

Form B: EDTE's Single Subject Proposed Program Changes

The California Context

There is a clear set of links between our proposal and the mandate we face from the Legislature. Senate Bill 2042 (Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998), signed by the governor in 1998, called for a major reform in the professional preparation of teachers in California. To accomplish this reform, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) created a new set of program standards from the ground up and required every institutional sponsor of basic credential programs to reform its existing programs in accordance with the new specifications by December 31, 2003.

Five of the many substantive changes called for by the Commission in response to legislation have had considerable influence on the nature of the changes we are proposing. We summarize these legislated changes here:

- Replacement of the Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) emphasis with the English Language Authorization (ELA) and the requirement that the ELA be completed by all candidates in the basic program – the preliminary credential (the CLAD emphasis was optional for candidates);
- Integration of what were previously post-preliminary credential topics into the basic credential program (Health, Special Populations);
- Introduction of a standardized Teaching Performance Assessment System (TPA) into the program with a set of performance outcomes that are consistent across the state;
 - Requirement that new teachers have expertise with and understanding of technology in educational settings before they begin teaching;
 - Requirement that credentials are realistically accessible in one year of professional study.

The first point (replacement of CLAD with the ELA – English Language Authorization – and its integration into the basic program) required us in spring and summer of 2002 (due to the passage of AB 1059 and its implementation prior to the implementation of SB 2042 standards) to examine our then-current 18-unit CLAD option together with all of the basic credential courses in order to merge these course aggregates into one program. The second point (Health, Special Populations) required us to examine two courses that have been offered to candidates only after they had completed the basic credential program in order to integrate their content into the basic credential courses. The third point (TPA) required us to align everything we do across the program with the expectations of the assessment system. The fourth point (technology) was initially dealt with by examining yet a third course that had been offered to candidates after they complete the basic credential program (as part of the Professional Clear Credential) in order to integrate its content into the basic credential courses; we began requiring two new courses in Fall 2002 to meet this requirement. The fifth point (one-year expectation) required us to integrate all of these new topics and outcomes into the basic credential program in almost half the time.

These five points reinforce for us the major theme of Senate Bill 2042, namely, that we must produce teachers who know how and are disposed to teach *all* children in California from their first days as professionals, that we must provide consistent and compelling evidence of our capacity to produce such teachers, and that we must achieve this goal with maximum efficiency and reliability. Our program created more than three decades ago under the Ryan Act had swollen over the years to over 60 units if candidates wanted to earn the CLAD designation. Our task was to create a program that would meet the new standards and still produce a credential in fewer than 43 units.

Among these new CCTC criteria, the truly “new” idea for us was the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA). Senate Bill 2042 requires all preliminary credential candidates attending fifth year, intern, or blended teacher preparation programs in California to pass a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA). This assessment is designed to give candidates the opportunity to develop, refine, and demonstrate knowledge, skills, and abilities during their teacher preparation program. The TPA must be integrated in coursework, formative and summative in its usage, and linked to the California state-adopted academic content standards for students, the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, and the California Frameworks.

Importantly, the TPA is part of a three-year preparation cycle of growth and development for teachers. All teacher candidates must take and pass the TPA in order to be recommended for a Preliminary Teaching Credential. After receiving the Preliminary Credential, and upon employment within a California school, teachers must participate in an approved induction program for a two-year period leading to a Professional Credential. With the TPA as a central organizer and link between professional preparation in IHEs and induction as a credentialed teacher in the field, the architecture of professional preparation has changed dramatically in California. Institutional sponsors of teacher preparation programs are not expected to provide candidates with everything they need to know and be able to do as an experienced teacher. The Commission has embraced the notion that good beginning teachers are not “finished” until they have profited from systematic learning during their first two years as practitioners. Hence, this new architecture asks the institution to prepare “good beginning teachers” who have adequate skill to add value to the learning of children from their first day of professional teaching—and who have the foundational knowledge and abilities requisite for their subsequent development in the field.

The Current Program

Any potential credential candidate who visits the CSUS website and consults the current catalog will find the following program information.

Single Subject Credential Program (37-42 units)

Two-semester and three-semester programs are available. Contact the Teacher Preparation Program Office for sequence of courses, time commitment, and other information.

- (3) EDTE 100 Observation-Participation in Schools
- (3) EDBM 105 Multicultural Education for a Pluralistic Society - SS
- (3) EDTE 106 Educational Psychology (Admission to the Teacher Credentialing Program)
- (2) EDTE 330A Educational Technology in the Classroom: Applications and Integration, Part I (Students will be required to have a basic knowledge of word processing and e-mail.
Corequisite: Enrollment in a preliminary credential program at CSUS)
- (1) EDTE 330B Educational Technology in the Classroom: Applications and Integration, Part II (EDTE 330A. **Corequisite:** Enrollment in a preliminary credential program at CSUS)
- (3) EDTE 380 Secondary School Teaching
- (2) EDTE 382 Seminar: Single Subject Student Teaching, Phase III
- (3) EDTE 384 Teaching Reading in the Secondary School
- (4) EDTE 480A Student Teaching - SS (Admission to Teacher Preparation Program)
- (10-15) Select one of the following:
 - EDTE 480B Student Teaching - SS (Admission to Teacher Preparation Program)
 - EDTE 480C Student Teaching - SS CLAD (CLAD Program approval and successful completion of EDTE 480A)
 - EDTE 480D Student Teaching Internship - SS
 - EDTE 480E Student Teaching Internship- SS CLAD (CLAD program approval; limited to students who have satisfactorily completed all requirements in Phase II and have been approved by the Center Coordinator and the Education Student Service Center)
- (3) a Single Subject Teaching Methods course

