



**Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report
Academic Years 07-08 and 08-09**

Institution: California State University, Long Beach

Date report is submitted: Fall 2009

Date of last Site Visit: Spring 2007

Program documented in this report: Single Subject Credential Program

Name of Program: Single Subject Credential Program

Credential awarded: Preliminary Single Subject Credential

Is this program offered at more than one site? No

Program Contact: Dr. Karen Hakim-Butt

Phone #: 562-596-7959

E-Mail: kbutt@csulb.edu

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

I. Contextual Information

The Single Subject Credential Program (SSCP) rests on the bedrock principle clarified by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF, 1996, p.5): *What teachers know and can do makes the crucial difference in what children learn*. Building on this core principle, the program has as its overarching purpose the preparation of high quality beginning teachers who possess the knowledge, aptitudes and dispositions that will enable them to provide the conditions for meaningful, substantive and sequential learning for all students so that they can become active citizens in a democratic, increasingly global, technology-driven society.

The SSCP has three components: subject matter preparation, professional pedagogical preparation, and student teaching. The program has 11 Commission-approved subject matter programs: Art, English, Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS), Health Science (HCS), Industrial and Technology Education (ITE) Languages Other Than English (LOTE), Mathematics, Music, Physical Education, Science and Social Science. Subject matter programs vary in length from 35 to 75 units, and are essentially undergraduate majors. Professional preparation is accomplished through a 45-unit set of courses, with 27 units dedicated to foundational and pedagogical preparation and 18 units associated with the culminating student teaching experience. The program offers an Internship track within the same structure and unit load.

The SSCP is a university-wide program. As such it has a shared governance structure among the eleven constituent subject matter programs (housed in five colleges: Arts, Engineering, Health and Human Services, Liberal Arts and Natural Sciences and Mathematics) and the University Coordinator (based in the College of Education). The University Coordinator reports to the Dean of the College of Education. A Credential Coordinator and/or a Credential Advisor is responsible for each of the subject matter programs. Each subject matter program has a committee of faculty that, among other responsibilities, determines subject matter program policy and reviews applications to the program.

All courses in the professional education sequence integrate course activities and structured fieldwork. Fieldwork is designed to give candidates a variety of experiences in contemporary classrooms ranging from back-of-the-class observation through case studies and mini ethnographies to whole class teaching. Course activities and field experiences are closely tied to the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). The Teaching Performance Expectations serve as the SSCP student learning outcomes.

Table 1
Program Student Learning Outcomes and Relevant Standards

SLOs	Outcome 1: Makes subject matter comprehensible to students	Outcome 2: Assesses student learning	Outcome 3: Engages and supports all students in learning	Outcome 4: Plans instruction and designs learning experiences for all students	Outcome 5: Creates and maintains an effective environment for student learning	Outcome 6: Develops as a professional educator
Signature Assignment(s)	Teaching lesson, Course grade, TPA 1	Course grade, TPA 3	Lesson plans, Course grade, TPA 1-3	Curriculum unit map, Course grade, TPA 1-3	Demographic paper, Course grade	Reflective paper, Course grade, TPA 1-3
State Standards	Makes subject matter comprehensible to students	Assesses student learning	Engages and supports all students in learning	Plans instruction and designs learning experiences for all students	Creates and maintains an effective environment for student learning	Develops as a professional educator
Conceptual Framework	Promotes Growth	Research and Evaluation	Promotes Growth	Promotes Growth, Service and Collaboration	School Improvement, Values Diversity	Values Diversity, Research and Evaluation, School Improvement
NCATE Elements	Content Knowledge	Student Learning	Pedagogical Content Knowledge	Professional Knowledge & Skills	Professional Knowledge & Skills	Professional Dispositions

Program enrollment is determined by comparing candidates admitted over the previous 7 years with candidates who have yet to complete the program. There are approximately 1,542 current candidates who are in various stages of the program. This number may be slightly inflated. Since candidates do not necessarily inform us if they choose to withdraw from the program and consequently show up as active in the program even though they have drifted away and have not completed the program or officially withdrawn. In 2008-2009, the SSCP admitted 489 students to the program. During the same time, 320 students were enrolled in the culminating experience, student teaching. The remaining students are completing the professional preparation coursework.

Table 2
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2007-2009 (snapshots taken Fall 2008 and Summer 2009)

	Transition Point 1 Admission to Program					
	2007-2008			2008-2009		
	Applied	Accepted	Matriculated	Applied	Accepted	Matriculated
TOTAL	485	485	na	489	489	na

Table 3
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2007-2009 (snapshots taken Fall 2008 and Summer 2009)

	Transition Point 2 Advancement to Culminating Experience	
	2007-08¹	2008-09²
Single Subject Student Teaching	385	320

Table 4
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2007-2009 (snapshots taken Fall 2008 and Summer 2009)

	Transition Point 3 Exit	
	2007-2008	2008-2009
Credential³	363	329

¹ Data are reported for Fall 2007 and Spring 2008.

² Data are reported for Summer 2008 through Spring 2009.

³ Data for Initial and Advanced Credential Programs reflects students who have filed for their credential with the Credential Office. These data generally include students who have completed the program one or more years prior to filing their credential request, particularly related to the advanced credential programs. Data are reported for Summer 2007 through Spring 2009.

For university budget purposes the Single Subject Credential Program has a single faculty, the University Coordinator. Subject matter program advisors, teaching faculty, and the student teaching supervisors are members of the colleges and departments housing the subject matter programs and the Department of Teacher Education. They are “loaned” to the Single Subject Program. Table 5 displays the 07-08 profile of these faculty.

Table 5
Faculty Profile 2007-2009

Status	2007-2008	2008-2009
Full-time TT/Lecturer	28	26
Part-time Lecturer	96	94
Total:	124	120

II. Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

a) Primary candidate assessment(s) the program used up to and through recommending the candidate for a credential

Prior to Fall 2008, the SSCP used one signature assignment (pre/post assessment for SLO 2), the CalTPA and the TPE (through the student teaching evaluations) to analyze candidate performance data. Signature assignments for each SLO were chosen by the SSCP faculty in spring 2008 and implemented in fall 2008. The only signature assignment that was in existence for spring 2008 was the pre/post assessment completed by SSCP candidates in EDSS 473, assessing SLO 2, Assessing Student Learning.

Table 6 summarizes the six student learning outcomes (SLOs) and the signature assignments and CalTPAs used to assess them.

