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1.0 History, Mission, Goals, and Objectives

1.1 Overview of the field and department history

1.1.1. Overview of the field

Teacher preparation in California has traditionally been a post-baccalaureate “fifth year” program of study completed once a student earned a baccalaureate degree in a suitable area of subject matter preparation along with any mandated assessments, with the opportunity to earn a Master of Arts degree soon after. By the 1990s, the greying of California’s teacher pool, particularly in larger urban school districts, accompanied by significant growth in the populations of students who were English learners and/or had disabilities lead to a critical shortage of well-prepared teachers, often resulting in the placement of unprepared “waiver” or intern teachers in classrooms who began teaching with little or no formal teacher education coursework and with minimal mentorship or supervision in the classroom.

In response to the shortage of newly prepared teachers and the dramatic growth of intern teachers, California realized it needed to expand the range of pathways a prospective teacher might take to the classroom, including a quicker route to completion of a preliminary teaching credential. As a result, the state proposed a new model of teacher preparation in the late 90s: the blended undergraduate teacher preparation program (now known as the integrated teacher preparation program). In this model, undergraduate students were allowed to complete a baccalaureate degree program suitable to teacher preparation while “blending” subject matter content with professional education coursework. In most institutions, traditional teacher preparation majors such as Liberal Studies or Child Development developed new blended options, which accompanied their traditional fifth-year teacher preparation pathway, giving students two routes to their teaching credentials. These programs require coordination between the department offering the major and the institution’s school of education, requiring undergraduate students to bridge two schools or colleges with separate rules, policies and practices, with the predictable inconsistent information and student frustration a feature of these programs.

Although California does not allow teacher preparation candidates to major in professional education, the Charter College of Education (CCOE) believed it had the faculty resources and commitment to offer an innovative undergraduate blended major that would be grounded in the social scientific context of teaching in the urban environment, a heretofore under-addresses aspect of teacher candidate study, while providing preparation for an elementary education or special education credential, all in the same college. The CCOE believed a single-college blended program would allow us to build a cross-departmental program that would provide consistent advisement and information dissemination, could be structured more like similar programs of professional preparation, such as nursing, and would afford students the opportunity to learn in small learning communities, or cohorts while progressing through their degree program in a timely manner.
The Urban Learning (URLN) major was developed by the CCOE in 1999 to meet the growing demand for university teacher education programs that train credentialed general and special educators in the most efficient and effective manner possible. The Bachelor of Arts degree in Urban Learning is an innovative teacher preparation program that combines courses in pedagogy with major courses emphasizing an interdisciplinary approach to understanding teaching and learning in an urban setting as a social scientific phenomenon. The major is supported by a depth area in social sciences which focuses on development of cultural awareness, and a credential option that prepares students to teach in elementary school general education classrooms or in special education classrooms at the elementary and secondary level.

The undergraduate major in Urban Learning prepares students to become educators with the skills and knowledge required to teach in the urban centers of California and beyond. Because Cal State LA is located in one of the largest and most diverse urban communities in the world, our graduates must understand how the urban environment impacts the educational system, and the children and their families served by urban public schools. Therefore, the program’s mission is closely aligned to that of the Charter College of Education: to provide the best possible education professionals for the culturally and linguistically diverse typical and atypical learners in urban, and suburban, schools.

1.1.2 History

In 1993, California State University, Los Angeles, was given approval by Chancellor Barry Munitz to operate the first Charter College of Education in the nation; the CCOE’s charter was renewed by Chancellor Timothy White in September 2012. The campus is located in the heart of metropolitan Los Angeles and is considered an urban campus serving a large community of diverse urban students. Consequently, the mission, vision and programs of the Charter College of Education reflect concern with the unique issue and challenges of urban education with particular emphasis on a wide range of diversity.

The Charter College of Education is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Commission on Accreditation (COA). The governance structure of the CCOE, the School-as-a-Whole (SAW), operates as direct democratic, collaborative decision-making body comprising college administrators, faculty and staff. The SAW encourages innovation in curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, and research. Among the many noteworthy innovative activities that originated within the charter is the Urban Learning Program, a blended undergraduate teacher preparation program that provides a fast-track to earning a bachelor’s degree in urban learning along with a California Multiple Subject credential or Education Specialist Internship credential. The major is unique in the United States, and was designed to prepare teachers for the urban public schools Cal State LA and the CCOE serve, schools that are culturally and linguistically diverse, include a broad range of students with disabilities and are historically hard-to-
staff. In addition, reflecting the CCOE’s role in special education teacher preparation, ULRN is among a handful of blended programs offering a credential option in special education, with four disability specializations.

ULRN’s predecessor, the Cal State LA Model Teacher Education Program (MTEP) offered students entering in fall 1997 and fall 1998 the opportunity to pursue their credentials while majoring in one of nine subject areas. Growing out of this program, the Urban Learning Program (ULRN) began as a pilot program in the fall of 1999. Of its first 94 transfer students, 41 (or 43%) graduated by the end of Summer Quarter, 2001. This percentage was considerably higher than the average for all Cal State LA transfers in fall 1999. Thus, the CCOE became the first California college of education to enroll a cohort of transfer students and produce a substantial number of qualified teachers in only a two-year period.

Accountability for this pilot program was required by the SAW, and data from multiple sources were collected in order to ascertain if the program was meeting the Interim Standards for Blended Programs form the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). The CCOE also received recommendations from the Cal State LA Academic Senate Educational Policy Committee to assist in the process of moving the pilot program to permanent status.

In 2001, CCOE enlisted an outside evaluation team, Evaluation and Development Associates from San Francisco, to conduct a program evaluation based on the CCOE’s Interim Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Blended Programs. Program results were positive and stated that the program was characterized by: (a) higher persistence rates to graduation than comparable transfer students at Cal State LA (b) a dedicated faculty who built the program from the original Model Teacher Education Program (MTEP), (c) successful use of the model of learning communities or cohorts of students who attend classes together and give each other academic and social support, (d) a connected, sequential, interdisciplinary curricula that blends content and “hands-on” field and classroom experiences, and (e) inter- and intra-institutional collaboration within the CCOE, across Cal State LA, and with the CCTE.

In fall of 2003, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) approved ULRN as a permanent blended undergraduate teacher preparation program. To obtain this approval, the ULRN program was modified to meet the new SB 2042 Standards for Elementary Subject Matter (ESM) and Blended Programs, and it worked closely with the CTC to match its blended curriculum and pedagogy with state standards. At Cal State LA, ULRN was approved as a permanent undergraduate major that is offered to both freshmen and transfer students. It is a fast-paced program in which transfer students earn a bachelor’s degree and a Multiple Subject Credential or an Education Specialist Internship Credential in approximately two years (2-1/2 years on the semester calendar), while freshman earn the degree and credential in four years. Students who choose ULRN as a major are those who wish to become teachers and teach in urban schools, and who value a culture of inclusive, collaborative teaching and learning.
Over the next decade, the ULRN program grew in size, diversity, and reputation. Of the 94 students who began the first ULRN program as transfer students in fall 1999, 84% were female, and between the ages of 21 and 26 (60%). An additional 29% were between the ages of 27 and 35 years. Approximately 91% were Latino; 3% American Indian/Alaskan Native, 3% Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander, 3% Black/Non-Hispanic, and 0% White. ULRN was the main reason that 45% of them decided to attend Cal State LA and 83% of them were employed while they attended the program. Yet, 83% of them took 13-20 units with 27% taking 17-20 units. These statistics illustrate that from the beginning, ULRN served a student population that had some unique characteristics compared to other undergraduate program profiles. They were somewhat older, with the majority working while in the program, and for 48% of them, Spanish was their primary language spoken at home.

When an internal program evaluation was conducted with the ULRN in 2007, ULRN had grown to 160 transfer students in six cohorts in the ULRN program. Over 13% were Asian/Pacific Islander, 7% White, 2% African American, 2% Mixed, 1% Native American and 72% Hispanic. Approximately 58% came from homes where Spanish was the native language, 31% came from English-speaking homes, and others from homes where the primary language was Chinese (5%), Japanese (1%), Korean (2%), Armenian (2%), and Tagalog (1%). The majority of ULRN students were English Learners in K-12 grades and are now bilingual adults. The cohort system of small communities of 25-30 ULRN students with peer leaders was a major factor cited as helping these students manage work and school at the same time, stay in the program through tough times, and graduate in the expected time interval. By this time, local principals, who had employed ULRN graduates, were voicing formal and informal comments that they preferred ULRN graduates due to their interdisciplinary curriculum and preparation in handling urban issues. Word-of-mouth had become the most useful advertising method for the program with former ULRN students telling others about it. This resulted in the ULRN program enrolling sisters, mothers and sons and daughters, cousins, and or familial duos, another source of support for ULRN students.

Program Modifications
The Urban Learning Program has undergone four program modifications since it was approved for permanent status. All dates reflect final approval by the Cal State LA Educational Policy Committee.

- In 2007, the program was modified to align the requirements for the Multiple Subject program with the new S.B 2042 requirements for the Multiple Subject credential. (Approved: April 16, 2007)
- In 2009, reauthorization of ESEA Title V limited all Bachelor of Arts degree programs to 180 quarter (120 semester)-units. In response, ULRN underwent a comprehensive modification of the program to what became known as the “Directed Electives” model. Its general education program was reduced from 90 units to 72 units, and aligned with the university GE program while reducing the units in the major from 198 units to 180 units. This modification made it possible for students who transfer from a community college with CSU-GE or IGETC certification to matriculate as Urban Learning majors with their GE coursework.
Prescribed credential program coursework was replaced with 45 units of electives, which allowed students to select from among credential and California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET) preparation courses, offering them a more flexible course of study. Following the introduction of this option, the original program was phased out. (Approved: October 5, 2009)

- The third modification, in 2011, significantly revised the program of depth courses to strengthen their urban emphasis. At that time, the option to declare a credential pathway was restored to the program, while the more flexible Directed Electives plan was retained for students wishing to select coursework that will prepare them for the CSET. This gave the program three tracks of coursework, one emphasizing CSET preparation, and two emphasizing credential preparation. (Approved: May 23, 2011)

- The fourth modification, in 2014-15, converted the program from a single track on the quarter calendar to two tracks on the semester calendar as part of the university’s change to semester. Option I (Teacher Preparation), the teacher preparation track is a 135 semester-unit program. This program will take effect in Fall 2016, and includes two new courses (ULRN 4140 and EDIT 4100) in the major, along with reconfiguration of the depth courses and the credential coursework to incorporate new semester offerings. In addition, the program converted the Directed Electives option to Option II (Teaching and Learning), a 120 semester-unit option for students not seeking a teaching credential. Initially, this will be an opt-out program for students who elect not to teach once in the major, but may over time evolve into a major-only option available to students who prefer not to teach or to pursue a credential at the graduate level, but who want to study urban teaching and learning. (Approved: January 5, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Code</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Years Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ULRN</td>
<td>Multiple Subject Credential</td>
<td>2003-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRI</td>
<td>Education Specialist Credential</td>
<td>2003-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRD</td>
<td>Directed Electives</td>
<td>2009-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRG</td>
<td>Teacher Preparation</td>
<td>2011-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Initially, ULRN was the course prefix, program nickname and plan code for the ULRN option (then called a minor) in elementary education. When we restore the two credential options in 2011, a new plan code, ULRG was selected to differentiate the plan code from the course prefix. Currently, ULRN is our course prefix and program nickname, and our plan code is ULRG, with a small number of students in ULRD.

### 1.2 Mission

Unlike other colleges on the campus that are made up of largely autonomous academic departments, the Charter College of Education comprises three administrative divisions: Applied and Advanced Studies in Education (hosting ULRN, and offering ULRN prefix courses as well as courses in learning theory, educational foundations, and technology), Curriculum and Instruction (offering coursework in the elementary education option), and Special Education and Counseling (offering coursework counseling and in the
special education option) who have a shared responsibility: the preparation of teachers and other education professionals (school counselors, school psychologists, administrators, etc.), with degree programs growing out of and supporting this primary responsibility. The three divisions are highly inter-dependent, with credential students frequently required to take coursework in all three divisions as part of their professional preparation, both degree and licensure. Therefore, it was the decision of the School as a Whole, our internal governing body, that the CCOE would have one shared conceptual framework, including a mission and vision, reflecting our common values. The Urban Learning Program shares this Conceptual Framework with the rest of the CCOE.

The Conceptual Framework of the Charter College of Education is communicated to students at two entry points: in their first CCOE courses, where it appears on every course outline, and on the application for their selected credential program, where they are asked to write a personal philosophy of education which in part must address the mission and vision. The mission and vision are also posted prominently in administrative, divisional, and faculty offices, as well as on bulletin boards. The mission and vision appear on every course outline in the CCOE.

The Mission of the Charter College of Education
The CCOE mission is to develop in CCOE students the professional knowledge, skills and dispositions to promote academic, social and psychological development of diverse learners in urban schools and related agencies. CCOE graduates become teachers, special educators, school administrators, educational technologists, researchers, program evaluators, school psychologists, counselors, rehabilitation professionals, higher education faculty, and other educational specialists. Within an environment of shared governance, CCOE professional preparation programs utilize data-driven decision-making, technologically-integrated instruction, meaningful curricula, and outcome-based assessments to insure high quality educational opportunities for all CCOE students.

The Vision of the Charter College of Education
The Charter College of Education (CCOE) is a learning community of faculty, administrators, staff, CCOE students, and community members who work collaborative to ensure that all CCOE students receive a high-quality education, honor the diversity of all learners, advocate for educational and community reforms, develop reflective practices that promote equity, and facilitate the maximum learning and achievement potential of all children and adults.

The CCOE Conceptual Framework includes four shared values:
- Educational equity
- Collaboration
- Professionalism
- Reflective practices

Leading to four shared commitments:
- Urban focus
- Data driven decisions
- Technology driven
- Diversity
The Conceptual Framework of the Charter College of Education

The Goal of the Urban Learning Program

The goal of the Urban Learning Major is to allow freshmen to graduate with a Bachelor of Arts degree and a preliminary Multiple Subject (elementary education) teaching credential or Education Specialist (special education) Internship teaching credential in four years and for juniors or community college transfers to complete the program in two years (8 quarters). ULRN graduates hold a Bachelor of Arts in Urban Learning and either a preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential or eligibility for the Education Specialist Internship Credential. Students who earn this degree must complete a minimum of 180 units to graduate along with meeting a series of course, fieldwork and assessment requirements.

With the conversion to the semester calendar, the program increased from 180 quarter (120 semester) to 135 semester units as authorized by the Chancellor’s office. The goal of the semester program is for freshmen to graduate with a bachelor’s degree and a preliminary Multiple Subject (elementary education) teaching credential or an
Education Specialist (special education) Internship teaching credential in four years and for juniors or community college transfers to complete the program in 2-1/2 years (5 semesters) based on a 15 unit per semester program.

1.3 Goals and objectives (student learning outcomes)

The Urban Learning Program has adopted the following Student Learning Outcomes:

UL-SLO 1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of the needs and demands of diverse students in urban schools and communities.

UL-SLO 2: Students will develop and model critical thinking skills for themselves and the students they teach.

UL-SLO 3: Students will connect subject matter and pedagogy to meet the educational needs of all students.

UL-SLO 4: Students will build on the diverse languages, cultures, capabilities and experiences of their students to assure them the optimum opportunities to grow and develop academically.

UL-SLO 5: Students will develop curriculum and instruction that integrate the urban students' strengths, including their languages, cultures, learning styles and communities.

UL-SLO 6: Students will demonstrate professional writing skills, including the ability to discuss, analyze, synthesize and apply professional literature in writing.

UL-SLO 7: Students will demonstrate collaboration skills needed to work as a member of an instructional team in the urban school environment.

Education Specialist (Special Education) Credential Option

UL-SLO 8ES: Students in the Education Specialist credential option will design and implement high quality instruction that allows their students with special needs in urban schools the maximum opportunity to access the general curriculum within an individualized program guided by students' learning strengths, goals and needs.

Multiple Subject (Elementary Education) Credential Option

UL-SLO 8MS: Students will design and implement high quality instruction across the elementary grade curriculum that integrates strategies designed to meet the unique cultural, linguistic and learning needs of urban school children.
1.4 Changes in goals and objectives

The original ULRN program goals were developed by the ULRN faculty in 2005. The initial goals were designed to reflect core skills our students would develop in the major (ULRN-prefix) courses such as collaboration and critical thinking in tandem with critical skills derived from the NCATE and COA standards: connecting subject matter to pedagogy, holding students to high standards, and developing and delivering instruction. These early goals were written at a time when ULRN was reviewed as part of the CCOE’s accreditation by NCATE and the COA.

The program goals and student learning outcomes (objectives) were revised in Fall, 2009. The previous objectives were broad and were not written as student learning outcomes. The revised SLO’s were modified to more closely reflect the breadth of student achievement in the program and to align with the university’s adoption of student learning outcomes by individual degree programs.

At the time of the revision, ULRN continued to be reviewed as part of the CCOE’s accreditation by NCATE and the COA. Consequently, the SLOs were also written so that assessment measures align with the California Standards for Teacher Preparation (CSTP) and CTC Educator Preparation standards. Language was adopted that created observable and measurable outcomes. One SLO specific to each credential option was added at that time.

When program review and semester conversion were re-initiated in 2013-14, we recognized the need to revisit our SLOs. We felt the body were appropriate for assessment under the guidelines of the university program review process, but felt one additional SLO, addressing writing, was needed. At that time, we added SLO 6 (see previous page).

1.4.1 Pre-2009 Program Objectives

1. Students will successfully engage in work in urban schools and communities.

2. Students will develop and model critical thinking skills for themselves and the students they teach.

3. Students will have the ability to connect subject matter and pedagogy to successfully meet the educational needs of all students.

4. Students will develop beliefs of holding high expectations of all urban students to attain high academic achievement while building on their diverse languages, cultures, and experiences.

5. Students will be able to develop a curriculum and instructional strategies that integrate the urban students’ strengths, including their languages, cultures, communities.
1.5 Recommendations from last program review and accrediting body recommendations (if applicable) and actions taken by Programs

Not applicable; this is the program’s first review.
2.0 Program Data

2.1 Enrollment data

2.1.1. Program enrollment

ULRN draws students from three pools: first-time freshmen who declare Urban Learning as their major on entry, continuing students changing their majors, and first-time transfer students who declare ULRN or who learn about ULRN and change their majors before they matriculate. We see few first time freshmen declare the major, perhaps because of its unique nature, which limits student and high school counselor awareness of it. Based on the results of or student entry survey, our enrollment reflects a significant “word-of-mouth” element to how we attract (versus recruit) students. Consequently, the following discussion is organized to provide the most meaningful overview of our enrollment data.

One of the most important features of the Urban Learning Program is that students complete their junior and senior years in a cohort. Freshmen and sophomores work independently toward completion of their general education requirements, which allows them to work at a pace that best suits their needs and readiness for college. Transfer and continuing ULRN students enter a cohort the first quarter of their junior year, and study with that cohort until graduation. Consequently, ULRN largely measures its enrollment in terms of numbers of cohorts and numbers of students in cohorts, along with the number of lower-division (frosh/sophomore) students completing general education requirement. Numbers by cohort also allow for the most complete view of enrollment in the program.

Annual enrollment in the Urban Learning Program over the past five years ranged from 164 and 224 students, with the majority juniors and seniors who are placed in one of four to six active cohorts of approximately 25-30 students. Enrollment includes 10-15 lower-division (freshman and sophomore) students completing their general education requirements, averaging 189 students per year from AY 2010-11 through 2014-15. The next section will examine transfer student enrollment data in terms both absolute numbers and of the composition of cohorts.

Transfer Student Enrollment

ULRN enrolled 407 transfer and continuing students holding junior standing over the review period. Among these students, we enrolled 137 first-time transfer students (range = 15-40 per year), with an average of 27 students. We matriculate approximately 65% of students who apply to Cal State LA and declare a major in ULRN. The majority of those who do not matriculate do so because a) Cal State LA was not their first choice campus; b) ULRN was not their first choice major or; c) because they did not meet admission requirements. These data do not reflect the additional 15 to 20 students each fall who change their declared major to ULRN prior to matriculation.
Among first-time transfer students, 92% (n = 126), enter in the fall quarter, having graduated from or completed their general education course of study at a community college. Consequently, the study period includes two new cohorts per year (n=10) started during the fall quarter.

Prior to Fall 2010, Cal State LA admitted transfer students on a quarterly basis. Junior cohorts were formed in the fall, winter and summer quarters, the quarters in which sizable numbers of students complete their study at community colleges and transfer to Cal State LA. Because of the budget crisis, Cal State LA limited admission to fall quarter for all students beginning in Fall 2010, resulting in formation of cohorts once a year in the fall until the year-round admission calendar was restored in Winter 2015. Continuing upper division students wishing to change their majors to ULRN during the remainder of the year are assimilated into existing cohorts or occasionally held out of a cohort and allowed to study independently until the subsequent fall, on a case-by-case basis. When Cal State LA resumed admitting during winter and spring in Winter 2015, we were able to started two small cohorts in Spring 2015. Refer to Appendix B for complete enrollment data.

Table 2.1
Enrollment by Cohort (Juniors and Seniors)
Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

| Qtr.Formed | U  | V  | W  | X  | Y  | Z  | A  | B  | C  | D  | E  | F  | G  | H  | I  | J  | Av |
|------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
|            | F08| W09| Su09| F  | 10 | F  | 11 | F  | 12 | F  | 13 | F  | 14 | S  | 15 | S  | 15 |
| # of Students | 25 | 21 | 19 | 33 | 31 | 34 | 33 | 23 | 18 | 18 | 30 | 32 | 18 | 18 | 25 |
| MS Credential | 10 | 9  | 10 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 22 | 17 | 10 | 15 | 8  | 10 | 21 | 22 | 8  | 10 | 14 |
| ES Credential | 15 | 12 | 9  | 13 | 16 | 16 | 12 | 16 | 13 | 8  | 10 | 8  | 9  | 10 | 10 | 8  | 12 |
| % Electing SE | 60 | 57 | 47 | 39 | 52 | 52 | 35 | 48 | 57 | 35 | 56 | 44 | 30 | 31 | 56 | 44 | 45 |

Note: Cohorts U – X were formed prior to the review period, but were enrolled during the review period. Cohort I includes six students admitted Winter, 2015. (SE = Special Education).

From Fall 2010 through Summer 2015, the number of students in a cohort ranged from 18 to 34 (m = 25). Enrollment in Fall 2010 and Fall 2011 was robust, with above-average cohort sizes (m = 32). In Fall 2012, the state’s budget crisis and Cal State LA’s decision to declare impaction had a notable impact on transfer enrollment, as did the uncertain employment market, as the state began to lay off teachers in sizeable numbers. A notable drop in enrollment back to pre-2010 levels occurred at this time. Although there were sufficient students to form two cohorts, each cohort lost a small number of students who eventually decided teaching was not a suitable career choice for them, and changed majors. Losses were largely balanced by incoming students changing their majors so that enrollment in the two Fall 2012 cohorts (C and D) stabilized at roughly 22 students each. Enrollment in Fall 2013 remained low as student uncertainty about the job market in education persisted, with the two fall cohorts (E and F) stabilizing at 18 apiece. However the Fall 2014 enrollment returned to Fall 2010 levels, possibly as a result of the passage of Proposition 30 and the first signs of a more
hopeful employment market for teachers. In addition, we were able to start two cohorts of 18 in Spring 2015, with final enrollment in four AY 2014-15 cohorts of 98.

Credential Selection by Cohort
ULRN students entering a cohort in their junior year typically designate a credential objective by their third quarter in the program, and one trend should be noted briefly. Students in the program may elect to pursue an elementary education or special education credential, and typically, the majority electing to earn an elementary education credential. Although students are always encouraged to pursue the credential that best fits their professional goals, ULRN actively identifies and recruits students with potential to teach special education as part of its goal to address the shortage of special education teachers in urban Los Angeles schools. Over the past five years, the percentage of students pursuing a special education credential has ranged from 30% to 57%, with an average of 45% of the students in each cohort choosing a special education credential. Many of these students are also bilingual, increasing the pool of potential bilingual special education teachers, a significant need in the schools of the Los Angeles basin.

![Figure 2.1.2](image)

**Figure 2.1.2**
**Total Enrollment and Credential Objective by Cohort**
AY 2010-11 through 2014-15

Freshman Enrollment
The university Institutional Research data presented in Table B2 (Appendix B) reflects the small numbers of first-time freshmen who initially designated a major in Urban Learning, ranging from 5-9 per year over the past five years. However, it does not reflect the growth in numbers of continuing freshmen who change their majors to ULRN
once they matriculate at Cal State LA, either because they enter as undeclared majors or because they elect to change their majors to pursue teaching. Over the five-year period examined, freshman/sophomore enrollment in ULRN rose from 7 students in Fall 2010 to 24 students in Fall 2014. Of the students beginning their GE coursework at Cal State LA from Fall 2010 to Fall 2014, 21 of 26 students (81%) have reached junior standing and are now in a cohort.

Ethnic and Gender Make-up
The composition of the student population from AY 2010-11 through 2014-15 is strongly female (81%) and Hispanic (64%), with the remainder Asian/Pacific Islander (17%), White (9%) Black (3%) or International (3%). These figures have remained stable over the past five years (see Tables B6 and B7, Appendix B). The dominance of women may be reflective ULRN’s emphasis on elementary and special education in the program, typically viewed as the fields in which most women teach. The ethnic make-up of our students and sizeable numbers of Hispanic students is representative of the Hispanic community that surrounds the campus, with smaller numbers of students coming from the growing Asian communities and multi-generational white communities to the south, east and west of the campus; it this group where we have seen the greatest growth, from 7% of our students in 2010-11 to 14% in 2014-15. Our small, and declining numbers of African-American students is indicative of the distance of the campus from traditionally black communities, most of which are closer to one of our sister campuses; prospective students are directed there as a result of impaction. However, anecdotal enrollment records for Fall 2015 and 2016 suggest an encouraging uptick in the number of African-American students enrolling in ULRN, many of them male.

![Diagram showing enrollment in ULRN by Ethnicity from AY 2010-11 through 2014-15](image)

Figure 2.1.3
Average enrollment in ULRN by Ethnicity
AY 2010-11 through 2014-15
2.1.2 Enrollment by course

ULRN offers five courses that are taken by each student in the program. Among these courses is one service course, ULRN 462 (The Implications of Play in Learning) taken by both ULRN and Child Development majors.

ULRN program course enrollment averages between 23-28 students per offering, which is roughly comparable to the number of students in a cohort (see Table B9, Appendix B). Scheduling students by cohort assures we can predict course offerings and numbers in courses accurately, and schedule accordingly. Each cohort has a two-year roadmap that is used to schedule its classes and issue permits for the CCOE classes in which they are to enroll. The use of a cohort roadmap along with quarterly scheduling of each cohort also allows us to maintain regular patterns of offerings with reasonably stable enrollment.

2.1.3 Graduation and persistence
Graduation and persistence rate data are presented in Appendix C, Tables C1 – C5

Graduation Rates
Rates of graduation and persistence for freshmen and transfer students are available in Tables C4 and C5, and demonstrate that over 80% of our students, both those who begin as freshmen and those who transfer as juniors remain in the program and persist to graduation.

Our students cite the cohort experience as one of the factors leading to successful completion of their degrees. Consequently, it is also useful to examine the overall graduation rates by cohort. (See Table C1, Appendix C) As previously noted, 81% of freshmen starting between Fall 2010 and Fall 2012 have entered a junior cohort; their progress going forward will be considered in light of the pattern exhibited by their cohort. Over the review period, 298 students entered or were enrolled in a cohort and were eligible or approaching eligibility to graduate. Of those students, 248 (83%) have graduated, 25 (8%) are continuing students completing graduation requirements, and 25 (8%) changed their majors or did not complete their degrees. These figures indicate that 90% or more of ULRN students enrolled and eligible to graduate during the review period have or will soon graduate, with half students not yet ready to graduate still making appropriate progress toward a degree.

Gender and Ethnic Composition of Graduates
Tables C2 and C3 (Appendix C) present the gender and ethnic distribution of graduates from the Urban Learning Program from AY 2010-11 through 2014-15. Of the graduates reporting their gender, 77% were women (range 72-80%). Of those stating their ethnicity, 57% (range 19-31%) of graduates were Hispanic, 9% were white, 8% Asian/Pacific Islander, 3% black, 2% biracial, 2% international students and 3% Asian, with 28% declining to state their ethnicity. As with enrollment for the program, this strong pattern of Hispanic female graduates has remained relatively stable over the past five years, and reflects the ethnic composition of the community that surrounds Cal
State LA. The modest growth in Asian students enrolled in ULRN is has begun to be reflected in graduation rates, as shown in Table C3, the number of Asian graduates in 2012-13 did rise over previous years, and we can expect those numbers to continue to grow in proportion with the growth in the number of Asian students enrolling in ULRN.

Persistence of Transfer Students enrolling Fall 2010 through Spring 2015

Table C4 (Appendix C) presents persistence data for transfer students across the three options (ULRN/I, ULRD and ULRG, see Table 1.1 for an explanation of the plan codes). Possibly because of the two program modifications made during the review period, six-year data were not consistently available.

It should be noted that a) the ULRN/I option was phased out in Fall 2009, and only a handful of continuing students remained in the option into the review period; b) students entered the program in the ULRD option between Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 and; c) in Fall 2011 all new students entered in the ULRG option; it unclear why retention data are not available prior to Fall 2013 but may be a consequence of GET initially assigning them to the ULRD option. Availability of retention data will reflect these patterns, and data are broken out by plan code.

Examination of the data shows that, overall, retention of transfer students enrolling during the review period ranges from 85-100%. The sharp decline among ULRD option students in Fall 2012 may be the result of our having migrated a group of transfer students from the ULRD option to the ULRG option, with corresponding ULRG data not available until Fall 2013.

In its first years, retention of students in the new ULRG option in which current students are enrolled is between 88 and 100%. Feedback from students indicates that significant factors in their continuation to graduation are their cohorts, the permits for classes provided and quarterly scheduling, all of which keep them on track to graduation. Barriers include the program pace and the gatekeeper assessments (such as CBEST and CSET) that must be managed while carrying a full study load.

Unlike freshmen, transfer students typically enroll with more firmly established career goals; as a result few students leave ULRN to pursue another major. Loss of students results from three principal factors: academic difficulty, financial or personal challenges, or availability of their first choice teacher-preparation major (generally Child Development).

Persistence of Freshmen enrolling between Fall 2010 and Fall 2014

Table C5 (Appendix C) presents persistence data for freshmen across the three options. When examining these retention data, it is important to recall that ULRN has small numbers of first-time freshman; many of its freshmen and sophomores come to us when they change their majors, having chosen to become teachers after completing some or all of their general education study. Moreover, it is reasonable to expect that freshman persistence data will reflect lower levels of persistence than that of transfer student persistence data. Freshmen often arrive at Cal State LA as undeclared majors,
uncertain about their career plans, or having chosen a major not suitable for their career goals, and subsequently try one or two majors before settling on one they feel best suits their career goals.

Despite this, examination of the table shows that, overall, retention of transfer students enrolling during the review period ranges from 85-100% from Year 1 to Year 2. The one-year retention rate of 67% for ULRD in Fall 2011 reflects the loss of one of three students, and appears to be an outlier.

2.2 Impact of enrollment trends
Three major patterns of enrollment emerged from the data presented.

A. Stable enrollment, but limited growth
Our enrollment figures show clearly the impact of the recent budget crisis and the campus decision to declare impaction. The drop in graduates from community college due to course shortage may explain some of the stalled growth and more recent drop in enrollment. Students at community colleges remain faced with fewer course options, dramatically reduced summer offerings, the ability to take fewer courses per semester and a longer time to complete their lower division coursework or degree. These enrollment issues, which have been well documented over the three years of severe budgetary shortages made themselves felt in the drop in enrollment among students transferring to Cal State LA and major in ULRN. However, as we emerged from the budget crisis in Fall 2014, enrollment began to grow again. Despite this, aggressive recruitment will be needed to attract students who might otherwise elect the better known Liberal Studies or Child Development majors.

