

# 2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

## Part 1: Background Information

**B1. Program name:** [Multiple Subject Credential Program and Multiple Subject Credential with Bilingual Authorization Program]

**B2. Report author(s):** [Pia Wong]

**B3. Fall 2012 enrollment:** [ 120 ]

Use the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment: (<http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html>).

**B4. Program type:** [SELECT ONLY ONE]

	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
XX	2. Credential
	3. Master's degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

### Brief description of program characteristics.

The CSUS Multiple Subject (MS) Credential Program and the MS Program with Bilingual Authorization (MS/BilAuth)<sup>1</sup> focus on preparing novice teachers to be effective educators in typical California public school settings, e.g., those that serve a primarily low income and culturally, linguistically and racially diverse student body. The program is guided by a set of principles which articulate the faculty vision and align with the Program Standards issued by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (see Appendix A). Table One aligns the Baccalaureate Learning Goals with our state accreditation standards and Table Two displays the ways in which all the relevant learner outcomes (WASC and CTC) are assessed by our program. Candidates earning the MS or MS/BilAuth credential complete a two or three semester program in which coursework and field work/student teaching are aligned to provide candidates the opportunity to integrate theory with practice and develop ever-more sophisticated skills as educators. The primary outcome indicators for candidates are a set of 13 Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) adopted by the state; the program uses multiple measures to evaluate candidate performance against these TPEs. (see link to TPEs here: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/adopted-TPEs-2013.pdf>)

---

<sup>1</sup> Candidates seeking a Multiple Subject Credential with a Bilingual Authorization take the same courses as those seeking a Multiple Subject Credential but complete additional requirements including passing a language and culture exam, administered externally by the California State Department of Education, completing additional coursework, and conducting student teaching in a bilingual setting. Because the core program is basically the same, these programs are discussed together in this report.

## Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

### Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed **in 2013-2014**.

**Q1.1.** Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess **in 2013-2014**? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

Assessed?	WASC Baccalaureate Standards	California Commission on Teacher Credentialing: Teaching Performance Expectations (see <a href="http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/adopted-TPEs-2013.pdf">http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/adopted-TPEs-2013.pdf</a> )
Y	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) *	TPE 4, 6, 9
Y	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)	TPE 1, 8
Y	3. Written communication (WASC 3)	TPE 1, 9
Y	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)	TPE 4, 5, 6
Y	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)	TPE 2, 3, 7
Y	6. Inquiry and analysis	TPE 5, 8
Y	7. Creative thinking	TPE 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11
NA	8. Reading	
Y	9. Team work	TPE 8, 11, 12, 13
Y	10. Problem solving	TPE 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10
Y	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global	TPE 11
Y	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency	TPE 4, 5, 7, 8, 11
Y	13. Ethical reasoning	TPE 1, 3, 4, 8, 12
Y	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning	TPE 13
NA	15. Global learning	
Y	16. Integrative and applied learning	All TPEs
NA	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge	
NA	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline	
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above:	

\* One of the WASC's new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance at graduation in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy**.

#### **Q1.1.1.** Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

We have cross-referenced our state accreditation program standards and performance outcomes onto the Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (SSBLGs) and displayed this alignment in the table for Question 1.

**Q1.2.** Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q1.3.** Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

X	1. Yes, by California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
	2. No <b>(If no, go to Q1.4)</b>
	3. Don't know <b>(Go to Q1.4)</b>

**Q1.3.1.** If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q1.4.** Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)*\* to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No, but I know what DQP is. *Our program does not terminate in a degree but rather a credential.
	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

\* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details:

[http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The\\_Degree\\_Qualifications\\_Profile.pdf](http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf) and  
<http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNNew.html>.

## **Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.**

**Q2.1.** Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in **2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

X	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for <b>ALL PLOs assessed in 2013-14.</b>
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for <b>SOME PLOs assessed in 2013-14.</b>
	3. No <b>(If no, go to Q2.2)</b>
	4. Don't know <b>(Go to Q2.2)</b>
	5. Not Applicable <b>(Go to Q2.2)</b>

**Q2.1.1.** If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

We do not assess each PLO separately. Rather, within a single assessment measure, candidates are expected to demonstrate several PLOs. Table 2 below identifies the assessment tool, delineates the CTC-TPEs assessed (with a WASC alignment included), and identifies the criteria for acceptable performance.

