



ACADEMIC SENATE

<http://www.csueastbay.edu/senate>

College	CEAS
Department	Educational Psychology
Program Unit	*MS in Special Education, Mild Moderate Disabilities Option *MS in Special Education, Moderate Severe Disabilities Option *Education Specialist, Mild Moderate Disabilities Credential, Preliminary *Education Specialist, Moderate Severe Disabilities Credential, Preliminary
Reporting for Academic Year	2012-2013
Department Chair	Dr. Jack Davis
Date Submitted	2/5/2014

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT

1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)

A. Five-year Review Planning Goals

For purposes of national (CAEP) and state (CTC) accreditation, these programs, like all programs in our PreK-12 Professional Education Unit, 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. Goals and objectives were defined during the 2010-2011 academic year. Program modifications were made in 2011-2012 to achieve those goals and objectives. Those goals and objectives are reported here with a summary of the achievement of those goals/objectives in the next section. 2012-2013 was an Analytic Year, the analysis has been completed, new goals/objectives will be defined during the 13-14 year, to be implemented in the Winter and Spring of 2014 and the Fall of 2014.

Cluster Improvement Goals Defined in 2011, for Implementation in 2011-2012

Unit Goal 2: Special Education Cluster: Improve candidate competence in the area of student support (UA0 3: Working Collaboratively).

UG Objective 2.1: Mild Moderate Disabilities program: Incorporate content and strategies in curriculum and instruction courses that prepare candidates with the knowledge and skills to support student's access to and learning in the core curriculum.

UG Objective 2.2: Mild Moderate Disabilities program: Incorporate content and strategies in curriculum and instruction courses that enable candidates to increase student positive behavior, social and communication skills.

UG Objective 2.3: Moderate-Severe Disabilities program: Include information in course syllabi for EPSY 6671 on collaborating with families, general educators, related services, peers via individual student planning meetings.

UG Objective 2.4: Moderate-Severe Disabilities program: Identify local practitioners to present student planning meeting strategies to class.

B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress

Goal 2: Special Education Cluster: Improve candidate competence in the area of student support (UAO 3: Working Collaboratively).

Objective 2.1: Mild Moderate Program: Incorporate content and strategies in curriculum and instruction courses that prepare candidates with the knowledge and skills to support student access to and learning in the core curriculum.

Objective Met

The content of EPSY 6133 was revised to incorporate targeted strategies that would provide candidates with more knowledge and skills to support student's access to the core curriculum. The syllabus was reorganized; the content of the course became subject matter focused. The text, Validated Practices for Teaching Students with Diverse Needs and Abilities presented candidates with subject specific strategies as well as strategies that could be incorporated across the curriculum. Candidates were presented with strategies and programs that have documented success as presented in research and professional literature. Programs such as Board English, Board Math, Touch Math, Read Naturally, REWARDS were modeled by the course instructor and then practiced by the candidates. Strategies from the Strategic Instruction Model (SIM) developed at the University of Kansas were modeled in class. Candidates were able to apply some of the strategies and/or materials in their classrooms. Documentation of the strategy implementation was presented in a course assignment.

Candidates prepared a strategy presentation through the use of pod-casts, video demonstrations, Voice-Thread, Prezi or Glogster presentation programs. Technology presentation and student interaction/response is an underutilized method to provide for student access to the core curriculum.

The requirements for the Teacher Work Sample completed by candidates in EPSY 6134 were revised to focus on demonstration of candidate's knowledge and skills to enable their students to access the core curriculum.

Objective 2.2: Mild Moderate Program: Incorporate content and strategies in curriculum and instruction courses that enable candidates to increase student positive behavior, social, and communicative skills.

Objective Met

The content of EPSY 6127 was revised to incorporate strategies that would prepare candidates to increase student positive behavior, social and communication skills. The assigned reading for the course included chapters from Strategies for Teaching Students with Learning and Behavior Problems on positive behavior support, social and communication skills. Additional readings from You're Going to Love this Kid!, focused on building social and communication skills for students with autism. In class materials from the IRIS center <http://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/index.html> and from a multi agency site <http://www.autisminternetmodules.org/> added to candidates knowledge and skills in the areas of communication, social skills and positive behavioral support.

