FINAL REPORT

Prepared for:

Lurie College of Education

San Jose' State University

San Jose', CA

June 20, 2018

Consultant:

JOSUE' CRUZ, JR.

Dean and Professor (Emeritus)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

In May, 2017, the Consultant, Josue' Cruz, was contacted by Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Andrew Feinstein regarding the opportunity to assist the university take inventory of the strengths and potential of the Lurie College of Education. With the appointment of a new university president and a change of leadership in the college of education, it was determined that the time was right to engage the services of an external consultant. During that same academic year, the university had commissioned the AASCU-Penson Center for Professional Development to conduct an assessment of the culture and climate of the college.

The results of the report (aka the Welty report), dated September 24, 2017, compiled by the assigned AASCU consultant indicated the existence of numerous concerns encompassing poor staff/faculty morale, lack of stable leadership, tension among personnel, and a work environment not conducive to collaborative and collegial professional development and relationships.

Originally established as the first public Normal School in the State of California, San Jose' State University (as known today), has distinguished itself as a leader in the preparation of teachers. At this juncture, the Lurie College is at a crossroads with several options open to pursue. Located in the center of the Silicon Valley, it is surrounded by some of the world's most creative minds and innovative technology R&D initiatives. With this as a backdrop, the college is positioned to explore new and interesting approaches that impact the preparation of teachers and related school personnel, partnerships, and research.

The college counts on approximately 1800 students, 50+ tenure track faculty, 18 administrative and support staff, and an array of lecturers and adjunct faculty. Six departments and one program (Ed.D) comprise the college's various academic programs and overseen by chairs. The day-to-day operations of the college are handled by the Dean's Office. In addition to the teacher preparation programs, the college offers a doctoral level program in leadership, undergraduate and graduate majors in child and adolescent development and communicative disorders and sciences, and considering an audiology doctorate (AuD).

Priorities

In conjunction with the Provost and the college Interim Dean a beginning point for this review produced three major initial priorities. Although rather broad as stated, the intent was to encompass the Welty report results and allow for other concerns and recommendations to surface and become part of the review/process:

1. Review and update the Lurie College vision/mission statements and strategic plan;

2. Provide guidance to departments and the Dean's office regarding infrastructure, operations, and procedures, and
3. Make recommendations to departments and programmatic areas on matters related to academic realignments (formal and informal).

Data Collection

On Campus

Over a period of nine months (August, 2017 - April, 2018), the Consultant was able to spend a total of fourteen days on campus meeting with staff, faculty, dean's office personnel, and various university central office administrators. On three occasions, the Consultant provided updates to a college-wide faculty and staff audience and on those same campus visits also participated in the following:

> two college-wide staff meetings (attendance=16)
> two college-wide faculty meetings (attendance=10)
> individual staff appointments on campus (11)
> individual faculty appointments on campus (21)
> interim/associate deans appointments (8)
> visits with departments/programs (4)
> tenure track assistant professor faculty group meeting (attendance=5)
> tenured associate/full professor group meeting (attendance=4)
> officers of college alumni board
> provost and other academic affairs staff meetings (3)
> university library representative meetings (2)
> director and staff of e-Learning services
> Tower Foundation college liaison meetings (2)
> office of research representatives
> STEM representative meetings (2)

(Media relations and information technology services were unable to accommodate an appointment with the Consultant.)

Off Campus

In addition to the numerous meetings held on campus, the Consultant also utilized an array of other data collection strategies. These were intended to maintain an ongoing flow of information and to accommodate those that wished to follow-up or unable to schedule a meeting during the on-campus visits. For example:

> conference calls with college interim dean and associate dean (8)
> email communiques (4 staff / 6 faculty)
> phone interviews (2 staff / 4 faculty)
> concept papers (6)

As part of the effort to maximize the participation of as many as possible, the Consultant's personal cell # and email address were made available to all staff and faculty. To assure all interested parties would have the opportunity to participate in the process, the consultant availed himself for follow-up when not on campus.

