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Executive Summary

This document represents the first formal strategic plan for the College of Education at California State University Fullerton. The plan was developed through a comprehensive planning process that was initiated in the fall 2010 and completed in the summer 2011. Dean Claire Cavallaro and a Strategic Planning Task Force, comprised of faculty, staff, alumni, and community representatives, provided leadership in developing the plan with the assistance of Dr. B. Thomas Mayes, an external facilitator. All faculty and staff in the college were encouraged to contribute to the definition of a new vision and goals, which are summarized below. The mission that was developed in preparation for the 2007 accreditation review by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the National Council on Accreditation in Teacher Education was retained.

Vision:

We aspire to be transformational leaders who advance the readiness of all learners to actively participate in an ever-changing, diverse and digital world.

Mission:

The COE mission is to teach, to serve, and to engage in scholarship. We teach our students to be critical thinkers and lifelong learners. We prepare professionals who improve student learning, promote diversity, make informed decisions, engage in collaborative endeavors, maintain professional and ethical standards, and become change agents in their workplaces. We engage in scholarly work that informs the profession and serve the educational community by providing applied scholarship.

Goals (AY 2011-12 to AY 2015-16):

1. Institutionalize processes that better reflect the demands and expectations for faculty teaching, scholarship and service.
2. Strengthen local, regional, national and international partnerships that exemplify excellence in teaching and learning.
3. Prepare professionals who model and advocate just, equitable and inclusive education.
4. Ensure the effective use and integration of technology to support teaching and learning throughout all COE programs, including face-to-face, hybrid and fully online learning environments.
Institutional Context

Cal State Fullerton has offered teacher preparation programs since it was founded in 1959, and the preparation of teachers and school leaders has remained an important part of the university mission since that time. The university has long taken pride in the quality of these programs, which have been accredited continuously by the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) since 1970, with the most recent re-accreditation in 2007.

The organizational structure of these educator preparation programs evolved with the university’s growth in its first 50 years. By the turn of the century, these programs were organized as a School of Education within the College of Human Development and Community Service (HDCS). In 2004, the College of Education was established as a separate college, in recognition of the university’s commitment to educator preparation and in anticipation of a new independent doctoral degree – the first in the university – that would be launched in 2007. As noted in the Institutional Report submitted for the college’s 2007 accreditation review: “Establishing the College of Education underscores the university’s commitment, even in fiscally challenging times, to prepare professionals for work in P-12 settings. College status has strengthened the institution’s ability to attract outstanding leadership with appropriate subject matter expertise; streamlined institutional organization to more effectively respond to increasing state, federal and accrediting body requirements placed on teacher preparation; facilitated communication with other CSU sister campus colleges of education through parallel leadership and organization; and provided name recognition and an easily identifiable college profile for students and the community that has enhanced scholarships and external gifts.”

This document represents the first formal strategic plan for the College of Education. The plan was developed through a comprehensive planning process that was initiated in the fall 2010 and completed in the summer 2011. Dean Claire Cavallaro and a Strategic Planning Task Force, comprised of faculty, alumni and community representatives, provided leadership in developing the plan with the assistance of Dr. B. Thomas Mayes, an external facilitator. All faculty and staff in the college were encouraged to contribute to the definition of a new vision, goals, and strategies. This college-level strategic planning process occurred concurrently with a university-wide comprehensive strategic planning process, which concluded at approximately the same time and culminated in a University Integrated Strategic Plan that was approved by President Milton Gordon in October 2011.

To provide context for the College of Education plan, a summary of the College of Education’s departments, programs, centers of excellence and statistics is provided on the following pages. All information is from the 2010-2011 academic year.
Departments

The Educational Leadership Department provides credential and degree programs that support the growth of leaders for P-12 schools, community colleges, and higher education. The Department houses the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree program in Educational Leadership.

The Elementary and Bilingual Education Department offers the Multiple Subject Credential Program (MSCP) for people who wish to become accredited K-8 teachers, a Combined Credential/Master's Program and Master's Degree Programs for educators who wish to further their studies.

The Reading Education Department offers graduate programs in Reading Education. Coursework and field experiences equip candidates to make informed instructional decisions in a variety of leadership roles. The graduate programs are designed to prepare professionals who promote diversity, engage in collaborative endeavors, think critically, maintain professional and ethical standards and value lifelong learning.

The Secondary Education Department develops single subject teachers, primarily for secondary schools, through a program that reflects the complex contexts of the secondary classroom and models a professional community where learning is interactive and dynamic. Their master's programs feature a fully online option as well as an emphasis on teaching foundational mathematics.

The Special Education Department offers credential programs for teachers specializing in Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Moderate/Severe Disabilities and Early Childhood Special Education. Programs are designed to train educational generalists in inclusive non-categorical approaches for children with heterogeneous special needs.

