



---

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW  
ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT

College	CEAS
Department	Teacher Education
Program Unit	MS in Reading Instruction
Reporting for Academic Year	2015-2016
Department Chair	Eric Engdahl
Date Submitted	9/24/16

**1. SELF-STUDY** (about 1 page)

**A. Five-year Review Planning Goals**

Goals for 2015-2016

- 1) Continue improve candidates' abilities to promote a "culture of literacy". The new CTC Reading and Literacy Added Authorization Standard 2 requires programs to instruct candidates on promoting a "culture of literacy".
- 2) Demonstrate reliability of scoring of signature assessments in the Reading Program. The new CTC Reading and Literacy Added Authorization Standards require programs to demonstrate that instructors who score signature assessments are calibrated to ensure reliability.
- 3) Continue Alignment of the Reading Program with the Common Core State Standards, the new English Language Development Standards.
- 4) Revise content of Reading courses to ensure that candidates are prepared for the changing role of literacy leadership in schools.

**B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress**

*Created 9/2016*

Goal 1: Lectures focusing on developing a culture of literacy was developed and a culture of literacy assignment (paper) was added to the course requirements for TED 6253 to meet new CTC requirements. In 2015-2016 candidates demonstrated deeper understanding through both in class discussions and a “Culture of Literacy” written reflection on personal beliefs and practices. As a product of numerous discussions and collaborative work, all students received a 10/10 on the project.

Goal 2: As a small program, there is only one instructor per course. In 2015-2016, faculty met to discuss signature assessments and to refine scoring rubrics. Faculty will continue to meet jointly not only discuss calibration but also to then score signature assessments (as well as to discuss scoring decisions for one or more courses in the program).

Goal 3: All courses have been fully aligned with the Common Core State Standards and the English Language Development Standards. Lectures have been revised and assignments added to ensure that candidates are fully prepared to act as literacy leaders in standards-based California public schools. For example, candidates complete a sequence of the standards activity in TED 6253, examining the progression of vocabulary and comprehension skills from the Preschool Foundations through Common Core State Standards at every grade level. In TED 6220 candidates complete an assignment, reviewing and aligning the Common Core State Standards and the English Development Standards at a particular grade level.

Goal 4: Lectures and assignments have been added to the Reading Program that address the changing role of the literacy leader in today’s schools. For example, candidates in TED 6253 complete a professional development workshop based a literacy need identified at their school. This need could be strategy specific or foundational (such as establishing a shared pedagogical belief regarding literacy learning). This experience leads towards their demonstration of ability to coach other teacher in exemplary literacy practices.

### **C. Program Changes and Needs**

Program goals represent the incorporation of the CTC’s RLAA Standards. In 2016, CTC officially renamed the Reading Certificate (Added Authorization) as the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization. Program goals reflect the criteria for most current program standards.

#### **Changes in Response to External Accreditors:**

We made major changes to the Reading program when our accrediting organization, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), issued new Reading standards. All of our courses were re-designed to meet the new standards.

#### **Changes in Response to University Mandates:**

The Reading Program, like all other academic programs on campus, is focused on conversion to semesters. In 2015-2015, faculty reorganized the program to maintain the high caliber and rigor while adjusting to the semesterisation schedule. The proposed semerterised program was submitted for approval in 2015-2016.

#### **Changes in Response to Public Schools:**

We have aligned the Reading Program with the Common Core State Standards, the new English Language Development Standards. We continue to work towards alignment with the newer

Smarter Balanced Assessment Program. To achieve this, Reading Program professors have revised course content and have developed lectures and assignments aligned with the CCSS. The Reading Program faculty continues to carefully monitor changes made by the Commission in Teacher Credentialing, the California Department of Education, Smarter Balanced Assessments and in public school instruction to ensure relevance in a rapidly changing educational setting.

Literacy demands at the Middle School and High School levels, especially in the light of CCSS, have created a demand for foundational literacy knowledge and skills for the secondary educator. The Graduate Reading Program is actively researching this need. Findings from this research will inform content./ course modifications to fill this gap.

During the past decade of budget cuts in the public schools most Reading specialist positions were eliminated and few graduates of the Reading Program were hired for the jobs they were trained to do. However, budgets are expanding and Reading specialist positions appear to be returning, albeit in altered form. For example, positions are opening in high schools, working with struggling secondary readers, particularly English learners. Reading specialists are also being hired as literacy coaches for schools and districts. Although all Reading positions require a deep understanding of literacy development, coaching teachers requires a different set of skills than working directly with students. Our candidates must be skilled in Reading development, literacy instructional methods, and adult learning theory. Course content has been changed to ensure that our program prepares candidates to be the literacy leaders of the future.

