



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

College	CEAS
Department	Educational Leadership
Program Unit	Tier 1, Tier II, MS
Reporting for Academic Year	2016-17
Department Chair	Dr. Winkelman, Chair Dr. Dailey, Coordinator of Tier 1, Tier II, MS, Dr. Harris, Coordinator of Tier 1
Date Submitted	10/20/2017

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

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

For purposes of national (CAEP) and state (CTC) accreditation, Educational Leadership programs define goals/objectives biennially. Data is gathered every year. Every other year is an “Analytic Year,” in which two years of data are analyzed to determine Unit and Program improvement goals/objectives. The alternate year is an “Implementation Year,” in which program modifications are completed to meet the goals/objectives. 2012-2013 was an Analytic Year and the analysis was completed. The CTC was scheduled to approve revised program standards for the Preliminary Administrative Services (Tier 1) as well as Tier II programs in October 2013 however these standards were not approved until February 13, 2014.

\* The Transition Plan for Tier I was submitted on September 1, 2014 The Transition Plan for Tier II was submitted on January 30, 2015.

\* As of the 2015-2016 academic year, both plans have been initially approved by the CCTC, California Commission for Teacher Credentials.

\* Revised California Administrator Performance Expectations, CAPE were approved at the July CCTC, California Commission for Teacher Credentials meeting. Several faculty members from CSUEB’s Department of Educational Leadership addressed the Commission with a proposal to add an equity preamble to frame the standards. This preamble was added.

Relevant for this report are the goals/objectives defined in 2011:

2011 Administrative Services Cluster Goal 1 - Unit Assessment Outcomes: Continue to reduce the number of graduates of the Tier I Program who consider themselves to be only somewhat prepared to help teachers design and implement an instructional program that allows all students, including English Learners and students with special needs, to succeed. Objective UAO/ADM 1.1: Continue to build coursework and field experience requirements that prepare candidates to help teachers design and implement an instructional program that allows all students, including English Learners and students with special needs, to succeed

NCATE/CAEP Standards 1, 3, and 4; CTC Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program Standards 4, 7, 8, and 13.

\* We have incorporated the text, *Bridging the English Learner Achievement Gap: Essential Lessons for School Leaders* by Ray Garcia across all Cohorts.

2011 Administrative Services Program Standard Goal 2: Evaluate the expectations for authentic and significant field experiences at a variety of school levels for candidates in the Preliminary Administrative Services Tier I Program

Objective ADM/PSG 1.1: Develop a revised set of options for cross-level field experiences for Tier I candidates. Cohort leaders and University Fieldwork Supervisors need to continue monitoring and adjusting experiences for individual candidates.

NCATE/CAEP Standards 3; CTC Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program Standards 7 & 8.

\*Fieldwork expectations and assessments have been revised to more closely align with the new Tier 1, Tier II, and MS standards.

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

2011 Administrative Services Cluster \*Goal 1 - Unit Assessment Outcomes: Continue to reduce the number of graduates of the \* Tier 1, Tier II, and MS programs who consider themselves to be only somewhat prepared to help teachers design and implement an instructional program that allows all students, including English Learners and students with special needs, to succeed.

Objective UAO/ADM 1.1: Continue to build coursework and field experience requirements that prepare candidates to help teachers design and implement an instructional program that allows all students, including English Learners and students with special needs, to succeed.

NCATE/CAEP Standards 1, 3, and 4; CTC Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program Standards 4, 7, 8, and 13.

Objective Partially Met: While the program has further developed support for leadership in the area of English language Learners, faculty need to continue to focus on leadership for students with special needs and further develop curriculum for leadership in Special Education

\* In Cohorts we have developed collaborative work groups identified special education issues of concern in districts.

2011 Administrative Services Program Standard \*Goal 2: Evaluate the expectations for authentic and significant field experiences at a variety of school levels for candidates in the \*Preliminary Administrative Services Tier I , Tier II, and MS Programs

Objective ADM/PSG 1.1: Develop a revised set of options for cross-level field experiences for Tier I candidates. Cohort leaders and University Fieldwork Supervisors need to continue monitoring and adjusting experiences for individual candidates.

NCATE/CAEP Standards 3; CTC Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program Standards 7 & 8.

Objective Met: The faculty have developed a revised set of options for cross-level field experiences for Tier I candidates. Cohort leaders and University Fieldwork Supervisors continue monitoring and adjusting experiences for individual candidates.

\*We piloted a new Tier 1 fieldwork assessment tool aligned to the state standards and developed fieldwork assessment tools for the new Tier II program.