Candidates shared the positive behavior support plan forms and procedures from their school districts. In class candidates reviewed websites such as Positive Environments Network of Trainers (PENT) <http://www.pent.ca.gov>, papers and presentations from Dr. George Sugai and others. Candidates completed a positive behavior support case study where they identified a student who required such support, conducted a functional analysis and used the data gathered to create a positive behavior support plan. Candidates implemented the positive behavior support plan and provided a progress report of changes in student behavior.

Social and communication skills were addressed through the incorporation of the work of Michelle Garcia Winner and her Social Thinking Program and Carol Gray's Social Stories into the content of the course. Candidates created instructional sequences to develop students' social and communication skills; many were able to carry out their plans within their fieldwork sites and service delivery models.

Candidates in EPSY 6134, Level II Advanced Curriculum and Instruction and Behavioral Support studied executive functioning and the role that executive functioning has in learning and behavior. Candidates completed a case study of a student with executive functioning difficulties. The candidates collected baseline data from a variety of sources, identified executive functioning difficulties and created a program to help the student build executive functioning skills.

Objective 2.3: Moderate Severe Program: Include information in course syllabi for EPSY 6671 on collaboration with families, general educators, related services, and peers via individual student planning meetings.

Objective Met

The added content focus on collaborative Individual Student Planning Team ongoing meetings facilitation and strategies has been added to the Advanced Seminar EPSY 6671 syllabus. For example, student teachers are now required to lead and prepare an analysis of at least one ISPM as an assignment during the final student teaching quarter of 6671. (please see Sharepoint, Winter 2012).

Objective 2.4: Moderate Severe Program: Identify local practitioners to present student planning meeting strategies to class.

Objective Met

The University Supervisor, Maureen Kennedy, is also a part time Inclusion Support Teacher in an area district, who regularly conducts such meetings for students on her caseload. Ms. Kennedy presents this content and demonstrates the competencies for students in field sites. In addition, each of our Master Teachers in school districts now schedules/co-conducts Individual Student Planning Meetings with the student teachers as well.

C. Program Changes and Needs

The CTC revised the standards for Special Education Credential Programs in 2011. 2012-2013 was the first year of implementation of revised program courses designed to meet the new standards. The new standards call for a two-tier system, preliminary credentials, offered by CSU East Bay for both Mild Moderate Disabilities and Moderate Severe Disabilities; and professional clear credentials, offered by school districts and county offices of education. Under previous CTC Special Education standards, IHEs, like CSU East Bay, could offer both tiers, the Level I and the Level II.

2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (about 1 page)

A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

The Special Education Programs has two sets of Program Student Learning Outcomes:

(1) Four Program Student Learning Outcomes adopted by Program faculty for the MS in Special Education Degree. These PSLOs are the same as the first four Unit Assessment Outcomes (UAOs) shared by all programs in our PreK-12 Professional Education Unit.

(2) For the credential programs, candidate (University student) performance expectations defined by the CTC Standards for Education Specialist Credentials.

(1) Program Student Learning Outcomes for the MS In Special Education/ Unit Assessment Outcomes 1-4

Our graduates will:

(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 Education Specialist Credential; either Mild/Moderate or Moderate/Severe Disabilities.

(2) CTC Standards

16 standards shared by all Education Specialist Credential Programs, and 6 specialty standards for the Mild Moderate Disabilities Preliminary Credential Program and 8 specialty standards for the Moderate Severe Disabilities Preliminary Credential Program

*** Attached as Appendix A: Correlation (Curriculum) Map: ILOs and UAOs (MS Program PSLOs)

B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

As required by CTC, data is gathered every year on the four shared UAOs/PSLOs and the relevant CTC standards.