## **2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (about 1 page)**

### **A. Program Student Learning Outcomes**

\*\*\* MS in Education, Option in Reading Instruction \*\*\*

#### Program Specific Student Learning Outcomes

Candidates who graduate with the MS in Education, Option in Reading Instruction, will be able to:

- (1) Demonstrate a thorough understanding of theory and research on an effective culture of literacy for diverse prekindergarten through high school students, their families, and communities;
- (2) Demonstrate knowledge of research-based instructional practices in each component of literacy and the ability to assess, instruct, and provide intervention for each component of literacy instruction, including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language development, reading and listening comprehension, and vocabulary development, and writing;
- (3) Successfully plan and implement a balanced literacy environment, including the selection and use instructional materials, technology, routines, and strategies that are appropriately aligned with students' assessed language and literacy needs; and
- (4) Complete an action research project in the field of literacy, including a review of the research

*Created 9/2016*

literature, planning and implementing an instructional unit, and an analysis of student learning and research results

Our candidates will:

UAO1: Demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions aligned with professional standards to implement universal design and research-based programs to achieve equitable learning outcomes.

UAO2: Demonstrate the ability to create environments, systems, and practices in which all individuals are treated with respect, dignity, trust, and fairness.

UAO3: Work collaboratively with students, parents, and professional colleagues to achieve equitable learning outcomes and equitable environments.

UAO4: Know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

\*\*\* Attached as Appendix A: Correlation (Curriculum) Map: ILOs, UAOs, CTC Standards

\*\*\* Attached as Appendix B: Correlation (Curriculum) Map: ILOs and SLOs

Please list all outcomes in the box below, and append a curriculum map showing alignment of the Program Student Learning Outcomes and CSUEB Institutional Learning Outcomes.

### **B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed**

Unit Assessment Outcome (4) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions  
Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Program Student Learning Outcome (2) Demonstrate knowledge of research-based instructional practices in each component of literacy and the ability to assess, instruct, and provide intervention for each component of literacy instruction, including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language development, reading and listening comprehension, and vocabulary development, and writing;

### **C. Summary of Assessment Process**

Signature assignments are administered in each of the Graduate Reading courses. Two of the assessments are discussed in this report.

Candidates are assessed on their ability to design instruction for struggling readers in TED 6253 and their ability to identify student learning needs, administer assessments, and interpret assessments in TED 6231. Disaggregated data are used to evaluate program effectiveness and to inform program improvement.

#### **D. Summary of Assessment Results**

Following a previous decline in overall scores on the signature assignment in TED 6253, as reported in the Field Experience Report from 2013/2014 year, the TED 6253 curriculum returned to the previous model in summer 2014 as well as the addition of the “culture of literacy” component. In 2014/2015, we saw an overall increase from the 2013/2014 score of 3.68 to an overall 2014/2015 score of 3.92. In 2015/2016, additional scaffolds were added to further support assessment, analysis, planning, delivery and reflections. As a result, candidates received an overall score of 4.0. The scoring rubric will be evaluated for 2016-2017 to increase the sensitivity of the rubric to add to more variable, informative scores.

The TED 6231 scores on the signature assignment, the Assessment Report has remained consistent with 2014/2015 overall score of 3.62 and a 2015/2016 score of 3.61. The sub-areas of Assessment, Analysis and Interpretation show the greatest need with an average of 3.4, 3.37, and 3.37, respectively. Between the 2014/2015 and 2015/2016, there were no significant instructional changes. Further investigation of the content/ instruction in these particular areas for the 2016/ 2017 year will be conducted to determine means of strengthening content/ instruction and further student support.

All Graduate Reading Program professors continue to focus on improving student reflections. This skill was considered an important professional disposition and a necessary precursor to the development of professional competence. Improvements in this skill continue to be noted in the signature assignment for TED 6253.

### **3. STATISTICAL DATA (about 1 page)**

Planning and Institutional Research produce program statistics annually in standard format. These statistics will be attached to the Annual Report of the Program Unit. This statistical document is expected to be approximately one page long and will contain the same data as required for the five-year review including student demographics of majors, student level of majors (e.g. Juniors, Seniors), faculty and academic allocation, and course data.

