

**The San José State University  
Connie L. Lurie College of Education**

**Response to the Offsite BOE Report  
February 2011**

This report responds to concerns raised in the Offsite BOE Report. The response is organized around the standards and the concerns stated within each standard. On some of the standards, we have attempted to address questions raised in the sections entitled “Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the on-site visit” by providing a more detailed explanation than was in our original IR and creating links to documents accessible on our accreditation website. Note: Hyperlinks are **Yellow Highlighted text**.

To facilitate reviewers’ ability to locate new exhibits provided in this response, we have created a separate webpage within our Accreditation Electronic Document website where the specific items mentioned in the response can be found. The new webpage is called “**Addendum to Exhibit List**.” Hyperlinks to the new exhibits are provided in the response below. These new exhibits can also be found in the original electronic document website referred to in our initial Institutional Report submitted to NCATE in September 2010.

### **Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Professional Dispositions**

*1.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard:*

*(1) Summary evidence for all programs including the advanced and reading specialist programs was not presented.*

More detailed responses regarding the advanced and reading specialist programs are presented below.

NOTE: A meeting with the coordinator of the Reading Certificate and Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential has been scheduled for Monday, March 14th at 11 a.m. during the site visit.

The Department of Elementary Education offers the Reading Certificate and Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential. These two programs are nested in the MA in Education degree program, LACES emphasis (Literacy Across the Curriculum for an Equitable Society). All requirements for the certificate and specialist credential are accomplished within the MA coursework, except for two field-based practica. Until this AY, we offered a single reading practicum (**EDTE 217**), which was part of the MA program, but we removed the practicum from the MA program and increased it to two practica (**EDTE 217A** and **EDTE 217B**) as we found that candidates were often not as well-versed in how to use ongoing assessments to make informed instructional decisions as we believe reading teachers holding the Reading Certificate or Reading/Language Arts Specialist credential should be. These decisions were made as a consequence of a multi-year, in-depth program review process that has been conducted by our Advisory Group. This work began in 2008 and was designed to strengthen the MA, the Reading Certificate, and the Reading/Language Arts Specialist credential programs. Please see a full description of the Reading Certificate and Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential program coursework at [http://www.sjsu.edu/elementaryed/programs/master\\_of\\_arts/index.htm](http://www.sjsu.edu/elementaryed/programs/master_of_arts/index.htm)

While candidates are routinely assessed in courses to determine their progress throughout the program and at completion of the MA, and the programs are assessed on an ongoing basis, at this time there is no data system in place for specifically documenting candidate performance and program effectiveness for the Reading Certificate and Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential programs. However, we are actively engaged in developing mechanisms for

assessing the skills of Reading Certificate and Reading/Language Arts Specialist candidates, and have done or are in the process of doing the following:

1. Developing a survey/questionnaire for graduates of the program in which they are asked to assess and comment on the degree to which the program prepared them to be a reading specialist (for those who have a reading specialist position or literacy coaching position) and/or for being a better reading teacher (for those who have remained as classroom teachers). This survey/questionnaire will be sent to graduates in January, 2011.
2. Developing a survey/questionnaire for school principals/supervisors of our graduates in which they are asked to assess and comment on the skills and effectiveness of our graduates as teachers of reading. This survey/questionnaire will be sent to school principals and supervisors once we have ascertained where our graduates are teaching and who their principals/supervisors are. We anticipate sending out the survey/questionnaire in February 2011.
3. Determining key transition points in the program that allow us to assess the knowledge and skills of each candidate. For example, we are considering holding an exam at the end of the fall semester in which the **EDTE 216: *Ongoing Assessment in the Classroom*** course is held in which candidates must analyze and interpret various ongoing reading assessment data on a given student (e.g., running records, miscue analyses, checklists, reading interviews); determine appropriate instructional needs; and plan for instruction. Although students do this kind of work routinely in several courses, such as **EDTE 216, EDTE 210: *Becoming a Reader at Any Age***, and **EDTE 211: *Academic Language***, they do it with support from their peers and the course instructor, and we need to know how well our candidates are able to independently do this kind of work. This will probably be used as a form of gatekeeper in that candidates would need to pass this exam in order to be eligible to take the reading practica (**EDTE 217A** and **217B**). After identifying candidates who lack the requisite skills, we will offer support (e.g., providing a special session course that focuses on the assess/analyze/plan/teach continuum that is critical to good reading instruction) and give them the opportunity to take another exam. We anticipate completing this work by May 2011 and instituting the plan in Fall 2011, the next time that the **EDTE 216: *Ongoing Assessment*** course will be offered.
4. Introducing a candidate assessment plan for **EDTE 217B: *Reading Practicum*** in Spring 2011. Towards this goal, we will implement the following mechanisms for determining whether candidates for the Reading Certificate or Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential demonstrate a level of competence in teaching reading that is commensurate with being a reading specialist:
  - a. After three consecutive lessons at the beginning of the semester, candidates will turn in a running record (RR). The RR will need to be analyzed and then, in accordance with the candidate's notes, three reading strategies will need to be listed as next steps for a given student. We are developing a checklist to use in determining whether candidates have met an acceptable standard for administering and analyzing the RR and planning appropriate instruction.
  - b. The 217B instructor will observe four candidates each week and will look for connections between the candidates' assessments, their lists of reading strategies, and their teaching. We are modifying an observation form to meet this purpose.

- c. Candidates will submit reports on their students in Week 4, so that the 217B instructor can gather information on who needs more support from her. In these reports, candidates will indicate what assessments were administered, what was learned about the reader (e.g., reading skill and strategy use, reading skill and strategy needs, the outcomes of instruction), and next instructional steps. They will also attach an analyzed RR. We are developing a checklist to use in determining candidates' knowledge about assessing and teaching reading, and for providing feedback to the candidates.
- d. At the end of the semester, candidates will submit reports on their two students in which they describe what they did over the course of the semester, and what they learned about their students (e.g., reading skill and strategy use and growth, and reading skill and strategy needs). They will attach the most recent RRs, which they will analyze. We will use the same checklist mentioned in #a above to determine whether the teacher has met the required level of competence to receive credit for the practicum.