Programs

Doctor of Education Degree Program
  1. P-12 Leadership
  2. Community College Leadership

Master's Degree Programs
  1. Education Administration (preK-12)
  2. Higher Education Leadership
3. Elementary and Bilingual Education*
   - Bilingual/Bicultural
   - Educational Technology
   - Curriculum and Instruction
     - Early Childhood Education
     - Staff Development
     - Professional Inquiry and Practice
     - Diversity
     - Math and Science
     - Technology in Education
4. Instructional Design & Technology*
5. Teaching Foundational Mathematics
6. Reading Education*
7. Secondary Education*
8. Special Education

Teaching and Administrative Services Credential Programs
1. Multiple Subject
2. Single Subject: English, Social Science, Foundational Level Math, Mathematics, Foundational Level General Science, Science (Biology, Chemistry, Geosciences and Physics), World Languages, Music and Art
3. Special Education (Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe and Early Childhood)*
4. Administrative Services
5. Reading and Language Arts Specialist

Selected Certificate Programs
1. Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development
2. Community College Leadership Studies
3. Computing Certificate
4. Instructional Design and Technology*
5. Online Teaching and Learning*
6. Post-Secondary Reading and Learning*

*Fully online options are available in these programs.

Centers of Excellence
1. Center for Research on Educational Access and Leadership (C-REAL)
2. Community Learning and Literacy Center (CLLC)
3. Professional Development Teaching Center
4. SchoolsFirst Center for Creativity and Critical Thinking in Schools
5. Catalyst Center for the Advancement of Research in Teaching and Learning Math and Science (co-sponsored by College of Education and College of Natural Science and Mathematics)

**COE Statistics (Fall 2010)**

Student enrollment
- 1,088 in Teaching and Administrative Credential programs
- 686 in Master’s degree programs
- 108 in Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) program

Ethnic diversity of graduate students
- 0.5% American Indian,
- 3.1% African American,
- 24.1% Hispanic, 13.4% Asian,
- 44.5% White, 12% Unknown,
- 1.4% International,
- 1% Multiple Race

82 Full-time faculty (77% tenured/tenure track).

Graduate Assistantships/Field Placements in over 50 higher educational settings including international placements options.

Contracts with 74 public school districts for student teaching placements.

**Strategic Planning Process**

The plan was developed through a comprehensive planning process that was initiated in the fall 2010 semester and completed in summer 2011. Dean Claire Cavallaro appointed a Strategic Planning Task Force, comprised of faculty, staff, alumni and community representatives. The task force met throughout the year to complete an environmental scan and formulate a vision and initial strategic goals. A smaller subcommittee worked between meetings to refine the vision and goals. All faculty and staff in the college were encouraged to contribute to the definition of a new vision and goals through a community website and a college-wide retreat in the spring 2011. The College of Education Leadership Council, Advisory Board and Student Interclub Council were consulted and provided input from their unique perspectives.

The following detailed description of the planning process begins with the names and affiliations of the task force members who contributed to the strategic plan. Following this are descriptions of the procedures used by the task force to identify
critical aspects of the external and internal environments facing the COE, and the components of the strategic planning process (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats). A review of the vision and mission statements is followed by a description of goals and strategies that make up the strategic plan for the college.

**Task Force Members**

Council of Chairs:
1. Dr. Louise Adler, Professor and Chair, Department of Educational Leadership
2. Dr. Lisa Kirtman, Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Elementary & Bilingual Education
3. Dr. Mark Ellis, Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Secondary Education
4. Dr. Melinda Pierson, Professor and Chair, Department of Special Education
5. Dr. Ula Manzo, Professor and Chair, Department of Reading, and Interim Co-Director, Community Learning and Literacy Center
6. Dr. JoAnn Carter-Wells, Professor, Reading and Director, Master’s of Science in Instructional Design and Technology (MSIDT)
7. Ms. Aimee Nelson, Assistant Dean for Student Affairs
8. Ms. Bobbee Cline, Director of Development
9. Dr. Karen Ivers, Associate Dean
10. Dr. Claire Cavallaro, Dean

Center Directors:
11. Dr. Dawn Person, Director, C-REAL; Coordinator, Ed.D. Program in Community College Leadership; and Professor, Department of Educational Leadership
12. Dr. Teresa Crawford, SchoolsFirst Center for Creativity and Critical Thinking in Schools; College Assessment Coordinator; and Professor, Department of Elementary and Bilingual Education

Probationary Faculty:
13. Dr. Woo Jung, Associate Professor, Department of Special Education
14. Dr. Minerva Chavez, Assistant Professor, Department of Secondary Education
15. Dr. Jennifer Ponder, Assistant Professor, Elementary & Bilingual Education

Temporary Faculty:
16. Dr. Jerome Hunter, Distinguished Lecturer, Department of Educational Leadership

Alumni/Community:

---

*1Indicates those members who also served on the planning subcommittee.*
17. Ms. Jackie Counts, English specialist for Anaheim UHSD, National Board Certified Teacher, and former part-time faculty in the Department of Secondary Education

18. Dr. Julianne Hoefer, Alumna and Principal, James H. Cox Elementary School, Fountain Valley

19. Dr. Christie Baird, Alumna and Early Childhood Coordinator, Orange County Department of Education

**Task Force Process**

The process used for the development of the COE strategic plan was adapted from a model described by Tromp and Ruben (2010). The major parts of this process included identifying environmental assumptions, a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis, development of a future vision statement, review of the COE mission statement, and the formulation of long-range goals and strategies for COE.

