



**Commission on Teacher Credentialing Biennial Report
Academic Years 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-2013**

Institution	San José State University
Date report is submitted	
Program documented in this report	
Name of Program	Educational Leadership
Please identify all delivery options through which this program is offered (Traditional, Intern, Other)	Traditional, Hybrid/Online
Credential awarded	Master of Arts in Education: Administration and Supervision
Is this program offered at more than one site? Yes	
If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered	San José State University, Sobrato Center
Program Contact	Lisa Oliver, Ph.D.
Title	Interim Chair
Phone #	(408) 924-3619
E-Mail	lisa.oliver@sjsu.edu
If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:	
Name	Rebeca Burciaga, Ph.D.
Title	Assistant Professor
Phone #	(408) 924-3644
E-mail	rebeca.burciaga@sjsu.edu

PART I – Contextual Information

The Connie L. Lurie College of Education

San José State University is a major, comprehensive public university located in the center of San José and in the heart of Silicon Valley. SJSU is the oldest state university in California. Among its most prized traditions is an uncompromising commitment to offer access to higher education to all persons who meet the criteria for admission, yielding a stimulating mix of age groups, cultures, and economic backgrounds for teaching, learning, and research.

As one of the seven colleges at the University, The Connie L. Lurie College of Education has been preparing the majority of the teachers, administrators, and counselors who serve throughout Silicon Valley and the South Bay area for over a century and a half. We offer credential and graduate programs that prepare teachers, administrators, and counselors for K-12 settings. We also offer undergraduate and graduate degrees in Child and Adolescent Development and Communicative Disorders and Speech Pathology.

The Lurie College of Education has a long history of close collaborative partnerships with the region's schools and social service providers. Although the majority of our students gain their experiences in Silicon Valley schools and clinics, our programs also reach students as far north as the Oregon border and as far south as the Monterey Peninsula.

We make extensive use of new technologies, many developed in the Silicon Valley, to offer quality education to students in all of our programs. Our goal is to prepare teachers, counselors, administrators and other service providers who are knowledgeable about and adept at using new technologies to educate their students and serve their clients.

Educational Leadership

Master of Arts in Education: Administration and Supervision prepares candidates whose future career goals include leadership within an educational organization, including the principalship, district and county leadership, teacher leadership and mentoring, curriculum development, and the superintendency. The master's degree program includes the Preliminary Administrative Services credential (Tier 1); these can be completed concurrently. We do not currently have any Professional Services Credential students (Tier 2). The program coursework is focused on five themes:

1. Leadership Concepts and Management Strategies;
2. The Role of Schooling in a Democratic Society;
3. Building Equity in Diverse Communities;
4. Facilitating Collaborative Change; and
5. Inquiry, Research, Learning, and Reflective Practice.

Table 1: Educational Leadership Program Candidate Information
--

Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for three years reported						
	2010- 2011		2011-2012		2012- 2013	
Site Delivery Option	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates
San José State University Connie L. Lurie College of Education	187	124	150	91	124	59

Educational Leadership Program

Since the Spring 2011 NCATE/CTC site visit, the Department of Educational Leadership has made the following changes:

1. Administrative fieldwork has expanded from a two-semester to a four-semester model.
2. Aligned the timing of administrative fieldwork practice with content courses.
3. Changed delivery model of 7 courses to a hybrid online/in-person format.
4. Changed delivery method of courses that were taught in tandem (e.g. 205/206, 203/204, and 200/201 were changed to six separate courses – most are now hybrid).
5. Implementation of the College-Wide Diversity Assessment.
6. Research seminars on instructional leadership have been revised
7. Strengthening of cultural competency assignments in all courses.
8. Co-hosted 2 national webinars on Latina/o Education in the U.S.
9. Chair of Department stepped down from position in the Spring of 2012.
10. Temporary Department Chair, Dr. Carol Reade (2011-2012)
11. Temporary Department Chair, Dr. Lisa Oliver (2013 -)
12. One failed faculty search (2011-2012)
13. New faculty hire (Began Fall 2013)
14. Loss of 2 tenure-track faculty members.
15. Former Chair has entered the Faculty Early Retirement Program.
16. Assessment Coordinator took Family Medical Leave 2012-2013 (25% - 50%)
17. Online assessment system changed twice - from Waypoint I (2010-2011) to Waypoint II (2011-2012, 2012-2013). We began using Taskstream in the Fall of 2013

