



The Standard of Excellence  
in Teacher Preparation

**Offsite BOE Report:  
San José State University  
November 2, 2010 1:00 pm - 5:00 pm**

**Offsite BOE Team Members**

Dr. Elazer James Barnette, Chair  
Mr. Derek K. Minakami, Member  
Dr. Linda Olasov, Member  
Mr. Mark Cary, State Member  
Dr. Helene Mandell, State Member  
Dr. Caron Mellblom-Nishioka, State Member

**Offsite BOE Team Observers**

Ms. Cheryl Hickey, State Consultant  
Dr. Katie Croy, State Consultant  
Ms. Mary Beth Nowinski, NCATE Staff

The following report indicates areas of concern on which the Onsite BOE Team will focus during the upcoming visit. In addition, the last section for each standard is a list of evidence that the team plans to validate during the visit to ensure that the standards continue to be met. This validation will occur as the team interviews faculty, administrators, school-based partners, and other members of the professional community. Validation could also occur in the visits to schools and observations on campus. The validation list also includes some specific documentation that the team would like to review during the onsite visit. In some cases, the Offsite team members could not locate a document or open a link and have requested that the Onsite Team review those documents.

## **Conceptual Framework**

**Statement about the evidence:** The professional education unit's conceptual framework has been reviewed and revised to reflect the core values and principles relating to equity and excellence as defined in the 2003 conceptual framework. The current conceptual framework has been updated to show current alignment to standards and the integration of technology to support the assessment system. Most significant among the changes are the development of a college-wide comprehensive assessment system, investment in new technologies to support the collection and analysis of program and PACT data, aligned identified transition point assessments with the elements of standards, continuous and aligned the assessments with the key elements in the unit's professional preparation program as illustrated graphically in the 2003 conceptual framework.

The main tenets of the conceptual framework are its set of shared values that undergird the vision and mission of the unit and provide the framework for philosophy, purpose and goals, knowledge bases, and expectations for candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions.

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

**None**

---

### **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.*

#### **1.1 Statement about the evidence:**

According to the institutional report, the unit offers seven programs that lead to initial licensure, possibly one program for advanced candidates, and ten programs for other school personnel. Each program has been approved by the state of California. Additionally, the master's degree programs have been accredited by WASC, the program for Speech Pathologists was accredited by ASHA, and the school counseling programs were accredited by the Council on Social Work Education.

For initial licensure programs, candidates must pass the California Basic Educational Skills Tests (CBEST) and maintain a minimum grade point average of 2.87 for their last 60 semester hours. Secondary education candidates must complete an approved major or course of study in their areas of concentration. Alternatively, they may submit a passing score on the content exam (CSET). Candidates pursuing credentials for other school personnel must pass their respective CSETs.

Each program must submit a Biennial Data Report (BDR) to the California Commission on the Credentialing of Teachers. Data presented in the BDRs cover candidates' content and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Additionally, the BDRs provide summaries of employer and alumni surveys.

### **Initial Teacher Preparation**

According to the BDRs for elementary, secondary, and special education, candidates demonstrate adequate or effective content, pedagogical content, and professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills during field experiences. These results are mirrored in their performances on the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). The only area of improvement was noted in assessments of curriculum and instruction for candidates in the Moderate to Severe Disabilities Credential Program and implementing research.

Surveys of alumni and employers corroborate assessment results. Elementary education employers noted strength in the preparation of candidates to teach reading and mathematics. However, surveys of both employers and alumni of the elementary education program reveal a lack of adequate preparation in teaching art and physical education. Elementary education alumni also felt ill prepared to use educational technology and to meet the educational needs of all students. Meanwhile, a majority of employers rated secondary education alumni as well or adequately prepared to use technology and a mix of instructional strategies.

### **Advanced Teacher Preparation**

Upon review of the BDR, no data were provided for advanced programs.

### **Other School Personnel**

According to the BDRs for speech and language pathology services, school counseling, educational leadership, reading specialists and teacher librarian services candidates demonstrated adequate knowledge and skills in key or signature assessments. Furthermore, candidates for other professional school roles meet the target criteria for student learning. The only exception to this would be the program for reading specialists. An assessment system has yet to be established; hence no data were presented in the BDR.

