Section 3 - Completer

The total number of candidates who completed education programs within NCATE's scope (initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs) during the 2009-2010 academic year?

Please enter numeric data only. (Include the number of candidates who have completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings in the 2009-2010 academic year. They should include all candidates who completed a program that made them eligible for a teaching license. It also includes licensed teachers who completed a graduate program and candidates who completed a program to work as a school administrator, school psychologist, school library media specialist, school psychologist, reading specialist, and other specialties in schools. These include the candidates who have completed a bachelor's, post-bachelor's, master's, specialist, or doctoral program. The programs are not tied to a state license.)
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Section 4. Substantive Changes

Describe any of the following substantive changes that have occurred at your institution or unit during the past year:

1. Changes in program delivery from traditionally delivered programs to distance learning programs in which more than 50 percent of the courses are not delivered face-to-face.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th># of Candidates Enrolled</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services Tier I - online</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Addition or removal of a level of preparation (e.g., a master's degree).

3. Change in control of institution. Please indicate any changes in control or ownership of the institution such as a merger with another institution, separation from an institution, purchase of an institution, etc.

4. Increased offerings for the preparation of education professionals at off-campus sites and outside the United States.
Section 5. Conceptual Framework(s)

The conceptual framework(s) establishes the shared vision for a unit’s efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework(s) is knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and/or institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

Please indicate evaluations of and changes made to the unit’s conceptual framework (if any) during this year:

There have been three changes in the Unit Conceptual Framework since the April 2009 CTC/NCATE visit:

1. The Conceptual Framework is now a Unit Conceptual Framework, rather than a Conceptual Framework for the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS). This change goes beyond the cosmetic, beyond simply changing the name from the “CEAS Conceptual Framework” to the “CSU East Bay Professional Education Unit Conceptual Framework.” Rather the name change reflects an intensified effort to integrate the Speech/Language Pathology Cluster, housed in the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS), with the other Clusters housed in CEAS. Most notable has been the participation of representatives from the Speech/Language Pathology Cluster in the Unit Accreditation and Assessment Task Force; the interaction between accreditation staff in CEAS and the staff serving the Speech/Language Pathology Cluster; and the participation of the Dean of CLASS in the Unit-level assessment process.

2. We revised the Candidate Outcomes in the Conceptual Framework. In response to the results of the 2009 CTC/NCATE review, the Unit’s Accreditation and Assessment Task Force re-assessed the Candidate Outcomes in the Unit’s Conceptual Framework. As the 2009 reviewers correctly noted, the Unit assessment system was not aligned with the Conceptual Framework. We had not considered how the Candidate Outcomes in the Conceptual Framework would be measured. When we began that process, it was clear that one of the previous four Candidates Outcomes in the Conceptual Framework would need to be modified and another would need to be eliminated. The first two outcomes remain in place (see below).

   The previous third outcome was “Our graduates will work collaboratively within systems as change agents to who promote democratic engagement and seek socially just solutions.”

   The previous fourth outcome was “Our graduates will demonstrate the ability to identify social injustices and the courage and commitment to engage in action and advocacy to redress them.” After careful consideration, the third outcome was revised and the fourth outcome was eliminated because during the time our candidates are enrolled in our programs, they are not at a place in their careers when they can be “change agents” taking steps to “redress” the social injustices they see in their organizations and working environments. Also, both outcomes as previously stated would be almost impossible to assess.

   Thus, the revised Conceptual Framework defines three outcomes for candidates in all of the Unit’s programs:

   Our graduates will:

   1. Demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions aligned with professional standards that implement universal design and
Section 6. Unit Standards

Standard 1. 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.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement.

Standard 2. 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.

Please describe the unit's plans for and progress in meeting this standard.

The Unit adopted a new unit assessment system during the 2009-2010 academic year. The Unit’s assessment system has two inter-related components:

1. A Unit Assessment Plan, which was developed during the 2009-2010 academic year as a result of the 2009 CTC/NCATE accreditation visit. Both accrediting bodies found that the Unit “does not have a comprehensive unit-wide assessment system” (NCATE Board of Examiners Report, p. 17; CTC Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report, p. 18). The Plan describes how the CSU East Bay Professional Education Unit gathers, analyzes, and shares data to evaluate operations at the Unit level. This Unit Assessment Plan establishes a system for the aggregation of data across programs to evaluate and improve Unit operations and to evaluate the Unit Conceptual Framework.