PART II – Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

Table 2: Overview of Key Assessments

Candidate Competency

Instrument	Description	Data Collection	Use
Cultural/Racial Autobiography (pre) (EDAD 201)	Rubric measuring a reflection on growth in personal influences on leadership approaches, noting connections among research and	As a reflection piece completed in the first semester, 1 st year of the program.	CTC 3 CPSEL 1 CPSEL 2
Cultural/Racial Autobiography (post) (EDAD 206)	Rubric measuring a reflection on growth in personal influences on leadership approaches, noting connections among research and	As a reflection piece completed in the last semester, 2 nd year of the program.	CPSEL 6
Equity Focused Challenge (EDAD 200)	Rubric measuring a personal assessment of candidate's own actions and how they could be improved, noting connections among research and instruction.	A personal assessment completed in the first semester of the program.	CTC 3 CPSEL 1 CPSEL 2

Philosophy/Vision of Education (EDAD 202)	Rubric measuring a reflection of how leadership is shaped by philosophy of education, noting connections to educational practitioners and theorists.	A reflection completed in the second semester of the first year.	CTC 10 CTC 12 CTC 3 CTC 6
Research Literature Review (EDAD 221)	Rubric measuring a review of research literature informed by research focus and foundational as well as new research in the field.	A review of the leadership research – a culminating project ending the second semester of their first year.	CTC 3 CTC 6 CPSEL 2
Professional Development Plan (EDAD 203)	Rubric measuring a candidate's demonstration of how research, practice and theory inform data-driven leadership strategies for student and school improvement.	A plan and reflection due the first semester of the second year.	CTC 3 CTC 6 CPSEL 2 CPSEL 5 CPSEL 6
Coherence in School Focus (EDAD 205)	Rubric measuring a candidate's comparison and analysis of vision (language) and practice as related to school leadership.	An analysis due in the second semester of the candidates' second year.	CPSEL 6

Educational Leadership Portfolio (EDAD 242)	A portfolio of administrative practice, reflections, and research over the course of two years.	Due in the second semester of their second year.	CPSEL 1 CTC 14 CTC 4 CTC 6c
<i>Program Effectiveness</i>			
Instrument	Description	Data Collection	Use
Student evaluations of the Educational Leadership Program	Program evaluation – This is a required, confidential, essay required of each candidate.	Essay – assigned and collected (without names) by the Fieldwork Supervision faculty and given to the department chair at the end of each candidate’s last semester.	Curricular and pedagogical improvement
Advisory Board	Alumni, administrators from surrounding school districts, and faculty meet each semester for discussion.	Informal feedback provided regarding candidate recruitment, instructional methods, and alumni.	Feedback is utilized and changes made accordingly.

Data Tables

Table 3: Student Competency

		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2103	
		Fall 2010	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013
EDAD-CCTC-3	Mean Score	3.91	n/a	2.8	3.4	3.6	3.2
	N	36	n/a	95	109	98	68
	Std. dev.	0.55	n/a	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.9
EDAD-CCTC-4	Mean Score	3.91	3.47	3.1	3.4	3.7	2.9
	N	36	38.00	95	109	98	68
	Std. dev.	0.55	0.51	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.9
EDAD-CCTC-5	Mean Score	3.91	n/a	3.1	3.4	3.7	2.9
	N	36	n/a	95	109	98	68
	Std. dev.	0.55	n/a	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.9
EDAD-CCTC-6	Mean Score	3.91	3.47	3.2	assessed in fall	3.6	assessed in fall
	N	36	38.00	95	assessed in fall	98	assessed in fall
	Std. dev.	0.55	0.51	0.6	assessed in fall	0.6	assessed in fall
EDAD-CCTC-10	Mean Score	3.91	n/a	3.3	3.5	n/a	3.5
	N	36	n/a	89	51	n/a	32
	Std. dev.	0.55	n/a	0.6	0.5	n/a	0.6
EDAD-CCTC-11	Mean Score	3.91	assessed in fall	3.4	n/a	n/a	n/a
	N	36	assessed in fall	47	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Std. dev.	0.55	assessed in fall	0.8	n/a	n/a	n/a
EDAD-CCTC-12	Mean Score	3.91	assessed in fall	3	assessed in fall	3.7	assessed in fall
	N	36	assessed in fall	95	assessed in fall	98	assessed in fall
	Std. dev.	0.55	assessed in fall	0.4	assessed in fall	0.5	assessed in fall