The coordinator of the Reading/Language Arts Specialist Program and the 217B instructor are working together closely in developing these procedures. The Advisory Board has also provided input.

Determining which assignments can be used for systematic data collection, and devising additional methods for documenting candidate progress and performance as well as program effectiveness. We are also exploring methods for systematically collecting, interpreting and using these data.

The table below provides a description of potential assessment data sources to be developed and used in the future. Most are based on current assignments embedded in program coursework and agreed upon student learning outcomes (SLO) designated for the program as part of our University WASC accreditation requirements. See course syllabi for descriptions of assignments as they are currently implemented. Live links to each course syllabus are provided and shown as highlighted yellow text by course number in Table 3.

#### Overview of Potential Course Embedded Assessment Sources

Potential Assessment Tool(s)	Type of Assessment (formative/summative)	Course	MA Program SLO(s)
Assessment and Teaching Cycle: Case Study Report	Formative	<a href="#">EDTE 210</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review known and learn new tools for assessing and diagnosing reading/writing strengths and needs of emergent readers from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds</li> <li>• Use the results from assessments to teach emergent readers from diverse backgrounds</li> </ul>

Academic language research review	Formative	EDTE 211	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scaffold for students' understanding of difficult text and develop academic language</li> <li>• Critically examine and evaluate methods of instruction in reading/language arts, including those used with struggling readers and writers and speakers of English as a second language or dialect</li> </ul>
Small Group Workshop and Paper	Formative	EDTE 213	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop and implement multicultural literature-based methods that are appropriate for both native and nonnative English speaking students</li> </ul>
Curriculum and Classroom Practice Analysis from Theoretical Perspectives	Formative	EDTE 224	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critically examine and evaluate arguments and literature used to develop and implement instructional literacy programs for all students, particularly struggling K-12 learners, culturally diverse learners, and non-native speakers of English</li> </ul>
Assessment and Instruction Case Study	Formative	EDTE 216	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administer and evaluate the usefulness of various standardized and non-standardized literacy assessment tools and procedures</li> <li>• Use a range of assessment tools and related learning experiences appropriate for struggling readers and writers</li> </ul>
Records of weekly assessment and instruction  Beginning and end of semester reports	Summative	EDTE 217A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply effective, ongoing literacy assessments to inform instruction, curriculum development, and program planning for students of varied needs</li> </ul>
Records of weekly assessment and instruction  Beginning and end of semester reports	Summative	EDTE 217B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply effective, ongoing literacy assessments to inform instruction, curriculum development, and program planning for students of varied needs</li> </ul>

*(2) There appears to be lack of preparedness of elementary education candidates to teach art and physical education as well as use educational technology.*

NOTE: A meeting with faculty engaged in supporting the integration of technology into our programs is scheduled for Monday, March 14th at 9:00 a.m. during the site visit.

When potential candidates apply to enter the multiple subject credential program, they have taken and passed CSET for Multiple Subjects. Part III assesses knowledge they bring to the program related to art and physical education. Thus, they bring some basic knowledge on both elements. The program is unable to include methods courses for art or physical education because we are constrained by the state's requirement that teacher credential programs last no more than one calendar year. Adding methods courses in art or physical education would exceed the length of time in which the credential program could be offered.

Efforts have been made to include activities both in courses and supervision meetings to include instruction on teaching art and PE. For example, in field practice candidates are

provided materials and suggestions for activities related to PE and, when possible, are required to teach or lead a PE lesson.

In some of the language arts classes, art is brought in as part of lesson and/or unit, where it complements what is being taught. In **EDEL 108A**, when candidates finished the study of “The Big Wave” by P. Buck, an art major candidate conducted a learning experience where participants learned about Japanese art (works of Hokusai and Hiroshige), blockprinting and symbolism, followed by a lesson on how to simulate blockprinting as a culminating activity for the unit on teaching comprehension skills. Infusion is our best option at this point.

The Lurie College is also providing support for candidates in the teaching of art through extracurricular activities. In 2009, the Lurie College received a gift from an alum to sponsor an annual arts in education conference (see newsletter article entitled “**The art of giving**” for details about the first arts conference.)

Candidates in student teaching seminar classes are required to attend. Faculty in other multiple subject program courses encourage candidates to attend by offering them extra credit. The conference is free for all candidates in our program.

The conference lasts half a day and provides candidates with workshops on how to teach fine and performing arts. The workshops are also designed to help candidates learn to incorporate the fine and performing arts in their teaching of other subject areas. Candidates choose from a variety of topic. Each workshop is led by an experienced art educator and/or local artist experienced in providing professional development for teachers in K-12 schools.

Funding for the arts conference is adequate to support an annual conference for 10 years. While the conference is no substitution for a methods course devoted to art education for K-8 pupils, it does supplement what can be provided in the program’s methods courses. We anticipate expanding the span of grade levels that is the focus of the conference from preK-4 to preK-8 in the next and subsequent years.

Candidates are also encouraged to attend other free workshops provided by the Santa Clara County Office of Education and the Montalvo Arts Center that are designed to support teachers professional development in the arts. The Lurie College has been offering fee waivers for up to 10 candidates in the multiple subject program who wish to attend the annual California Kindergarten Association Arts conference, which takes place over two days in February.

*(3) There appears to be a lack of preparedness in the area of curriculum and instruction and using research for candidates in the Moderate to Severe Disabilities Credential program.*

NOTE: The assessment coordinator for the Department of Special Education will be part of the Assessment Committee that is scheduled for an interview on Monday, March 14th at 9:00 a.m. during the site visit.