2. Each program in the Unit has a program-level assessment system using multiple assessments at multiple points before, during, and after candidates complete the program. Program-level assessment systems gather and analyze data to determine if the program meets relevant CTC and NCATE standards. The 2009 CTC/NCATE accreditation process yielded reports that found that the Unit’s program-level assessment systems met requirements of NCATE Standard 2 and were “strong” (NCATE, page 17; CTC, page 18).
Thus, the Unit Assessment Plan is part of a larger Unit Assessment System that includes program-level assessment systems. The Unit Assessment Plan was developed by the Unit Accreditation and Assessment Task Force (UAATF), with considerable input from Unit faculty and staff. It has been reviewed by our K-12 and University partners. In March 2010 the Plan was positively reviewed by the CTC team lead and the Commission consultant. Important features of the Unit Assessment Plan are:

* An organization scheme for the Unit the places the Unit’s programs in eight clusters: Administrative Services, Curriculum and Early Childhood Education, Educational Technology, Pupil Personnel Services, Reading, Special Education, Speech/Language Pathology, and Teaching Credentials.

* Definitions of roles and responsibilities for implementing the plan, under the leadership of the Associate Dean of the College of Education and Allied Studies and the Unit Accreditation and Assessment Task Force (UAATF). The UAATF consists of representatives from each of the Unit’s eight clusters. Roles are also defined for: (1) the Dean of the College of Education and Allied Studies and the Dean of the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences; (2) program faculty, (3) our K-12 partners, and (4) the Campus Committee on Professional Education.

* Eleven Unit Assessment Outcomes (UAOs), which will be assessed annually. The sources of the UAOs are: (a) The three outcomes defined in the Unit Conceptual Framework, (b) the six NCATE Unit Standards, with some modifications to avoid redundancy with the Unit Conceptual Framework outcomes, and (c) The two CTC Common Standards that are not covered by the NCATE Unit Standards.

* A system for disaggregating data within programs and a system for aggregating data at the Unit level; and a process for analyzing data for both program and Unit improvement.

* The use of technology resources to support the Unit Assessment Plan. TaskStream and SharePoint serve as the primary technology resources supporting the Unit Assessment Plan. All programs, except those in the Speech/Language Pathology and Pupil Personnel Services Cluster, use TaskStream for the assessment of “signature assignments.” Speech/Language Pathology and Pupil Personnel Services have developed their own database systems. TaskStream eases the process of the aggregation and disaggregation of data Unit staff translate essential data summaries from TaskStream and other systems on to SharePoint. All Unit faculty have access to SharePoint and can access any of the data stored there for any program.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The unit does not have a comprehensive and integrated assessment system to monitor candidate performance and manage and improve the unit's operations and programs.</td>
<td>(ITP) (ADV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The unit assessment system is not aligned with the conceptual framework.</td>
<td>(ITP) (ADV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The unit assessment system is not regularly evaluated by the faculty and professional community.</td>
<td>(ITP) (ADV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The unit does not compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze candidate assessment data.</td>
<td>(ITP) (ADV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The unit does not use technology to provide faculty with access to individual and aggregated data on candidate performance.</td>
<td>(ITP) (ADV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The unit does not disaggregate candidate performance data for off-campus programs.</td>
<td>(ITP) (ADV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Data for key assessments were limited to one year.</td>
<td>(ITP) (ADV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement.

(1) The Unit Assessment Plan adopted in 2009-2010, operating concurrently with program assessment systems, constitutes a comprehensive and integrated assessment system that monitors candidate performance and manages and improves the unit’s operations and programs. A brief description of the Plan is provided in the previous section.

(2) As noted in the previous section, the Unit Assessment Plan defines 11 Unit Assessment Objectives. The first three are derived from the Conceptual Framework's mission statement, “To prepare collaborative leaders, committed to professional excellence, social justice, and democracy who will influence a diverse and interconnected world.” The Conceptual Framework’s three Candidate Outcomes serve as the first three Unit Assessment Outcomes:

   UAO 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.

   UAO 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.