EDAD-CCTC-13	Mean Score	3.82	3.45	3.1	n/a	3.7	3.7
	N	87	20	95	n/a	98	39
	Std. dev.	0.5	0.6	0.6	n/a	0.5	0.7
EDAD-CCTC-14	Mean Score	n/a	3.75	2.9	assessed in fall	3.7	assessed in fall
	N	n/a	38.00	95	assessed in fall	98	assessed in fall
	Std. dev.	n/a	0.44	0.7	assessed in fall	0.6	assessed in fall
EDAD-CCTC-15	Mean Score	n/a	n/a	3.1	assessed in fall	3.7	assessed in fall
	N	n/a	n/a	95	assessed in fall	98	assessed in fall
	Std. dev.	n/a	n/a	0.6	assessed in fall	0.6	assessed in fall

Table 4: California Professional Standards for Educational Leadership

		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2103	
		Fall 2010	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013
EDAD-CPSEL-1	Mean Score	3.91	3.57	3.1	3.5	3.4	3.2
	N	36	46.00	89	31	41	59
	Std. dev.	0.55	0.50	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5
EDAD-CPSEL-2	Mean Score	n/a	2.67	3.1	3.5	3.7	3.3
	N	n/a	9.00	95	31	98	21
	Std. dev.	n/a	0.50	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5
EDAD-CPSEL-3	Mean Score	n/a	2.67	3.1	3.6	3.7	3.2
	N	n/a	9.00	95	31	98	59
	Std. dev.	n/a	0.71	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5
EDAD-CPSEL-4	Mean Score	n/a	3.00	3.1	3.6	3.7	3.6
	N	n/a	9.00	95	31	98	52
	Std. dev.	n/a	0.00	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.7
EDAD-CPSEL-5	Mean Score	n/a	2.78	2.8	3.6	3.8	3.6
	N	n/a	9.00	95	31	57	53
	Std. dev.	n/a	0.44	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.7
EDAD-CPSEL-6	Mean Score	n/a	2.67	3.1	3.6	3.8	3.5
	N	n/a	9.00	95	31	98	91
	Std. dev.	n/a	0.50	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.6

Table 5: Student Open-ended Student Evaluations of the Educational Leadership Program

Strengths of Program: Top 5 themes from 2012-2013

1	Curriculum/meaningful assignments from class; engaging and thoughtful, including fieldwork opportunities
2	Exceptional instructors; approachable, offers practical solutions, wonderful mentors, valuable personal experiences shared.
3	Face-to-face discussions, collaboration and networking opportunities.
4	Gained foundational tools needed to be a successful educational leader; expanded knowledge of educational leadership.
5	Equity and social justice foundation in program; rich theoretical framework.

Areas of Growth: Top 4 themes from 2012-2013

1	Better communication between program and course requirements, graduation requirements, and processes between administration/faculty and students.
2	Disappointment about mid-program shift in course offerings (from traditional face-to-face to hybrid). Hybrid format reduces opportunities for collaborative reflective experiences.
3	Improve consistency between faculty with respect to grading policies, attendance policies, and expectations for assignments. Hold high expectations for all students in all classes.
4	Need for a research course in the 1 st semester of program: to become familiar with reading research and APA format for Master's Research Project.

Modifications:

- Recalibration reduced from each semester to annually (2011)

Strength:

A) Candidate Competence

CPSEL Standards: Quantitative

1. Fall 2011/Fall 2012: Students have demonstrated improvement in all CPSELs. We believe that some of this improvement is due to improving signature assignments and classroom activities in each Fall course (Fall 2011 and Fall 2012)

CTC Standards: Quantitative

Slight restructuring of a few of assessment strategies yielded the following improvements:

1. CTC 3: 2.8 to 3.6
2. CTC 4: 3.1 to 3.7
3. CTC 5: 3.1 to 3.7
4. CTC 6: 3.2 to 3.6
5. CTC 12: 3.0 – 3.7
6. CTC 14: 2.9 – 3.7
7. CTC 15: 3.1 to 3.7

B) Program Effectiveness:

CPSEL Standards: Quantitative

1. Since Fall 2011, we have made general improvements to our assessment system for measuring CPSEL standards (including signature assignments, rubrics, and alignment).

Student Assessment: Qualitative

Among the top 5 themes in the Student Evaluations of the Educational Leadership Program were as follows:

1. Students felt the curriculum (including fieldwork opportunities) had meaningful assignments and were engaging and thoughtful.
1. Students felt instructors were approachable, offered practical solutions, served as good mentors and shared valuable personal experiences.
2. Students appreciated face-to-face discussions, collaboration, and networking opportunities.
3. Gained foundational tools needed to be a successful educational leader; expanded knowledge of educational leadership.
4. Equity and social justice foundation in program; rich theoretical framework.

Areas for Improvement:

A) Candidate Competence

CPSEL Standards:

2. Since Fall 2011, we have made general improvements to our assessment system for measuring CPSEL standards (including signature assignments, rubrics, and alignment).