Table 6
Program Student Learning Outcomes and Signature Assignments

Student Learning Outcomes	Signature Assignment(s)	Description of the Assignment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLO 1: Makes subject matter comprehensible to students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EDSS 450: Teaching Lesson Teacher Performance Assessment (CalTPA) 1 and 4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EDSS 450 Teaching Lesson Assignment: The purpose of this assignment is to demonstrate that the candidate has the ability to make subject matter comprehensible to students. This is an in-class assessment in which students teach a 15-minute component/section of a lesson to their peers. The lesson is drawn from the unit plan the candidate is developing. CalTPA 1 assesses candidates knowledge of subject specific pedagogy CalTPA 4 is the culminating experience which assesses candidates ability to reflect on their teaching
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLO 2: Assesses student learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EDSS 473: Pre-Post Assignment Teacher Performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EDSS 473 Pre-Post Assignment: The purpose of this assignment is to access candidates' ability to develop a lesson that includes a pre/post assessment appropriate to the demographics of the class and to interpret/analyze data and then formulate an action / intervention plan to re-teach lesson. The assignment is given in the student

Student Learning Outcomes	Signature Assignment(s)	Description of the Assignment
	Assessment (CalTPA) 3 and 4	<p>teaching seminar and candidates carry out the assignment during their student teaching experience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CalTPA 3 assesses candidates knowledge of assessing learning • CalTPA 4 is the culminating experience which assesses candidates ability to reflect on their teaching
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLO 3: Engages and supports all students in learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDSE 457: Lesson Plans • Teacher Performance Assessment (CalTPA) 1-4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDSE 457 Lesson Plan Assignment: The purpose of this assignment is for candidates to demonstrate proficiency at engaging and supporting all students. This is a take-home assignment. Candidates are responsible for developing 5 content specific lessons that include: a SDAIE lesson plan demonstrating differentiating for ELLs; a lesson plan focusing on vocabulary instruction; a lesson focusing on writing to learn in the content area; a lesson stressing levels of comprehension; and a lesson incorporating B-D-A strategies. • CalTPA 1 assesses candidates knowledge of subject specific pedagogy • CalTPA 2 assesses candidates knowledge of designing learning • CalTPA 3 assesses candidates knowledge of assessing learning • CalTPA 4 is the culminating experience which assesses candidates ability to reflect on their teaching
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLO 4: Plans instruction and designs learning experiences for all students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDSE 436: Curriculum Unit Map • Teacher Performance Assessment (CalTPA) 1-4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDSE 436 Curriculum Unit Map: The purpose of this take-home assignment is for candidates to develop learning experiences for all students. Candidates are expected to: select a developmentally appropriate four to six-week state-adopted academic content standard curriculum unit map; plan instruction, including adaptations for a student with a special education need and an English language learner; and develop a formative or summative assessment that is directly aligned to the content standards and unit goals with differentiation for a student with a special education need and an English language learner. • CalTPA 1 assesses candidates knowledge of subject specific pedagogy • CalTPA 2 assesses candidates knowledge of designing learning • CalTPA 3 assesses candidates knowledge of assessing learning • CalTPA 4 is the culminating experience which assesses candidates ability to reflect on their teaching
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLO 5: Creates and maintains an effective environment for student learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDSE 435: Demographic Paper 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDSE 435 Demographic paper assignment: The purpose of this take-home assignment is to: observe and interpret democratic practices and multiculturalism of a school and classroom; demonstrate an understanding of various perspectives on culture and diversity in educational contexts; and recognize the impact of migration and immigration on teaching and learning in secondary schools. Candidates are responsible for fulfilling a 15-hour field mini demographic study of the school and classroom to analyze and assess the effectiveness of the environment for student learning, culminating in a final report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLO 6: Develops as a professional educator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDSS 300: Reflective Paper • Teacher Performance Assessment 1-4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDSS 300 Reflective paper: The purpose of this assignment is for candidates to begin developing as professional educators by reflecting on professional competencies they observed during their early 45-hour field experience in the schools. This is a take-home assignment with specific prompts related to identifying, describing and explaining what is done in conjunction with their field-work. • CalTPA 1 assesses candidates knowledge of subject specific pedagogy • CalTPA 2 assesses candidates knowledge of designing learning • CalTPA 3 assesses candidates knowledge of assessing learning

Student Learning Outcomes	Signature Assignment(s)	Description of the Assignment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CalTPA 4 is the culminating experience which assesses candidates ability to reflect on their teaching

Table 7 presents signature assignment data for 2007-09.

Table 7
Signature Assignment Data for 2007-2009

CalTPA Task	Semester	Score 1 or 2 (not passing)	Score 3 or 4 (passing)	Total
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLO 1: Makes subject matter comprehensible to students. EDSS 450: Teaching Lesson 	Fall 2007	NA	NA	
	Spring 2008	NA	NA	
	Fall 2008	7 %, n = 15	93 %, n = 189	204
	Spring 2009	7 %, n = 17	93 %, n = 217	234
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLO 2: Assesses student learning. EDSS 473: Pre-Post Assignment 	Fall 2007	NA	NA	
	Spring 2008	18 %, n= 14	82 %, n= 77	91
	Fall 2008	11 %, n = 18	89 %, n = 142	160
	Spring 2009	18 %, n = 26	82 %, n = 115	141
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLO 3: Engages and supports all students in learning. EDSE 457: Lesson Plans 	Fall 2007	NA	NA	
	Spring 2008	NA	NA	
	Fall 2008	14%, n = 24	86%, n = 152	176
	Spring 2009	6 %, n = 11	94 %, n = 170	181
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLO 4: Plans instruction and designs learning experiences for all students. EDSE 436: Curriculum Unit Map 	Fall 2007	NA	NA	
	Spring 2008	NA	NA	
	Fall 2008	10 %, n = 20	90%, n = 176	196
	Spring 2009	8%, n = 16	92 %, n = 195	211
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLO 5: Creates and maintains an effective environment for student learning. EDSE 435: Demographic Paper 	Fall 2007	NA	NA	
	Spring 2008	NA	NA	
	Fall 2008	12%, n = 20	88%, n = 152	172
	Spring 2009	4 %, n = 7	96 %, n = 180	187
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLO 6: Develops as a professional educator. EDSS 300: Reflective Paper 	Fall 2007	NA	NA	
	Spring 2008	NA	NA	
	Fall 2008	9%, n = 21	91%, n = 220	241
	Spring 2009	16 %, n = 41	84 %, n = 213	254

The CalTPA is a series of four tasks that assess student competence as classroom teachers. Each CalTPA is tied to multiple TPEs. During the 2007-2008 academic year, CalTPAs were completed by candidates throughout the SSCP as a low-stakes course assignment. Although all instructors used the state designed rubric, during the 2007-2008 academic year not all instructors were calibrated in its use. Additionally, since it was a low-stakes assignment, instructors used the assignment in different ways: Some instructors provided feedback and allowed rewrites while others gave only summative feedback and did not allow rewrites. During the 2007-2008 academic year only the 4 core subject approved CalTPA Task 1's were available. The 6 instructors for the other subjects developed their own TPA-like assignments. Since the CalTPAs went high stakes July 1, 2008, all instructors have been calibrated in scoring the CalTPAs and the CalTPAs are being used as high-stakes assessments for all students who were admitted to the SSCP after July 1, 2008.