   UAO 3: Working Collaboratively. Our candidates will work collaboratively with students, parents, and professional colleagues to achieve equitable learning outcomes and equitable environments.
Standard 3. 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.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 3 that occurred in your unit this year:

In 2010-2011, the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential Program is piloting an innovative "residency" model for field experience. There has been considerable interest nationally in revising field experience in traditional student teaching so that it more closely resembles a medical school model. In this pilot, student teachers are spending the entire academic year in one school.

The CTC/NCATE reviewers in 2009 declared that Administrative Services Preliminary Credential Program Standard 7(e) had been “met with concerns.” In The Administrative Services Preliminary Credential Standards of 2003, Standard 7(e) states “Authentic and significant experiences addressing a variety of school levels and a variety of settings are required for each candidate, including field experiences at least one of which involves a site with a diverse school population.” When the CTC team visited in 2009, the 2003 Administrative Services Credential standards were operative. The 2009 CTC report stated “Although graduates and field supervisors reported the field experiences were positive, evidence indicated that candidates usually perform field experience at only one school level.”

As a result, faculty in the Administrative Services Preliminary Program have clarified the required field experiences for candidates. Candidates are required to complete the following experiences involving a school at a different level from the one where they work (and complete most of the field experiences):

(1) Colleague visit - each candidate must visit the school site of a fellow candidate who works at a school site that is at a different
Areas for Improvement related to Standard 3 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement.

**Standard 4. Diversity**

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 4 that occurred in your unit this year:

A new, aggregated database provides ethnicity data on the K-12 students and faculty in all the schools used for field placements for all programs in the Unit.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement.

**Standard 5. 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.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 5 that occurred in your unit this year:

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 5 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement.

**Standard 6. 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.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 6 that occurred in your unit this year.

See comments below.
Areas for Improvement related to Standard 6 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. The unit does not have a governance structure to effectively plan, deliver, operate, and evaluate coherent programs of study.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement.

First of all, it is important to note that all but two of the programs in the Professional Education Unit are housed in the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS). The Speech/Language Pathology Services Credential and the MS in Speech/Language Pathology are located in the Department of Communicative Sciences and Disorders in the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS). Thus, strong, consistent leadership from the dean and associate dean of CEAS are essential to the health of the Unit, especially in regards to maintaining a governance structure for evaluating program and Unit operations at the Unit level. Since 2006, CEAS had three failed dean searches, three interim deans, and four interim associate deans. Fortunately, all that is behind us now.

The fourth dean search was successful and Dr. Carolyn Nelson was appointed Dean of the College of Education and Allied Studies in January of 2011. Dr. James Zarrillo was appointed Associate Dean of the College of Education and Allied Studies in January of 2011. Both had been appointed to their now “permanent” positions on an interim basis in August of 2009, thus giving the CEAS and the Unit continuity of leadership. Previously, Dr. Nelson had served as associate dean in the College of Education and chair of the Department of Teacher Education at San Jose State University. Dr. Zarrillo previously served as the assistant dean of CEAS and as chair of the Department of Teacher Education at CSU East Bay.

Also of note is that the Unit Assessment Plan has helped create an even-stronger Unit-level identity among all programs. The newly created Unit Accreditation and Assessment Task Force (UAATF), under the direction of Associate Dean Zarrillo, has met monthly during the academic year since October of 2009 and is functioning smoothly.

In addition, the Unit Assessment Plan created a revised organization scheme for the Unit that places the Unit’s programs in eight clusters: Administrative Services, Curriculum and Early Childhood Education, Educational Technology, Pupil Personnel Services, Reading, Special Education, Speech/Language Pathology, and Teaching Credentials. So far, this scheme has facilitated the Unit-level analysis of the data.

Finally, it should be noted that there have been administrative changes in CLASS, the CSU East Bay college that houses the Speech/Language Pathology programs. Dr. Kathleen Rountree was appointed Interim Dean of CLASS in 2009 and Dr. Jiansheng Guo was appointed Interim Associate Dean of CLASS in 2010. Dean Rountree stays in close communication with Dean Nelson and will have an important role in approving annual Unit Evaluation Reports. Associate Dean Guo attended the first UAATF meeting of the year and participates in Campus Committee on Professional Education (CCPE).

If you have another comments, use the space below:

---

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Dr. James Zarrillo  
Phone: 510-885-7439  
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