CTC Standards:

1. CTC 10 Stayed the same 3.5 to 3.5 – changed assessment to Spring only
2. CTC 11: missing data

Student Assessment

1. Our current student assessment is not as effective as we would like it to be. We are currently working to develop a more efficient survey for our candidates in our department in conjunction with the Lurie College.

Quantitative Assessment

CPSEL:

1. Spring 2012/Spring 2013: No growth (e.g. CPSEL 4) or slight decline (e.g. CPSEL 1). in mean score.

B) Program Effectiveness

CTC Standards

1. Our Department has faced significant staffing challenges over the past few years (see Part I: Changes to Department). As a result, our assessment system has not improved as quickly as we would have preferred. While the majority of our rubrics and signature assignments to measure standards have improved, we struggled with the following:
 - a. Not all instructors (e.g. part-time adjuncts) were entering assessment data, despite reminders
 - i. With Taskstream, as a department it can be efficiently noted who has entered data and who has not. In the previous systems, we had to consult with the College data analyst – another position that underwent significant transition – who could not provide the list of incomplete assessment entries until too late.
 - b. Assessment data was entered at the end of the semester
 - i. As part of our regular assessment discussions at faculty meetings, we are working on a timeline for data entry and subsequent discussions for data-driven changes to the program.
 - c. Mis-alignment of standards (e.g. until Fall 2011, multiple standards were tied to one element). In many cases, this was due to courses that were offered in tandem (e.g. 205/206, 200/201 and 203/204).
 - i. This was especially a challenge (re: data output) when Year 1 students were assessed on a rubric/standard that was assessed concurrently with a Year 2 rubric/standard. Aside from realignment and changes we made to remedy this, we should also be able to isolate standards,

- rubrics, and courses more efficiently in Taskstream.
- ii. We also now offer courses individually instead of stacked/tandem.
- d. Missing standards
 - i. We have recently engaged in a walkthrough of each standard to ensure they aligned with *all* signature assignments.
- e. Inconsistent alignment of standards in Waypoint for the following standards: CTC 10, 11, 13 (2011-2012 and 2012-2013)
 - i. These have since been realigned
- 2. As a result of incomplete dataset and in lieu of changing CTC standards, we took this opportunity to improve signature assignments in each course.
- 3. Here are some ways we have already improved our assessment system:
 - a. Revision of assessment rubrics to accompany revised signature assignments.
 - b. Re-alignment of all rubrics (some new) with all standards. These new alignments will be included in all syllabi.
 - c. Assigned a point-person (not Assessment coordinator) to facilitate updates with new Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program Standards proposed by CTC.
 - d. Beginning Fall 2013, all students will be assessed on each standard twice to capture formative growth, not just summative as previously measured.

Due to a series of transitions in our Department, we have experienced some inconsistencies with respect to data collection – since fall of 2013, with the support of the Lurie College we have accomplished the following:

Based upon analysis of quantitative data

1. Established a bi-monthly assessment coordinators' working group;
2. Incorporated assessment into every department meeting; and
3. Created shared ownership of signature assignment rubrics between the department and the instructor to help with buy-in.

Based upon qualitative feedback given within the Student Program Evaluations,

1. students are now assigned to the same university supervisor for all 4 semesters in the program for consistency;
 - Program and/or Common Standard(s) → CTC 12, CTC 13
2. we have established time during every faculty meeting to review assignments, grading expectations, consistency of coursework, and the establishment of committees outside of department meetings to foster faculty collaboration.
 - Program and/or Common Standard(s) → CPSEL 1-6
3. the department's curriculum committee has met to discuss and develop a plan of action for a minor course change for the research course sequence so that coursework begins during the first semester in the program, continues for 2 more semesters, then culminates in semester 4 with the students working with the advisor to complete a thesis project. So, students will be engaged for all 4 semesters. The department will submit minor course changes by December 2013 so that the revised research course sequence will be effective and in place Fall 2014;
 - Program and/or Common Standard(s) → CTC 1
4. faculty engaged in a meaningful reflective discussion of curriculum, rubrics, and standards. As a result, each of these areas have made improvements that address curricular, pedagogical, and assessment-related concerns;
 - Program and/or Common Standard(s) → CTC 1
5. hybrid courses are being examined so that students continue to have collaborative opportunities and the ability to learn and network with classmates while maximizing face-to-face time with students. This includes piloting hybrid courses with different meeting schedules; and
 - Program and/or Common Standard(s) → CTC 1
6. the department will continue to foster the current equity and social justice focus, and theoretical framework.
 - Program and/or Common Standard(s) → CTC