Although the extended time-to-transfer is a significant factor in reducing enrollment, the dramatic budgetary issues confronting the state of California, resulting in teacher layoffs and no new teaching jobs may mean students are increasingly reluctant to major in education with no promise of work at the time of graduation. Although the first signs of growth in job availability has begun to emerge in recent months, the growth is very modest and has largely limited to special education teaching positions. More vigorous growth in job availability, the first signs of which began to appear for the Fall 2014 school year, will be needed to encourage freshmen and community college students to decide that they wish to become teacher. Moreover, the CCOE must assure that information about the job market is available to prospective students at all levels of study.

Two additional factors may play a role in ULRN’s enrollment data. First, current recruitment methods may be insufficient to expand enrollment in the program. As the pool of students electing to become teachers shrinks and with no lower division community college major corresponding to ULRN at the community colleges, ULRN has to work harder to be visible, and a desirable choice of major for transferring students. Although the program recently developed a website and has begun developing relationships with community college teacher preparation centers in
addition developing traditional recruitment materials (flyers, an information bulletin, etc.) ULRN needs to be a more visible presence at the community college level. Moreover, the lack of a degree-only option for students not wishing to enroll in a blended program along with a minor and/or certificate program in Urban Learning further limits the pool of students from which the program can draw.

2. **Strong representation of Hispanic and female students, growth in Asian/Pacific Islander students**
   
The strong representation of Hispanic female students in the program appears to reflect the percentage of students who indicate the chose Cal State LA because of its proximity to their homes and thereby come from predominantly Hispanic communities. Although the modest growth in Asian/Pacific Islander students and signs of growth among African-American students is encouraging, active recruitment at community colleges whose enrollment reflecting the wider diversity present in the Los Angeles basin will enhance the overall diversity of the program and the pool of teachers ULRN trains.

3. **Strong persistence to graduation.**
   
   Strong graduation rates among ULRN students can be attributed to a number of factors:
   
   - The cohort structure and the system of support provided by the cohort. Formal and informal feedback from students in the program indicate the cohorts were one of the elements of the program that they valued most, not only because of the sense of belonging and community they provided, but because of the network of support that grew while students were in a cohort.
   - Regular scheduling, permits and a program roadmap. Schedules and roadmaps assure students know what they do and do not have take each quarter, and permits assure seats in their classes will be available when they need them. Increasing collaboration with departments providing students' social sciences courses have eased enrollment in these courses, and cohort numbers have made it possible for ULRN to request sections of courses with a guarantee of a minimum number of enrolled students.
   - Close monitoring and regular advisement. Student progress through the program is closely monitored, and students are encouraged to seek regular advisement. Moreover, monitoring of student progress allows program advisors to intervene early when academic problems arise, allowing collaborative intervention before academic problems become insuperable, preventing dropping out.

**Why Do Students Leave?**

Exit interviews with students indicate that those who leave do so because:

- *Teaching is not the right career choice.* As with any major or professional objective, a small number of students realize the program they chose is not the best fit for them and elect to change their majors, often early in the program. Moreover, as a result of program impaction, ULRN may have been a second choice major for some students. If a place in their first choice major
opens up, students may elect to make a change. The recent lack of teaching jobs adds to student stress and uncertainty about post-degree employment opportunities. This, in turn results in students questioning their career choice, or opting for a less desirable career where there is a stronger job market upon graduation.

- **Academics.** For some students, college is not the right choice for them, and they are not prepared to commit to the requirements of the program, or the course of study is too demanding. A small number of students are academically disqualified from the program, do not return or continue to fail even after being reinstated, and do not complete their degrees.

- **Difficulties with or loss of financial aid.** Recent federal policy resulting in reductions in available financial aid, including the loss support for summer courses, the change to self-support summer, the corresponding potential lengthening of time to degree and increases in student financial obligations resulting from fee increases have resulted in students feeling they can no longer continue their education, or must take fewer classes at a time.

- **Family concerns, military service, the birth of a child or the demands of childrearing.** As might be anticipated among a student population that is over 80% female, the majority of whom are of childbearing age, childbirth, childrearing and associated family concerns contribute to students’ decision to leave the university, either temporarily or permanently. The program has become accustomed to accommodating female students who must be programmed or take a leave of absence to have a child, and is increasingly asked to accommodate the needs of students who serve or whose spouses are serving in the military. While the program endeavors to be as flexible as possible, the stresses of these events often are too much for students who must cope with dramatic changes in their lives.

### Adequacy of faculty

As discussed in Chapter 5, ULRN’s faculty is atypical in that the program has no faculty assigned solely to ULRN, and course faculty potentially can come from any of the college’s three divisions. Consequently, the program has no full-time faculty. The current program director, who has served in the position for seven years, is from the Division of Special Education and Counseling, and teaches courses in both her own division and ULRN. The remaining faculty are drawn from two pools: a) full-time faculty and; b) adjunct faculty, many of whom are well-qualified doctoral students and/or working teachers.

It should also be noted that Cal State LA is the only campus with a major in Urban Learning. While it might be possible to make some comparisons to similar majors such as Liberal Studies or Child Development, those programs are multi-track programs with teaching different subject matter and with their own full-time faculty. Therefore, system-wide comparative data are not available. Instead, the critical faculty issue is how classes are staffed, and how our faculty pool is constructed.

Staffing of ULRN courses has proven to be, at times, a challenging and occasionally contentious issue as program goals come into conflict with the need to assure faculty
have classes to teach. The college has a rich, diverse full-time and part-time faculty
from which it can draw course instructors, but the breadth of knowledge and expertise
available is inconsistently deployed among the five ULRN classes.

When ULRN was developed, course staffing was to have been done across divisions,
with faculty assigned based on skills, experience and interests. The intent of this model
was to reflect the CCOE mission and vision by creating cross-disciplinary learning
opportunities for ULRN students that modeled inclusive instruction for all students. At
one time, the program director was responsible for staffing ULRN courses in
collaboration with the division chairs, and faculty were assigned from the three divisions.
However, ULRN has to have a home division, and after several options were tried, it
was situated in the Division of Applied in Advanced Studies in Education, with program
faculty to have been drawn from the three divisions.

Over time, and with multiple changes of college, divisional and program leadership,
along with budget reductions and declines in student numbers, the staffing of courses
has been altered dramatically. Course staffing decisions are made by the chair of the
Division of Applied and Advanced Studies in Education with advisory input from the
program director. Given ULRN is housed in the Division of Applied and Advanced
Studies in Education and its faculty order of workload assignment constraints, many
ULRN-prefix courses are now being staffed primarily by faculty from AASE and
consequently less representative of a cross-divisional program. However, ULRN
students take credential courses from faculty in the Divisions of Curriculum and
Instruction and Special Education and Counseling, allowing them to have some
opportunities to engage with faculty across all three divisions in the college.
Unfortunately, these staffing constraints have resulted in decreased involvement in the
program by faculty from the teacher preparation divisions.

ULRN feels this faculty drift most when it comes to program decision-making and
operations. Because faculty from the Division of Curriculum and Instruction and from
the Division of Special Education and Counseling seldom teach courses in the program,
there is no incentive for them to be involved in the program’s shared decision-making.
This program review and the upcoming change to the semester calendar provides the
program and the college an opportunity to encourage faculty involvement from all three
divisions, and to examine how class staffing is done, and how we can increase the
breadth of full-time faculty teaching ULRN courses.

A notable strength among the faculty is our cadre of adjunct faculty, particularly the
working K-12 teachers. These teachers, particularly three who teach courses in culture
and learning, community literacy, and assessment, as well as our introduction to higher
education class, bring the public school classroom into the university classroom through
their experiences and their teaching. They also provide a window into the classroom
that our students, many of whom have little or no experience working in schools, might
not otherwise have. Observations are useful, but the voice of a working teacher affords
students a perspective they cannot gain other than through the actual experience of
teaching.
3.0 Curriculum and Instruction

3.1 Curriculum

In its current quarter configuration, ULRN is a single-track major with two options: elementary education credential preparation (ULRG OCEL) and special education credential preparation (ULRG OCSE). The curriculum for the bachelor’s degree in Urban Learning consists of four components: general education (subject matter) and upper division theme, major (breadth) courses, major (depth) courses in the social sciences and teacher preparation coursework, and is developmentally sequenced. Teacher preparation coursework includes both foundational courses needed by students with little field experience and courses that lead to a California Education Specialist (special education) or Multiple Subject (elementary education) credential.

In order to strengthen collaboration, inclusive practices and group work skills among our students, the program strongly emphasizes study in cohorts beginning in the junior year. Students are assigned to a cohort of roughly 25, mixing elementary education and special education credential candidates. Individual cohorts take their classes together following a developmentally sequenced roadmap. Students receive quarterly schedules and are permitted into the majority of their classes and are expected to register with their cohort. The cohorts, in turn, become a system of support and unity that students value highly, and often identify as a principle reason for their success in the program. Scheduling depends on a high level of collaboration across the three divisions in the college as well as with subject-matter departments (such as Sociology, Communication Studies, History and Social Work) in the depth area.

Unlike other blended programs at Cal State LA, ULRN does not offer a general (major-only) option, but we recognize students in progress toward their degree may change their career plans or elect not to complete their credential program for academic, personal or professional reasons. Although this is rare, students in the program who have an appropriate reason may petition to complete the degree program but not the credential. In these cases, students are placed on the older Directed Electives (ULRD OESD) track and advised individually on the selection of elective courses needed to earn the degree without a credential. Students struggling to complete mandated gatekeeper assessments such as CSET may also elect to limit credential coursework and replace it with additional subject matter preparation coursework, such as lower-division courses in mathematics, English or history, which is selected on an individual basis.

Conversion to semester
We elected retain our overall course structure when the program was converted to semester, with a few updates that incorporate contemporary pedagogy and content in the field, and better move students from subject-matter learning to learning to teach. As part of our conversion, we added a general option to the program, which students may select with advisor approval. In time, we will begin to make this option available to all
students, and may explore a minor in Urban Learning as well. Other changes made during the conversion include:

- Comprehensive re-numbering of the ULRN courses (ULRN 41#0), and re-sequencing of courses into a more appropriate developmental sequence. In the quarter program, ULRN 460 (assessment) was an early course. It soon became apparent that students needed fieldwork and at least one course in curriculum before they had the foundation knowledge needed to meaningfully complete the course. Its new number (ULRN 4150) now places it late in the developmental sequence, when students are better prepared for its demanding content.

- Retention of the EDUC 301 (currently our transition to higher education course) as an updated course (CCOE 3010) emphasizing student success in urban teacher education. The two semester-unit course is now a ULRN program requirement that retains much of EDUC 301’s content, and adds more in-depth exploration of the nature and structure of urban schools. Given the university has dropped the junior-level transition to higher education requirement, we will change its prefix to one that more accurately reflects its content in the next program modification.

- Shifting coursework in human development to the general education program. Review of student records and feedback from students indicated duplication of content in human development; on the semester program ULRN will require a GE course in human development rather than an upper division course. We also retired ULRN 462, The Role of Play in Learning to further reduce content duplication, with its content distributed across three courses: GE human development, ULRN 4130 and EDEL 4670.

- Development of a new ULRN course (ULRN 4140: Integrated STEM Project-Based Learning in Urban Environments), which will replace ULRN 462. This course emphasizes project-based learning in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, and accompanies our community-based learning course in literacy (ULRN 4130). Project-based learning is cutting edge, and the two courses (ULRN 4130 and 4140) will form a bridge between general education coursework and instructional methodology courses that will allow students to apply subject matter content to real-world situations such as their own students might address.

- Incorporation of the content of EDFN 420 into CCOE 3010 and ULRN 4120 (formerly ULRN 464). The nature and structure of schools will be explored in CCOE 3010, and issues of culture, language and diversity in schools is now part of ULRN 4120, creating a less fragmented presentation of the subject matter.

- Addition of EDIT 4100, a technology course designed for undergraduate teacher preparation students, to the major. Previously, only candidates for the special education credential took a technology course. The course includes basic skill using software packages such as Microsoft Office, development of information literacy and use of both web-based and application-based resources in urban educational settings.

- Addition of a course in disability (EDSP 3010) to the elementary education option. This course, already part of the special education option, will build students fundamental knowledge of disability as a social phenomenon early in
the program, broadening their foundational knowledge. The semester revision of the course also meets the civic learning and upper division block D general education requirement, and will be double-counted.

Program modifications and corresponding program codes
The program has undergone three modifications with corresponding changes in program codes, which will be used throughout the document (see also Table 1.0). Included are approved changes that will convert the program to semester.

Original program (2003) and first modification (2007):
- ULRI (Education Specialist internship credential minor)
- ULRN (Multiple Subject credential minor)

Directed electives (2009):
- ULRD (CSET preparation and both credential options)

Current program (2011):
- ULRD (CSET preparation or other electives)
- ULRG OCEL (Multiple Subject credential option)
- ULRG OCSE (Education Specialist internship credential option)

Semester program (2014-5, effective Fall 2016)
Option I: Teacher Preparation (135 units)
- ULRG OCEL (Elementary Education)
- ULRG OCSE (Special Education)

Option II: Teaching and Learning (120 units)
- ULRD OETL (Teaching and Learning)

3.1.1 General education coursework

In the Urban Learning Program, general education courses provide foundational subject matter knowledge needed by teachers, and careful selection of courses to best align with professional content knowledge which is utilized in upper division major and pedagogy coursework and assessed on gatekeeper assessments (see section 3.1.2) is strongly encouraged for both native and potential transfer students.

Freshmen
Freshmen entering the program meet individually with the program director for advisement, and receive an individual GE plan, which allows them track progress in the general education program, informs them of university GE requirements, identifies key courses which best prepare them for advanced study and professional assessment, and includes a model quarter-by-quarter schedule (see Figures 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 for recommended GE course selection and course sequence). Quarterly advisement leading to course selection is also required of all lower-division students. By concentrating the first 60 units of study in the program on general education, we assure students enter a junior cohort with a shared subject matter knowledge base, and are ready for advanced study and assessment.

Cal State LA freshmen wishing to become teachers and major in Urban Learning are identified early with the assistance of the University Academic Advisement Center, and
encouraged to enroll in EDUC 101 (4), Introduction to Higher Education, their first quarter at Cal State LA. This course is designed to support college success, develop writing, oral language and early critical thinking skills, provide early intensive advisement, and build connections between program faculty and students. Traditionally taught by a working urban high school teacher, the course also eases first-time college students into the world of a major university while it offers early acculturation to not only life at the university level designed to strengthen academic success, but also to the world of professional education. The general education program is self-paced and students are monitored closely as they progress through their GE courses.

In the semester program, students will continue to meet university general education course requirements, and our advisement strategies for first time frosh students will remain the same.
Figure 3.1.1
Recommended General Education Courses for Lower-division Students

Urban Learning Program
Recommended General Education Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block A: Basic Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1 ENGL 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2 COMM 150*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3 COMM 176 or POLS 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-4 MATH 100 or 109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block AM: American Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM-1 HIST 202A or 202B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM-2 POLS 150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block B: Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1 BIO 155 or 156 with lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2 ASTR 150/1, GEOG 170, GEOL 150 or 155 with lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3 ANTH 260, ASTR 160, GEOG 160 or GEOL 158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block C: Humanities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-1 ENGL 207, ENGL 250 or ENGL 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2 LBS 234, MUS 150 or one course from ART 150 – 159,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3 1 course in foreign language†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block D: Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 ANTH 250, GEOL 155, PAS 180, URBA 180 or WOMS 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 CHDV 140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block E Lifelong Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Will be satisfied by EDUC 101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 110²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV 400 (WPE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing requires all credential candidates to complete a course in public speaking.

Students may take courses equivalent to Cal State LA GE courses at a Community College. See ASSIST for course equivalents, or check with Dr. Clark

Notes:
† Students are encouraged to take one semester of Spanish or equivalent to develop their non-English home language. Heritage speakers who take SPAN 105/205 to develop their skills in written Spanish will receive elective credit. In lieu of foreign language students planning to teach children with disabilities may take a quarter of sign language.

² All credential candidates must complete MATH 110 to be eligible to take credential coursework in mathematics instructional methods.
### Figure 3.1.2
Sample General Education Course Sequence for Lower-division Students

**Urban Learning Program**  
**Freshman/Sophomore General Education Course Sequence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One: Fall</th>
<th>Year Two: Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 101 (4)</td>
<td>B1 Biological Science with lab (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 101 (4) or remedial course (0)</td>
<td>AM1 History (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 100 or 109 (4) or remedial course (0)</td>
<td>C4 Foreign Language (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units: 4-12</strong></td>
<td>EDEL 490-01 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One: Winter</th>
<th>Year Two: Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 102 (4) or remedial course (0)</td>
<td>POLS 150 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 110* (4) or remedial course (0)</td>
<td>B2 Physical Science with lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block D Discipline 1(^d) (4)</td>
<td>Block D Discipline 2(^d) (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units: 12</strong></td>
<td>EDEL 490-02 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One: Spring</th>
<th>Year Two: Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A3 Critical Thinking (4)</td>
<td>B3 Natural Science (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Literature (4)</td>
<td>C2 Arts (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 150 (4)</td>
<td>EDFN 420 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV 400 (0)</td>
<td>EDEL 490-03 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units: 12</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Units: 12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pass WPE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One: Summer</th>
<th>Year Two: Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make-up classes</td>
<td>Complete missing GE classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Transition to ULRN cohort in Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass CBEST</strong></td>
<td>Pass CSET Arts/Human Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1. ENGL 101, MATH 100/109, A3 Critical Thinking, and COMM 150 must be completed during your first year.
2. Students must maintain a 2.0 grade point average in their GE courses to remain in good standing.

* Prerequisite to EDEL 417 in the credential program

\(^d\) Select two courses from among those in Blocks C, D or E designated with \(d\) to satisfy the university diversity requirement.

1 Students needing developmental English courses must complete these courses prior to enrollment in ENGL 101. See your EPT score report or an advisor for assistance with course selection.

2 Students needing developmental math courses must complete these courses prior to enrollment in MATH 100 or 109. See your ELM score report or an advisor for assistance with course selection.
Transfer Students
For potential transfer students, Cal State LA general education requirements can be satisfied at a community college. As part of the required 60 transferrable semester units, students enrolled at a California community college are encouraged to complete the 39 semester unit CSU-GE or Intersegmental General Education Transfer Credit (IGETC) pattern for their community college, which assures they arrive at Cal State LA with both junior standing and no remaining GE courses needed. Students are encouraged to select a program of study that includes:

- A three-semester sequence of writing coursework, including responding to literature and critical thinking
- Biology plus geology or astronomy
- Public speaking
- One course in fundamentals of child development
- One course drawn from ethnic studies
- One semester of foreign language

To foster potential candidate preparation for ULRN and Cal State LA, partnerships are being developed with local community colleges to create transfer paths to Cal State LA and ULRN. As part of this, individualized programs of suggested study have been developed or are being developed for partner community colleges, among them Los Angeles Southwest College, Citrus College and Pasadena City College (See Figure 3.1.3 for the program of study for Los Angeles Southwest College). These programs of study direct students to coursework which will a) strengthen their preparation in content taught in the public skills; b) provide foundation knowledge in the issues surrounding culture and diversity in America and; c) prepare them for the CSET Multiple Subject assessment.

Transfer students interested in majoring in Urban Learning are encouraged to make early visits to the Urban Learning program office for transfer advisement. As part of these on-campus visits, students are encouraged to make regular use of their campus transfer centers to assure they are properly prepared to transfer, to seek IGETC/CSU-GE certification, and advised on procedures for transferring to Cal State LA. At that time, students receive a short orientation to the program from a student enrolled in the program, file a program application and meet with the program director for advisement. As part of the advisement procedure, we remind students that we are available to help guide them through the transfer process, and define our role in that process versus that of the community college to assure they are getting the best and most accurate information.
**Figure 3.1.3**  
**Recommended General Education Courses for Los Angeles Southwest College Students**

**Urban Learning Program**  
**Recommended General Education Courses**  
**Los Angeles Southwest College**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>English Language Communication and Critical Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>Speech 101*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>English 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3</td>
<td>English 103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>Geology or Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Biology 3 (with lab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3</td>
<td>Math 227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>Arts and Humanities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>1 course in the arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>English 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-4</td>
<td>1 course in foreign language†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1/D5</td>
<td>Anthropology 102 or Geography 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Sociology 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>Child Development 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>Lifelong Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health 11 or Sociology 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>US History, Constitution and Ideals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History 11 or 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing requires all credential candidates to complete a course in public speaking. Transfer courses must be equivalent to COMM 150 to meet this requirement.

Other recommended courses:

**English 103: Composition and Critical Thinking**  
This course satisfies the advanced composition prerequisite for the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (WPE).

**Math 215: Principles of Mathematics I**  
This course will satisfy the MATH 110 requirement. All credential candidates must complete this course to be eligible to take credential coursework in mathematics instructional methods.

**Notes**  
† Students are encouraged to take one semester of Spanish or equivalent to develop their non-English home language. Heritage speakers who take Spanish 44 to develop their skills in written Spanish will receive elective credit. In lieu of foreign language students planning to teach children with disabilities should take a semester of sign language.
3.1.2 Upper division coursework

Transfer students entering Cal State LA and ULRN as juniors and continuing students reaching junior standing are assigned to a cohort of roughly 25 students before beginning their upper division coursework. Each student must complete a short application and interview that screens their writing skills and professional dispositions, as required by the CCOE and California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, before they are placed in a cohort.

The upper division curriculum emphasizes a series of overlapping strands, including:

- In-depth understanding the context of teaching and learning in an urban society (ULRN courses)
- Social sciences courses that build knowledge of the urban community that surrounds schools (COMM, CHS, PAS, SOC, HIST, PSY, COUN)
- Upper division general education
- Fieldwork across the curriculum
- Preparation for one of two basic teaching credentials: an elementary education (Multiple Subject) credential or a special education internship (Education Specialist) credential with one of four disability specializations.

Upon placement in a cohort, students enroll in EDUC 301 where they receive a two-year course roadmap (and are reminded that all roads have bumps along the way!) and an informal program plan (see Figure 3.1.4 for a sample roadmap). The program of study, course content, and the roadmap are discussed in detail in EDUC 301, at which time students are guided through the credential program application procedure.

The first two quarters of instruction emphasize foundational coursework: major courses covering the roles of critical thinking (ULRN 461) and culture (ULRN 464) in learning, learning theory and motivation (EDFN 413), human development (COUN 400A), introduction to special education (EDSP 400), intercultural communication (COMM 389), foundations of urban learning (EDFN 420) and sociology of urban settings (SOC 330). During these first two quarters, students complete the GWAR and the criterion-referenced California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST), the first of three gatekeeper assessments they must take in the program.

In their third quarter, eligible students enter the teaching credential program. Official program plans are prepared in EDCI/EDSP 300, the elementary (EDCI) and special education (EDSP) credential options’ introduction to teaching course. This aligns ULRN program planning with CCOE credential program planning requirements. Once admitted to the program, elementary education candidates must complete three of four Teacher Performance Assessments, case study assessments evaluating specific instructional planning and assessment skills. These assessments are not required of special education candidates.

For the remainder of the program, coursework is scheduled so that students take one ULRN course, one depth course, one credential course and a fourth course such as a theme or a second credential course. The typical quarterly study load is 16 units per
quarter, which included summers prior to the summer 2013 term. Summers were reduced to 12 state-supported units for Summer 2013 and Summer 2014, before being removed in Summer 2015; this resulted from the lack of financial aid available to students, and the high cost of self-support courses. During this time, students are expected to begin their final gatekeeper assessment, the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET), which meets the federal “highly qualified teacher” assignment.

The final term in ULRN includes a practicum course: directed teaching for the elementary education candidates, and an early on-campus practicum (EDSP 407 in the Learning Center) for special education candidates. Students seeking the Multiple Subject credential must pass the three gatekeeper assessments prior to enrolling in directed teaching. Education Specialist candidates must pass CSET prior to graduation, but can enroll in the Learning Center having only attempted the test. While taking the Learning Center, special education credential students enroll in two courses, a specialization course and their final major course.

Cohorts are scheduled for classes each quarter by the program director in collaboration with the three CCOE divisions, and each student in the cohort receives a written schedule prior to the beginning of registration. Permits for CCOE courses and some out-of-college courses are provided to students in the program. This assists cohort formation of small learning communities. Progress in the program is closely monitored, and advisement is targeted to assist students with academic and personal needs affecting their progress, along with staying on track and with the cohort. Even if a student falls behind, they remain in the same cohort, thus maintaining access to the connections and support systems built in the cohort.
### Urban Learning Program Roadmap  
**Cohort H (Fall, 2014)**

#### YEAR ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Subject</th>
<th>Education Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2014</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 301 (2)</td>
<td>EDUC 301 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDFN 420 (2)</td>
<td>EDFN 420 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUN 400A</td>
<td>COUN 400A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 476 (4)</td>
<td>SW 476 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 102 (4)</td>
<td>ENGL 102 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units: 12-16</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Units: 12-16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attempt all parts of the CBEST</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>Attempt all parts of the CBEST</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 461 (4)</td>
<td>ULRN 461 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSP 400 (4)</td>
<td>EDSP 400 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDFN 413 (4)</td>
<td>EDFN 413 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 330 (4)</td>
<td>SOC 330 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units: 16</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Units: 16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pass WPE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 464 (4)</td>
<td>ULRN 464 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 300 (2)</td>
<td>EDCI 300 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEL 467 (4)</td>
<td>EDEL 467 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 110 (4)*</td>
<td>MATH 110 (4)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units: 16</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Units: 16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pass all parts of CBEST</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 462 (4)</td>
<td>ULRN 462 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Theme #1 (4)</td>
<td>GE Theme #1 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Block 1) <strong>[TPA Task 1]</strong></td>
<td>(Block 1) <strong>[TPA Task 1]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 402 (4)</td>
<td>EDCI 402 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEL 405 (4)</td>
<td>EDEL 405 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units: 16</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Units: 15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attempt CSET</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### YEAR TWO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Subject</th>
<th>Education Specialist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 463 (4)</td>
<td>ULRN 463 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 389 (4)</td>
<td>COMM 389 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Theme #2 (4)</td>
<td>GE Theme #2 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Block 2) <strong>[TPA Task 2]</strong></td>
<td>(Block 2) <strong>[TPA Task 2]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEL 415 (4)</td>
<td>EDEL 415 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units: 16</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Units: 16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter 2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 460 (4)</td>
<td>ULRN 460 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 383 (4)</td>
<td>HIST 383 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Block 2)</td>
<td>(Block 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEL 415 (4)</td>
<td>EDEL 415 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEL 417 (4)</td>
<td>EDEL 417 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units: 16</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Units: 16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 469 (4)</td>
<td>ULRN 469 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS 472 (4)</td>
<td>CHS 472 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Block 3) <strong>[TPA Task 3]</strong></td>
<td>(Block 3) <strong>[TPA Task 3]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEL 416 (4)</td>
<td>EDEL 416 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEL 419 (4)</td>
<td>EDEL 419 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units: 16</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Units: 16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 488 (4)</td>
<td>HIST 488 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Theme #3 (4)</td>
<td>GE Theme #3 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEL 490 (2/2)</td>
<td>EDEL 490 (2/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fall Semester 2016: Directed Teaching)</td>
<td>(Fall Semester 2016: Directed Teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEL 403 (10)</td>
<td>EDEL 403 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEL 403C (2) [TPA Task 4]</td>
<td>EDEL 403C (2) [TPA Task 4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units: 12</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Units: 12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This schedule is tentative and subject to change. Students are expected to take classes as scheduled quarterly. Permits will be issued for scheduled classes only. This schedule assumes completion of all lower division GE requirements prior to entering ULRN program.

*Summer, 2016 will be a six-week summer session; Cal State LA moves to semester in Fall 2016.*
General Education Theme Courses
Upon completion of their general education courses, attainment of junior standing and entry into a cohort, students complete a three-course general education theme in a course of study selected from among eight options. The theme consists one course each from Natural Sciences or Mathematics, Social Sciences, and Humanities; themes generally offer a choice of four courses in each discipline. Theme courses are integrated into the program roadmap. ULRN students are free to select a theme of interest to them, but are encouraged to complete Theme D (Urban Life and Environment) or Theme H (Race, Diversity and Justice), which best compliment the ULRN program of study.

Foundation Courses
Foundational coursework builds early core knowledge of schools and the nature of schooling during the first two quarters in the program. Students enrolled in EDUC 301 complete ten hours of early field observations in public school classrooms during these first courses, while they complete their first major coursework and transition into the teaching credential program. Foundational coursework includes:

EDUC 301 (2) Transition to Higher Education and EDFN 420 (2) Introduction to Urban Learning: Taken concurrently and back-to-back the first quarter in the program. EDUC 301 is the junior-level equivalent to EDUC 101, and is required of all students in the program. It develops upper division oral and written language skills, critical thinking and reflection skills, and professional identity. It also introduces students to the process of teacher preparation, including early fieldwork, classroom processes and reflective practice. Students are guided through the process of applying for the credential program in this course. EDFN 420 accompanies this course, introducing students to the issues, problems, practices and communities surrounding urban schools. Students develop critical thinking skills related to schools, teaching and learning in the course.

EDFN 413 (4) Psychological Foundations of Education: An introductory course in learning theory, motivation, and social/cultural aspects of learning and motivation. Students explore major theoretical views including social learning theory, attribution theory and information processing theory, behaviorism and conditioning, motivation and memory, and theories of personal and moral development.

EDSP 400 (4) Introduction to Special Education: A survey course in disability across the lifespan, including characteristics, risk factors, identification and instruction of students with disabilities in a range of classroom placements. Related content in law, lifespan issues and vocational/ skills are also addressed.

In addition, students entering the teaching credential program their third quarter take: EDCI 300 (2) The Teaching Profession: Preparing the Urban Educator or EDSP 300 (4) Foundations of Special Education. These courses introduce students to the process of teaching, assessment, lesson planning and instructional delivery in California schools, with emphasis on teaching English learners and students with disabilities. 45 hours of field observation are required. Course selection is governed by credential option.
Major Breadth and Depth Courses
Seven major breadth courses (28 units) develop the student’s understanding of critical urban issues from a social scientific perspective, while examining how pedagogical issues such as critical thinking, assessment, development of literacy and intercultural proficiency develop within the context of the urban school and its surrounding community. These courses tie the context of learning to later pedagogical preparation, and assist students in understanding not only how to teach, but the nature of the place we call school and the community that surrounds it.

Courses in the major breadth area are:

**ULRN 460 (4) Assessment and Learning**: Exploration of the issues and impact of assessment, application of assessment data to classroom practice, implications of high-stakes assessment. Students in this course are grouped by credential option, with sections emphasizing specific topics and issues surrounding assessment in elementary education or special education. (Semester course: ULRN 4150)

**ULRN 461 (4) Learning and Critical Thinking**: Critical thinking in education. Development of teacher critical thinking and reflection skills, critical thinking as an integral part of teaching and student learning. (Semester course: ULRN 4110)

**ULRN 462 (4) The Role of Play in Learning**: Roles of play in learning across the developmental period. Students examine the interface between teaching, learning and play, and how to evaluate students play as a means to understand student development, social skills and well-being. (Retiring from program upon conversion to semester)

**ULRN 463 (4) Literacy and the Urban Community**: Understanding literacy development in young urban readers, parent-child literacy and development community-based literacy. Development of literacy activities for young children designed to prepare students to learn to read and write, encouraging a love of reading and writing. Includes supervised fieldwork with young children in community settings. (Semester course: ULRN 4130)

**ULRN 464 (4) Contemporary Issues in Knowledge, Culture and Learning**: Exploration of the role of culture in learning, how cultures view the role of schooling, educational strivings, blending cultures in the classroom. Examination of critical knowledge for teachers in urban schools. Students explore contemporary issues surrounding diversity in the public schools. (Semester course: ULRN 4120)

**COUN 484 (4) Conferencing with Parents/Primary Caregivers or EDEL 467 (4) School/Family/Community Partnerships in Urban Learning or EDSP 416 (4) Working with Families of Young Children with Disabilities**: The relationship between schooling and families, including family issues and supports, student discipline, attendance, homework, coping with academic challenges and supporting academic development.
Students are assigned to this course by cohort, and content is examined from the perspective of elementary education, special education or school-based counseling.