We first formed a task force comprised of major college stakeholders including administrators, faculty, alumni and key community members. A comprehensive strategic plan should attend to the needs of key stakeholders since their cooperation and support will be needed to accomplish the goals set out in the plan. Participation in the planning process helps to assure that all constituent points of view are considered and to generate commitment to accomplishing the goals derived from the plan. Five of these members also served on a subcommittee to refine and clarify the outputs of the whole task force.

In a series of meetings that took place from September 2010 through June 2011 the task force members identified the key forces acting on the college that should be considered in developing its strategic plan. The external facilitator, Dr. Mayes, developed meeting agendas and guided the meeting process. The task force explored these topics in depth:

1. Assumptions about the internal and external environments of COE and its parent unit, CSU Fullerton.
2. Vision of what COE should be like in 5 to 10 years.
3. Strengths of COE that will facilitate accomplishment of the vision.
4. Weaknesses of COE that would inhibit achieving the vision.
5. Opportunities that could be exploited to achieve the vision.
6. Threats or forces that might create barriers to vision accomplishment.
7. Strategic, long-range, goals and strategies to achieve the vision.
At each meeting the task force members were asked to write down their ideas about the nature of the specific topic on the agenda. Individually they wrote each idea on a single Post-it® Note so that each note contained only one idea. The individual notes were then shared with the group and similar concepts were grouped together. The task force gave these concept groupings short names and these names were posted on flip charts. The task force members then voted individually for the three concepts they believed to be most important in developing a strategic plan. They voted by placing three colored dots next to the items they preferred. By adding the number of dots placed on each item we derived a group ranking of the items with respect to their importance.

**Planning Subcommittee Deliberations**

Following this series of meetings a planning subcommittee was formed to review the detailed task force meeting reports and recommendations. The subcommittee condensed these reports to produce statements of a future vision of COE, major strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, as well as a set of goals for the next 5 to 10 years. The subcommittee documents were then posted on the Community Web Site for review and comment by all faculty and staff. The subcommittee met to review the comments posted on the Community Web. They made necessary revisions to the documents and prepared a meeting to share this information with the full faculty and staff.

**Meeting Dates & Major Agenda Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Parties Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 30, 2010</td>
<td>Environmental assumptions and opportunities</td>
<td>Full task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 18, 2010</td>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>Full task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 16, 2010</td>
<td>Strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td>Full task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17, 2011</td>
<td>Create vision, values, mission</td>
<td>Full task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3, 2011</td>
<td>Revise vision, values, mission</td>
<td>Planning subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24, 2011</td>
<td>Vision and goals prioritization</td>
<td>Full task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documents posted on Community Discussion Board</td>
<td>COE Faculty and Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5, 2011</td>
<td>Review discussion board content and edit and streamline vision and goals</td>
<td>Planning subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean and student leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2011</td>
<td>COE Retreat to share task force products &amp; obtain input</td>
<td>COE Faculty and Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2011</td>
<td>Review plan with College Advisory Board</td>
<td>Dean and Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 14, 2011</td>
<td>COE Chairs summer retreat</td>
<td>Dean and COE Chairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Scan Results

The initial step in strategic planning was to assess the characteristics of the environment in which COE operates. The key environmental dimensions that were analyzed by the task force included societal, economic, political, regulatory, technological and organizational factors. Based on subcommittee deliberations the major environmental features affecting COE are the following:

1. Need for schools to respond to cultural, linguistic, ethnic, socioeconomic diversity and to eliminate inequities in opportunity and achievement.
2. Public awareness that education is critical for future economic competitiveness of U.S.
3. Demands for accountability and increased public perception of low quality of public education and educator preparation programs.
4. Increasing regulatory pressure – state and federal.
5. Constrained and uncertain state funding.
6. Increasingly accessible and powerful, but rapidly changing technology.
7. Time-consuming and stressful RTP process including expectations that do not support faculty involvement in partnerships.
8. Evolution of CSUF mission and culture for master's and doctoral programs.

COE Strengths

Strengths are those resources controlled by a college that enhance its ability to accomplish its strategic goals. Strengths could reside in organizational systems, personnel, or other resources available to a college. Strategic plans should attempt to leverage a college's strengths, or to increase them.

The strategic planning task force developed a list of COE strengths that will facilitate its efforts to accomplish its strategic plan. The planning subcommittee selected the following as the most important strengths of COE:

1. High-quality faculty, staff and students: The quality of faculty was noted as a strength in the last NCATE accreditation review in 2007. Faculty are experienced practitioners and scholars, who are dedicated to teaching and learning. The College has staff that are experienced, knowledgeable and committed to supporting student engagement and success.

2. High-quality programs with an outstanding reputation for developing quality graduates: COE credential and graduate programs are well known
throughout Orange County and beyond for producing successful teachers and education leaders. Our programs are known for being rigorous and relevant. Graduates serve as leaders in their schools and communities.

3. **Resources and support for technology:** The University has an outstanding technology infrastructure that provides ample resources (e.g., laptops, smart classrooms) and support for educational technology integration. The COE has invested in cutting-edge technology for teacher preparation (e.g., smart boards). Both the university and the college provide opportunities for faculty development and invest resources into the development of quality online programs.