**1.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard: N/A**

**1.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs): N/A**

**AFIs corrected from last visit: N/A**

**AFIs continued from last visit: N/A**

**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.

*Rationale:* No data for advanced and reading specialist programs were found in IR.

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

*Rationale:* Alumni and employer perceptions indicate a lack of preparedness to teach art and physical education as well as use educational technology.

- (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.

*Rationale:* Candidates in the Moderate to Severe Disabilities Credential program achieved a less than adequate mean score in curriculum and instruction and using research.

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

1. Exit surveys for the school counseling program disaggregated by identified competencies. What do the surveys indicate about the school counseling program candidate competencies?
2. The rating system for rubrics for the educational leadership program. What do the rubrics indicate about the educational leadership candidate competencies?
3. Data for the advanced and reading specialist programs. What does the assessment data indicate about the advanced and reading specialist program candidate competencies?
4. Dispositions assessment evidence for all programs except special education. What do the data indicate regarding the candidate dispositions?

---

**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.*

**2.1 Statement about the evidence**

The Connie L. Lurie College of Education continues to use the Unit Assessment System (UAS) to collect, analyze, evaluate, and use data for unit and program continuous improvements. The UAS is composed of three major components: program assessments, infrastructure to support the system, and policies that guide its implementation and continual operation. Spring 2008, the

unit adopted Waypoint Outcomes, a web-based rubric design and data collection program, for assessment. Documents show that unit faculty has been trained to use Waypoint to score assessments and there are representatives from each department to assist faculty members with the use of Waypoint Outcomes.

The UAS is designed to allow flexibility in the development of specific forms of assessments to accommodate the specific assessment needs of each program. Each program develops its forms of assessment that can evaluate professional competencies that are sensitive to the environmental factors for a specific program. Program assessment transition points are unique to each program and are integral to the Biennial Data Report. For example, the Secondary Education/Single Subject program focuses on three key assessment transition points that are used to make decisions about candidate competence prior to being recommended for a credential. These transition points are (1) Phase I Student Teaching Evaluation, (2) Phase II Student Teaching Evaluation, and (3) Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT).

Key transition point assessments in the Special Education Program (with four separate programs) include (1) Signature assignment from EDSE 279, (2) Managing Behavior and Emotional Problems Dispositions Evaluation, and (3) Directed Teaching course evaluations. Candidate performance on key assessment is correlated with California Commission on Teacher Credentialing standards, California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTPs), and the Department of Special Education Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Other unit programs have similar diverse key transition assessment points.

Although each program may define its key transition points and assessments used, every program is required to collect data at all transition points. The results of the analysis of data collected from program assessment transition points establishes the data set for the Biennial Data Report that the unit submits to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) for each program.

The table below identifies the programs, level (initial, advanced, other school personnel) and transitions points.

Programs	Level	Transition Points
Multiple Subjects, Single Subjects, and Educational Specialist	Initial	(1) Admission, (2) Field experiences (I&II), (3) Program Completion, and (4) Post-program.
Reading Specialist	Advanced	(1) Admission, (2) In-program Transition, (3) Program completion, and (4) Post-Program.
School Counselors - Pupil Personnel Services	Other School Personnel	(1) Rubric assessment on student portfolio, (2) Rubric assessment for group presentation on school counseling program design,

		(3) Field Supervisor Evaluation on candidate fieldwork performance and (4) Comprehensive Essay Exam graded with a standardized rubric.
School Leaders - Administrative Services	Other School Personnel	(1) Entry, (2) Coursework, and (3) Completion.
School Library Media Specialists	Other School Personnel	(1) Demonstrating an understanding of how to design and implement standards-based instructional strategies, (2) Two assessments demonstrating an understanding of the missions, functions and management of school library media centers, and (3) School Library Field Work; demonstrating readiness to exit program and enter the profession.
Speech & Hearing Specialists – Speech Pathologist	Other School Personnel	(1) Continuation of academic program and continued assignment to clinical practicum.

Exhibit documents show all programs at the initial level are being assessed and faculty are analyzing data and using the results for individual program changes and overall unit changes. However, documents reveal that the Reading Specialist program currently only has data for admission and post-program. The in-program and program completion assessment instruments are under development. Exhibits show that some of the key transition points for other school programs are being accessed, but all key transition points are not represented. Further, it was unclear as to how program findings identified in the Biennial Report were shared across programs for overall unit continuous improvements.