### C. Program Changes and Needs

- (1) Based on the positive responses from candidates and school districts, more district partnerships have been developed.
- (2) In 2011-12 District Partnerships continued with Pleasanton, Oakland, New Haven, and Hayward unified school districts.
- (3) During the 2012-2013 academic year a department team including the Department Chair and Tier 1 Coordinator met with Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents, and other district leaders representing 17 Bay Area school districts.
- (3) During the 2012-2013 academic year the Tier 1 Coordinator attended CTC meetings to provide input and receive updates on proposed changes in the credentialing requirements and expectations.
- (4) The program has established partnerships with 20 school districts in 6 geographic areas.
- (5) Like all programs in the CTC/CAEP PreK-12 Professional Education Unit (except Multiple Subject and Single Subject), the Educational Leadership Program we abandoned Taskstream in 2013-2014 - and moved to Blackboard Rubrics and a CEAS in-house Analytic Tool.
- \* In 2014-2015 we established a total of twenty-one district partnerships resulting in the establishment of five Cohorts in: West Contra Costa , East Contra Costa, San Mateo/South San Francisco, New Haven/Fremont, Oakland/Hayward. We have moved our assessments rubrics to Blackboard for purposes of accountability.
- \* In 2015-2016 we sustained and deepened district partnership work through the use of program graduates and district leaders as advisors in the semester conversion design work.

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

### A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

Institutional Learning Outcome	Program Student Learning Outcomes & Assessments
1. Graduates of CSUEB will be able to think critically and creatively and apply analytical and quantitative reasoning to address complex challenges and everyday problems	<b>EDLD graduates are required to engage critically and creatively to address complex challenges in five areas of leadership. For instance, in developing organizational capacity, EDLD students examine the quantitative and qualitative data at their sites and address the question, "How do we focus resources and energy where they will make the most difference to the quality of teaching and learning?"</b>
2. Graduates of CSUEB will	<b>In the area of visionary leadership EDLD graduates must develop strategies to</b>

be able to communicate ideas, perspectives, and values clearly and persuasively while listening openly to others	address the question, “What are powerful ways to include and energize everyone to share responsibility for equity and better results for all students?” Graduates must demonstrate the capacity to develop the norms, structures and skills for inquiry, innovation and continuous improvement as part of the school culture.
3. Graduates of CSUEB will be able to apply knowledge of diversity and multicultural competencies to promote equity and social justice in our communities	The area of instructional leadership challenges graduates to insure that race, class, language, culture, income, gender and sexual identity are no longer good predictors of academic success (or failure). Graduates address the questions, What difference are we making and for which students? From whose perspective? What skills and support do I need to take risks and lead for equity?
4. Graduates of CSUEB will be able to work collaboratively and respectfully as members and leaders of diverse teams and communities	In the area of professional learning and ethical practice honest, open discussion of significant—and sometimes difficult— issues and questions is valued in a supportive, caring learning community. EDLD graduates must consider, who belongs and has influence—and who doesn’t? How does it feel to work, learn, participate, and live here? From whose perspective? Graduates must demonstrate strategies to develop inclusive communities.
5. Graduates of CSUEB will be able to act responsibly and sustainably at local, national, and global levels	In their community leadership graduates must actively generate knowledge and resources for continuous improvement. They consistently query, How are we engaging outside resources, forces and relationships to help us learn and change what needs to change to get the results we want? Graduates demonstrate the ability to develop two-way learning relationships and partnerships essential to proactively meeting new challenges.
6. Graduates of CSUEB will demonstrate expertise and integration of ideas, methods, theory and practice in a specialized discipline of study.	EDLD graduates demonstrate their integration of methods, theory and practice in culminating leadership portfolios. Graduates articulate their beliefs, theories of action, and practice and must provide evidence of their work in each area of leadership. Artifacts include meeting notes, analyses of student achievement data, budgets, family involvement, instructional programs, etc. leading to collaboratively- developed improvement plans based on shared data.

