



**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW
ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT**

College	CEAS
Department	Teacher Education
Program Unit	Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential Programs
Reporting for Academic Year	2015-2016
Department Chair	Eric Engdahl
Date Submitted	6/16/2016

1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)

A. Five-year Review Planning Goals

The accrediting agency for Teacher Education, the California Commission on Teaching Credentialing (CTC) requires programs to work on a cycle of goal setting, implementation and analysis. In 2015-2016, we were analyzing our result as follows:

1. Objective Identified in Improvement Plan:

Teaching Credentials Cluster Objective 14.1 Develop and provide professional development for university supervisors so that they can support candidates in their field placements to, a) better identify EL and special needs students in their placements and b) provide candidates with a broader range of EL and special needs strategies. UAO Outcome 1: Equitable Learning Outcomes.

Changes implemented in response to Improvement Plan: The October 1, 2014 supervisor meeting included professional development with a focus on SDAIE strategies for EL students. The February 4, 2015 supervisor meeting included a report on support for candidates in working with special needs student and a session on the subject. An additional PD on special needs to which supervisors were invited was held on March 11, 2015.

Data Source: We will look at supervisor evaluations of student teachers on TPE 7 when they are finally tabulated in June, 2015.

Summary of Achievement: As a baseline the objectives were met.

Explanation/discussion: While the objective of providing professional development was met it demonstrated the importance of continuing this as on-going work.

Implications for future: In order to support candidates in understanding how to meet the needs of special needs students we are implementing changes that support PD for supervisors. These include a change in the system of staffing the Special Education courses in the multiple and single subject programs as well as a strengthening of the master course outline. They include the addition of curriculum on SPED in all single subject methods courses. There will also be future PD for supervisors and a SPED tenure track faculty hire has been identified for 2018.

2. Objective Identified in Improvement Plan:

Teaching Credentials Cluster Objective 14.2 Develop an online training module for Multiple and Single Subject Credential Candidates on successful collaborative relationships with other school personnel, to be included in Multiple Subject Course TED 5351. UAO 3: Working Collaboratively.

Changes implemented in response to Improvement Plan: Due to scheduling factors this training module was not developed in time for summer implementation. As a pilot, one lesson in one section was devoted to focusing on collaboration. In addition, TED 5373 included a lesson on collaboration.

Data Source: We will look at supervisor evaluations of student teachers on TPE 11 when they are finally tabulated in June, 2015 and the CSU exit survey results when they are available.

Summary of Achievement: There is on-going work needed in this area in order to implement it across the program.

Explanation/discussion: As previously noted, scheduling factors prevented this from being fully implemented.

Implications for future: The take away from this is that TED 5373 is the best course for implementation of this training. That course includes a study of the Linked Learning Model, which will enable candidates to improve collaboration skills in context. TED 5373 is taken by both single and multiple subject candidates.

3. Objective Identified in Improvement Plan:

Teaching Credentials Cluster Objective 14.3 Develop an online training module for Multiple and Single Subject Credential Candidates on sound SDAIE strategies, to be included in Single Subject Course TED 5391. UAO Outcome 1: Equitable Learning Outcomes.

Changes implemented in response to Improvement Plan: All multiple and single subject candidates were given real time GLAD training during the summer of 2014.

Data Source: We will look at supervisor evaluations of student teachers on TPE 7 when they are finally tabulated in June, 2015.