**Table Two: Key Assessments for the MS and MS/BilAuth  
Credential Program PLOs**

<b>Assessment Tool</b> <i>(see Appendix B for a description of each tool)</i>	<b>Type of Assessment</b>	<b>When administered</b>	<b>Details about Administration</b>	<b>Passing Standard/ Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>CCTC TPEs and WASC Outcomes Addressed</b>
Assessment #1: Community Study	Formative/ Indirect	End of first semester of the program, assigned as part of a course	Instructors use a rubric		TPE 6, 7, 8  WASC 1, 2, 4- 10, 12, 13
Assessment #2: Mathematics Mini- Teaching Event	Formative/ Direct	Culminating assignment for math methods course	Scored by instructor using a # item rubric with a 4 point scale	Score of 2 or above on all rubrics	TPE 1-5, 7-9, 13  WASC 1-7, 9, 10, 12-14
Assessment #3: Science Content Area Task	Formative/ Direct	Assigned as part of Science methods course	Scored by instructor using a 3 item rubric with a 4 point scale	Score of 2 or above on all rubrics	TPE 1-7, 9  WASC 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 13
Assessment #4: Language/ Literacy Content Area Task	Formative/ Direct	Assigned as part of Literacy methods course	Scored by instructor using a 3 item rubric with a 4 point scale	Score of 2 or above on all rubrics	TPE 1-7, 9, 13  WASC 1-7, 9, 10, 12-14
Assessment #5: History/Social Science Content Area Task	Formative/ Direct	Assigned as part of Social Studies methods course	Scored by instructor using one rubric with a 4 point scale	Score of 2 or above	TPE 1-7, 9, 13  WASC 1-7, 9, 10, 12-14
Assessment #6: Final student teaching evaluation – tool used over two semesters	Summative/ Direct	In final semester at the midterm and at the end of the semester	Mentor teacher and university supervisor evaluate performance using a standard protocol with 43 items and a 4 point scale	Majority 3s and 4s on all items	All TPEs  WASC 1-7, 9- 14, 16

Assessment Tool (see Appendix B for a description of each tool)	Type of Assessment	When administered	Details about Administration	Passing Standard/ Evaluation Criteria	CCTC TPEs and WASC Outcomes Addressed
Assessment #7: PACT Teaching Event	Summative/ Direct	Final semester	Scored by trained and calibrated assessors using a 12 item rubric with a 4 point scale	No more than 2 scores of “1” and 50% of scores for each task above “1” on the 12 rubrics	TPEs1-11  WASC 1-7, 9-14, 16

**Q2.2.** Have you published the **PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s)** you assessed in 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q3.1)

**Q2.2.1.** If yes, where were the **PLOs/expectations/rubrics** published? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

	1. In <b>SOME</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
X	2. In <b>ALL</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
X	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university’s strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university’s budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

### Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

**Q3.1.** Was assessment data/evidence collected for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don’t know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

**Q3.2.** If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don’t know (Go to Part 3)

	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)
--	----------------------------------

**Q3.3.** If yes, what **DATA** have you collected? What are the **results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s)** for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including **tables and graphs** if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

We do not assess each program learning outcome individually since much of how candidates are assessed are through authentic performances (student teaching, creating learning plans, analyzing student assessment data) where multiple skills and knowledge bases must be skillfully applied. Thus, rather than display data for each learning outcome, we have the scores for candidates (as an aggregate) on specific measures by which multiple learning outcomes are assessed.