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

Educational Leadership Graduate Program Outcomes Assessed						
I = Introduce P = Practice M = Master						
Year I (Tier I Credential)						
PLOs	PLO 1	PLO 2	PLO 3	PLO 4	PLO 5	
Courses						
6000	I	I	I	I	I	
6400	P	P	P	P	P	
6550	Approach M	Approach M	Approach M	Approach M	Approach M	Approach M
6801	I	I	I	I	I	
6802	P	P	P	P	P	
6803	Approach M	Approach M	Approach M	Approach M	Approach M	Approach M
6410	P	P	P	I	I	
6650		P	P	I	I	
6675		P	P	I	I	

### Educational Leadership Year 2 Masters

Students graduating with an M.S. in Educational Leadership from Cal State East Bay will be able to:

1. Demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions aligned with professional standards to implement universal design and research-based programs to achieve equitable learning outcomes;
2. Demonstrate the ability to create environments, systems, and practices in which all individuals are treated with respect, dignity, trust, and fairness;
3. Work collaboratively with students, parents, and professional colleagues to achieve equitable learning outcomes and equitable environments;
4. Know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, and pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, as defined by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing [CTC] Standards for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential.

### Educational Leadership Year 2 Masters

PLOs PLO 1 PLO 2 PLO 3 PLO 4

Courses

6020	I	I	P	P	
6025	P	P	M	M	
6026	P	P	M	M	
6027	P	P	M	M	
6201(a)		I	I	M	M
6201(b)		P	P	P	P
6201(c)		M	M	M	M
6650	I	P	P	M	
6720	Approach	M	Approach	M	Approach M M
6908	M	M	M	M	
6999(a)		P	P	P	P
6999(b)		M	P	M	M
6999(c)		I	I	I	P

Educational Leadership Graduate Program ILO Alignment Matrix (place X in appropriate boxes): Tier I Credential and Year 2 Masters Completion

ILO's PLO 1 PLO 2 PLO 3 PLO 4 PLO 5

Critical Thinking		X	X	X	X	X		
Communication		X	X	X	X	X		
Collaboration	X	X	X	X	X			
Social Responsibility (Ethics, Sustainability)							X	X X
Diversity	X	X	X	X	X			
Discipline	X	X	X	X	X			

### C. Summary of Assessment Process

Assessment Process

Program Student Learning Outcomes

It is the Department of Educational Leadership's primary goal that professionals emerge from cohort communities as bold, socially responsible leaders with a skill set to improve schools. The credential and MS programs are structured in cohorts, groups of professional educators who enter a program at the same time and are placed into a group for their core classes. These cohorts are designed to create communities of learners and leaders who can work together collaboratively, supporting each other during rich, intense experiences in professional growth.

Graduate students in the Department of Educational Leadership are required to take the following courses for the Preliminary Services Credential (Year 1) Program: As sequence of foundation courses: EDLD 6000 Introduction to Educational Leadership; EDLD 6400 Instructional Leadership; EDLD 6550 School Site Leadership and Organizational Behavior complimented each quarter by fieldwork courses EDLD 6801, 6802, and 6803 and further strengthened by EDLD 6650 Educational Law for Equity; EDLD 6675 Finance & Human Resources for Equity; and EDLD 6410 Supervision and Staff Development. DEL has developed and implemented a systemic assessment system built around three aligned perspectives on candidate competency:

A set of five Department Mindscapes that define standards for Bold Socially Responsible Leadership \* have been aligned with the revised six California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) and the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE).

Though signature assignments were created for every course, we have narrowed our standardized data collection to signature assignments in:

- (1) EDLD 6000 – The signature assignment is a series of written reflections, with examples of practice, based on the \* revised CAPE rubric.
- (2) EDLD 6550 – The signature assignment is the completion of a professional portfolio based on the \*revised CAPE rubric, with several evidentiary artifacts for each standard.
- (3) First Quarter Field Experience
- (4) Second Quarter Field Experience
- (5) Third Quarter Field Experience

The same 4-point rubric is used for the EDLD 6000 mindscapes reflections and the EDLD 6550 portfolios: 1- Insufficient Evidence; 2- Some Evidence/Shares Beliefs and examples; 3- Sufficient Evidence; 4- Evidence and Application.

Two separate year-long assignments provide the basis for field work assessment: (a) The Fieldwork Activities Plan – with evidence of success in field activities based on the six California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders and CTC Standards 10-15; and (b) The Leadership Project, a year-long effort that could include curriculum assessment, a plan to disaggregate data, or an intervention program.

The three program strands take a developmental and mastery approach with respect to outcomes. Thus, all student work must meet or exceed standards in order for the student to achieve a passing grade. Faculty considers the entire body of work at the student and (if appropriate) cohort level to assess progress toward mastery and to monitor and adjust instruction accordingly.

\*The department has moved to the use of Blackboard to obtain data on student performance of signature assignments. The data has been used to monitor student achievement and program improvement. Moved to the use of Blackboard allows faculty to better utilize assessment data to inform our teaching.

