

2014 Unit Improvement Plan

Summary of Achievement, 09/25/2016

Objectives Adopted November 14, 2014
Based on 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Data
Unit Level Analysis of Unit Assessment Outcomes (UAOs)

1. Unit Objective 14.1

For UAO 1, to bring the Unit to Target, develop program-specific plans to increase the number of Unit exiting candidates who consider themselves to be “well” or “adequately” prepared to provide services that help children who receive special education services.

_____ By end of the 2015-2016 academic year

*** **How did we do?** There is good news here. The 2015 and 2016 Exit Surveys of Candidates showed improved scores. In both years, 75% of all exiting candidates considered themselves to be “well” or “adequately” prepared to provide services that help children who receive special education services (10% improvement over the 2014 results). In the 2014-2015, and 2015-2016, all programs focused on improving in this area. Improving the ability of our completers to work effectively with students with special needs was a priority during our Accreditation team meetings during 2014-2015.

2. Unit Objective 14.2

For UAO 8, to maintain the Unit at the Target Level, continue the two components of Unit faculty development: financial support for faculty and the eLearning Initiative.

_____ By the end of the 2015-2016 academic year

***** How did we do?** The results are mixed here. On the positive side, the all tenure and tenure track faculty in the Unit working out of the College of Education and Allied Studies continued to receive \$1500/year to travel to academic conferences. Unit faculty in the Speech/Language Pathology Program (College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences) are eligible for a similar level of support. The eLearning Initiative was discontinued for several reasons, primarily the high level of support in computer-based learning offered at the University level, especially the Office of Faculty Development.

3. Unit Objective 14.3

For UAO 5, to maintain the Unit at the Target Level, determine the Unit’s continued participation in the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP); and either begin CAEP Continuous Improvement process (continue), or develop program impact data gathering process (discontinue).

***** How did we do?** A final decision on CAEP was delayed because of ongoing negotiations between the CTC and CAEP. In the Spring of 2016, the final agreement between CTC and CAEP was reached. Our ongoing review of the cost/benefits of CAEP membership led to the unanimous conclusion among Unit faculty and administrators that we should discontinue CAEP membership. On April 18, 2016, the President of Cal State East Bay (Leroy Morishita) notified CAEP that we were withdrawing from CAEP.

At the same time, CTC was revising the Common Standards. The final draft includes a Common Standard (5) on Program Impact. We await further direction from the CTC on what specific data sources we need to collect. However, we have already implemented each of the following:

(1) Expanded surveys of Program Completers. A database of program completers, including home emails, is compiled every year. We completed our first email survey of our Spring 2015 completers in Winter of 2016. The response rate was good for a program completer survey, 180 completers responded (30%), which far exceeds the number of responses among completers in the annual surveys by CSU’s Center for Teacher Quality. Our 2016 graduates will be surveyed in the Fall of 2016 and our 2015 graduates will receive our Second Year Survey at the same time. Our current plan is for telephone surveys of some 2015 graduates.

(2) Collection of Honors and Awards. We have developed a collection of awards and honors received by our graduates (e.g., County Teacher of the Year, job promotions, etc.), which provide anecdotal evidence of impact of our graduates.