Table 8
CalTPA Data for 2007-2009

CalTPA Task	Semester	Score 1 or 2 (not passing)	Score 3 or 4 (passing)	Total
1. Subject Specific Pedagogy	Fall 2007	7% n=18	93% n=237	225
	Spring 2008	5% n=12	95% n=215	227
	Fall 2008	25%, n = 1	75%, n = 3	4
	Spring 2009	16%, n = 10	84%, n = 54	64
2. Designing Instruction	Fall 2007	25% n=26	75% n=117	155
	Spring 2008	25% n=44	75% n=131	175
	Fall 2008	30 %, n = 3	70 %, n = 7	10
	Spring 2009	16%, n = 20	84%, n = 106	126
3. Assessing Learning	Fall 2007	13% n=26	87% n=167	193
	Spring 2008	29% n=57	71% n=142	199
	Fall 2008	n = 0	n = 0	0
	Spring 2009	0%, n = 0	100%, n = 3	3
4. Culminating Teaching Experience	Fall 2007	14% n=21	85% n=126	147
	Spring 2008	15% n=29	85% n=166	195
	Fall 2008	n = 0	n = 0	0
	Spring 2009	0%, n = 0	100%, n = 3	3

Note – The large drop in non-passing scores for TPA 3 between fall 2007 and spring 2008 may be explained by the fact that we used this TPA as a pilot for high stakes and the assignment did not count it as part of the class grade. We believe students may have been less motivated to do well.

Note – The large drop in numbers of students taking the TPAs from 07-08 to 08-09 may be explained by the fact that prior to the TPA going high-stakes, all program students took the TPA as a low stakes assignment for their classes. After July 1, 2008, only high-stakes students took the TPA.

b) What additional information about candidate and program completer performance or program effectiveness is collected and analyzed that informs programmatic decision making?

Table 9
Summary of Single Subject Evaluation & Data Collection & Analysis

	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	Spring 2010	Fall 2010	Spring 2011
Course Evaluations	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A
CSU Exit Survey	D, A (Analyze 05-06 Data)	D	D, A (Analyze 06-07 Data)	D	D, A (Analyze 07-08 Data)	D	D, A (Analyze 08-09 Data)	D

	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	Spring 2010	Fall 2010	Spring 2011
CSU Survey of Graduates	D, A (Analyze 05-06 Data)	D	D, A (Analyze 06-07 Data)	D	D, A (Analyze 07-08 Data)	D	D, A (Analyze 08-09 Data)	D
CSU Survey of Supervisors	D, A (Analyze 05-06 Data)	D	D, A (Analyze 06-07 Data)	D	D, A (Analyze 07-08 Data)	D	D, A (Analyze 08-09 Data)	D
Evaluation of Cooperating Teachers	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A
Evaluation of University Supervisors	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A
Cooperating Teacher Program Evaluation Survey	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A
Instructor Survey					D	A		
Candidate Disposition	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A
SLO #1			D	D	D	D	D	D,A (F08-Sp11)
SLO#2	D	D	D,A (F07-F08)	D	D	D	D	D
SLO #3			D	D	D,A (F08-F09)	D	D	D
SLO #4			D	D	D	D	D,A (F08-F10)	D
SLO #5			D	D	D	D,A (F08-Sp10)	D	D
SLO #6			D	D,A (F08-Sp09)	D	D	D	D
CalTPAs Tasks 1 - 4		D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A	D,A

D=Data Collected

A= Data Analyzed

III. Analysis of Candidate Assessment

Prior to Fall 2008, the SSCP used one signature assignment (pre/post assessment for SLO 2), the CalTPA and the TPE (through the student teaching evaluations) to analyze candidate performance data. Signature assignments for each SLO were chosen by the SSCP faculty spring 2008 and implemented fall 2008. The only signature assignment that was in existence for spring 2008 was the pre/post assessment completed by SSCP candidates in EDSS 473, assessing SLO 2, Assessing Student Learning.

Data analysis/discussion began by looking at the types of data currently collected and data to collect in future semesters. Single Subject is currently satisfied with the data being collected and the data to be collected in future semesters. Data analysis/discussion then began to look at each of the individual assessment items.

Pre/Post signature assignment for SLO 2: Although all EDSS 473 instructors gave the signature assignment to students in past semesters, instructors used a variety of rubrics and the assignment itself varied from class to class. Spring 08 was the first time all instructors used the same assignment with the same rubric for scoring the assignment. Although the results show that the majority of students met SLO 2, the data are statistically insignificant. One important outcome from the data discussion was that the instructors were not trained in the use of the rubric and therefore data had to be read/interpreted with this in mind. To address this concern, the SSCP plans to hold a workshop for EDSS 437 instructors in the near future to share student work and to reach some agreement as to what a rubric score of 4, 3, 2, and 1 should look like so instructors can then be calibrated and data considered statistically significant.

CalTPA analysis/discussion for 2007-2008 brought about similar concerns when analyzing data. Although the SSCP has been using the CalTPAs as low-stakes assignments in classes and all instructors used the state-developed rubric, each instructor used the assignment differently. Some instructors allowed students to work together, submit the assignment in stages and rewrite sections after receiving feedback, while others used the CalTPA as a mid-term or final with no editing or re-writing allowed. Once again, this makes the statistical analysis insignificant. One important highlight from the data discussion was that the semester CalTPA 3 was used as a pilot for high-stakes TPAs (spring 08) and no longer counted for a class grade, the scores dropped significantly. It was suggested that the students knew the assignment would not count as either high-stakes or toward their class grades so did not take the assessment as seriously as they did other assignments. There was also concern about the percentage of students earning a non-passing score on CalTPA task 2.

After the TPAs went high-stakes and were scored anonymously by trained, calibrated assessors, the issue of lower scores for CalTPA task 2 was revisited during our fall 2009 data discussion. It was brought to the attention of the SSCP committee that the CalTPA task that students seem to struggle with the most continues to be CalTPA 2. One committee member pointed out that there were more 3's than 4's on this assignment. When this information was sent out to the instructors of the course associated with CalTPA 2, a discussion ensued.

The first concern of the faculty teaching CalTPA 2 was the current placement of the TPA in EDSE 436, a course students may or may not take in a sequenced order. Some students have already taken EDSS 450 which contains CalTPA 1 but many take EDSE 436 at the same time they are taking EDSS 450 or after; therefore CalTPA 2 may be their first introduction to TPAs. One solution was to develop a power point introduction to CalTPA 2 that all instructors would use to ensure consistency across sections and give the students a standardized introduction to the CalTPAs. This power point was developed and is

being implemented for the first time in fall 2009. We will revisit this issue during spring 2010 to discuss whether or not the instructors felt this was helpful and after we have had a chance to review the fall 2009 CalTPA 2 data.

A second concern was that EDSE 436 students may not have access to all of the information needed to satisfy CalTPA 2 while they are completing the required 15-hours of field-work associated with the course. For CalTPA 1, candidates do not need access to real students. For CalTPAs 3 & 4, our candidates are student teaching and have greater access to all of the information needed to satisfy the CalTPA requirements. The Single Subject Credential Program has not yet decided how to address this concern.