The faculty in the Department of Special Education reviewed the data from the Directed Teaching Evaluations for the Fall 2008, Spring 2009, Fall 2009 semesters in the department meeting on April 6th, 2010. We discussed the possible factors influencing the ratings during the Fall 2008 semester in the areas of “implementing research-based practices,” with an average of 2.5 out of 4 and “honoring diversity” in which the candidates average ratings were 2.2 and 2.5 out of 4. We noted that much of the Directed Teaching Evaluation used in the Moderate to Severe disabilities credential program to assess candidate performance is based on “Quality Indicators” from original work on the development of the curriculum guide from the Special

Education Administrators of County Offices (SEACO). These indicators outlined the expectations that students with moderate to severe disabilities be integrated with general education peers; but our candidates were working in settings with little integration and so they were not rated favorably in this area.

We decided to make several changes in the program based on these data:

1. We will conduct some informational class lectures or college-wide seminars about RTI and inclusive education. We are working with the Education Leadership program, to provide information in courses, where principals are being prepared for their work. Our students tell us that they do not receive support for new models for inclusive educational practices.
2. We decided to revise the evaluation used for the directed teaching class to match the new 2009 CCTC standards and TPEs across the credential programs.
3. We also began a series of discussions in the department meetings as we re-designed the credential programs and incorporated the new standards about “evidence or research-based practices.”

In addition to these changes, we updated our syllabi and re-wrote 11 courses in the program, and agreed to indicate the most recent research findings related to all topics in each class. The data results for the spring 2009 indicate improvement for these areas; candidates were rated an average of 3.3 for “implementing research-based practices,” and an average of 3.9 out of 5 for “honoring diversity.” The data results for the fall 2009 semester look even better for these areas; candidates were rated an average of 4.2 for “implementing research-based practices,” and an average of 4.8 out of 5 for “honoring diversity.” We revised the Directed Teacher Evaluation during the 2009-2010 school year and began using the assessment in the fall 2010 semester.

*(4). Dispositions assessment evidence for all programs except special education. What do the data indicate regarding the candidate dispositions?*

Much of the assessment of dispositions is done in conjunction with other assessments. For example, the PACT data on Monitoring Student Learning or Supporting Students Learning of Academic Language indirectly assesses candidates’ belief that all students can learn. Data from the employers’ survey of our initial teacher credential programs shows that our graduates are prepared to teach for equity and diversity. However, all programs are undertaking efforts to more directly assess candidate dispositions as they progress through the program. The Administrative Services Credential Program is now linking its leadership dispositions to specific assessments used in the program (See [Educational Leadership Dispositions](#).)

## **Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation**

### ***Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard:***

- (1) Reading Specialist program and other school programs do not have complete assessment data for all key assessment transition points.*

NOTE: A meeting with the coordinator of the Reading Certificate and Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential has been scheduled for Monday, March 14th at 11 a.m. during the site visit.

The Reading Specialist program is in the process of developing *In-program and Transition and Program Completion* assessments. For example, we are developing a mechanism for assessing if candidates at the end of the **EDTE 216: Ongoing Assessment** course have mastered key ongoing reading assessment tools, including analyzing assessment data and planning for appropriate and specialized reading instruction; this will act as a prerequisite for enrollment in the reading practica, EDTE 216A and EDTE 216B. We are also developing mechanisms for use in the **EDTE 217A** and **EDTE 217B** practica that can be used to determine whether candidates for the Reading Certificate or Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential demonstrate a level of competence in teaching reading that is commensurate with being a reading specialist. In addition, towards the end of each semester, LACES instructors meet to discuss the progress of students, identify students who are struggling/not meeting expectations, and determine next steps for these students. We plan to have gathered program completion data by the end of the spring 2011 semester.

A complete listing of data for key transition points collected for all other programs can be found in **Table S2.1: Transition Point Assessments**.

*(2) Procedures for sharing program findings for overall unit continuous improvements were not clear.*

NOTE: A meeting with the unit's assessment committee is scheduled for Monday, March 14th at 9:00 a.m. during the site visit..

The College began the process of sharing program findings when it adopted Waypoint as its assessment tool and assigned faculty in each department to lead their colleagues in the use of this tool. We called this working group the Waypoint Go-To faculty. During 2007-2009, we focused our efforts on building our assessment system and beginning to institutionalize assessment routines and practices. The Waypoint faculty focused their efforts on helping faculty design their rubrics within Waypoint and to enter the data on candidates' performances on key assessments. Faculty shared strategies for training other faculty in the use of Waypoint and in the design of rubrics. However, we had not yet developed routines for sharing the findings from the analysis of assessment data that each program was collecting.

Beginning in Spring 2011, we reconfigured the Waypoint working group. Instead of focusing just on Waypoint and its implementation in each program area, this group of faculty has been assigned to be the assessment coordinators for their departments. The assessment coordinators will focus on revising and refining our assessment system spring semester and sharing knowledge about the various assessment tools and practices developed within each department. The assessment coordinators will work closely with their department chairs to ensure that data are regularly collected, compiled aggregated, summarized and analyzed. They will also work with the department chairs in leading discussions with the faculty about the findings from the analyses of the program data.

In constituting a cross-college assessment group, we can better communicate assessment findings across the unit to accomplish the following unit-wide tasks:

- Check the alignment of transition points across the various programs.
- Identify the data that are common to all programs (e.g., data on candidate dispositions).
- Develop common strategies for analyzing these data

- Share findings from the analysis of unit-wide data
- Develop unit-wide approaches for program improvement based upon findings from the unit-wide analyses.

Our aim is to deepen all of our faculty’s knowledge about the assessments used in their programs and in the college and to distribute that knowledge more widely within the college itself. One of our goals is to ensure that faculty model the assessment practices that they are teaching to candidates in their programs and to demonstrate how assessment informs program improvement efforts.