**Table Three. Average Scores on Program Assessments for MS and MS/BilAuth Credential Program Candidates Completing the Program in Spring 2014**

Assessment Tool	Fall 2013 (N=120)	Spring 2014
Assessment #1: Community Study	<b>2.0 out of 3.0</b>	
Assessment #2: Math Mini Teaching Event	<b>2.0 out of 4.0</b>	
Assessment #3: Science Content Area Task	<b>3.2 out of 4</b>	
Assessment #4: Language/Literacy Content Area Task		<b>3.2 out of 4 (n=120)</b>
Assessment #5: History/Social Studies Content Area Task	<b>3.1 out of 4</b>	
Assessment #6: Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) Teaching Event (12 rubrics, 4 point scale) <i>(pertains only to those completing the 2 semester program)</i>		Planning average: 2.65/4.0 Instruction average: 2.51/4.0 Assessment average: 2.50/4.0 Reflection average: 2.51/4.0 Academic language average: 2.4/4.0 (N=75)
Assessment #7: Final Student Teaching Evaluation (43 rubrics, 4 point scale) <i>(pertains only to those completing the 2 semester program)</i>		Planning average: 3.73/4.0 Instruction average: 3.87/4.0 Assessment average: 3.72/4.0 Professionalism average: 3.96/4.0 (N=75)

**Q3.4.** Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

The majority of the candidates met our learning outcomes, as assessed by the 7 measures identified above. For the Community Study, the Science Content Area Task and the History/Social Studies Content Area Task, all candidates met or exceeded the passing standard. For the Math Mini Teaching Event, 2 candidates did not meet the passing standard, but all others did. These two candidates had the opportunity to resubmit their Math Mini Teaching Event after remediation. One passed, the other did not. All candidates but three passed the Language/Literacy Content Area Task. These three remediated this assessment and achieved a passing score. All candidates except two achieved a passing score on the PACT Teaching Event. One candidate will return in the fall to prepare a new Teaching Event (this candidate also did not pass final student teaching and will repeat it concurrently with preparing her new Teaching Event). The second candidate is preparing a new Teaching Event during summer session. All candidates but three met the passing standards for final student teaching. All three will return in the fall to repeat this experience. There is one candidate who has failed to meet the passing standards as evaluated by a number of assessments; this candidate will need to submit an appeal to the Credential Appeals Committee in order to be considered for continued participation in the program.

#### **Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.**

**Q4.1.** How many PLOs **in total** did your program **assess in the 2013-2014 academic year**? [13]

**Q4.2.** Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO **in 2013-14**, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) <sup>1</sup>
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
X	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

**Direct Measures****Q4.3.** Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.4)

**Q4.3.1.** Which of the following **DIRECT** measures were used? [Check all that apply]

	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
X	2. Key assignments from other <b>CORE</b> classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
X	8. Other measure. Specify: Student teaching evaluation protocol (performance measure), PACT Teaching Event rubrics

**Q4.3.2.** Please provide the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

See Appendix B for a description of the measures.

**Q4.3.2.1.** Was the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.3.** Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes, <i>with multiple PLOs</i>
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.4.** How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [Select one only]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
X, for Community Study	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
X	5. Use other means. Specify: Student teaching evaluation protocol aligned to CTC program standards, pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty to



	evaluate student teaching; State adopted 12 item/4 point rubric to evaluate Teaching Event and all Content Area Tasks
--	---

**Q4.3.5.** What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? **[Select one only]**

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
X	4. Use other means. Specify: See Q4.3.4

**Q4.3.6.** Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.7.** Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

X	1. Yes, for PACT Teaching Event and all Content Area Tasks
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.8.** Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

X	1. Yes, for PACT Teaching Event
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.9.** Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

No sampling conducted; all candidates were assessed.	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.10.** How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

All candidates were assessed.

### **Indirect Measures**

**Q4.4.** Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No <b>(If no, go to Q4.5)</b>

**Q4.4.1.** Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
X	7. Others, specify: Community study rubric

**Q4.4.2.** If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.4.3.** If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

### **Other Measures**

**Q4.5.** Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Q4.6</b> )

**Q4.5.1.** Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
X	4. Others, specify: CTC program standards, Teacher Performance Expectations

**Q4.6.** Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No ( <b>Go to Q4.7</b> )
	3. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q4.7</b> )

**Q4.6.1.** If yes, please specify: [\_\_\_\_\_]

### **Alignment and Quality**

**Q4.7.** Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

All of our assessments, except the PACT Teaching Event and student teaching evaluation, are course-embedded signature assignments. Thus, all candidates are required to complete each assessment by virtue of being enrolled and desiring to pass a course. The student work is uploaded to an online portfolio system (TaskStream) and is scored there by the instructor using the appropriate rubric(s). For assessments 2-6, instructors were trained to use the rubrics during a two day training at some point in the past and each year participate in a calibration session. For assessment #1, there is no training. There is basic training for assessment #7 but there is no calibration. We have not conducted reliability studies for assessments 2-6, but in the case of a failed assessment, a second scorer evaluates the work. If there is agreement, then the work must be remediated. If there is disagreement, a third scorer evaluates the work and a final score is adjudicated. In this way, we attempt to ensure reliability in the evaluation of assessments 2-6.