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. Previously, data was gathered and analyzed through the use of Taskstream. Beginning with the 13-14 academic year, data will be gathered and analyzed through Blackboard Outcomes.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

Each year, a mountain of data is collected on the candidates (University students) who complete the Special Education Credential and Masters Degree Programs, including 14 signature assignments with data collected on Blackboard Outcomes. Obviously, the format of this report does not allow for a complete report of the 2012-2013, data. Complete results can be found on the CEAS Accreditation 2017, Candidate Assessment SharePoint site. One set of data will be shared here. Table 1 below provides a comparison of individual candidate scores at the midpoint fieldwork (SA2) and again on the same items at the end of student teaching (SA 5) demonstrating progress from midpoint to mastery prior to program completion in the Moderate Severe Disabilities. The data from 2012 is shown as well for comparative purposes.

Table 1: Comparison: Fieldwork (SA2) to Student Teaching (SA5) for first Preliminary Cohort, Candidate Fieldwork, Moderate Severe Disabilities

	Spring 2012	Spring 2013
Candidate 1	4.72/6	5.89/6
Candidate 2	4.69/6	5.88/6
Candidate 3	4.78/6	5.48/6
Candidate 4	4.84/6	5.85/6
Candidate 5	4.41/6	5.91/6

The high mean scores of 5.74/6 (95.74%) for 2012 and 5.80/6 (96.63%) for 2013 on a six point scale for this culminating fourth field experience –full time student teaching, indicate that this training program is very successful in producing teachers who are highly qualified to provide effective educational services for students with moderate to severe disabilities in inclusive schools. All of the candidates from the 2010-12 (former Level 1) and 2011-13 (new Preliminary) cohorts were recommended for credentials. They are highly qualified according to CSUEB program standards, CTC standards and the requirements of IDEA and NCLB.

3. STATISTICAL DATA

See data attached to end of document, after Appendix A.

Appendix A: Correlation (Curriculum) Map: ILOs, UAOs

California State University, East Bay PreK-12 Professional Education Unit

- * CSU East Bay Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)
- * Unit Assessment Outcomes (UAOs) Related to Candidate (CSUEB Student) Performance (Student Learning Outcomes)

Correlation (Curriculum) Map

CSU East Bay Institutional Learning Outcomes

* Thinking and Reasoning: Think critically and creatively and apply analytic and quantitative reasoning to address complex challenges and everyday problems.

Related Unit Assessment Outcome(s):

UAO 4: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

UAO 6: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

* Communication: Communicate ideas, perspectives, and values clearly and persuasively while listening openly to others.

Related Unit Assessment Outcome(s):

UAO 4: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

UAO 6: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

* Diversity: Apply knowledge of diversity and multicultural competencies to promote equity and social justice in our communities.

Related Unit Assessment Outcome(s):

UAO 1: Equitable Learning Outcomes

UAO 2: Equitable Environments

UAO 4: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

UAO 6: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

* Collaboration: Work collaboratively and respectfully as members and leaders of diverse teams and communities.

Related Unit Assessment Outcome(s):

UAO 3: Working Collaboratively

UAO 6: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

* Sustainability: Act responsively and sustainably at local, national, and global levels.

Related Unit Assessment Outcome(s):

UAO 6: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

* Specialized Education: Demonstrate expertise and integration of ideas, methods, theory and practice in a specialized discipline of study.

Related Unit Assessment Outcome(s):

UAO 4: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

UAO 6: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

Unit Assessment Outcomes Related to Candidate (CSU East Bay Student) Performance
(Student Learning Outcomes)

* Unit Assessment Outcome 1: Equitable Learning Outcomes

Our candidates will demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions aligned with professional standards to implement universal design and research-based programs to achieve equitable learning outcomes. (*Unit Conceptual Framework Outcome 1*)

Related ILO(s):

Diversity

* Unit Assessment Outcome 2: Equitable Environments

Our candidates will demonstrate the ability to create environments, systems, and practices in which all individuals are treated with respect, dignity, trust, and fairness. (*Unit Conceptual Framework Outcome 2*)

Related ILO(s):

Diversity

* Unit Assessment Outcome 3: Working Collaboratively

Our candidates will work collaboratively with students, parents, and professional colleagues to achieve equitable learning outcomes and equitable environments. (*Unit Conceptual Framework Outcome 3*)

Related ILO(s):