Single Subject Credential with a Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development Emphasis (CLAD) (18 units)

- (3) ENGL 110A Linguistics and the English Language **OR** EDBM 171
Bilingualism in the Classroom
- (3) ANTH 101 Cultural Diversity **OR** approved equivalent
- (3) EDBM 170 Introduction to Bilingual Education
- (3) EDBM 279 Methods in Teaching a Second Language (EDBM 170)
- (6) Six college-level units in a foreign language or three high school years of the same foreign language **AND** The coursework required in the Single Subject Credential Program.

Potential credential candidates also learn that the Preliminary Credential they earn as a consequence of their work at CSUS is valid for a five year period and is NOT renewable UNLESS the candidates complete an additional 8 units of coursework, including the Health, Technology, and Special Populations requirement as follows (again quoting from the current catalog):

Within that five-year period, the candidate must meet the following requirements for the **Professional Clear Credential**: 30 approved semester units beyond the Bachelor's degree to include the following courses:

<u>HLSC 136</u>	School Health Education (CPR training; may be taken concurrently)
<u>EDS 100A</u> <u>100B OR</u> <u>EDS 101</u>	[Education of Exceptional Children/Youth (Corequisite : <u>EDS 100B OR EDS 101</u>) [Consultation Skills in Inclusive and Supportive Educational Environments]
<u>EDTE 330A</u>	Educational Technology in the Classroom: Applications and Integration, Part I (Students will be required to have a basic knowledge of word processing and e-mail. Corequisite : Enrollment in a preliminary credential program at CSUS)
<u>EDTE 330B</u>	Educational Technology in the Classroom: Applications and Integration, Part II (<u>EDTE 330A</u> . Corequisite : Enrollment in a preliminary credential program at CSUS) Note : The computer requirement is 3 units.

As was mentioned on the first page of this document, one new CCTC requirement was implemented since the 2002-2004 catalog was printed, but prior to other SB 2042 requirements, because of the passage of AB 1059. This new requirement was the replacement of the Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) emphasis with the English Language Authorization (ELA) and the requirement that the ELA be completed by all candidates in the basic program. The COE response to AB 1059 was approved by CCTC in early Fall 2002, approved by the COE Academic Affairs Committee in Fall 2002, and submitted to University Academic Affairs this month (February, 2003). In the meantime, the new ELA requirement took effect in Fall 2002 for all entering credential candidates, so those revised requirements are listed below.

English Language Authorization (ELA) for Single Subjects Credential Candidates (6 units)

- (3) EDBM 170 Introduction to Bilingual Education
- (3) EDBM 279 Classroom Strategies for teaching English Language Learners

To summarize the task before us, here are the changes we were asked to make: 1) The purpose of ENGL110A/BMED 171, ANTH 101, EDBM 170, and EDBM 279 (optional in the catalog, required under a temporary agreement with the Commission) had to be met within the basic credential courses (non-optional) and 2) The functions of EDS 100A with EDS 100B or EDS 101, HLSC 136, and EDTE 330A and 330B (now requirements AFTER the basic program) had to be partially served within the basic credential program. An 18-unit optional course aggregate and a 9-unit required post-completion course aggregate had to be integrated into an already existing 37-42 unit course aggregate.

Re-conceptualizing the Single Subject Credential

The Commission organizes its new Standards into four categories. Category A is titled “Program Design, Governance, and Qualities” and includes a set of criteria that require 1) a coherent curriculum grounded in the professional literature and explicitly connected to the TPA, 2) the careful integration of pedagogical theory and professional practice, and 3) a heavy focus on teaching for equity and fairness. Category B is titled “Preparation to Teach Curriculum to All Students in California Schools” and includes a set of criteria that require 1) opportunities to reflect on actual teaching experiences, 2) preparation to teach Reading-Language Arts, 3) preparation to teach subject-specific content, and 4) use of computer-based technology in the classroom. Category C is titled “Preparation to Teach All Students in California Schools” and includes criteria that speak to what used to be optional (CLAD) or post-completion (Health, Special Populations, and Technology). Category D is titled “Supervised Fieldwork in the Program” and includes criteria that specify qualities of field placements, field supervisors, candidate qualifications to student teach, and quality assignments and assessments.

