

**TEACHER EDUCATION AND K-12 RELATIONS COMMITTEE
CSU ACADEMIC SENATE**

**UPDATE on CalStateTEACH
May 2, 2002**

INTRODUCTION

This report is in response to two documents produced by the Academic Senate in the spring of 1999. The first document was Senate Resolution 2450-99. (*It appears as Appendix A.*) Responses to issues raised in this resolution appear in Section One below. The second document was the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review CalStateTEACH. (*It appears as Appendix B.*) Responses to issues raised in this report appear in Section Two below. A notation appears in italics after each section heading which references the pertinent section in the corresponding appended documents. A final section is offered to summarize some recent evaluation information and evaluation data are appended.

**SECTION ONE: Responses to Issues Raised in the Senate Resolution,
Implementation of CalStateTEACH (AS-2450-99)**

1. Need (*Rationale*)

CalStateTEACH prepares Multiple Subject credential candidates in response to California's shortage of credentialed K-8 teachers. According to the California Department of Education, it is expected that within the next 10 years, California must recruit and credential approximately 300,000 new teachers.

At present, there are 34,000 teachers in California (roughly half in elementary schools) who do not hold appropriate credentials –some are employed on “Emergency Permits,” some are enrolled in intern programs, and some hold out-of-state credentials they are working to clear. This number has not been reduced in the three years since CalStateTEACH began, and, in fact, it appears to have increased. These teachers are allowed to continue teaching while earning their credentials. CSU campus teacher education programs may often be inaccessible for prospective applicants. CalStateTEACH was designed to be flexible and accessible enough to help overcome those barriers. The need for CalStateTEACH or similar delivery models appears to continue.

The CalStateTEACH program was designed by CSU faculty during 1998-99 and began accepting students in the fall of 1999. Since that time, more than 500 teachers have completed the program and received credentials. Approximately 800 are currently enrolled for the stage beginning fall 2002. While no one contends the program can solve the teacher shortage in California, there is reason to expect that it will continue to be a valuable option in the array of routes to the credential.

2. Role of Chancellor's Office (*Resolve #3*)

The Academic Senate emphatically stated, in its resolution, that the Office of the Chancellor was not an appropriate place to develop curriculum.

The CalStateTEACH curriculum was originally developed by faculty from throughout the CSU and coordinated centrally. Currently, the CalStateTEACH faculty are responsible for curriculum modifications, and modifications are subject to consultation with TEKR.

3. Reporting to Senate (*Resolve #4*)

The Academic Senate was clear that it wanted to be continually involved in the oversight of the program as it progressed, and actively engaged in its evaluation. CalStateTEACH's director, Dr. Jodi Servatius, met regularly with the Teacher Education and K-12 Relations committee, providing written and oral reports at each TEKR meeting until she left her position in December 2001. Dr. Servatius also met with the Faculty Affairs Committee (*May, 2000*), as well as the Academic Senate as a whole (*February, 2000*).

Dr. Servatius discussed all implementation issues and potential problems with TEKR as soon as they emerged. There have been a number of points at which feedback from the TEKR committee has been formative in making program decisions. For example, in response to a disappointing low initial enrollment, program staff asked TEKR for suggestions on handling a possible mid-year enrollment period. The suggestions were later implemented. TEKR also advised, and staff agreed, that the curriculum revision teams should be comprised of members of the program faculty, and not the original curriculum development faculty, who had since returned to their home campuses. This, also, was implemented.

Members of TEKR, the Senate, and faculty appointed by the Senate served along side campus administrators and program faculty on a CalStateTEACH Advisory Board which met regularly during Dr. Servatius' tenure. Significant administrative monitoring and changes were discussed in that body which also provided recommendations.

4. Cohort Size/Faculty Workload (*Resolve #5*)

The Academic Senate expressed serious concern about how faculty loads would be determined in CalStateTEACH and how equity with campus programs would be achieved. The recommendation in the 1999 Ad Hoc Committee report was for cohorts of 12-15 students, and AS-2450-99 specified that 15 students should be a full-time load. The CalStateTEACH program has not to date been funded at a level which would make this a reality. In fact, the cohort sizes are approximately 20 students for a full-time faculty member. CalStateTEACH faculty supervise these candidates in the field and also teach the equivalent of one class (online) during each stage. At the time of the 1999 report, teaching load was envisioned in terms of a single cohort of students progressing through the four program stages in sequence.