**ULRN 469 (4) Senior Seminar: Reflection, Assessment, and Writing:** The capstone course in the major, ULRN 469 also meets the senior writing requirement. This course examines current topics and issues in urban education, including culturally responsive instruction, legal and ethical issues in urban education or law, policy and practice. Students read key foundational research as well as current academic literature, discuss and write in response to their reading in light of their study in the major. (Semester course: ULRN 4190)

**Social sciences depth courses** support major breadth coursework, by developing students’ understanding of the diversity, the urban environment and their relationship to teaching and learning in urban schools. The seven social science depth courses (28 units) engage students the study of aspects of the urban environment in a range of social scientific disciplines. These courses establish the context in which urban schools operate from multiple perspectives: race, justice, development, history or government, interpersonal phenomena and communication.

**Depth 1: Critical Race Theory**  
**CHS 472 (4) Chicana/o Education: Theory and Research** or **PAS 401 (4) Topics on Education and African American Advancement:** Exploration of the role of race in education, educational strivings and cultural views of education.

**Depth 2: Inter-cultural Communication**  
**COMM 389 (4) Intercultural Communication** or **ML 300 (4) Language Diversity in Urban America:** How culture and language impact social interactions across and within groups, depth and breadth of language and communication styles in American society.

**Depth 3: Human Development**  
**COUN 400A (4) Lifespan Human Development** or **PSY 412A (4): Psychology of Human Development: Infancy and Childhood.** Principles of human development from birth to adolescence. Development of thinking, language, social skills, personality and cognition during the developmental period. (Removed from the semester program)

**Depth 4: Child Welfare and Justice**  
**COUN/PSY 403 (4) The Psychosocial Dynamics of Child Maltreatment and Family Violence** or **PHIL 323 (4) Human Diversity and Justice** or **SW 476 (4) Child Welfare:** Child welfare law, child interaction with the judicial system, family violence and the role of culture in family dynamics. (Students may substitute CHDV 412 (4) Issues in Child Abuse, Interpersonal Violence, which has been added to the semester program.)

**Depth 5: Development of the Urban Environment**  
**ANTH 433 (4) Urban Anthropology** or **HIST 383 (4) Rise of Urban America:** Development of urban America from a historical or anthropological perspective.
Depth 6: Urban History or Government
CHS 443 (4) History of Chicano People in California or HIST 488 (4) California or POLS 404 (4) Urban Government and Politics: Urban government with an emphasis on California, California history, history of cultural groups in California.

Depth 7: Social Groupings in the Urban Environment
SOC 330 (4) Social Issues in the Urban Setting or (CHDV 321 (4) Urban Families: Contemporary Issues): How social groups form in urban society, family structure and dynamics in urban groups. (CHDV 321 is not a part of the quarter program, but was added to the semester program, and may be used as a substitution for SOC 330.)

Credential: Elementary Education
Prerequisites:
EDCI 300 - The Teaching Profession: Preparing the Urban Educator (2)
EDSP 400 - Foundations of Special Education (4)
MATH 110 - Foundations of the Real Number System for Elementary and Middle School Teachers (4) or equivalent (prerequisite for EDEL 417)

Instructional Methodology:
Block One (Must be completed before Block Two)
EDCI 402 - Introduction to Instructional Design, Assessment and Classroom Management Methods (4)
EDEL 405 - Proseminar: Language Development in the Elementary Classroom (4)

Block Two (Must be completed before Block Three)
EDEL 415 - Proseminar: Curriculum and Teaching of Reading/Language Arts (4)
EDEL 417 - Proseminar: Curriculum and Teaching of Mathematics (4)
EDEL 418 - Proseminar: Curriculum and Teaching of Science (4)

Block Three (Must be completed before Block Four)
EDEL 416 - Proseminar: Curriculum and Teaching of Writing/Language Arts (4)
EDEL 419 - Proseminar: Curriculum and Teaching of Social Science (4)

Directed Teaching (12 units)
Block Four
EDEL 403 - Directed Teaching: Multiple Subject (10)
EDEL 403C - Reflection, Synthesis and Assessment of Directed Teaching (2)

Credential: Special Education
Prerequisites:
EDSP 300 - Introduction to Special Education (4)
MATH 110 - Foundations of the Real Number System for Elementary and Middle School Teachers (4) or equivalent (prerequisite for EDEL 417)

Instructional Methodology:
EDSP 301 - Individuals with Disabilities in Contemporary Society (3)
EDSP 400 - Foundations of Special Education (4)
EDEL 415 - Proseminar: Curriculum and Teaching of Reading/Language Arts (4)
EDEL 417 - Proseminar: Curriculum and Teaching of Mathematics (4)
EDSP 407 - Directed Teaching in Special Education (3–12)
EDSP 408 - Cognitive, Linguistic and Literacy Processes in Individuals with Special Needs (4)
EDSP 409 - Assessment for Individuals with Exceptional Needs in Diverse Educational Settings (4)
EDIT 430 - Information Technologies in the Classroom (4) or equivalent

Specialization: (Students select one of the following)

*Mild-to-Moderate Disabilities*
EDSP 413 - Student Behavior and Social Interaction Skills: Support for Individuals with Special Needs (4)
EDSP 452 - Instructional Planning and Delivery for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities (4)

*Moderate-to-Severe Disabilities*
EDSP 413 - Student Behavior and Social Interaction Skills: Support for Individuals with Special Needs (4)
EDSP 451 - Curriculum and Instructional Methods for Individuals with Moderate/Severe Disabilities (4)

*Physical and Health Impairments*
EDSP 462 - Understanding Physical, Health, and Multiple Disabilities (4)
EDSP 460 - Implications of Physical and Health Impairments (4)

*Visual Impairment and Blindness*
EDSP 465 - Medical Aspects of Visual Impairments (3)
EDSP 465L - Functional Low Vision Assessment (1)
EDSP 469 - Psychological, Sociological, and Vocational Implications of Visual Impairment and Blindness (4)

3.2 Justification for greater than 180 units

N/A. The major is 180 units.

3.3 Comparison with peer institutions

After a comprehensive review of Los Angeles basin IHE's and a national search of teacher preparation programs, we believe we can justifiably state that the Urban Learning major is unique among peer institutions (including the basin CSU campuses and UC campuses as well as local private institutions such as USC, Loyola-Marymount College and Azusa-Pacific University) as well as nationally as the only baccalaureate degree program emphasizing the urban environment as a context for teaching and learning.
Traditionally, undergraduates preparing to teach declare a major in either Liberal Studies (the so-called “Teacher’s Major”, emphasizing in-depth exploration of one or more areas of subject matter) or Child Development (emphasizing human development in infancy and early childhood). Each of Cal State LA’s integrated teacher preparation majors have two common features: a) they prepare teacher-candidates in the development of children and; b) they develop deep understanding of subject matter to be taught.

ULRN enhances teacher-candidate preparation through the study of the urban community, the needs and challenges of urban families, and how they influence urban schools. Given that one in three public-school children in California are educated in an urban school in Los Angeles County (LACOE, 2016), ULRN fills a vital need by providing teacher-candidates a knowledge base needed to undertake the challenges presented by large, diverse urban schools, and the families of the children who attend these schools.

The program was developed not only prepare good teachers, but to address three critical needs in the schools of the greater Los Angeles area:

- The need for teachers prepared to meet the challenges, demands and opportunities of urban schools;
- The need for teachers prepared to teach in classrooms with a significant proportion of English Learners and;
- The need for teachers prepared to teach the number and breadth of children with disabilities in large urban schools.

Table 3.3.1: Available majors at IHE’s in the Los Angeles basin with a blended option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Credential Options</th>
<th>Major(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Subject</td>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Poly, Pomona</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Fullerton</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>Liberal Studies, Child Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Long Beach</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSU Los Angeles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Studies, Chicano Studies, Child Development, ULRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Northridge</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Riverside</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. St. Mary’s College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Liberal Studies, Child Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Housed in the College of Education; dual elementary/special education option

Note: Parenthetic number indicates the number of disability emphasis options available

As the faculty of America’s first chartered College of Education, a highly diverse urban institution of higher education and a Hispanic Serving Institution with a mission to
prepare teachers for urban schools, we recognized we were uniquely positioned to offer our students a blended undergraduate major that would draw on campus and college expertise so as to emphasize four critical strands of knowledge necessary to all teachers:

- Subject matter preparation
- In-depth exploration of critical issues related to teaching and learning in the urban schools
- Understanding of urban society and the context of urban teaching and learning
- Pedagogy and fieldwork appropriate to the credential sought

Moreover, we recognized our responsibility to address the shortage of special education teachers in the urban schools of greater Los Angeles. As shown in Table 3.3.1, Cal State LA is one of only four Los Angeles basin IHE’s with integrated programs to offer the Education Specialist credential to its students. Further, we are the only campus to offer an option in Physical and Health Impairments or an option in Visual Impairments and Blindness. Eighty percent or more of those students who elect the Education Specialist credential as an undergraduate choose to major in Urban Learning. We actively recruit students who have an interest in special education, as well as identifying students with potential to be special educators from among undecided students. Consequently, our past five years’ cohorts average 45% Education Specialist candidates, a percentage that will make a meaningful contribution to addressing the persistent shortage of special education teachers in urban Los Angeles while still assuring an adequate pool of new elementary educators. (It should be noted that students in the Liberal Studies and Child Development blended majors also have the option to earn an Education Specialist credential, but that these programs strongly emphasize preparation for the Multiple Subject credential.)

Table 3.3.2
Distribution of undergraduate blended programs among IHE’s California by credential option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>Total (by system)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (by credential)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We believe ULRN is unique not only in California, but nationally as well. A national search of IHE’s preparing teachers yielded a small number of programs emphasizing teaching in the urban environment, distributed as follows, with representative IHE’s:

- Opportunities for study in an allied center (University of Northern Colorado)
- Minor program in urban teaching (University of Pennsylvania, Barnard College)
- Undergraduate major in professional education with an urban teaching track (University of Miami Ohio, University of Dayton)
- Master’s level programs in urban teaching (Boston College, University of Chicago, Vanderbilt University, University of Colorado, Denver)
Doctoral-level emphasis in urban leadership (Teacher's College at Columbia University, Cal State LA)

It is important to point out the difference in emphasis between ULRN and programs in professional education with a track in urban teaching, such as at the University of Dayton. In programs that emphasize professional education, the curriculum is driven by and is organized around coursework that teaches candidates to be teachers, with infused content situating their skills in urban schools. This differs significantly from ULRN’s curriculum, which arranges coursework around major and depth courses that examine urban schools, communities and learning in depth, accompanied by teacher preparation both training teachers and supporting major coursework.

This review suggests there are opportunities for ULRN to expand beyond the blended program in order to serve new pools of students, including offering a general option for students preparing for careers related to education, creation of a minor in Urban Learning for students in subject matter majors (i.e. math, English, etc.) with a single-subject credential objective, creation of a certificate program and/or creation of a master’s degree program that would afford majors and interested students the opportunity for further study.

3.4 GE courses

The Urban Learning Program does not offer any GE courses. 

*EDUC 101 (Introduction to Higher Education)*, which is designed for any student interested in becoming a teacher, regardless of major, is staffed and scheduled by AASE in collaboration with ULRN for our students and students in the Rehabilitation Studies major. This course satisfies the university IHE requirement and the Block E requirement. The course is offered once a year, in the fall, and is traditionally taught by a working high school teacher with expertise in written language development.

In the semester program, EDUC 101 will continue to be offered as CCOE 1010, which now meets the lower-division civic learning requirement.

3.5 Service course

The Urban Learning Program and the Division of Curriculum and Instruction offer multiple sections of *ULRN 462 (The Role of Play in Learning)* each year for students majoring in Child Development. To be eligible to take the course, students must hold either a California Certificate of Clearance or a California Child Development Center Permit issued by the CTC. Although the Certificate of Clearance application procedure is not difficult, it can be complicated and a bit frustrating to students unaccustomed to interacting with CTC’s bureaucracy. In addition to scheduling the class, ULRN assists students with the two-part process, provides hands-on assistance, and requests permits when their certificates are granted.
Staffing and scheduling of ULRN 462 is done by the Division of Curriculum and Instruction. Students in other blended programs may also add sections of the course designated for ULRN students on a space available basis, and sections are scheduled for graduate students in Early Childhood Education, and for Child Development majors. The Department of Child and Family Studies has indicated a high level of satisfaction with the course (see Appendix F for the course evaluation). ULRN maintains a collaborative relationship with CFS, and frequently correspond via e-mail and at quarterly meetings to solve student advisement issues.

In addition, the Division of Applied and Advanced Studies in Education makes EDFN 420 and the Division of Special Education and Counseling makes EDSP 301 available to blended majors in Liberal Studies and Child Development along with students in Urban Learning as part of their credential program offerings. These courses were written specifically for the blended programs, and are taken principally by ULRN students. In the ULRN semester program, EDFN 420’s content has been subsumed into two courses, CCOE 3010 and ULRN 4120, but will continue to be offered by AASE for other blended majors.

In order to expand its student base, EDSP 301 (3) was carried into the semester program as EDSP 3010, a three-unit course as a Block D general education course that meets both the diversity and civic learning requirements. Recently, it was developed as a hybrid course in collaboration with CETL’s initiative to prepare “flipped” courses offered half in-person and half-online; it will be offered in this configuration in Fall 2016.

3.6 Credential or certificate programs

The Urban Learning Program has no credential option of its own, but offers the students two credentials in collaboration with the Division of Curriculum and Instruction (elementary education) and the Division of Special Education and Counseling (special education). Students designate their credential option early in the program, and may change their credential option at any time.

Students electing to pursue an Education Specialist (special education) credential may select from among four options:

- Mild-to-Moderate Disabilities (learning disability, mild behavior disorders, mild intellectual disability and autism)
- Moderate-to-Severe Disabilities (intellectual disability, severe and multiple disabilities, emotional and behavioral disorders and autism)
- Physical and Health Impairments (orthopedic and health-related disabilities)
- Visual Impairment and Blindness

Program graduates may also pursue additional credentials, including more than one special education credential, as well as certification in autism or applied behavior analysis.
Students in the elementary education option may also add a single subject authorization to their basic credential, allowing them to teach in secondary schools (grades 7-12) in a range of subjects from English, mathematics and science to art or vocational arts.

3.7 Opportunities for student research/scholarly/creative activity

Without question, the most important high-impact practice that ULRN uses is its cohort system, which forms students into small learning communities. As discussed earlier, students are assigned to a cohort in their junior year, and students consistently cite their cohort as an important reason for their success in the program.

ULRN is a demanding program, and students are encouraged to limit their extra-curricular activities while in a cohort to prevent overload and burn out. However, some opportunities for research, scholarly and creative activities are available, including:

- Students assistantships on faculty research projects
- Involvement in student government and student organizations: typically, one of two CCOE representatives to ASI comes from ULRN.
- Participation in grant projects or individual faculty research projects

During the review period, ULRN students had the opportunity to work with Dr. Anna Osipova and Dr. Allison Mattheis on their research projects. Eight ULRN students were participants in Dr. Osipova’s study “Academic Language Self-Reflection and Coaching Training of Pre-service Special Education Teachers in the Context of Content Area Writing Instruction.” Participating students were members of weekly coaching focus groups and structured video self-reflection designed to improve their instruction of academic language in social studies.

3.8 Academic advising

ULRN has a centralized team of academic advisors. Students receive regular academic advisement from the Program Director, the Office for Student Services Advisement Center, a peer advisor, cohort leaders; support from TPA coordinator, division leadership and faculty supplement regular sources of advisement. Advisement is provided principally at two locations:

**The Urban Learning Program Office**

**Location:** King Hall D2079  
**Phone:** 323-343-6197  
**Email:** ulrn@calstatela.edu

The Urban Learning Program office provides advisement for current ULRN students regarding:

1. Selection of general education, major, depth and elective courses
2. Selection of credential option and coursework
3. Credential program admission
4. Academic progress and progress monitoring  
5. Petitions and related university procedures  
6. Credential and degree program planning  
7. Graduation applications  
8. Completion of degree and assessment requirements  
9. Post-baccalaureate degree and credential programs  

The Urban Learning Program office provides advisement for prospective ULRN students regarding:  
1. Program application and admission, including assessment and clearance requirements  
2. First-time (freshman) admission to the university  
3. Community college and university transfer requirements and procedures  
4. GE/IGETC certification and transferability of coursework  
5. Scheduling of courses  

**Charter College of Education Advisement Center (Office for Student Services)**

**Location:**  King Hall D2078  
**Phone:**  323-343-4342  

The Charter College of Education Credential Advisement Center provides advisement regarding:  
1. Credential program admission and coursework  
2. Academic progress and progress monitoring  
3. Petitions and related university procedures  
4. Credential and degree program planning  
5. Completion of degree and assessment requirements  
6. Application for directed teaching and teaching credentials  
7. Post-baccalaureate degree and credential programs  

Advisement for students in the ULRN program or interested in the ULRN program is also available from the University Academic Advisement Center and for eligible students, from the Equal Opportunity Program.

The University Academic Advisement Center and EOP counselors provide additional support, including:  
1. First-time freshman advisement  
2. Transferring from another university  
3. Selecting general education courses  
4. Transferring general education courses from another college or university  
5. Meeting university course and assessment requirements  

Students are encouraged to seek advisement early, and should see an advisor at least once a quarter. In order to profit from advisement, the Urban Learning Program expects the following of its students:
Students in the Urban Learning Program are responsible for:
1. Accessing the *Schedule of Classes* and meeting all quarterly university registration deadlines.
2. Timely registration as scheduled.
3. Keeping current on all university and program requirements, including requirements for the credential program.
4. Checking their Cal State LA e-mail accounts regularly.
5. Maintaining satisfactory progress in all academic courses.
6. Adhering to all university and program policies, including the requirements of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Through effective advisement, current and prospective students in the Urban Learning Program will:
1. Form small collaborative learning communities (cohorts) that build their self-advocacy, educational leadership, collaborative, academic, and instructional skills.
2. Demonstrate personal responsibility for their academic, personal, and professional success.
3. Be well-informed about academic and assessment requirements they must meet in order to complete their degree and credential, and graduate in a timely manner.
4. Maintain awareness of how their academic program leads to meeting their long-term personal and professional goals.
5. Seek information, resources, and available options needed to make sound educational and professional decisions.

The program director is available for advisement six to eight hours a week minimum in the afternoon on a drop-in basis, including at least one day with early evening hours. In addition, appointments can be made for advisement earlier in the day. Advisors in the CCOE Advisement Center are available from 9:00 – 6:00 pm daily. Despite this, student feedback indicates a desire to have the program director available for more advisement hours, a challenge given students tend to seek advisement after 3:00 and before their 4:20 courses, and the director must teach two courses a quarter, limiting her availability after 4:00 pm. Students tend to under-use the CCOE Advisement Center, further limiting their access to high-quality advisement.

Despite these challenges, the effectiveness of our plan is evidenced by our students’ timely progress through the program, and their persistence to graduation as discussed above. Of particular value to students is the use of peer advisement and peer leadership, which often is a speedy and reliable way to solve smaller problems, leaving faculty and college advisors free to handle larger, more demanding and more pressing advisement issues.

**3.9 Masters theses and projects**

N/A. This is a baccalaureate degree program only
3.10 Innovations in the curriculum

As was discussed earlier, the major in Urban Learning was developed as part of an initiative to offer students expertise in teaching in high need, highly diverse urban schools. At the time the program was first designed, a growing literature on the needs of urban schools, our geographical location, our students, and our faculty expertise informed our efforts to design this program.

As the program has matured, the challenge has been to keep the program responsive to students’ needs and to incorporate cutting edge content while maintaining the program’s core:
- Cross-divisional program
- Emphasis on context as well as subject matter taught and pedagogy
- Developmentally sequenced blended program
- One-stop program (degree and credential in one college)
- Collaborative small learning communities blending elementary and special education credential candidates via our cohorts

To do this, two major changes to the program were made. The first was the 2011 modification that reduced the number of upper division courses targeted to examination content already covered in lower-division general education classes, and strengthened the “urban” component of urban learning through the addition of critical race theory, child welfare law, and inter-cultural communication. Major courses were strengthened so as to integrate the study of the impact of culturally responsive pedagogy on diverse urban schools within the context of individual course content (i.e.: critical thinking, community literacy, etc.), tying it more fully to culturally responsive practices taught in students’ credential courses.

The second major innovation was the development of ULRN 4140: Integrated STEM Project-Based Learning in Urban Environments, as part of our new semester program, and the corresponding development of a two semesters of instruction that will emphasize literacy and math/science. ULRN 4140 blends project-based learning with application of science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) content from students’ general education coursework. Students will work in teams to identify and solve an urban problem using strategies and methods from these disciplines. Before completing their projects, they will consider aesthetic elements that must be considered in their final product, transforming STEM to STEAM.

As described, this course will be imbedded in a semester of coursework that will emphasize STEM. It will also accompany a second semester of coursework that will emphasize literacy in the community, organized around ULRN 4130. By so doing, this new two-semester course of study, taken during the second year of the program, will offer students the opportunity to bridge traditional academic disciplines such as mathematics, English, and science, and instructional methodology courses through community-based and hands-on project-based learning.
For students who are often the first in their families to go to college, and who come to us with limited understanding of what the job of college is, this two-semester sequence will strengthen their understanding of the connections between traditional academic learning, hands-on experience and fieldwork, the urban environment, and instructional practices. We also anticipate this course of study will better prepare them for their directed teaching experiences, their professional practice and for post-baccalaureate study.
4.0 Assessment of Program-level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

4.1 Assessment Plan

The Urban Learning Program’s assessment plan is in a state of transition at present. Prior to this review, ULRN was reviewed as part of CCOE accreditation reviews by National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing’s Committee on Accreditation (COA).

Consequently, our assessment plan was designed to address our accrediting bodies’ standards for program quality, and our assessment data were imbedded in the overall data for the divisions and the college. Data collected emphasized attainment of skills required of pre-service teachers: lesson planning, instructional delivery, collaboration, diagnostic-prescriptive assessment, and classroom management. Progress toward ULRN SLOs was evaluated within this context.

The change to university program review process, along with the transition to semester will require a comprehensive re-evaluation of our program of assessment, and a change to a plan of assessment better suited to university program review. A critical part of this transition will be the development of assignments and other assessment processes that directly measure the program SLOs rather than indirectly measuring them using assessments required by our program accreditation procedures.

The suspension of our program review at the beginning of semester conversion allowed us the opportunity to identify some key points of assessment, that need immediate attention, and to collect data better suited to university program review. We targeted two areas of concern: a) students’ writing skills and ability to write using professional literature and; b) completion of a writing intensive case study assessments by the elementary education candidates. We reviewed our SLO’s and wrote a new one, SLO #6, which specifically addresses writing, developed a rubric for evaluation of student writing, and targeted performance in two writing-intensive courses: EDUC 301 taken at the beginning of the program, and ULRN 469, take at the end, which satisfies the senior writing requirement. In addition, we examined the pass/fail rates for the Teacher Performance Assessments (TPAs), the case study assessment required of elementary education candidates across the EDEL 415-419 course sequence. This allowed us to collect data that reflected both academic and professional writing. It should be noted that only elementary education candidates complete the TPAs at this time, but it will be added to the special education credential option in the near future.

4.2 List of Program level SLOs for each Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UL-SLO 1</th>
<th>Students will demonstrate knowledge of the needs and demands of diverse students in urban schools and communities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UL-SLO 2</td>
<td>Students will develop and model critical thinking skills for themselves and the students they teach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL-SLO 3</td>
<td>Students will connect subject matter and pedagogy to meet the educational needs of all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL-SLO 4</td>
<td>Students will build on the diverse languages, cultures, capabilities and experiences of their students to assure them the optimum opportunities to grow and develop academically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL-SLO 5</td>
<td>Students will develop curriculum and instruction that integrate the urban students’ strengths, including their languages, cultures, learning styles and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL-SLO 6</td>
<td>Students will demonstrate professional writing skills, including the ability to discuss, analyze, synthesize and apply professional literature in writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL-SLO 7</td>
<td>Students will demonstrate collaboration skills needed to work as a member of an instructional team in the urban school environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL-SLO 8ES</td>
<td>Students in the Education Specialist credential option will design and implement high quality instruction that allows their students with special needs in urban schools the maximum opportunity to access the general curriculum within a individualized program guided by students' learning strengths, goals and needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL-SLO 8MS</td>
<td>Students in the Multiple Subject credential option will design and implement high quality instruction across the elementary grade curriculum that integrates strategies designed to meet the unique cultural, linguistic and learning needs of urban school children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.3 Program SLO Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Indicate which Program SLOs were assessed since the last self study and how they were measured. Enter each SLO into a separate row.</th>
<th>2. Describe the results: (For example, how many students reached what level of proficiency on the SLOs assessed?)</th>
<th>3. Based on the results, what instructional, programmatic, or curricular improvements were made (If the findings indicated a need for changes)?</th>
<th>4. List the classes in your program where the SLO in 1 is addressed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| #6: Students will demonstrate professional writing skills, including the ability to discuss, analyze, synthesize and apply professional literature in writing. Writing skills were measured using a rubric. The rubric was applied: | Writing Skills  
Initial assessment (EDUC 301):  
Emerging: 13%  
Developing: 32%  
Proficient: 36%  
Mastery: 19%  
Notable areas of skill development include:  
- Development of ideas  
- Content organization  
- Use of introduction and summary/conclusions  
- Vocabulary  
- Paragraph structure  
- Grammar and mechanics | Writing Skills  
Endpoint assessment (ULRN 469):  
Emerging: 4%  
Developing: 12%  
Proficient: 47%  
Mastery: 37%  
| (EDUC 301)  
ULRN 460  
ULRN 461  
ULRN 464  
ULRN 469  
Note: The writing skills assessment data also measures outcomes for:  
SLO #2  
SLO #3 |
but requires significant skill development
- Developing: student typically demonstrates college level writing, but lacks or has limited specific skills.
- Proficient: student generally demonstrates college level writing, including all skills measured with few omissions
- Mastery: student consistently demonstrates college level writing, including all skills measured

The rubric measured eight skill areas:
- Responsiveness to topic
- Development of ideas
- Vocabulary
- APA format
- Sentence and paragraph construction
- Grammar and mechanics
- Utilization of external sources (if applicable)
- Application to practice (if applicable)

Along with an aggregate rating used for program review purposes. Our target is for 84% reached proficient or mastery.

Notable areas of skill development remained much the same, and include:
- Development of ideas
- Content organization
- Use of introduction and summary/conclusions
- Vocabulary
- Paragraph structure
- Grammar and mechanics
- Use of APA format

Results must be considered in light of two factors:
- Roughly 2/3 of our students' first language is other than English, and 1/3 self-identify as English learners
- Student willingness to commit to demonstrating appropriate writing skills. Assessment results may reflect not only what students can do, but what they will do, or perhaps more accurately, will take the time to do.

- Further development of writing assessment in ULRN 469
- Development of online modules to train/support use of APA format, as used in professional education.
Students to reach proficiency or mastery level.

TPA requires students to develop a professional case study in one of four areas:
- Pedagogy
- Assessment
- Adaptations for English Learners
- Adaptations for Students with Special Needs

Students complete the TPAs in sequential order, and must successfully pass by their third attempt. To be eligible for Directed (Student) Teaching, students must pass TPA 1-3.

Success on these assessments is highly depended on students' ability to demonstrate and apply content knowledge in writing. TPAs are administered and scored off the campus, and we do not receive a detailed breakdown of student performance. However, TPA pass rates are indicative of student ability use writing in an applied context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Performance Assessment</th>
<th>Rate of completion on first attempt:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| TPA 1 (Pedagogy) | 2010-11: 97%  
2011-12: 84%  
2012-13: 100%  
2013-14: 100%  
2014-15: 80%  
Five Year: 93% |
| TPA 2 (Assessment) | 2010-11: 77%  
2011-12: 90%  
2012-13: 91%  
2013-14: 86%  
2014-15: 83%  
Five Year: 85% |
| TPA 3 (Adaptations for ELs) | 2010-11: 100%  
2011-12: 100%  
2012-13: 73%  
2013-14: 88%  
2014-15: 87%  
Five Year: 85% |

1. Provide mentorship by ULRN faculty for students preparing for TPA.
2. Utilize available feedback from TPA results to build needed support mechanisms.
3. Design workshops and small group work sessions to develop case study writing skills to supplement workshop already provided by the Division of Curriculum and Instruction.

Note: The TPAs also measure outcomes for: SLO #1 SLO #3 SLO #5

EDCI 402
EDEL 415-419
* EDUC 301 is a Charter College of Education class, but is offered with sections reserved by program, are taught by program faculty, and content is tailored to Rehabilitation Studies versus Urban Learning. These data were collected in the sections offered for Urban Learning, which is taken the students' first quarter in the program.
Student Satisfaction
As discussed previously ULRN has historically been reviewed as part of the CCOE NCATE/COA accreditation process. Consequently, our student satisfaction survey was college-wide, and was driven by the needs of the credential programs. Moreover, ULRN students in credential classes were directed to a survey designed for graduate students, and could not identify themselves as ULRN students.

Results of the first two years' data indicate the following trends:
- 80-84% agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their choice of major in Urban Learning, with 4-5% disagreeing or strongly disagreed.
- 74-77% agreed or strongly agreed that the course load (16 units) was realistic with 14-15% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing.
- 78-82% agreed or strongly agreed that they were prepared to be an education professional, while only 2-6% disagreed or strongly disagreed.
- 78-81% agreed or strongly agreed that their cohort was essential to their success in the program.
- Advisement is the biggest area of need, largely due to the limited hours faculty are available to advise students who work until 3:00 and go to class at 4:20. This is a college-wide issue we have grappled with for many years. However, students were more satisfied with printed advisement materials, where 68-77% agreed or strongly agreed that the materials were adequate and accurate.

Among the questions removed from the survey were questions regarding instruction of ULRN courses. Consequently, the only satisfaction data we have regarding instruction evaluates responses to a limited number of elementary education credential courses, which are framed so as to measure the responses of graduate students.

As a result, it will be critical to work with the CCOE Assessment Committee and the CCOE Associate Dean’s office in the fall to assure that the college-wide student satisfaction survey is clear, appropriately measures undergraduate student experiences with the college and program, and includes questions needed to fully examine student satisfaction with the program as well as their credential option. Similarly, a key to the success of the survey will be to assure faculty members provide directions to students that reflect what both undergraduate and graduate students must do to complete the survey.
Table 4.3.1
Results of student satisfaction survey, AY 2014-15 and 2015-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2014-15 (n=51)</th>
<th>2015-16 (n=44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with each of the following? (Select one response per row)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My decision to major in Urban Learning</td>
<td>84% 12% 4% 80% 16% 5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The advisement I have received from the ULRN program</td>
<td>76% 18% 6% 59% 23% 18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you agree or disagrees with the following? (Select one response per row)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed advisement materials provide accurate information describing my ULRN program</td>
<td>75% 18% 8% 68% 25% 7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled advisement hours of ULRN faculty and staff are adequate for my needs.</td>
<td>67% 24% 10% 57% 18% 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving permits for my ULRN and credential classes helps me progress through the program in a timely manner.</td>
<td>84% 10% 6% 90% 7% 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ULRN course load this quarter has been realistic and manageable.</td>
<td>75% 12% 14% 77% 9% 14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ULRN cohort is very supportive and essential to my success in the program.</td>
<td>73% 16% 12% 81% 17% 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel ULRN has prepared me to be an education professional.</td>
<td>78% 16% 6% 82% 16% 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Faculty involvement in assessment

At present, ULRN does not have an assessment committee. As previously discussed, assessment was imbedded in the division data as required by NCATE/COA. Teaching faculty members have been responsible for assessment in individual classes, but we lack a coordinated plan that focuses on incremental assessment suitable for program review, rather than the NCATE standards.

As we transition to semester, and away from the NCATE/COA assessment model to an assessment plan appropriate to ULRN program review, some critical assessment needs must be addressed:

- Formation of an assessment committee representing the three divisions, ULRN course teaching faculty, and credential program faculty
- Review and revision of our assessment plan
- Development of signature assignments with key assessment data points
- Screening of students with intensive needs in oral and written language, and in English proficiency which impact course achievement

4.5 Further education of alumni

Post-baccalaureate education is a critical part of teacher preparation, with most teachers eventually earning a Master’s degree in education or a closely related field. Therefore we would expect many of our ULRN graduates to enroll in a Master’s program following graduation. In addition, ULRN graduates in the special education credential option, representing roughly 1/3 of our overall cadre of students, must re-enroll as post baccalaureate students to complete their credentials. Additionally, these students must complete additional graduate coursework to receive their professional (“clear”) credentials.