To meet the expectations of the new criteria, the EDTE Single Subject Area Group in consultation with colleagues from other departments made the following three organizing decisions. First, the program would change from its current configuration wherein candidates attend all or most of their classes on campus and participate in field experiences in middle and high schools scattered throughout the region to a program wherein candidates attend courses that are usually offered on a school site and participate in a cohort of candidates in field experiences offered within a small cluster of middle and high schools. This change would require faculty to work together themselves in cohorts and to make new agreements with surrounding districts to create arrangements reminiscent of the Professional Development School model of teacher preparation.

Second, the Single Subject faculty would put all of the current course aggregate on the table for examination and revision, using the following principles to guide the redesign of the curriculum:

1. The program will be designed according to expectations of candidate development at given points in the program. At bottom, the program is designed to accommodate learning needs from novice status through apprentice and “competent.”
2. The program will be designed according to a recursive loop wherein topics are introduced, examined, applied, and critiqued in increasing depth as the candidate matriculates; this recursivity models the kind of instruction the program aims to promote among its graduates in their practices. Thus, not just “time,” but “timing” is critical to the program design.
3. A modular structure to the program (6 weeks/9 weeks and then 9 weeks/6 weeks for each semester) permits flexibility in the allocation of human and other resources and allows the program to refine its response to candidate needs in a finer grain than the current 15-week semester structure allows.
4. The program must make full use of technology in the courses and in the assessment system for instructional and evaluative purposes.

Third, the Single Subject faculty agreed to develop and implement a computer-based portfolio assessment system that would unify the actual work of the candidates as they negotiated the courses and field experiences and would accommodate the requirements of the TPA. The portfolio system includes two major categories of artifacts from course work: “Inquiries” and “Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment” (CIA). Also included is a section that holds the candidate’s official TPA work. Within the Inquiry category candidates complete community studies, case studies, and self-studies. Within each of these studies is the expectation that candidates focus attention on diversity in terms of social class, cultural background, linguistic competence, learning ability, special needs, and other types of concerns. So case studies, for example, include several assignments that look at a range of students encountered during field experience. The same is true of the other Inquiries.

Within the CIA category are a number of assignments that produce artifacts. Under ‘Teaching and Learning Theory’ candidates might create carefully designed and prompted essays grounded in a research literature; they might include journal entries with on-the-spot reflection; they could be assigned the task of composing a statement that captures their ‘stance toward effective teaching’—what it is, how it is achieved, how it is assessed. Within the ‘Lesson and Unit Design’ category candidates could provide written artifacts of planning, observational notes from a supervisor, video clips on-line, with a range of other possibilities. Within the ‘Academic Language and Literacy’ section candidates could be asked to provide student work from lessons they teach wherein language and literacy are addressed in important ways. This student work could be contextualized by way of orienting statements and reflective analysis (“What? Now what? So what?” sorts of reflective writing).

Single Subject Program Proposal:

With these agreements in mind, the faculty then created the following program.

Co-requisites/Prerequisites (8 units)

- (2) HLSC 136 School Health Education
- (3) EDBM 170 Introduction to Bilingual Education
- (2) EDS 100B Education of Exceptional Youth
- (1) EDTE 331 Educational Technology Laboratory Single Subject

Semester 1 (21 units)

- (3) EDTE 371A Schools and Community I
- (3) EDTE 116 The Psychology of Instruction
- (3) EDTE 372 Anthropology of Education
- (3) EDTE 38__ Special Methods
- (7) EDTE 470 Student Teaching I: Secondary Schools
- (2) EDTE 373A Assessment Center Laboratory I

Semester 2 (21 units)

- (3) EDTE 371B Schools and Community II
- (13) EDTE 470B Student Teaching II: Secondary Schools
- (3) EDTE 384 Instruction and Assessment of Academic Literacy
- (2) EDTE 373B Assessment Center Laboratory II

Future Plans

Accompanying this Form B and its elaboration are Form A course proposals for all of the courses included in this preliminary credential preparation program for middle and high school teachers which are offered by the Department of Teacher Education. We plan to continue to consult with our colleagues in EDBM and EDS and look forward to sharing our ideas as they design curriculum for EDBM 170, HLSC 136, and EDS 100, three of our prerequisites.

We have quite a number of program documents to complete. We will need a portfolio handbook for faculty and students that spells out the portfolio components, procedures, policies, and scoring strategies. This requirement will be handled in electronic form; we will need to make use of the technological expertise of our colleagues in EDTE and across the College for this work. Our admissions procedures will likely undergo some change as well in order to align our admissions procedures and criteria with the program outcomes. Our links to the TPA implementation currently under development within the College will need to be made explicit, and we will need to ensure that our candidates have trained assessors available to give them feedback.

A major area of need also is the creation of a field experience binder. The precise nature of the field experiences our candidates will have need to be defined and described so that there is true integration of pedagogical theory and professional practice. Coupled with this need is the need to articulate clearly and fully our expectations for Cooperating Teachers and for Field Supervisors. With a cohort model we hope to make use of the faculty member who teaches the seminar course on site as the faculty liaison; this liaison will work closely with up to two university supervisors.

Our plan is to maintain the current program through the 2003-2004 academic year while we pilot one cohort of the new program in Fall, 2003.