As the program was implemented and cohort sizes and composition varied, the loads for individual faculty varied greatly in terms of the stages and levels of progress of the students assigned to them. For example, a faculty member may have students in each of the program stages, thus requiring preparation and individualized instructional assistance in multiple program levels. This situation more closely resembles preparing and instructing two, three or four separate courses. Additionally, the location and geographic concentration of the students was more challenging than initially envisioned. Rather than many students concentrated in a geographic area, often times the faculty member has students located 50 or more miles from any other student, necessitating considerable travel to sites for supervision and feedback. Faculty workload continues to be a significant concern for TEKR, and a study of workload comparability with campus programs appears to be in order.

5. Program Evaluation by Senate (*Resolve #6*)

The TEKR Committee was integrally involved in the formative evaluation of CalStateTEACH. In December, 1999 the TEKR Committee devoted a full meeting to CalStateTEACH. As many as three hours of subsequent meetings were devoted to the program and several subcommittee meetings

were held with program staff between TEKR meetings. At TEKR's suggestion, CalStateTEACH and TEKR collaboratively developed and conducted a program sponsored mini-grant program for CSU faculty to conduct research on questions critical to the program. TEKR was involved in writing the request for proposals, as well as selecting the grant recipients. In two instances, TEKR initiated meetings with other Senate Standing Committees to ensure that concerns within their jurisdiction were being addressed in the ongoing monitoring of the program. TEKR was influential in the decision to have CalStateTEACH evaluated by an external evaluator. In addition, a TEKR subcommittee helped design the general evaluation plan for CalStateTEACH, which guided the development of the RFP for the external evaluation of the program. The TEKR chair reviewed contractor responses to the RFP and made recommendations for the award. The evaluation subcommittee received all interim evaluation reports and made suggestions for the conduct of the external evaluation.

6. Approval by Participating Campuses' Senates (*Resolve #7, 8, 9, 10*)

The initial CalStateTEACH program was reviewed and approved, using the established shared governance procedures, on each of the five lead campuses (CSU LA, Cal Poly Pomona, CSU Fullerton, CSU Fresno and CSU Hayward), prior to the end of March, 2000 as required in AS-2450-99). None of the five lead campuses declined to approve the CalStateTEACH program

8. Future Role of Centralized Programs in the CSU (*Resolve #11*)

The Academic Senate stated in the most emphatic of terms that the Chancellor's Office should not be seen, by virtue of having established this one program centrally, as a place where curriculum is developed and instructional programs delivered. There have been no additional centralized programs developed, despite field interest in expanding the CalStateTEACH program to include credentials in secondary and special education.

SECTION TWO- Responses to Specific Recommendations Raised as Program Concerns Specific Recommendations in the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review CalStateTEACH, May, 1999 (*Resolve #2*)

1. LSF (faculty) Workload (*Specific Recommendation # 1 and Concern #1*)

As discussed above, the cohort sizes are approximately 20 students for a full-time faculty member. CSU administration reports that the program is funded at 20:1 and that actual practice may vary at different regional centers. The LSF teaches the equivalent of one class (online) per Stage with that group. However, as noted above, geographical considerations and faculty commitment to continuing with the same students, results in many if not most faculty teaching students at several different program stages. This may be equated to teaching two, three, or four low enrollment courses because the curriculum and performance expectation varies at each stage. In addition, the LSF visits each Intern at least once a month, observing him or her teaching. The observation visits might involve significant driving (some as much 60-80 miles away), as well as complex scheduling to find time both to observe and to conduct a private conference with the Intern. Response from faculty members has generally been that they are very busy, but most especially from those with the largest distances to travel. A recent survey of LSFs, conducted by the program's external evaluator, asked their level of agreement with the following statement "I have sufficient support to manage my workload." On a scale of 1-7, with 1 being "not at all satisfied" and 7 being "very satisfied", the statewide average (29 respondents) was 5.4. Those LSFs who teach Interns at various stages of the program simultaneously have more work than those whose entire load consists of Interns at one stage.

It may be necessary for CalStateTEACH to take travel and multiple-stages of teaching into account when determining faculty workload, an issue that was raised in TEKR's joint meeting with Faculty Affairs.

Faculty workload continues to be a significant concern. A study of workload comparability appears to be in order.

2. Department Reimbursement (*Concern #2 and Recommendation #2*)

CalStateTEACH has not been particularly successful in attracting regular CSU faculty. However, in the instances (about 6) in which a CSU faculty member has joined the program as an LSF, the campus department has received reimbursement at actual, not replacement, costs as recommended by the Academic Senate in 1999. Thus, the program does not impoverish campus programs.

All faculty who have been borrowed from campuses have had their contracts bought out for a full academic year. Any faculty member whose student load falls below the assigned level is given tasks that are mutually agreed upon to bring the workload up to the level in the contract. These tasks might include such activities as curriculum development or interviewing prospective candidates.