### **Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice**

#### ***Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard:***

##### ***(1) Limited school site personnel training***

*Rationale: Training for the school site personnel varies significantly across the programs. There is evidence of training sessions for school personnel working with candidates in the multiple subject residency program. No evidence of training for school personnel in secondary program; in fact, they say “Currently, there is no formal training for cooperating teachers.” The special education program talks mostly about training of the university supervisors and with respect to master teachers states “This role varies so much in the field that we have not standardized the preparation of the Master Teachers.”*

#### **3.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit:**

*a. Training of School Site Personnel. Who is responsible to ensure that there is appropriate training for school site personnel who work with SJSU candidates and what is the process to ensure this?*

NOTE: A meeting with the Field Placement coordinators has been scheduled for Monday at 11:15 a.m. In addition, a school visit has been scheduled for Monday morning, and both phone and possibly on-campus interviews with our P-12 partners have been scheduled for Monday afternoon.

All of the programs in the Lurie College of Education are moving towards providing more training through on-line materials and the use of training handbooks. Faculty supervising candidates during the field experiences already spend considerable amounts of time working with cooperating teachers to help them understand the requirements for the various field experiences. For example, in the Single Subject Credential Program, university supervisors review the student teaching handbooks for Phase I and Phase II (see **Phase I** and **Phase II**) with each cooperating teacher. They ensure that the cooperating teachers understand how the student teaching experience will unfold over time; expectations for university supervisor, mentor teacher and student teacher; key policies and procedures regarding the PACT assessment; and evaluation of the student teaching experience. The orientation includes recommendations on how to increase student teacher responsibilities over time, focus discussion on areas of strength and need, and when necessary, how to work with the university supervisor to draft an improvement plan for remediation.

The handbooks ensure standardization in how candidates in all programs work with their mentors in the field. The severe budget cuts to the California State University System in the past few years have forced us to find alternative ways of providing training when there are no longer funds to support much on-site or face-to-face training for all of our programs. Training costs have typically included substitute pay for teachers during their work-day, stipends for the trainers, the cost of travel, parking and materials. With funding limited to the teaching of courses, we can no longer do much on-site training unless it is supported through non-state funds, such as grants. (The handbook for Counselor Education can be seen at [http://www.sjsu.edu/counselored/docs/292handbook\\_super\\_2011.pdf](http://www.sjsu.edu/counselored/docs/292handbook_super_2011.pdf) and those for other departments will be available in paper format in the Exhibit Room during the site visit.)

The majority of candidates in the Educational Specialist credential at SJSU tend to be interns rather than student teachers. Thus, the training of master teachers does not pertain to interns who are working as teachers of record in their classroom. However, interns do work with support providers during their internship experiences.

The Department of Special Education Interns are supported by “Support Providers,” who are assigned by the employing school district, County Office of Education, or Non-Public School. Each Support Provider completes an application form indicating the credentials held (that match the Intern credential), sign an MOU agreeing to perform the job according to the job description and agreeing to attend a University-sponsored Support Provider training session each semester. Topics from the sessions include, for example, the new teacher cycle, the top ten areas in which the Interns indicate they need support, recommended strategies for mentoring based on studies and research findings. The department is pursuing the development of Support Provider training materials with information from the Support Providers about areas in which they need additional training and information.

In Educational Leadership, the syllabus for **EDAD 242** includes standards approved by all of the Department instructors. The syllabus also includes a “Principal/Site Supervisor, Leadership student, and SJSU Advisor Agreement”.

Fieldwork objectives are agreed upon by student, SJSU fieldwork supervisor and school principal/school supervisor and aligned to CPSEL standards. Regular meetings are scheduled between Principal/Site Supervisor and SJSU Advisor.

*(2) Limited candidate’s use of instructional technology during field experience.*

- a. *How are candidates using instructional technology during their field experiences? Specifically, how is the use of technology integrated into the candidate field experience and clinical placements?*

NOTE: An interview with faculty who are incorporating technology into instruction as well as a tour of our new refurbished classrooms is scheduled for Monday, March 14th at 9:00 a.m. during the site visit.

The candidates’ ability to use instructional technology during field experiences has been affected by two factors: a) the existing instructional technology infrastructure in the Lurie College of Education and at San José State University, and b) the availability and accessibility of instructional technology in our field sites. The Lurie College has typically lagged behind our local schools in the installation and adoption of new instructional tools such as interactive white

boards or computer-based projection system. Thus, candidates may encounter new technologies in classrooms that they did not have experience within our preparation programs. This discrepancy between their experiences in the field and their experiences on campus may lead graduates of our programs to report less confidence with their ability to use instructional technology (see [Department of Elementary Education's Biennial Data Report](#)).

Until 2003, our classes took place in classrooms equipped with only standard furniture and equipment, such as VCRs with TV monitors, blackboards or whiteboards, overhead projectors and screens. Wireless access to the internet was installed in 2003 but not available in much of the building. The College did provide students access to computer labs equipped with PCs and Macintosh laptops. Widespread use of instructional technologies by our students was limited to the spaces where equipment was located.

From 2003-2007, the campus made significant investments in building its technological infrastructure to support instruction. Preparation programs in the Lurie College took advantage of the new technologies as they emerged, most notably by using our learning management system (first WebCT and then Blackboard) to teach their courses on-line, thus modeling for students different ways of teaching and engaging students. The refurbishing of classrooms in Sweeney Hall continued at a much slower pace due in large part to budgetary constraints. Only three classrooms in Sweeney Hall were equipped with computer-based, Internet enabled, projection systems during 2003. No other upgrades to classrooms in Sweeney Hall were made by the university until 2007. Meanwhile, the College pursued private funding to refurbish and upgrade its facilities.

In 2007-2009, the Lurie College received significant donor gifts to equip two classrooms with interactive whiteboards, dual projection systems, clickers, document cameras and wireless signal boosters. The Lurie College made significant investment in refurbishing these rooms to take full advantage of the new technological tools and to establish an environment that would support different ways of learning through technology (see [article on new classroom spaces](#)). In addition, the Lurie College received a donation of 5 interactive white boards, tablets and clicker systems, and an interactive Smart Table designed for use by K-4 pupils from Smart Technologies. Extensive professional development for faculty is being provided during 2011-2012 AY to learn how to use these new tools.