Following the completion of their bachelor’s degree, a student has three options open to them: re-enroll as an MA or credential candidate, enroll in another institution as an MA/MEd candidate or concentrate on teaching before pursuing an MA/MEd. As the data in Table 4.5.1 indicate, roughly 22% of our students enroll in either an MA or credential program.

Table 4.5.1
Enrollment in post-baccalaureate credential or MA program by ULRN graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Graduates</th>
<th>305</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Credential Program</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied To MA</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed MA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers should be taken as an estimate of actual enrollment only. In the process of preparing this self-study, we discovered that it is remarkably difficult to track our students' transitions from their B (baccalaureate) to G (graduate) careers through GET, even with the support of internal CCOE records. Of the 305 students who we reviewed, it seems unlikely
that only 22-24% enrolled in one or more graduate programs. Anecdotal records suggest very few enroll in other institutions, particularly outside the CSU. Certainly, it can be expected that far more have actually enrolled given the professional development required by the State of California and the typical progression of teachers from the BA to the MA/MEd.

Our challenge, then, is to find a better and timelier way to track these students. Post-hoc surveys may provide some help, but with response rates to most surveys at roughly 30%, surveys will be of minimal assistance. Regular, annual tracking of students will be our best way forward as we endeavor to understand the further educational choices our students make.

4.6 Student and alumni awards/achievements

Awards and recognitions for teacher education candidates tend to be scare, and are often limited to traditional graduate or fifth-year post-baccalaureate students. However, student placement on the Dean's list is an important distinction and leads to graduation with honors and/or membership in national honor societies in education, including Phi Lambda Theta and Phi Kappa Delta, or national honor societies such as Phi Kappa Phi or Golden Key.

The Charter College of Education has two undergraduate programs with approximately the same enrollment. Therefore, we would hope to have roughly 50% of the 50-70 CCOE students per year earn Dean’s list distinction. Our numbers for the past five calendar years are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>44/54</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>38/48</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>29/49</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>35/69</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>39/69</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Because of the method Cal State LA uses to place students on the Dean's list, these figures include Fall 2015, but exclude Fall 2010.

As is readily seen, ULRN students perform well academically, and are represent at least half of the CCOE students awarded Dean’s List standing each year. It should be noted that the Rehabilitation Studies program has grown significantly in numbers over the past three years, and the ratio of ULRN v. Rehabilitation Studies students on the Dean’s list has kept pace with that grown.
### 4.7 GE Program SLO Assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Indicate which GE SLOs were assessed since the last self study and how they were measured:</th>
<th>2. Describe the results: (For example, how many students reached what level of proficiency on the SLOs assessed?)</th>
<th>3. Based on the results, what instructional, were made? (If the findings indicated a need for changes.)</th>
<th>4. List the classes the GE SLO listed in 1 is addressed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As previously discussed, ULRN does not offer general education courses at present.
5.0 Department Faculty

As discussed previously, ULRN has no faculty of its own. Faculty are drawn from each of the three college divisions, and staffing of program classes is done by the Division of Applied and Advanced Studies in Education, principally from among its faculty. ULRN has three groups of faculty involved in instruction and decision-making: the full-time, tenure track faculty, its adjunct faculty, and faculty who frequently teach credential courses who participate in program operations and shared governance.

The ULRN faculty has scheduled meetings twice a quarter, on the second and seventh Wednesdays, and all interested faculty are invited to attend. Historically, meetings have been attended by teaching faculty as well as faculty wishing to be involved in the program, along with a representative from the college’s Office of Student Services. The challenge the program faces is to encourage faculty to prioritize the meetings and to be actively, and consistently, involved. Moreover, although there has been consistent participation by faculty from the Division of Curriculum and Instruction, the involvement of faculty from the Division of Special Education and Counseling has always been limited to the program director and division chair, and is an area of particular need going forward.

It should be noted that the Charter College of Education serves roughly 70% graduate students in 7 credential, 17 certificates or authorization, and 26 advanced degree programs. With the decrease in faculty numbers, remaining faculty members are spread thin. Consequently, during the recent budgetary crisis, faculty involvement in ULRN declined. Faculty members were forced to turn their attention to supporting their own graduate programs, particularly as enrollment declined and the prospect of program suspension loomed. Moreover, during the furlough year, faculty were encouraged to limit activities that were voluntary, further reducing faculty participation in the program; once faculty are gone, it’s hard to bring them back as other activities occupy their time. These problems extended across all three divisions, where faculty from Division of Curriculum and Instruction and Division of Special Education and Counseling faced similar pressure to prioritize their graduate programs. Moreover, ULRN is one of three programs with voluntary faculty involvement, the others being our doctoral program in educational leadership, and our residency program. The programs are newer, and offer our decreasing numbers of faculty other opportunities, often with incentives attached that we can’t offer.

However, during the recent conversion to semester, active faculty involvement increased as we revised our program. Faculty meetings were well attended, and were representative of all three divisions. A cross-divisional collaborative team with a representative from the College of Engineering, Computer Science and Technology developed ULRN 4140, a new STEM project-based learning course; a team with expertise in urban education and culturally responsive teaching revised our courses on critical thinking (ULRN 461), and on culture in education (ULRN 464), full-time and adjunct faculty collaborated to revise our assessment course (ULRN 460), and faculty with expertise in literacy revised our community-based literacy course (ULRN 463). Of particular value were insights by faculty members with expertise in urban education, who reviewed our courses to be sure we kept the "urban" in
Urban Learning. The challenge now is to retain that faculty involvement as the demands of the new semester calendar and semester courses present themselves.

5.0.1. Program Faculty by Role

Although we do not have our own faculty, it is important to highlight the faculty who teach in the program. The following three tables present the three faculty groups (full-time, adjunct, and participating) who take a role in the program.

The faculty list below identifies full-time (tenure track) faculty who have taught one or more ULRN prefix courses during the period of the self-study. Rank noted is as of the last course section they taught; three faculty members have subsequently retired, and one has taken a position at another institution.

Table 5.1
**Full-time (Tenure Track) Teaching Faculty**
AY 2010-11 to 2013-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aina, Emmanuel</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbour, Ann</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, Margaret D.</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>SE&amp;C</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hafner, Anne</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>AASE</td>
<td>Chair, AASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javeri, Manisha</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>AASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunnan, Anthony</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>AASE</td>
<td>Resigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroufi, Chogollah</td>
<td>Professor, Retired</td>
<td>AASE</td>
<td>FERP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattheis, Allison</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>AASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moustafa, Margaret</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tejeda, Carlos</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>AASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Ann</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>AASE</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The faculty list below identifies part-time faculty who have taught ULRN prefix courses during the period of the self-study. All part-time faculty members are assigned to the Division of Applied and Advanced Studies in Education, and hold rank as an adjunct professor. Adjunct faculty members participate in program governance as their work schedules allow. Their full-time positions are noted.

Table 5.2
**Adjunct Teaching Faculty**
AY 2010-11 to 2013-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cervantes, Agustin</td>
<td>Director, Office of Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fried, Charlene E</td>
<td>High School Literacy Teacher, BPUSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawell, Susan</td>
<td>Literacy Specialist, full-time adjunct in C&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orozco, Socorro</td>
<td>Doctoral Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Saito, Noriko  Retired from C&I
Staub, Joseph Neil  High School Special Education Teacher, LAUSD
Washington, Rudolph  Doctoral Candidate
White, Jeffrey  Doctoral Student

In addition, faculty from the three Divisions of the Charter College of Education who teach principally in the credential component of the program are actively involved in shared governance of the program. Shared governance includes curriculum development and establishing program policy. Participation is voluntary.

Table 5.3
**CCOE Faculty Participating in Program Governance**
AY 2010-11 to 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Division/Office</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arvedson, Paula</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castaneda, Mario</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chee, Anna</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cravello, Nicole</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>ULRN Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle-Nichols, Adelaide</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>AASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menzies, Holly</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>SE&amp;C</td>
<td>Chair, SE&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persiani, Kimberly</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uy, Frederick</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
<td>Chair, C&amp;I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 Student opinion surveys

The Charter College of Education student opinion survey results trend high, with division means generally falling above 4.50 with little variability. The majority of students surveyed are graduate students, who typically demonstrate high levels of satisfaction with their classes, and data from undergraduates only is not available college-wide.

Data are presented in three forms: overall student responses for the review period (Table M1, Appendix M), responses measured by in-person administration of the survey (Table M2) and responses measured by online administration of the survey (Table M3). Given the small numbers of students responding to these early administrations of the online survey (range = 5 - 9), it seemed wise to present these data in multiple forms, disaggregating the data by mode of administration.

ULRN student opinion survey data are compared to Charter College of Education rather than University data for two important reasons:

- As a chartered college accredited by NCATE and the COA, our baseline for measurement is performance across the divisions within the college, particularly given our course of study includes both academic and professional preparation. ULRN is an integrated program that blends academic and professional preparation, making the mean ratings for the College a better basis for comparison of overall student opinions than the more traditional academic programs university-wide.
- CCOE means tend to run at or above 4.5 with standard deviations near or below 1.0. This is a high standard, and it is important that ULRN keep pace with the overall performance of the college.

Consequently, comparisons between ULRN and undergraduate data University wide might be viewed as “comparing apples and oranges”, whereas comparisons to college data gives us a meaningful perspective on student opinions. What is critical in evaluating the results of ULRN course student satisfaction survey is to compare the CCOE to the ULRN.

Overall, trends in student opinion surveys indicate a high level of satisfaction with ULRN course instruction. The responses to all eleven items surveyed, particularly on the critical item #11 (instructor effectiveness) fall at or near the division mean for the CCOE with a mode of 5. Students agreed or strongly agreed that their instructor was well prepared (m=4.53; sd=.51), provided timely feedback (m=4.43; sd=.58), presented the subject matter clearly (m=4.48; sd=.55) and demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter (m=4.63; sd=.47), and that the instructor was an effective teacher (m=4.49; sd=.52). There were no meaningful differences between these responses and those of the college as a whole.

Similarly, students felt their ULRN classes had a syllabus that clearly stated course objectives and requirements (m=4.56; sd=.53); that readings and assignments contributed to their understanding of the course (m=4.46; sd=.57) and that exams and assignments were good measures of the course material (m=4.45; sd=.61); and that the course contributed to their intellectual growth or skill development (m=4.51; sd=.54). Interactions between students and faculty were similarly highly rated, and as above there were no notable differences between ULRN and CCOE responses.

As previously noted, the data were disaggregated by mode of administration. Despite the small numbers of students completing student opinion surveys electronically, examination of the data suggests no significant differences by mode of administration.

5.2 Trends in percent of courses taught by faculty rank

Over the past five years, the percentage of tenure-track faculty teaching courses has steadily declined as overall faculty census in the divisions has declined. In AY 2010-11, 76% of ULRN course sections were taught by full-time, tenure track faculty, 88% at the rank of full professor. Over the four subsequent academic years, the percentage of adjunct faculty teaching ULRN course sections increased markedly, as shown in the table below.
Table 5.4  
Percentage of Full-time v. Adjunct Faculty Teaching ULRN Course Sections  
AY 2010-11 to 2013-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FT</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>%FT</th>
<th>%PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are several possible explanations for this trend. First, the budget crisis resulted in a number of retired faculty members not being replaced. This reduces the number of available full-time faculty, and in a college that serves roughly 70% graduate students, places an extra burden on the full-time faculty to teach more advanced graduate courses. Similarly, many faculty members, particularly in AASE, coordinate small graduate programs, and prefer to concentrate on recruitment and on teaching the courses in their own programs, many of which were at risk of suspension at the height of the budget crisis. With the reduction in full-time teaching faculty and shifting faculty priorities, the numbers of adjunct faculty teaching ULRN courses necessarily increased. Lastly, the full-time faculty in Curriculum and Instruction and in Special Education and Counseling, while qualified to teach ULRN classes, face similar pressures to teach courses in their own divisions, and are often unavailable when willing to teach ULRN classes, which for many would be new preparations.

In the last three academic years (2013-14 to present) we have added three new tenure track faculty members to the teaching faculty, an encouraging pattern. One, Dr. Allison Mattheis is included in the data above, and teaches courses in critical thinking, culturally responsive pedagogy, and foundations of urban teaching and learning; she has also mentored students as part of her early program of research. The newest members of our faculty joined in Fall 2015. One, Dr. Tony Ross, an associate professor, taught ULRN 464, our course in the role of race and culture in education, and Dr. Bahiyyih Hardacre, an assistant professor, teaches ULRN 460, our course in the implications of assessment in urban education.

Although our numbers of tenure track faculty have declined in recent years, the trend in the growth of adjunct faculty has a positive side. Adjunct faculty members with current experience in the field bring some particular strength to our course offerings. Selection of our adjunct faculty has been done with care to match adjuncts to course content. Consequently, among our adjunct faculty are three doctoral students in educational leadership, all of whom have been classroom teachers, and two full-time working teachers holding a Master of Arts degree in education, one with expertise in assessment and the other with expertise in literacy. Each teaches courses in their areas of expertise.

Informal feedback from students and comments on student opinion surveys indicate that they value the expertise and currency of these adjunct faculty, particularly in three courses: a)
ULRN 463, the community literacy practicum course, taught by a reading specialist with expertise in teaching literacy to English learners; b) ULRN 460, the course on assessment taught by a working special education teacher with 20 years’ experience who holds multiple credentials; and c) ULRN 464, taught by a doctoral student with expertise in critical race theory, culturally responsive instructions and their implications for urban schools. Students value the perspective that comes from faculty who are currently engaging in the work that they will do in the classroom, as well as the hands-on, real-world point of view working and experienced teachers bring to their courses. They see these faculty members as particularly able to make knowledge of course content accessible. (See Appendix M for student opinion survey data).

5.3 Faculty scholarly activities

As part of their faculty duties in their home divisions, faculty teaching in the Urban Learning Program have active research agendas and present at a wide range of national and international conferences. Please see section 3.7 for a discussion of research including ULRN students, and Appendix L for summary vitae.

5.4 Faculty Service to the University.

Faculty teaching in ULRN serve on/chair numerous divisional, college and university committees including, but not limited to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Educational Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Policy</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP and ARTP</td>
<td>Equity and Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Policy</td>
<td>Student and Faculty Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Faculty Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ULRN faculty also serve as members of the Academic Senate, CCOE Administrative Council, CCOE Steering Committee and the CCOE Assessment Task Force. Our faculty includes two division chairs.
6.0 Student Engagement, Outreach and Recruitment

6.1 Description of activities

External Outreach and Recruitment
One of the biggest challenges ULRN faces is its own uniqueness, and the need to make colleges, high schools and potential students aware of the program. As noted in Chapter 3.3 most universities preparing teachers have a teacher preparation major in Liberal Studies and/or Child Development. Consequently, college and high school counselors are well aware of them as the traditional teacher preparation majors, giving them a natural flow of students into them. In contrast, no comparable community college major means ULRN must more aggressively make community college and high school counselors aware of the program.

Our other challenge has been the job market for teachers, along with the diminished prestige of teaching and poor salary prospects, all of which make the pool of potential students smaller, more spread out, and academically weaker than it was in the program’s early years. The recent growth in available teaching positions is hopeful, but too new to have had any meaningful effect on the pool of potential students as yet. Moreover, community college transfer preparation is generally limited to academic coursework, meaning students come unprepared for the gatekeeper assessments (CBEST, CSET) they must take at Cal State LA; often the greatest challenge they face is preparation for subject matter assessments without having take the general education courses that will best develop the content on which they will be tested.

ULRN has developed high quality recruitment materials, including an eight-page information bulletin, modeled on the one produced by our sister program in Rehabilitation Studies, which we make available to high school and community college counselors, and send to students inquiring about the program. We also have a two-page information sheet, which is available online, at the ULRN office, and by request, which describes the specifics of the program. In addition, we have a flyer that details the credential options available to students wishing to pursue a special education credential in ULRN, and another for students wishing to add a single-subject authorization to their elementary education credential.

In no small part because of the restrictions a dwindling budget has created, the Urban Learning Program largely recruits via electronic media: notably the Cal State LA catalog and its own website. The website went live during Winter 2010, and was developed collaboratively with interns from the CCOE’s master’s degree program in media design. While it is always desirable to use internal resources for projects such as the website, the limited number, and skills, of the students has meant the site did not have a major update since its original development until Cal State LA converted to the Drupal interface in 2014. This WYSIWYG interface has recently made it easier to maintain, update and expand the site, which is presently undergoing a major revision to reflect our change to the semester system. But it still depends on in-program resources, and that will always limit the development of the site to the limits of our “know how.”
We have a program email address (ulrn@calstatela.edu) which is monitored daily by a student assistant and the program director, and we reply to inquiries quickly. We typically respond by sending the program’s information bulletin and two-page flyer, along with any other materials a student might request. Students can also request information via an e-mail interface recently installed.

ULRN is represented at college recruitment days when invited or notified of such events. We regularly participate in career days, such as those held at Citrus College and Pasadena City College. Generally, however, such outreach activities are handled via our Office of Student Services and the advisement personnel there, but coordination is limited.

ULRN does not have a recruiter as such. At one time, the program director had sufficient release units to do external recruitment; with budgetary issues and a shift in college priorities, those units are gone, and the opportunity to recruit externally reduced as a consequence.

Internal Outreach and Recruitment
Internal outreach methods include the use of bulletin boards and literature already discussed, periodic (but infrequent) information meetings, the website and a Moodle information site. Our student assistant is available to meet with potential students on a drop-in basis, and as a member of the program herself, is a valuable resource who can speak to prospective students from their own point-of-view. Interested students can then make an appointment to meet with the program director for advisement and to join the program. It’s a very successful model of recruitment because of its high content/low pressure approach. As a result, we have a great deal of success recruiting interested of students who make inquiries about the program. We are also a presence at campus welcome and recruitment events, and at counselor conferences, when we are aware of them, and make ourselves available to table whenever we are invited.

Despite this, we find ourselves in a difficult position: there is an internal practice at the administrative level that the college cannot bias teacher preparation information in favor of ULRN, but must equally represent each of the integrated programs. At times, this is a reasonable policy, but also ties both our hands and those of the college when it comes to actively recruiting for ULRN. The CCOE and the Office of Student Services can rarely recruit internally for ULRN without mention of Cal State LA’s three other integrated programs, none of which is similarly constrained. Consequently, there is little college-level recruitment that is targeted just on ULRN and we generally lose the benefit of a college-level “here is our program” model of recruitment that undergraduate majors typically have. As we go forward, it may be worthwhile to explore a balance between fairness to other programs and support of ULRN.

ULRN is part of a collaborative Teacher Preparation Academy, which is under development, and works collaboratively with the Associate Dean’s office and our Office of Student Services on internal recruitment activities. The Teacher Preparation Academy has begun to develop workshops and other activities for students in blended programs, or interested in becoming teachers. While it is still in its formative stages, it has tremendous potential to recruit students to ULRN and our other campus integrated teacher preparation majors.
Student Engagement and Retention

Our students carry a heavy academic and assessment load, many are working six hours or more a day, and many have families with small children, so campus engagement is necessarily limited. Despite this, we encourage students to become involved in campus clubs and organizations, and in student government. One ULRN student typically serves as a representative to ASI (the second coming from Rehabilitation Studies), and others have held higher positions in ASI, just as its legislative affairs officer, committee chairs, or communications officer. Current students are actively involved in a range of campus clubs. Many also belong to campus fraternities and sororities, or honor societies, including Phi Kappa Phi, Pi Lambda Theta and Golden Key.

ULRN has an internal student organization known as the Urban Learning Students’ Association (ULRNSA). ULRNSA depends on active student participation, and engages in a range of activities, including CSET and CBEST preparation workshops, barbecues and other social events, and our quarterly “Tacos and Treats for Teachers” fundraiser. It also provides the means to make facilities available to students needing study space and other campus resources. Student volunteers assist with college activities such as the annual Distinguished Educator’s dinner, and the statewide “Better Together” teacher’s conference, which afford them opportunities to network with university administration and professional educators.

But without doubt, the most critical and effective source of student engagement and retention are the cohorts. The cohorts are small learning communities, but rapidly grow into a network of support and engagement. Students study together, collaborate on projects, and support one another through the cohort structure. Social media, notably Facebook, forms their main line of communication, along with e-mail and text messages. Information travels between the program and the cohorts via e-mail and the cohorts peer leaders, who meet with the director and student assistant twice a quarter. We also maintain a Facebook page for informal communication, managed by our student assistant. Research, survey data and informal feedback all indicate the cohorts attract students to ULRN and, that students believe the cohorts are a critical factor in their success in the program and their persistence to graduation.

6.2 Effectiveness of activities

ULRN is a demanding program, and with many of our students working as many as six hours a day in the public schools as instructional assistants while keeping up with family demands, they are a busy group. Consequently, interest in activities such as student government, clubs and organizations, fundraisers and our own ULRNSA organization is limited. Most are reluctant to give up scarce free time to be on campus for activities when they would prefer to be with their families. Consequently, engagement outside their cohorts is broad-based, but limited. Despite this, the availability of peer advisement in the ULRN office and the cohorts are highly successful recruitment and engagement tools. Students value the perspective they gain from discussing the program with a peer who is doing what they are considering. Once in the major, students in the program soon develop an identity as a cohort member, and frequently indicate that they attribute their engagement in the program to the cohorts.
This is supported by our website, literature, tabling at campus events, and outreach to the larger community. Together, they are effective, but their scale remains small. This is a particular challenge for a major that is unique, and doesn’t flow from a comparable community college major. Critical to these efforts is the flow of information from the Associate Dean’s office and the Office of Student Services, and makes collaboration with these offices a critical element of our future recruitment efforts.

**Action**

There are a number of areas where action can be taken which will strengthen outreach and recruitment.

- **Regular updates of the website.** Currently, website updates depend on the program director or student assistant, who are trained to edit, but not build the site. This is workable for small updates and minor improvements, but does not foster use of strategies that would improve visibility of the website among parents, potential students, teacher candidates and advisement personnel at the high school and community college level. Investment in web design and expansion to aggressively market undergraduate education in the Charter College of Education would pay good dividends, given our prospective students’ increasing dependence on web-based information resources.

- **Orientation/advisement sessions for prospective students.** Information sessions have been held irregularly over the life of the program, but largely fell by the wayside during the furlough year, and the conversion to semester. However these meetings have yielded some good results, and should be reinstated on a regular schedule, allowing potential transfer students and continuing students considering teacher education can interact with the program, ask questions, receive advisement, and learn about the program. With the recent appointment of a CCOE Director of Student Services, coordination of these sessions is more manageable, and could be put in place for the Fall 2016 application period.

- **Implement the program’s recruitment plan.** ULRN has a written recruitment plan, but changes in college administration, budget cuts, and the demands of semester conversion have slowed its implementation. It may be worthwhile to form a recruitment committee designed to implement the plan and to support recruitment efforts by the program.

- **Continue connection-building with community colleges.** Collaboration with community colleges is critical to the growth of the program. Recent efforts to build transition programs (2+2 agreements) with Pasadena City College, Los Angeles Southwest College, and Citrus College have resulted in increasing numbers of students from these colleges majoring in Urban Learning.

- **Hold an annual on-campus college day and related activities for high school and college counselors.** Building on the above, the Charter College of Education would profit from the development of an annual college information day, when counselors, recruiters and teacher-education faculty can come to the campus, interact with faculty, and see a program of information about our undergraduate programs. This could be done in conjunction with the Teacher Preparation Academy.
• *Identify target high schools, widen the area gradually.*

The program’s future lies in the recruitment of first-time freshman. As previously discussed, our numbers are small, and the decision to declare a major in Urban Learning depends upon individual students’ and counselor’s awareness of the program. Developing relationships with high schools and supplying counselors with quality advisement materials will be critical to growth in the number of first-time freshmen declaring ULRN as their major.
7.0 Program Self-Recommendations

The results of this self-study indicate the need for growth and development of the program in four areas: assessment, curriculum, recruitment, program growth and faculty involvement and collaboration. The following recommendations will form the basis of a five-year plan of action to strengthen and develop the Urban Learning Program going forward. The ultimate goal of these recommendations is to improve student learning and critical skills through assessment and curricular development, broaden opportunities for students interested in urban teaching and learning, increase faculty involvement, and to build the program beyond a single-option undergraduate program.

Assessment
1. Review and revise program SLO’s to strengthen emphasis on key academic skills such as writing, critical thinking, and oral language.
2. Identify early screening strategies, possibly built into CCOE 3010 that will identify students with intensive writing, oral language and/or English fluency needs.
3. Revise assessment plan to identify key assessment points in each ULRN course.
4. Identify ULRN student outcomes on key assessments in credential program courses.
5. Designate a ULRN program assessment committee from among faculty with assessment background.
6. Review existing assessment procedures and develop/update the program’s current assessment plan with greater attention to:
   a. Assessment of academic progress
   b. Assessment of critical skills (writing, critical thinking, oral language)
   c. Completion of required professional gatekeeper assessments (CBEST, CSET, TPA) in a timely manner
7. Develop a rubric to evaluate professional content and professional writing skills demonstrated in key pieces of writing (program application, Philosophy of Education, etc.) completed outside of classes.
8. Develop a program of support for completion of CBEST, CSET in a timely manner and management of TPA, including appointment of a TPA coordinator from among ULRN Program faculty.
9. Review and revise the ULRN student satisfaction survey, and coordinate with the college assessment committee to assure appropriate administration

Curriculum
1. Develop courses needed to offer a certificate and minor in Urban Learning.
2. Review course content in the ULRN prefix courses through the transition to semester, to evaluate, and as needed, strengthen:
   a. Writing and oral language skills, including use of APA format
   b. Development of oral language skills
   c. Critical thinking
   d. Student knowledge of culturally responsive pedagogy
   e. Field-based activities
3. Design signature assignments with critical assessment points in each ULRN-prefix course.
4. Explore the need for a 2000- or 3000-level writing course for students whose writing does not meet professional expectations.
5. Explore the addition of field experiences for lower-division students in the Urban Learning Program.
6. Explore potential development of a lower division general education course and/or an upper division general education course that examines the interaction between diversity, education and urban schooling.

**Recruitment and Program Growth**
1. Update or develop and circulate program recruitment materials: a) a flyer that can be circulated campus-wide; b) a three-fold brochure; c) program description handouts; d) a one-sheet informational handout and; e) an information bulletin. We currently have all but the first; the third is under development by the Associate Dean’s office and the last two have been updated to the semester system.
2. Review and update the ULRN recruitment plan, and implement an active program of recruitment to contain the following components:
   a. Support for maintenance of the program website
   b. Collaborative plans of transition (2+2 agreements) with local community colleges
   c. Field visits to area high schools and colleges
   d. Periodic on-campus orientation meetings
   e. Update the program brochure to enhance existing recruitment materials
   f. Advertising the program in appropriate media
   g. Sufficient release time for the program director to conduct recruitment activities
3. Develop a minor in Urban Learning, designed to target students in subject matter and other related majors (Liberal Studies, Child Development, Rehabilitation Counseling, Social Work, etc.)
4. Develop a certificate program in Urban Learning designed to target post-baccalaureate credential candidates interested in strengthening their knowledge of the context of teaching and learning in urban schools.
5. Collaborate with the Office of Student Services and the University Office of Outreach and Recruitment to accomplish these goals.
6. Strengthen connections with alumni, particularly those teaching in the Los Angeles basin as a means to both monitor student progress and as a tool for recruitment.

**Faculty Involvement and Collaboration**
1. Review staffing procedures for ULRN classes to enhance the cross-divisional nature of ULRN and broaden the pool of faculty teaching in these courses, allowing students more opportunity to learn from CCOE faculty, particularly from the Division of Special Education and Counseling.
2. Strengthen involvement of college administration in the program, and broaden faculty involvement in program governance and decision-making.
3. Provide comprehensive training on the semester ULRN program for college administration and staff, division faculty and staff.
4. Provide staffing support necessary to allow courses to be taught by adjunct faculty currently working in the schools.
Five Year Plan

Based on the findings of the self-study and the program recommendations, we have developed a five-year plan that emphasizes four areas of development for the program. These are:

Assessment
Without question, this is the area of greatest need for the program. As previously discussed, our program of assessment has been targeted to measuring student attainment of standards set by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and NCATE. With our shift to measuring student achievement using the model adopted by the university program review process, we need to reappraise our assessment plan and our assessment process in totality. To that end, our plan includes the following steps:

- **Formation of an assessment committee** with representation from the three divisions and one student representative. This will also engage more faculty in non-instructional program activities.
- **Review alignment of course and program SLOs**. This is a doubly important process as we move to new courses on the semester calendar. Program SLOs guided our curriculum process, but as we implement our new courses, some revisions may be needed.
- **Revision of our assessment plan**. As part of this process, we will develop program benchmarks for three critical skills to run across courses: writing, critical thinking, and oral language, as well as benchmarks for attainment of core content knowledge in individual courses.
- **Development of signature assignments** designed to assess core skills (writing, oral language and critical thinking) as well as course-specific benchmark skills in all offerings of a given course.
- **Collection and annual review of assessment** data to be used for program development, curricular design, support of student achievement and program growth. This ongoing assessment process will inform program instruction, curriculum and decision-making over the next five years. It will also allow us to closely monitor the success of our new semester program and individual courses.

Over the next five years, we will collect, evaluate and monitor data and data collection in order to refine our assessment plan, benchmarks and SLOs, signature assignments and assessment methods.

Curriculum
Curriculum and assessment must, of necessity overlap to some degree. Much of our planning for assessment is also curricular in nature, particularly the development and implementation of the signature assignments. Implementation of these assignments will require coordination of course syllabi across sections of a given course as we roll out our new semester courses. This development and implementation process will begin with ULRN 4110 (ULRN 461) and 4120 (ULRN 464) in Fall 2016. In addition, we will:

- **Screen, identify and provide instructional support** for students in writing, oral language and critical thinking across the ULRN breadth courses.
• **Identify core basic professional skills** that can be infused and developed across the major courses. This will allow us to assure that ULRN majors enter their credential methods courses with a consistent set of basic skills, (such as writing a lesson plan or developing instructional goals) that tend to be taught at different points in the two options.

• **Broaden the program beyond the Bachelor’s degree program.** Over the next five years, we will develop a minor in Urban Learning designed for majors earning a single-subject (secondary education) credential, and a certificate in Urban Teaching and Learning, which can be earned separately or infused as part of degree or credential preparation.

The focus of our curricular efforts will be on implementing our new semester program, and on expanding the heretofore BA-only program to one that offers a broader range of both undergraduate and graduate students the opportunity to study in the program.

**Recruitment and Program Growth**

As the minor and certificate programs are developed, recruitment efforts will be an important part of their success, making the two connected. They will also allow us to tap into new groups of students who might not have previously or otherwise taken a course offered by ULRN. To that end, we will:

• **Schedule and offer periodic program information sessions.** This will be offered both in-person and electronically using Adobe Connect. We will also develop an asynchronous session that can be accessed on demand.

• **Continue development of 2+2 articulation** agreements with local community colleges. We are currently developing plans with Pasadena City College (PCC) and Los Angeles Southwest (LASC), and have begun developing relationships with Rio Hondo College, East Los Angeles College and Citrus College. These will be the target of our efforts over the next five years, with the possible addition of Mount San Antonio College.

• **Review our existing recruitment plan,** and implement a plan for recruitment from local feeder high schools in LAUSD and immediately surrounding school districts.

• **Design and implement more personalized activities for counselors and prospective students.** This will include campus information days for high school and community college counselors, preparation of online and other electronic materials for counselors and campus visits for prospective students. Much of this effort will take place in coordination with the CCOE Office of Student Services and the university Office of Outreach and Recruitment.

At the end of the five-year period, will review and assess the success of our recruitment activities, and revise or update as appropriate.

**Faculty Involvement and Collaboration**

The program has always struggled to define what constitutes ULRN faculty and to actively engage faculty from each of the three CCOE divisions in program operations and decision-making. Given the challenges detailed in the self-study, faculty participation has become increasingly limited, and largely confined to teaching and attending faculty meetings. In order to build broader and deeper faculty participation in the program, we will:
• **Train college administration, faculty and staff on the undergraduate program.** In a college that is driven by graduate education, knowledge of University undergraduate program requirements and the ULRN program can be limited. This will bot more actively engage stakeholders, increase their knowledge base to ease work with undergraduate students, and provide better support to students.

