Our analysis of the relevant data resulted in the adoption of two 2016-2017 Unit Improvement Objectives (approved by the Accreditation CEAS Team on 01-11-2017). Our experience dictates that for the process of continuous improvement to work, a limited number of Unit objectives should be defined. Achievement of the Unit Improvement Objectives will result in improved Unit operations. More complete information about the Objectives, including the data sources that serve as their foundation, can be found at the end of this document. The objectives are:

1. Unit Improvement Objective 16-1

<u>Data Sources</u>: Candidate Performance Data, PACT, RICA, CTC Surveys, CSU Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ) Surveys, Cal State East Bay Surveys.

## **UAO-16-2: Equitable Environments**

The Unit ensures that candidates demonstrate the ability to create environments, systems, and practices in which all individuals are treated with respect, dignity, trust, and fairness.

Our review of the relevant data shows that we meet this UAO and have several notable strengths in this area.

Data Sources: Candidate Performance Data, CTC Surveys, CSU CTQ Surveys, Cal State East Bay Surveys.

## **UAO-16-3: Working Collaboratively**

The Unit ensures that our candidates will work collaboratively with students, parents, and professional colleagues to achieve equitable learning outcomes and equitable environments.

Our review of the relevant data shows that we meet this UAO and have several notable strengths in this area.

<u>Data Sources</u>: Candidate Performance Data, CTC Surveys, CSU CTQ Surveys, Cal State East Bay Surveys.

# UAO-16-4: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation (CTC Common Standard 1)

The Institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs.

Our review of the relevant data shows that we meet all elements of this UAO (and Common Standard) and have several notable strengths in this area. Please see our *2017Common Standard Response* for more information about our status for this UAO.

Previously, in our 2014 Unit Improvement Plan, we identified a Unit Improvement Objective on financial support for Unit faculty development and implementation of an eLearning initiative. Since 2014, Unit faculty have continued to receive \$1500/year from either the College of Education and Allied Studies or the College of Arts, Letters, and Social Sciences (Speech/Language Pathology) to travel to academic conferences. Some faculty receive additional support from Department and external sources. The eLearning Initiative operated for two years and greatly increased the ability of Unit faculty to use computer-based resources in their teaching. The Initiative was not continued, however, because of the high level of support offered at the University level, especially the Office of Faculty Development.

descriptions,	, candidate	evaluations o	of instructors	and supervi	isors, annual	periodic rev	iews of lect	urers,

The Unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites, as appropriate to the program.

For this UAO, we adopted one Unit Improvement Objective:

Unit Improvement Objective 16-1: All University supervisors will observe or support their candidates at a level consistent with the relevant program policy.

Please see the information on Unit Improvement Objective 16-1 at the end of this document. Results of the 2016 CTC Survey of our Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Administrative Services Preliminary Credential Programs Program Completers revealed a lack of consistency in the number of times our supervisors observed and/or supported our candidates. Each program will establish a minimum number of times each candidate is observed or supported. Depending on the nature of field experience, some programs will require a minimum number of site observations, while others will require a minimum number of supportive contacts (field visit, phone calls, emails), and others will require a minimum number of both observations and supportive contacts

<u>Data Sources</u>: Candidate Performance Data, PACT, RICA, CEAS Program Completer Surveys, CTC Surveys, CSU CTQ Surveys, Cal State East Bay Surveys, candidate evaluations of course instructors and supervisors, annual periodic lecturer evaluations, RTP recommendations, faculty evaluations of candidate course performance, program handbooks, and program websites, program advisory council meeting minutes and rosters.

# UAO-16-7: Continuous Improvement (CTC Common Standard 4)

The education Unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at the U

and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California's students.

This is new Common Standard, and we are just beginning to develop a plan to gather, analyze, and use appropriate data to meet the standard. Please see our Common Standard Response for more information about our status for this UAO.

<u>Data Sources</u>: CTC Surveys, CSU CTQ Surveys, Cal State East Bay Surveys, Anecdotal Evidence of Program Impact, *Description of Positive Program Impact* 

a. 2016 CTC Exit Survey of Program Completers (Administrative Services Preliminary, Multiple Subject Preliminary, Single Subject Preliminary).