As technology for instruction has become more sophisticated and pervasive, the teacher preparation programs are making more concerted efforts to link coursework with field assignments where candidates must try using technology in the field. For example, in 2011-2012, Single Subject Credential Program (SSCP) instructors have been modeling the use of interactive whiteboards in class. Candidates in all sections EDSC 182 are required to develop materials that use computer-based projection systems or interactive whiteboards in their field experiences. After they try out their lessons in their field experiences, they discuss or reflect upon what they have learned through these experiments. The ways in which technology is used in the subject areas in the SSCP vary by subject matter. For example, instructors of the math methods courses may model ways of using graphing calculators while instructors in the art teaching credential may connect to museum websites on the internet to explore different genres and periods of art.

Faculty in the Multiple Subject Credential Program have made similar efforts to embed instructional technology into the methods and foundation courses. For example, the instructor

for the math methods course models the use of document cameras in demonstrating how to help students use manipulatives to learn math concepts. The science methods course draws upon an extensive set of web-based tools to help students explore the resources available to teach science. Instructors for the literacy course are exploring the use of the interactive whiteboards to demonstrate story-boards as a way to help students learn about narrative structures. Candidates learn how to use document cameras to model and manage vocabulary activities, to do read-alouds with non-readers. Many of these innovations in teaching through technology are relatively new and still being refined. Interviews with faculty teaching with new technological tools have been scheduled during the site visit so that NCATE can verify these claims.

The Department of Special Education requires the course **EDSE 241**, “Emerging Technology for All Learners” in each of the credential programs. Candidates examine research related to the use of technology in schools, they evaluate curriculum materials and instructional media, and they design and use web quests, blogs, filtered emails, chats, and wikis for educational purposes. During the field work, which in most cases takes place in the candidates’ own classrooms (since most of the candidates are Interns), supervisors discuss with the candidates the use of the technology that they learned in the course.

Candidates in the Administrative Credential and School Counseling programs are more likely to use the technological tools in the field that are employed by their school-site supervisors. For example, candidates in the Administrative Services Credential program use available presentation tools, streaming videos or interactive white boards in their presentations at their school sites to parent or teacher groups. Evidence of the use of these technological tools by the Administrative Services candidates can be found in the candidate portfolios, which will be made available during the site visit. Candidates in the School Counseling program regularly access school data systems in providing academic advising to K-12 students.

*(3) Teacher librarian and reading specialist programs. How do these candidates complete the field experiences?*

For the Teacher Librarian program, eligible students enroll in the LIBR 295: School Library Fieldwork course - offered once each semester. Dr. Riedling is the SLIS faculty member teaching the LIBR 295 course. ALL TL candidates are required to take this course - no waivers, no exceptions. The course requires 67.5 hrs in an elementary and 67.5 hrs in a secondary school library setting - under the direct supervision of a credentialed school librarian.

Candidates find their field placements on their own and with the help of Dr. Riedling and Dr. Jane Fisher the Assistant Director of the School Librarian program. The placements and the placement supervisors are reviewed and approved by Dr. Riedling.

Candidates complete both the coursework and their field placements through the on-line course module. They demonstrate their growing competency through their learning logs, course discussions and other course assignments.

Dr. Riedling contacts the site supervisors approximately 3 times during the semester. The site supervisors are given a **Handbook** and fill out an evaluation on their students at the close of the placements. Samples of the student evaluations can be viewed at <https://slisapps.sjsu.edu/ctc/>. Use the following log-in name and password to view these student evaluations. Log in: ctc  
Password: 295.

For the Reading Special Program, as of the 2010-2011 AY, we now require two reading practica, EDTE 217A and EDTE 217B. In the EDTE 217A practicum, candidates work with small groups of students and in EDTE 217B, they work one-on-one with two students. These supervised practica are semester-long courses held after school one day a week in a Title I school in a local school district, Santa Clara USD. The instructor is a well-qualified, experienced reading teacher and coach who works at the school as a reading specialist.

The 217B practicum meets from 4:00-6:45. (NCATE reviewers will be able to visit the EDTE 217B, if they wish, as it meets on Tuesdays but it is off campus). The first 75 minutes will be dedicated to two one half-hour tutoring sessions with struggling/emergent readers, with a 15-minute break between sessions; the 217B instructor will observe candidates while they are teaching and hold meetings with them to discuss their teaching later. Following the two tutoring sessions, candidates will meet in small Teaching Teams to do one of the following: a) debrief their experiences, b) analyze assessment data, or c) discuss challenges/successes using Pat Johnson's *So what, here's what . . .* format from *One Child at a Time: Making the Most of Your Time with Struggling Readers, K-6* (2006). After these discussions and under the guidance of the 217B instructor, candidates will explore a range of issues that pertain to assessing and teaching struggling readers, including assessment tools/procedures and appropriate instructional practices/materials.

*(4) Professional Development. What are the plans for continued professional development for the Education Leadership faculty?*

Dr. Enid Lee and Dr. Tara Yosso are being invited to provide faculty in the educational leadership department with professional development in multicultural educational leadership and culturally relevant pedagogy. Dr. Mei-Yan Lu will continue to provide faculty with training in how to use technological tools such as Elluminate and D2L to enhance distance-learning and web-based conferencing.

*(5) P-12 Student Learning. What is the evidence (beyond initial teacher preparation programs) that candidates systematically collect and examine data on P-12 student learning during the field and clinical experience?*

The School Counseling program has been running three GEAR UP grants for the past 12 years. The majority of their candidates participate in the GEAR UP grant as they are placed in schools serving students from low social economic families. A key aspect of that grant is the examination of data on student learning tied to the interventions that the GEAR UP counselors are using in the K-12 schools. Candidates who are not part of the GEAR UP grant have similar opportunities in their field sites to examine data on P-12 student learning as part of their roles as academic advisors for students.

