

2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

Part 1: Background Information

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

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

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: [116]

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 Single Subject (SS) Credential Program and the SS Program with Bilingual Authorization (SS/BilAuth)¹ 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 aligns with the Program Standards issued by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and key learner outcomes (Teaching Performance Expectations-TPEs) are also delineated by the CTC (see Appendix A for descriptors associated with the TPEs). Table One aligns the Baccalaureate Learning Goals with the TPEs and Table Two displays the multiple measures by which all the relevant learner outcomes (WASC and CTC) are assessed by our program. Candidates earning the SS or SS/BilAuth credential complete a two semester program in which coursework and field work/student teaching are purposefully integrated to provide candidates the opportunity to integrate theory with practice and develop ever-more sophisticated skills as educators.

¹ Candidates seeking a Single Subject Credential with a Bilingual Authorization take the same core courses as those seeking a Single Subject Credential but complete additional requirements including passing a language and culture exam administered by the California 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 http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/adopted-TPEs-2013.pdf)
Y	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) *	TPE 4, 6, 9
Y	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)	TPE 1B, 8
Y	3. Written communication (WASC 3)	TPE 1B, 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 1B, 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 1B, 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 (If no, go to Q1.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q1.4)

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 and
<http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.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 ALL PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for SOME PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	3. No (If no, go to Q2.2)
	4. Don't know (Go to Q2.2)
	5. Not Applicable (Go to Q2.2)

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. Assessment #1 is assigned in a course, though the candidate work is uploaded to an electronic portfolio that all instructors can access. All other assessments are administered as part of candidate assessment for the program, but not also as part of the requirements for a course. These assessments are also completed online.

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

Assessment Tool <i>(see Appendix B for a description of each tool)</i>	Type of Assessment (formative/summative and direct/indirect)	When administered	Details about Administration	Passing Standard/Evaluation Criteria	CCTC TPEs and WASC Outcomes Addressed
Assessment #1: Unit Plan	Formative/ Direct	End of first semester of the program, also required for a course	Instructors use a rubric with 6 levels and 5 criteria	Score of 4.5 or above on all criteria (min score = 22.5)	TPE 1-11 (WASC 1, 3, 7, 10, 12)
Assessment #2: Field Experience Evaluation	Formative/ Direct	End of first semester of the program	Mentor teacher and university supervisor evaluate performance using a rubric with 32 criteria and 4 levels	Score of 2 or above on majority of the criteria	TPE 1-13 (WASC 1-7, 9-14, 16)
Assessment #3: Final student teaching evaluation	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 criteria and a 4 levels	Majority 3s and 4s on all criteria	TPE 1-13 (WASC 1-7, 9-14, 16)
Assessment #4: PACT Teaching Event	Summative/ Direct	Final semester	Scored by trained and calibrated assessors using a rubric with 12 criteria and 4 levels	No more than 2 scores of "1" and 50% of scores for each individual task must be higher than "1"	TPEs 1-11 (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 SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
X	2. In ALL 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 appropriately 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 SS and SS/BilAuth Credential Program Candidates Completing the Program in Spring 2014 (N=116)

Assessment Tool	Fall 2013	Spring 2014
Assessment #1: Unit Plan	25/30	
Assessment #2: Field Experience Evaluation	3.14/4.0	
Assessment #3: Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) Teaching Event		Planning average: 2.73/4.0 Instruction average: 2.39/4.0 Assessment average: 2.6/4.0 Reflection average: 2.49/4.0 Academic language average: 2.21/4.0
Assessment #4: Final Student Teaching Evaluation		Planning average: 3.81/4.0 Instruction average: 3.74/4.0 Assessment average: 3.82/4.0 Professionalism average: 3.9/4.0