Others sources of information that were accessed as part of this review included:

> university policy documents
> college of education policy/operations documents
> college-wide committee meeting minutes for the previous four academic years
> consultations with four nationally recognized teacher education leaders
> web-sites for AACTE and CAEP
> Office of the Chancellor, California State University System
> mission and vision statements for twelve of the CSU colleges of education

Methodology

This review employed multiple and mixed qualitative research strategies for data collection. Given the broadness of the priorities, the Consultant opted to rely on the following:

> interviews
> focus groups
> observations
> meeting minutes
> surveys
> archived documents
> outside experts
> select customized reports (concept papers)Subjects

All full-time college staff/administrative personnel, tenure-track and tenured faculty members were invited and encouraged to participate in the process.

All information collected was considered confidential
All notes were transcribed by the Consultant
No other person had access to the raw and transcribed notes

Names and affiliation of participants were not revealed

In light of the forthcoming change in the college leadership, this report has been written to capture the sentiments of the staff and faculty. It is not intended to serve as a detailed list of recommendations with operational and conceptual specifics to be implemented. Rather, it should be treated as a "blueprint" of sorts that can stimulate discourse and consideration for continued teaching, research, and service development.

Process Steps

> Consultant reviewed 80% of faculty vita
> Interview questions were provided to the interviewees prior to meeting
> In cases of group meetings written questions were provided to participants
> Phone introductions preceded interview meetings with representatives from administrative units outside of the college
> All meetings were guided by an agenda and time allowed for interviewee(s) to add items to the discussion
> Confidentiality was guaranteed
> Average time of one-on-one interview on-site was thirty minutes
> Average time of group meeting was one hour
> Average time of phone call interview was forty-five minutes

Items in Progress

Throughout the process of meeting with personnel and collecting information, a number of initiatives were undertaken by the dean's office to address some new concerns and others that resurfaced. The following items have been pursued this past academic year:

> CAEP Accreditation (a recommendation was submitted to the university administration to allow the Lurie College to postpone its reaccreditation application date from 2018 to no sooner than the 2020-2021 academic year - - action is pending)
> Counselor Education (EDCO) Plan (this initiative was undertaken as a means to address enrollment, curriculum, student advising, and faculty issues)
> Educational Leadership (EDAD) Plan (revision of credential and master's program, development of new undergraduate minor in civic and community engagement, introduction of a GE course, and strategies for increasing enrollment)
> College RSCA Initiative (in response to Academic Affairs, the college faculty engaged in a planning process intended to increase research productivity,

stimulate innovation teaching, and embrace community and professional
service)
> Undergraduate Certification Programs in math (special education)/science/
> Developed an undergraduate minor in deaf education
> Doctor of Audiology (AuD) degree plan
> Joint undergraduate degree in social justice with the College of Applied Sciences
and Arts
> Professional Development Partnerships (an outreach initiative by the college to
create an ongoing working relationship with select schools, public/private
agencies, NGOs, and business entities)
> Agreements with the colleges of science and liberal arts to cooperate on a joint
venture offering an undergraduate credential in teaching special education
> Teacher Education Plan (implementation of the CalTPA summative assessment;
Integration of the revised TPEs)
> Inter-Professional Experience Project (interdisciplinary training for Lurie College
of Education students with College of Health and Human Sciences students)
> Child and Adolescent Development: Development of an undergraduate ITEP
program
> Redevelopment of the LPCC program
> Summer funding for curriculum, research, and advising projects
> Chairperson stability

Data Collection: Phases 1 and 2

The process of meeting with staff and faculty and reviewing an array of documents
produced an extensive list of themes, topics, concerns and recommendations. Given the
previously produced Welty report and the urgency expressed by university administrators
to move aggressively in capturing the most compelling strengths and opportunities that
would enhance the image and prominence of Lurie College, the Consultant opted to begin
by soliciting the best thinking of the staff and faculty. To get at the priorities and beyond
there were two phases to the process.