Candidates in the Administrative Services credential program learn to analyze and interpret data from standardized test data for K-12 students in **EDAD 200/201**. Students are required to focus specifically on failing subgroups of students and make recommendations for interventions. Many of these candidates are teachers in local schools where the analysis and discussion of findings from standardized test data is a well-established routine. An entire Saturday class is devoted to Data Analysis for Year One students (EDAD/201) whereby experts in the field are invited to present to our students. For our year two students, in **EDAD 205/206** students gather and examine data on access to GATE, Honors, College Prep, AP, Band, Speech, Debate, Discipline, Attendance by ethnicity, grade and/or track level.

(6) *Collaboration between unit and school partners. What is the nature of the collaborations? What types of current collaborations exist? How does the collaboration support the candidates' preparation?*

The Lurie College of Education has a long history of collaborations with our school partners. **Table S3: School Collaborations** provides how each program has collaborated with various schools and districts in preparing our candidates.

### Standard 4: Diversity

#### 4.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard:

(1). *Candidates are not demonstrating mastery of diversity standards.*

*Standard 4 – Diversity Exhibit 3 Assessment Instruments, Scoring Guides, and Data Related to Diversity reveals that candidates are scoring in the 60 to 70 percentiles on several standards assessed. Does the unit believe the data are accurate? What unit plans have been made to address this?*

At the time the original IR was submitted, we reported data about graduates' mastery of diversity competencies in the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Programs. These data were drawn from a system-wide annual survey of graduates of CSU teacher preparation programs. The data were reported for graduates who completed their credential in 2006-2007. These data represent the findings from the individual questions on the survey.

The most recent findings from the candidates who completed their credential program in 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 show improvement in their ability to teach English Language Learners, to teach in inclusive classrooms, and to teach for equity and diversity. In fact, the candidates who completed their credential program in 2008-2009 outperformed candidates in the entire CSU system in terms of the ratings employers gave of their ability to meet the needs of a diverse population of K-12 students.

Table S4  
Results from Survey of Employers of Graduates of  
Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Educational Specialist Programs  
2008-2009 Cohort

Percentage of Employers rating SJSU/CSU grads as Well or Adequately Prepared

Competencies	SJSU Cohorts – MS, SS, ES				CSU System 2008-2009
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	
Teaching for equity and diversity	69%	69%	74%	<b>84%</b>	79%
Teaching English Lang. Learners	69%	69%	76%	<b>84%</b>	79%
Teaching in inclusive classrooms (special needs students)*	70%	68%	72%	<b>83%</b>	78%

\*This item represents the ratings for MS and SS candidates only.

\*\*n < 5 for ES employers in 2006-07 and 2007-08.

The data presented in Table S4 represent composite measures whereas the data presented in our previous exhibits for the 2006-2007 cohort represent measures from single items in the survey. See [Table S4.1](#), [Table S4.2](#) and [Table S4.3](#) for the reports from the CSU Chancellor’s Office where the data in Table S4 are drawn.

The steady improvement in candidates’ ability to address the diversity of K-12 students is the result of three specific actions taken by the faculty as part of their program improvement efforts:

- Candidates in the Multiple Subject Credential Program were encouraged to take the mainstreaming class offered by the Department of Special Education rather than the on-line course offered by UC Santa Cruz Extension that was often used as substitution for the SJSU course. In addition, the department required that lesson plans include attention to differentiation in teaching, and careful monitoring of learning through on-going assessments. The implementation of PACT increased attention to planning and attending to the needs of ALL learners.
- The Department of Special Education focused their efforts to help all candidates, but especially those from our general teacher preparation program, learn to address the needs of students with special needs. Candidates completing the Level II Education Specialist credential programs are evaluated by the school principals in areas about curriculum and instruction when working with English Learners. This data from the last four semesters is summarized in the table below:

**Department of Special Education Diversity Assessment**

5= Superior    4= Strong    3= Satisfactory    2= Low    1= Poor

N= 34 candidates who completed the Preliminary Education Specialist credential programs in M/M, M/S, ECSE in Fall 2010, Spring 2010, Fall 2009, and Spring 2009.

	[Each item is assessed by the Principal] <i>The teacher :</i>	Mean	SD
1.	Knows the purposes, goals and content of the adopted instructional program for the effective teaching of and support for English learners.	4.02	.67
2.	Knows local and school organizational structures and resources designed to meet the needs of English learners.	4.11	.64
3.	Knows the purposes, contents and uses of California’s English Language Development Standards and English Language Development Test.	4.08	.66
4.	Draws upon available resources to enhance English learners’ comprehension of content by organizing the classroom and utilizing first language support services, when available, to support mastery of State-adopted content standards for students.	4.29	.75
5.	Demonstrates the skills and abilities to use English language development methods and strategies as part of the approved program, including teaching of reading, writing, speaking and listening skills that logically progress to the grade level program for English speakers.	4.26	.75
6.	Demonstrates ability to appropriately use adopted instructional materials and	4.35	.84

	strategies for English learners, based on students' assessed proficiency in English, and in their first language, when available.		
7.	Demonstrates ability to use a variety of systematic, well planned teaching strategies that develop academic language, make content comprehensible to English learners, provide access to the adopted grade level curriculum in core academic subject matter, and develop concepts and critical thinking skills.	4.47	.92
8.	Knows how to use assessment information to diagnose students' language abilities and to develop lessons that maximize students' academic success and achievement in the State-adopted academic content standards.	4.21	1.19
9.	Plans and delivers appropriate instruction and applies understandings of how cultural, experiential, cognitive and pedagogical factors and individual student needs affect first and second language development.	4.45	1.20
10.	Develops appropriate and meaningful learning experiences that draw on students' prior knowledge and experiences.	4.58	1.32
11.	Understands and knows how to interpret assessments of English learners for student diagnosis and placement, and for instructional planning.	4.23	1.61
12.	Effectively uses appropriate measures for initial, progress monitoring, and summative assessment of English learners for language development and for content knowledge in the core curriculum.	4.38	1.68
13.	Provides an equitable learning environment that encourages students to express meaning in a variety of ways.	4.85	1.72
14.	Effectively teaches students from diverse backgrounds and communities, and can communicate effectively with parents and families.	5	1.87