• **Revisit and redefine what constitutes ULRN Program faculty.** Involvement by college leadership will be critical to this step.

• **Actively engage faculty in program activities** such as program decision-making, support for test preparation, leadership roles (TPA, assessment), cohort mentorship.

• **Survey and identify full-time faculty teaching interests in ULRN.** Using these data, the program can work with the divisions to broaden and deepen the cadre of faculty from the three divisions teaching in the program.

Administrative participation will be key to this process. Administrators set expectations and are role models. But administrators can’t operate in a vacuum; they need to understand the program well enough to infuse it into their own programs, and to encourage faculty involvement. Faculty knowledge is equally important. If faculty do not understand how the undergraduate program works, and what ULRN is and does, they will not engage.

**Curriculum**

Over the next five years, we have planned a series of curricular changes that will accomplish three major goals: a) strengthening our assessment-to-curriculum linkages, with specific attention to critical skills (writing, oral language, and critical thinking) and professional skills; b) alignment of new semester courses to program SLOs and development of signature assignments to evaluate student learning and; c) expansion of program offerings to include a minor and a certificate program.

These changes will strengthen the existing program by assuring consistent assessment and instruction of skills needed by professionals in education, developing them in our major courses while applying them to course content relevant to professional education. In so doing, we will develop students’ understanding of the relationship between their academic performance while at the university and their professional lives. Students often fail to see that everything they do as students is a reflection of who they will be as teachers (a simple example: would they as a teacher find their own writing acceptable in the classroom?) By consistently, and continuously building and measuring these three critical skills, and coordinating with the credential programs to support professional skill development, we strengthen students’ growth as teachers in training, apply these skills to the critical problems in contemporary urban schools and communities, and make connections between academic and professional skills such as lesson planning and reporting of assessment data.

ULRN has been static in terms of program offerings since it was developed. Although we have modified and refined the program several times over its life, we have never grown beyond the baccalaureate program. Cal State LA’s conversion to semester has given impetus for use to initiate a program of growth by developing a certificate program and a minor. These changes, with new courses designed for them, will open the program up to new students, expand our curriculum, notably to explore urban teaching and learning at the
secondary and post-secondary school (grades 7-14) levels, and offer the opportunity for students in other majors to develop a cluster of critical skills in urban teaching and learning.

**Students**

This plan is highly student-centered. The majority of our students might reasonably be described as at-risk. Too often they a) are the first in their families to attend college and have little experience with this thing we call college; b) work 4-6 hours a day; c) have significant family and financial demands placed upon them and; d) are often English learners and/or have academic needs that require support or intervention. Moreover, they do not intuitively make the link between their performance as students and their professional performance, a critical point of evaluation we make throughout the degree program and credential preparation. More problematically, as the job market for teachers shrank during the budget crisis, the quality of student we recruited declined. This change intensifies the need for the program to move to an instructional model that includes intensive, continuous support of core and professional skills needed for academic and professional success.

As we phase in the new semester program and implement our recruitment plan, and as the university returns to year-round admission of transfer students, we anticipate modest growth in the number of majors. We have historically built two cohorts of 25-30 each fall; with spring semester admission in 2018, we have planned for two fall and two spring semester cohorts bringing in roughly 100 students a year. The job market in teaching has opened up significantly since the period of lay-offs and zero hiring in the height of the budget crisis. With the current teaching pool greying, the need for teachers will grow significantly, making opportunities in education more appealing to students who may have hesitated to declare a major leading to a teaching credential in the past.

Our collaborative scheduling process will handle the growth in the number of cohorts to the extent the divisions can offer the classes we need. The college is hiring new faculty in two divisions and is actively building capacity in all of its programs; consequently, we anticipate available teaching resources, including adjuncts, will be available to teach courses for the cohorts for which we have planned. We will need to include planning for recruitment of new faculty with an interest and expertise in urban schools and schooling as part of the development of these new program components in order to assure we are prepared to serve the new students that they will bring to the program.

Corresponding plans for recruitment and program growth have been built into the plan. The central activity is developing 2+2 transitional agreements with local community colleges. These plans will lay out a student’s course of study at both institution, assure a smooth transition, focus their lower division study to best prepare them for gatekeeper assessments and upper division coursework, and keep their time to degree as short as possible, and with their financial aid in force to the greatest degree feasible.

One of the critical tasks we must undertake as we begin to implement the action plan is to review and align our program and course SLOs. As discussed earlier, the program SLOs informed development of course SLOs, but as we review and revise our assessment plan and make corresponding curricular changes, we must evaluate whether our SLOs need
revision in order to best meet the needs of our students and best prepare them as education professionals.

Our plan includes some ambitious activities for supporting student achievement: a) imbedding continuous instruction and assessment of writing, oral language and critical thinking; b) infusing core professional skills across the major and; c) development of support mechanisms to prepare students for gatekeeper assessments with which students struggle, delaying completion of their degrees. Central to these plans is a “catch them before they fail” approach to assessment and instruction that addresses the three core skills discussed earlier. Essential to this plan is the leveraging of adjunct faculty who are also working teachers, and can provide mentorship and instructional support with basic skills that these students need. Building these skills across the curriculum will require administrative support, collaboration and planning, and a significant commitment of time in order to yield the results needed. The larger issue of faculty resources is discussed in the next two sections.

Resources
It should be noted that ULRN has no budget of its own. The program is funded as part of the overall operating budget of Applied and Advanced Studies in Education, with some additional funding from the Dean’s Office. As such, we cannot commit funds to particular action, but instead, recommend priorities for funding by the division and college.

The following resources will be essential to successfully completing this plan:

1. **Faculty and staff time.** The single biggest resource this plan will require is human: faculty and staff time and energy. The success of this plan depends on faculty from the three divisions a) participating in the program and; b) engaging in the action required by the plan. Developing curriculum and assessment procedures as extensive as this plan requires is time intensive and some release time will be critical to assuring faculty have sufficient time to complete the tasks outlined.

2. **Assigned time for the program director.** Development of 2+2 agreements, and other recruitment activities are time consuming and involve considerable off-campus time. In order for the director to have adequate time for these activities, the position’s release time (12 units/quarter), which was reduced by half during the budget crisis, should be restored. The cost of adjuncts to teach is small next to the FTES generated by students who will enroll at Cal State LA and in the Charter College of Education for as many as six years (BA + credential, then MA).

3. **Utilization of professional advisors.** Timely, targeted advisement of current and prospective students is critical to the success of this plan. The Charter College of Education has two full-time advisors with expertise in undergraduate education and credential preparation. These advisors, in collaboration with our Office for Student Services, will play an essential role in identifying and recruiting potential students for the program, particularly at the community college, and among students identifying or changing their majors. Further, collaboration with the Cal State LA’s Undergraduate Academic Advisement Center will also support identification and advisement of freshmen and sophomores wishing to become teachers.

4. **Funding for materials preparation and printing.** ULRN has a $1000/year recruitment budget that should cover preparation and printing of the flyer and purchase
of small give-away items such as plastic bags, pens and magnets. However, preparation of the packages of materials to be distributed to high schools and community colleges will be significant enough that additional funding will be needed.

5. **Funding for workshops and other events needed by students taking gatekeeper assessments (CBEST, CSET and TPA).** Currently, these workshops and other events are rare, largely because there is no budget to pay adjunct faculty to present them or purchase materials needed to offer them to students while they negotiate three gatekeeper assessments that expensive to take and often difficult to pass. Consequently, students leave the program or their time-to-degree is lengthened because they cannot pass these assessments, particularly the CSET. We have done some collaborative work on these events through the Teacher Academy, but with the time pressures full-time faculty are under, our ability to support these students with the depth, breadth and intensity they need is limited. The ability to stipend adjunct faculty who teach the skills these students need (writing, English, mathematics, etc.)

**Faculty**
The biggest resource and faculty challenge we face is the human one: do we have the faculty to a) do the work that needs to be done and; b) develop and teach the courses that our plan of program growth demands? Critical to the success of this plan must be a re-examination of our traditional cross divisional “borrow” of faculty to teach in the program rather than the program having faculty of its own.

When the program was new, the existing faculty model worked. As the program has aged and the numbers of tenure-track faculty decreased, the model has, if anything, held the program back, and forced us to depend increasingly on adjunct faculty, albeit high quality adjunct faculty. Growth of the nature described in this plan will place new pressures on the college, and will require an administrative-level discussion as to whether the Division of Applied and Advanced Studies in Education should begin to hire new faculty who have expertise in urban schools, schooling and pedagogy, and who are interested in teaching ULRN major course content. Given the decline in tenure-track faculty teaching in the program over the last five years, reexamination of the available faculty and the need for faculty assigned to ULRN is essential to the program’s growth.

**Action Plan**
On the following pages, the five-year action plan is presented on a year-by-year basis in grid form. Some of the planned action described above will take more than one year, and some crosses over between two of the four topical areas (such as the development of a minor and a certificate program crossing between curriculum and recruitment). The plan indicates the most important of these overlaps. The plan is ambitious, especially the first two years, but we believe it is attainable, and has been designed to align well with the program’s transition to the semester program and the evaluative and reflective processes that will naturally take place as we do.
# Urban Learning Program
## Five-Year Action Plan
### Academic Years 2016-17 to 2020-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One AY 2016-17</th>
<th>Year Two AY 2017-18</th>
<th>Year Three AY 2018-19</th>
<th>Year Four AY 2019-20</th>
<th>Year Five AY 2020-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review course SLOs, map to program SLOs. (Program faculty)</td>
<td>Review and revise assessment plan. (Assessment committee)</td>
<td>Review Year 1 data and problem solve. (Program faculty, assessment committee)</td>
<td>Ongoing review and problem solving (Program faculty, assessment committee)</td>
<td>Continue data collection (Program director, instructional faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise program SLOs as needed. (Program faculty) [SLOs 1-8]</td>
<td>Begin data collection. (Assessment committee) [SLOs 1-8]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop program benchmarks and screening for:  - Writing  - Critical Thinking  - Oral Language (Instructional faculty developing baseline course outlines for ULRN 4110-4150, 4190) [SLOs 2, 3, 6]</td>
<td>Review course outlines to incorporate benchmark skills. (Instructional faculty developing baseline course outlines for ULRN 4110-4150, 4190) Implement screening. (Assessment committee) [SLOs 1-7]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor and revise instruction and assessment of benchmark skills (Instructional faculty developing baseline course outlines for ULRN 4110-4150, 4190, assessment committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop signature assignments for ULRN courses (4110-4150, 4190) to be incorporated into semester course outlines. (Instructional faculty developing baseline course outlines for ULRN 4110-4150, 4190) [SLOs 1-7]</td>
<td>Begin data collection using signature assignments. (Program director, instructional faculty) Continue development and begin implementation of signature assignments. (Instructional faculty developing baseline course outlines for ULRN 4110-4150, 4190, assessment committee) [SLOs 1-7]</td>
<td>Implement data collection with signature assignments. (Instructional faculty) [SLOs 1-7]</td>
<td>Review and revise signature assignments. (Instructional faculty developing baseline course outlines for ULRN 4110-4150, 4190, assessment committee) [SLOs 1-7]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify core professional skills to</td>
<td>Review course outlines to incorporate core</td>
<td>Ongoing instruction and assessment of core professional skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate outcomes of professional skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Involvement and Collaboration</td>
<td>Recruitment and Program Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit and define ULRN faculty.</td>
<td>Identify and target community colleges for development of 2+2 transition agreements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalize ongoing arrangements (LASC, PCC) (Program director, Office of Student Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review recruitment plan, identify plan for recruitment at feeder high schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee oversees program assessment activities described above. (Assessment committee)</td>
<td>Continue development and implement 2+2 agreements. Develop on campus information days for high school and community college students in collaboration with Orientation and Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Recruit actively involved faculty from AASE, C&I and SE&C Establish priorities and implement program activities including:  
  - Ongoing program decision-making | Design and implement information day(s) for high school and community college counselors in collaboration with Orientation and Recruitment |
|                                      | Prepare package of recruitment materials, distribute to high schools and community colleges (Program director, Office of Student Services) |
|                                      | Assess outcomes of recruitment activities. Evaluate recruitment plan, revise/update as needed. (Program director, Office of Student Services, program faculty) |
| Implement certificate and minor program (Program director, appointed committee as needed) | Schedule and implement periodic information sessions (Program director) |
| Survey possible stakeholders (i.e. secondary education, other majors) regarding needs/interests: minor, certificate program. (Program director) | Implement certificate and minor program in Urban Learning (Program director, appointed committee as needed) |
| Design certificate program and minor program in Urban Learning (Program director, appointed committee as needed) | Certificate and minor curriculum process (Program director, appointed committee as needed) |
| Program director, credential program faculty) | (SLO 8ES, 8MS) |
| (Instructional faculty, credential program faculty) | (SLO 8ES, 8MS) |
| (Instructional faculty) | (SLO 8ES, 8MS) |
| Instructional faculty, credential program faculty) | (SLO 8ES, 8MS) |
| Recruitment and Program Growth | Faculty Involvement and Collaboration |
| Implement core professional skills in ULRN courses (S’18) (Instructional faculty) | Form an assessment committee to design, implement and monitor program assessment (Program director, division chairs) |
| Professional skills. (F’17) (Instructional faculty, credential program faculty) | Committee oversees program assessment activities described above. (Assessment committee) |
| Program director, credential program faculty) | Revisit and define ULRN faculty. |
| (Program director, course director) | Revisit and define ULRN faculty. |
| Implement core professional skills in ULRN courses (S’18) (Instructional faculty) | Design certificate program and minor program in Urban Learning (Program director, appointed committee as needed) |
| Survey possible stakeholders (i.e. secondary education, other majors) regarding needs/interests: minor, certificate program. (Program director) | Design certificate program and minor program in Urban Learning (Program director, appointed committee as needed) |
| Set a fixed calendar and develop an ongoing agenda for ULRN faculty meetings (Program director and program faculty) | • Support preparation for CBEST and CSET examinations  
• Monitoring and support for TPA (elementary education candidates) (Program director, college administration and division chairs) |
| Provide training for college administration and staff on the semester ULRN program. (Program director) | Provide training for division faculty and staff on the semester ULRN program. (Program director) |
| Identify faculty members’ teaching interests to build cadre of full-time faculty to teaching ULRN courses across the divisions. (Program director, division chairs) | Coordinate with division administration to increase the number of full-time faculty across divisions teaching in ULRN. (Program director, division chairs) |

**Notes:**

1. The Program Director is assumed to be responsible for oversight of all action detailed in the narrative and on the plan, including initiating action, forming committees and scheduling meetings needed. Activities that are principally the director’s responsibility are noted in parenthesis.
2. Persons or committees responsible for specific elements of the plan are noted in (parenthesis).
3. SLOs addressed are noted in [brackets].
Appendix A. Reports from Previous Program Reviews

N/A. This is the program's first review.
Appendix B. Students in the Major

Enrollment in the Program

Table B1
Total Enrollment by Quarter
Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2010-11</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2011-12</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2012-13</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2013-14</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B2
Enrollment by Quarter: First-time Freshman
Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2010-11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2011-12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2012-13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2013-14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B3
Enrollment by Quarter: First-time Transfer Students
Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2010-11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2011-12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2012-13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2013-14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B4
Enrollment by Quarter: Continuing Undergraduate Students
Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2010-11</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2011-12</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2012-13</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2013-14</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B5
Enrollment by Cohort: Continuing Juniors and Seniors
Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Av.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Qtr.</td>
<td>F 10</td>
<td>F 10</td>
<td>F 11</td>
<td>F 11</td>
<td>F 12</td>
<td>F 12</td>
<td>F’13</td>
<td>F’13</td>
<td>F’14</td>
<td>F’14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Credential Opt.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Credential Opt.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% SE</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B6
Enrollment by Gender and Ethnicity

Total Enrollment by Gender
Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% F</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B7
Total Enrollment by Ethnicity
Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Pacific Island</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Inter'l</th>
<th>Two Races</th>
<th>Unkwn</th>
<th>America n Indian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 18 10 1 1 10 8 63 5 3 15 9 5 3 3 2 15 9 0 0 17 10
### Table B8

**Enrollment by Gender and Ethnicity**  
Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Inter’tl</th>
<th>Two Races</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total enrollments range from 120 to 220 with a total of 100% for each academic year.
Table B9

**Enrollment by Course**

Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>S#</th>
<th>AY 2010-11</th>
<th>AY 2011-12</th>
<th>AY 2012-13</th>
<th>AY 2013-14</th>
<th>AY 2014-15</th>
<th>Average Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 460</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 461</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 462</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 463</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 464</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 469</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

Students enroll in ULRN 463 Section 1 (Lect.) and 2 (Act.) concurrently; enrollment data is recorded for Section 1.
Appendix C. Graduation and Persistence Rates

Graduation Rates

Table C1
Graduation Rates by Cohort
Cohorts Starting Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Qtr.</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 08</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Credential Opt.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Credential Opt.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Pending</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Complete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduates</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Graduating</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>90.48</td>
<td>89.47</td>
<td>87.88</td>
<td>83.87</td>
<td>96.77</td>
<td>81.25</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>78.95</td>
<td>58.82</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>83.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Students in the program designate a credential option, generally by their third quarter in the program.
2. Cohorts starting the program in Fall, 2013 will begin graduating in Summer 2015. Candidates for the Multiple Subject credential will begin directed teaching and graduate in Fall 2015.

Table C2
Degrees Granted by Gender
Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2010-11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2011-12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2012-13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2013-14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C3
**Degrees Granted by Ethnicity**
Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Pacific Island</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Int’l</th>
<th>Two Races</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2010-11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2011-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2012-13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2013-14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>239</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Persistence Data

### Freshman Retention

**Table C4**

**Freshman Retention**

Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>ULRN</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Major in the same Academic Plan</th>
<th>Major changed</th>
<th>Cumulative Degrees Awarded (Same Plan)</th>
<th>Cumulative Degrees Awarded (New Plan)</th>
<th>Cumulative Degrees Awarded</th>
<th>% Cumulative Degrees Awarded</th>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>% Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year</td>
<td>3 Year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year</td>
<td>4 Year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRD</td>
<td>ULRD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year</td>
<td>3 Year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year</td>
<td>4 Year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Year</td>
<td>5 Year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Year</td>
<td>6 Year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRG</td>
<td>ULRG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>ULRN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year</td>
<td>3 Year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year</td>
<td>4 Year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRD</td>
<td>ULRD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year</td>
<td>3 Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year</td>
<td>4 Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRG</td>
<td>ULRG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>ULRN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>ULRN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRG</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>ULRN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Transfer Student Retention

### Table C5

**Transfer Student Retention: Fall Quarter**  
Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Major in the same Academic Plan</th>
<th>Major changed to Other Academic Plan</th>
<th>Cumulative Degrees Awarded (Same Plan)</th>
<th>Cumulative Degrees Awarded (New Plan)</th>
<th>Cumulative Degrees Awarded</th>
<th>% Cumulative Degrees Awarded</th>
<th>Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>ULRN</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ULRD</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ULRG</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>ULRN</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ULRD</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ULRG</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>ULRN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>ULRN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRG</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>ULRN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRG</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. Faculty Utilization

Table D1
Full Time Student Equivalents, Enrollment, Full Time Faculty Equivalents and Student-Faculty Ratio, by Academic Year
Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>FTEF</th>
<th>FTES</th>
<th>SFR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2010-11</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>127.12</td>
<td>23.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2011-12</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>120.14</td>
<td>30.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2012-13</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>91.09</td>
<td>22.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2013-14</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>60.53</td>
<td>17.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>22.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>487.29</td>
<td>24.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ULRN is an inter-departmental program with no full-time faculty. Courses taught by ULRN faculty are part of their overall teaching assignment; typically faculty teach no more than one ULRN course per quarter.
Table D2

**Full Time Student Equivalents, Enrollment, Full Time Faculty Equivalents and Student-Faculty Ratio, by Quarter**

Academic Years 2010-11 through 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th></th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th></th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th></th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY</td>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>FTEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>26.33</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>36.33</td>
<td>22.71</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>30.64</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>48.08</td>
<td>30.05</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>20.47</td>
<td>25.59</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>30.48</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** ULRN is an inter-departmental program with no full-time faculty. Courses taught by ULRN faculty are part of their overall teaching assignment; typically faculty teach no more than one ULRN course per quarter.
Appendix E. Catalog Description of Each Program

Bachelor of Arts Degree in Urban Learning

The Bachelor of Arts degree in Urban Learning is an Integrated Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Program designed to prepare culturally sensitive teachers for assignments in hard-to-staff diverse urban elementary (K-6) or Special Education (K-12 or B-21) classrooms. The major combines courses in teacher preparation with major courses emphasizing an interdisciplinary approach to understanding urban learning as a social phenomenon. The major is supported by a depth area in the social sciences and preparation for either a Multiple Subject Credential (Elementary Education) or an Education Specialist (Special Education) Teaching Credential. Students who complete this degree must complete a minimum of 180 units to graduate. The requirements are described below. For additional information concerning this program, see the section on Basic Teaching Credentials.

Faculty
Margaret Clark (Director), Paula Arvedson, Ann Barbour, Stephanie Evans, Ambika Gopalakrishnan, Manish Javeri, J. Sabrina Mims, Frederick L. Uy.

Advisement
Prospective students must attend an orientation session and meet with an adviser prior to enrolling in any courses. Upon completion of their GE requirements, students are grouped into learning communities (cohorts) which support a climate conducive to building life long professional networks, development of collaboration skills, and academic success. Students are expected to enroll in courses designated for their cohort each quarter.

Freshmen are encouraged to seek advisement from a ULRN adviser early and often to assure timely completion of General Education requirements and program application procedures prior to placement in a cohort.

Admission
The major is available to students who:

- Meet the general university requirements for admission as a first-year student or transfer student; and
- If a transfer student, attain a GPA of at least 2.75 in the last 90 quarter units of coursework.
- Meet with an Urban Learning program advisor and complete a program application
- Demonstrate suitable aptitude for teaching in public schools
- Students are expected to satisfy all the requirements established by the Charter College of Education and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing for admission into the credential option of choice during the first two quarters in a cohort.

Requirements for the Major (180 units)

Students must complete 180 units to graduate. The Urban Learning major requires completion of 60 units of General Education at the lower division, 12 units at the upper...
division and 6 units of graduation requirements (i.e., ENGL 102 and either the Introduction to Higher Education EDUC 101 or Transition to Cal State L.A. EDUC 301). It also requires 56 units in the major with the remaining 46 units as recommended electives for teacher preparation.

Students in an Elementary Subject Matter Teacher Preparation Program are subject to the same General Education requirements as non-teaching majors. Students transferring from community colleges should seek advisement from a counselor and complete a program of General Education coursework leading to CSU GE or IGETC certification.

Students interested in securing a California Multiple Subject Teaching or Education Specialist Internship Credential should consult the Charter College of Education section in the Academic Programs, College-Based and University Wide chapter for the regulations governing all teaching credential programs.

A grade of C or higher is required in all courses used to meet the major requirements for Elementary Subject Matter Teacher Preparation.

**Elementary Subject Matter Teacher Preparation (180 units)**
University Requirements (6-12 units)
ENGL 102 - Composition II: Analytic and Persuasive Writing (4) (4)
UNIV 400 - Writing Proficiency Examination (0) or
UNIV 401 - Writing Proficiency (4)

EDUC 101 - Introduction to Higher Education in the Charter College of Education (4) or
EDUC 301 - Transition to Cal State LA and the Charter College of Education (2)

*Note:* 
EDUC 101 or EDUC 301 must be completed within the first two quarters of enrollment.

**Major Courses (28 units)**
COUN 484 - Conferences with Parents/Primary Caregivers (4) or
EDEL 467 - School/Family/Community Partnerships in Urban Learning (4 units) or
EDSP 416 - Working with Families of Young Handicapped Children (4)
ULRN 460 - Assessment and Learning (4)
ULRN 461 - Learning and Critical Thinking (4)
ULRN 462 - The Role of Play in Learning (4)
ULRN 464 - Contemporary Issues in Knowledge, Culture and Learning (4)
ULRN 463 - Literacy and the Urban Community (4)
ULRN 469 - Senior Seminar: Reflection, Assessment, and Writing (4 units)

**Social Science Depth Area (28 units)**
CHS 472 - Chicana/o Education: Theory and Research (4) or
PAS 401 - Topics on Education and African American Advancement (4)
COMM 389 - Intercultural Communication in the Urban Environment (4) or
ML 300 - Language Diversity in Urban America (4)
COUN 400A - Lifespan Human Development (4) or
PSY 412A - Psychology of Human Development: Infancy and Childhood (4)
COUN 403 - The Psychosocial Dynamics of Child Maltreatment and Family Violence (4)/
PSY 403 - The Psychosocial Dynamics of Child Maltreatment and Family Violence (4) or
PHIL 323 - Human Diversity and Justice (4) or
SW 476 - Child Welfare (4)
HIST 383 - Rise of Urban America (4) or
ANTH 433 - Urban Anthropology (4)
HIST 488 - California (4) or
CHS 443 - History of the Chicano People in California (4) or
POLS 404 - Urban Government and Politics (4)
SOC 330 - Social Issues in the Urban Setting (4)

Teacher Preparation (46 units)

With advisor approval students select up to 46 units as needed from the following courses, which are designed to strengthen the student’s preparation for the CSET Multiple Subject Examination. Students who have already passed one or more subtests of the CSET may take, with advisor approval, credential courses as electives.

EDEL 490 - Problems in Elementary Education (2–5) (may be taken up to three times for

Reading, Language and Literature; History and Social Science (CSET Subtest I)
ENGL 207 - Beginning Creative Writing (4)
ENGL 301 - Introduction to Language (4)
ENGL 430 - Children’s Literature (4)
HIST 110A - World Civilization I (4)
HIST 110B - World Civilization II (4)

Science and Mathematics (CSET Subtest II)
MATH 110 - Foundations of the Real Number System for Elementary and Middle School
Teachers (4)
MATH 115 - Elements of Algebra and Statistics for Elementary and Middle School Teachers
(4)
MATH 225 - Explorations in Geometry for Elementary and Middle School teachers (4)
BIOL 180 - Life Science for Elementary Teachers (4)
NATS 180 - Motion and Energy for Elementary Teachers (3)
NATS 181 - Structure and Properties of Matter for Elementary Teachers (3)
NATS 182 - Topics in Space Science for Elementary Teachers (2)
NATS 183 - Earth Science for Elementary Teachers (4)

Physical Education, Human Development, Visual and Performing Arts (CSET Subtest III)
ART 400 - Elementary Classroom Visual Art (3)
CHDV 140 - Child Development (4)
CHDV 343 - Child and Adolescent Cognition (4)
CHDV 350 - Social and Emotional Development (4)
DANC 400 - Creative Dance in the Elementary Classroom (3)
KIN 420 - Development of Physical Activity (3)
MUS 400 - Elementary Classroom Music (3)
PH 457 - Health Education for Elementary School Teachers (1)
TA 400 - Creative Drama for the Elementary Classroom (3)

Teaching Credential Preparation
A minimum GPA of 2.75 in the last 90 quarter units is prerequisite to enrollment in EDCI 300 or EDSP 300. See Catalog, Multiple Subject Credential or Education Specialist Credential, for additional prerequisites. An overall 3.0 GPA must be maintained in all Professional Education courses with a minimum grade of “C” in each course. Students should see a major adviser regarding completion of the degree and other credential requirements.

Select one of the following:
A. Elementary Education (For a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential)

Required Prerequisite Courses (10 units)
EDUC 301 - Transition to Cal State LA and the Charter College of Education (2) (also satisfies the Transition to Higher Education requirement)
EDFN 420 - Introduction to Foundations of Urban Learning (2)
EDCI 300 - The Teaching Profession: Preparing the Urban Educator (2)
MATH 110 - Foundations of the Real Number System for Elementary and Middle School Teachers (4) or equivalent (prerequisite for EDEL 417)

Electives
EDSP 400 - Foundations of Special Education (4)
(It is recommended that this course be taken prior to Block Three)
Block One (Must be completed before Block Two)
EDCI 402 - Introduction to Instructional Design, Assessment and Classroom Management Methods (4)
EDEL 405 - Proseminar: Language Development in the Elementary Classroom (4)
Block Two (Must be completed before Block Three)
EDEL 415 - Proseminar: Curriculum and Teaching of Reading/Language Arts (4)
EDEL 417 - Proseminar: Curriculum and Teaching of Mathematics (4)
EDEL 418 - Proseminar: Curriculum and Teaching of Science (4)
Block Three (Must be completed before Block Four)
EDEL 416 - Proseminar: Curriculum and Teaching of Writing/Language Arts (4)
EDEL 419 - Proseminar: Curriculum and Teaching of Social Science (4)

Directed Teaching (12 units)
Block Four (Must attend a mandatory directed teaching meeting prior to enrolling in these courses)
EDEL 403 - Directed Teaching: Multiple Subject (10)
EDEL 403C - Reflection, Synthesis and Assessment of Directed Teaching (2)
B. Special Education (Eligibility for an Education Specialist Internship Credential)
Completion of this course of study and passage of the CSET Multiple Subject qualifies students for an internship credential with verification of employment from a cooperating school district. For a Preliminary Education Specialist Credential, students must complete the additional post-baccalaureate credential coursework and directed teaching in their area of specialization (i.e., Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Moderate/Severe Disabilities, Physical and Health Impairments or Visual Impairment and Blindness).

Required Prerequisite Courses (12 units)
EDUC 301 - Transition to Cal State LA and the Charter College of Education (2) (also satisfies the Transition to Higher Education requirement)
EDFN 420 - Introduction to Foundations of Urban Learning (2)
EDSP 300 - Introduction to Special Education (4)
MATH 110 - Foundations of the Real Number System for Elementary and Middle School Teachers (4) or equivalent (prerequisite for EDEL 417)

Electives
EDSP 301 - Individuals with Disabilities in Contemporary Society (3)
EDSP 400 - Foundations of Special Education (4)
EDEL 415 - Proseminar: Curriculum and Teaching of Reading/Language Arts (4)
EDEL 417 - Proseminar: Curriculum and Teaching of Mathematics (4)
EDSP 407 - Directed Teaching in Special Education (3–12)
EDSP 408 - Cognitive, Linguistic and Literacy Processes in Individuals with Special Needs (4)
EDSP 409 - Assessment for Individuals with Exceptional Needs in Diverse Educational Settings (4)
EDIT 430 - Information Technologies in the Classroom (4) or equivalent

Internship Emphasis: Specialization (8 units)
Complete 8 units of appropriate course work in the selected area of specialization.

Mild-to-Moderate Disabilities
EDSP 413 - Student Behavior and Social Interaction Skills: Support for Individuals with Special Needs (4)
EDSP 452 - Instructional Planning and Delivery for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities (4)

Moderate-to-Severe Disabilities
EDSP 413 - Student Behavior and Social Interaction Skills: Support for Individuals with Special Needs (4)
EDSP 451 - Curriculum and Instructional Methods for Individuals with Moderate/Severe Disabilities (4)

Physical and Health Impairments
EDSP 462 - Understanding Physical, Health, and Multiple Disabilities (4)
EDSP 460 - Implications of Physical and Health Impairments (4)
Visual Impairment and Blindness
EDSP 465 - Medical Aspects of Visual Impairments (3)
EDSP 465L - Functional Low Vision Assessment (1)
EDSP 469 - Psychological, Sociological, and Vocational Implications of Visual Impairment and Blindness (4)
Appendix F. Reviews from Departments

ULRN 462 (4): The Role of Play in Learning

The Division of Applied and Advanced Studies in Education, with the support of ULRN, provides this course as a service course to Child Development (CHDV) majors. CHDV majors may take the course in ULRN sections on a space available basis, and at least two sections a year are offered for CHDV majors.

1 = fully meets needs/expectations  
2 = meets some needs/expectations  
3 = doesn’t meet needs/expectations  

Response

1. Course content meets your program needs.  
   1

2. The quality of the content meets your expectations.  
   1

3. The quality of delivery meets your expectations.  
   1

4. Sufficient sections of the course are offered on an annual basis.  
   1

5. Time of course offering varies to meet student needs.  
   1

6. Students are able to access permits to enroll.  
   1

Additional comments:
The Department of Child and Family studies recognizes the importance of this course and appreciates the long history of collaboration and support that exists between CFS and the Urban Learning programs.