As a result of these discussions, it was decided that we should revisit these issues after another semester or two of data is available. Depending on what the data reveals, we may review the placement of assessment in the program curriculum.

In fall 2009, while reviewing the data from SLO 3, a concern was expressed about the number of students who did not submit a portion of their signature assignments. The number of non-submitters was highest for criterion 1 and it equaled the number of students who did not receive a passing score on the overall assignment. It was suggested that we work with the EDSE 457 instructors to place an emphasis on instructions for the assignment and perhaps configure the submission electronically in such a way that students cannot leave a section blank.

During data discussions in spring 2009, it was decided that the data numbers were too small (only 12 students) to draw any conclusions about the CalTPAs. As a reminder, only high stakes CalTPA data was collected for spring 2009. However, the data for SLO 6 were discussed in detail. The SSCP committee was pleased with the data from SLO 6. The students did as well on the reflection criteria as they did on describing the experience. One suggestion that came from the discussion was that it would be interesting to find out whether there was any correlation between how well students did on this assignment and how and where they obtained their subject matter competency. There was some concern that instructors were not calibrated in the use of the rubric. In the near future it is our hope to have the resources to convene instructors to discuss exemplars and calibrate instructors on the use of the rubrics.

IV. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

Priority	Action or Proposed Changes To Be Made	By Whom?	By When?	Applicable Program or Common Standard(s)
Collect exemplars for all SLO signature assignments in order to establish guidelines for calibration	Action: Collect exemplars for a score of 1, 2, 3, & 4 for all 6 SLO assignments.	Each instructor teaching courses & then turned into the Single Subject Office	Fall 2009 & Spring 2010	All Single Subject Programs
Calibrate all instructors in the use of the rubric associated with their courses SLO signature assignment	Action: Calibrate all instructors in the use of the rubric associated with their courses SLO signature assignment	Single Subject Program	As soon as funding allows	All Single Subject Programs
Revisit CalTPA 2 scores	Action: Revisit & analyze CalTPA 2 scores for a minimum of 2 semesters (fall 09 & spring 10) after the power point presentation has been used. If needed, review where in program assessment is taught and if EDSE 436 is the appropriate place to offer CalTPA 2	Single Subject Program and all EDSE 436 instructors	Fall 2010	Assessment
Review powerpoint presentation for EDSE 436	Action: Survey instructors & students about the power points about taking CalTPA's.	EDSE 436 instructors & students	Fall 2010 & Spring 2011	EDSE 436 & All Single Subject Programs
Look for any correlation between how well students do on SLO 6 and whether they are subject matter competent and how they obtained their subject matter competence	Action: Survey students to discover if they are subject matter competent & if so, did they do a subject matter program or take the CSET. Look to see if there is any correlation between subject matter competence, how subject matter competence is gained and the ability to reflect in SLO 6	All EDSS 300 instructors	Fall 2010	All Single Subject Programs

Single Subject Credential Program
Single Subject Teacher Education Committee Meeting
December 5, 2007
8:30 – 10:30
CLMER

MINUTES

Meeting called to order at 8:30 a.m.

Present: O. Rubio, E. Hartung, D. Mitchell, S. Champlin, E. Williams, J. Jura, E. Luhr, D. Zanutto, A. Segalla, D. Nickles, K. Hakim-Butt, M. Lichty

Absent: C. Zitzer-Comfort

Guests: J. Houck, C. Riley

- I. Approval of Agenda **M/S/P**
- II. Approval of the Minutes from 11/7/07 Meeting **M/S/P**
- III. Announcements

A. **TPA Trainings** have been scheduled for those who have not been calibrated. SSCP is looking at January 24, 25 and 26 for the January training. SSCP will cover the cost of a sub for attending. The May training dates are tentatively scheduled for May 27, 28 and 30. For both trainings, the first day is bias training. If a bias training has already been completed, it is not necessary to repeat. TPA 1 training materials have not been provided at this time, but K. Hakim-Butt believes the materials will be ready by the January training.
Handout – State Lead Assessor Spring Training Schedule (after the spring the state will no longer be running trainings).

B. Curricular items for resource room

Money is available for purchasing curricular resources for the new Teacher Resource Center. K. Hakim-Butt requested lists from the coordinators of items the SSCP can purchase. A scanner, SSCP laptop that can be used by SSCP faculty, and a color printer were suggested. Deadline for requests: 1/15/08

C. **SSCP Assessment Workshop (Friday, February 29 from 8:30-2:30, working lunch)** - Please save the date. More details will be given later.

D. Pre- Post data & TPA reminder

K. Hakim-Butt asked coordinators to remind EDSS instructors to submit scores and samples of student work.

E. **Kudos** - E. Hartung has an art piece in the CSULB Downtown Art Museum located at 3rd and Pine.

- IV. Maryam's Time

A. Evaluations

Faculty evaluations were delivered to department offices and are due to the SSCP office the week before finals. **Final Student Teaching** evaluations are due no later than January 10, 2008. Students will not receive recommendation for their credential until mid-term and final evaluations from one Cooperating Teacher and their University Supervisor are submitted. M. Hall asked coordinators to indicate what their students have been instructed to do regarding submission of the evaluations. Students have also been emailed regarding the **CSU Exit Survey** and their **University Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher** evaluations which should be submitted to the 473 instructor.

B. Internship Grant

41 of the 57 SSCP University Interns are participating in the Internship Grant. The Saturday professional development workshops are being video-recorded for interns who aren't able to attend to borrow and watch.

C. Subject Matter Verification Forms

Please submit as soon as possible.

D. Student Teaching Placement Information Forms

Please submit as they are completed so the SSCP office can send them out as confirmation to the school site and district. The program prefers to have them before winter break, January 11, 2008 at the latest.

E. Grades

M. Hall reminded coordinators that grades are due 1/4/08 and Incomplete Forms must be submitted to the SSCP office, not the subject area department office. Handout – Fall 2007 grading memo.

V. Discussion Items

A. The **CSU Exit Survey results** were reviewed to identify perceived SSCP strengths and weaknesses. Weaknesses revealed in the Exit Survey are the issues that have consistently been identified in previous years. These issues include working with students with special needs as well as EL students.

B. Revise Student Teaching Handbook

Please review Student Teaching Handbook and be prepared to make recommendations for revisions at next meeting.

C. Assessment Committee Update

M. Lichty shared the names of the members of the CED Assessment Committee and discussed the goals and timeline for the Assessment Committee. Assessment meetings have been scheduled for the College of Ed and a separate meeting for Single Subject. The primary goal of the committee is to create a master assessment plan for collecting and reporting data for the CED as a unit.

D. STEELI Grant

An email was sent by K. Hakim-Butt regarding the upcoming workshops. The 450 instructors are participating in spring – 473 instructors in the Fall.

E. Other

The committee reviewed the CED Constitution had a discussion about the ways the SSCP can be represented on the faculty council. Several recommendations were made that will be explored and brought back to the committee for discussion at the next committee meeting.