- There was greater cross-departmental communication about the needs of candidates in terms of their preparation to teach a diverse population of students.
- The development and implementation of signature assessments in the methods courses for the Multiple Subject Credential program gave faculty new insights into their candidates' needs. Faculty discussions helped illuminate issues about candidates' needs that were previously not visible to them.
- In the Single Subject Credential Program, the faculty of **EDSC 162: Literacy and English Language Development** met to standardize the curriculum and adopt a signature assignment across sections. Adopting a common curriculum and signature assignment has guaranteed a more consistent experience across sections, with greater oversight (of both curriculum and student outcomes) by full-time faculty.

## **Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development**

### ***5.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard***

#### ***(1) Faculty service in P-12 settings, university and professional associations***

See Table entitled "Summary of Service and Engagement with Professional Community at [http://www.sjsu.edu/education/docs/Accreditation/FacultyService\\_P12Engagement-1.htm](http://www.sjsu.edu/education/docs/Accreditation/FacultyService_P12Engagement-1.htm).

The term Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty refers to full-time permanent faculty in the Lurie College of Education and in other colleges who participate in our educator preparation programs. Our Professional School and Clinical Faculty are our part-time faculty who also play important roles in preparing our candidates but who are hired on an as-needed basis.

**5.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit**

*(1) Review evidence of faculty terminal degrees, service and scholarship. What is the evidence on faculty terminal degrees, scholarship and research?*

See Table listing Faculty degrees, assignment and rank at <http://www.sjsu.edu/education/docs/Accreditation/FacultyQualifications-4.pdf>. Faculty Curriculum Vita will also be available during the on-site visit. A listing of samples of faculty scholarly activities can be found at [http://www.sjsu.edu/education/docs/Accreditation/Samples\\_of\\_Faculty\\_Scholarship.htm](http://www.sjsu.edu/education/docs/Accreditation/Samples_of_Faculty_Scholarship.htm).

*(2) Course syllabi.*

All Course syllabi are available at <http://www.sjsu.edu/education/accreditation/standards/Background/syllabi/index.htm>. Syllabi are listed by department. Table 5 below provides a cross-listing between the departments and the programs each department offers. Course prefixes are aligned with the specialty areas within each credential program.

**Table 5**

Initial Teacher Preparation Programs	Department	Alignment of Course Prefixes with Program
Multiple Subject Credential Program	Elementary Education	EDEL – Prof.Educ. Courses
Single Subject Credentials	Secondary Education	EDSC – Prof. Educ. Courses
Art		ArED
English		ENED
Foreign Language		FLED
Mathematics		MTED
Music		MUED
Physical Education		KNED
Science		SCED
Social Science		SSED
Educational Specialist Credential	Special Education	See courses for Fall 2010 for new program
Early Childhood Special		EDSE 102, 279, 218A, 228A, 224, 241, 235A, 214A, 104, 108,

Education (ECSE)		221, 154
Mild-Moderate Disabilities		EDSE 192A, 102, 279, 216A, 224, 230A, 215, 241, 228A, 218B, 217A, EDEL108D, EDTE 190
Moderate-Severe Disabilities		EDSE 192A, 102, 279, 206A, 213A, 216A, 218A, 235A, 214A, 154, EDEL 108D
Deaf & Hard of Hearing (on hiatus due to low enrollment)		EDSE 192A, 102, 279, 216A, 119, 221, 276C, 276D, 224, 241, 218A or 218B, 277, 228A, 281, EDEL 198D, EDTE 190
Advanced Teacher Preparation Programs – LACES	Elementary Education	EDTE
Other School Professionals		
Administrative Services	Educational Leadership	EdAd
School Counseling	Counselor Education	EDCO

*Qualifications of school personnel.*

Details about how school personnel are selected for each program can be found at <http://www.sjsu.edu/education/accreditation/standards/Standard3/exhibit2/index.htm>

**Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources**

*(1) AUTEK Information. What is its membership and role in the unit governance? Are P-12 practitioners included in AUTEK membership?*

NOTE: An interview with AUTEK has been scheduled for Monday, March 14th at 8:30 a.m. during the site visit.

The All-University Teacher Education Committee (AUTEK) was formed by the Academic Senate in 1997. The mission of the committee was to support better coordination among the various units in the university involved or concerned with teacher preparation. At that time, several colleges offered subject matter waiver programs. AUTEK oversaw the design and revision of subject matter programs that fed into the teacher preparation programs at SJSU. However, as many departments chose not to continue their subject matter waiver programs, the need for AUTEK oversight has diminished and the committee now seldom has business to conduct.

The members of AUTEK will be revisiting their charter later this year to determine whether to continue as a standing university committee, and if so, what their new charter should be.

Given the infrequency of the meetings and lack of business, P-12 practitioners have not been attending the AUTC meetings in the past three years.

(2) *Advisory Boards (P-12 Collaboration)*. How do P-12 practitioners and other members of the professional community participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its programs?

NOTE: Reviewers will meet with members of each program's advisory boards on Sunday afternoon (March 13<sup>th</sup>) beginning at 5 p.m.