Completed by: Rita Ledesma, Chair
Department of Child and Family Studies
Appendix G. Masters Theses and Projects

Urban Learning is a baccalaureate degree-only program, with no graduate degree options at present.
Appendix H. Matrix of Courses and Instructional Modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Instructional Mode</th>
<th>Teaching Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GE, S, M</td>
<td>Lect</td>
<td>Sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 460</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 461</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 462</td>
<td>S, M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 463</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 464</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 469</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many faculty use active learning in at least one course? 16

How many faculty use service learning in at least one course? None. The major courses emphasizes fieldwork in public school classrooms rather than service learning. Students are in contact with and working with school children from their first quarter via observations, school-based projects or school-based activities.

Courses Indicating Other
Two courses, ULRN 462 and ULRN 463 include field-based activities with community children. In ULRN 462, students observe and interact with children in school and day-care settings as part of their course requirements. In ULRN 463, students working in collaborative dyads develop and implement literacy-development (not instructional) strategies designed to encourage community children to read and write for pleasure, to interact with books and to develop a love of reading and writing. These activities take place on a weekly basis in the campus Reading Clinic under the supervision of a literacy specialist.
### Appendix I. Assessment plan(s)

**Table I1**

**Assessment Plan for ULRN Students Pursuing the Multiple Subject Credential**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENCHMARK</th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>DISPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Equity</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Reflective Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Entry</strong></td>
<td>General education coursework, GPA (UG 1, 2; UL 1)</td>
<td>Program interview, application essay (UG 1, 2; UL 1)</td>
<td>Program interview, application essay (UG 1, 2; UL 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Benchmark</strong></td>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDC103/403C</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDF101</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDC100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Monitoring (Q1 and Q2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ULRN 464 and ULRN 461</strong> (UG 1, 2, 4; UL 1, 2)</td>
<td><strong>EDS400</strong> (UG 3, 4; UL 4, 7ES)</td>
<td><strong>EDF102, EDF103, ULRN 464</strong> (UG 3, 4; UL 1, 7ES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDC100</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDF103</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDC100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credentia Program Admission (Q3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>CBEST scores</strong></td>
<td><strong>Field experience. EDC100: field observations (UG 3, 4; UL 2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDC100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Monitoring (Major Coursework Q3-Q7)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ULRN 460, 462 and 463, EDEL 467/COUN 484 (UG 1, 2, 4; UL 1, 2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ULRN 460, ULRN 463/463 lab (UG 3, 4; UL 2, 3, 4, 5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDC100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Monitoring (Credential coursework Q3-Q7)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Block 1-3 courses TPA 1-3 (UG 1, 2, 4; UL 3, 4, 5, 7MS)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Field observations Instructional projects Block 1-3 courses, TPA 1-3 (UG 3, 4; UL 2, 3, 4, 5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Benchmark products and projects Block 1-3 courses, TPA 1-3 (UG 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Competence (Instructional Skills: Q8)</strong></td>
<td><strong>CSET EDC103/403C TPA 4 (UG 1, 2, 4; UL 3, 4, 5, 6, 7MS)</strong></td>
<td><strong>CSET EDC103/403C TPA 4 (UG 3, 4; UL 3, 4, 5, 6, 7MS)</strong></td>
<td><strong>CSET EDC103/403C TPA 4 (UG 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Exit (Capstone Course: Q8)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ULRN 469 Exit assessment Writing portfolio (UG 1, 2, 4; UL 1, 2, 6)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ULRN 469 Exit assessment Writing portfolio (UG 1, 2, 4; UL 1, 2, 6)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ULRN 469 Exit assessment Writing portfolio (UG 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: Also assessed by the Division of Curriculum and Instruction. EDC103/403C is the students’ final directed teaching assignment.
Table I2
Assessment Plan for ULRN Students Pursuing the Education Specialist Internship Credential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENCHMARK</th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>DISPOSITIONS</th>
<th>COLLABORATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Equity</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Reflective Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Entry</td>
<td>General education coursework, GPA (UG 1, 2; UL 1)</td>
<td>Program interview, application essay (UG 1, 2; UL 1)</td>
<td>Program interview, application essay (UG 1, 2; UL 1)</td>
<td>Application essay (UG 1, 2; UL 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Monitoring (Q1 and Q2)</td>
<td>ULRN 464 and ULRN 461 (UG 1, 2, 4; UL 1, 2)</td>
<td>EDSP 400 (UG 3, 4; UL 4, 7ES)</td>
<td>EDFN 420, EDSP 400, ULRN 464 (UG 3, 4; UL 1, 7ES)</td>
<td>EDUC 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDUC 301 Program application (UL 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDSP 300 Philosophy of Education (UL 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benchmark products and projects: EDEL and EDSP courses (UG 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benchmark products and projects: EDEL and EDSP courses (UG 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benchmark products and projects: EDEL and EDSP courses (UG 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative projects: EDEL and EDSP courses (UG 6; UL 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Competence</td>
<td>EDEL 415, 417 EDSP 408, 408, 409, Specialization (UG 1, 2, 4; UL 3, 4, 5, 7ES)</td>
<td>Field observations Instructional projects: EDEL and EDSP courses (UG 3, 4; UL 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benchmark products and projects: EDEL and EDSP courses (UG 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Exit</td>
<td>ULRN 469 Exit assessment Portfolio (UG 1, 2, 4; UL 1, 2, 6)</td>
<td>ULRN 469 Exit assessment Portfolio (UG 1, 2, 4; UL 1, 2, 6)</td>
<td>ULRN 469 Exit assessment Portfolio (UG 1, 2, 4; UL 3, 4)</td>
<td>ULRN 469 Exit assessment Portfolio (UG 5; UL 2, 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Also assessed by the Division of Special Education and Counseling

2Students in the Physical and Health Impairments option complete a field placement.

Note: Instructional skills for students in the Education Specialist option are measured in EDSP 407-6, the first of two practica. Students in this option complete 2-5 additional specialization courses, RICA and a final directed teaching experience as post-baccalaureate students, and are assessed within the credential program assessment system.
Appendix J. Curriculum Map for Each Academic Degree Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Bachelor of Arts in Urban Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLO 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 460</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 461</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 462</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 463</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 464</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 469</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mastery to be attained in the credential component of the program

Key
I: Introduction
D: Developing
M: Mastery

Student Learning Outcomes

UL-SLO 1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of the needs and demands of diverse students in urban schools and communities.

UL-SLO 2: Students will develop and model critical thinking skills for themselves and the students they teach.

UL-SLO 3: Students will connect subject matter and pedagogy to meet the educational needs of all students.

UL-SLO 4: Students will build on the diverse languages, cultures, capabilities and experiences of their students to assure them the optimum opportunities to grow and develop academically.

UL-SLO 5: Students will develop curriculum and instruction that integrate the urban students’ strengths, including their languages, cultures, learning styles and communities.

UL-SLO 6: Students will demonstrate professional writing skills, including the ability to discuss, analyze, synthesize and apply professional literature in writing.

UL-SLO 7: Students will demonstrate collaboration skills needed to work as a member of an instructional team in the urban school environment.
Education Specialist Credential Option

UL-SLO 8ES: Students in the Education Specialist credential option will design and implement high quality instruction that allows their students with special needs in urban schools the maximum opportunity to access the general curriculum within a individualized program guided by students’ learning strengths, goals and needs.

Multiple Subject Credential Option

UL-SLO 8MS: Students in the Multiple Subject credential option will design and implement high quality instruction across the elementary grade curriculum that integrates strategies designed to meet the unique cultural, linguistic and learning needs of urban school children.

Descriptions of Rated ULRN Courses

ULRN 460

Assessment and Learning (4)
Basic principles and applications of educational assessment. Topics include learning goals and objectives, multidimensional assessment strategies, including formal (e.g., standardized tests) and informal (e.g., rubrics), measures, use of data to guide instruction, and communicate results. (Note: students are divided by credential option so as to allow emphasis on the specific roles of assessment in elementary education versus special education settings.)

Overview of the course content and what students are expected to learn
The overall goal of the course is to begin mastery of the ability to use assessment as an instructional tool. The seven course leaning outcomes support this goal by addressing the component skills of using assessment effectively: First, choosing the appropriate assessment for the task and instructional goal; second, understanding the pedagogical and statistical dimensions to developing assessments; third, using both stock and teacher-made assessments effectively; fourth, using assessment data to make sound pedagogical decisions; fifth, using assessment data as part of an effective grading and feedback policy; sixth, configuring assessment results for use by other stakeholders; and seventh, recognizing and avoiding assessment procedures that are ineffective or otherwise inappropriate.

The program SLO’s are supported by students learning to think critically about the complex relationships among the assessor, the assessed, the instrument, the environment, the curriculum, and the numerous logistical, pedagogical, cultural, and even political forces at work in every classroom. The Education Specialist Credential Option (7ES) is supported by students designing instructional modules to accompany their testing strategies incorporating accommodation and modification strategies into both. The Multiple Subject Credential Option (7MS) is supported by students designing assessment and feedback plans for an elementary urban classroom that is linguistically, ethnically, and academically diverse.
**Instructional delivery, including class activities and use of technology**
Instructional delivery consists of a combination of lecture, class discussion, and collaborative projects. Very often, students were asked to create, implement, analyze and reflect on projects in real time, providing them with valuable insight into the time constraints faced by classroom teachers. Class discussions focused on observations made during the fieldwork, readings from course materials, articles from newspapers and magazines, Internet sites, and other sources.

**Expectations for students enrolled in the course**
Students were expected to use the Internet to collaborate, submit assignments, create assignment materials, monitor their progress and that of their team, and stay in touch with the instructor. Student writing was expected to be accessibly constructed, technically correct, linguistically precise, and highly professional.

**Assessment of student learning**
Students are assessed with a variety of methods: exit tickets, both written and verbal; quizzes, both planned and pop, essays, in-discussion probes; and so on. The primary method, however, is through analysis of individual and collaborative projects. Students are asked to completed several large projects in conjunction with teams of their colleagues, sometimes selected and sometimes assigned. Students are always informed that their thoughtful analysis of their colleagues’ work will be part of their assessment. Again, these projects are designed to actualize the scope and scale of the typical urban teacher experience, and are evaluated as such.

**Field experiences (if applicable)**
For field experience students are required to interview a teacher about testing issues and observe a test given in a classroom with at least one student. Both assignments require precise documentation, written critical analysis, and incorporation into class discussion.

**ULRN 461**

**Learning and Critical Thinking** (4)
Perspectives and practices to integrate inquiry, problem solving, critical thinking, metacognition, and self-regulation into urban learning settings. Views of learning, intelligence and their growth through multiple learning styles are also examined.

**Overview of the course content and what students are expected to learn**
This course covers five areas of systematic thinking and reasoning: (1) Informal and a selected assortment of formal logic and deductive reasoning (e.g., sentential logic, quantitative logic, modal logic.) (2) Major and frequently used informal fallacies. (3) Inductive and scientific reasoning. (4) Creative, aesthetic, and imaginative approach to reasoning (5) An introductory overview of research, statistical and probabilistic reasoning. The latter approaches are used for analysis, evaluation, reconstruction and critique of arguments in variety of contexts and subject matters where the above skills will be applied: e.g., current and historical issues (e.g., core curriculum debate and historical court decisions), current
political and world events, five elementary school subject matter contexts (science, mathematics, language arts, social studies, and art), pseudo-science, religion, and religious fundamentalism of various kinds. This course will also deal with five major philosophical questions in order to practice skills learned and materials dealt with in the class. The five major questions are: What can I know? Why am I here? What am I? How should I behave? What is to come of me?

**Instructional delivery, including class activities and use of technology**

Lectures are presented in an inquiry atmosphere. Materials are presented in a dialogical format in the manner of Socratic dialogue in Plato’s *Republic*: Questions are asked, then possible answers are solicited from students, and finally, critique of answers considered. Students are invited to do the same in small groups and whole class discussions. Various other methods, conducive to critical inquiry are utilized by the instructor and students, e.g., dramatization (i.e., Supreme Court debates for critical-historical issues in education, debates, student group presentations, etc. Videos, internet resources, HyperCard, Elmo, and other technical devices are used by the instructor and the students.

**Expectations for students enrolled in the course**

Students are expected to complete with competence the following assignments, activities, and projects: (1) Reading of all materials assigned: Required class texts, additional handouts (e.g., the actual Supreme Court arguments), and assigned materials on internet (e.g., President’s State of the Union Address, latest educational policies, etc.) (2) Lively class participation in small groups and as whole class. (3) Student group presentations. (4) In class and take-home exams. (6) Cogent, intellectually rigorous, and academically acceptable (e.g., with APA format) essay papers. (7) Class attendance and punctuality. (8) Extra credit assignments (optional).

Students are required to contextualize all materials learned via the above seven activities in several ways: (1) Student will be able to apply these skill to their own personal lives and belief systems. (2) Students will be able to apply these skills in analyzing and evaluating other people’s arguments and beliefs (family members, friends, and professors,) media, and/or in published forms. (3) Student will be able to create a few lessons and activities to teach the same skills they have learned in ULRN 461 to their diverse students. (4) Students will be able to apply all they have learned in variety of contexts for their students: various subject matters, various grade levels, various student abilities, and various socio-cultural backgrounds.

**Assessment of student learning**

Specific rubrics are used for each of the above assignments. Students are informed of these rubrics in advance of each assignment. The areas of accomplishment and achievement are subject to evaluation include: (1) Students' ability to apply materials and skills learned in the class to their own personal lives, e.g., subject their own personal beliefs to critical scrutiny in order to uncover hidden prejudices and fallacies embedded in their cognitive schemata. (2) Application of the class materials for that analysis of media, politics, and other current national and international events. (3) Ability to teach, explain and explicate critical thinking principles and theories to peers and classmates in group presentations. (5) Ability to create
activities and lesson plans for various populations: various grades, various subject matters, and various abilities.

Field experiences (if applicable)
Student will interview one child and one adult to learn about a few of their beliefs and arguments they offer to support those beliefs for analysis of the beliefs and possible fallacies hidden in assumptions and in manner of argumentation.

ULRN 462

The Role of Play in Learning (4)
Prerequisite: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Certificate of Clearance or California Child Development permit. Dynamics of the role of group and individual play in children’s learning. Emphasis on understanding human development, behavior, and adult facilitation of learning. Observation in early education settings required.

Overview of the course content and what students are expected to learn
This course is designed to afford students the opportunity to engage in a comprehensive study of the role of play in children’s development, learning, and behavior. Topics related to play as well as contexts that support play will be introduced to develop students’ comprehension of the significance of play in the lives of children. More specifically, this course will enable students to understand:

- various theoretical and historical viewpoints that seek to explain the nature and function of children’s play.
- trends and issues influencing the research undergirding play.
- the influences of factors such as gender, culture, play materials, the media, and social class on the play behaviors of children.
- interrelationships between play and cognitive, psychosocial, physical, and language development from infancy through adolescence.
- characteristics of appropriate play environments and materials for children of various ages.
- the roles of adults in supporting children’s play.

Instructional delivery, including class activities and use of technology
The course employs activities that will enhance a hands-on professional development process designed to help teachers enrich their understanding of active hands-on learning and the creative use of open-ended materials aligned with the State Standards. The course will prepare would be teachers as the key to developing instructional strategies that encourage active, engaged learning to insure success with the State Standards/Curriculum.

Expectations for students enrolled in the course
Students will be required to complete three field-based assignments, including ten hours (10) observations and quasi-research activities in situations with children in the community. These assignments are keyed to topics scheduled for discussion in class. Their purposes are to aid in understanding children’s play and contexts that support children’s development, as well as how to research these topics through systematic data collection and reflective analysis. The field-based assignments will consist of:
• identifying and analyzing play behaviors based on Piaget’s cognitive and Parten’s social categories of play
• assessing two outdoor play environments with a partner using the Frost Rating System as the basis for evaluating the extent to which these playgrounds foster children’s development and learning
• designing and creating a prop box based on observations of children’s play that stimulates dramatic play related to a particular theme. You will complete this assignment with a partner.

Assessment of student learning
All written work submitted should be of professional quality, neatly presented, grammatically correct, and free of spelling and punctuation errors. Please refer to the “Writing Tips” in the Course Guide. Written assignments should be prepared on a computer. Technology literate is a must to do well in this class. Be sure to use spell and grammar check and proofread carefully before printing final drafts. Title pages, including your name, course/section number, instructor’s name, title of assignment, and date are required. The acceptable format is APA 6th Edition. Pages should be stapled together. Full credit cannot be earned for work that does not meet these standards.

Field experiences (if applicable)

ULRN 463
Literacy and the Urban Community (4)
Prerequisite: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Certificate of Clearance or California Child Development permit. Basic concepts of emerging literacy in the urban community: family literacy, language acquisition, phonemic awareness and techniques for integrating early reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. Field site application through community-based experiences and service learning. Lecture 2 hours, activity 2 hours.

Overview of the course content and what students are expected to learn
Students learn about the needs and demands of diverse students in urban schools and communities (K-8). In class, they learn what it means for students to become learners and readers who often struggle to acquire academic language proficiency. They learn ways to find out what strengths and needs students bring with them to school, and to build on their diverse languages, cultures, capabilities and experiences. They learn strategies to reinforce and develop the reading skills their tutees bring to class; they learn strategies to motivate their tutees to enjoy reading and understand its importance in their own lives. They learn ways to talk to parents to make them aware of the value of reading, as well as strategies parents can use to help their children learn to read and acquire strong academic literacy bases. They learn how to contextualize their own lessons to meet the diverse needs of their students. They learn alternative ways to access their students’ reading and academic language proficiency.

Students spend half their class time learning about how young children acquire academic literacy and become good readers, and spend the other half of their class tutoring children (K-8) in the Cal State LA Reading Clinic. The students work one-on-one with their tutees in
small classrooms equipped with everything they need to maximize their instruction. They provide hands-on instruction. What they learn in class, they practice with their tutees.

**Instructional delivery, including class activities and use of technology**
In class, the professor teaches reading and language acquisition theory through practice and hands-on experimentation. Following instruction, ULRN students practice what they have learned with their tutees. The combination of practice and implementation works beautifully for both the tutors and tutees. The professor explains and models the strategy; then, the students practice the strategy in class; sometimes, a tutor might modify an activity to meet the needs of his/her own tutee.

The tutors help their tutees create a parent-child (or tutor-tutee child) co-authored book. At the end of the quarter, the class celebrates the success their tutees have experienced. They design certificates for their tutees, and publish their books. These two projects incorporate the use of technology into the curriculum; they create certificates to honor their tutees, and publish books to give to the parents.

**Expectations for students enrolled in the course**
The ULRN students are required to master the reading strategies presented by the professor, and then successfully implement them with their tutees. They must demonstrate effective writing through their Case Study and Parent-Child Co-Authored book. They must be able to recognize the unique learning needs of their tutees and implement strategies that will increase their tutees’ motivation to read and acquire academic reading proficiency.

**Assessment of student learning**
The ULRN students are assessed on their ability to work successfully with their tutees, as well as write-up a case study and observations about their tutoring experiences.

**Field experiences (if applicable)**
The field experiences are the most valuable part of this course. This is the first time the ULRN students actually work with children. This course lays the foundation for the reading classes they will take later on in the program. It shows the students what urban literacy really means, and prepares them to meet the diverse academic and social needs of the students they will meet when they start teaching in their own classrooms.

The ULRN students work with the parents during their fieldwork hours. This helps them understand the diverse backgrounds of the parents of the children they will teach. In this course, the students learn ways to empower parents to assist their children. They learn ways to help parents access and support their children’s homework assignments, and work with their own children at home to improve their reading skills.

**ULRN 464**
**Contemporary Issues in Knowledge, Culture and Learning** (4)
Theoretical approaches to understanding the construction of knowledge in and through culture. Contemporary Issues and problems in a diverse learning community.
Overview of the course content and what students are expected to learn
The course content and pedagogical approach of ULRN 464 are designed to engage students in the ongoing practice of thinking about the “things” they think when they think about knowledge, culture, and learning. The course introduces students to a set of conceptual tools (theorizations, concepts, and ideas) for the analysis, and understanding of knowledge, culture, and learning in relation to their own educational experience and their thinking and practice as future teachers in an urban context.

Students are expected to actively participate in class discussions and activities. They are also expected to demonstrate a solid understanding of the course material and the ability to effectively employ said understanding toward an analysis and interpretation of their educational experience and their future thinking and practice as urban teachers.

Instructional delivery, including class activities and use of technology
The instructional approach in ULRN 464 integrates interactive lectures structured around PowerPoint presentations, small group activities, and whole-group discussions. It seeks to create a pedagogical space that is dialogical and collaborative, where students are free to question, comment, and/or constructively critique as they engage the course material, the instructional content and delivery, and each other’s thinking.

Expectations for students enrolled in the course
Students in ULRN 464 are expected to actively and collaboratively participate in both small-group activities and whole-group discussions, contributing to the ongoing dialogue and the understanding of their classmates. Students are also expected to effectively articulate in writing their understanding of the course material and their critical reflection on the same—and to so in a manner that adheres to the grammatical and structural conventions of writing for academic purposes.

Assessment of student learning
Students in ULRN 464 are assessed on the basis of four writing assignments and a final paper in which they must effectively articulate their understanding of key concepts, theorizations and/or ideas presented in the course and reflect on the manner in which the aforementioned can inform the analysis and understanding of their own educational experience and their thinking and practice as future teachers in an urban context. They are further assessed on the basis of their participation in class lectures, small group activities, and whole-group discussions.

Field experiences (if applicable)
None

ULRN 469
Senior Seminar: Reflection, Assessment, and Writing (4 units)
Capstone activities for students in urban teaming major. Involves papers, reflections, and final project integrating the outcomes of the teaming experience.

Overview of the course content and what students are expected to learn
ULRN 469 examines contemporary issues in urban public education such as law and policy, culturally responsive education, development of inclusive educational environments and implications of high-stakes assessment. Students read, discuss and analyze core foundation literature along with current literature related to course topics, and are expected to develop increased awareness of current and critical issues in public education. Students respond to class reading, discussion and activities in writing, and are expected to develop early graduate-level writing skills.

**Instructional delivery, including class activities and use of technology**
Classroom discussion, group break-down and analysis of literature, individual and group critique of research methodology, and written response to literature. Technology used includes Moodle, online modules and instructional media, and Powerpoint. Students may also use technology ranging from Powerpoint to video editing software and/or YouTube to present their final project.

**Expectations for students enrolled in the course**
Careful reading of assigned academic literature, written response to three selected pieces of literature, group analysis and discussion of weekly readings, selection of one literature-based practice and applying it a classroom issue and preparation of a group project developing culturally responsive instruction on a designated topic.

**Assessment of student learning**
Student learning is assessed through:
- Written products and development of written products following instructor feedback
- Classroom participation and preparation
- Analysis of reading and response to guided prompts
- Preparation of a final group project

**Field experiences (if applicable)**
None
Appendix K. Faculty Composition

a. Number of Tenured and Probationary (Tenure-Track) faculty Fall quarter of each year under review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Faculty count is based on the number of teaching faculty

b. Number of Tenured and Probationary Faculty by Rank, Gender, Ethnicity, and Terminal Degree 2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Terminal Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Female: 4</td>
<td>Afr Amer: 1</td>
<td>Doctorate: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/PI: 1</td>
<td>Masters: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male: 4</td>
<td>Latino/a: 1</td>
<td>Bachelors: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Female: 2</td>
<td>Afr Amer: 2</td>
<td>Doctorate: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/PI: 1</td>
<td>Masters: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latino/a: 1</td>
<td>Bachelors: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Female: 1</td>
<td>Afr Amer: 1</td>
<td>Doctorate: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/PI: 1</td>
<td>Masters: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latino/a: 1</td>
<td>Bachelors: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Female: 4</td>
<td>Afr Amer: 1</td>
<td>Doctorate: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/PI: 1</td>
<td>Masters: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latino/a: 2</td>
<td>Bachelors: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Age distribution of Tenured and Probationary Faculty as of July 1, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 or younger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 or older</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Number of anticipated faculty retirements before the next program review:

N/A. We do not have our own faculty, as discussed previously. Faculty teaching in the program vary, and are assigned to our three divisions.
Appendix L. Faculty Summary Vitae

Vitae for the following tenure-track teaching faculty follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ola Ainya</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret D. Clark*</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Special Education and Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Hafner</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Applied and Advanced Studies in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manisha Javeri</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Applied and Advanced Studies in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Mattheis</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Applied and Advanced Studies in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Tejeda</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Applied and Advanced Studies in Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Program Director

Vitae for the following adjunct teaching faculty follow:
Agustin Cervantes
Charlene Fried
Susan Kawell
Socorro Orozco
Joseph Staub
Rudolph Washington
Olaiya E. Aina, Professor  
Division of Curriculum & Instruction  
oaina@calstatela.edu

Education and Relevant Experience

Ph. D. University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada 1996 Early Childhood Education
M.Ed. University of Ibadan, Nigeria 1990 Early Childhood Education
B.Ed. University of Ibadan, Nigeria 1989 Preprimary/Primary Education  
Minor: Religious Studies

Teacher Grade II Diploma 1981 Ekiti Teacher Training College, Ikere-Ekiti, Nigeria

2011 - Present California State University, Los Angeles, Full Professor
2005 - 2011 California State University, Los Angeles, Associate Professor
2001 - 2005 College of Charleston, Charleston, SC, Associate Professor
1996 - 2001 College of Charleston, Charleston, SC, Assistant Professor
1992-1996 University of Alberta, Canada, Teaching/Research Assistant
1991-1992 High School Teacher/Head of Arts Department, Ifaki Grammar School, Ifaki-Ekiti, Nigeria
1981 – 1985 Classroom Teacher, Preprimary/Primary Grades, Ondo State Teaching Service Board, Akure, Nigeria

Primary Area of Teaching and Department Courses Taught

2005- Present Coordinator, MA Early Childhood/Primary Education Program
ULRN 462: The Role of Play in Learning (4units)
EDEL 461: Curriculum Procedures and Materials for Early Childhood Education (4units)
EDEL 466: Cultural Diversity in Early Childhood Classrooms (4units)
EDEL 403: Supervision of Directed Student Teaching (4units)
EDEL 467: School-Family-Community Partnerships in Urban Learning (4units)
EDEL 560: Design and Management of Early Childhood Program (4units)
EDEL 563: Current Trends and Issues in Early Childhood Education (4units)
EDEL 564: Advanced Methodologies in Early Childhood Education (4units)
EDEL 596: Comprehensive Exam in Early Childhood Education (Supervision/Review)
EDEL 597/598: Independent Research Study in Early Childhood Education. (Supervision)

Selected service to the Department, College and University

2015 – Present Member, C & I Selection/Appointments Committee (1year term)
2015 – Present Member, C & I Curriculum Sub-Committee (3years term)
2013 – 2015 Member, C & I Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Committee
2009 – Present Coordinator, MA Program Coordinators Committee
2005 – 2013 Chair, Student and Program Diversity Committee
2010 – 2011 Member, C & I Student Policy Committee
2015 – Present Voting Member, CCOE Executive Steering Committee
2015 – Present Member, CCOE By-laws Committee
2015 – Present Member, CSULA Academic Senate (3 Years Term)
2015– Present Member, Nominations Committee
2009 – 2011 Member, CSULA Academic Senate

Selected Professional Presentations


Aina, E. O. & Bartel, V. (2014). The Effects of Television/IPad and other Screen Gadgets on the Development of Young Children. A Pre-Conference Round Table Discussion at the Annual Conference of the Association for Constructivist Teaching on December 5th-6th, 2014 at Hilton Hotel, Charleston, SC.


Selected publications since the last self study in the past five years


Margaret D. Clark, Associate Professor  
Division of Special Education and Counseling  
Director, Urban Learning Program  
mclark@calstatela.edu

Education and Relevant Experience
June, 1980  Bachelor of Arts in Child Development  
June, 1983  Master of Arts in Special Education, emphasis in Learning Handicap  
California State University, Los Angeles  
June, 1998  Doctor of Philosophy in Special Education  
California State University, Los Angeles/University of California, Los Angeles

Teaching Credentials
1982  Multiple Subjects (Ryan) Teaching Credential  
1983  Special Education Specialist Teaching Credential (Learning Handicapped)  
1990  Resource Specialist Certificate of Competence

Experience
Substitute Teacher (1980-82)  
Charter Oak Unified School District  
Special Day Class Teacher (1982-84)  
Resource Specialist (1984-1990), Mentor Teacher  
Ontario-Montclair School District

Adjunct Professor (1993-98)  
Full-Time Temporary Professor (1998-99)  
Assistant Professor (1999-2004)  
Associate Professor (2005-)  
Division of Special Education, later Division of Special Education and Counseling  
California State University, Los Angeles

Primary Area of Teaching and Department Courses Taught
Director, Urban Learning Program: responsible for program operations and instruction in the program. Responsibilities include (but are not limited to) supervision of a student assistant; advisement; program planning, graduation planning and records management on GET; recruitment of new students; intake, orientation and programming of new students; quarterly coordinated scheduling across divisions and with departments offering depth courses; faculty meetings; collaboration with partner community colleges; recruitment of adjunct faculty; and service on various committees and task forces at the pleasure of the Dean of the Charter College of Education.

   EDUC 301: Transition to Higher Education and the Charter College of Education  
   ULRN 460: Assessment and Learning  
   ULRN 469: Senior Seminar, Reflection, Writing and Reading

Division of Special Education and Counseling: faculty member in the mild-to-moderate disabilities program

   EDSP 400: Introduction to Special Education  
   EDSP 500: Research in Special Education  
   EDSP 501: Problems and Practices in Special Education  
   EDSP 556: Research in Mild-to-Moderate Disabilities  
   EDSP 558: Teaching Comprehension and Written Language to Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities
Selected Service to the Department, College and University

Division
Instructional Policy Committee
Joint Doctoral Committee
Special Action Admission Committee
Credential Program Admissions Committee
Integrated Program Coordinating Committee

I have been a member of 5 Master of Arts degree committees and two Doctoral Committees, one in the CSULA/UCLA Joint Doctoral Program and one at the University of Southern California.

College
Academic Information Resources Committee; Chair 2014-
Innovation, Curriculum and Assessment Committee; Chair 2010-11
School as a Whole Steering Committee
Advisor, Urban Learning Students’ Association

University
Educational Policy Committee; Chair 2011-12
Provost’s “Immediate Action” Committee
Curriculum Committee
Ad Hoc Committee on the Transition to Higher Education Requirement
PTIRC Committee; Chair 2015
Review and retention of UNIV 101/301 Instructors

Selected Professional Presentations


In addition, I presented a paper for Jessica Pandya (CSULB) in the panel Curriculum and Scholarship in the USA and the UK: Definitions, Knowledge and Language Arts/English when she was unable to attend the conference.
Anne L. Hafner, Professor
California State University Los Angeles
Division of Applied & Advanced Studies in Education
ahafner@calstatela.edu

EDUCATION AND RELEVANT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
1990  Ph.D., Educational Psychology, Social Research Methodology,
University of California, Los Angeles
1983  M.F.A., Professional Writing, University of Southern California
1975 - 1978  Doctoral studies in Educational Psychology, UCSC
2010 – Present  Chair, Division of Applied and Advanced Studies in Education,
California State University, Los Angeles
2005 - 2010  WASC Faculty Coordinator,
Academic Affairs, California State University, Los Angeles, CA
1997 - Present  Professor, Charter College of Education, Applied and Advanced Studies in
Education, California State University, Los Angeles, CA
2004 – 2010  CSULA Campus Assessment Coordinator, Associate Vice President,
Academic Affairs, CSULA.
1996 – Present  Director, Program Evaluation Research Cooperative
(PERC), California State University, Los Angeles
2002 – 2010  Faculty Member, UC Irvine- Calif. State University Joint Doctorate in
Educational Leadership
1993 - 1997  Associate Professor, School of Education, Educational
Foundations, California State University, Los Angeles, CA
1991 - 1993  Senior Research Associate, Southwest Regional Laboratory
1992 – 1994  Adjunct Professor, Education, Pepperdine University
1987 - 1991  Statistician and Project Officer, U. S. Dept. of Education,
National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Washington D. C.
1983 - 1986  Teaching Associate, Department of Education, UCLA
1984 - 1986  Research Analyst, Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA
1982 - 1984  Staff Research Associate, Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA

PRIMARY AREAS OF TEACHING AND COURSES TAUGHT
- EDFN 452  Statistics in Education
- EDFN 500  Evaluation of Educational Research
- ULRN 460  Assessment and Learning
- EDFN 602  Applications of Social and Behavioral Research Methods
- EDFN 541  Evaluation of State and Federal Programs

I have supervised over 20 master’s theses in the past 15 years. I also was the dissertation chair for
one of the UCI-CSULA Joint Doctorate students in 2006, and also chaired two committees and served
on several other dissertation committees. I taught quantitative methods for the UCI/CSU Joint
Doctorate program from 2003 – 2007, and evaluation and statistics for the EdD program in
Educational Leadership.