The assessments are aligned to the state-mandated TPEs and there is alignment across assessments so that candidates receive multiple opportunities to demonstrate the same competencies and outcomes. There is

strong alignment between the assessment tasks and the skills and knowledge needed to be successful in the primary performance arena, a public school and/or public school classroom. Therefore, we believe that the assessment tools measure the knowledge, skills and dispositions we are requiring and that, therefore, the data are valid.

**Q4.8.** How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [  7  ]

**NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.**

**Q4.8.1.** Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.8.2.** Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

### Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

**Q5.1.** To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	<b>Very Much (1)</b>	<b>Quite a Bit (2)</b>	<b>Some (3)</b>	<b>Not at all (4)</b>	<b>Not Applicable (9)</b>
1. Improving specific courses		X			
2. Modifying curriculum		X			
3. Improving advising and mentoring		X			
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals					
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations					
6. Developing/updating assessment plan					
7. Annual assessment reports		X			
8. Program review					
9. Prospective student and family information					
10. Alumni communication					
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)		X			
12. Program accreditation		X			
13. External accountability reporting requirement					
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					
15. Strategic planning		X			
16. Institutional benchmarking					
17. Academic policy development or modification					
18. Institutional Improvement					
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					
20. New faculty hiring					

21. Professional development for faculty and staff		X			
22. Other Specify:					

**Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.**

Our assessment data indicate that our candidates still need extra support to develop their knowledge base and skills related to pupil academic language development strategies and pupil assessment strategies. Based on the analysis of performance data from this year, we note that, though there has been growth since spring 2013 on indicators related to our candidates' ability to plan effective instruction for English learners (especially academic language development strategies) and to consistently assess their pupils, there is still room for improvement. We have created many tools in the past to support candidate growth in this area including: creating a uniform lesson plan template, where these two domains of teaching are explicitly identified, using standard language to introduce concepts related to academic language development and pupil assessment, and restructuring the first week of the program so there is a basic overview of these key concepts (and others) that is then built upon by all instructors (rather than having each instructor provide his/her own interpretation of these foundational concepts). We will continue to use these strategies while introducing two new approaches which will be important for the consistent teaching of key foundational skills (related to planning, assessment, etc.). First, the core faculty will develop collaboratively a single PowerPoint presentation for these key concepts and skills. All instructors will have access to this presentation and when referencing or enhancing instruction about these foundational skills or concepts (e.g., introducing application of the skills in a particular content area), the instructor will use the basic, collaboratively designed PowerPoint presentation as the starting point. This standardization of terms and frameworks should support candidate learning and minimize the confusion that sometimes arises when faculty definitions of core ideas vary from instructor to instructor. In addition, the faculty completed a curriculum map that aligns content from courses with field expectations and delineates the relationships between concepts and skills taught in one course to other courses in the program.

**Q5.2.** As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

Yes, see response to Q5.2.

X	1. Yes
	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Q5.3</b> )
	3. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q5.3</b> )

**Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]**

The faculty identified the changes during year end meetings. The department chair will translate the proposed changes in to a master calendar and a finalized curriculum map, which will be shared with the faculty. They will likely meet at least once during the summer to review these documents and fine-tune them. They will then be available for faculty as they finalize their syllabi and engage in kick off meetings for the 2014-2015 academic year. We anticipate the modifications will result in modest increases in assessment items that relate to academic language development strategies and assessment strategies implemented by our candidates. We also anticipate that we will receive more positive feedback from candidates about program cohesion and coherence.