Phase 1

September - December, 2017   The bulk of the time was dedicated to
getting familiar with the organizational
structure of the college, meeting faculty
and staff, making connections with other
university administrative and service
offices, sitting in on department/

program/committee meetings, and consulting internal documents

Phase 2

January - April, 2018

This mostly entailed follow-up to some of the information that had been gathered in the first phase and new queries that surfaced. On numerous occasions meetings were requested with select faculty and staff as well as representatives from select university administrative units. Depending on the issue or question at hand, participants were asked to provide a brief "concept paper" to further elaborate on a particular idea.

In order to get at the "soul" or context of the college and the impact to its citizens (staff and faculty), the Consultant used a common set of questions. As opposed to asking every question, the Consultant selectively chose certain ones depending on the audience. Comments shared by the interviewees outside of the scope of the questions noted below were recorded and included as part of the information collected.

1. What do you consider to be the major strengths of the college?

2. What are the major distractions currently impacting the college?

3. What benefits do you believe can be reaped by participating in this initiative?

4. How compelling is this initiative to the success of the college?

5. What is your opinion of the college vision/mission statement?

6. To what extent is the college living up to its potential?

7. What are the college's greatest weaknesses?

8. In what ways can the college/department/program enhance your citizenship?

9. As a recently hired tenure track faculty member how has the college/department/program lived up to your expectations?

10. What have you found to be the most appealing and gratifying aspects of the college/department?

11. What aspects/practices of the college/department would you like to see addressed?

12. How would you describe the college/department support system relative to your teaching, research, and service?

13. In what ways is the college/department/program taking advantage of the technology, library, and community resources currently at its disposal?

14. How would you describe the relationship of the college/department/program to the school district and other entities in the community?

15. How would you describe the "market product" of the college/department/program?

16. In what ways is professional development an integral part of the daily life of the college?

17. What would you like to see accomplished/addressed by the college at the end of one year?

As part of the interview process, the Consultant kept track of the most common terms/descriptors used by the interviewees. The significance of such common use of terms has to do with the context to which they were applied. Inasmuch as there was frequency to their use, there was also a similar context overall. In addition, the majority of the descriptors used can be found in the college's vision and mission statement.

Diversity*	Scholarship	Professional*	Vision
Democracy	Pedagogy	Service	Alignment
Equity	Transformation	Values*	Appreciation
Excellence	Empowerment*	Collaboration	Citizenship
Leadership*	Technology	Trust	Reputation
Community	Morale*	Assessment	Respect
Accountability	Mentoring*	Transparency*	Stability
Respect	Stability	Connections*	Connections*

(*Ten most cited descriptors)

Revised Priorities

The use of the Q-sort method to the more than 200 pieces of qualitative data recorded by the Consultant produced five major priorities. The three original priorities introduced as the impetus for this review clearly opened the discourse for a more encompassing overview and perception of the college's state of affairs and potential. Specifically, the revised priorities and corresponding descriptors were determined to be:

1. Professional development and community relations

    The primary concern of this priority rested on the belief that although the college supported the professional development of faculty and staff, the depth and breadth of opportunities were narrow and limiting. The perception is that there is no long-term and sustained plan. It was often stated that different approaches to professional development should be encouraged to meet the diverse interests and needs of staff and faculty. A beginning point of departure is to inventory what all is in place and survey personnel PD needs and interests. Other comments suggested joint departmental endeavors and campus-wide collaborative efforts with other service units and academic departments. Lastly, it was noted that given the minimal involvement of the college in the surrounding community opportunities to actively engage external partners in professional development activities were in most cases limited. This latter point was considered to be crucial to the college's role and responsibility on issues of diversity, democracy, equity, and professional citizenship.

2. College climate

    There were many strong reactions to the presence of a prevailing negative and less than amicable personal and professional environment. Without any provocation or encouragement from the Consultant, a majority of the participants (staff and faculty) managed to express their dismay and frustration to what was often referred to as a distraction. This view was shared with the Consultant primarily in the first phase of the review process. In the second phase participants rarely made reference to the negative environment and instead many went out of their way to note that the interim dean and associate dean were "dealing" with climate issues and gaining the support of the staff and faculty. Much of this was attributed to a restored sense of leadership, respect, transparency, accountability and trust on behalf of the dean's office. Other comments were more in line with extending the interim dean's office staff the opportunity to rebuild aspects of the college that had been neglected. Although it was acknowledged that the college was moving in the right direction, the optimism expressed was with some calculated caution.