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE
- University Council of Chairs, Co-Chair and member, 2012-2015
- CCOE Administrative Council, 2010-2016
- CCOE Steering Committee, 2010-2016
- CCOE Assessment Task Force 2010-2016
• CCOE RAAC Committee: 2011-2013
• CCOE Graduation Committee, 2014, 2015, 2016
• University Faculty Visioning Task Force, 2013-2014
• CSU Systemwide CTQ Advisory Committee, 2013-14, 2014-15
• University GO-EAST LA Consortium (2013-14, 2014-15)
• LAUSD-Chamber of Commerce Los Angeles Educational Preparation Group (2012-2015)
• CSULA Educational Effectiveness & Assessment Committee: 2010-2016

SELECTED CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS


SELECTED PUBLICATIONS


Manisha Javeri, Professor  
California State University Los Angeles  
Division of Applied & Advanced Studies in Education  
mjaveri@calstatela.edu

Education and Relevant Experience
2003: Ph.D., Educational Technology, with a minor in Applied Research and Statistics University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO.
1993: B. Ed., Education (Math and Science), University of Bombay, India
1992: M.Sc., Physical Chemistry, University of Bombay, India.
1989: B.Sc., Chemistry, University of Bombay, India.

Aug. ‘03 – Present: Professor, College of Education. California State University, Los Angeles.
Aug. ‘99 – Aug. ‘03: Research and Teaching Assistant, University of Northern Colorado, CO
Jun. ‘94 - Jan. ‘99: Assistant Professor, Chemistry dept, Royal College University of Bombay, India.
June ‘93 - May ‘94: High School Teacher (Math and Science), Lady Vissanji High School, Bombay.

2016: Global Peace Index: Ambassador for GPI
2010 World Peace Fellow. Rotary International Award for Peace and Conflict Resolution
(Implementing technology to design humanitarian interventions).
2010: Certificate, Peace and Conflict Resolution, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

Primary Area of Teaching and Department Courses Taught
Faculty: Educational Technology Program
Courses taught:
EDAD 562A
EDCI 549
EDFN 500
EDHI 605D, 605F
EDIT 430, 451, 490, 540, 565, 600
EDSE 594
ULRN 461

Selected service to the Department, College and University

Selected Professional Presentations


**Selected Publications**


**Selected Grants funded in the past five years**

Fall 2014-Spring 2014 California State University Los Angeles. California

Program Investigator for Grant Sponsored by So Cal Gas Company: Campus as a Living Lab: Environmental and Sustainable Energy Educators

2012-2013: Technology, Environmental Education and Sustainability: Program Investigator for Service- Learning Energy Efficiency and Education (Grant Sponsored by CSU Vice Chancellor and Southern California Gas Company)

2006-2011: Project Evaluator for the Integrated Training Pipeline for Scientific Visualization (National Science Foundation Grant)

2007-Current: Project Evaluator for the Consortium for Undergraduate Research Experience CURE Grant (National Science Foundation Grant)

2007-2011: Project Evaluator for the CCLI: CCLI project is to create a cyber infrastructure to support remote lab and enhance students' hands-on skills using OPNET simulator (National Science Foundation Grant)

2007-2011: Project Evaluator for the Collaborative PBL to Enhance Freshman Design Experience in Digital Engineering (National Science Foundation Grant)
Chogollah Maroufi, Professor  
California State University Los Angeles  
Division of Applied & Advanced Studies in Education  
maroufi@calstatela.edu

EDUCATION

Presently I am completing a Master's thesis for an M.A. program in philosophy at Cal State LA

1995-96 Ph.D., Philosophy. Completed one year of doctoral work in philosophy, UCLA. (Did not complete the program.)

February-June 1990 A Postdoctoral Project with Jerome Bruner. "Metaphor and Narration" UCLA.


1987 Ph. D., University of California, Los Angeles; Curriculum and Study of Schooling

1979 M. A., Educational Administration, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

1979 M. A., Curriculum and Instruction, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Credentials
1982 California School Administrative Credential.
1980 California Teaching Credential (general science and mathematics)

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1996-Present Professor, California State University, Los Angeles

2006-2009 Chair, Division of Applied and Advanced Studies in Education

1998-2006 Joint appointment with the Divisions of AASE and C&I

1988-1996 Assistant and associate Professor, California State University, Los Angeles.

1986-1987 Assistant Professor, Full-Time Temporary Position, California State University, Los Angeles.

1984-1986 Lecturer and Student Teaching Supervisor, California State University, Los Angeles.

Courses taught and supervisory field assignments CSULA:
EDFN 413—Psychological Foundations of Education
EDFN 414—Sociological Foundations of Education
EDCI 560—Principles of Curriculum Development.
EDFN 530—Human Development
EDFN 510—Theories of Learning
EDFN 508—Philosophy of Education
EDSE 425A/B--Secondary directed teaching supervision.
EDE 425A/B--Elementary directed teaching supervision.
EDSE 598/EDFN 598--Graduate independent study supervision.
EDSE 599/EDFN 599--Master's thesis committee member and chair.

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SERVICES

College RTP Committee, fall 2015


Chair, Division Selection Committee, 2012 – 2013


I have been member of six MA thesis committees since 2011

I’m now a member of an Ed.D. Dissertation Committee in AASE

University Search Committee for the Dean of Extended Education and Research, 2009-2010.

PRESENTATIONS


“Illusions of Alvin Plantinga and Delusions of Richard Dawkins: How to navigate the delightful and fruitful schizophrenia of faith and reason.” Presented at Oxford Round Table, Jesus College, Oxford University, Oxford, UK, July 28-August 1, 2013.

“The phenomenon of excessive sacredness and profaneness”, presented at the Oxford Round Table, “Religion and Politics: Middle East Peace or the Bomb.” Harris Manchester College, Oxford University, Oxford, UK, August 7-3, 2011.

Respondent to a presented paper titles “The Life Experience of Middle Eastern Immigrant Women to the United States: The Case of Iranian Women in Minnesota.”, presented at the Oxford Round Table, “Religion and Politics: Middle East Peace or the Bomb.” Harris Manchester College, Oxford University, Oxford, UK, August 7-3, 2011.

“Epistemology of Sacredness.” Presented at the 3rd Annual Live Options in the Study of Religion, Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, California, March 24-25, 2011.

PUBLICATIONS

Allison H. Mattheis, Assistant Professor
California State University Los Angeles
Division of Applied and Advanced Studies in Education
amatthe5@calstatela.edu

EDUCATION AND RELEVANT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development, Ph.D. 2013
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Department of Educational Policy and Administration, M.A. 2009
Oberlin College International Politics, Environmental Studies (majors), Geology (minor), B.A. 1999

6th Grade Math/Science Teacher
Colegio Granadino, Manizales, Colombia, South America 2006-2008
7th/8th Grade Science Teacher
Richard Green Central Park School, Minneapolis, MN. 2001-2006
7th Grade Science Teacher
Chestnut Accelerated Middle School, Springfield, MA. 2001-2006

Educational Licensures: K-12 Principal (MN), 5-9 General Science (MN)

PRIMARY AREA OF TEACHING AND DEPARTMENT COURSES TAUGHT
California State University, Los Angeles • Instructor of record for courses in Ed.D. in Educational Leadership, M.A. in Educational Foundations, and combined B.A. and initial teaching credential program. Course titles:
- EDAD 605: Advocacy, Community Engagement, and Governance
- EDFN 605C: Communities Research Laboratory
- EDFN 505: Introduction to Qualitative Research
- EDFN 500: Evaluation of Educational Research
- EDAD 562A: Research and Data Assessment
- EDCI 502: Introduction to Science and Mathematics Content Methods
- EDFN 440: Schooling in a Diverse Urban Society
- EDFN 420: Foundations of Urban Learning
- ULRN 461: Learning and Critical Thinking

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE
Social Scientist Appointee to University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board 2016-2017
Faculty representative: Student Educational Equity Advisory Committee 2015-2017
Co-chair “School as a Whole” (College of Education Faculty Governance Committee) 2015-present
Faculty Advisor: The Queer Connection (Student Group) 2014-present
Ed.D / Educational Graduate Student Research Symposium Coordinator 2013-2015
Education Faculty Representative: Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies 2013-present
Program Board Member: Center for the Study of Genders and Sexualities 2014-2017
Community Council Representative and Volunteer educator Marc and Eva Stern Math and Science School, Los Angeles, CA 2013-2015

SELECTED CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Mattheis, A., Yoder, J. and Cruz-Arellano, D. Queer in STEM: Disrupting Stereotypes of Identity and


**SELECTED CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS BY MENTORED STUDENTS**


**SELECTED PUBLICATIONS (PEER-REVIEWED JOURNALS AND EDITED VOLUMES)**


**GRANT AWARDS (SINCE 2013)**

Exploring Individual Impacts and Documenting Collective Voice at the Youth Bike Summit 2016-
Funded AERA Educational Research Service Project, with Recycle-A-Bicycle (NYC): $2750
Examing Cal State L.A. Campus Stakeholder Identities with the IDI: $5000
Queer in STEM: $5,000

*indicates Cal State L.A. student co-author
Carlos Tejeda, Professor  
California State University Los Angeles  
Division of Applied and Advanced Studies in Education  
ctejeda3@calstatela.edu

### Education and Relevant Experience

- **Ph.D. Education**  
  University of California, Los Angeles  
  *Urban Schooling*  
  2000

- **M.A. Education**  
  California State University, Los Angeles  
  *Educational Foundations*  
  1994

- **Bachelor of Arts Degree**  
  University of California, Santa Cruz  
  *Latin American Studies*  
  1987

* * * * * *

- **California State University Los Angeles**  
  E.O.P. Summer Bridge Program - Social Science Team Leader & Instructor  
  2007

- **California State University Los Angeles**  
  Summer Bridge Program, Social Science Instructor  
  2007

- **University of California, Los Angeles**  
  Migrant Student Leadership Institute – Social Science Instructor  
  2001

- **University of California, Los Angeles**  
  Migrant Student Leadership Institute – Social Science Instructor  
  2002 - 2005

- **Los Angeles Unified School District**  
  Emergency Credentialed Multiple Subject Teacher  
  1990 - 1994

### Primary Area of Teaching and Department Courses Taught

California State University, Los Angeles – Charter College of Education

- Instructor for the Educational Foundations Program Area

- Instructor of Record for the following courses:
  - EDFN 440 – Schooling in a Diverse Urban Society
  - ULRN 464 – Contemporary Issues in Knowledge, Culture, & Learning
  - EDFN 507 – History of Education
  - EDFN 506 – Comparative Education
  - EDFN 525 – Educational Sociology
  - EDFN 530 – Advanced Study Human Development
  - EDFN 550 – Contemporary Social Theory & Issues in Education

### Selected Service to the Department, College and University

- **Charter College of Education – RTP Committee**  
  *Member, Fall 2016 – Spring 2017*
- Charter College of Education – RTP Committee  
  *Member*, Fall 2015 – Spring 2016

- Charter College of Education – RTP Committee  
  *Member*, Fall 2013 – Spring 2014

- Charter College of Education – Associate Dean Search Committee  
  *Member*, Summer 2013

- Charter College of Education – Student Development Committee  
  *Member*, Spring 2013 – Summer 2013

- Charter College of Education – RTP Committee  
  *Member*, Fall 2011 – Spring 2012

- Charter College of Education – RTP Committee  
  *Member*, Fall 2010 – Spring 2011

- Charter College of Education Faculty & Staff Committee  
  *Member*, Fall 2010

- Student Development Committee  
  *Member* (Fall 2009 – Winter 2012) / *Chair* (Spring 2012)

- AASE Division – Appointments Committee  
  *Member*, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

- AASE Division – Chair Selection Advisory Committee  
  *Chair*, Spring 2013

- AASE Division – Fiscal Policy Committee  
  *Member*, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

- AASE Division – Student Development Committee  
  Winter 2009 – Fall 2013

**Selected Professional Presentations**

“Thoughts on the How and Why of Ethnic Studies”  
  Keynote Speaker  
  Ethnic Studies Summit – Chapman University, April 26, 2016

“The Battle for Transformative Pedagogies: Decolonial Perspectives”  
  Keynote Speaker  
  National Association for Multicultural Education – California Chapter  
  3rd Annual Conference, Fullerton, California, January 11, 2014

“Faculty Collaboration Toward a Critical Cohort Experience”  
  National Association for Multicultural Education  
  19th Annual International Conference, Denver, Colorado, October 29, 2009

**Selected Presentations by Mentored Students**

- *None* -
Selected Publications


Selected Grants

- None -
Agustin Cervantes

Education and Relevant Experience
2006   Stanford University, Stanford, CA
       Master of Arts in Education: Social Sciences in Education
       Bachelor of Arts: Urban Studies and Spanish & Portuguese

Experience
• **Director**   California State University, Los Angeles   *Office for Student Services--Charter College of Education*  8/2014 – Present

• **Director of Enrollment**   The National Hispanic University, San José, CA   *Laureate Education Inc. / Laureate International Universities*   7/2008 – 7/2014

• **Associate Director**   Stanford University, Stanford, CA   *Office of the Vice Provost for Student Affairs--El Centro Chicano*   9/2007 – 7/2008

• **Education & Youth Development Fellow**   Stanford University, Stanford, CA   *The Haas Center for Public Service--Upward Bound Program*, 4/2006 – 8/2006

• **Stanford University**   Student Initiated Course Instructor

Taught and facilitated 2 courses of 20 students on Latino gang culture and formation. Provided readings, lectures, discussions, and guest speaker participation. Independent research sponsored by the Contemporary Studies in Race and Ethnicity Department at Stanford University. Cecilia and Antonio Burciaga Community Development Award Selection Committee: Select (committee of 5) the award’s recipient for the contributions made to and for the Chicano/Latino community in Stanford.

Ravenswood English & Barrio Assistance Tutor • Via the Haas Center for Public Service. Tutored a monolingual Spanish-speaking students (K-8) twice a week for over 5 hours total; transcribed video/audio data for organizing professor; Drove 6-8 student mentors twice a week to site schools; mentor for Stanford College Preparatory Program (until 2011).

Primary Area of Teaching and Department Courses Taught
       ULRN 464   Contemporary Issues in Knowledge, Culture and Learning
Charlene Fried

Education and Relevant Experience:

- M.S. Bilingual Cross-Cultural Education
  Pepperdine University, Graduate School of Education, Malibu, CA
  Thesis: *Attitudes of Latino Parents towards Bilingual Education*

- K-12 Bilingual Cross-Cultural Specialist Credential: Spanish, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA

- B.A. English/Speech
  California State University, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA

- Standard Secondary Credential: English/Speech,
  California State University, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA

- **Additional Certification**
  - ERWC (Expository Reading and Writing Course) Training Certificate, Cal Poly, Pomona
  - LAWP (Los Angeles Writing Project) Fellow, CSULA
  - RIAP Trainer, CSULA
  - AVID Trainer, CSULA
  - CLAD/BCLAD Certification/Trainer
  - SDAIE Trainer of Trainers
  - Certificate of Completion: APPQMR, Applying the QM (Quality Matters) Rubric, Online Course

- **Professional Development**
  - Symposium on Literacies, Languages, and Writing in Urban Areas, CSULA
  - Common Core/SBAC Training, All Subject Areas, BPUSD
  - Common Core Training: CRLP/UCLA, BPUSD, *Awakening the Common Core from Within; Unpacking the Standards*
  - National Teen Leadership Program: Diversity Day
  - RTI at Work, Solution Tree, Response to Intervention Training
  - ERWC (Expository Reading and Writing Course) Training Certificate, Cal Poly, Pomona
  - LAWP (Los Angeles Writing Project Fellow), CSULA
  - Californian’s Tomorrow, ELD Training
  - GLAD (Guided Language Acquisition Design) Training, BPUSD
  - RIAP Training, CSULA

**Primary Area of Teaching:** First and Second Language Acquisition, Urban Literacy/Reading

**Department Courses Taught:**
- ULRN 460 (Assessment and Learning)
- ULRN 463 (Literacy and the Urban Community)
- EDCI 300 (The Teaching Profession: Prepare Urban)
- EDCI 453 (Teaching in a Bilingual/Cross-Cultural School)
- EDCI 549 (English Reading/Language Art/Bilingual)
- EDEL 405 (Pro-seminar: Language Development in the Elementary Classroom)
- EDEL 419 (Social Science Methodology, Elementary Classroom)
- EDSE 401 (Instructional Strategies)
- EDSE 415 (Classroom Management)
- EDSE 421L (Languages Other Than English)
- EDSE 445B (Curriculum, Teaching and School Culture)
- EDSE 445C (Directed Teaching Secondary School)
- EDSE 430 (ESL Techniques in Content Area)
- EDSE 499 (Undergraduate Directed Study)
- EDSE 594 (Special Topics in EDSE: English Learners)

Selected Service to the Department, College, and University in the Past Five Years, or Since the Last Self-Study

- Supervised two student teachers
- Directed and produced four community based monologue shows; students presented monologues to selected CSULA classes (Dr. Joseph, Professor Haussler, Professor Fried)
- Promote CSULA to my students and encourage them to explore the campus
- Take groups of students to CSULA to present to classes and participate in question/answer forums (mine and others)
- Invite CSULA students and faculty to visit my high school campus and talk to parents and students
- Open Doors to Classrooms
  - I maintain an open door policy at my high school. My doors are always open to CSULA student observers and guest speakers. Not only are my own students welcome, but other professors’ students are welcome, as well.
  - I make arrangements so CSULA students can observe classes in their own subject areas.
  - We have had several student teachers on our campus; I give them all support.
  - We have several CSULA graduates who teach in Baldwin Park; I have written letters of recommendation for many of them, and once we are working side-by-side I offer them support.
- ULRN 463 – My ULRN students and I work in the CSULA Reading Clinic with children all quarter (promoting literacy and academic language development), and then honor the children and their families with a formal award’s ceremony (certificates, gifts, medallions, food).
- CBEST/RICA/TPA support
  - I have always dedicated time to help students pass the CBEST and RICA exams, as well as give them TPA support. I often stay after class to tutor students who are having difficulty with these tests and the TPA.
Selected Professional Presentations in the Past Five Years:

- **CABE** (California Association for Bilingual Education) 2016 Board *Corazon Award* Winner; accepted award and presented to 2000 members and guests about pressing educational issues, such as common core, bilingual education, differentiated instruction, and the value of first language instruction (see presentation on You Tube, Charlene Fried, CABE, 2016)

- **CABE Workshops**
  - Bridging the Gap between Listening/Speaking and Reading/Writing
  - The Power of the Dramatic Monologue in ELD Classes
  - Academic Literacy and Writing

- **Los Angeles Writing Project (LAWP)**
  - The Use of the Dramatic Monologue in ELD Classes
  - The Magical Culture Bag

- **Sierra Vista High School**
  - Academic English/Academic Writing
  - Common Core Strategies
  - ELD/SDAIE Strategies
  - 2015 Gold Ribbon School
    - The California Department of Education visited our school; my classroom was the only room they visited; they observed the last phase in the evolution of the House Project. The presentation accented student and parent collaboration and involvement.
    - The school was honored as a Gold Ribbon School.

- **Baldwin Park Unified School District**
  - LAWP Strategy: The House Project

- **Akumal, Quintana Roo, Mexico**
  - Teaching Strategies to Promote Academic Literacy

Selected Presentations by Mentored Students in the Past Five Years:

- High School Mentored Students Presented Dramatic Monologues to Selected CSULA Classes
- NABE/CABE Student Essay Contest Winners’ Presentations at the Seal of Excellence Ceremonies

Selected Publications in the Past Five Years:

- Published in the *2016 Multilingual Educator*, “What’s Love Got to Do with It?”
- Published, June 23, 2016 in the *NABE Weekly eNews*, “Teaching for Love”
- Featured in *CABE 2016 Awards: Bridging Multiple Worlds for Love and Global Success*, “*CABE 2016 CABE Board Corazon Award*”
- Featured in *Multilingual Educator*, “Connecting Cultures, Reclaiming our Future: CABE Teachers of the Year”
Susan Kawell, Ph.D.

Education and Relevant Experience

Primary Area of Teaching and Department Courses Taught
EDEL 415 Seminar: Reading and Language Arts
EDEL 416 Seminar: Writing and Language Arts
EDEL 419 Seminar: Social Studies Methods
ULRN 463
EDCI 540 Reading Clinic Practicum
EDEL 412 Emergent Reading
EDCI 521 Research in Reading
EDCI 513 Reading as a Cognitive Process
EDEL 525 Reading in the Content Areas
EDEL 490 CSET Prep and Rica Prep

Selected service to the Department, College and University

Direct the Literacy Resource Lab for the last 14 years
Direct The Reading Clinic for the last 10 years
Direct the Reading Summer camp for the last eight years
Served on two Masters Thesis committees
Conducted five independent studies
Co-coordinator for the Masters Program/Option Reading

Selected Professional Presentations
Presentation of the Reading Clinic ...Winds of Change Conference, Rancho Palos Verde

Selected Publications
Poplin, M; Rivera, J., Kawell, S. et al. "She's Strict for a Good Reason: Highly Effective Teachers in Low Performing Schools" Phi Delta Kappan, 2011.
Socorro Orozco

Education and Relevant Experience

Ed.D. Educational Leadership, California State University, Los Angeles (enrolled)
Master of Arts Child Development, California State University, Los Angeles (2009)
Bachelor of Arts Child Development, California State University, Los Angeles (2005)
Multiple-Subject Teaching Credential, California State University, Los Angeles (2005)
Certificate: Introduction to Online Teaching and Learning, Quality Matters (2016)

Primary Area of Teaching and Department Courses Taught

I taught a total of six classes (24 units) in the last year. Of those classes, one of them (ULRN 464) was a course I taught for the first time. For that reason, I submitted the syllabus I developed that outlines my assessments, readings, and design. The table below summarizes the courses I taught and the quarter when I taught them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter/Year</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>ULRN 464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
<td>EDFN 413 (LAUTR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>EDFN 413 ULRN 464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2016</td>
<td>EDFN 413 ULRN 464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected service to the Department, College and University

I participated as a consultant for the Educational Opportunity Program to help develop a non-cognitive curriculum for the Summer Bridge Program on our campus. In this assignment, I was able to collect data from Summer Bridge instructors in order to clearly identify the most critical affective factors that impact student learning in a college math classroom. Following this, I created a set of activities to address non-cognitive needs that were weaved into the course content and curriculum. Also, I administered a pre- and a post- survey to measure growth. The results of the surveys were presented at the debrief meeting at the end of the program.

A second project I completed with the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) on our campus was to develop a peer mentoring team (Spring Quarter 2015). During this quarter, we were able to develop and pilot both academic support and socio-emotional support workshops for first-year EOP students. Under my general supervision, this team of four senior student mentors implemented a six-week peer-mentoring curriculum during the summer quarter 2015. Also, I was a mentor and acted as a Team Leader for the Supplemental Instruction Leaders (SIL) of the math component in the Summer Bridge Program. These SILs are tasked with providing innovative learning strategies and instructional practices to newly admitted Cal State LA students.

Selected Professional Presentations

Charter College of Education Graduate Student Research Symposium, California State University, Los Angeles (May 2016). *The Ins and Outs of Working as a Part-Time Faculty Member*. Los Angeles, California. *Panelist.*


Joseph Staub

EDUCATION
A.S. in General Studies, Middlesex Community College, Middletown, CT. 1992
B.A. in English, Albertus Magnus College, New Haven, Connecticut, 1995
M.A. in Educational Administration (Option: Educational Leadership), CSULA, 2009

CREDENTIALS
Clear Level II Education Specialist Instruction Credential (Mild/Moderate), CSULA, 2005
Cross-Cultural, Language and Academic Development Certificate, 2005
Administrative Services Credential (Certificate of Eligibility), CSULA, 2009

EXPERIENCE
2000 – present. Resource Specialist Teacher – Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles, CA. Providing special education services to students with exceptional needs, as well as to general education students in co-teaching environments, especially in language arts, math, and social studies. Behavior Intervention Case Manager. Responsible for implementing accommodations and modifications mandated by students’ Individual Education Plans (IEPs) and Behavior Support Plans, and for overall remediation and enrichment of curricula.

Schools: Thomas Starr King Middle School, Thomas Starr King Computer Arts and Technology Magnet, Downtown Magnets High School.

Primary Area of Teaching and Department Courses Taught

Urban Learning Program
ULRN 460
EDUC 101
EDUC 301

Selected Service to the Department, College and University
Workshops on Special Education procedures and practices for students in the undergraduate blended major programs
Rudolph Washington

Education and Relevant Experience:

Ed. D –California State University, Los Angeles
Master's Public Administration, National University
Bachelor of Science, Business Administration, University of Redlands

Experience:

Adjunct Professor, California State University, Los Angeles-Education
Adjunct Professor, Pepperdine University-Education
Adjunct Professor, National University-Education
Community College Adjunct Professor-Political Science
High School Principal

Primary Area of Teaching and Department Courses Taught:

ULRN 461: Critical Thinking, Urban Education

Selected service to the Department, College and University in the past five years or since the last self-study:

Chaired or committee member on 14 Western Association Schools & Colleges for California High Schools
Appendix M. Student Opinions of Faculty Instruction in the Programs

Table M1
Student Satisfaction with ULRN Courses by Item (Fall 2010 – Summer 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Program N=1065</th>
<th>College N=9142</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table M2
Student Satisfaction with ULRN Courses by Item, In-Person Administration (Fall 2010 – Fall 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Program N=899</th>
<th>College N=5573</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table M3  
Overall Student Satisfaction with ULRN Courses by Item, Electronic Administration (Winter 2014 – Summer 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Program N=130</th>
<th>College N=3569</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N. Instructional Faculty Types in the Programs’ Courses

Proportion of Classes Taught by Faculty Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appt. Level</th>
<th>Number of classes</th>
<th>Major Classes</th>
<th>Graduate Classes</th>
<th>Service Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Tenure-Track</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Associates</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ULRN 462 is both a major course and a service course, and counts in two columns.

Trends by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FT</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>%FT</th>
<th>%PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trends by Course

ULRN 460

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FT</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>%FT</th>
<th>%PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ULRN 461

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FT</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>%FT</th>
<th>%PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULRN 462</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Sections</td>
<td>%FT</td>
<td>%PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ULRN 463</th>
<th>FT</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>%FT</th>
<th>%PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ULRN 464</th>
<th>FT</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>%FT</th>
<th>%PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ULRN 469</th>
<th>FT</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>%FT</th>
<th>%PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. Executive Summary

This report includes a critical analysis of the Bachelor of Arts in Urban Learning program from California State University, Los Angeles in the areas of (a) History, Mission, Goals, and Objectives; (b) Program Data: Enrollment Data & Impact of Enrollment Trends; (c) Curriculum and Instruction, d) Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs); (e) Department Faculty; (f) Student Engagement, Outreach and Recruitment; (g) Program Self Recommendation; and (h) Five Year Plan. This report identifies areas of strength in the program and provides recommendations for program improvement based on close review of the self-study document including any additional requested materials and interviews conducted with several stakeholder groups (e.g., administrators, faculty and students).

II. Review Process

This external review was conducted by Dr. Maryann Krikorian, Clinical Faculty and Director, Strategic Partnerships and Educational Effectiveness, at Loyola Marymount University and Dr. Cathi Draper Rodriguez, Associate Professor and Department Chair, Department of Education and Leadership, from California State University, Monterey Bay. The reviewers would like to thank Dr. Margi Clark, Program Director, for the detailed self-study and supporting documents. The reviewers would also like to extend their appreciation to the administrators, faculty, staff, and students who participated in the interview process and provided valuable information that informed this report. The reviewers visited the California State University, Los Angeles campus on March 7th and 8th, 2017 and met with the following individuals:

Administrative

● Dr. Cheryl Ney, Dean, Charter College of Education
● Dr. Diane Fazzi, Associate Dean, Charter College of Education
● Dr. Karin Brown, Dean of Graduate Studies
● Agustin Cervantes, Director, Office of Student Services Education
● Dr. Margaret Garcia, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies

Staff

● Rosa Cessna
● Michelle Torres
● Nicole Cravello
● Abril Trasvina
● Joanna Grey-Perez
● Jennifer Hua
● Karen Von Lawn

Department Chairs

● Dr. Holly Menzies, Division of Special Education and Counseling
● Dr. Anne Hafner, Division of Applied and Advanced Studies in Education
● Dr. Fred Uy, Division of Curriculum and Instruction

Faculty – URLN Program

● Dr. Paula Arvedson
● Charlene Fried
● Dr. Mario Casteñeda
● Dr. Allison Mattheis

Faculty – C&I and AASE Departments

● Dr. Chojellah Marout
● Dr. John Eichinger

Candidates and Graduates

CSULA Bachelor of Arts in Urban Learning, External Review, Spring 2017
III. General overview of program

The Bachelor of Arts in Urban Learning (ULRN) program is in an overall emerging stage in its progress and development. The Program Data provided some analysis and may be strengthened by the inclusion of varying data indicators to support program trends. The findings presented related to curriculum and instruction lack evidence to demonstrate how instruction fulfills outcomes and needs of stakeholders. Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes requires enhancements in the areas of curriculum and program mapping, methods and measurement, assessment infrastructure, and presentation, publication, and use of findings. There were few full-time program faculty and part-time faculty teach a significant portion of the courses. Student engagement, outreach and recruitment lack clear and concise information of culminating experience and integrative learning. Lastly, the five-year plan evidenced accurate and thoughtful interventions aligned with the overall recommendation of the external reviewers.

IV. Evaluation of Program Quality including:

a. History, Mission, Goals, and Objectives

The Urban Learning (ULRN) self-study report contains a detailed overview of the history, goals and objectives of the program. This program is a unique one in the state of California in that is both integrated and offers pathways towards the Multiple Subject Credential and the Education Specialist Intern Credential. The following areas were not addressed specifically and play an integral role in the context of the program and how it is shaped with respect to the teacher education landscape including (a) the context of Commission on California Teacher Credentialing (CTC) revised Teacher Preparation Expectations Standards and how it informs curriculum and instruction; (b) the need for strategic PK-12 partnerships in the urban setting and...
its role in co-constructing program outcomes, curricula, and tools for assessment; (c) the Institutional Learning Outcomes and their alignment with the Program and Course level Outcomes specific to ULRN; and (d) the incorporated context for budget crisis mentioned in later sections of the self-study (page 12) and how it may or may not be relevant to the current financial context in today’s market.

b. Program Data: Enrollment Data & Impact of Enrollment Trends

The ULRN self-study report provides data related to the graduation rates, demographics, and enrollment patterns. The program data demonstrated increasing graduation rates and stable enrollment. Additionally, the program presents strong data related to diversity. The diversity in this program is a strength and is very important to increasing the diversity across the teacher education landscape. The following areas (a) full-time and part-time faculty involvement in recent PK-12 meaningful experience as denoted by CTC Precondition Nine; (b) admission data with varying data indicators related to candidate inputs (e.g., candidate admission GPA) and outputs (e.g., candidate performance) to better understand candidate growth over time; (c) recruitment and marketing strategic plan to promote the program reputation in the field and increase enrollment over time; and (d) procedures and processes related to disqualified student and appropriate evidence to support this action (mentioned on page 19 of self-study report) were not addressed and may inform the development of a student-centered 5-year plan for program improvement.

c. Curriculum and Instruction

The self-study report describes the curriculum and instruction of the program. The program utilizes a cohort model which is a great strength of this program. There is mention of both the quarter curriculum and the semester curriculum in the report. The conversion from quarter to
semester is also mentioned and was a laudable feat that was completed by the university and program faculty. Moreover, the Special Education students are allowed to take American Sign Language as their foreign language. Given the increasing number of students with varying abilities who remain in the general education setting, it may be beneficial for the General Education students to have this opportunity as well. Evidence in support of clinical partnerships and practice was not outlined within the report. Lastly, the following areas (a) process and procedures for clinical placements; (b) context for seminar courses concurrently offered while students are enrolled in clinical practice; (c) evidence demonstrating integration of current state and national accreditation standards (e.g., CTC standards) as well as content frameworks (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards), were not addressed and may inform the student experience in preparation for clinical practice.

d. Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

The self-study report describes the student learning outcomes. It would have been beneficial to understand how the PLOs were revised during the Q2S conversion. There were no data related to how students are meeting these goals provided. It is also unclear how the assessment data are shared with faculty on a continuous basis for program decision-making. This will be important given the program doesn’t have dedicated faculty. The CCOE is commended for conducting a student satisfaction survey each year. It was mentioned by students that their instructors seemed to require the completion of the survey as a course assignment at the beginning of the program but stopped focusing on it by the end of the program. It may be time for the CCOE faculty to reconfirm the importance of this survey and its’ results.