4. **Infusion and application of technology:** Faculty have integrated technology use into many programs and courses (both face-to-face and online), and the college has more than 10 years experience in providing online courses and programs.

5. **Strong commitment to serving and supporting diverse and at risk populations:** The college’s faculty and leadership have a strong commitment to serving diverse and at-risk populations. This commitment has had a positive impact in the community, addressing issues such as the “achievement gap” or “opportunity gap.”

6. **Fiscal management and stability:** Both the university and the college have strong fiscal management, resulting in stability even in difficult economic times.

7. **Support for faculty research and professional development:** The COE has provided resources and support to develop a culture of research. This includes the colloquia series sponsored by the Center for Research on Educational Access and Leadership (C-REAL), reassigned time for faculty research and funding for new faculty, graduate assistants and travel funds. The university has also provided resources and support for research and creative activities, as reflected in the “Intellectual Climate” theme of the University’s Integrated Strategic Plan.

8. **COE Centers of Excellence:** The College’s centers (see list on page 5) provide a focal point and catalyst for the development of innovative programs that address important needs and issues in education, both locally and nationally.

9. **Strong relationships with community partners and alumni:** The COE has a history of successful collaboration with P-12 school districts and community colleges, including activities such as placement of student teachers, writing of collaborative grants and provision of professional development opportunities. Our partners were noted as being very supportive and
positive during the 2007 accreditation review. Many alumni work as leaders and teachers in local P-14 schools and colleges and contribute to the success of our partnerships.

COE Weaknesses

Weaknesses are those deficiencies in the organization that could interfere with goal accomplishment. The strategic plan should be devised so that weaknesses can be overcome or eliminated.

The strategic planning task force identified and discussed COE weaknesses. The planning subcommittee then selected the following as the most significant weaknesses that could affect meeting the goals of the strategic plan:

1. **Communications (internal and external, including alumni):** The college does not yet have a strong and comprehensive public relations plan, and it needs a consistent message, marketing materials and personnel to enhance external communications for the purpose of marketing and advocacy. As a result, the College is not seen as a source for professional development, within or outside the university.

2. **Gaps in technology integration across all departments and programs:** Although technology integration is a strength in the college, it is not consistently implemented in all departments and programs.

3. **Inconsistencies in language and college culture that support all students:** While faculty and staff have a strong commitment to serving diverse populations, there is a need to increase the awareness, sensitivity and knowledge to issues of language, cultures, class, sexuality and religion in an effort to create a more inclusive community.

4. **Limitations in collaborations with community partners, businesses, and international partners:** Many existing P-14 partnerships need to be deepened to be more meaningful and focused on college priorities. In addition, the college needs to expand partnerships with businesses, other institutions of higher education and international partners.

5. **Disconnect between COE and P-14 classrooms:** Some faculty perceive a gap between the COE and some of the communities it serves. There is a need to increase efforts to address the achievement/opportunity gap, particularly among Hispanic students. The College also needs realignment and readiness for the common core standards and for performance based assessment.
6. **COE Information Technology (IT) limitations:** The COE database infrastructure lacks capacity to handle increasing demands of reporting and assessment. In addition, the college has a shortage of IT staff.

7. **Space/facilities limitations:** The college is currently housed in two buildings (College Park and the Education Classroom Building) creating some barriers to communication and collaboration. Additional classrooms are needed in College Park. The college has no space for student activities. The need to plan for future space needs is noted in the University’s Integrated Strategic Plan.

8. **Faculty workload, role, and expectations:** Faculty have a heavy workload, and there is a disconnect between work that faculty see as their charge (especially related to P-14 partnerships and community involvement) and the way that the university defines scholarship.

9. **Limited student recruitment activities:** The college does not currently have targeted recruitment plans for high achieving students, including those from underrepresented backgrounds.

**COE Opportunities**

A scan of the external environment of the college can identify situations or trends that represent opportunities for the college to pursue new pathways to achieve its vision of the future. The strategic planning taskforce identified such opportunities that might be exploited by COE in developing its strategic plan. The planning subcommittee further reviewed these opportunities to identify those that appear most important or fruitful. These are the following:

1. **Provide innovative, high quality access to technology based learning:** The college can tap its faculty expertise in educational technology and online instruction to become leaders, align technology use with students’ needs and expectations, and achieve innovation by striving to meet the needs of digital natives.

2. **Deepen partnerships including community, P-12, colleges, and business—locally, nationally, and globally:** The general public’s interest in education issues and education reform efforts provide an opportunity to connect with parents, school districts, other institutions of higher education and businesses to create partnerships that address problems of mutual concern. The College can leverage state and national initiatives, including the California Alliance for Teacher Preparation which focuses on implementing ideas from the NCATE Blue Ribbon Report, *Transforming Teacher Education*...
through Clinical Practice: A National Strategy to Prepare Effective Teachers. Collaboration is a strength of the college and we should leverage it to become a leader in partnerships with schools, colleges and other entities.

3. **Be responsive to external forces in support of education reform:** The college can respond to calls for education reform by being leaders of change and working with partners to help improve educational practice.