3. Future Program Funding (*Concern #3*)

CalStateTEACH is now funded primarily by General Fund reimbursements for FTES and fee revenue. FTES enrollment has been higher than original estimates (on which budgets are established) in each of the first two years, so the Chancellor has augmented the program budget from special funds. These augmentations have decreased each year as enrollment has increased. It is anticipated that augmentation of the CalStateTEACH budget will no longer be necessary at program enrollments beyond approximately 800 annualized FTES. Original projections indicated that this would occur in the program's fifth year (2003-04). The program is on schedule to meet this goal. FTES enrollment in 2001-02 is 565, a little short of the 630 target. FTES enrollment in 2001-02 are expected to increase by approximately 40%.

The SFR issue has not been resolved. Currently, the program is funded at the rate of 20:1 SFR multiplied times the average CSU faculty salary.

4. Target Schools and Adjunct Site Faculty (*Concern #4*)

Each candidate admitted to CalStateTEACH is supported not only by the LSF (CSU faculty member), but also by a local site mentor called the Adjunct Site Faculty (ASF). The Academic Senate accurately projected difficulty in locating and securing the participation of such individuals, given the shortage of credentialed teachers and the fact that many of the schools involved could be considered difficult to staff. This has, in fact, been a problem in some schools. CalStateTEACH's policy allows a candidate who is having difficulty finding a qualified ASF at that school site to nominate one who works at another school nearby, or who has recently retired. This flexibility, combined with the fact that CalStateTEACH has grant monies which are used to provide a stipend to each of the ASFs, has made it easier to find qualified individuals willing to act as ASFs. Currently, the percentages of Intern teachers with an ASF assigned range from 92% to 98%.

5. Student Enrollment (*Concern #5*)

Student enrollment has shown steady increases above systemwide averages since the inception of CalStateTEACH. Headcount, FTES, individual, and new student enrollment including projections for 2001-02 are shown below:

	1999-2000 Enrollment	2000-2001 Enrollment	2001-2002 Enrollment
Enrollment: Summer	0	235	312
Enrollment: Fall	329	638	786
Enrollment: Spring	336	666	872
FTES Enrollment	179	428	565
Program Completers	0	198	316*
Enrollment: Summer	0	235	316
Enrollment: Fall	329	638	786

(* this includes graduates from Nov. 01, March 02, July 02)

CalStateTEACH enrollment is represented in 45 different counties. Most enrolled interns are either in geographic areas away from CSU campuses or teaching on emergency permits in urban districts. They are frequently older students (average age, 36) with dependents. These students often find the logistical problems of attending campus classes while working full-time to be insurmountable. However, the CalStateTEACH program is designed for independent learners and many program applicants need the support of the traditional classroom. These applicants are advised to seek their credentials through CSU campus programs. Because the program's toll-free call center as proven popular with people interested in seeking teaching careers, considerable counseling is given to the general public encouraging them to seek admission in CSU campus credentialing programs.

6. Advisory Board Structure (*Concern #6*)

CalStateTEACH has had an Advisory Board, which met 2-3 times in each of the first two years. The Academic Senate had raised a concern early on about the relative number of administrators to faculty. At that time, there were only two Senate appointed faculty representatives on the board. There are currently five faculty members on the board—four representing the Academic Senate and one representing the LSFs working in the program.

7. Program Structure (*Concern #7*)

Presently, the CalStateTEACH Program has Interim Co-Directors, who report directly to the California State University Director of Teacher Education and Public School Programs. The Co-Directors are currently serving in both the roles of Statewide Director and Associate Director for Curriculum. The previously established CalStateTEACH program structure involves a Director, two Associate Directors (Curriculum and Student Services) and five Regional Center Academic Directors (RCADs), one at each of the lead campuses. One of the perceived difficulties with this distributed structure is that the Regional Center Academic Directors each report to their home campuses, not to the Director of CalStateTEACH. At the present time, four of the five RCADs have a direct reporting relationship only to the campus. One RCAD's contract indicates a dual evaluation by the Dean and the Director of CalStateTEACH. All other RCADs' contracts provide for evaluation only by the campus. Thus, the program Director has little authority in directing the work of the RCADs.

While there is good reason to continue central coordination of some functions, options other than the Chancellor's Office should be considered as its locus. Decentralization of funding, allowing each lead campus to collect its own FTE, should be considered. Further, the number of lead campuses could be expanded to allow individual campuses to serve as a lead campus.

