



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

College	CEAS
Department	Educational Leadership
Program Unit	Tier 1, MS, Tier 2, EdD
Reporting for Academic Year	2014-2015
Department Chair	Ray Garcia (Program Coordinators Ardella Dailey & Peg Winkelman)
Date Submitted	6/12/2015

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. New goals/objectives were defined during the 13-14 year. 2014-2015 is an “Analytic Year.”

The CTC adopted new standards for the Tier 1 and Tier 2/Induction programs in 2013. The Department of Educational Leadership submitted a Transition Plan for Tier 1 on September 1, 2014 and a Transition Plan for Tier 2 on January 30, 2015. Both plans are available on the CEAS sharepoint site and both plans have been preliminarily approved by the CTC. In addition to the Tier 1 and 2 program reviews, the EdD program received a positive review as part of the WASC accreditation visit in April 2015. Due to the extensive reporting required for the Tier 1, Tier 2, and EdD programs, this review of planning goals will focus on department goals aligning the MS program in the continuum of service to students who enter as Tier 1 candidates and have the option of continuing to work with department faculty through the MS, Tier 2 and completion of a dissertation in the Educational Leadership for Social Justice, EdD program.

1. Objective Identified in Improvement Plan:

The Educational Leadership Cluster Objective 7.1 Improve Cross Course alignment with professional standards PSLO (1) Demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions aligned with professional standards to implement universal design and research-based programs to achieve equitable outcomes.

Changes implemented in response to the Improvement Plan: In Spring 2014 a focus group was conducted with students exiting the program. There was agreement among the students that the courses could be better aligned to support their equity inquiry project. The candidates reported that the primary reason for their dissatisfaction with the course alignment was the lack of correlation of the online courses to the Masters Cohort seminar series Candidates identified that

some of the work was redundant and not useful to support their equity inquiry project.

The first step in addressing MS Educational Leadership Cluster Objective 7.1 was to convene a meeting of the faculty teaching all of the courses for Master Year 2 Program to identify specific curriculum alignment of content and assignments across the curriculum for the program.

The second step in addressing MS Educational Leadership Cluster Objective 7.1 was to design a Cross Course Content Table for each quarter. The following courses were revised an alignment plan for: Fall Quarter Table Courses: EDLD 6720, EDLD 6201, and EDLD 6025; Winter Quarter EDLD 6020, EDLD 6201, EDLD 6026 and EDLD 6999; Spring Quarter EDLD 6908, EDLD 6999 and EDLD 6027.

Evidence used to document changes: The syllabi for courses in each quarter and for all cohorts used common assignments. Annotated bibliographies were required in all courses in the three Cohorts for Fall 2014 and Winter 2015 quarters to support students building of comprehensive references for their Literature synthesis assignment and equity inquiry research project. Faculty collaborated to design a cross course context table to ensure alignment with professional standards of California administrative credential.

Evaluation of Changes: Changes were all implemented as of Spring 2015. The 2014-2015 Exit focus groups results will be analyzed to determine whether there is candidate satisfaction with the curriculum alignment of content and assignments across the curriculum for the program.

2. Objective Identified in Improvement Plan:

The Educational Leadership Cluster Objective 7.4 Improve Assessment of content knowledge
PSLO: (4) Know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, and pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, as defined the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Standards for Administrative Credential.

Changes implemented in response to the Improvement Plan: In June 2014 at the Department of Educational Leadership Retreat staff identified a need to improve the rubrics designed to evaluate student work on their equity inquiry project. Specific focus areas were: Signature Assessment (Leadership Reflection) for EDLD 6720 and EDLD 6908; Literature Synthesis Assignment for EDLD 6020; Equity Research Project Rubric for EDLD 6908. Faculty completed the redesign of the Leadership Reflection Rubric, Literature Synthesis Rubric and the Equity Research Project Rubric and implemented use in 2014-2015 academic year.

Evidence used to document change: Syllabi included rubrics for EDLD 6720, EDLD 6020 and EDLD 6908; Course lectures and common assignments of Leadership Reflection, Literature Synthesis and Equity Research Project for all cohorts enrolled in Masters Year 2 Program.

Evaluation of changes: All Programmatic changes were completed by Spring 2015. In June 2015 at the Educational Leadership Departmental Retreat a calibration process will be used to examine student work by comparing scoring between two readers of each piece of student work.

B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress

Based on the bi-annual cycle of an “Analytic Year” and an Implementation year mandated by the accreditation bodies an explanation of the goals is contained in the previous response.

C. Program Changes and Needs

In 2014-2015 the Department of Educational Leadership established a total of twenty-one district partnerships resulting in the establishment of five Cohorts in: West Contra Costa, East Contra Costa, Sam Mateo/South San Francisco, New Haven/Fremont, Oakland/Hayward. As of June 2015, a second cohort of EdD students was admitted and two new faculty members, each with extensive experience teaching qualitative and quantitative methods, were hired.