4. **Take the lead on behalf of the university to bring about transformative change:** The university’s strategic planning initiative and anticipated changes in university leadership will provide opportunities for transformative change and the College of Education should be prepared to provide leadership in areas of strength.

5. **Prepare to meet needs created by impending retirement of K-12 teachers and administrators and higher education leadership:** Demographic data indicate that the supply of teachers in the state is declining even as the school-age population is expected to increase. The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning report, California’s Teaching Force 2010: Key Issues and Trends, states that approximately one-third of the state’s teachers are more than 50-years-old. Moreover, the same report indicates that the number of candidates in teacher preparation programs has declined by almost half in the last seven years.

6. **Align the college culture and expectations for all faculty, staff and students to consistently reflect the college vision:** The new vision that was developed through COE strategic planning provides an opportunity for faculty, staff and students to re-think perspectives and adjust behavior related to critical issues that will impact our future. New faculty hiring and standards for retention, tenure and promotion (RTP); curriculum and program outcomes (student learning goals); and the co-curricular program for students should be aligned with our vision and strategic priorities.

7. **Be part of the solution to balancing state and federal demands with research-based best practices:** State and national policy have often been at odds with educational best practices that are supported by research. The college has an opportunity to provide leadership in developing solutions.

8. **Develop a culture of engaging alumni:** As a new college, we have an opportunity to identify and connect with both recent and long-time alumni.

9. **Examine RTP requirements/processes to include value for engaged scholarship:** The university and the college expect COE faculty to be engaged in P-14 schools and communities, and to have an impact on educational change at the local, regional, state and national levels. The COE
has an opportunity to re-examine RTP standards in light of these expectations, and to consider alternative processes or standards for evaluating scholarly achievements.

10. **Proactively frame the dialogue around diversity in students, program, and research; have a national impact on how diverse populations can succeed:** The diversity of CSUF and the communities that we serve provide opportunities for cutting-edge research and practice that can have a national impact.

**COE Threats**

Threats are those forces that can inhibit or prevent COE from achieving its vision for the future. Threats can arise from the environment, such as political, social, competitive, technological or economic forces. Threats can also arise from within the university such as resource shortages, competing goals, or lack of support from needed constituents. Elements of the strategic plan will focus on overcoming these threats when feasible.

The strategic planning task force identified a number of threats facing COE. The planning subcommittee summarized this discussion and identified the following as the major threats facing COE:

1. **Resource shortages and economic uncertainty affect programs and staffing, grant support and assessment:** The ongoing California State budget crisis and stagnant economy will continue to have a negative impact on enrollment and resources. The recent rapid increase of CSU fees allows competitors to develop and advertise similarly priced programs that have a faster pace. Opportunities for external fund raising – both public and private – are reduced due to the continuing economic downturn.

2. **Public perception and misassumptions about role, quality and competence of teachers and institutions:** There has been an increase recently in negative portrayals of education and educators in the popular media. Problems in the public schools are perceived as the fault of teachers and teacher education programs, making it more difficult to obtain support for COE efforts and initiatives.

3. **Rapidly changing technology:** The rapid pace of change in technology makes it difficult to anticipate needs, and to maintain currency in faculty and student skills. Limited resources for equipment, software, training and support are problematic. There are also emerging problems regarding quality control and issues such as authentication of student work.
4. **Shifting standards and mandates from regulatory agencies:** Increasing political involvement in education law and policy impacts the work of the COE as well as P-14 schools, and sometimes results in a disconnect between teacher and administrator preparation and what happens in schools and classrooms. New prescriptive mandates and continually shifting accreditation standards affect the directions that COE programs can take.

5. **Organizational resistance:** Other campus constituents, including faculty and administrators (both long-term and new, both internal and external), may impede changes that the COE wants to make, particularly related to RTP processes and standards. The COE is sometimes seen as the “forgotten college” and may be seen as disconnected from the rest of the university because of the level (post-baccalaureate only) and nature (professional) of its programs.

**COE Strategic Plan for 2011-2016**

Following completion of the environmental scan, the Task Force and Subcommittee formulated a vision statement, reaffirmed the college mission, and developed new strategic goals and strategies, with input from the broader College of Education community. Each of these elements is described and stated in the following text.

**Vision**

A vision statement reflects the aspirations of the college, as it looks five years into the future. It reflects how the COE could excel, given the realities of the university and state systems. The vision identifies the defining characteristics of the college that will differentiate it from others in the future (Tromp & Ruben, 2010).

The current COE vision statement was developed during this strategic planning process and it differs from prior vision statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COE Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>We aspire to be transformational leaders who advance the readiness of all learners to actively participate in an ever-changing, diverse and digital world.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission

A mission statement reflects the primary purpose for which the college exists and how its mission fits into, and contributes to the larger university mission. The mission statement will also state the activities and functions that are necessary to carry out the work of the college (Tromp & Ruben, 2010). The COE mission statement was developed for the 2007 accreditation review and was not modified during this strategic planning process.