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 4 measures identified above. For the Unit Plan, all candidates met or exceeded the passing standard. All but 4 candidates met the passing standard for the Field Experience. The four that did not repeated this experience in spring 2014 and met the standard upon repeating. On the PACT Teaching Event, all candidates passed except for 7 candidates, 4 of whom will return in the fall to make a second and final attempt at passing this assessment. 3 of the candidates will submit a new PACT Teaching Event during the 2014 summer session. In the final semester of student teaching, six candidates failed to demonstrate all of the required competencies and will return in fall 2014 to repeat this experience. One candidate failed both summative assessments administered in the program in the final semester (final student teaching evaluation and the PACT Teaching Event). This candidate will have an opportunity to repeat the final semester, but is also reconsidering teaching as a professional choice. Overall, despite the number of candidates who will return to repeat one key experience and therefore be subject to additional assessments, most of the candidates demonstrated the required learner outcomes on the full range of assessments administered by 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) ¹
	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 CORE 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

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 Unit Plan	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 criteria/4 level rubric used to evaluate Teaching Event

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 only
	2. No
	3. Don't know

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

X	1. Yes, for PACT Teaching Event only
	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?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)

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
	7. Others, specify:

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 (If no, go to Q4.6)

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

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

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

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]

The Unit Plan is a course-embedded signature assessment and must be completed for course credit. Instructors complete their evaluation of the unit plan, using the faculty developed rubric, and then submit all scores to the department chair for program assessment purposes. The field experience and student teaching evaluations are connected to work that candidates complete in the field (7-12 classrooms) and are submitted using our on-line portfolio platform (TaskStream). All evaluation data for these two experiences are entered into TaskStream and reports are generated for faculty to review. Candidates upload their PACT Teaching Event to TaskStream where evaluators (blind assignment) can access and evaluate the work. A TaskStream manager (CoE staff person) and the Teaching Credentials Department Chair monitor the scoring process so that all state-approved protocols, including double scoring for any initial fail, are followed. At the conclusion of PACT scoring, a report is generated for faculty review. The PACT is a stand-alone assessment (mandated by the CTC).

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. The rubric for the Unit Plan was developed by a faculty team. This team does not engage in training or calibration but it is a stable team (has not changed in 3 years) and the members engage in regular discussion in order to refine the rubric criteria and levels and ensure that there is consistency in evaluation. The field experience and student teaching evaluation protocols are used by university supervisors and mentor teachers. There is limited training for both groups and no calibration. The PACT Teaching Event scoring is monitored by the Teaching Credentials Department Chair who ensures that all scorers have received the requisite training and are calibrated using official calibration materials from the PACT consortium each year. There are internal reliability checks conducted and when double scoring has occurred, there has been adequate reliability.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total did you use to assess this PLO? [4]**

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**]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
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		X			
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.

The assessment data indicate that there are still inconsistencies across sections of the same course and in the ways that program expectations and key ideas are communicated across a variety of educators connected with the program, including university instructors, university supervisors and mentor teachers. Faculty and university supervisors examined the assessment data at the conclusion of the spring 2014 semester and identified the following changes: (a) professional development offerings for mentor teachers so that they were more familiar with program components and expectations; (b) modifications in key courses (assignments, readings, in-class activities) so that candidates received more opportunity to integrate theory with practice.

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 Q5.1.1.

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

	2. No (If no, go to Q5.3)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q5.3)

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]

We will implement a small scale professional development session for our mentor teachers in fall 2014. We will introduce several new assignments in the Single Subject Seminar including a series of field observation tasks and an analysis of the student teaching binder. We will conduct the same assessments used this year and anticipate there will be some improvements in specific criteria as well as in the feedback we receive in response to a mid-program survey and end-of-program focus group. While we do anticipate some improvement, we must also note that the key variables change from year to year – new candidates, new mentor teachers and new supervisors. The level of dynamism in our system makes steady improvement not necessarily quantifiable.

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

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

We will review feedback from candidates about their experience during our annual focus group sessions. We will also collect anecdotal feedback from supervisors and instructors about the extent to which candidates are making connections among program components, due to the changes identified above.