Should the CCOE undergo review by the Council for Accreditation for Educator Preparation
(CAEP), ULRN may consider addressing the following missing components specific to program data: (a) candidate dispositional data; (b) clinical experience data; (c) employer satisfaction data; (d) PK-12 partnership data; (e) alumni performance data; and (f) quality evidence in support of assessment instruments and tools (e.g., rubric validity and reliability). Data indicators should relate to targeted knowledge, skills, and dispositions called out by program level outcomes as well as indicate student growth over time within the program.

e. Department Faculty

The ULRN program does not have any dedicated full-time faculty other than a faculty member, who holds the program director role as part of their faculty load. The students expressed that the faculty they have in the program are typically very strong. Data provided within the report indicated that ULRN courses are taught mostly by part-time faculty (36% Full-time and 64% Part-time faculty). It may beneficial to consider how to increase full-time faculty involvement in the ULRN program in both teaching and mentorship.

f. Student Engagement, Outreach and Recruitment

The program reviewers met with eight students from four different cohorts as part of this review process. It is clear that the students in this program are passionate about ULRN and the success of the program. The students believe that the ULRN program was designed to meet a specific need in the region and they themselves identify with that need. The students seemed to experience frustrations related to the functioning and organization of the program. It was clear that students believe the current administrative structure of the program is not meeting their needs. The students believe there is only one person to whom they can reach out to for advising and that this is not sufficient for the hundreds of students in the program. They stated that the open office hours for the program conflict with the work schedules for students and more hours
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after work are needed. Lastly, students expressed a lack of understanding related to graduation requirements needed to play an active role in tracking progress toward graduation. Another area that students expressed concerns around was the content related to ‘urban learning’. Students indicated that they had not taken enough classes related to marginalized groups (e.g., students of color, LGBTQ, urban youth (with reference to varying urban definitions) as well as urban settings (e.g., eastside versus westside). The students would like the program to provide more direct focus related to the aforementioned areas. They had difficulty identifying specific evidenced-based strategies related to serving populations from urban schools. They expressed that some of their courses are repetitive in nature because the instructor believes that the content is important. It may be beneficial for the program to look at the curriculum alignment and identify the purposeful repetition and the accidental repetition. It is important to note that faculty feel that the urban education curriculum is strong. The program is encouraged to explore discussions with students to understand if the faculty and students are in alignment when discussing what is meant by urban learning.

**g. Program Self Recommendation and Five Year Plan**

The Program Director has a very realistic view of the needs of the ULRN program. The program self-recommendations were found by the external reviewers to be self-reflective and meaningful. Many of the recommendations align with the identified needs found by the external reviewers.

**V. Additional Areas**

Throughout the review, the external reviewers were asked to look into a few more areas. That said, the external reviewers inquired about such areas with all stakeholders to ensure findings were holistically represented with consideration to diverse perspectives within the program and college. The additional areas are as follows:
● Divisional home
  ○ Through discussions, it was clear that faculty, staff, and students are satisfied with the divisional home of the program.

● Student-centered approach to program operations and academics
  ○ The review indicates improvements may be made to the current system and process of the ULRN program. Detailed recommendations are available below.

● Technology preparation within the program
  ○ Students are satisfied with the technology preparation in the program. They seemed to concur that they would not like more online or hybrid classes in the program.
  ○ The external reviewers recommend investigating ways to use technology to assist with some of the advising challenges. With the integration of technology in advising, students access to information may remedy challenges expressed specific to graduation requirements and tracking of progress.
  ○ Faculty were also able to describe many ways technology is integrated into the curriculum.

● Benefits to the College of Education
  ○ ULRN students enroll in the program early, offering an opportunity to develop the students around psycho-social issues.
  ○ ULRN students may serve as a pipeline for MA or Doctorate program enrollment. This pathway could be cultivated internally to increase recruit
across programs within the college.

○ ULRN students are deeply committed to issues of social justice and highly are motivated to serve all students.

○ ULRN program offers a degree and credential. This joint offering indicates the CCOE’s ability to serve as more than a credential granting college.

○ ULRN program has a unique niche not represented at the undergraduate level in Southern California. CCOE has the potential to benefit from external funding (e.g., grants, donations) to support students within the program and college due to this level of uniqueness.

VI. Commendations of Strengths, Innovations and Unique Features

● The Program Director, Program Faculty, Staff, and Students are clearly devoted to the program and its success.

● Adjunct faculty who support the program are well respected by faculty and students.

● The utilization of the cohort model is a great strength of the program.

VII. Opportunities for Improvement

● Administrative Structure - The structure does not appear to meet the needs of students. It is recommended that the administration, department chairs, director of student services, and program director formally coordinate planning meetings on a continuous basis to determine an appropriate administrative structure. The following are staffing options to consider:

   ○ Option One: Staffing a Program Director and department leads in the other departments within the college.
○ Option Two: Staffing co-directors of the program.

○ Option Three: Provide a special recognition for service to ULRN if no administrative structure change is possible. This may increase faculty desire to participate in the work that needs to be done

• Advising - Students enjoy the ease of their scheduling though the current process. However, the current process also causes issues for staff and department chairs within the college. The following are recommendations to consider:

○ The university provide the CCOE one advisor that will not only support the undergraduate programs in the college, but also students in other colleges who would like to pursue education as a career

  ■ Increase clarity with advising. For example, Education Specialist students do not seem clear that they are not done with their credential at the end of the program. It is recommended that monthly meetings with advisors be reinstated

○ Separate the technical advising (General Education requirements, degree requirements, university requirements for graduation, etc.) from the faculty mentoring.

  ■ A staff advisor may be assigned the responsibility for technical advising. Thus, allowing faculty to mentor based on content choices not degree specifics. This will reduce the reliance on faculty to help with technical advising

○ Increase availability of advising hours

  ■ Hours should be flexible, accommodate working students, and extend
beyond business hours when they are on campus

○ Diversify mentorship with full-time faculty
  ■ Consider different faculty mentors assigned to each cohort of students.

● Program Recruitment and Marketing - The program should seek to understand the type of students drawn to the ULRN program for recruitment purposes. The following are recommendations to consider:

  ○ The Program Director and the director of Student Services co-construct a recruitment plan detailed with timelines and specific to each party’s role and responsibility

  ○ In consultation with the program director, the Office of Student Services may work to develop formal agreements with local Community Colleges to build pipelines that feed into ULRN. Additionally, such agreements should denote specific transferable units to allow seamless transitions for ULRN transfer students without consequential outcomes (e.g., taking additional coursework that was not transferable, adding time toward degree completion due to un-transferable units)

● Formal Structures for Program Communication - Program planning should include formal processes to increase communication between all stakeholders: Program and division chairs, faculty across divisions, staff advisors, Dean’s Office staff, and students. Formal meetings, committees, and documented minutes should be considered to increase accountability in pursuit of strengthening the program. The following are strategies to consider:

  ○ Recurring meetings with the following (a) students for program related
discussions; (b) faculty across divisions related to updates, program data, and program operations; and (c) staff at the department and college levels

- The program is encouraged to reinstate the regular program meetings. It may be beneficial to reimagine the Dean and/or Associate Dean’s role in supporting faculty involvement for such meetings (note: No SPED faculty other than the department chair participated in the review)

- Recurring meetings to discuss the following topics with all appropriate stakeholders:
  - syllabus review
  - work between divisions
  - data collection
  - student engagement
  - cohort management
  - student accountability
  - increasing faculty engagement across divisions

- ULRN Assessment Committee Representative - The program director’s involvement of university and college level committees related to assessment may assist with understanding the WSUSC assessment collection

- Student Engagement and Accountability - The students engaged in the interview process don’t seem to identify with the program; Mostly, they identify with their cohort. The current use of cohort leaders is also a method for presenting needs that may need to be looked at more closely to offer identified structures for problem solving opportunities. There is some concerns among faculty and staff that there is too much ‘hand-holding’ of the ULRN student

  - The program may want to increase ways of student engagement to allow students across cohorts to work together.
○ Student advising support should be appropriately scaffolding to promote independence and accountability upon credentialing

○ The program may consider recurring and systematic voting processes for cohort leads to allow for changes as needed.

VIII. **Overall recommendation to the review**

The reviewers greatly appreciate the diligence and devotion that many of the faculty, staff and students, especially Dr. Margi Clark, have for the BA in Urban Learning Program at CSULA. This program serves a need both in the local community as well as the field of education. Based on the recommendations of the external reviewers above, the overall recommendation is:

**Recommend Reaffirmation, but with specific concerns for transmittal to the program:** The concerns cited may not be sufficient to preclude a favorable recommendation, but the report should reinforce the External Reviewer’s recommendation that the program attend to these concerns in its Continuous Improvement Plan.
Summary Report on the Urban Learning Program
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Degree Programs:
Option: Directed Electives (initiated in 2009, modified in 2011)
Option: Elementary Education (initiated in 2011, modified in 2015)
Option: Special Education (initiated in 2011, modified in 2015)
Option: Teaching and Learning (initiated in 2015)

Last Program Review Self Study Report: First Review

This report is based on the following documents; self-study report prepared by the undergraduate (2016), an external review dated Spring 2017, responses to questions from the committee, and iterative meetings with the College and Department representatives to develop this document.
Overview of the Field

1. Mission, Goals, Objectives

The Urban Learning (URLN) major was developed by the CCOE in 1999 to meet the growing demand for university teacher education programs that train credentialed general and special educators in the most efficient and effective manner possible. The undergraduate major in Urban Learning prepares students to become educators with the skills and knowledge required to teach in the urban centers of California and beyond.

The CCOE has one shared conceptual framework shared by the Urban Learning Program, The mission and vision is the shared by the program and the CCOE.

The goal of the Urban Learning Major is to allow freshmen to graduate with a Bachelor of Arts degree and a preliminary Multiple Subject (elementary education) teaching credential or Education Specialist (special education) Internship teaching credential in four years and for juniors or community college transfers to complete the program in two years. ULRN graduates hold a Bachelor of Arts in Urban Learning and either a preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential or eligibility for the Education Specialist Internship Credential. Students who earn this degree must complete a minimum of 120-135 units to graduate along with meeting a series of course, fieldwork and assessment requirements.

The self-study stated seven student-learning outcomes:

1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of the needs and demands of diverse students in urban schools and communities.

2: Students will develop and model critical thinking skills for themselves and the students they teach.

3: Students will connect subject matter and pedagogy to meet the educational needs of all students.

4: Students will build on the diverse languages, cultures, capabilities and experiences of their students to assure them the optimum opportunities to grow and develop academically.

5: Students will develop curriculum and instruction that integrate the urban students’ strengths, including their languages, cultures, learning styles and communities.

6: Students will demonstrate professional writing skills, including the ability to discuss, analyze, synthesize and apply professional literature in writing.

7: Students will demonstrate collaboration skills needed to work as a member of an instructional team in the urban school environment.

In addition the self-study stated two specific learning outcomes:
Education Specialist Special Education Credential Option:

Students will design and implement high quality instruction across the elementary grade curriculum that integrates strategies designed to meet the unique cultural, linguistic and learning needs of urban school children.

And Multiple Subject Elementary Education Credential Option:

Students will design and implement high quality instruction across the elementary grade curriculum that integrates strategies designed to meet the unique cultural, linguistic and learning needs of urban school children.

**Commendations**

#1: To the Program:
The program has revised its SLOs at the time of semester conversion (2013-12) and added an SLO to reflect the need to include writing.

The program is dynamic and has had four internal program evaluations and modification starting in 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2014-15,

#1: To the College:

#1: To the University:

**Affirmations**

#1: To the Program:

#1: To the College:
The program strives to be cohesive within the college and forms part of a learning community whose members work collaboratively, honoring diversity, equity and the achievement of potential for all.

#1: To the University:

**Recommendations**

#1.1: To the Program:
The external reviewers stressed the need for strategic PK-12 partnerships in the urban setting and Cal State LA BA in Urban learning.

#1.2:
The external reviewers recommended the revision of the Teacher Preparation Standards to reflect how it informs the curriculum and instruction of the program.

**#1.3:**
The reviewers recommended the alignment of the Program and Course Level Outcomes specific to Urban Learning to the Institutional Learning Outcomes.

**#1: To the College:**

**#1: To the University:**

2. **Program Data**

Graduation rates indicate that over 80% of students, both those beginning as freshmen and those transferring or changing their majors, will graduate. Moreover, 81% of students who enter the program as freshmen will persist to junior standing and enter a cohort. During the review period, 298 students were eligible or approached eligibility to graduate; of them 83% have graduated as of the time the self study was prepared, 8% were finishing requirements and the remainder changed their majors. Demographics among graduates roughly parallel those of the overall body of students enrolled: 77% female and 57% Hispanic (with 28% declining to state an ethnicity).

The ULRN self-study report provides data related to the graduation rates, demographics, and enrollment patterns. The program data demonstrated increasing graduation rates and stable enrollment. Additionally, the program presents strong data related to diversity. The diversity in this program is a strength and is very important to increasing the diversity across the teacher education landscape. The following areas (a) full-time and part-time faculty involvement in recent PK-12 meaningful experience as denoted by CTC Precondition Nine; (b) admission data with varying data indicators related to candidate inputs (e.g., candidate admission GPA) and outputs (e.g., candidate performance) to better understand candidate growth over time; (c) recruitment and marketing strategic plan to promote the program reputation in the field and increase enrollment over time; and (d) procedures and processes related to disqualified student and appropriate evidence to support this action (mentioned on page 19 of self-study report) were not addressed and may inform the development of a student-centered 5-year plan for program improvement.

**Commendations**

**#2.1: To the Program:**
The program data demonstrated increasing graduation rates and stable enrollment.

**#2.2:**
The program presents strong data related to diversity.

**#2: To the College:**
#2: To the University:

**Affirmations**

#2: To the Program:

#2: To the College:

#2: To the University:

**Recommendations**

#2.1: To the Program:
Looking at admission candidates’ GPA and their performance to understand candidate growth over time.

#2.2:
Planning strategically to promote program reputation in the field and increase enrollment over time.

#2.3:
Developing a student-centered 5-year plan and develop processes and procedures to support disqualified students

#2: To the College:

#2: To the University:

3. Program Curriculum

The program utilizes a cohort model, which is a great strength of this program.

Freshmen and the sophomores in the program receive individualized general education course plans and quarterly advisement in collaboration with the UAAC. Students enter a cohort as juniors. Cohorts are scheduled by the program each quarter, receive permits for their classes and study as small learning communities; a developmentally sequenced roadmap guides each cohort’s progress. Cohorts are an important aspect of the student experience: as many as 40% of the students may be first-in-the-family college students with no family role model to guide them through the process of earning a degree. Cohorts provide peer support, unity, and connectedness that contribute significantly to students’ success and persistence.

The program in the major is a sequence of courses on critical thinking, culture, literacy, and family in urban teaching and learning. The program concludes with a senior seminar and a practicum course.
The Special Education Students inclusion American Sign Language (ASL) could benefit all students.

There is need for more evidence in support of clinical partnerships to understand the student experience in preparation for clinical practice.

Students’ biggest challenge with the ULRN curriculum is the assessment requirements imposed by the state of California. Students in elementary education must complete four assessments: basic skills (CBEST), subject matter knowledge (CSET), instructional theory and practice (TPA) and reading instruction (RICA) in addition to coursework and directed teaching; special education students do not submit the TPAs. The demands, and costs, of these assessments present a significant challenge to full-time students, in some case delaying program completion.

ULRN is currently working on re-instituting the Elementary Subject Matter (ESM) waiver program, which will replace the currently mandated subject matter test, CSET with ESM coursework. This will include modifications to the program options that will align it with EO 1071.

ULRN has been funded by the State to add a third accelerated option which is a four-year dual credential; this option will fully align with EO 1071 once completed since it will undergo review and approval at the Chancellor’s Office.

There is a need for a dedicated advisor (SSP) and clarification as to the progress and needs of students.

Commendations
#3: To the Program:
The program greatest strength is its cohort model.

#3: To the College:

#3: To the University:

Affirmations
#3.1: To the Program:
The speed with which Q2S was undertaken required the program to make some compromises. Advantage was taken to “break in” the new courses and review them.

#3.2:
Addressing current campus mandates (GRAD 2025), CSU mandates (EO1071) and state mandates for credentials (which regularly change), continues to lead to more curricular review and redesign.
#3.3:
ULRN is currently working on re-instituting the Elementary Subject Matter (ESM) waiver program,

#3: To the College:

#3: To the University:

**Recommendations**

#3.1: To the Program:

The formation of a URLN curriculum committee (acknowledged in the response to the PRS questions).

#3.2:

In response to the PRS questions: three areas of review will be undertaken:  a) Program SLOs; b) Assessment of student outcomes and development of signature assignments and; c) Curriculum alignment and mapping.

#3.1: To the College:

Funding the effort to form a current and alumni student-centered focus group to review courses, review the program SLOs, assess student outcomes, and review curriculum alignment and mapping.

#3.2:

That the college provide minimally one SSP position to be assigned as the dedicated undergraduate advisor for technical advisement.

#3: To the University:

4. Program Assessment

The needs of two kinds of assessment were mentioned.

First, students’ biggest challenge with the ULRN curriculum is the assessment requirements imposed by the state of California. Students in elementary education must complete four assessments: basic skills (CBEST), subject matter knowledge (CSET), instructional theory and practice (TPA) and reading instruction (RICA) in addition to coursework and directed teaching; special education students do not submit the TPAs. The demands, and costs, of these assessments present a significant challenge to full-time students, in some case delaying program completion.
Second, assessment data collected during the review period emphasized writing skills, a critical need among ULRN students. Data indicate that half of the students begin the program as emerging or developing writers, with only 20% having reached the mastery level. By the end of the program, 84% are at proficient or mastery level, with notable growth in development of ideas, organization of content, and use of appropriate structure and mechanics. It should be noted that roughly 65% of the students self-identify as English learners, and experience language-related challenges when writing. Data are encouraging, but demonstrate trends in what students are capable of doing, but may not always do in practice.

Elementary education candidates must complete four case-study-based Teacher Performance Assessments during the program. Five-year pass rates for the first three completed prior to directed teaching indicate 93% complete TPA 1 (Pedagogy) and 85% complete TPA 2 (Assessment) and TPA 3 (Adaptations for English Learners). The case studies are long, demanding of considerable and require strong writing skills, presenting a challenge students must take on over-and-above a 16-unit course load.

There is need for data related to how students are meeting the SLOs goals provided.

There is need to clarify how the assessment data are shared with faculty on a continuous basis for program decision-making.

Commendations
#4: To the Program:

#4: To the College:
The CCOE is commended for conducting student satisfaction survey each year.

#4: To the University:

Affirmations
#4: To the Program:

#4: To the College:

#4: To the University:

Recommendations
#4.1: To the Program:
Should the CCOE undergo review by the Council for Accreditation for Educator Preparation (CAEP), ULRN may consider addressing the following missing components specific to program data (a) candidate dispositional data; (b) clinical experience data; (c) employer satisfaction data; (d) PK-12 partnership data; (e) alumni performance data; and (f) quality evidence in support of assessment instruments and tools (e.g., rubric validity and reliability). Data indicators should relate to targeted knowledge, skills, and dispositions called out by program level
outcomes as well as indicate student growth over time within the program.

#4.2: Need to review the SLOs and develop an assessment plan.

#4.3: Form an ULRN assessment committee to implement a five-year plan in Fall 2017, including a) development of signature assignments and; b) identification of benchmark skill-based (particularly writing and speaking) assessments.

#4: To the College:
The case studies are long, demanding of considerable and require strong writing skills, presenting a challenge students must take on over-and-above a 16-unit course load. It is recommended that the college provide the appropriate resources to the program to conduct and complete the assessment.

Provide the support to develop meaningful and productive assessment plans.

The program would benefit from dedicated faculty to share date on the SLOs on a continuous basis to affect decision-making.

#4: To the University:

5. Faculty and Instruction
The ULRN program does not have any dedicated full-time faculty other than a faculty member, who holds the program director role as part of their faculty load.

Faculty teaching in the program has assignments in each of the three divisions in the college, allowing students to study with faculty from a wide range of disciplines. The students expressed that the faculty they have in the program are typically very strong.

Data provided within the report indicated that ULRN courses are taught mostly by part-time faculty (36% Full-time and 64% Part-time faculty). It may beneficial to consider how to increase full-time faculty involvement in the ULRN program in both teaching and mentorship.

As the number of full time CCOE faculty declined, the availability of full-time faculty to teach ULRN courses declined as well. Over the review period, the percentage of full-time faculty teaching ULRN courses decreased from 76% to 54%, with the remaining courses taught by adjunct faculty. This faculty are mostly working teachers who bring currency and grounding in practice to students’ learning experience that they highly value. Staffing of classes was designed to draw from across the college faculty. However, as fewer classes were offered by the college, the staffing demands of the division hosting the program, AASE, took precedence in the selection of teaching faculty, a trend that has further narrowed the pool of full-time faculty with whom students study.
Student performance in all required testing areas CBEST/CSET/RICA/Ed TPA is low.

**Commendations**

#5: To the Program:
Teaching much with little. Stretching faculty knowledge and skills.

#5: To the College:

#5: To the University:

**Affirmations**

#5: To the Program:
The faculty assigned to the program was described as very strong.

#5: To the College:

#5: To the University:

**Recommendations**

#5.1: To the Program:
Review course-staffing procedures to strengthen the cross-divisional nature of the program and broaden the pool of faculty teaching in the program.

#5.2:
Adapt the training program for adjuncts from the Division of Special Education and Counseling.

#5.3:
ULRN requires an assessment committee to examine student performance in all required testing areas CBEST/CSET/RICA/Ed TPA

#5.1: To the College:
Broaden the pool of faculty teaching in the program.

#5.2:
Provide incentives to teach in ULRN and make ULRN a college-wide priority.

#5: To the University:

6. Recruitment, Outreach and Alumni
The self-study mentioned that student engagement, outreach and recruitment lack clear and concise information of culminating experience and integrative learning. The self study mentions the ULRN recruitment plan; develop 2+2 transition plans with local community colleges and improve outreach to local high schools which may not be aware of ULRN as an option for incoming freshmen wanting to be teachers.

In their answers to the PRS questions, it was mentioned that ULRN has an alumni survey revised and expanded for Fall 2016. More responses are needed to the alumni survey.

The program also responded with the plan of including alumni performance data and employer satisfaction.

The program has levels of redundancy that need to be reduced.

Commendations
#6: To the Program:

#6: To the College:

#6: To the University:

Affirmations
#6: To the Program:
For expanding and revising the alumni survey.

#6: To the College:

#6: To the University:

Recommendations
#6.1: To the Program:
Follow up on the suggested recruitment plan by developing a 2+2 transition plan with local community colleges and improve outreach to local high schools to inform them of the URLN as an option for future students who want to become teacher.

#6.2:
Include alumni performance data and employer satisfaction in the next review.

#6.3:
Survey alumni to reduce redundancy and increase content on serving marginalized students.

#6.1: To the College:
Funding the outreach to high schools.
#6.2: Including alumni in focus groups]

#6: To the University:

7. Program Recommendations

The following recommendations were provided in the Self Study.

Assessment
1. Review and revise program SLO’s to strengthen emphasis on key academic skills such as writing, critical thinking, and oral language.
2. Identify early screening strategies, possibly built into CCOE 3010 that will identify students with intensive writing, oral language and/or English fluency needs.
3. Revise assessment plan to identify key assessment points in each ULRN course.
4. Identify ULRN student outcomes on key assessments in credential program courses.
5. Designate a ULRN program assessment committee from among faculty with assessment background.
6. Review existing assessment procedures and develop/update the program’s current assessment plan with greater attention to:
   a. Assessment of academic progress
   b. Assessment of critical skills (writing, critical thinking, oral language)
   c. Completion of required professional gatekeeper assessments (CBEST, CSET, TPA) in a timely manner
7. Develop a rubric to evaluate professional content and professional writing skills demonstrated in key pieces of writing (program application, Philosophy of Education, etc.) completed outside of classes.
8. Develop a program of support for completion of CBEST, CSET in a timely manner and management of TPA, including appointment of a TPA coordinator from among ULRN Program faculty.
9. Review and revise the ULRN student satisfaction survey, and coordinate with the college assessment committee to assure appropriate administration

Curriculum
1. Develop courses needed to offer a certificate and minor in Urban Learning.
2. Review course content in the ULRN prefix courses through the transition to semester to evaluate, and as needed, strengthen:
   a. Writing and oral language skills, including use of APA format
   b. Development of oral language skills
   c. Critical thinking
   d. Student knowledge of culturally responsive pedagogy
   e. Field-based activities
3. Design signature assignments with critical assessment points in each ULRN-prefix course.
4. Explore the need for a 2000- or 3000-level writing course for students whose writing does not meet professional expectations.
5. Explore the addition of field experiences for lower-division students in the Urban Learning Program.
6. Explore potential development of a lower division general education course and/or an upper division general education course that examines the interaction between diversity, education and urban schooling.

**Recruitment and Program Growth**
1. Update or develop and circulate program recruitment materials: a) a flyer that can be circulated campus-wide; b) a three-fold brochure; c) program description handouts; d) a one-sheet informational handout and; e) an information bulletin. The program currently has all but the first; the third is under development by the Associate Dean’s office and the last two have been updated to the semester system.
2. Review and update the ULRN recruitment plan, and implement an active program of recruitment to contain the following components:
   a. Support for maintenance of the program website
   b. Collaborative plans of transition (2+2 agreements) with local community colleges
   c. Field visits to area high schools and colleges
   d. Periodic on-campus orientation meetings
   e. Update the program brochure to enhance existing recruitment materials
   f. Advertising the program in appropriate media
   g. Sufficient release time for the program director to conduct recruitment activities
3. Develop a minor in Urban Learning, designed to target students in subject matter and other related majors (Liberal Studies, Child Development, Rehabilitation Counseling, Social Work, etc.)
4. Develop a certificate program in Urban Learning designed to target post-baccalaureate credential candidates interested in strengthening their knowledge of the context of teaching and learning in urban schools.
5. Collaborate with the Office of Student Services and the University Office of Outreach and Recruitment to accomplish these goals.
6. Strengthen connections with alumni, particularly those teaching in the Los Angeles basin as a means to both monitor student progress and as a tool for recruitment.

**Faculty Involvement and Collaboration**
1. Review staffing procedures for ULRN classes to enhance the cross-divisional nature of ULRN and broaden the pool of faculty teaching in these courses, allowing students more opportunity to learn from CCOE faculty, particularly from the Division of Special Education and Counseling.
2. Strengthen involvement of college administration in the program, and broaden faculty involvement in program governance and decision-making.
3. Provide comprehensive training on the semester ULRN program for college administration and staff, division faculty and staff.
4. Provide staffing support necessary to allow courses to be taught by adjunct faculty currently working in the schools.

To the University:
- Recommendation 1:
- Recommendation 2:

To the Charter College of Education

- Recommendation 1:
  Develop a minor and a certificate program in Urban Learning; explore the need for a 2000- or 3000-level writing course for students needing writing support.

- Recommendation 2:
  Review course-staffing procedures to strengthen the cross-divisional nature of the program and broaden the pool of faculty teaching in the program.

- Recommendation 3:
  Encourage involvement and engagement in the program across the three divisions.
8. Summary of Commendations and Recommendations

Commendations to the Program

#1: To the Program:
The program has revised its SLOs at the time of semester conversion (2013-12) and added and SLO to reflect the need to include writing.

The program is dynamic and has had four internal program evaluations and modification starting in 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2014-15

#2: To the Program:
The program data demonstrated increasing graduation rates and stable enrollment. The program presents strong data related to diversity.

#3: To the Program:
The program greatest strength is its cohort model.

#5: To the Program:
Teaching much with little. Stretching faculty knowledge and skills.

Commendations to the College

#4: To the College:
The CCOE is commended for conducting student satisfaction surveys each year.

Affirmations to the Program

#3: To the Program:
The speed with which Q2S was undertaken required the program to make some compromises. Advantage was taken to “break in” the new courses and review them.

Addressing current campus mandates (GRAD 2025), CSU mandates (EO1071) and state mandates for credentials (which regularly change), continues to lead to more curricular review and redesign.

ULRN is currently working on re-instituting the Elementary Subject Matter (ESM) waiver program,
#5: To the Program:
The faculty assigned to the program was described as very strong.

#6: To the Program:
Expanding and revising the alumni survey.

Affirmations to the College

#1: To the College:
The program strives to be cohesive within the college and forms part of a learning community whose members work collaboratively, honoring diversity, equity and the achievement of potential for all.

Recommendations to the Program

#1: To the Program:
The need for strategic PK-12 partnerships in the urban setting and Cal State LA BA in Urban learning.

The revision of the Teacher Preparation Standards to reflect how it informs the curriculum and instruction of the program.

The alignment of the Program and Course Level Outcomes specific to Urban Learning to the Institutional Learning Outcomes.

#2: To the Program:
Looking at admission candidates’ GPA and their performance to understand candidate growth over time.

Planning strategically to promote program reputation in the field and increase enrollment over time.

Developing a student-centered 5-year plan and develop processes and procedures to support disqualified students

#3: To the Program:
The formation of a URLN curriculum committee (acknowledged in the response to the PRS questions).

In response to the PRS questions: three areas of review will be undertaken: a) Program SLOs; b) Assessment of student outcomes and development of signature assignments and; c) Curriculum alignment and mapping.
#4: To the Program:

Should the CCOE undergo review by the Council for Accreditation for Educator Preparation (CAEP), ULRN may consider addressing the following missing components specific to program data (a) candidate dispositional data; (b) clinical experience data; (c) employer satisfaction data; (d) PK-12 partnership data; (e) alumni performance data; and (f) quality evidence in support of assessment instruments and tools (e.g., rubric validity and reliability). Data indicators should relate to targeted knowledge, skills, and dispositions called out by program level outcomes as well as indicate student growth over time within the program.

Need to review the SLOs and develop an assessment plan.

Form an ULRN assessment committee to implement a five-year plan in Fall 2017, including a) development of signature assignments and; b) identification of benchmark skill-based (particularly writing and speaking) assessments.

#5: To the Program:

Review course-staffing procedures to strengthen the cross-divisional nature of the program and broaden the pool of faculty teaching in the program.

Adapt the training program for adjuncts from the Division of Special Education and Counseling.

ULRN requires an assessment committee to examine student performance in all required testing areas CBEST/CSET/RICA/Ed TPA

#6: To the Program:

Follow up on the suggested recruitment plan by developing a 2+2 transition plan with local community colleges and improve outreach to local high schools to inform them of the URLN as an option for future students who want to become teacher.

Include alumni performance data and employer satisfaction in the next review.

Survey alumni to reduce redundancy and increase content on serving marginalized students.

Recommendations to the College

#3: To the College:

Funding the effort to form a current and alumni student-centered focus group to review courses, review the program SLOs, assess student outcomes, and review curriculum alignment and mapping.

That the college provide minimally one SSP position

#4: To the College:
The case studies are long, demanding of considerable and require strong writing skills, presenting a challenge students must take on over-and-above a 16-unit course load. It is recommended that the college provide the appropriate resources to the program to conduct and complete the assessment.

Provide the support to develop meaningful and productive assessment plans.

The program would benefit from dedicated faculty to share date on the SLOs on a continuous basis to affect decision-making.

**#5: To the College:**

Broaden the pool of faculty teaching in the program.
Provide incentives to teach in ULRN and make ULRN a college-wide priority.

**#6: To the College:**
Funding the outreach to high schools.

Including alumni in focus groups.