8. LSF Qualifications (*Concern #8*)

The Senate raised the possibility that CalStateTEACH's faculty could possibly be built at the expense of campus faculties, simply transferring current faculty to new roles, and not advancing the goal of increasing the overall output of teachers. As it has turned out, very few CSU faculty members have chosen to join CalStateTEACH. The vast majority of the faculty in the program come from positions in K-12 schools (e.g., mentor teachers, principals). The concern raised about the proportion of campus-based faculty to non campus-based faculty is still a relevant one. TEKR has encouraged CalStateTEACH to work to attract more tenured/tenure track individuals to work as LSFs, both for credibility, as well as to build ownership among the faculty on the campuses. Efforts to increase the participation of campus-based faculty should be refined and increased.

9. Student Support Services (*Concern #9*)

CalStateTEACH directly provides admission services, registration processing, financial aid counseling, and advisement. These services are coordinated with the lead campuses at which CalStateTEACH students are processed for enrollment, financial aid, and credentialing. (Library services are also available at CSU campuses closest to students.) Campus student services are compensated by the program. The coordination between the student services on the campuses and CalStateTEACH requires considerable manual processing since computer systems are not always compatible. Program staff are working with PeopleSoft to integrate the CalStateTEACH and campus information systems, where appropriate, as a part of the systemwide integration project.

10. Evaluation (*Concern #10*)

The firm of Rockman and Associates were used as external evaluators of CalStateTEACH. Funds to cover this expense have been made available within the program. They have produced three comprehensive reports to date, and have contributed to this review by TEKR.

In addition to its external evaluation, the CalStateTEACH program is reviewed by its accrediting Agencies. WASC conducted a Substantive Change Proposal hearing in October, 1999 and later visited two centers for what they call their "due diligence" reviews, in the Spring of 2001. They indicated no concerns. CCTC originally reviewed and approved CalStateTEACH as one of a handful of pilot credential programs in the state in May, 1999. A CCTC consultant, four Board of Institutional Review (BIR) members and two researchers conducted a focused review of the program at four sites in March, 2002. Based on the very positive report of the BIR team, CalStateTEACH has been placed on the regular schedule of CCTC campus program reviews.

11. Facilities (*Concern #11*)

CalStateTEACH does not provide offices to its faculty. The LSFs work in the field and from their homes. Each Regional Center has a center office, either on campus or in a rented facility. The rent is reimbursed by the program. Faculty may use the facilities of the Regional Center as a drop-in office. Monthly faculty meetings in each region are conducted either at the Regional Center's office or on a campus. Saturday Seminars are held on campuses. Statewide faculty meetings (held twice yearly) have been held at CSUMB and at Cal Poly Pomona. Every full time faculty member is provided with

a laptop computer. All faculty have telephone credit cards for work related calls, and charges are reviewed monthly.

12. General Concerns (*Resolves # 7 and 8*)

a. Broad-based involvement of CSU campuses, curriculum approval process

During the planning year, 1998-99, more than 30 faculty members from across the CSU, recommended by their campus presidents and/or senate chairs, developed the original drafts for the four stages of the CalStateTEACH curriculum. In January, 1999, the drafts were distributed to all campus libraries, Senate chairs, Provost Offices and Schools/Colleges of Education. In order to collect feedback from reviewing faculty, a web-based system for written feedback was established. More than 100 responses were received. With those responses, the faculty curriculum teams made a number of changes. A detailed review of the materials was conducted by TEKR and shared with the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on CalStateTEACH, as well as with the original curriculum developers.

As outlined in the resolution, each of the original five lead campuses for CalStateTEACH approved, through their established shared governance procedures, their campuses' continuing participation in the spring of 2000.

In the fall of 1999, the "ownership" of the curriculum shifted to the faculty who were teaching in the program. Small curriculum specialty area teams of faculty were formed to continually review and update the curriculum. By the mid-fall, 1999, it was clear the student workload was too high, and, in consultation with TEKR, these groups designed changes, which streamlined the activities and reduced the workload requirement to a more realistic level, while maintaining the content quality.

As the CalStateTEACH program prepares to respond to the mandates of SB 2042 which govern credential program curricula, faculty teams (2-5 LSFs per team), coordinated by the Associate Director for Curriculum, are preparing the new curriculum document drafts.

b. Academic freedom issues (*Resolve #11, Specific Recommendation #7*)

As regular members of the CSU faculty, CalStateTEACH's LSFs participate fully in maintaining and improving the program. Updating and modifying the curriculum is the work of the faculty. This work is facilitated through the Associate Director for Curriculum.

The maintenance of a common, consistent curriculum throughout the State is a unique challenge of the CalStateTEACH program. This need arises both from the fact that the curriculum was approved as a unified program by the CSU campuses as well as because the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and WASC approved the program as a statewide effort. It is within that context that the program faculty have the opportunity to modify the curriculum materials, activities and assessments.