Handout – CED Constitution

VI. Action Items

A. TPA Policies

TPA Policy Statements (handout) 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 were reviewed and approved with a revision to Policy #5. Policy Statement #3 was tabled.

VII. Time Certain

A. Carol Riley

Final credential meeting for student teachers will be held this week. Reminder: Without final evaluation the Credential Center cannot approve and grant the credential. Students are aware and have asked about this. The Credential Center now has the authority to approve and grant credentials (no longer just recommend). The CTC has agreed to make a small change for candidates who have not been able to secure employment during the 5-year preliminary credential window. Candidates can request a three-year extension through appeal whether or not they are employed at the time of the appeal. German and French programs on the agenda for approval at the next commission meeting. The Foundational Level Science Credential is also on the agenda.

Meeting Adjourned: 10:15 a. m.

Minutes Prepared by Maryam Hall

These minutes have not been approved.

MINUTES

Dr. Karen Hakim-Butt called the meeting to order at 8:30am.

Present: S. Carlile, S. Champlin, K. Hakim-Butt, E. Hartung, J.Jura, T. Keirn, M. Lichty, D. Mitchell, C. Riley, A. Segalla, E. Williams

Absent: D. Nickles, O. Rubio

Guest: Associate Dean Steve Turley,

I. Approval of Agenda **M/S/P**

II. Approval of Minutes from 9/3/08 Meeting **M/S/P**

III. Announcements

K. Hakim-Butt announced the state CalTPA trainings. If there are any instructors who cannot make the training that will be held here in December then they need to attend one of the state trainings.

We have received 107 applications for the ASA II position. We are currently sifting through the applications and hope to have someone in the position by mid November.

K. Hakim-Butt thanked everyone that come to the SS get-together. We had over 30 people there and it was a great success. We hope to be able to do it again.

K Hakim-Butt reminded the committee of the TaskStream workshops this Friday. Please check with you instructors to make sure they are attending. There will be one held at 9 am and one at 5pm both in LA1-200.

S. Champlin reported on her training in Little Rock. She enjoyed it a lot and had a great time.

T. Keirn reported on his Freeman Foundation Grant and that he went to the committee and they really liked what he was doing with it. The bad part is all the money is tied up in AIG stock so they are not sure what is going to happen.

F. Other

E. Hartung announced that as of July 1st 2009 you could not bring anyone new into your subject matter program if it has not yet been revised and approved by the CTC. She passed out a copy of the old Art Education course plan and a copy of the revisions that she has made. There was some discussion about what can be in the subject matter program and what cannot be part of the program. There was discussion if EDSS 300 could be part of the subject matter program. The committee voted and approved the revisions to the Art Education program.

M/S/P

IV. Jessica's Time

A. Travel Claim reminder

The committee was asked to remind their supervisors that August travel claims should be coming in now. We have not received many and any that are 2 months old or more will not be processed.

B. Student Teacher Applications Update

We had 183 students attend the student teaching application meetings. Today is deadline day. We have received a total of 165 applications so far and we are expecting about 30 more to come in today. So far we have received 11 from Art, 35 from English, 1 from FCS, 9 from Health, 19 from LOTE, 31 from Math, 5 from Music, 12 from PE, 14 from Science, and 28 from Social Science. The committee asked what the deadline was for reapplicants. There really is no deadline but is something that should be talked about and we will add it to the November agenda.

C. GPA review reminder for EDSS 300

Please remind your EDSS 300 instructors that GPA Reviews need to start to come in. Staci will be working on the GPA review this semester. Please ask instructors to get them to her sooner than later since this will be her first time doing them and she will need some time to be trained and work on them. Also please remind students to completely read the Blue cover sheet and follow the directions.

V. Discussion Items

A. Data analysis & action plan (Time Certain for D. Haviland)

D. Haviland from the College of Education Assessment Office came to discuss the new assessment program for the college. The credential programs report is due in December. K. Hakim-Butt is the one that writes the report but it will require input from each individual program to write the report. Don explained what the assessment program is and how it fits into CTC and NCATE reviews and also how the report can be used for program review. The committee looked at the data and began to discuss what the data tells us and what it points out. T. Keirn pointed out the differences between the two EDSS 473S Pre/Post Assessment sections. One section had almost all 3's and the other section had mostly 4's. These 2 sections have 2 different instructors and it appears that they graded differently. The committee discussed the importance of getting all the instructors together to talk about how to score the Signature Assignments. J. Jura mentioned the need for some bias training. D. Haviland brought up the idea of having everyone sit down and grade a few assignments together so instructors could agree upon what a 4 looks like, what a 3 looks like, etc. T. Keirn brought up the idea of constructing a perfect 4, a perfect 3, a perfect 2 and a perfect 1 and put them on Beachboard for instructors to see only. This way they have something to

look at and compare their students' work to when grading them. The committee also looked back at the rubric for the EDSS 473 Pre/Post Assessment Task. A. Segalla noted the discrepancy in the score range and the need to revise the scale. The committee also discussed the need to change the name to Pre/Post Assignment from its current name, Pre/Post Assessment. The concern stated was that there is a lack of resources to support getting instructors together to calibrate. As a way to get this process started, K. Hakim=Butt suggested that each program that has 2 or more instructors for the same course get the instructors together to discuss the rubric/

B. Student Teaching Withdrawal Policy

Tabled

C. Reading basic skills requirement

Tabled

D. Provisional Admit SMC – (How and When to Verify)

Tabled

E. Waiver evaluations

Tabled

F. Technology requirement

Tabled

G. Student Teaching Handbook

Tabled

H. Pilot of new CalTPA Task 1 in Spring 09

Tabled

VI. Action Items

A. Student Teaching Handbook approval

The committee briefly discussed the student teaching handbook. We will be discussing the student teaching handbook revisions at the next meeting so please come prepared with your questions and revisions. E. Williams suggested that the handbook be re designed in a way to make it more fun to read. It was recommended that we find an art or design student to offer a small stipend to redesign the handbook and make it more exciting to read.

B. Private school student teaching

Tabled

C.Approval of EDSS 473 Course Proposal M/S/P

As you can recall we got permission to change EDSS 473 from a 2 to a 3-unit course. We had to rewrite the course and it needs to go through curriculum. The first step is that it needs to be approved by this committee and then it needs to go onto the college curriculum committee later this month. K. Hakim-Butt asked the committee to look over the new standard course outline and the committee discussed the changes. K. Hakim-Butt went over the changes that have been made and how the course was re-conceptualized. The committee discussed the changes in the course and unanimously voted to pass the new course proposal.

VII. TIME CERTAINS:

A. Tim Caron, 8:40

The committee introduced themselves to T Caron. He introduced himself as the new director of the Honors program on campus. He spoke to committee about the honors program and the need to grow the program. He wants to make students, faculty, and staff aware of the program. He wants to first reach out to the students in the program and increase retention of the program. Only about half the students in the program actually complete the capstone course and the program. He wants to make advisors aware of the program so that they can encourage students to enter the program. The committee discussed how the Honors Program could work with the SSCP and subject matter programs.