**Q5.2.2.** Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

There is no direct follow up assessment. We will continue to implement our program assessment plan, which yields data about these areas for improvement.

**Q5.3.** Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

We conduct a mid-program survey and we also conduct 2 focus groups, one at the end of the fall semester and one at the end of the spring semester. The survey asks candidates to comment on the structure of the program (e.g., team-taught large lecture class followed by small “workshop”/discussion groups, field application experiences connected to the methods courses, etc.). In the fall focus group, we ask for formative feedback on candidates’ experience to date. In the spring focus group, we ask candidates to reflect on areas where they feel well-prepared and areas where they might feel deficient. On the whole, the data collected from all three processes is fairly positive with candidates indicating they feel relatively well-prepared and knowledgeable. Candidates have requested less “communication” in a more consistent medium (e.g., not SacCT AND email AND professor webpage) and they also request more “coordination” (such as that proposed above as improvements we intend to implement for next year.)

**Question 6 (Q6).** Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

Assessed in 2014-2015?	WASC Baccalaureate Standards	California Commission on Teacher Credentialing: Teaching Performance Expectations (see <a href="http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/adopted-TPEs-2013.pdf">http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/adopted-TPEs-2013.pdf</a> )
Y	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) *	TPE 4, 6, 9
Y	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)	TPE 1, 8
Y	3. Written communication (WASC 3)	TPE 1, 9
Y	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)	TPE 4, 5, 6
Y	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)	TPE 2, 3, 7
Y	6. Inquiry and analysis	TPE 5, 8
Y	7. Creative thinking	TPE 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11
NA	8. Reading	
Y	9. Team work	TPE 8, 11, 12, 13
Y	10. Problem solving	TPE 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10
Y	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global	TPE 11
Y	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency	TPE 4, 5, 7, 8, 11
Y	13. Ethical reasoning	TPE 1, 3, 4, 8, 12

Y	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning	TPE 13
NA	15. Global learning	
Y	16. Integrative and applied learning	All TPEs
NA	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge	
NA	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline	
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were <b>assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above:</b>	

### Part 3: Additional Information

**A1.** In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
X	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet <b>developed</b> a formal assessment plan

**A2.** In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
X	9. Have not yet <b>updated</b> the assessment plan

**A3.** Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A4.** Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A5.** Does the program have any capstone class?

	1. Yes
--	--------

X	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A5.1.** If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [\_\_\_\_\_]

**A6.** Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A7.** Name of the academic unit: [Multiple Subject + Multiple Subject/Bilingual Authorization Credential Program]

**A8.** Department in which the academic unit is located: [Teaching Credentials]

**A9.** Department Chair's Name: [Pia Wong]

**A10.** Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [1]

**A11.** College in which the academic unit is located:

	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
X	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

***Undergraduate Degree Program(s):***

**A12.** Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_ \_\_]

**A12.1.** List all the name(s): [\_\_\_\_\_]

**A12.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [\_\_ \_\_]

***Master Degree Program(s):***

**A13.** Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_ \_\_]

**A13.1.** List all the name(s): [\_\_\_\_\_]

**A13.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? [\_\_\_\_\_]

***Credential Program(s):***

**A14.** Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: [2]

**A14.1.** List all the names: [Multiple Subject, Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization]

***Doctorate Program(s)***

**A15.** Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_\_\_\_]

**A15.1.** List the name(s): [\_\_\_\_\_]

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit\*?

	1. Yes
X	2. No

\*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: \_\_\_\_\_

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: \_\_\_\_\_



## APPENDIX A: Guiding Principles for the Multiple Subject and Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization Programs

Teacher candidates in the College of Education multiple subject teacher preparation program will exit our program with the knowledge, skills and habits of mind needed to transform education into a tool for social equity as opposed to a tool for the reproduction of an unequal status quo. They will do this by:

1. Using resources in such a way that every child in grades K-8 has multiple and varied opportunities (school and other contexts) to reach his/her full potential.
2. Using informed, research-oriented, culturally competent practices to remove barriers to learning and equalize opportunities to learn for all children/youth in the K-8 public education system.
3. Viewing the uniqueness of every child, parent/guardian, and community as a strength rather than a weakness or deficit.
4. Developing robust understandings of how to promote educational equity through participation in structured field experiences in contexts that serve large numbers of low-income, culturally and linguistically diverse students.
5. Knowing how to effectively motivate students in their learning and their behavior, including creating a caring learning community, exhibiting leadership and skills to maintain a successful and safe learning community.
6. Setting goals and purposes for learning and making strategic/deliberate decisions about resources and methods.
7. Knowing the discipline including its big ideas, thought processes and dispositions (tools?) (e.g., historical thinking, scientific method, math...Stephanie?). This includes recognizing own gaps in content knowledge and taking the initiative to develop understandings to the point that effective teaching can occur.
8. Gaining knowledge and experience needed to be confident and competent teaching the full curriculum (all content areas) to students.
9. Developing/deepening habits of mind and related practices that emphasize “growth.” Modeling and acting upon these attributes consistently. Experiencing success and efficacy in varied teaching and learning contexts with students that represent California’s demographics.
10. Engaging in action research and inquiry as a way of developing realistic, rigorous, and effective educational approaches that promote educational equity.
11. Using assessment at multiple points to evaluate, reflect, inform and reset goals.
12. Thinking analytically and acting (intentionally, strategically, reflectively, proactively) to ensure that their work meets standards of excellence and increases opportunity for access and equity for their students.
13. Working effectively as members of a team, where leadership and collaboration skills are simultaneously required.
14. Cultivating an evolving philosophy that is actualized.
15. Contributing to a caring, ethical community of professionals that maintains the highest standards of practice and professional engagement.
16. Extending the core knowledge they developed in the CoE through continued study, participation in networks, and active, critical reflection on their professional practice.

## Appendix B: Description of Assessment Tools used in the Multiple Subject Credential Program

Community Study: To complete the community study, candidates conduct an extensive and nested inquiry into the communities that make up their student teaching school context. They examine data from demographics sources about cultural, ethnic, language and social class factors of the community where the school resides. They also collect data related to the school, its funding sources, its governance structure, the program it offers and characteristics of its staff. They finally complete a mini-ethnographic study of the students in their particular classroom, gathering data about individual student background, experiences, and other factors. They are required to take this information into account when planning instruction.

### Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT):

- PACT Teaching Event is a summative assessment that evaluates a candidate's ability to plan, instruct, assess and reflect on high quality instruction that attends to content knowledge, skills acquisition and academic language development. Candidates plan a 3-5 lesson learning segment, teach it, video tape all lessons, and analyze student work connected to the lessons. The entire sequence must also include strategies to develop students' academic language acquisition. Finally, candidates use theoretical frameworks related to teaching and learning to synthesize lessons about teaching practice from the experience. Multiple Subject candidates at Sacramento State complete a Teaching Event in Elementary Mathematics. The Teaching Event is scored using a 12 item rubric that has been field tested and approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing as meeting its standards for reliability and validity. Trained and calibrated evaluators (mostly our faculty) use these rubrics to score the Teaching Event. (to view the Teaching Event Handbook for Elementary Mathematics and the scoring rubrics, go to [http://www.pacttpa.org/\\_main/hub.php?pageName=Home](http://www.pacttpa.org/_main/hub.php?pageName=Home))
- PACT Content Area Tasks have been developed for each of the core content areas of the K-8 curriculum in addition to mathematics including: science, history/social studies, and English/Language Arts. The Content Area Tasks focus on one component of the Teaching Event (planning, instruction or assessment) and use the corresponding rubrics.
- Mini-Teaching Event uses a subset of Teaching Event tasks and rubrics.

Student Teaching Evaluation Protocol: This is a 43 item rubric that evaluates candidates' ability to plan instruction, deliver content, manage student behavior, optimize student engagement, assess student learning, and conduct themselves in a professional and ethical manner. The rubric is aligned with the state-mandated Teaching Performance Expectations. University supervisors and cooperating teachers assess candidates twice per semester using this rubric. (to view this assessment measure, go to pages 25-29 of the program Handbook:

<http://www.csus.edu/coe/academics/credentials/handbooks/assets/hbk-cred-ms-field-placement-20130906.pdf>)