3. Branding and student success

Responses to the questions regarding the "product" of the college brought forth in many instances a pause and often comments that reflected a limited overview of the successes or points of pride. The most common response was that it was something to which they had not given much thought. Once pushed further, many of them opened up and shared interesting notions about certain aspects of the college and ideas on how to promote them within the university and local communities. More importantly, there was a sense that the college was not promoting itself in ways that captured or conveyed its unique professional culture in scholarship, service and pedagogy and expertise in the field of practice. Many of the respondents admitted they knew little about what was going on outside of their departments and personal research interests. Several of the respondents noted that there was little difference in the message to prospective students that separated them from any other recruiter in the geographic area or why SJSU held a competitive edge over others. Value-added reasons for making Lurie College the school of choice for graduate degrees and certification were not evident.

The service that received the most attention and positive reviews from the participants was the Student Success Center (SSC). Although in its first year of operation during this review, the prevailing feedback captured the following sentiments: improved credibility between Office of the Dean and faculty/staff; openness to diverse ideas for professional development/inservice training and tutoring; more opportunities to establish partnerships with other university support units (academic and service); liaison to UG majors (math, science, social justice, liberals arts, etc...); inclusion of services designed to meet the needs of certification/graduate degree students, and as a college outreach office to various groups and entities (schools, non-profits, public agencies,etc...) external to the university.

4. Research and assessment

This priority was one that drew the attention of most of the interviewees regardless of professorial rank. The concern here was not so much the amount of research or number of publications needed or required for promotion and/or tenure, but rather the issue of time. With the standard 4-4 teaching assignment for most of the tenured and tenure track faculty, making time during the week to be out in the field or processing and analyzing data in their offices is a challenge. Concern was also expressed that details on changes or revised interpretations of tenure/promotion requirements often are not systematically communicated. This issue was discussed at a college-wide meeting in January this academic year. The result was a college recommendation to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs in response to his request for a plan to implement RSCA. Throughout the interviews and group meeting discussions that encompassed research, there were occasional references to the state of the college's Tower development fund. A follow-up by the Consultant

revealed a surplus of discretionary Tower monies in addition to the availability of unencumbered college reserves. It is the Consultant's understanding that the college's RSCA proposal incorporates a co-funding plan that allows all faculty members to apply for a reduced semester course load.

The Lurie College is a complex and comprehensive entity that prepares specialized teachers and professionals. A centralized and managed system of data collection and maintenance would support college operations, accountability and accreditation, CSU program reporting requirements, research, recruitment and compatibility with the university's goals and values.

5. Communication

The responses this priority generated were mixed. On the one hand, faculty and staff members of the same departments seemed to be in agreement regarding internal communication. In some cases the information flow seemed to work well and appeared to be an integral part of the department's function. In other departments information flow was haphazard and attributed to frequent changes in leadership. Regarding the Office of the Dean, the comments shared in the second phase of the review were significantly different than the first phase. It was noted that information and announcements were often late or simply not sent. In the second phase, interviewees pointed out that the interim deans were addressing this problem by keeping the personnel informed via e-communiques, open meetings, attending department meetings and accepting requests for appointments from faculty and staff.

Additionally, the communication concern went further than just internal information flow matters. It was pointed out that the professional climate and related personnel incidences took front and center public stage. Professional contributions and achievements worthy of note to the academic and local communities were not properly acknowledged or recognized. The college does not have a designated media person and the university's media office, currently undergoing personnel changes, is a small operation with what appears to be a limited staff and service portfolio.