B. Carol Riley

C. Riley from the Credential Center passed out a list of the licensing meetings that she will be doing this semester. If students miss their class meeting they can attend another one.

C. Riley mentioned that there has been a glitch in the process of people whose credentials are going to expire and want to apply for an extension. It will probably not be fixed until the first of the year so she is not sure what is going to happen with those that have credentials that will expire before.

C. Riley thanked the committee for encouraging their students to get their student teaching applications in early. The Credential Center has seen a steady stream of students coming in over the past couple weeks.

C. Riley will be in Sacramento in 2 weeks for a conference so if there are any issues that need to be taken care of let her know and she will take it to the commission.

C. Judi Walker

J. Walker did not attend the meeting.

**Single Subject Credential Program
Single Subject Teacher Education Committee Meeting**

April 22, 2009

8:30 - 10:30

CLMER

MINUTES

Call to Order

K. Hakim-Butt called the meeting to order at 8:30am.

Roll Call

Present: S. Carlile, S. Champlin, K. Hakim-Butt, E. Hartung J. Jura, M. Lichty, E. Luhr, B. Mack, D. Mitchell, H. Nguyen, D. Nickles, A. Segalla, E. Williams

Absent: None

Guest: None

I. Approval of Agenda

M/S/P

II. Announcements

A. TPA timeline

K. Hakim-Butt passed out the Summer and Fall CalTPA timelines. The committee reviewed the timelines and were asked to provide feedback on the timelines. The new deadline of 4:00pm was reviewed and the reason for the change.

B. Video Permission Slips

The committee discussed the need to get permission slips for each student that is in a class where videotaping is taking place. For the CalTPA Task 4 assignment students will have to collect the permission slip for each student and adult that will be in the room while videotaping is taking place. The permission slips will then need to be scanned and uploaded as an attachment to the CalTPA assignment on Taskstream. This will allow us to easily store the permission slips and hold them for 7 years as required by law.

D. Kudos

E. Hartung gave an update on the replacement for the Art coordinator. She read a statement issued by the Art Education department which said, "The replacement search for the retiring advisor/coordinator/PhD faculty member teaching BA, MA, and Art Credential program students (who come from all Art Department programs including studio, art history, and art education) has been brought down from a priority tenure track position to a one year lectureship by the powers that be. The tenure track candidate pool was not allowed to be opened and reviewed by the elected committee."

E. Hartung Also announced the Big Art Event that is coming up on April 30th.

E. Luhr announced that the English department is holding a reception for faculty authors for the year. S. Carlile will be one of the authors being honored.

S. Carlile announced that the History department is holding a reception for their faculty authors on Thursday and E. Luhr will be one of the authors honored.

J. Jura May 13th The Medieval Stage ...

A. Segalla reported that on March 14th the Math education department offered their 10th annual Math day. A. Segalla started the event 10 years ago and it has since grown to over 300 participants.

III. Jessica's Time

A. Summer 09 Student Teaching

J. Vieira asked the committee for clarification on summer student teachers. She stated that there were 3 summer student teachers, one from English for 1 placement, one from History for 1 placement and one from PE for a full 3 placements. The board agreed. J. Vieira stated that she would cancel the remaining sections of student teaching this week.

VI. Discussion Items

A. CalTPA Data Discussion

The CalTPA data for the Fall was distributed to the committee. The committee looked over the data and was reminded that this data is only for the high stakes students in the Fall which was a very small group of only 12 students. Any student that got a 1 or 2 has to retake their CalTPA during the resubmission course. K. Hakim-Butt asked the committee if there were any concerns or surprises about the data. D. Mitchell stated that it is hard to tell anything from the data since the numbers were so small. It will be easier to see trends in the data when the numbers grow. K. Hakim-Butt pointed out that there were no scores of 4 for task 1 in any of the subject areas. This is something that we should watch over the next few semesters to see if this changes as the numbers get larger. The committee discussed the need to keep an eye on the Task 1 scores.

B. Signature Assignment for SLO #6 (EDSS 300) Data Discussion

K. Hakim-Butt reported that each semester the committee will be looking at results from a different SLO. For the spring semester we are looking at data for SLO #6 which is collected through the signature assignment in EDSS 300. M. Lichty gave some background info about the assignment and how it was developed. The committee that created the assignment decided to just focus on developing as a professional educator and reflecting on early field experiences. Through the assignment the student will look at what they saw in their classroom field experiences and how they would use it in their own classroom. J. Jura stated that he was surprised that there was a higher score on criteria 2 than on criteria 1. Students seemed to do a better job on reflecting than they did on describing the experience. M. Lichty stated that student were able to state what they saw but they had a difficult time applying it and saying why they saw it. Students had difficulty with the reflective part. S. Carlile gave some feedback from her 300 instructors. She stated that her instructors feel that the 5 page limit was not long enough for the student to effectively get everything in writing. M. Lichty stated that the committee that created the assignment did not want to allow student to go on for 15 pages because it will be a lot to read for the assessor. The committee agreed that overall the students seem to be doing well with the assignment. E. Williams stated that this does not tell us about the students that are subject matter competent and those that are not and how their scores differ. Is a student that is subject matter competent able to do better on these signature

assignments? K. Hakim-Butt stated that it may be possible to add some questions to the beginning of the signature assignment to ask if they are subject matter competent and if so did they complete it through coursework or through the CSET.

K. Hakim-Butt asked if the committee thought the assignment gave them the data that they were looking for. The committee felt that the assignment was a good assignment and was working to give them the data and “dip stick” that is needed for the course. K. Hakim-Butt also asked the committee if there were any revisions that needed to be made to the assignment. The committee felt that it was a great assignment and that there were not many changes that needed to be made. The rubric is simple and offers reflection for the students. K. Hakim-Butt stated that we needed to share these results with our EDSS 300 instructors. M. Lichty stated that an action that we might take would be to do a practice run with our students. E. Williams suggested that the instructors save some samples of a 2, 3, and 4 and then share the samples with students.

The committee looked at the rest of the packet of Signature Assignment Data for all the other courses. D. Mitchell asked that the students that are in the combined sections of EDSS 473 be separated by subject area. She also stated that the score of 3 was predominate in the EDSS 473 assignment. K. Hakim-Butt also stated that due to the correlation of the signature assignment and the CalTPA Task 3 and 4 in EDSS 473 students may be scoring similar on the CalTPA and the signature assignment. Students are using a lot of the same information for the Signature assignments and the TPA's.

C. Professional Day for Student Teachers

K. Hakim-Butt discussed the idea of having a professional day for student teachers. It will be one day where all student teachers will come to campus for a series of workshops. These workshops could include job search workshops, resume workshops, interview workshops, ELL workshops, and Education Specialist workshops. The committee discussed the idea and agreed that it would be a great thing to complement the seminar and support the student teachers a little bit further. K. Hakim-Butt asked that the committee think about the professional day and that they bring back to the next committee meeting feedback about what they feel would be helpful to have at the workshops.