Collaboration

* 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. (italics added)* (NCATE Unit Standard 1)

Incorporated into this UAO are:

- (a) All relevant CTC standards relating to candidate performance
- (b) For the School Psychology program, all National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) standards related to candidate performance
- (c) For the Speech/Language Pathology program, all American of Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) standards related to candidate performance
- (d) For the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Teaching Credential programs, the CTC Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)

Related ILO(s):

Thinking and Reasoning

Communication

Diversity

Specialized Education

* Unit Assessment Outcome 6: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. (NCATE Unit Standard 3)

Related ILO(s):

Thinking and Reasoning

Communication

Diversity

Collaboration

Sustainability

Specialized Education

Other Unit Assessment Outcomes

(not directly related to candidate performance)

- Unit Assessment Outcome 5: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs. (NCATE Unit Standard 2)

- Unit Assessment Outcome 7: Diversity

Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and K-12 faculty, candidates, and students in K-12 schools. (Last sentence of NCATE Unit Standard 4 – the first part of this NCATE Standard is covered in UAO 1, 2, and 3.)

- Unit Assessment Outcome 8: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance. They also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development. (NCATE Unit Standard 5)

- Unit Assessment Outcome 9: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. (NCATE Unit Standard 6)

- Unit Assessment Outcome 10: Credential Recommendation Process

The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements. (CTC Common Standard not covered in the NCATE Unit Standards, last sentence of CTC Common Standard 1)

- Unit Assessment Outcome 11: Advice and Assistance

Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional, and personal development, and to assist each candidate's professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts. (CTC Common Standard not covered NCATE Unit Standards, CTC Common Standard 6)

	ILO to UAO					
	T&R	COM	DIV	COLL	SUS	SE
1			x			
2			x			
3				x		
4	x	x	x			x
6	x	x	x	x	x	x

ILO

T&R, Thinking and Reasoning; COM, Communication; DIV, Diversity; COLL, Collaboration;

SUS, Sustainability; SE, Specialized Education

UAO

1, Equitable Learning Outcomes; 2, Equitable Environments; 3, Working Collaboratively;

4, Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions; 6, Field Experience and Clinical Experience

Supplemental Data

CAPR Table 1

California State University, East Bay

Special Education		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		Fall 2009		Fall 2010		Fall 2011	
		Degree Level	TOTAL	Degree Level	TOTAL	Degree Level	TOTAL	Degree Level	TOTAL	Degree Level	TOTAL
		Master		Master		Master		Master		Master	
Female	Black, non-Hispanic	1	1	2	2			1	1	2	2
	Asian	6	6	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	5
	Hispanic	7	7	3	3	1	1	3	3	3	3
	White	18	18	19	19	11	11	18	18	12	12
	Multiple ethnicity							2	2		
	Race/ethnicity unknown	11	11	7	7	16	16	25	25	24	24
Male	Black, non-Hispanic	1	1	1	1	2	2			1	1
	Asian	3	3	1	1						
	Hispanic			1	1	1	1			1	1
	White	4	4	1	1	1	1	3	3	2	2
	Multiple ethnicity										
	Race/ethnicity unknown	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	5	5
Total	Black, non-Hispanic	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	1	3	3
	Asian	9	9	6	6	4	4	4	4	5	5
	Hispanic	7	7	4	4	2	2	3	3	4	4
	White	22	22	20	20	12	12	21	21	14	14
	Multiple ethnicity							2	2		
	Race/ethnicity unknown	13	13	9	9	18	18	27	27	29	29

The SAS System

Special Education		CY07-08				CY08-09				CY09-10				CY10-11				CY11-12YTD			
		Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total				
		Bccalaur eate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalaur eate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalaur eate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalaur eate	Mast er	Ed Doct or					
Female	Black, non-Hispanic					1		1													
	American Indian or Alaska Native								1		1										
	Asian		1		1	1		1		1		2		2							
	Pacific Islander																				
	Hispanic		1		1	1		1		1					4		4				
	White		2		2	4		4		8		6		6		4		4			
	Multiple ethnicity									2		2		1		1		1			
	Race/ethnicity unknown					2		2		3		3				5		5			
	Nonresident aliens																				
Male	Black, non-Hispanic															1		1			
	American Indian or Alaska Native																				
	Asian																				