Exit survey responses were also collected and analyzed. This survey included one question about current position, six about self-reported level of preparation, and a space to provide any other comments. In addition, meetings with local superintendents and annual meetings of the program's advisory council provide considerable useful data from the school administrators who host and hire our candidates.

#### D. Summary of Assessment Results

In the 5<sup>th</sup> year of the review cycle, the summary will focus on exit survey data including the revised Tier II program

#### Educational Leadership Graduate Program Assessment Plan:

PLO's	2013-2014	2014-15	2015-16
PLO 1-5 Tier I Credential	(1) <b>EDLD 6000</b> – The signature assignment is a series of written reflections, with examples of practice, based on the Mindscapes rubric. (2) <b>EDLD 6550</b> – The signature assignment is the completion of a professional portfolio based on the Mindscapes rubric, with several evidentiary artifacts for each standard. (3) <b>EDLD 6801</b> 1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter Field Experience (4) <b>EDLD 6803</b> 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter Field Experience (5) <b>EDLD6803</b> 3rd Quarter Field Experience	<b>EDLD 6000</b> – The signature assignment is a series of written reflections, with examples of practice, based on the Mindscapes rubric. (2) <b>EDLD 6550</b> – The signature assignment is the completion of a professional portfolio based on the Mindscapes rubric, with several evidentiary artifacts for each standard. (3) <b>EDLD 6801</b> 1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter Field Experience (4) <b>EDLD 6803</b> 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter Field Experience (5) <b>EDLD6803</b> 3rd QuarterField Experience	<b>Prepared program review document for CTC</b>
	*Exit Survey		5-Year Program Review
PLO 1-4 Masters Year 2	(1) <b>EDLD 6908</b> – Part I of the signature assignment is the completion of an Equity Inquiry Project at a school site or district level. (2) <b>EDLD 6908</b> Part 2 of the signature assignment is a written reflection with examples based on their Equity Inquiry Project of their leadership growth and development (scored by a rubric) (3) <b>EDLD 6720</b> Inquiry Focus	1. <b>EDLD 6908</b> – Part I of the signature assignment is the completion of an Equity Inquiry Project at a school site or district level. 2. <b>EDLD 6908</b> – Part 2 of the signature assignment is a written reflection with examples	

the project work involving data analysis and action research based on their	
Equity Inquiry Project of their leadership growth and development (scored by a rubric)	
*Exit Survey	5-Year Program Review
PLO 1-4 Tier 2, based on CTC redesign to a 2 year program	Tier II, Year 1 portfolio assessment
*Exit Survey	5-Year Program Review

**Program Review reports were submitted to the CCTC, California Commission on Teacher Education in 2016-17 AND all programs are under Accreditation Review for the 2017-2018 academic year.**

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

STATISTICAL DATA 2011-2013

- 1- Little Evidence
- 2- Some Evidence
- 3- Sufficient Evidence
- 4- Evidence & Application

Course Standard	2011-12 Mean	2012-13 Mean
Fall		
6000 Equity Achievement	2.00	1.79
6000 Systematic Thinking	2.00	1.63
6000 Organizational Capacity	2.00	1.38
6000 Ethical Practice	2.00	1.75
6000 Engaging/Influencing	2.00	1.54
Spring		
6550 Mindscape 1	3.79	4.00
6550 Mindscape 2	3.79	4.00
6550 Mindscape 3	3.5	4.00
6550 Mindscape 4	3.79	4.00
6550 Mindscape 5	3.64	4.00

For Fieldwork I, II, and III the progress of all candidates is monitored each quarter by a university supervisor as well as a school district administrator. Candidates must complete the objectives outlined in the Fieldwork Activities as well as the individualized Leadership Project.

Given the demands of working and completing all required program requirements, not all candidates meet the fieldwork expectations within one year, but all candidates must meet the requirements prior to applying for the credential.



Exit Survey Results on scale of 1-4

4 Well prepared

3 Adequately prepared

2 Somewhat prepared

1 Not at all prepared

Question How well prepared are you to: Help teachers design and implement a program that allows all children, including English Learners and children with special needs, to succeed?

2011-2012	2012-2013
-----------	-----------

3.40	
------	--

	3.11
--	------

Question How well prepared are you to: Create a school environment in which all individuals are treated with respect, dignity, trust, and fairness?

2011-2012	2012-2013
-----------	-----------

3.74	
------	--

	3.53
--	------

Question How well prepared are you to: Work collaboratively with children, parents, staff, and

teachers to achieve equitable learning outcomes and equitable environments?