D. Disposition Discussion (how to monitor throughout program)

The committee looked at the different ways that disposition data is collected in the program. K. Hakim-Butt stated that disposition data is collected at the beginning of the program and also during student teaching but no-where else in the program. The committee discussed each form and the difficulties of the form. E. Williams suggested simplifying the forms and just having boxes for Needs Improvement and Satisfactory. This would limit the choices and either state that they are meeting the requirement or not. If a student is really exemplary there can be comments that say this.

The committee also discussed the need to have a form available to monitor students throughout the program. Instructors in the EDSE courses could have access to the forms to fill out on students that they have concerns with. They will not have to fill them out on every student but just those that there are concerns with. E. Luhr also brought up the idea of having

the forms available to the subject areas to use to survey teachers at the end of the semester for students that they have concerns with. For instance, a student that is provisionally admitted due to dispositional issues we could survey their teachers after the first semester to see if the issues have been resolved. The Single Subject Program Office will work on a form and bring it to a meeting in the Fall.

E. Student teaching observation protocols?

K. Hakim Butt asked the committee if anyone has a specific protocol for the student teaching observations.

S. Carlile stated that the English department has a couple different forms that their supervisors can choose from. She will send them to everyone in an email.

J. Jura brought a copy of a observation checklist to share that their supervisors use both as a pacing guide and also as a to provide feedback.

E. Hartung reported that the Art department has a form that they use that is very open and allows the supervisor to note anything that they need and want about the student teacher's performance. It is a carbon copy so the supervisor can leave one with the student teacher and also keep one for their records.

E. Williams stated that they do not have a form right now but that they are looking at creating one.

K. Hakim-Butt reported that it is important to have some sort of documentation for students that are failing. This makes it so that we have everything in writing and that there is documentation and feedback from the university supervisor that is left for the student teacher at any and all observations.

F. IAP discussion

Tabled

G. High Stakes student discussion

K. Hakim-Butt reported that no matter how we try to contact student to let them know about the high stakes CalTPA's and when things are due we still have students that are missing deadlines and that claim to not know that they are high stakes. We are not sure how else to get the message out to students and would like some input from the coordinators. The coordinators discussed the situation and decided that we have done everything possible and it is really up to the student to know the policies and to know if they are high stakes. In a few years this will disappear because all students will be high stakes.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:33am.

Single Subject Credential Program
Single Subject Teacher Education Committee Meeting
October 7, 2009
8:30 - 10:30
Anatol

MINUTES

Call to Order

Dr. Karen Hakim-Butt called the meeting to order at 8:30am.

Roll Call

Present: S. Carlile, S. Champlin, K. Hakim-Butt, J. Jura, T. Keirn, M. Lichty, B. Mack, D. Mitchell, D. Nickles, A. Segalla, C. Silveira, E. Williams

Absent: H. Nguyen

Guest: S. Cynar, S. Turley

I. Approval of Agenda

M/S/P

II. Approval of Minutes from 9/2/09

M/S/P

III. Announcements

A. Maternity leave for Staci

Just a reminder that S. Goldberg-Berrey will be going out on maternity leave beginning on Monday October 6th. The office will be short staffed until after the first of the year. Please remind students and faculty of this if they should complain about services taking a little longer.

B. Student Teaching Professional Day

Student Teacher Professional Day will be held on Friday October 30th from 12-5. The day will begin promptly at 12:00 with Rick Morris speaking about classroom management. At 1:30 the students will then break off and attend 3 different session from which they have 4 to choose from. The first workshop is the Credential Center where they will talk about applying for your preliminary credential. This workshop is mandatory and all student teachers must attend it. The other workshops will be on Strategies for Teaching Student With Special Needs, Strategies for Teaching English Language Learners and on Resume and Interview Techniques. Volunteers were asked for to help out on the day. J. Jura and C. Silveira volunteered to help out.

C. Policy Related to Open Enrollment Students Entering the Program

Students that want to begin the program in the Spring will have to attend through Open University since the University is not accepting any students. The new way to control enrollment is that students cannot be admitted to the program until they are admitted to the university. We have composed a letter to give students that have taken all the co-requisites courses and are trying to apply to the program. The letter states that they have met the admission requirements however since they are not admitted to the university they cannot be admitted to the program. Students should take courses through Open University for Spring 2010 and apply to the university for Fall 2010.

D. Open Enrollment Student Teaching

Students who were planning on Student Teaching in the Spring 2010 through Open University are currently being denied. We are still working with the College of Continuing and Professional Education to try and set up a special arrangement to allow this to happen. We will keep you all posted on what we works out.

E. Student Teacher substitute policy

K. Hakim-Butt reminded the committee of the policy on student teachers substituting for their mentor teachers. In order for a student teacher to sub for their mentor teacher, they must first be half way through the student teaching semester (the half way point is Nov. 15th) and they must have a satisfactory midterm evaluation from both their cooperating teacher and their university supervisor.

F. EDSP 355B to replace EDSP 350

As a result of the discussions that we had with the EDSP faculty and the Chancellors office IAP, EDSP 350 is in the process of going through the curriculum process to change to EDSP 355B which will be a teaching student with special needs course for secondary students only. This course will move away from the “disability of the week” model and will also include an assignment that is like the current TPA and asks for modifications for students with special needs.

G. Kudos

Social Science’s subject matter program was approved at the October CTC meeting.

J. Jura just got back from New Jersey where he did a presentation.

K. Hakim-Butt reported that she would be presenting at CCTE for STEELI next week. She also reported that the Teacher Quality Grant was sent off yesterday. She will report back to the committee once she hears anything. The grant was for \$7.5 million over 5 years.

J. Jura reported that LOTE is now able to do subject waive evaluations that have not been able to do before.

IV. Jessica’s Time**A. LBUSD security badges**

LBUSD has a new policy that all teachers including student teachers must wear security badges. Most student teachers have picked up their badges but there are still a few that have not. Please remind your student teachers to stop by and get them.

B. Student Teaching Numbers

For Spring 2010 student teaching we had a total is 188 student teachers that applied. Keep in mind that these numbers do not yet include the reapplies since their applications are not due until November 1st. So far we have had 8 art, 40 English, 4 health, 2 FCS, 20 PE, 21 LOTE, 24 Math, 8 Music, 25 Science, and 36 Music students apply. Final number will be presented at the November meeting.

C. High Stakes Rosters

New High stakes rosters were emailed out to all faculty members. These rosters show enrollment in the courses as of census as well as has all the high stakes students highlighted. The students that are highlighted need to be reminded to enroll in Taskstream ASAP.