SECTION THREE: Evaluation Data for CalStateTEACH

Accreditation

CalStateTEACH was reviewed by CCTC March 3-6, 2002 and fully met all Common and Program Standards. Numerous strengths were noted, including, but not limited to:

- Highly qualified leadership,
- Well-qualified faculty for an alternative, field-based program,
- Responsiveness to external evaluations,
- K-12 administrators having a high degree of satisfaction with the performance of Learning Support Faculty,
- Considerable effort and expense made to train Adjunct Site Faculty members (school-site mentors).

Evaluation

CalStateTEACH received the results of the California State University Systemwide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs Pilot Study 2001. Overall, eighty percent or more of all program graduates and principals rated all categories surveyed as, "Well or Adequately Prepared." A sampling of results from the survey is included below.

CSU Study Teacher Preparation Programs
Effectiveness as Reported by K-8 Principals and Other Supervisors

<i>Preparation to:</i>	<i>Well or Adequately Prepared</i>
Promote student learning effectively	93%
Organize and manage a classroom for instruction	91%
Use instructional materials and to teach reading-language arts according to grade-level State Content Standards	90%

Effectiveness as Reported by CalStateTEACH Graduates

<i>Preparation to:</i>	<i>Well or Adequately Prepared</i>
Promote student learning effectively	96%
Organize and manage a classroom for instruction	88%
Use instructional materials and to teach reading-language arts according to grade-level State Content Standards	94%

Revised May 3, 2002 (L. Cook, C. Caplan)

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Item 5

AS-2450-99/ad hoc committee
on CalStateTEACH
May 6-7, 1999

Implementation of CalStateTEACH

- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University extend its thanks to all California State University faculty who labored under extreme time pressure to author material and to those who volunteer generously their time and expertise to review and refine the curriculum and design for CalStateTEACH; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU receive and acknowledge the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review CalStateTEACH and endorse specific recommendations, numbers 1 through 8, as contained on pages 7 and 8 of the report; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Chancellor's Office is not the appropriate place to develop curriculum, but given the urgent nature of California's acute shortage of credentialed K-12 teachers, the Academic Senate CSU supports moving ahead with CalStateTEACH on a trial basis; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU approve the implementation of the CalStateTEACH program on an experimental basis for two cycles of the program with the proviso that the individuals responsible for the program report to the Senate on a frequent basis, through the Teacher Education and K-12 Relations Committee on the ongoing implementation and refinement of the program; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the learning support faculty be assigned no more than 15 students as a full-time load; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the individuals responsible for the program, in consultation with the Academic Senate Committee on Teacher Education and K-12 Relations (TEKR), conduct a thorough evaluation of the program by June 2002; and be it further

RESOLVED: That participation of individual campuses in CalStateTEACH is dependent upon approval by the faculty on those campuses using the established shared governance procedures; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU request that participating campuses, using their established shared governance procedures, review CalStateTEACH prior to March 1, 2000, to determine whether or not the campus will participate in the program; and be it further

RESOLVED: That lead campuses which do not approve participation in CalStateTEACH by established campus governance procedures accept no additional cohorts of students; and be it further

RESOLVED: That should no campuses approve CalStateTEACH, no further cohorts of students shall be accepted into the program; and be it further

RESOLVED: That approval of the implementation of the CalStateTEACH program on a trial basis by the Academic Senate CSU is not an endorsement of any future systemwide programs that involve curricula, degrees, or credentials.

RATIONALE: The state of California has experienced a significant shortage of credentialed teachers in the last five years with a resulting increase in the number of emergency permit teachers teaching the students in our schools. The CSU was awarded the funds to develop an open learning approach to earning a credential through an alternative credential program. The CalStateTEACH development staff has worked diligently under extreme time pressure to develop this program and has been responsive to Senate concerns during this process. This is a specific program to meet an emergency in K-12 education in California, and should not be seen as a precedent for future systemwide programs. This alternative credential program, and the funding that supports it, will supplement and not supplant existing campus-based credential programs. The CalStateTEACH curriculum has been approved by TEKR. The extreme time pressure has made it difficult for participating campuses to approve the program and curriculum in a timely fashion. Curriculum and program approval is, however, the responsibility of individual campus faculty and the program should not continue to be supported by any campus beyond its initial cycle if this approval is not forthcoming.