#### <u>Evidence to be collected that will demonstrate that objective has been met:</u>

a. 2017, 2018, 2019 CTC Exit Surveys of Program Completers (Administrative Services Preliminary, Multiple Subject Preliminary, Single Subject Preliminary)

b. 2017, 2018, 2019 Cal State East Bay Exit Survey of Program Completers

#### To be completed by:

a. Spring 2017. Interventions implemented this academic year should show immediate results.

#### Appendix 16-1 A: Relevant Data from CTC 2016 Program Completer Surveys

## <u>Preliminary Multiple Subject Credential Program Completer Survey – 2016</u>

Item 28. How often did preparation program faculty or supervisors observe your classroom instruction and provide feedback during your clinical practice?

N = 45		
1. Once or twice	2	4.4%
2. 3-5 times	9	20.0%
3. 6-10 times	24	53.3%
4. 11-15 times	4	8.9%
5. 16-20 times	2	4.4%
6. More than 20 times	4	8.9%

Note: Of the 45 respondents, 8 were interns, which may account for the responses to categories 4, 5, and 6

#### Preliminary Single Subject Credential Program Completer Survey – 2016

Item 26. How often did preparation program faculty or supervisors observe your classroom instruction and provide feedback during your clinical practice?

0	0.0%
4	7.7%
28	53.8%
10	19 .2%
8	15 .4%
2	3.8%
	4 28 10 8

Note: of the 52 respondents, 22 were interns, which may account for responses to categories 4, 5, and 6 –

N = 15		
1. Never or I do not have	0	0.0%
a program supervisor		
2. Less than once per month	6	40.0%
3. Once per month	3	20.0%
4. Twice per month	3	20.0%
5. Once per week	2	13.3%
6. 2-3 times per week	1	6.7%
7. Daily	0	0.0%

Note: Response rate is low: 15 responses from 125 program completers.

Unit Improvement Objective 16-2

Each program will: (a) identify categories of California's population that are currently underrepresented in the program; and (b) develop and implement a plan to recruit and admit

Did not answer: 1

Total As + His + Two + BI + NA/PI = 4/14 28.6%

## Mild to Moderate Disabilities Specialist Credential

Total Admitted = 28; Total Responded=20

Male Female W As His Two + BI NA/PI No 5 15 8 2 2 2 1 1 3

Did not answer: 8 Did not complete: 1

Total As + His + Two + BI + NA/PI = 8/20 40%

#### Moderate to Severe Disabilities Specialist Credential

Total Admitted = 8; Total Responded= 5

Male Female W As His Two + BI NA/PI No 2 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 1

Did not answer: 3

Total As + His + Two + BI + NA/PI = 0/5 0%

#### Multiple Subject Teaching Credential

Total Admitted = 162; Total Responded = 120

Male Female W As His Two + BI NA/PI No 18 102 67 12 14 8 10 0 7

Did not answer: 42 Did not complete: 2

Total As + His + Two + BI + NA/PI = 44/120 - 36.7%

# Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling Credential

Total Admitted = 19; Total Responded = 14

Male Female W As His Two + BI NA/PI No

1 13

Total Admitted = 11; Total Responded = 10

Male Female W As His Two + BI NA/PI No 2 8 5 0 4 1 0 0 0

Did not Answer: 1

Total As + His + Two + BI + NA/PI = 5/10 50%

## Reading/Literacy Added Authorization

Total Admitted = 21; Total Responded = 20

Male Female W As His Two + BI NA/PI No 1 19 9 3 1 2 1 0 4

Did not answer: 1

Total As + His + Two + BI + NA/PI = 7/20 35%

#### Single Subject Teaching Credential

Total Admitted = 130; Total Responded= 105

Male Female W As His Two + BI NA/PI No 54 51 55 20 10 8 8 1 3

Did not answer: 25

Total As + His + Two + BI + NA/PI = 47/105 44.8%

## Speech/Language Pathology Credential

Total Admitted = 14; Total Responded = 13

Male Female W As His Two + BI NA/PI No 3 10 7 2 4 0 0 0 0

Did not answer: 1

Total As + His + Two + BI + NA/PI = 6/13 46.1%

UNIT TOTAL: 170/427 39.8%

Unitimpplan20170214