V. Action Items

None

VI. Discussion Items

A. Data Discussion for SLO#3 (EDSE 457, signature assignments, CalTPA)

Paul Boyd-Batstone was present to facilitate the data discussion. He introduced himself to the committee and began by directing the committee's attention to the overall SLO data for Spring 2009. He asked the committee to take a look at the data and think about what they see. Is it good? Is it surprising in any way? P. Boyd-Batstone pointed out that SLO 1,3,5, and 6 all have more scores of 4 than they do 3's. SLO 2 and 4 both have a larger number of 3's than 4's. When looking at the mean scores of all the SLO's they are pretty even across the board. K. Hakim-Butt pointed out that the lowest mean score is for SLO 2 which is Assesses student learning. The assessing learning TPA is one that students struggle with so we may need to take another look at our program and see what we are currently doing to teach assessing learning and how we can add more places for students to practice it. M. Lichty pointed out that the TPA's and SLO's are so new and have been moved around so much that there really is no data that goes back across the semesters so students are just learning about them and how to do them.

P. Boyb-Batstone stated that the Signature Assignments are used to point out trends. He also looked at the scores and noticed that the number of 2's are pretty consistent across the board. He stated that it almost seems like the same cohort of students are consistently getting 2's. M. Lichty asked if there was a way to see if it was the same students. P. Boyd-Batstone responded that the Assessment office would be able to look at that. He also pointed out that it shows a consistency of scoring across the board.

The committee then looked at the SLO 3 data overall. The committee pointed out and was concerned that there were 10 students that did not submit the assignment. P. Boyd-Batstone pointed out that there was a large majority of the students that did pass the Signature Assignment. J. Jura stated that the number of non-submissions was almost equal to the number of students that did not pass the Signature Assignment.

The committee then looked at the scores by criterion. K. Hakim-Butt noticed that criterion 1 had the highest number of non-submissions and the lowest number of 4's. That criterion was one that students really struggled with. Criterion #4 was the next one that students seemed to really struggle with. P. Boyd-Batstone mentioned that criterion 4 was the "why" section. Students had to make adaptations and then explain why they did that. S. Champlin pointed out that students did a great job on criterion 6.

P. Boyd-Batstone then asked the committee about what the next steps would be. What feedback do we give the EDSE 457 instructors? M. Lichty stated that we need to put an emphasis on instructions and making sure that they submit all parts of the assignments. S. Carlile stated that there needs to be attention made to the non-submissions and encouraging students to submit who did not submit all together. M. Lichty stated that some positive feedback would be that between the 3's and 4's a large majority of the students passed. M. Lichty also would encourage the instructors to have their students follow up all "what" questions with "why" questions.

B. Budget & Low Enrolled Classes (may be an action item)

K. Hakim-Butt stated that at the past budget meeting we had to cut another 6.7% out of the operating expense. At the next meeting this week we will be talking about cutting instructional expenses. The SSCP will be combining Art, Health, FCS, and Music into one EDSS 473 section in the Spring and we will also be only offering 2 sections of EDSS 300G rather than 3 sections. We have been told that next years cuts will be 9 times worse than they are this year. Next year staff and

faculty will not be furloughed which helped reduce the cuts this year. The president also gave some money that was in reserves and the students fees were increased which helped to cover the costs this year but will not help next year.

K. Hakim-Butt asked the committee to brainstorm ways to make cuts for next year. We will begin to look at ways to limit enrollment. We need to talk about our philosophy for admitting students and be prepared to cut enrollment in the Fall. We will be told to offer less courses so we need to admit less students. Up to now we have been combining low enrolled sections but this will not continue to be enough.

K. Hakim-Butt gave the ideas that we may need to create a criterion scale for admitting students to the program. This may include students with a 4.0 GPA get 5 points, students with a 3.5 get 4 points, etc. We may also look at students who are coming through our subject matter programs program. S. Carlile suggested that we give preference to students with higher GPA's and also students who came through our subject matter programs. K. Hakim-Butt pointed out that we cannot exclude CSET takers. T. Keirn pointed out that many of his students come from other majors on campus, communication studies or criminal justice, and want to teach history. These students are our students but they are not subject matter students. S. Carlile asked if each program could have their own criterion. J. Jura asked if we could require subject matter competency prior to being admitted to the university. K. Hakim-Butt announced that we now have the authority to choose who is admitted to the university and who is not. E. Williams suggested that all programs take the hit equally which could be difficult for the smaller programs. K. Hakim-Butt reported that the latest news coming from the president and the chancellors office is that the university is going to come out of this situation much different that it is now. It will be a smaller university. We have been told to shrink our programs rather than cutting programs.

D. Mitchell asked that we have a meeting solely dedicated to this issue. K. Hakim-butt stated that the next meeting will be mostly dedicated to this topic.

K. Hakim-Butt also recommended that some of the smaller programs be asked to change the offering of their courses to ever other semester. Larger programs that offer 2 sections of their courses may be asked to go to only offering one sections.

K. Hakim-Butt asked the committee to begin to think of ways to prioritize admissions and come to the next meeting ready to brainstorm.

A. Segalla stated that the university is a Teacher Training institution and that there should be no cuts to Single Subject. K. Hakim-Butt stated that the university is looking to make cuts in all program across the board and we cannot guarantee that we will be saved from the cuts. It is important that we ask the question of "it takes a university to raise a teacher" and that we need to continue to grow our programs.

C. Continuous Attendance Policy

Tabled

D. Instructor Assessment Form

Tabled

E. Protocol for fieldwork for EDSS 300

Tabled

V. Time Certains

Carol Riley

Not Present

Steve Turley (NCATE) 8:45am

Dr. Turley spoke to the committee about the upcoming NCATE visit. He stated that in one sense Single Subject will not be included in the review on Nov. 14th-17th. The Single Subject Program passed the review 2 years ago and it is really the advanced programs that did not pass. However, the Single Subject Program's data will be included as part of the Unit Assessment system. K. Hakim-Butt will have to attend the program coordinator meeting to answer questions about the Single Subject data as it pertains to the Unit Assessment System. There will be an open forum session for all faculty in which everyone is invited to attend and voluntarily ask questions about the program or be there to answer any questions that they may have about the program. There will also be a meeting of the Assessment Committee in which M. Lichty will attend as the SS representative. K. Hakim-Butt asked if there was going to be a meeting of faculty council. Dr. Turley reported that right now they do not have a faculty council meeting planned but the reviewers may ask when they get here to speak to faculty. He asked that all faculty be on call during those days if something comes up and they ask to speak to faculty. Dr. Turley recommended that all faculty take a look at the CED website. All the documents are under the Accreditation link. The Institutional Report is up there and can be downloaded. The Unit Assessment System is also up there and Dr. Turley highly recommended that everyone take a look at the system.

Dr. Turley directed everyone's attention to the handout that outlines the Unit Assessment System. It is the schematic of the system. On the flip side of the handout is the Unit Assessment System Program Improvement Process.

K. Hakim Butt asked the committee if they had any other questions or concerns from the Dean office. M. Lichty asked Dr. Turley if Dean Grenot-Scheyer has asked about postponing the TPA due to the budget. Dr. Turley reported that Dean Grenot-Scheyer is in favor of postponing the TPA however many of the other Deans in the State of CA are not. Many other universities have found way to pay for the TPA's and are not in favor of suspending them.

Judy Walker

Not Present