Each of the programs in the unit has at least one advisory board that is comprised of P-12 practitioners and other professionals in the community who advise them on the design of their programs. Members of the advisory boards for each program will be invited to attend the Sunday, March 13, 2011 afternoon sessions with NCATE reviewers. Examples of how each program constitutes and works with their advisory boards are listed below:

- The Administrative Services Credential program works with two advisory boards representing two distinct geographic regions that their program serves – North Santa Clara County and South Santa Clara County. They are considering adding a third advisory board that will include members from Santa Cruz County.
- The Advanced Preparation program for Teachers in Reading (the LACES-emphasis MA program) has an Advisory Board that meets regularly and has a very active role in developing and revising our programs. For almost three years, this advisory group has been engaged in a continuous, in-depth program review process designed to strengthen the Reading/Language Arts Specialist (RLAS) credential program; the advisory group is made up of faculty members who teach in the program (tenured, tenure-track, and adjunct), school district representatives, and graduates from our program. In the 2008-2009 AY, this group met on a monthly basis to carefully assess and redesign our program. Since then, they have met once a semester to explore ways to strengthen the program, and this collaborative work has led program faculty to take the following actions:
  - Coordinating readings and assignments to avoid unnecessary duplications and to fill gaps
  - Reviewing professional texts for possible inclusion in courses
  - Placing more emphasis on ongoing assessment in three key courses: EDTE 210: *Becoming a Reader at Any Age*, **EDTE 211**: *Academic Language/Reading Comprehension*, and EDTE 292: *Teaching Writing across Cultures and Curriculum*.
  - Identifying students who need additional support.

The advisory group continues to meet once a semester.

- The School Counseling Credential Program meets with its advisory board annually to discuss the needs of the community and how the program can best meet those needs.
- The Special Education Advisory Board meets each semester and consists of administrators in special education, district Intern coordinators, NPS directors, and HR representatives. This group provides feedback about the program, and at the onset of the

current Intern Program, they helped to design the process and procedures for the program, which are reviewed each semester at the meetings.

- The Single Subject Credential Program convenes an Advisory Board, composed of representatives from our partnership districts, bi-annually to discuss issues related to internships, professional development, curriculum and future directions. (See [Advisory Board Meetings](#)).

*(3) Fall 2010 full-time/part-time faculty workload. Do the unit workload policies allow faculty to be effectively engaged in teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, P-12 school collaboration, and service Are graduate assistants provided?*

Workloads for all faculty (both full-time and part-time) are proscribed by the contract between the California State University System (CSU) and California Faculty Association (CFA). Under this contract, full-time faculty are required to undertake a 12 Weighted Teaching Unit (WTU) instructional workload. Full-time appointment is 15 WTUs. Full-time faculty spend the remaining 3 WTUs in advising students, serving on committees, and engaging in scholarship. In addition, the Lurie College funds a number of assigned time responsibilities to faculty to support programs, institutionalize our assessment system, engage with community partners, or engage in research of benefit to the unit as a whole. Faculty who receive grants also buy out their time to work on their grant projects.

Part-time faculty assignments are typically determined by the number of courses they are hired to teach or special assignments that they are asked to take on. For example, one part-time faculty is hired at a 50% appointment as the PACT coordinator.

Graduate assistants are employed by those faculty who may have grant funds to hire graduate students to work on their projects. There are no additional funds provided to the unit to employ graduate assistants for research or special projects. As the Lurie College continues to seek additional private funding, it will deploy some of those funds to support faculty scholarship.

*(4) Student Faculty Ratio (6:1 ratio for field experience supervision). Does it differ across programs or is it constant across the unit? How does it impact the faculty workload? How does it impact the quality of instruction with higher enrollments for seminar and lecture classes? (Interview candidates, faculty, check with Standard 5 for faculty/course evaluations)*

The unit provides funding to each department for its field experience supervision at a 6:1 ratio. The funding is tied to the number of sections and students served within each course identified as a field supervision course. However, department chairs have some discretion in how they allocate the total funding their department receives. They must balance the needs to provide the greatest number of students access to the courses while also maintaining program quality. This balancing act has become more difficult with the uncertainty in the state funding and changing directives from the Chancellor's Office about enrollment targets for each campus.

*(5) Budget Information. Are there adequate professional development funds?*

Each year full-time faculty can apply for professional development funds from the Dean's Office. An email from the Dean dated September 2, 2010 describes the amounts for which faculty can apply. Travel, and Other Activities and materials that are directly related to the faculty's professional are allowable expenses. See [Dean's Email to Faculty](#).

*(6) Support Personnel. Is there sufficient support for candidates?*

NOTE: Meetings with the Credential Analysts and the PACT staff have been scheduled for Monday, March 14th at 9:30 a.m. during the site visit.

Each program is housed within a department that is led by a department chair, who is assisted by administrative staff who ensure that policies and procedures that affect candidates are consistently and fairly enacted. Both the chair and full-time faculty in each department take on the role of advising candidates, with the chair responsible for student affairs in each department. Candidates also receive support from the two full-time credential analysts who ensure that candidate files are complete and comply with all licensure requirements. Candidates benefit from newly refurbished classrooms equipped with new interactive whiteboards, which are supported by a full-time IT desktop support staff. Candidates in the Multiple and Single Subject Credential programs are supported by the PACT coordinator and PACT office staff who support the successful implementation of the PACT assessment.

Candidates also have access to a variety of student services on-campus, including writing labs, other computing facilities, and librarians assigned to the Lurie College of Education as information and library liaisons (see [Sue Kendall's](#) & [Shannon Staley's](#) webpages).

*(7) Coordination with other departments (AFI). How does the unit coordinate efforts among other departments to prepare its candidates?*

Please see response in 2010 Part C of NCATE Annual Report on AIMS.

*(8) Office Space (AFI). How and where does the unit provide space for candidates to meet with faculty and faculty advisors?*

Please see response in 2010 Part C of NCATE Annual Report on AIMS.

*(9) Counselor Education (AFI). What is the advising load for faculty in counselor education?*

Please see response in 2010 Part C of NCATE Annual Report on AIMS.

*(10) Library facilities. Does the curricular resource center adequately provide for the needs of candidates?*

See [Educational Resource Center webpage](#) for a description of their policies and services.

*(11) Distance learning programs. Are there adequate resources to provide reliable DLPs? Are there formal policies and procedures established to address online delivery in determining the faculty load?*

There are currently no online distance learning programs within the Lurie College of Education. All programs are offered on site.