Special Education		CY07-08				CY08-09				CY09-10				CY10-11				CY11-12YTD			
		Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total				
		Bccalaur eate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalaur eate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalaur eate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalaur eate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalaur eate	Mast er	Ed Doct or	
	Pacific Islander																				
	Hispanic												1	1							
	White								1	1						1		1			
	Multiple ethnicity																				
	Race/ethnicity unknown		1		1								1	1							
	Nonresident aliens																				
Total	Black, non-Hispanic						1	1									1	1			
	American Indian or Alaska Native									1	1										
	Asian		1		1		1	1		1	1		2	2							
	Pacific Islander																				
	Hispanic		1		1		1	1		1	1		1	1		4		4			
	White		2		2		4	4		9	9		6	6		5		5			
	Multiple ethnicity									2	2		1	1		1		1			
	Race/ethnicity unknown			1	1		2	2		3	3		1	1		5		5			
	Nonreside																				

Special Education	CY07-08				CY08-09				CY09-10				CY10-11				CY11-12YTD			
	Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total
	Bccalaur eate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalaur eate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalaur eate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalaur eate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalaur eate	Mast er	Ed Doct or	
nt aliens																				

Academic Program Review SFR Table - Subject

California State University, East Bay

SFR BY COURSE LEVEL: TERM FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENTS / ALL FACULTY AND LECTURERS

Fall 2008 through Fall 2012

EPS Y	Tenured & Tenure Track	239 3	192 4	339 0	307 4	270 2	159. 5	128. 3	226	204. 9	180. 1	12. 7	9.2 2	10. 2	10. 6	9.9 3	12. 6	13. 9	22. 1	19. 3	18. 2	
	Lecture r	858	125 9	813	964	106 5	57.2	83.9 3	54. 2	64.2 7	71	4.1 4	5.4 7	3.8 1	5.6 7	3.2 4	13. 8	15. 4	14. 2	11. 3	21. 9	
	Lower Division	.	.	.	156	192	.	.	.	10.4	12.8	.	.	.	0.2 7	0.4	39	32
	Upper Division
	Graduat e	325 1	318 3	420 3	388 2	357 5	216. 7	212. 2	280	258. 8	238. 3	16. 8	14. 7	14	16	12. 8	12. 9	14. 5	20	16. 2	18. 7	
	Total	325 1	318 3	420 3	403 8	376 7	216. 7	212. 2	280	269. 2	251. 1	16. 8	14. 7	14	16. 3	13. 2	12. 9	14. 5	20	16. 6	19. 1	

Source: CSU Academic Planning Data Base (APDB); Section Master File (BKPD SMF) and Faculty Master File(BKPD FMF)

TOTAL FTES will differ slightly between ERSS and APDB. ERSS FTES is the official figure for CSU System reporting.

TERM FTES: Student Credit Units/15; FTEF: Instructional Faculty FTE only. Administrative and Other support fractions excluded.

Student Faculty Ratio(SFR) = TERM FTES / TERM FTEF

FTES generated is assigned to the department of record for the course subject area.

Document: Cal State East Bay Fact Book

Planning and Institutional Research

Course History Table 10.1c
California State University, East Bay COURSE HISTORY
By Quarter from Summer 2007 through Spring 2012