The UAS has procedures embedded for ensuring that key assessments of candidate performance and evaluations of unit operations are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias. Procedures presented in the IR and supported in the exhibits include:

- Actively involves all stakeholders in the evaluation process and continues to improve the evaluation process.
- College-wide process and meetings can be helpful to share data collected and discuss the issues encountered.

- Inter-rater reliability is established for all signature assignments through discussions among faculty.
- Unit's approved response to PACT Standard 19: *Assessment Administered for Validity, Accuracy and Fairness.*

The unit has policies in place and available for candidates related to the process of filing complaints related to unit programs and faculty/staff. Located in the electronic exhibits is a sample of the Student Complaint Policy and Department of Educational Studies Student Concern Form.

Since the last NCATE visit, the following represents significant program and unit changes as a result of data collection from the assessment system and analysis at all transition points:

***(Initial and Advanced Programs)***

- Developed a new comprehensive assessment system where each program identified transition points that characterize the candidates' developing competency in the skills and knowledge required for their credential or degree program. The competencies are aligned with professional standards.
- Used candidate portfolios to assess candidates' emerging competencies. Candidates in the Special Education Department develop a portfolio in the final directed teaching course of each level of the program and at the end of the first semester for Interns that is evaluated by the University Supervisor.
- Engaged in faculty professional development activities that addressed the design of assessments and the creation of rubrics for the key transition points in their programs
- Decided fall 2009 to that key assessment of our teacher candidates is the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT).
- Established procedures and policies for each department to ensure fair and consistent administration of other transition point assessments.
- Adopted technological tools that allowed faculty to share program-level assessments in ways that had not occurred previously.
- Initiated effort to identify and pilot test web-based tools that facilitate the building of rubrics and collection of data for each transition point assessment. Fall 2008, the unit adopted Waypoint for assessment purposes.
- Presented portfolio guidelines and rubrics to a national audience in June 2001 at the AACTE Assessment Conference. Feedback from the conference led to a revision of the portfolio guidelines and rubric with reference to reliability and validity.
- Encapsulated assessment data in the unit Biennial Data Reports that each program submits to the CCTC.

**2.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard:** Not Applicable

**2.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs):** None

**2.4 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.

*Rationale:* According to document presented, there is no data system for documenting candidate performance or program effectiveness for the Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential program

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

*Rationale:* The unit is assessing most of its professional education programs at the initial and advanced levels, but evidences were limited as to how individual program findings were shared with unit faculty for continuous overall unit improvements.

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

1. Review description of the Unit Assessment System. Who is responsible for identifying key transition points for each program? Who is responsible for ensuring data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and reported for unit continuous improvements.
2. Interview individual(s) responsible for managing the Unit Assessment System
3. Unit Assessment System. What is the process? Is there a unit assessment committee that reviews transition points in relationship to state and national standards?
4. Biennial Report Data. How are these data and other program data being used for program and unit improvement? How are candidate competency data used for program and unit improvement?
5. Unit Assessment Data. How are the common program data being shared across programs for unit improvements?

---

### **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.*

**3.1 Statement about the evidence:**

The San Jose State University PEU works closely with their multiple school partners to provide a variety of field experiences and clinical practice, for candidates in professional preparation programs. It appears that the various field experiences and clinical practices afford candidates the opportunity to develop the requisite knowledge, skills and dispositions they will need to work effectively in California schools.

The diverse communities in and around San Jose provide school placements whereby university supervisors and school-based professionals conduct formative and summative evaluations of candidates' preparation for working effectively in those contexts. Appropriate to the specific program, candidates in professional preparation programs have opportunities to experience the full-range of activities and responsibilities of a public school teacher, or counselor or administrator.

Particular requirements for field placements vary from one unit program to another, but across all programs, specific considerations guide decisions about site selection, the qualifications and responsibilities of site personnel, and about the manner in which College faculty and site personnel work together to assess the quality and outcome of the experience for all candidates.

The professional development—specifically how school site personnel are prepared to “coach” and provide on-site supervision—is uneven across the programs. (See section below on “concerns.”) But, in response to this issue, it is worth noting the following: SJSU is in the process of providing relevant professional development for cooperating teachers and school-site personnel, to assist them in honing their own teaching practices. Specific examples for the teacher candidates are that two of the College faculty are currently providing training for cooperating teachers in how to teach academic language so as to enhance the math abilities of English learners in several school districts. The intent is to assist cooperating teachers to provide more appropriate instruction for their students and to model these strategies for the teacher candidates the reflective stance that characterizes excellent teachers.