COE Mission

The COE mission is to teach, to serve, and to engage in scholarship. We teach our students to be critical thinkers and lifelong learners. We prepare professionals who improve student learning, promote diversity, make informed decisions, engage in collaborative endeavors, maintain professional and ethical standards, and become change agents in their workplaces. We engage in scholarly work that informs the profession and serve the educational community by providing applied scholarship.

Strategic Goals and Strategies for The Next 5-10 Years

The College of Education Council of Chairs worked during the summer 2011 to formulate specific goals based on all of the data that were generated during the planning year, including the SWOT analysis and input obtained from all faculty and staff during the spring college retreat.

Strategic goals are the “big ideas” that will move us closer to achieving our aspirations. They provide a purpose and reference point to gauge work and accomplishments - as steps are taken to achieve an outcome based on a future vision. A well-formulated goal is clear, shared, doable and focused on processes and outcomes. A key feature of a well-formulated goal is that it is measurable, allowing us to easily track its progress.

Strategies are the steps needed to accomplish a strategic goal. Strategies define what needs to be done and the sequence in which these steps need to be accomplished and form the basis for action plans that include responsible persons, coordination needs, budgets and time horizons for completion.
The following are highlights of the strategic goals and strategies formulated through the strategic planning process. Details about persons who will accomplish these goals/strategies, time frames for accomplishing them and budgetary considerations are located in the *Appendix* to this document.

1. **Institutionalize processes that better reflect the demands and expectations for faculty teaching, scholarship, and service.**

   Strategy 1.1: Explore modifications of RTP standards.

   Strategy 1.2: Enhance the research culture of the College of Education.

2. **Strengthen local, regional, national and international partnerships that exemplify excellence in teaching and learning.**

   Strategy 2.1: Align our partnerships to strengthen clinical components of programs for initial preparation and professional development of educators for P-12 schools.

   Strategy 2.2: Develop dynamic vision and infrastructure to expand model partnerships with P-14 schools.

   Strategy 2.3: Increase support of international partnerships to build research collaborations and opportunities for student and faculty exchanges in order to further enhance a global perspective.

3. **Prepare professionals who model and advocate just, equitable and inclusive education.**

   Strategy 3.1: Identify guidelines for partnerships to ensure they support just, equitable and inclusive education.

   Strategy 3.2: Identify and embed in our assessment system key measures in terms of candidate/graduate recruitment, retention and outcomes.

   Strategy 3.3: Identify and implement strategies in terms of recruitment and faculty development.

4. **Ensure the effective use and integration of technology to support teaching and learning throughout all COE programs, including face-to-face, hybrid and fully online learning environments.**
Strategy 4.1: Assure that new full-time and part-time faculty are competent in using technology to teach and manage instruction.

Strategy 4.2: Provide awareness of best practices and college guidelines for effective use and integration of technology including Accessible Technology Initiative.

Strategy 4.3: Incorporate technology goals into department annual goals.

Strategy 4.4: Support professional development and foster leadership in the effective use and integration of technology.

Strategy 4.5: Support acquisition of current technology resources to support effective teaching and learning with technology, aligned with University IT vision and plans.
References
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ACTION PLAN

Goal 1: Faculty Roles and Expectations

Goal Description: Institutionalize processes that better reflect the demands and expectations for faculty teaching, scholarship, and service.

Task Force Chair: Lisa Kirtman (EDEL)

Task Force Members:
- Erica Bowers (READ)
- John Hoffman (EDAD)
- Chris Street (EDSC)
- Woo Jung (SPED)

Strategy 1.1: Explore modification of RTP standards.

Key Steps/Activities:
1) Search for models of personnel standards and expectations at other institutions.
2) Examine the definition of scholarship and explore ways to improve alignment with faculty priorities.
3) Examine alignment of personnel standards among departments and consistency with college priorities.
4) Based on outcomes in year one, establish steps for years 2-5.

Funding considerations: The time required for research and development may make it necessary to provide stipends for task force members.

Communication and engagement issues: Chair of task force will contact potential members; faculty surveyed and informed throughout process concerning possible changes.

Deliverables: Analysis of model review, revised definition of scholarship, and recommendations for years 2-5.

Timeframe (start-up), milestones, target completion date: Task force to develop recommendation for a model for RTP standards for COE faculty (year 1).

Effectiveness measure(s):
1. Collect and review of Models
2. Examine definition of scholarship as it aligns with COE goals and priorities
3. Create list of recommendations for years 2-5
Strategy 1.2: Enhance the research culture of the College of Education.

Key Steps/Activities:
1) Based on outcomes in year one, review current research support.
2) Identify resources to institutionalize support for faculty and student research and scholarship.
3) Create list of recommendations for enhancing the research culture.

Funding considerations: Continued funding of COE research support (reassigned units/grad assistants or other sources of support will be needed).

Communication and engagement issues: Chair of task force will contact potential members; faculty and students surveyed and informed throughout process concerning possible changes.

Deliverables: Recommendation for resources and processes to institutionalize research support for faculty and student.

Timeframe (start-up), milestones, and target completion date: This work will begin year 2 of the 5-year plan after the RTP recommendations are completed.

