

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1. Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs) **did you assess in 2014-2015?** [Check all that apply]

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| ☐ | 1. Critical thinking |
| ☐ | 2. Information literacy |
| ☐ | 3. Written communication |
| ☐ | 4. Oral communication |
| ☐ | 5. Quantitative literacy |
| ☒ | 6. Inquiry and analysis |
| ☐ | 7. Creative thinking |
| ☐ | 8. Reading |
| ☐ | 9. Team work |
| ☐ | 10. Problem solving |
| ☐ | 11. Civic knowledge and engagement |
| ☐ | 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency |
| ☐ | 13. Ethical reasoning |
| ☐ | 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning |
| ☐ | 15. Global learning |
| ☐ | 16. Integrative and applied learning |
| ☐ | 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge |
| ☐ | 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline |
| ☐ | 19. Other, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above: |
| | a. |
| | b. |
| | c. |

Q1.3. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| ☒ | 1. Yes |
| ☐ | 2. No |
| ☐ | 3. Don't know |

Q1.4. Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC)?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| ☒ | 1. Yes |
| ☐ | 2. No (Go to Q1.5) |
| ☐ | 3. Don't know (Go to Q1.5) |

Q1.4.1. If the answer to Q1.4 is yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| ☒ | 1. Yes |
| ☐ | 2. No |
| ☐ | 3. Don't know |

Q1.5. Did your program use the [Degree Qualification Profile](#) (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| ☐ | 1. Yes |
| ☒ | 2. No, but I know what the DQP is |
| ☐ | 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is. |
| ☐ | 4. Don't know |

Q1.6. Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable (See Attachment I)?

Q1.2. Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information such as how your specific PLOs were **explicitly** linked to the Sac State BLGs:

This is the report for the Single Subject Teaching Credential Program.

Q1.2.1. Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| ☐ | 1. Yes, for all PLOs |
| ☒ | 2. Yes, but for some PLOs |
| ☐ | 3. No rubrics for PLOs |
| ☐ | N/A, other (please specify): |

IN QUESTIONS 2 THROUGH 5, REPORT IN DETAIL ON ONE PLO THAT YOU ASSESSED IN 2014-2015

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the selected PLO

Q2.1. Specify one PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you checked the correct box for this PLO in Q1.1):
We assessed candidates' ability to analyze data related to student learning and make instructional decisions based on that process.

Q2.2. Has the program developed or adopted **explicit** standards of performance for this PLO?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| ☒ | 1. Yes |
| ☐ | 2. No |
| ☐ | 3. Don't know |
| ☐ | 4. N/A |

Q2.3. Please provide the rubric(s) and standard of performance that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix: [Word limit: 300]

See Appendix A

Q2.4. Please indicate the category in which the selected PLO falls into.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| ☐ | 1. Critical thinking |
| ☐ | 2. Information literacy |
| ☐ | 3. Written communication |
| ☐ | 4. Oral communication |
| ☐ | 5. Quantitative literacy |
| ☒ | 6. Inquiry and analysis |
| ☐ | 7. Creative thinking |
| ☐ | 8. Reading |
| ☐ | 9. Team work |
| ☐ | 10. Problem solving |
| ☐ | 11. Civic knowledge and engagement |
| ☐ | 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency |
| ☐ | 13. Ethical reasoning |
| ☐ | 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning |
| ☐ | 15. Global learning |
| ☐ | 16. Integrative and applied learning |
| ☐ | 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge |
| ☐ | 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline |
| ☐ | 19. Other: |

Please indicate where you have published the PLO, the standard of performance, and the rubric that measures the PLO:

	Q2.5	Q2.6	Q2.7
	(1) PLO	(2) Standards of Performance	(3) Rubrics
1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO			
2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO	x	x	X
3. In the student handbook/advising handbook	X		x
4. In the university catalogue			
5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters			
6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources or activities	x	x	x
7. In 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. Other, specify:			

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for the selected PLO in 2014-2015? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No (Skip to Q6) ☐ 3. Don't know (Skip to Q6) ☐ 4. N/A (Skip to Q6)		Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for this PLO in 2014-2015? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No (Skip to Q6) ☐ 3. Don't know (Skip to Q6) ☐ 4. N/A (Skip to Q6)	
Q3.1A. How many assessment tools/methods/measures in total did you use to assess this PLO? 1		Q3.2A Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected (see Attachment II)? [Word limit: 300] The PLO is assessed through the state-mandated teaching performance assessment, the PACT Teaching Event.	
Q3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios)			
Q3.3. Were direct measures [key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No (Go to Q3.7) ☐ 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.7)		Q3.3.1. Which of the following direct measures were used? [Check all that apply] ☒ 1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences ☒ 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program ☐ 3. Key assignments from elective 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 ☐ 8. Other measure. Specify:	
Q3.3.2. Please attach the direct measure you used to collect data. See Appendix B			
Q3.4. How was the data evaluated? [Select only one] ☐ 1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (Go to Q3.5) ☐ 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class ☐ 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty ☐ 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty ☐ 5. The VALUE rubric(s) ☐ 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) ☒ 7. Used other means. Specify: Used rubric approved by our state accreditation agency.			
Q3.4.1. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know ☐ 4. N/A		Q3.4.2. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know ☐ 4. N/A	
		Q3.4.3. Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know ☐ 4. N/A	
Q3.5. How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO? All faculty. This is a state mandated assessment process.		Q3.5.1. If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know	