Summary of Achievement: An online module was not developed, but this was because the opportunity to have GLAD trainers in classrooms presented itself. While GLAD and SDAIE are not the same the overlap is significant. The candidates found the workshops extremely valuable. The candidate responses from the workshops rated them on an average of 4.5 on a 5 point scale. A summary of their comments states:

1. The vast majority of the opinions indicated that the GLAD Strategies, as a whole, would benefit all students.
2. The visual aspects of the GLAD tools were unquestionably the most impressive aspect of the training.
3. It was noted that through the use of all the tools, an excellent flow of information and learning can be conducted. The only exception was for music studies; other than the chants, the responder saw little application of GLAD in a music classroom.
4. The specific tools most mentioned in the responses were the Graphic Organizer and Input Charts. The Inquiry Chart (KWL application) is thought to be an excellent tool for the teacher to understand the current state of classroom knowledge and can, therefore, better construct lesson plans for a specific class.
5. The majority of primary grade teachers and student teachers saw the value of the chants.
6. Many of the responses focused on how the GLAD components would help the teachers better

understand the English Language Learners from the prospective of their cultural backgrounds as well as pertinent subject matter content.

7. It was also noted that the use of GLAD strategies would help hook the ELLs to participate and share their individual ideas.

8. Mentioned by several responders was that the use of GLAD tools would benefit the whole classroom, not just the ELLs. This is viewed as a real positive.

9. Also noteworthy is that the GLAD techniques are viewed by many as a classroom management tool to assure the teachers of a positive learning environment.

Explanation/discussion: The GLAD training sessions were able to reach candidates in both the multiple and single subject programs.

Implications for future: The usefulness of the training has led us to repeat it this upcoming year.

B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress

The progress report is embedded in the response to “A.”

C. Program Changes and Needs

According to the CTC, we will be developing new improvement goals next year. These will likely be based on the new Teacher Performance Expectations and Program Standards; which will go into effect September, 2017; our accreditation visit, which will occur in spring 2018; and semester conversion in summer 2018.

We hired a new faculty member in Reading and Literacy and this year we have a search for a Special Education faculty.

The teacher shortage in the region is intensifying. While we have not been able to increase enrollments due to budget constraints, our application numbers were over 600 last year for the approximately 200 available slots. We anticipate that number to grow.

After lengthy consultation with the faculty, the administration of CEAS, and the Chancellor’s Office, President Morishta made the decision not to pursue national accreditation for the CSUEB teacher credential programs any longer. This was due to a number of factors; among them cost, differences between the state accrediting agency and the national agency (since we recommend candidates for state licensure, the state requirements trump the national requirements), and weaknesses in evaluation processes of the national agency.

2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (about 1 page)

A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

The Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential have two sets of Program Student Learning Outcomes: (1) The four Unit Assessment Outcomes (UAOs) shared by all programs in our PreK-12 Professional Education Unit; unit outcomes are required by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and (2) the 13 Teaching Performance Expectations defined by the CTC

Unit Assessment Outcomes

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.

CTC Teaching Performance Expectations

- 1 Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction
- 2 Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction
- 3 Interpretation and Use of Assessments
- 4 Making Content Accessible
- 5 Student Engagement
- 6 Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices
- 7 Teaching English Learners
- 8 Learning About Students
- 9 Instructional Planning
- 10 Instructional Time
- 11 Social Environment
- 12 Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations
- 13 Professional Growth

Attached as Appendix "A" – Multiple Subjects Curriculum and Assessment Map

Attached as Appendix "B" - Single Subjects Curriculum and Assessment Map

B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

As required by CTC, data is gathered every year on the four shared UAOs and the 13 CTC TPEs.I

C. Summary of Assessment Process

Overview: As part of the CTC/CAEP PreK-12 Professional Education Unit, these programs follow the Unit Assessment Plan. Data is gathered every year. Every other year is an “Analytic Year,” in which two years of data are analyzed and program improvement goals/objectives are written. The alternative year is an “Implementation Year,” in which program modifications are made to achieve goals/objectives. The Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs continue to use TaskStream for data collection and analysis. We are looking forward to a visit from our accreditors in spring 2018.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

Each year, extensive data is collected on the candidates (post-baccalaureate university students) who complete the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Teaching Credential Programs, including: (1) the results of the CTC-mandated PACT exam; (2) results of field work (student teaching or internship) evaluations completed by University field supervisors and School District master teachers; (3) exit surveys required by CTC of every program completer; and (4) surveys of graduates and their employers two years after program completion.