APPROVED WITHOUT DISSENT – May 6-7, 1999

Appendix B to May 2, 2002 TEKR Report

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW CalStateTEACH May 1999

BACKGROUND

CalStateTEACH was developed by approximately 30 CSU faculty from across the system, working in conjunction with Chancellor's Office and campus faculty during the last academic year. The initiative was created in response to the critical shortage in California of fully prepared teachers for elementary schools. CalStateTEACH is designed to be an alternative route to certification, without lowering any of the high standards or quality of more traditional CSU programs. Recently CalStateTEACH was unanimously approved for full California accreditation by the California Commission on Teacher Certification (CCTC) Committee on Accreditation.

CalStateTEACH was described in the following terms by Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence in a March 29, 1999 memorandum:

"CalStateTEACH is a multiple subject intern program ... designed ... for fully employed elementary teachers holding emergency permits or waivers. It is a system-wide program with a common curriculum and an identified support system operated by CSU regional centers, each headed by a Regional Center Academic Director (RCAD). ... When [students] enter CalStateTEACH, they will become Intern Teachers who are guided and advised by CSU Learning Support Faculty (LSF) associated with the regional centers. Additionally, each Intern Teacher will be mentored by Adjunct Site Faculty (ASF) in the school where the Intern Teacher is employed.

... There are no regular university classes to attend... Participants can study at the place and time of their choice, but not at their own pace. They will begin the program when their respective cohorts begin, but once they start the program, they will be required to maintain the pace of their cohorts. They will be expected to submit written assignments at set times, participate in the four stages for established periods of time, and take examinations on fixed dates."

The Academic Senate CSU wishes to thank the faculty members who worked on curriculum development for CalStateTEACH. Curriculum teams were formed in August and September 1998. A great deal of work went into curriculum and

program development; faculty held many face-to-face meetings, communicated extensively through conference calls and participated in cross-curriculum meetings. Appreciation is also due to Drs. Carol Barnes and Jeri Hopkins, curriculum associate directors, and Dr. Jodi Servatius, student services associate director, as well as Dr. Beverly Young, Associate Director of Teacher Education and K-18 Programs, and Dr. Bill Wilson, Director, Teacher Education and K-18 Programs, for shepherding this program through and communicating regularly with the Academic Senate. Commendation and appreciation is further extended to the countless campus-based faculty who generously contributed their time and expertise, without compensation to the development and refinement of the curriculum and design of the program.

SENATE ROLE

The Senate Ad Hoc CalStateTEACH Review Committee was established by the Executive Committee to provide the final system-wide faculty review of the CalStateTEACH program in all of its aspects. In carrying out that review the committee gathered information from a variety of faculty sources. As a review committee, the Ad Hoc Committee relied, insofar as possible, on the expertise of the CSU Academic Senate standing committees in the following areas:

- Committee on Teacher Education and K-12 Relations (TEKR) for review and recommendations about the curriculum including its development and pedagogy as well as nontraditional delivery methods and approaches; and monitoring planning of the program, specifically as it relates to CSU policies and statewide priorities affecting campus teacher education and other credential programs. In completing its tasks, TEKR consulted with faculty from affected campuses.
- Faculty Affairs Committee for review and recommendations concerning: criteria and standards for the appointment, retention and promotion, evaluation, and tenure of academic employees; procedures related to local campus involvement in the personnel process; professional development; the appointment of individuals to system-wide positions; and academic freedom as it relates to curriculum development and delivery
- Academic Affairs Committee for review and recommendations concerning student admission, retention, and program completion.

Members of the Ad Hoc Committee are united in the belief that campus faculty must review the curriculum and approve the participation of their campus by their established methods in order for the campus to participate in the program and recommend students for credentials.

The Ad Hoc Committee, having made its recommendations, will continue to exist through the summer to monitor the final stages of the creation of the program. Future Senate oversight should be the responsibility of TEKR.

CURRICULUM

The Committee on Teacher Education and K-12 Relations (TEKR) reviewed the draft study guides and considered generally the other materials (textbooks, videotapes, etc) that were distributed to the campuses. It also reviewed written and verbal comments submitted to committee members as well as the comments submitted via the web to the curriculum development group. The following comments are based on TEKR's evaluations as well as the committee's interpretation of the input provided by others.

Generally, the draft study guides suggest that significant progress has been made in conceptualizing and developing a high quality curriculum for preparing multiple subject credential teachers through the CalStateTEACH program. The development team is to be commended for its accomplishments in transcending the conceptual boundaries often imposed by traditional disciplinary and departmental structures in order to design what may be a promising alternative teacher preparation curriculum. The materials reflect the considerable expertise, successful collaboration, and creativity of a most talented group of CSU faculty.