The Annual Report may include one or two pages of supplemental information, as appendices, in the form of graphical presentation (e.g., line graphs), tables, and pertinent discussion which summarize the data of the last several (3-5) years to make changes and trends more apparent.

**California State University, East Bay**  
**APR Summary Data**  
**Fall 2011 - 2015**

<b>Teacher Education</b>					
<b>Item</b>	<b>Fall Quarter</b>				
	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>
<b>A. Students Headcount</b>					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Postbaccalaureate (Credential)	273	271	273	273	309
3. Graduate	119	75	76	73	55
4. Total Number of Majors	392	346	349	346	364
<b>College Years</b>					
<b>B. Degrees Awarded</b>					
	<b>10-11</b>	<b>11-12</b>	<b>12-13</b>	<b>13-14</b>	<b>14-15</b>
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	149	107	131	80	110
3. Total	149	107	131	80	110
<b>Fall Quarter</b>					
	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>
<b>C. Faculty</b>					
<b>Tenured/Track Headcount</b>					
1. Full-Time	14	13	11	11	12
2. Part-Time	3	2	4	3	1
3a. Total Tenure Track	17	15	15	14	13
3b. % Tenure Track	42.5%	31.3%	31.9%	28.6%	22.8%
<b>Lecturer Headcount</b>					
4. Full-Time	1	0	0	0	0
5. Part-Time	22	33	32	35	44
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	23	33	32	35	44
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	57.5%	68.8%	68.1%	71.4%	77.2%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	40	48	47	49	57
<b>Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)</b>					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	9.1	9.3	9.4	6.7	6.7
9. Lecturer FTEF	2.5	1.8	1.8	4.3	4.5
10. Total Instructional FTEF	11.6	11.1	11.2	10.9	11.1
<b>Lecturer Teaching</b>					
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	215.0	207.2	193.8	149.0	152.6
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	76.2%	81.0%	86.5%	62.2%	59.7%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	67.2	48.5	30.3	90.5	103.2
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	23.8%	19.0%	13.5%	37.8%	40.3%
13. Total FTES taught	282.2	255.7	224.1	239.5	255.8
14. Total SCU taught	4233.0	3836.0	3362.0	3593.0	3837.0
<b>D. Student Faculty Ratios</b>					
1. Tenured/Track	23.8	22.2	20.6	22.3	23.0
2. Lecturer	26.8	26.7	17.3	21.3	23.0
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	24.4	23.0	20.1	21.9	23.0
4. Lower Division	.	.	.	.	.
5. Upper Division	28.1	9.4	18.0	25.4	21.4
6. Graduate	24.1	24.6	20.2	21.8	23.0
<b>E. Section Size</b>					
1. Number of Sections Offered	59.0	58.0	51.0	63.0	70.0
2. Average Section Size	31.4	21.6	20.3	20.5	21.1
3. Average Section Size for LD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Average Section Size for UD	24.4	17.2	17.6	20.4	20.5
5. Average Section Size for GD	32.2	22.0	20.7	20.5	21.2
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	2	3	4	4	4
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	41	44	38	39	36
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	3	2	1	1	0
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	13	9	8	19	30

Source and definitions available at:

<http://www.csueastbay.edu/ira/apr/summary/definitions.pdf>

Degrees Conferred

Education		CY10-11			CY11-12			CY12-13			CY13-14			CY14-15			
		Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total
		Bccalaur ate	Master	Ed Doctor		Bccalaur ate	Master	Ed Doctor		Bccalaur eate	Master	Ed Doctor		Bccalaur eate	Master	Ed Doctor	
Female	Black, non-Hispanic		5		5	10		10	10		10	1		1	6		6
	American Indian or Alaska Native											1		1			
	Asian		15		15	13		13	13		13	2		2	15		15
	Hawaiian/Other Pacific Island					1		1									
	Hispanic		21		21	7		7	9		9	7		7	7		7
	White		53		53	36		36	39		39	23		23	31		31
	Multiple ethnicity		4		4	2		2	1		1	1		1	3		3
	Race/ethnicity unknown		17		17	13		13	19		19	20		20	15		15
	Nonresident aliens		2		2	3		3	1		1	1		1	3		3
Male	Black, non-Hispanic		2		2				1		1	2		2	2		2
	American Indian or Alaska Native																
	Asian		2		2				5		5	1		1	2		2
	Hawaiian/Other Pacific Island		1		1				1		1						
	Hispanic		5		5	5		5	3		3	2		2	2		2
	White		15		15	10		10	22		22	8		8	13		13
	Multiple ethnicity		1		1							2		2			
	Race/ethnicity unknown		6		6	6		6	7		7	9		9	10		10
	Nonresident aliens					1		1							1		1
Total	Black, non-Hispanic		7		7	10		10	11		11	3		3	8		8
	American Indian or Alaska Native											1		1			
	Asian		17		17	13		13	18		18	3		3	17		17
	Hawaiian/Other Pacific Island		1		1	1		1	1		1						
	Hispanic		26		26	12		12	12		12	9		9	9		9
	White		68		68	46		46	61		61	31		31	44		44
	Multiple ethnicity		5		5	2		2	1		1	3		3	3		3
	Race/ethnicity unknown		23		23	19		19	26		26	29		29	25		25
	Nonresident aliens		2		2	4		4	1		1	1		1	4		4



