculty statistical tables were provided as obtained from Institutional Research.

c) Faculty
Tenure track hiring needs, leadership and workplace climate: During the last academic year in the area of post-BA and mild-moderate special education, two of five specialist faculty retired. With a climate of increased enrollment, increased student to supervisor ratios, declining lecturer funds, and core class sizes rising to 50-60 coupled with expected NCATE and CTC standard changes, new hires will be needed especially in the mild-moderate special education area. Faculty hiring needs for the coming review period (2010-16) were projected to be six (6) new assistant/associate professors across a range of special education area, one each year.

d) Resources
Academic resource requirements: The summary stated that there are unique resource needs of the special education programs include: Costs of field supervision, costs of travel reimbursement for field supervisors, acquisition of evaluation instruments for K-12 students, examples of K-12 instructional materials adapted for universal access, staff costs to administer TaskStream. There are additional costs in both faculty and staff time to maintain CTC and NCATE accreditation. No specific details on the size of these resource needs were provided.

6. **Department of Educational Psychology - MS in Counseling, Clinical Child/School Psychology Option, MS in Counseling, School Counseling Option, Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Option, and Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Option**

a) Program changes
The Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) cluster has been reformulated to permit greater collaboration in course design and delivery. Other than changes discussed below (personnel, recruitment, etc.), the only notable changes mentioned were efforts to enhance Blackboard use and outreach to students via Facebook and iGoogle sites for the programs.

b) Curriculum and student learning
Learning outcomes assessment procedures: Assessment is assessed in a number of different ways. Students complete self-assessments each year with respect to their work and professional relationships using the Professional Dispositions and Clinical Aptitude Rubric and fieldwork evaluations are performed by a student's supervisor. Highlighted in the report were the Professional Practice Portfolio (PPP) and the PRAXIS exam. All students maintain a PPP to show evidence of knowledge and skills attainment judged with a 1-4 rubric system. Mean scores have varied for the School Psychology and School Counseling programs over 2007-08 and 2008-09 from 3.17 to 3.7, with 3 being proficient and 4 exemplary. All graduates must take the PRAXIS exam. For School Counseling, all candidates passed with scores of 600 or more for both years. For School Psychology, all candidates passed with scores of 165 or more. For both, these scores indicate nationally recognized proficiency standards are being attained.

Recruitment, advising, retention and growth potential: The MS in Counseling program conducts six Prospective Student Orientations each year and performs presentations in undergraduate courses. Qualified applicants are invited to interviews conducted by faculty. In spring, a New Student Orientation is held and prior to the beginning of the fall term, a Fall Orientation is held that involves all the cohorts in the PPS cluster. Second year students organize a potluck and first year students are introduced to the learning community. This is aimed at providing a welcoming, inclusive environment and to ensure retention a variety of measures are performed including individual advising,

annual interviews, and weekly faculty meetings to address the issue of students experiencing challenges in the program. No specific data was provided on retention percentages. With respect to growth, the School Counseling program doubled in size since 2006 and is the only NASP accredited School Psychology program in the Bay Area. Efforts to publicize this fact may yield more applicants. School Counseling is considering CACREP accreditation. Curricular statistics: Student and faculty statistical tables were provided as obtained from Institutional Research.

c) Faculty
Tenure track hiring needs, leadership and workplace climate: Since 2005, School Counseling has had one retirement and added two faculty; both tenured associate level professors. School Psychology has had three retirements and one new full-time faculty in the Program. A total of 1.5 tenure-track positions are forecast as needed through 2015-16 beginning with a half-time faculty position as Clinical Director of the Community Counseling Clinic. An assistant professor position to teach School Psychology and Counseling is projected for 2012-13. If a major grant is secured, an additional assistant professor would be needed to replace whoever becomes that grant manager. The program indicated it is severely lacking in secretarial/administrative support. No specific observations were made about leadership or the workplace climate.

d) Resources
Academic resource requirements: The summary stated that there are unique resource needs of the pupil personnel programs include: Costs of field supervision, costs of travel reimbursement for field supervisors, acquisition of evaluation instruments for K-12 students, examples of K-12 instructional materials adapted for universal access, staff costs to administer TaskStream. There are additional costs in both faculty and staff time to maintain CTC and NCATE accreditation. No specific details on the size of these resource needs were provided.