Among the strengths of the curriculum are:

1. The curriculum content typically found in many discrete courses has been integrated and reconfigured into four major components (of 15-23 weeks each) thought to correspond to stages of needed knowledge and skill development for intern teachers.
2. The content is sequenced to address specific challenges in the likely order of their occurrence and priority for a beginning intern teacher (e.g., instruction relative to managing children's behaviors and organizing for classroom instruction is initially presented early in Stage 1).
3. Material is presented via books and other readings, video and audio tape, web sites, and interactive technologies. The range of media options is expected to make the curriculum more accessible and interesting to adult learners who are teaching full-time.
4. The content of the curriculum and instructional activities, while clearly focused on the on-going teaching responsibilities of the intern teacher, is soundly grounded in contemporary theory and empirically validated practice.

CURRICULUM CONCERNS

Many of the concerns identified here and elsewhere in the report appear to be the unavoidable result of the extremely short time available to the development team. Many concerns expressed by TEKR and others led to revisions in the current drafts of study guides. It is our understanding that the items of continuing concern are being addressed by the development team and we anticipate changes in the final materials.

Specifically, the assessment and technology guides are currently undergoing revision in response to concerns recently raised by TEKR and others. The overall student workload seems to be excessive but cannot be properly evaluated until a group of students has attempted the program.

PROGRAM CONCERNS

1. Learning Support Faculty (LSF) Workload. LSF workload is currently our number one concern; it must be spelled out before the program begins, and it should be closer to 12-15 students per LSF than to 20-23 cited by the Chancellor in press releases and press conferences. Workloads in this program should be similar to existing campus workloads. Care must be taken to assure an appropriate student-faculty ratio (SFR). Although the SFR for the British Open University is about 15, the tutors in that program are part-time employees, the job requirements are significantly less, and the tutors do not visit, observe, and coach intern teachers on site as will the LSFs. Moreover, British Open University tutors receive additional compensation for each task they undertake which is beyond the basic academic course.

2. Department Reimbursement. Department budgets must be protected for faculty "bought out" to participate in CalStateTEACH. If during the 18-month period most of the original cohort drop out of the program, the LSF should not be sent back to his/her department on the assumption that the department will be able to absorb the faculty member. The department should be guaranteed that when its faculty sign on for this program, funding will be provided for the entire year, regardless of the program's success. The LSF with very few, or even with no, students could be given other mutually agreed upon assignments to insure a full workload.

3. Future Program Funding. All documents from the Chancellor's office have indicated that although the program has been well-funded during its development, it will need to operate within the traditional CSU funding structure during its operational life. That being the case, we have serious concern about future program funding as it relates to workload and other aspects of the program. If giving LSFs a 12-15:1 SFR does not generate sufficient funds to pay adequate salaries for the LSFs, RCADs, and all the other people involved, money must be found somewhere other than "off the top" of the general CSU budget.

CalStateTEACH has the potential to be a very costly program. A funding stream outside the regular budget must be available, or at the very least, this experimental program must prove itself before funds should be allocated to it instead of to existing programs. We do not want the CSU to begin hiring only part-time instructors and less than fully qualified individuals to work in the program because it is short of money. At the same time, we do not want the CSU to think it can simply "up" the workload (SFR) of the LSFs to bring in more funds. The entire range of budgetary support needs to be made clear before the program is allowed to recruit a second cohort of students. A fairly extensive administrative structure is being created, one larger than can be supported by the money projected in the materials we have seen to date.

4. Target Schools and Adjunct Site Faculty. Since many uncredentialed teachers are in schools that are generally considered to be less desirable, it is not clear if well-qualified site faculty can be obtained. Furthermore, in these schools it may be difficult to learn good teaching practices and have them reinforced.

5. Student Enrollment. It is unknown how many students will enroll or whether they will be the appropriate students for such a program. Many uncredentialed teachers are located within travelling distance of a CSU campus and would be well served by an on-campus program. Why would such students choose CalStateTEACH? One possibility is that they think it will be easier. It is our understanding that in screening for this program students with strong commitment and self-motivation will be sought out. It is imperative that such students be found, since without these qualities failure is likely. Additionally it is essential that rigorous and ongoing program review be used to insure that high academic standards are maintained.

6. Advisory Board Structure. A new advisory board will be needed once the program is up and running—one with fewer presidents and with more faculty who have expertise in teacher education, curriculum development, and program evaluation. Such an advisory committee should include appropriate representation of faculty from campuses located in the areas of greatest need for credentialed teachers.

7. Program Structure. Currently the program will be run through consortia of campuses with the Regional Center Academic Directors (RCADs) reporting to the Chancellor's Office, to the host campuses, and to the individual consortia. Simpler is better.