In 2005 the Department of Educational Leadership, conducted a series of professional development sessions on “mentoring and coaching” with the New Teacher Center in Santa Cruz. The three-day institute was offered to all Educational Leadership faculty and there were 30 participants (both tenure track and part time instructors). There is no evidence this has occurred since then. However, in 2009, the department contracted with Dr. Enid Lee for a series of monthly meetings on ways to incorporate/embed issues of equity and social justice into their courses. There are plans to have her return in 2010-11.

Based on the fact that the California License Board in Speech-Language Pathology implemented a continuing education requirement for all licensed SLPs who provide clinical supervision, the Department of Communicative Sciences and Disorders (CDS) began offering Continuing Education Unit (CEU) opportunities to their supervisors at no charge to ensure the supervisors meet state licensure requirements.

All programs appear to have delineated guidelines for the field experiences and clinical practices. The exhibits provide these guidelines and specifics that are appropriate to the credential being sought. Similarly all programs have assessment instruments posted in the exhibits with the necessary rubrics, etc. for each.

All professional education candidates participate in systematic field experiences and/or clinical practices that form a cohesive set of learning experiences. The field experiences are designed to be a collaborative effort between candidates, K-12 practitioners, and university personnel.

During the supervised field experience, teacher candidates are evaluated based on the California Teaching Performance Expectations. SJSU has been a pioneer with respect to the state-mandated teaching performance assessment. Faculty were involved in the original design, pilot studies and benchmarking and they were one of the first programs to fully operationalize the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). They have a highly successful system for all aspects of its implementation.

**Changes since last NCATE review:**

SJSU's efforts for continuous improvement on this standard are centered on honing their candidate assessment tools and procedures, and modifying the design and implementation of their programs as warranted by the student outcome data emerging from those assessments. One example of this effort pertains to candidates' effectiveness in using instructional technology. University faculty and school personnel are currently collaborating to identify experiences in campus-based coursework and field placements that will together enable candidates to learn how and when to infuse their pedagogy with state-of-the art instructional technology.

**3.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard:**

Not applicable to this standard

**3.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs):**

No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit

**3.3 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."

- (2) Limited candidate's use of instructional technology during field experience.

*Rationale:* The exhibits lack details of what specifically candidates are doing with instructional technology in field experiences and clinical practices.

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

1. 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?
  2. Professional Development. What are the plans for continued professional development for the Education Leadership faculty?
  3. Candidates Use of Instructional Technology. 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?
  4. Teacher librarian and reading specialist programs. How do these candidates complete the field experiences?
  5. Professional development for university field work supervisors. What types of professional development are provided to the supervisors?
  6. 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?
  7. 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?
- 

## **STANDARD 4**

*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.*

### **4.1 Statement about the evidence**

Candidate proficiencies related to diversity are well documented and are aligned with NCATE, INTASC, and California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Candidates must demonstrate mastery of diversity standards through course assessments and their final portfolios. The unit has identified several courses with diversity standards and proficiencies embedded. For example, regardless of the program option they select, all candidates in our Multiple Subject Credential programs must take EDEL 102 and 103, Psychological and Socio-multicultural Foundations courses. Other courses are EDTE 162, Second Language Acquisition, EDEL 108 – Methods sequence, and EDEL 143A and EDSC 184X, Field Experience courses. However, data provided in Exhibit 3 Assessment Instruments, Scoring Guides, and Data Related to Diversity show that

many candidates are scoring in the 60 – 70 percentiles indicating they are minimally meeting the diversity proficiencies embedded in core courses.

The unit carefully reviews and evaluates selected field sites to ensure candidates will have experiences with students and clients reflecting the full range of cultures, ethnicities and academic abilities, and to pair them with experts who have the pedagogical, professional and cultural competence that reflects professional education. The unit requires multicultural field experiences providing candidates opportunities to develop an awareness of the importance of diversity in teaching and learning. Documents reveal all students in the multiple subjects, single subjects and education specialist credential programs complete at least one of their student teaching assignments in a hard-to-staff school, or a school with high proportions of English learners, with cooperating teachers who have extensive experience with diverse student populations. Additionally, counselor education candidates work with over 200 students from low-income schools in the GEAR-UP program.