Below are some of the data for (1) the results of the CTC-mandated PACT exam. Scores have been consistent over the years.

Multiple Subject Credential Program

Single Subject Credential Program

PACT Exam scores

2015-2016 Cohorts with 2014-2015 and 2013-2014 scores for comparison

There are twelve rubrics for the PACT, three that cover instructional planning, two that cover delivery of instruction (included 20 minute video), three that cover assessment (including student work samples) two that cover reflection, and two that cover the use of academic language.

	2015-2016	2014-2015	2013-2014
R1 (Planning)	2.76	2.81	2.79
R2 (Planning)	2.62	2.65	2.6
R3 (Planning)	2.62	2.69	2.71
R4 (Instruction)	2.39	2.37	2.38
R5 (Instruction)	2.37	2.33	2.39
R6 (Assessment)	2.45	2.39	2.52
R7 (Assessment)	2.20	2.16	2.3
R8 (Assessment)	2.46	2.53	2.56
R9 (Reflection)	2.37	2.27	2.35
R10 (Reflection)	2.34	2.25	2.37
R11 (Academic Language)	2.27	2.2	2.29
R12 (Academic Language)	2.20	2.18	2.26
	n=193	n=177	n = 139

3. STATISTICAL DATA (about 1 page)

Institutional Research, Analysis and Decision Support (IRAD) produces program statistics annually in standard format. These statistics (available on their page [here](#)) 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

Teacher Education					
Item	Fall Quarter				
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
A. Students Headcount					
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
College Years					
B. Degrees Awarded					
	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	149	107	131	80	110
3. Total	149	107	131	80	110
Fall Quarter					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
C. Faculty					
Tenured/Track Headcount					
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%
Lecturer Headcount					
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
Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)					
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
Lecturer Teaching					
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
D. Student Faculty Ratios					
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
E. Section Size					
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	Degree Level			Total
		Bccalaureate	Master	Ed Doctor		Bccalaureate	Master	Ed Doctor		Bccalaureate	Master	Ed Doctor		Bccalaureate	Master	Ed Doctor		Bccalaureate	Master	Ed Doctor	
Female	Black, non-Hispanic		5		5		10		10		10		1		1		6		6		
	American Indian or Alaska Native												1		1						
	Asian		15		15		13		13		13		2		2		15		15		
	Hawaiian/Other Pacific Island						1		1												
	Hispanic		21		21		7		7		9		7		7		7		7		
	White		53		53		36		36		39		23		23		31		31		
	Multiple ethnicity		4		4		2		2		1		1		1		3		3		
	Race/ethnicity unknown		17		17		13		13		19		20		20		15		15		
	Nonresident aliens		2		2		3		3		1		1		1		3		3		
Male	Black, non-Hispanic		2		2						1		1		2		2		2		
	American Indian or Alaska Native																				
	Asian		2		2						5		1		1		2		2		
	Hawaiian/Other Pacific Island		1		1						1		1								
	Hispanic		5		5		5		5		3		2		2		2		2		
	White		15		15		10		10		22		8		8		13		13		
	Multiple ethnicity		1		1								2		2						
	Race/ethnicity unknown		6		6		6		6		7		9		9		10		10		
	Nonresident aliens						1		1								1		1		
Total	Black, non-Hispanic		7		7		10		10		11		3		3		8		8		
	American Indian or Alaska Native												1		1						
	Asian		17		17		13		13		18		3		3		17		17		
	Hawaiian/Other Pacific Island		1		1		1		1		1										
	Hispanic		26		26		12		12		12		9		9		9		9		
	White		68		68		46		46		61		31		31		44		44		
	Multiple ethnicity		5		5		2		2		1		3		3		3		3		
	Race/ethnicity unknown																				
	Nonresident aliens		2		2		4		4		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		ummer					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

SFR

		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 &	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	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