January 28, 2001

Dr. Denise Thomas
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
2029 K Street N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Dr. Thomas:

This is to acknowledge receipt of the NCATE Board of Examiners Report subsequent to their November 11-15, 2000 visitation. The following constitutes our rejoinder to the description of decisions for each standard.

Category I: Design of Professional Education
C. Weaknesses Continued from the Previous Visit
   None
D. New Weaknesses
   Standard I A (Initial and Advanced) There is no evidence to indicate that the conceptual framework had been built on a theoretical base or informed by current research.

   Appropriate administrators in the School of Education have met to develop a plan to address this weakness through the following:
   1. A systematic analysis of the data that has served as the Knowledge Base of the theoretical base for the Conceptual Framework.
   2. An inductive examination of Knowledge Bases across programs (i.e., the standards of professional organizations the teaching profession and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing);
   3. Articulation of the analysis and examination by adding another dimension to our Conceptual Framework that identifies the common pedagogical theories and research base of all Knowledge Bases in the Educational Unit; and
   4. Development of a matrix explicating the commonalities of these theories and their research base.

This process will be conducted at multiple levels and will involve all faculty and administrators in the Educational Unit. Discussion will occur within individual academic departments and programs, Accreditation Team 2005, the Credential Programs Committee, the CHDCS Council of Chairs, and the All University Responsibility for Teacher Education Committee (AURTEC). Discussion will include the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the CHDCS Dean the CHDCS Associate Dean and Director of the School of Education, and Deans of other colleges in which Education programs are housed.

Category II: Candidates in Professional Education
C. Weaknesses Continued from the Previous Visit
   None
D. New Weaknesses
   None
Category III: Professional Education Faculty
C. Weaknesses Continued from the Previous Visit

*Standard III.C (Advanced) Graduate teaching load is excessive. (Continued)*

Appropriate administrators in the School of Education have met to develop a plan to address this weakness through the following:

1. The CHDCS Dean and the CHDCS Associate Dean and Director of the School of Education will meet with the Vice President, Academic Affairs to develop a plan for adjusting the teaching load for faculty who teach in graduate programs.

2. Revise the current method of analyzing teaching loads. Currently, only 300 level courses are distinguished from all others (credential courses are 400 level, graduate courses are 500 level). New data analyses will differentiate between prerequisite, credential, and graduate teaching assignments. This will allow a more accurate assessment of the graduate teaching loads of faculty.

3. Research how other CSU Units of Education and the CSU Fullerton College of Business and Economics deal with this problem.

4. Work with the CSU Chancellor's Office to determine the CSU System's position on this issue.

D. New Weaknesses

*None*

Category IV: The Unit for Professional Education
E. Weaknesses Continued from the Previous Visit

*None*

F. New Weaknesses

*None*

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the report submitted by the NCATE Board of Examiners. We found the visit to be a valuable experience and learned much in the process.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Judith Ramirez, Ph.D.
Acting Dean, College of Human Development and Community Service

Enclosures

cc: Ephraim Smith, Vice President, Academic Affairs
Keith Boyum, Acting Associate Vice President, Academic Programs
Mickey Hollis, Acting CHDCS Associate Dean, and Director of the School of Education
Members, Accreditation 2000 Committee
Members, Accreditation 2003 Committee