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	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?”
2. Graduates of CSUEB will be able to communicate ideas, perspectives, and values clearly and persuasively while listening openly to others	In the area of visionary leadership EDLD graduates must develop strategies to 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

All Program Learning Outcomes are assessed through the Tier 1 Equity Plan assignment; the MS Equity Inquiry Project; and the qualifying exams in year 1 & 2 culminating in the EdD dissertation. Student Learning Outcomes are defined by the CTC in the newly adopted California Administrator Performance Expectations, CAPEs and the “refreshed” California Administrator Professional Standards, CPSELs. Student portfolios are submitted for faculty review as a prerequisite for the program recommendation of any Tier 1 or Tier 2 credential candidate.

C. Summary of Assessment Process

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, MS, and EdD 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.

The Preliminary Administrative Services Program, Tier 1 assessment process is provided as an example of DEL’s work to examine students’ capacities to apply theory to practice.

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: (1) A set of Essential Questions that define standards for Bold Socially Responsible Leadership; (2) The six California Administrator Performance Expectations; and (3) CTC Standards 10-15.

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 CAPEs rubric. (2) EDLD 6550 – The signature assignment is the completion of a professional portfolio based on the CAPEs 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 CAPEs insights 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 Administrator Performance Expectations 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’s current use of Blackboard to obtain data on student performance of signature assignments 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 leadership teams provide considerable useful data from the school administrators who host and hire our candidates.

- As of Spring 2015, all Year 1 MS /Tier I and Tier 2 assessments were revised to reflect the new CTC standards.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

The 2015 exit survey results (reported by program below) provided the most significant data to consider for further program improvement.

Survey Questions	2014 Tier 1 Mean	2015 Tier 1 Mean	2015 MS Mean	2015 EdD Mean	2015 Tier II Mean
How well prepared are you to: Provide services that help English Learners succeed?	3.08	3.25	3.45	3.75	3.2
How well prepared are you to: Provide services that help children who receive special education services succeed?	2.64	3.01	3.11	3.5	3.2
How well prepared are you to: Create a school environment in which all individuals are treated with respect, dignity, trust and fairness?	3.52	3.72	3.84	4.0	3.6
How well prepared are you to: Work collaboratively with children, parents, staff, administrators, and teachers to achieve equitable learning outcomes and equitable environments?	3.6	3.64	3.82	4.0	3.8
In regards to the professional knowledge and skills you need to be successful, how well prepared are you?	3.16	3.32	3.52	4.0	3.6
Think back to all of your experiences in your Credential/Masters program. How would you rate the program?	3.2	3.45	3.51	3.0	3.8

As a result of the examination of 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. The first question now addresses the needs of English Language Learners and the second addresses Special Education students. The results are reported above. The data indicates that across programs, students are developing increased confidence in their ability to serve English Language learners. Leadership students, even doctoral candidates, are 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. During the 2014-2015 a CEAS podcast was developed to highlight best practices in serving special needs students. The department and the college will meet to further develop this important curricular area for the 2015-2016 academic year.

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 2010 - 2014

Educational Leadership					
Item	Fall Quarter				
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A. Students Headcount					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Postbaccalaureate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Graduate	131	131	109	198	187
4. Total Number of Majors	131	131	109	198	187
College Years					
B. Degrees Awarded					
	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	50	46	53	77	64
3. Total	50	46	53	77	64
Fall Quarter					
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
C. Faculty					
Tenured/Track Headcount					
1. Full-Time	6	6	7	4	6
2. Part-Time	0	0	0	0	0
3a. Total Tenure Track	6	6	7	4	6
3b. % Tenure Track	42.9%	31.6%	41.2%	15.4%	18.2%
Lecturer Headcount					
4. Full-Time	1	1	1	2	1
5. Part-Time	7	12	9	20	26
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	8	13	10	22	27
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	57.1%	68.4%	58.8%	84.6%	81.8%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	14	19	17	26	33
Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	4.1	2.0	4.7	3.2	5.6
9. Lecturer FTEF	2.9	3.3	3.4	5.9	5.6
10. Total Instructional FTEF	7.0	5.4	8.0	9.1	11.2
Lecturer Teaching					
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	42.3	15.3	32.3	46.4	48.9
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	47.4%	13.2%	40.2%	25.7%	30.2%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	46.9	100.3	48.0	133.9	112.9
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	52.6%	86.8%	59.8%	74.3%	69.8%
13. Total FTES taught	89.3	115.5	80.3	180.3	161.8
14. Total SCU taught	1339.0	1733.0	1204.0	2704.0	2427.0
D. Student Faculty Ratios					
1. Tenured/Track	10.3	7.5	6.9	14.5	8.7
2. Lecturer	16.3	30.1	14.3	22.6	20.2
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	12.8	21.5	10.0	19.7	14.5
4. Lower Division
5. Upper Division
6. Graduate	12.8	21.5	10.0	19.7	14.5
E. Section Size					
1. Number of Sections Offered	32.0	19.0	26.0	32.0	38.0
2. Average Section Size	21.1	26.0	18.4	25.0	19.9
3. Average Section Size for LD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Average Section Size for UD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Average Section Size for GD	21.1	26.0	18.4	25.0	19.9
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	18	5	9	10	13
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	14	14	17	22	25