2011-2012	2012-2013
3.69	3.44

Question In regards to the professional knowledge and skills school administrators need to be successful, how well prepared are you?

2011-2012	2012-2013
3.46	3.44

Question Think back to all of your experiences (so far) in the Administrative Services Tier I program. How would you rate the program?

2011-2012	2012-2013
3.46	3.35

As a result of the examination of the Exit Survey results for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 it was decided that the first question on the exit survey needed to be separated into two distinct questions. One question addresses the needs of English Language Learners and the other addresses Special Education students. The results are reported below. The data indicates that students felt confident with their ability to serve English Language learners. They were not as confident in their capacity to serve students with special needs. We will continue to implement the curriculum and assignments addressing service to English Language Learners. We need to expand our curriculum, instruction and assignments to build our candidates competency in serving students with special needs.

Survey Results	2014 Mean	2015-16
How well prepared are you to: Provide services that help English Learners succeed?	3.08	3.4
How well prepared are you to: Provide services that help children who receive special education services succeed?	2.64	3.3
How well prepared are you to: Create a school environment in which all individuals are treated with respect, dignity, trust and fairness?	3.52	3.8

How well prepared are you to: Work collaboratively with children, parents, staff, administrators, and teachers to achieve equitable learning outcomes and equitable	3.6	3.8
In regards to the professional knowledge and skills you need to be successful, how well prepared are you?	3.16	3.5
Think back to all of your experiences in your Credential/Masters program. How would you rate the program?	3.2	3.1

\*The exit survey data from 2015- 2016, illustrates that Tier 1, Tier II, and MS program graduates feel more prepared to: (1) Provide services that help English Learners succeed. (2) Provide services that help children who receive special education services succeed. (3) Create a school environment in which all individuals are treated with respect, dignity, trust and fairness. (4) Work collaboratively with children, parents, staff, administrators, and teachers to achieve equitable learning outcomes and equitable environments.

Though the overall rating of the three programs is slightly lower (3.2 -3.1) in 2015-2016, overall the department continues to improve in producing graduates to serve as educational leaders for social justice. A quote from the student comment section of the spring 2016 exit survey captures what the department hopes to accomplish, “The CSUEB Educational Leadership Department's work matches the mission provided in university documentation. The program was quality and the instructors helped us think about equity and justice. I look forward to continuing my work in the coming years”.

**The 2016-2017 Exit Survey Data indicates overall progress on the program, department, college (CEAS), and university objectives (see next page). The newly adopted (CTC) Tier 2 program will need some revisions in the second-year curriculum and instructional strategies.**



Q1 How well prepared are you to: Provide services that help English Learners succeed?	0.83	0.82	0.87	0.87
Q2 How well prepared are you to: Provide services that help children who receive special education services succeed?	0.68	0.70	0.80	0.79
Q3 How well prepared are you to: Create a school environment in which all individuals are treated with respect, dignity, trust, and fairness?	0.96	0.98	0.97	0.97
Q4 How well prepared are you to: Work collaboratively with children, parents, staff, administrators, and teachers to achieve equitable learning outcomes and equitable environments?	0.92	0.92	0.94	0.94
Q5 In regards to the professional knowledge and skills you need to be successful, how well prepared are you?	0.90	0.92	0.94	0.94
<b>Q6 Think back to all of your experiences in your Credential/Masters program. How would you rate the program?</b>	0.81	0.81	0.78	<b>0.83</b>

Admin Tier 1

	2014	2015	2016	2017
1	0.88	0.85	0.82	0.84
2	0.68	0.72	0.83	0.80
3	0.98	0.99	0.94	0.95
4	0.98	0.95	0.95	0.97
5	0.93	0.93	0.92	0.91
6	0.91	0.93	0.88	0.89

Admin Tier 2

	2014	2015	2016	2017
1		0.67	1.00	0.83
2		0.67	1.00	0.75
3		1.00	1.00	0.91
4		1.00	1.00	0.92
5		0.83	1.00	0.75
0.58	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.58

Degrees Conferred

Please note that the statistical data provided by the university (in October 2017 as well as fall 2016) was inaccurate. The department is in the process of collecting and creating a data set that includes the credential programs' enrollment.