The unit has identified six keys to successfully preparing candidates to work effectively with all students. The six keys are:

1. The *first key* is the *core set of values* that unit faculty members model.
2. A *second key* is the consistency with which these values have guided the unit as they worked together to craft programs and courses.
3. *The third key* is the professional expertise and pedagogical skill of unit faculty.
4. A *fourth key* lies within the candidates themselves. They embody the full range of diversity the unit is preparing them to embrace and they learn about meeting the needs of all students as they interact with one another in the classroom activities.
5. A *fifth key* to our success lies beyond SJSU's campus. The unit has forged enduring partnerships with schools and community organizations, in our immediate community and beyond. The cooperating teachers and supervisors who work with candidates share unit values and model ways to reach and teach all of their students and clients effectively.
6. A *sixth key* is the process of assessment the unit is continuing to design and implement. The unit has undertaken an ambitious, multi-faceted approach to monitoring learning outcomes for students in all of our programs.

San José State University has partnerships with Bay area-school districts where candidates are placed to ensure opportunities for interactions with faculty from diverse groups. Based on data presented, diversity of faculty in selected public schools reflects the students in the district. During the candidates' early field experiences, they are placed in the school with the higher percentage of diverse faculty. Within the unit, two faculty members who are classified from an ethnic minority group, interact with candidates. Unit faculty gained knowledge and experience in preparing candidates to work with students from diverse backgrounds through their personal experiences working with K-12 students from diverse groups.

Data show candidates have opportunities to work with diverse faculty. Of the 152 full-time and part-time unit faculty members, 30 percent are non-White. University-wide, 36 percent of the faculty is non-White. Efforts of the unit to recruit diverse faculty is documented in the Office of Faculty Affairs where unit faculty have received funding to attend professional conferences

where they could identify prospective tenure-line applicants from diverse backgrounds. Unit faculty follows university procedures when searching for new faculty.

Candidates have opportunities to interact with candidates of diverse groups in their professional education courses. Data from the university's office of Institutional Research provides evidence of diversity in the unit's programs. Documents show that 56 percent of candidates enrolled in unit programs are non-White. From the gender perspective, the majority is female (86%).

Candidates experience working with diverse students in P-12 schools though the selected field experiences as mentioned earlier. Data show that 90 percent of candidates are placed in districts where more than half of the students are non-White. Also, data shows that 75 percent of candidates are placed in districts where more than half of the students qualify for free and reduced lunch. Finally, 80 percent of candidates are placed in districts where 15 percent or more of the students are English learners.

The unit ensures that candidates use feedback from peers and supervisors to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups, assessing their reflections about diversity experiences through class discussions, reflective journals, portfolios, and field experience assignments.

#### **4.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard**

Based upon the exhibits presented, the unit is moving toward the target level but has not presented evidence to support that the unit is at the target for the following elements of the standard:

- Curriculum, field experiences, and clinical practice promote candidates' development of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity within the context of the unit's conceptual framework (4a)
- Candidates engage in extensive and substantive field experiences and clinical practices for both conventional and distance learning programs are designed to encourage candidates to interact with exceptional students and students from broad range of diverse groups

#### **4.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)**

No AFIs.

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

- (1). Candidates are not demonstrating mastery of diversity standards.  
*Rationale:* Survey data from candidates who graduated from programs and employers indicates graduates have not mastered diversity standards.

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

1. Diversity data for all programs. What do data indicate about the candidates' diversity proficiencies across all programs? What is the unit learning from these data?

2. 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?
3. MOU's with partner schools within the Bay area. How do MOU's between the unit and the partner schools support the candidates' diversity proficiencies?
4. What do Data on Candidate Diversity Competencies beyond Initial Teacher Preparation show about the proficiencies of these candidates?

---

### **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.*

#### **5.1 Statement about the evidence**

As indicated in Standard 4 there are 152 Faculty in the Connie L. Lurie College of Education. It is not clear if this number represents both full and part time faculty. The works of 42 Faculty are summarized in the *samples of faculty scholarship* that is linked in the narrative. Evidence of publications and examples of scholarship for those faculty included is impressive.