8. LSF Qualifications. Moving faculty from one program to another is not going to help meet credentialing needs. Where will the additional faculty come from? Will such faculty be as qualified as faculty currently employed in campus

programs? What inducements will be provided to attract tenure-track faculty from campus programs? What is the appropriate mix of campus-based and non-campus-based faculty and the effect of this ratio of regular and temporary faculty in campus programs?

9. Student Support Services. Student support services are important to assure student success in this program. For example, students will require appropriate counseling, technology assistance, and library access. Student support services provided in the program need to be clearly spelled out and adequately funded. If individual campuses provide the services, they should be fully reimbursed.

10. Evaluation. How will quality be assured? The criteria and methods for evaluating individual faculty program need to be specifically spelled out and funded. Part of the evaluation should include an assessment of student work, after it has been reviewed by the LSF, by teacher education faculty in on-campus program. Funds should be provided to carry out this important evaluation process.

11. Facilities. Will facilities and equipment be adequate to support the learning goals of the program? LSFs will require appropriate office space and computer access. Facilities for faculty meetings and professional development as well as meeting space for Saturday workshops/sessions will be needed.

GENERAL CONCERNS

We wish to express in the strongest terms that this is not an appropriate way to develop new academic programs in the CSU or in any other respectable university. In particular, academic program development should rely more on the faculty of individual campuses from beginning to end; programs should not be developed in a time frame so short that it leaves virtually no time for broad-based faculty consultation and campus participation.

The Chancellor's Office is not the appropriate place to develop programs. Rather the CO should facilitate the development of programs by faculty. The CO should encourage bottom-up, rather than top-down, program development. Nor is the Academic Senate CSU an appropriate curriculum and program review body. We undertook this extraordinary action because of the dire situation in California's K-12 teaching corps and because we recognize the importance of faculty involvement and advice in developing an innovative response that maintains high academic standards. We are fully aware that the program is on course for implementation with or without Senate "approval." Curriculum development and approval is a faculty function best carried out **on the campuses**. The Academic Senate has no desire to supplant the curriculum approval process in place on all CSU campuses. Participation of individual campuses in

CalStateTEACH should be dependent upon approval by the faculty on those campuses using their established shared governance processes.

Our actions in reviewing and "approving" this particular program should not be seen as in any way setting a precedent. Furthermore, we do not wish even to entertain the notion that there should be a CSU curriculum, and most decidedly not a CSU degree or certificate. The Chancellor's Office is not in the degree or credential granting business and should not use distance education to supplant programs on the campuses.

This program is a bad precedent for anything other than a program meeting state-mandated criteria in a crisis situation. It poses a real danger to the academic freedom of a faculty member to teach a course in the way he/she feels is appropriate: it comes close to assembly-line work.

THE FUTURE

Although the program has received regular approval by the California Commission on Teacher Certification, this program and its implementation by the CSU must be viewed as experimental. Faculty oversight, both centrally and on local campuses, is crucial as the program develops. More specifically, careful study and evaluation by CSU faculty is critical to insuring program quality and developing a knowledge base that will help to inform future efforts on campuses as well as in CST. CalStateTEACH should not be viewed as a permanent program, but rather as one designed for and intended solely to meet a crisis situation, one that will end as that crisis recedes.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Cohort size and workload should be equivalent to the workload presently in place on local campuses. For the initial cohort we recommend the size of 12-15 students for a full-time faculty member.
2. Faculty on individual campuses who participate in this program should be replaced at full cost.
3. This program should be approved on an experimental basis, carefully evaluated, and reviewed by this Senate--through TEKR--and by local campuses within three years.
4. Progress reports should be provided to TEKR on a frequent basis. The materials provided in these reports should include, but not be limited to, size of cohorts, attrition rates and reasons, workload, student support services provided, and funding.

5. Lines of responsibility for RCADs should be made clearer and simpler. Consideration should be given to dropping the consortia of campuses in favor of a single campus.
6. The Advisory Board should be reconstituted to include fewer presidents and a larger percentage of faculty appointed by the CSU Senate, representing appropriate disciplines and areas of expertise, as well as the interests of the faculty at large. This Board should include appropriate representation of faculty from the campuses and geographical areas experiencing the greatest shortages.
7. The CO at all costs should avoid repeating this exercise. Academic program development should be from the bottom up, and the CO should limit itself to facilitating rather than mandating academic program development, which is the prerogative of the faculty.
8. Participation of individual campuses in CalStateTEACH is dependent upon approval by the faculty on those campuses using the established shared governance processes. These campuses should review CalStateTEACH prior to March 1, 2000, to determine whether or not the campus will participate in the program.