Effectiveness measure(s):
1. Increased faculty and graduate student participation and presentations in research colloquia and learning communities.
2. Increased grant proposals and externally funded projects.
3. Increased faculty productivity resulting from reassigned time provided by college and EDD program.
**ACTION Plan**

**GOAL 2: Partnerships**

Goal Description: Strengthen local, regional, national and international partnerships that exemplify excellence in teaching and learning.

**Strategy 2.1: Align our partnerships to strengthen clinical components of programs for initial preparation and professional development of educators for P-12 schools.**

**Task Force Chair:** Andrea Guillaume (EDEL)

**Task Force Members:**
- Leigh Barton (EDAD)
- Maria Grant EDSC)
- Rosario Ordonez-Jasis (READ)
- Suzanne Robinson (SPED)

**Key Steps/Activities:**
1. Initiate college and unit-wide conversations on clinical practice and reform of teacher/leader preparation leading to creation of a college and unit wide definition of clinical practice.
2. Conduct co-teaching pilot and make recommendation for expansion based on results.
3. Identify best practices for clinical preparation (e.g. NCATE Blue Ribbon Report).
4. Identify gaps between best practices and current CSUF practices.
5. Develop college-wide standards for partnerships and a plan for implementation.
6. Continue to assess and cultivate partnerships.

**Funding considerations:** Some funding from other projects (Process, Chancellor’s Office grant for co-teaching pilot); need to identify resource implications of PDS model.

**Communication and engagement issues:** Faculty and district partners need to understand what is meant by clinical preparation and how it differs with our current practice.

**Deliverables:** College-wide partnership/PDS standards; PDS sites that are aligned with research-based best practices; revised curriculum and CTC program documents.
**Timeframe (start-up), milestones, target completion date:** Start-up - immediately, milestone - co-teaching pilot complete by June 2012, scale up co-teaching to all credential programs by target completion date of June 2013.

**Effectiveness measure(s):**
1. Number of PDS sites that are aligned with best practice; feedback from school district partners and teacher candidates.
2. How to move project to action: Appoint a task force including existing committee on co-teaching.

**Strategy 2.2: Develop dynamic vision and infrastructure to expand model partnerships with P-14 schools.**

**Task Force Chair:** TBD

**Task Force Members:**
- Teresa Crawford (EDEL, CCCTS)
- Dawn Person (EDAD, CREAL)
- Ula Manzo (READ, HMC Reading Center)
- Kristin Stang (SPED)

**Key Steps/Activities:**
1. Examine successful practices and models used in other colleges and universities (e.g., use Eduventures reports).
2. Inventory existing partnerships.
3. Assess interests and needs of school districts, colleges and other partners.
4. Develop innovative and creative model that will provide services that schools want and need, opportunities for CSUF students and resources that support these partnerships.
5. Develop mechanism (Web site, journal, etc.) to document and promote partnerships and programs.

**Funding considerations:** Secure seed money and develop mechanism to make it self-supporting.

**Communication and engagement issues:** Budget crisis may hinder school district involvement.

**Deliverables:** Web site, model partnership agreement, brochures/flyers and business plan.

**Timeframe (start-up), milestones, target completion date:** Spring 2012 pending progress of TF 2.1.
Effectiveness measure(s):
1. Number of districts/schools/agencies in partnership.
2. Number of activities sponsored by partnership.
3. Sustainability of model (funding to support activities).

**Strategy 2.3:** Increase support of international partnerships to build research collaborations and opportunities for student and faculty exchanges in order to further enhance a global perspective.

**Task Force Chair:** Melinda Pierson (SPED)

**Task Force Members:**
- Nawang Phuntsog (EDEL)
- JoAnn Carter-Wells (READ)
- John Hoffman (EDAD)
- Vita Jones (SPED)
- Debra Ambrosetti (EDSC)
- Rick Harrington (UEE)
- Mikyong Kim-Goh (International Programs)

**Key Steps/Activities:**
1. Establish Center for International Partnerships in Education.
2. Develop opportunities to study in international schools.
3. Generate funds through grants, donations, etc.
4. Host an international conference for faculty and students around the world.

**Funding considerations:** University center expansion program, external-funding opportunities.

**Communication and engagement issues:** Awareness within departments to students (admission overviews), international partners.

**Deliverables:** Increase in research published/disseminated, increase in global partnerships, student & faculty involvement.

**Timeframe (start-up), milestones, target completion date:** Start-up immediately with completion in three years.

**Effectiveness measure(s):**
1. Published research and student participation in study abroad programs.
2. Strong, on-going global partnerships.
3. Increases in global awareness of students.
ACTION PLAN

Goal 3: Just, Equitable and Inclusive Education

Goal Description: Prepare professionals who model and advocate just, equitable and inclusive education.

Task Force Chair: Mark Ellis (EDSC)

Task Force Members:
- Pablo Jasis (EDEL)
- Julian Jefferies (READ)
- Minerva Chavez (EDSC)
- Jackie Counts (Anaheim UHSD)
- Janice Myck-Wayne (SPED)
- Eugene Fujimoto (EDAD)
- Daniel Choi (EDAD)
- Teresa Crawford (EDEL) (Ex-Officio as Director of Accreditation and Assessment)

Strategy 3.1: Identify guidelines for partnerships to ensure they support just, equitable and inclusive education.