It is noted that all faculty have terminal degrees and only individuals with developing or established research agenda are invited to join the faculty in the College. Such information provides the sense that faculty are engaged in some level of research and development. However, links to Faculty vita were not found so it was difficult to assess these claims. Exhibit 3 Faculty Scholarship is the same document as that linked in paragraph one under "scholarship and their professional service."

Faculty are engaged in research involving collaborative groups from within the college and also are involved in research and development collaborations across the university and with community partners. Of note is the "Staying Alive" project which serves to engage mid career faculty whose productivity often lags at this point in their professional development. This was a college project that has been adopted for use with faculty throughout the university.

A review of the "Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness" surveys indicates a high degree of student satisfaction with the teaching and learning they are receiving in the courses taught by college faculty. Data indicate that College Faculty are rated higher in comparison than faculty from across the university.

Mention is also made that syllabi demonstrate "...the attention faculty pay to strive to create experiences where students can nurture a mastery orientation toward intellectual challenge

(Dweck, 2006),” however no syllabi are not linked to the document so investigation of this claim is not possible.

Further, it is noted that students are engaged in “course embedded” service learning projects to enhance their awareness of community and to create a “college-going culture” in the schools, yet specifics were not provided.

Discussion is provided regarding the intentional involvement of students in activities designed to gain mastery of concepts and strategies related to critical thinking and teaching and learning pedagogies. Review of syllabi will assist in determining the effectiveness of these claims.

## **5.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard**

Not applicable

## **5.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)**

None noted from previous reports

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

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

*Rationale:* Data on faculty service in these areas were not found.

## **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?
- (2) Course syllabi. How are students engaged in activities designed to promote the development of exemplary teaching and learning? What is the evidence that students are exposed to best practices in teaching? How are service learning projects embedded in courses? How are students engaged in activities to master strategies and concepts related to critical thinking and teaching and learning?
- (3) Qualifications of school personnel. How are school personnel qualified to develop, mentor and support the candidate learning in their programs? Are school personnel licensed or credentialed in the field that they teach or supervise (see Standard 3, Exhibit 2)?

The narrative discusses factors most important for fostering an engaged faculty who indicate understanding of the needs of both developing university students into effective teaching professionals and meeting the challenges presented by learners in the urban communities in the service region. However, without specific data it is not possible to rate this standard. Prior to the visit it would be extremely helpful to gain access to specific data sets that will provide

evidence to support the narrative. Specifically, resumes, course syllabi with student learning outcomes and course activities would assist the team.

---

### **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.*

#### **6.1 Statement about the evidence:**

The Lurie College of Education (COE) is headed by a Dean who is assisted by an Associate Dean. The Dean has responsibility for all academic and administrative operations which include management of fiscal, curricular, administrative, operational, personnel, research and grants, and student issues. The unit maintains responsibility for managing and coordinating all programs it offers. The governing structure includes the Dean, Associate Dean, Council of Chairs from each of the seven departments, budget analyst (nonvoting), and the Director of PreCollegiate Programs (nonvoting). Additional administrative support for the COE comes from the Budget and Personnel Services Office, the Credentials Office, and the Information and Technical Support Office. Because of state-mandated teacher performance assessment (PACT), there is now a half-time coordinator of the newly created PACT office. The organizational chart confirms this framework and lines of authority.

There are three standing unit committees: Curriculum, Personnel, and Research. These committees are part of the governance system that plans, delivers, and assesses the unit's programs. Departments also have separate committees appropriate to their program needs. Ad hoc committees can be proposed by faculty when they are needed. Minutes and/or bylaws of these committees confirm that an All University Teacher Education Committee (AUTEK) has responsibility for reviewing changes to the teacher preparation program and supporting communication among all university units that contribute to teacher education preparation.

There are numerous websites, both unit and program oriented, that confirm that the policies for student services- counseling and advising, recruiting and admission, academic calendars, catalogs, unit publications and grading policies are accessible, current, and accurate.

The COE's budget is comparable to that of similar units on campus; namely, Occupational Therapy and the School of Library and Information Science. The COE's allocation for professional development and assessment was proportionately more than either of the other two units. The line item for technology was highest for the School of Library and Information Science. The college has had to balance its continued commitment to low student-faculty ratio of six to one in clinical experiences by increasing enrollments in seminars and lecture classes. Although the college had run deficit budgets for several years, the associate dean undertook a detailed analysis that was submitted to the Provost and Vice-President for Institutional Planning and Academic Resources. With a revised allocation formula, the budget was aligned with

program needs and the issue was resolved. The college has also had to reduce the number of students admitted into teacher education, because state funding for all of public higher education in California has been significantly reduced in the last four years. Tables 6.1 and 6.2 confirm this information. The Instructional Technology Department and Master's degree in Instructional Technology were eliminated because of the enrollment-based budgetary process and changing market needs.