EPSY

		Summer					Fall					Winter					Spring				
		Sumr 2007	Sumr 2008	Sumr 2009	Sumr 2010	Sumr 2011	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Wntr 2008	Wntr 2009	Wntr 2010	Wntr 2011	Wntr 2012	Sprg 2008	Sprg 2009	Sprg 2010	Sprg 2011	Sprg 2012
Lower	Number Sections	1.0	1.0	2.0
	Total Enrollment	39	30	61
	Avg Section Size	39.0	30.0	30.5
Graduate	Number Sections	2.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	74.0	74.0	70.0	93.0	80.0	73.0	71.0	66.0	79.0	69.0	81.0	81.0	65.0	80.0	63.0
	Total Enrollment	72	118	113	90	82	888	953	1,011	1,411	1,144	919	913	978	1,303	1,170	954	1,010	986	1,258	1,035
	Avg Section Size	36.0	59.0	28.3	45.0	41.0	14.8	15.3	16.0	23.2	17.2	17.6	16.7	20.1	23.0	22.0	17.3	17.5	22.1	24.2	21.0
DISCIPLINE TOTAL	Number Sections	2.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	74.0	74.0	70.0	93.0	81.0	73.0	71.0	66.0	79.0	70.0	81.0	81.0	65.0	80.0	65.0
	Total Enrollment	72	118	113	90	82	888	953	1,011	1,411	1,183	919	913	978	1,303	1,200	954	1,010	986	1,258	1,096
	Avg Section Size	36.0	59.0	28.3	45.0	41.0	14.8	15.3	16.0	23.2	17.5	17.6	16.7	20.1	23.0	22.1	17.3	17.5	22.1	24.2	21.4

California State University, East Bay
APR Summary Data
Fall 2009 - 2013

Educational Psychology					
Item	Fall Quarter				
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A. Students Headcount					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Postbaccalaureate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Graduate	168	191	159	145	140
4. Total Number of Majors	168	191	159	145	140
College Years					
B. Degrees Awarded					
	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	72	64	81	67	51
3. Total	72	64	81	67	51
Fall Quarter					
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
C. Faculty					
Tenured/Track Headcount					
1. Full-Time	12	11	11	10	10
2. Part-Time	0	1	0	1	0
3a. Total Tenure Track	12	12	11	11	10
3b. % Tenure Track	41.4%	50.0%	42.3%	42.3%	35.7%
Lecturer Headcount					
4. Full-Time	0	0	0	0	0
5. Part-Time	17	12	15	15	18
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	17	12	15	15	18
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	58.6%	50.0%	57.7%	57.7%	64.3%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	29	24	26	26	28
Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	9.2	10.2	10.6	9.9	9.2
9. Lecturer FTEF	5.5	3.8	5.7	3.2	4.1
10. Total Instructional FTEF	14.7	14.0	16.3	13.2	13.3
Lecturer Teaching					
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	128.3	226.0	204.9	180.1	140.2
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	60.4%	80.7%	76.1%	71.7%	62.4%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	83.9	54.2	64.3	71.0	84.3
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	39.6%	19.3%	23.9%	28.3%	37.6%
13. Total FTES taught	212.2	280.2	269.2	251.1	224.5
14. Total SCU taught	3183.0	4203.0	4038.0	3767.0	3368.0
D. Student Faculty Ratios					
1. Tenured/Track	13.9	22.1	19.3	18.2	15.2
2. Lecturer	15.4	14.2	11.3	21.9	20.6

3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	14.5	20.0	16.6	19.1	16.9
4. Lower Division	0.0	0.0	39.0	32.0	29.1
5. Upper Division	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. Graduate	14.5	20.0	16.2	18.7	16.5
E. Section Size					
1. Number of Sections Offered	70.0	93.0	81.0	68.0	68.0
2. Average Section Size	16.0	23.2	17.5	21.2	21.3
3. Average Section Size for LD	0.0	0.0	39.0	28.0	28.0
4. Average Section Size for UD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Average Section Size for GD	16.0	23.2	17.2	20.9	21.0
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	41	58	51	49	46
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	1	2	2
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	29	35	29	17	20

Source and definitions available at:

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

	Fall Quarter				
Headcount Enrollment	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Counseling					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Postbaccalaureate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Graduate	130	133	104	107	105
4. Total Number of Majors	130	133	104	107	105
Special Education					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Postbaccalaureate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Graduate	38	58	55	38	35
4. Total Number of Majors	38	58	55	38	35
	College Years				
Degrees Awarded	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13
Counseling					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	63	47	70	51	40
3. Total Number of Majors	63	47	70	51	40
Special Education					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0

2. Graduate	9	17	11	16	11
3. Total Number of Majors	9	17	11	16	11

Caprannual2013sped