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 a focus group at the end of the final 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, 8 week modules, etc.). During 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 these two processes is fairly positive with candidates indicating they feel relatively well-prepared and knowledgeable. Candidates have requested more coordination among professors so that the assignments are more streamlined. We think actions outlined in Q5.2.1. will address some of these concerns.

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

Assessed in 2014-15?	WASC Baccalaureate Standards	California Commission on Teacher Credentialing: Teaching Performance Expectations (see http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/adopted-TPEs-2013.pdf)
Y	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) *	TPE 4, 6, 9
Y	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)	TPE 1B, 8
Y	3. Written communication (WASC 3)	TPE 1B, 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 1B, 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 1B, 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:	

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 developed 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 updated 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: [Single Subject + Single 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: [Single Subject, Single 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: CTC's Teacher Performance Expectations – Learner Outcomes for the Single Subject and Single Subject with Bilingual Authorization Credential Programs
(adopted by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2003 and available in full text at: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/TPA-files/TPEs-Full-Version.pdf>)

Making Subject matter Comprehensible to Students

TPE 1: Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction for Single Subject

- Understanding state-adopted academic content standards & how to teach the subject matter in the standards
- Planning to teach to the standards
- Demonstrating the ability to teach to the standards

Assessing Student Learning

TPE 2: Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction

- Determining student progress toward achieving the state-adopted academic content standards
- Supporting students' learning during instruction

TPE 3: Interpretation and Use of Assessments

- Understanding of assessments
- Using and interpreting assessments
- Giving feedback on assessments

Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning

TPE 4: Making Content Accessible

- Addressing state-adopted academic content standards
- Prioritizing and sequencing essential skills and strategies
- Using various strategies to facilitate student learning

TPE 5: Student Engagement

- Understanding of goals
- Ensuring active and equitable participation
- Monitoring student progress

TPE 6: Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices in Grades 9-12

- Understanding important concepts about the learners
- Designing instructional activities
- Providing appropriate educational experiences

TPE 7: Teacher English Learners

- Knowledge of important concepts about English learners
- Understanding theories, principles and instructional practices
- Applying theories, principles and instructional practices for comprehensive instruction of EL Ss

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students

TPE 8: Learning about Students

- Child and adolescent development
- Assessment of students
- Student' needs and abilities

TPE 9: Instructional Planning

- Establishing goals
- Connecting academic content to the students
- Selecting strategies/activities/materials

Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning

TPE 10: Instructional Time

- Allocating and managing instructional time
- Reflecting on the use of instructional time

TPE 11: Social Environment

- Understanding the importance of the social environment
- Establishing a positive environment for learning
- Engaging in behaviors that support a positive environment

Developing as a Professional Educator

TPE 12: Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations AND TPE 13: Professional Growth

- Evaluating teaching practice
- Improving teaching practice
- Reflection and feedback

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

Unit Plan: Candidates develop a three lesson unit plan which begins with qualitative descriptions of pupils in the candidate's classroom. The candidate articulates the ways in which the lessons address student needs and interests. S/he also identifies ways in which the lessons are thematically united by student activities designed to deepen their understanding of an essential question for the content area. The unit plan also includes key pupil assessments and uses the "Understanding by Design" framework for instructional planning.

Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT): The 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. The Teaching Event is scored using a rubric with 12 criteria and 4 levels; it 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 the rubric to score the Teaching Event. (to view the Teaching Event Handbook for Single Subject content areas and the associated scoring rubrics, go to http://www.pacttpa.org/_main/hub.php?pageName=Home)

Field Experience Evaluation Protocol: This is a rubric with 32 criteria (a subset of the student teaching evaluation protocol described below) and 4 levels. Key criteria focus the evaluator's (university supervisor and mentor teacher) attention on candidate's ability to engage students of diverse abilities and backgrounds, plan meaningful instruction, assess student progress and maintain standards of professionalism.

Student Teaching Evaluation Protocol: This rubric has 43 criteria and 4 levels. It 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 mentor 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>)