Key Steps/Activities:
1. Identify expectations for how COE partnerships can positively impact P-16 educational practices and outcomes.
2. Define “partnership” in terms of commitment to just, equitable and inclusive education.
3. Create template for formal approval/acknowledgement of partnerships (e.g., MOU).
4. Track outcome data on partnerships in terms of program improvement for both university and district/community partners.

Deliverables: See key steps.

Timeframe (start-up), milestones, target completion date: Three years

Effectiveness measure(s): Assessment of outcome measures.
Strategy 3.2: Identify and embed in our assessment system key measures in terms of candidate/graduate recruitment, retention and outcomes.

**Key Steps/Activities:**
1. Review disposition/research in this area.
2. Identify existing data.
3. Create and implement assessment.
4. Results inform changes in college programs/classes.

**Timeframe (start-up), milestones, target completion date:** Three years.

**Effectiveness measure(s):**
1. Baseline data re: candidate and graduate recruitment, completion, and dispositions show growth when compared with exit data.
2. Data are used to inform program design and course curricula.

**How to move the project to action:** Collaboration with COE Assessment Committee

Strategy 3.3: Identify and implement strategies in terms of recruitment and faculty development.

**Key Steps/Activities:**
1. Develop college-wide model and resources for recruitment of full-time and part-time faculty. (e.g. qualifications, interview questions, advertising, etc.).
2. Create opportunities for faculty development including an outside facilitator.

**Funding considerations:** Cost of outside expert on faculty development approximately $5,000.

**Deliverables:** Outcome measures and document samples for the hiring process.

**Timeframe (start-up), milestones, target completion date:** Three years.

**Effectiveness measure(s):**
1. Increase the proportion of faculty who: a) are reflective of the backgrounds of PK-16 students in Southern California region and statewide and b) have experience working in educational settings that effectively model just, equitable, and inclusive practices.
2. Demonstrate commitment to supporting faculty in modeling just, equitable, and inclusive education.
ACTION PLAN

Goal 4: Technology

Goal Description: Ensure the effective use and integration of technology to support teaching and learning throughout all COE programs, including face-to-face, hybrid, and fully online learning environments.

Task Force Chair: Loretta Donovan, (EDEL)

Task Force Members (Technology Committee):
- Natalie Tran (EDSC)
- Suzanne Robinson (SPED)
- Barbara Glaeser (SPED)
- Catherine Maderazo (READ)
- JoAnn Carter-Wells (MSIDT)
- Daniel Choi (EDAD)
- Cynthia Gautreau (EDEL)
- Dave Gomez-Garcia (COE/IT staff) - Ex-Officio
- Karen Ivers (Associate Dean) - Ex-Officio

Strategy 4.1: Assure that new full-time and part-time faculty are competent in using technology to teach and manage instruction.

Key Steps/Activities:
Develop college-wide model and resources for recruitment of full-time and part-time faculty (e.g. qualifications, interview questions, advertising, etc.).

Funding considerations: None.

Communication and engagement issues: Consistency addressing individual departments' needs.

Deliverables: New faculty competent in technology.

Timeframe (start-up), milestones, target completion date: Starting fall 2011; implement fall 2012.

Effectiveness measure(s):
1. Successful searches.
2. Evidence of new faculty technology competencies in learning environment (syllabi, SOQs, class visit).
3. New faculty participation in technology workshops and willingness to stay current.
4. New faculty leadership in technology.

**Strategy 4.2: Provide awareness of best practices and college guidelines for effective use and integration of technology including ATI.**

**Key Steps/Activities:**
1. Provide a dedicated COE retreat on best technology practices.
2. Post best practices, guidelines and resources on COE PORT site.
3. Update syllabus template to include emphasis on effective technology use.
4. Update COE online course checklist for courses moving to online.
5. Share best practices and resources at department meetings and Council of Chairs meetings.

**Funding considerations:** None.

**Communication and engagement issues:** Everyone’s access of PORT, participation in retreat. Work with COE Curriculum Committee.

**Deliverables:** Syllabus template plus checklist revisions, updated PORT site, department meeting agenda, technology retreat.

**Timeframe (start-up), milestones, target completion date:** Fall 2011-2014, ongoing.

**Effectiveness measure(s):**
1. Success of technology retreat/retreat evaluations.
2. Use of PORT community website.
4. SOQ’s, college/unit assessment measures.

**Strategy 4.3: Incorporate technology goals into department annual goals.**

**Key Steps/Activities:**
1. Assess faculty needs.
2. Assess student needs.
3. Assess current technologies (resources/facilities).
4. Assess field/community needs and expectations.
5. Identify department alignment with accreditation standards.
Potential Members:
- Department faculty, chair, IT support/COE Tech. committee

Funding considerations: None.

Communication and engagement issues: Faculty agreement, buy-in, need to share amongst department (place on PORT) and department levels.

Deliverables: Articulation in writing (annual goals in department annual reports).

Timeframe (start-up), milestones, target completion date: Begin fall 2011; implement fall 2012.

Effectiveness measure(s):
1. Annual report
2. Yearly internal assessment of stated goals
3. Accreditation results
4. External assessment