**Course History Table 10.1c  
California State University, East Bay  
COURSE HISTORY  
By Quarter from Summer 2011 through Spring 2016**

TED

		Summer					Fall					Winter					Spring				
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Upper Division	Number Sections	.	.	.	.	.	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	1.0
	Total Enrollment	.	.	.	.	.	122	86	88	102	82	78	88	56	76	55	49	25	19	14	16
	Avg Section Size	.	.	.	.	.	24.4	17.2	17.6	20.4	20.5	15.6	22.0	13.8	18.5	18.3	16.3	8.0	9.5	7.0	16.0
Undergraduate	Number Sections	.	.	.	.	.	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	1.0
	Total Enrollment	.	.	.	.	.	122	86	88	102	82	78	88	56	76	55	49	25	19	14	16
	Avg Section Size	.	.	.	.	.	24.4	17.2	17.6	20.4	20.5	15.6	22.0	13.8	18.5	18.3	16.3	8.0	9.5	7.0	16.0
Graduate	Number Sections	61.0	67.0	53.0	49.0	52.0	54.0	53.0	46.0	58.0	66.0	45.0	51.0	39.0	54.0	48.0	53.0	55.0	52.0	77.0	73.0
	Total Enrollment	1,571	1,608	1,387	1,146	1,172	1,521	1,151	1,011	1,061	1,341	1,315	1,057	931	1,057	1,377	1,189	1,440	1,493	1,551	1,607
	Avg Section Size	29.5	27.9	28.2	23.9	24.3	32.2	22.0	20.7	20.5	21.2	29.8	20.3	21.7	20.3	24.2	26.6	28.1	29.8	21.7	23.3
DISCIPLINE TOTAL	Number Sections	61.0	67.0	53.0	49.0	52.0	59.0	58.0	51.0	63.0	70.0	50.0	55.0	44.0	59.0	51.0	56.0	58.0	54.0	79.0	74.0
	Total Enrollment	1,571	1,608	1,387	1,146	1,172	1,643	1,237	1,099	1,163	1,423	1,393	1,145	987	1,133	1,432	1,238	1,465	1,512	1,565	1,623
	Avg Section Size	29.5	27.9	28.2	23.9	24.3	31.4	21.6	20.3	20.5	21.1	28.1	20.4	20.9	20.1	23.7	25.9	27.7	29.0	21.5	23.2

**Academic Program Review SFR Table-Subject  
California State University, East Bay  
SFR BY COURSE LEVEL: TERM-FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENTS/ALL  
FACULY AND LECTURERS  
Fall 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015**

		Total SCU					term_ftes					term_ftef					term_sfr				
		Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015
TED	Tenured & Tenure Track	3225	3108	2907	2235	2289	221.9	213.22	201.78	155.27	155.88	9.05	9.32	9.41	6.67	6.65	24.53	22.88	21.44	23.28	23.44
	Lecturer	1008	728	455	1358	1548	71.73	51.47	31.85	93.57	105.98	2.51	1.82	1.75	4.25	4.49	28.59	28.26	18.17	22.01	23.58
	Upper Division	373	174	157	199	142	28.3	11.6	10.47	14.67	10.47	0.88	1.23	0.58	0.52	0.44	32.01	9.42	17.95	28.04	23.63
	Graduate	3860	3662	3205	3394	3695	265.33	253.08	223.17	234.17	251.4	10.67	9.91	10.58	10.4	10.7	24.86	25.55	21.09	22.52	23.5
	Total	4233	3836	3362	3593	3837	293.63	264.68	233.63	248.83	261.87	11.56	11.14	11.17	10.92	11.14	25.41	23.76	20.92	22.79	23.5