Educational Leadership		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
		Baccalaureate	Master	Ed Doctor		Baccalaureate	Master	Ed Doctor		Baccalaureate	Master	Ed Doctor		Baccalaureate	Master	Ed Doctor		Baccalaureate	Master	Ed Doctor	
Female	Black, non-Hispanic		5	2	7		10	3	13		4	2	6		6	1	7		6	3	9
	American Indian or Alaska Native																				
	Asian		3		3		2		2		4		4		3	1	4		10	1	11
	Hawaiian/Other Pacific Island																			1	1
	Hispanic		5	2	7		7		7		5	1	6		7	1	8		7	4	11
	White		9	1	10		17	1	18		20	1	21		18	3	21		54	1	55
	Multiple ethnicity		1		1		1		1		1		1		3	1	4		3	1	4
	Race/ethnicity unknown		2		2		2		2		8		8		3		3		9		9
	Nonresident aliens														2		2				
Male	Black, non-Hispanic		2	1	3						3	1	4		3		3		3	2	5
	American Indian or Alaska Native		1		1																
	Asian						1		1		3		3			1	1		1	1	2
	Hawaiian/Other Pacific Island																				
	Hispanic		2		2		3		3		5		5		3		3		4	1	5
	White		9	1	10		6		6		11		11		6		6		14	1	15
	Multiple ethnicity																				
	Race/ethnicity unknown										8		8		2		2		5		5
	Nonresident aliens																				
Total	Black, non-Hispanic		7	3	10		10	3	13		7	3	10		9	1	10		9	5	14
	American Indian or Alaska Native		1		1																
	Asian		3		3		3		3		7		7		3	2	5		11	2	13
	Hawaiian/Other Pacific Island																		1		1

Hispanic		7	2	9		10		10		10	1	11		10	1	11		11	5	16
White		18	2	20		23	1	24		31	1	32		24	3	27		68	2	70
Multiple ethnicity		1		1		1		1		1		1		3	1	4		3	1	4
Race/ethnicity unknown		2		2		2		2		16		16		5		5		14		14
Nonresident aliens														2		2				

Source: CSU Academic Planning Data Base (APDB); Section Master File (BKPD SMF) and Faculty Master File (BKPD FMF)  
Office of Institutional Research, Analysis & Decision Support | Cal State East Bay

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

**EDLD**

		Summer					Fall					Winter					Spring				
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
<b>Graduate</b>	<b>Number Sections</b>	14.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	10.0	19.0	26.0	32.0	38.0	29.0	29.0	29.0	31.0	40.0	33.0	32.0	31.0	37.0	38.0	35.0
	<b>Total Enrollment</b>	129	118	114	96	151	464	358	713	723	668	412	390	697	657	678	450	405	879	689	801
	<b>Avg Section Size</b>	15.4	14.8	14.3	13.7	15.1	26.0	18.4	25.0	19.9	24.1	25.7	17.8	24.3	18.5	22.0	21.1	19.5	24.5	19.2	23.0
<b>DISCIPLINE TOTAL</b>	<b>Number Sections</b>	14.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	10.0	19.0	26.0	32.0	38.0	29.0	29.0	29.0	31.0	40.0	33.0	32.0	31.0	37.0	38.0	35.0
	<b>Total Enrollment</b>	129	118	114	96	151	464	358	713	723	668	412	390	697	657	678	450	405	879	689	801
	<b>Avg Section Size</b>	15.4	14.8	14.3	13.7	15.1	26.0	18.4	25.0	19.9	24.1	25.7	17.8	24.3	18.5	22.0	21.1	19.5	24.5	19.2	23.0

**Academic Program Review SFR Table - Department**  
**California State University, East Bay**  
**SFR BY COURSE LEVEL: TERM FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENTS / ALL FACULTY 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
<b>Educational Leadership</b>	<b>Tenured &amp; Tenure Track</b>	229	484	696	733	824	19.08	39.07	55.6	58.22	63.57	2.03	4.67	3.2	5.6	4.83	9.38	8.37	17.39	10.4	13.16
	<b>Lecturer</b>	1504	720	2008	1694	1602	117.23	56.43	158.73	132.8	123.8	3.34	3.36	5.93	5.59	3	35.15	16.82	26.76	23.77	41.23
	<b>Graduate</b>	1733	1204	2704	2427	2426	136.32	95.5	214.33	191.02	187.37	5.37	8.02	9.13	11.19	7.84	25.39	11.9	23.48	17.07	23.91
	<b>Total</b>	1733	1204	2704	2427	2426	136.32	95.5	214.33	191.02	187.37	5.37	8.02	9.13	11.19	7.84	25.39	11.9	23.48	17.07	23.91