7. **Department of Educational Leadership - Masters of Science (MS) in Educational Leadership, Administrative Services Credential, Level I, and Administrative Services Credential, Level II**

a) Program changes
Significant curricular changes occurred in the Educational Leadership program since 2005. Efforts have been directed to revise and standardize the three cohort course sequence, coordinate assessment and rubrics, and align courses. Specifically, a curriculum map has been developed, rubrics revised for Signature Assignments used in assessment (which themselves have been revised), cohort activities have been closely aligned and synchronized to start mid-year. Improvements in all areas are ongoing with regular faculty meetings designed to achieve higher quality and uniformity of experience across cohorts. In terms of delivery, an MS online program has been implemented, and wherever it is applicable, a standard hybrid model of 70% in-class and 30% online instruction has been adopted. Class size caps are now set at 33.

b) Curriculum and student learning
Learning outcomes assessment procedures: The goal of the Department of Educational Leadership is to prepare and influence bold, socially responsible leaders who will transform the world of schooling. Assessment is built around three aligned perspectives on candidate competency: a set of five Department Mindscapes that define standards for Bold Socially Responsible Leadership; the six California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders; and CTC Standards 10-15. Signature assignments and rubrics are used for each core class for a pre & post assessment of the three aligned student competencies. The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (Year 1) uses three signature assignments (Fall and Spring), a formative Mindscape reflection, and a summative Mindscapes reflection (i.e. a portfolio). The Master's Program (Year 2) uses two signature assignments (Fall and Spring), a Fall inquiry focus, a summative leadership reflection, and an end-of-year portfolio. The Professional Administrative Services Credential (Tier II) uses an administrative professional learning plan (part A and B), and a professional learning portfolio. The department is currently using TaskStream to obtain data on student performance of these signature assignments. The data has been used to monitor student achievement and program improvement using the pre-assessment signature assignment data and the post-assessment signature assignment data. The following summary data was provided in the report: Administrative Services Credential Program (Year 1) - pre-assessment results better than or equal to 1.95/4 and post-assessment results better than or equal to 3.90/4; MS Program (Year 2) – pre-assessment results of better than or equal to 2.79/4 and post-assessment results better than or equal to 3.73/4. The department is continuing to use TaskStream data to monitor student achievement and the potential for instructor improvement in delivery.
Recruitment, advising, retention and growth potential: Candidate-recruitment occurs through a structured on-site

(school district) recruitment program that includes networking with the district office staff. Faculty members meet with senior administrators to outline the program sequence. A meeting with a school district's principal core follows this initial step where each principal is asked to recommend three candidates to the program. The recommended candidates are provided an informational meeting where the program requirements, costs, timeline and schedule are outlined. This district on-site step initiates the application process for the candidate. The retention rate (students graduating) from the program is higher than 95%.

Curricular statistics: Student and faculty statistical tables were provided as obtained from Institutional Research.

c) Faculty

Tenure track hiring needs, leadership and workplace climate: The program lost three faculty due to resignation in 2009-10 and with a student recruitment plan for incrementally increasing student enrollment by 25 percent annually coupled with the growing needs of the doctorate program in educational leadership, additional faculty are needed, specifically three (3) educational leaders with fiscal and human resources (2011-12), educational law and policy (2012-13), and applied social justice action research (2013-14) backgrounds. No specific observations were made about leadership or the workplace climate.

d) Resources

Academic resource requirements: The summary stated that there are unique resource needs which include: Costs of field supervision and costs of travel reimbursement for field supervisors, staff costs to administer TaskStream. There are additional costs in both faculty and staff time to maintain CTC and NCATE accreditation. No specific details on the size of these resource needs were provided.