_____

Priorities	PD/CommRels	College Climate	Branding/ StdSuccess	Research/ Assessment	Communication

_____

Descriptors

Diversity	X	X	X	X	X
Values	X	X	X	X	X
Leadership	X	X	X	X	X
Transparency	X	X			X
Empowerment	X	X	X	X	X
Alignment	X	X	X		
Connections	X	X		X	X
Mentoring	X	X	X	X	
Professional	X	X	X	X	X
Morale	X	X	X		X

_____

(Distribution of most often used descriptors across revised priorities)

The intent of the table noted above is to provide a sense of the undergirding core principles, beliefs and significance that respondents attributed to the priorities. Five of the descriptors (diversity, values, leadership, empowerment, and professional) were represented across the five priorities. Two of the priorities (professional development/community relations and college climate) were cited across all ten of the descriptors and, indeed, were prominent in the feedback provided to the Consultant. Although not all of the descriptors and priorities fared equally in the feedback, the discussion and importance given to all them was substantive and constructive and, hence, merited inclusion in the table.

Limitations

Reviews of this nature usually engender more questions rather than provide prescriptive solutions. The role of the Consultant was to provoke and stimulate a serious discussion among the faculty and staff on the state and future of the college. Although this report is a blueprint of sorts, it is not intended to limit or stifle any discourse that may occur at a later

date. What is missing from this report is a detailed plan for implementation. This document should be used primarily to supplement and enhance the dialogue as the college considers its options. Decisions regarding who, what, why, when, and how can be better addressed under the leadership of the newly appointed incoming college dean.

In addition, there is the potential of unintended bias on behalf of the Consultant. Precautions were taken to avoid such and steps taken to assure that the assumptions or recommendations found within the report were based on compelling and consistent data provided by the interviewees and/or supported by documentation.

This review was conducted solely by the consultant who also was the only person privy to the data collected. Confidentiality was guaranteed to all participants and efforts taken to dispense with direct quotes or particular incidences in order not to inadvertently identify sources.

Summary

General Comments

> Consistently across the board, the mission and vision statements were considered to be adequate and not in need of any revisions (the review of the twelve CSU colleges of education statements were remarkably similar in content, language, and commitment to their constituent communities). It was stated on several occasions that the mission/vision statements had already been vetted by the faculty and there was no need to do so again. In fact, several of the departments and programs had revised their own mission/vision statements to make them compatible to the college's. Interestingly, the 10 most used descriptors were closely aligned with the vision and mission statement.

> Although there were still remnants of the challenges from the year before, the vast majority of persons interviewed expressed a sense of optimism (some more cautiously than others) that the college was on its way to recovery.

> All administrative unit representatives outside of the college who met with the consultant (research, library, e-Learning, and Tower Foundation) expressed a willingness to explore opportunities to work closer with the college.

> Much enthusiasm and support for the college was demonstrated by the vast majority of persons who participated in the process.

> A sense of urgency to move forward with great speed to that next level of academic and service excellence was noted.

> Judging from the content in my notes, Phase 2 was vastly different then Phase 1.

The second phase was more substantive and focused on the future of the college and a willingness to take greater risks.

BIO-SKETCH

for

JOSUE CRUZ, JR., PhD

CONSULTANT

Josue Cruz, Jr., is a former Dean of the College of Education and Human Development at Bowling Green State University in Ohio. Most recently he served a three-year term as Professor of Early Childhood Education and Accreditation Consultant to the College of Education, Sultan Qaboos University, Muscat, Oman. Prior to that assignment Josue' was the President/CEO of the Council for Professional Recognition in Washington, DC.

His professional career has afforded him to serve as a tenured faculty member at the University of Virginia, The Ohio State University and University of South Florida. Josue' received his PhD from the University of Wisconsin (Madison) where he was awarded a Ford Foundation Urban Education Fellowship. Later in his career he received a Fulbright Scholar appointment to study teacher education in India.

Throughout his professional career, Josue' has served the early education and public school communities in numerous capacities. He is a former President of the National Association of Young Children (NAEYC), advisory board member of Nick Jr. Magazine, and consultant to many public and private universities and foundations. On two occasions he served as President of his children's local elementary and high school PTAs. Additionally, Josue's professional interests in early education, curriculum development and accreditation have taken him to Central America, Caribbean, Middle East and Europe. He currently resides in the Tampa Bay area.