As part of the California State University system, the institution is unionized. The faculty workload is defined in the contract between the California Faculty Association and the California State University system. The document confirms that a normal faculty load consists of 25 Weighted Teaching Units (WTUs) per semester. Twelve WTUs are for instruction; the remaining three WTUs account for instruction-related activities including office hours, department and committee meetings and assignments. The contract also contains a specific policy regarding overloads.

Support staff for the dean's office includes one full-time and one part-time administrative assistant. There are also the three previously mentioned administrative support offices: Budget and Personnel; Credentials, and Information and Technical Support. Each department has its own support staff. Within the Department of Elementary Education, a faculty member has reassigned time to act as program coordinator. In addition, there is also a faculty member who has reassigned time for field placements.

The unit has focused on developing technology resources and training. Through donor gifts and unit allocation, Lurie College reconstructed two classrooms with interactive whiteboards and one has a dual projection system. In May 2010, the college partnered with SMART Technology on a SMART classroom initiative. The COE renovated classrooms that received SMART technology: interactive whiteboards, tablets, speakers, student response systems and a SMART table for K-6 pupils. One of the new technologically-fitted classrooms was the subject of a newspaper article entitled *The Leola Lyth Forward Classroom*. The unit has an incubator classroom designed for experimenting with a flexible learning environments and technology tools. The faculty also use Apple iPods and iVideos. The unit trained one faculty representative from each department to lead departmental colleagues in *Waypoint*, the college's web-based assessment technology. In relation to distance learning, the unit is training its faculty to move from the *Blackboard* format to the *Desire 2 Learn*. The college retreat agenda and Elementary Education meeting agenda confirm this training.

Library resources adequately support the preparation of teachers and other school professionals. The IR lists the library resources for each department. In addition, the library provides support for faculty research.

## **6.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard N/A**

## **6.3 AFI's continued from last visit need to be revisited by the on-site team**

**AFIs continued from last visit:**

<b>AFI Number &amp; Text</b>	<b>Apply to</b>	<b>AFI Rationale</b>
1. The College of Education lacks effective coordination with other departments housing programs for school personnel, resulting in a lack of program articulation. This lack of coordination is particularly evident with the College of Science regarding the M.A. in Mathematics (Math Education concentration) and the M.A. in Natural Science.	ADV	NEED WRITTEN DOCUMENTATION AND THOROUGH INTERVIEWS WITH THE APPROPRIATE COLLEGE OF SCIENCE FACULTY AND COE See 2009 Annual report...
2. Inadequate office space limits opportunities for faculty to meet with and advise candidates.	ITP,ADV	NO EVIDENCE YET See 2008 Annual report.
3. In the Counselor Education program, full-time faculty members carry excessive advising loads that compromise candidate advisement.	ADV	NEED TO CHECK ON SITE INTERVIEWS WITH FACULTY AND STUDENTS See 2008 Annual report.

**6.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard**

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

- 1) AUTECH Information. What is its membership and role in the unit governance? Are P-12 practitioners included in AUTECH membership?
- 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?
- 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?
- 3) 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)
- 4) Budget Information. Are there adequate professional development funds? (Interview faculty and administrative groups)
- 6) Faculty workloads. Does it allow time for service and scholarship? Are graduate assistants provided?
- 7) Support Personnel. Is there sufficient support for candidates?

- 8) Coordination with other departments (AFI). How does the unit coordinate efforts among other departments to prepare its candidates?
- 9) Office Space (AFI). How and where does the unit provide space for candidates to meet with faculty and faculty advisors?
- 10) Counselor Education (AFI). What is the advising load for faculty in counselor education?
- 11) Library facilities. Does the curricular resource center adequately provide for the needs of candidates?
- 12) 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?

### **Sources of Evidence**

San José State University's Institutional Report  
Annual Reports and Program Reports in NCATE's Accreditation Information Management  
System (AIMS)  
Website and Exhibits of San José State University

Website  
All Standard 6 Exhibits