Source and definitions available at:

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

Fall Quarter					
Headcount Enrollment	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
<i>Education (Ed.D)</i>					
1. Undergraduate					
2. Postbaccalaureate					
3. Graduate	38	41	45	42	39
4. Total Number of Majors	38	41	45	42	39
<i>Educational Leadership</i>					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Postbaccalaureate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Graduate	93	90	64	156	148
4. Total Number of Majors	93	90	64	156	148
College Years					
Degrees Awarded	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14
<i>Education (Ed.D)</i>					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	0	7	4	5	8
3. Total Number of Majors	0	7	4	5	8
<i>Educational Leadership</i>					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	50	39	49	72	56
3. Total Number of Majors	50	39	49	72	56

Degree Awarded
California State University,
College Years 2009-10

Educational Leadership	CY09-10				CY10-11				CY11-12				CY12-13				CY13-14			
	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	1	6		10	3	13		4	2	6		6		6
	American Indian or Alaska Native																			
	Asian	2		2		4		4		2		2		5		5		4	1	5
	Pacific Islander																			
	Hispanic	4		4		5	2	7		7		7		5	1	6		7	1	8
	White	24		24		9	1	10		18	1	19		23	1	24		17	3	20
	Multiple ethnicity					1		1		1		1		1		1		3	1	4
	Race/ethnicity unknown	7		7		1	1	2		1		1		4		4		3	1	4
Nonresident aliens																		2		2
Male	Black, non-Hispanic		2	2		2	1	3						3	1	4		2		2
	American Indian or Alaska Native					1		1												
	Asian	4		4						1		1		3		3			1	1
	Pacific Islander	1		1																
	Hispanic	1		1		2		2		3		3		5		5		3		3
	White	5		5		9	1	10		5		5		14		14		6		6
	Multiple ethnicity																			
	Race/ethnicity unknown									1		1		5		5		3		3
Nonresident aliens																				
Total	Black, non-Hispanic		2	2		7	2	9		10	3	13		7	3	10		8		8
	American Indian or Alaska Native					1		1												
	Asian	6		6		4		4		3		3		8		8		4	2	6
	Pacific Islander	1		1																
	Hispanic	5		5		7	2	9		10		10		10	1	11		10	1	11
	White	29		29		18	2	20		23	1	24		37	1	38		23	3	26
	Multiple ethnicity					1		1		1		1		1		1		3	1	4
	Race/ethnicity unknown		7	7		1	1	2		2		2		9		9		6	1	7
Nonresident aliens																		2		2

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 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014

		Total SCU					term_ftes					term_ftef					term_sfr					
		Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	
EDLD	Tenured & Tenure Track	635	229	484	696	733	42.33	15.27	32.27	46.4	48.87	4.12	2.03	4.67	3.2	5.6	10.28	7.51	6.91	14.51	8.73	
	Lecturer	704	1504	720	2008	1694	46.93	100.27	48	133.87	112.93	2.87	3.34	3.36	5.93	5.59	16.34	30.06	14.31	22.57	20.21	
	Lower Division
	Upper Division
	Graduate	1339	1733	1204	2704	2427	89.27	115.53	80.27	180.27	161.8	6.99	5.37	8.02	9.13	11.19	12.77	21.52	10.01	19.74	14.46	
	Total	1339	1733	1204	2704	2427	89.27	115.53	80.27	180.27	161.8	6.99	5.37	8.02	9.13	11.19	12.77	21.52	10.01	19.74	14.46	

Course History Table 10.1c
California State University, East Bay
COURSE HISTORY
By Quarter from Summer 2010 through Spring 2015

EDLD

		Summer					Fall					Winter					Spring				
		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Graduate	Number Sections	8.0	14.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	32.0	19.0	26.0	32.0	38.0	28.0	29.0	29.0	31.0	40.0	30.0	32.0	31.0	37.0	38.0
	Total Enrollment	107	129	118	114	96	380	464	358	713	723	354	412	390	697	657	339	450	405	879	689
	Avg Section Size	13.4	15.4	14.8	14.3	13.7	21.1	26.0	18.4	25.0	19.9	18.8	25.7	17.8	24.3	18.5	14.9	21.1	19.5	24.5	19.2
DISCIPLINE TOTAL	Number Sections	8.0	14.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	32.0	19.0	26.0	32.0	38.0	28.0	29.0	29.0	31.0	40.0	30.0	32.0	31.0	37.0	38.0
	Total Enrollment	107	129	118	114	96	380	464	358	713	723	354	412	390	697	657	339	450	405	879	689
	Avg Section Size	13.4	15.4	14.8	14.3	13.7	21.1	26.0	18.4	25.0	19.9	18.8	25.7	17.8	24.3	18.5	14.9	21.1	19.5	24.5	19.2