CONCLUSION

This recommendation to the Academic Senate from CAPR has taken a disaggregated approach to summarizing the seven separate five-year report summaries submitted to this committee, each of which encapsulate the review period on which the recent accreditation review was based. The contents of the summary reports, as can be gleaned from this document, are mostly backward looking rather than forward oriented. What is missing from each of them, and which one can assume is contained in the voluminous documents submitted to NCATE and the CTC (which the CAPR reviewer did not attempt to summarize), is a list of the goals and objectives for the period up to the next five year review. This, ultimately, is the purpose of the five year review process; a forward looking strategic planning approach that sets objectives and identifies challenges for the period until the next review that can orient program personnel, establish goals and activities, and provide a basis for an incremental annual reporting progress that enables CAPR, the Academic Senate and the administration to oversee and support progress toward maintaining and improving instructional outcomes. From the documents submitted to CAPR, we have a very good idea of what has happened over the last five years since 2005-06 in these accredited programs. The summary reports are generally well written, systematic, and based heavily on a comprehensive set of well-developed program self-studies painstakingly put together by faculty. But we do not have a clear idea of the future through 2015-16 which requires a synthesis of the five-year plan component of the program review rather than the self-study. About the only concrete summary we can make from these seven review reports submitted in response to 08-09 CAPR 23 (revised) is that there will be a sizeable need for new faculty over the six years from 2010-11 through 2015-16; projected needs from the seven programs total 23.5 assistant/associate tenure-track positions (with the potential for one or two more position requests subject to uncertainties such as grant awards and so forth).

With respect to the above observation, at the CAPR meeting of January 20, 2011, Interim Associate Dean Zarrillo reported that the lack of stated goals and objectives for the future is a result of the chronology of two processes: (1) the implementation of the CTC/NCATE *Unit Assessment Plan* and (2) the ongoing work of the CEAS Strategic Planning. As part of the implementation of the *Unit Assessment Plan*, programs in CEAS currently are working on data-driven improvement plans that will include goals and objectives for the next year (improvement plans will be completed by the end of February 2011). Second, the Strategic Planning process will result in approval of a revised CEAS mission statement, vision, values, and goals by the end of the 2010-2011 academic year. In 2011-2012, program coordinators and faculty can then define goals and objectives for the next five years. CAPR concurred with this sentiment and it was agreed that at the end of the 2011-2012 academic year, CEAS will submit program annual reports required by 08-09 CAPR 23 (revised) that will, in addition to the standard elements, list the program-specific goals and objectives in the CTC/NCATE improvement plans and will also provide CAPR with a separate overall summary of the new CEAS Strategic Plan by Fall quarter 2011. This document and the recommendation to approve

the 7 CEAS externally accredited programs for continuation without modification was approved unanimously by CAPR at its February 3, 2011 meting.

CAPR RECOMMENDATION FOR CONTINUATION OF THE PROGRAM

CAPR recommends: Acceptance of the Five-Year Program Reviews of the following College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS) programs and therefore their continuation without modification:
- the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential and the Single Subject Teaching Credential
- the Masters of Science (MS) in Education, Option in Reading Instruction (plus the Reading /Language Arts Certificate and Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential)
- the Masters of Science (MS) in Education, Educational Technology Leadership Option
- the Masters of Science (MS) in Education, Option in Curriculum
- the Masters of Science (MS) in Special Education, Mild-Moderate Option and Moderate-Severe Option (plus the Educational Specialist, Mild-Moderate Credential, Levels I and II and Educational Specialist, Moderate-Severe Credential, Levels I and II)
- the MS in Counseling, Clinical Child/School Psychology Option and School Counseling Option (plus the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Option and Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Option)
- the Masters of Science (MS) in Educational Leadership (plus the Administrative Services Credential and Level I Administrative Services Credential, Level II).

Each of these academic programs – degrees and their options, credentials, and certificates were accredited in 2010 (with conditions) by their accrediting bodies, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The date of the next Five-Year review is 2016-2017 (aligned with the requirements of the accreditation bodies as stated in 08-09 CAPR 23 (revised)).