Q3.6. How did you select the sample of student work [papers, projects, portfolios, etc.]? All candidates are assessed. No sampling.		Q3.6.1. How did you decide how many samples of student work to review?	
Q3.6.2. How many students were in the class or program? 95	Q3.6.3. How many samples of student work did you evaluate? all	Q3.6.4. Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know	
Q3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)			
Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO? ☐ 1. Yes ☒ 2. No (Skip to Q3.8) ☐ 3. Don't know		Q3.7.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used? [Check all that apply] ☐ 1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE) ☐ 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR) ☐ 3. College/Department/program 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. Other, specify:	
Q3.7.2 If surveys were used, how was the sample size decided?		Q3.7.4. If surveys were used, what was the response rate?	
Q3.7.3. If surveys were used, briefly specify how you selected your sample.			
Q3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)			
Q3.8. Were external benchmarking data such as licensing exams or standardized tests used to assess the PLO? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No (Go to Q3.8.2) ☐ 3. Don't know		Q3.8.1. Which of the following measures were 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.) ☒ 4. Other, specify: Licensure standards	
Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to assess the PLO? ☐ 1. Yes ☒ 2. No (Go to Q3.9) ☐ 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.9)		Q3.8.3. If other measures were used, please specify:	
Q3D: Alignment and Quality			
Q3.9. Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know		Q3.9.1. Were ALL the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know	

Question 4: Data, Findings and Conclusions

Q4.1. Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions: (see Attachment III)
[Word limit: 600 for selected PLO]

Candidates earned average scores of 2.7 and 2.5 on rubrics one and two respectively. The range was from 1 to 4 and the median score on both rubrics was 3.00.

Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

The average and median scores reported above exceed the published passing standard of "2" for these skills. The data indicate that the candidates are generally performing quite well in this domain. The skills required are fairly sophisticated and generally improve as novice teachers gain more experience. These data suggest that our candidates are exiting our program with strong foundation upon which we hope they build as they enter their initial teaching positions.

Q4.3. For **selected** PLO, the student performance:

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☒ | 1. Exceeded expectation/standard |
| ☐ | 2. Met expectation/standard |
| ☐ | 3. Partially met expectation/standard |
| ☐ | 4. Did not meet expectation/standard |
| ☐ | 5. No expectation or standard has been specified |
| ☐ | 6. Don't know |

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2014-2015** and based on the prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No (Go to **Q6**)
☐ 3. Don't know (Go to **Q6**)

Q5.1.2. Do you have a plan to assess the impact of the changes that you anticipate making?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

Q5.1.1. Please describe what changes you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes. **[Word limit: 300 words]**

Our program has instituted changes related to this domain and will continue to do so. We will continue to work on standardizing the ways in which our faculty present information about this domain of teaching. Standardizing terms, examples, and activities assists candidates in developing their own understanding and skills. We will also provide more training to our university supervisors and mentor teachers in order to align our course work with candidates' field experiences.

Q5.2. How have the assessment data from last year (**2013 - 2014**) been used so far? **[Check all that apply]**

	(1) Very Much	(2) Quite a Bit	(3) Some	(4) Not at all	(8) N/A
1. Improving specific courses		x			
2. Modifying curriculum		x			
3. Improving advising and mentoring					
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals					
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations					
6. Developing/updating assessment plan					
7. Annual assessment reports					
8. Program review					
9. Prospective student and family information					
10. Alumni communication					
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					
12. Program accreditation					
13. External accountability reporting requirement					
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					
15. Strategic planning					
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. Recruitment of new students					
23. Other Specify:					

Q5.2.1. Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above.

These data indicate that measures implemented in the past are rendering some benefits in terms of candidate performance. As a faculty we will continue to articulate, as a program, ways in which we introduce, practice, deepen and evaluate the knowledge and skills associated with assessment throughout our program.

Additional Assessment Activities

Q6. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to PLOs (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected data on the program elements, please briefly report your results here. **[Word limit: 300]**

Our program conducts a range of additional assessments as candidates progress through the program. These assessments are administered as embedded signature assignments and as direct evaluations of candidate performance in the field. Overall, the data on candidate performance indicates they are well-prepared by the program.

Q7. What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| ☐ | 1. Critical thinking |
| ☐ | 2. Information literacy |
| ☐ | 3. Written communication |
| ☐ | 4. Oral communication |
| ☐ | 5. Quantitative literacy |
| ☒ | 6. Inquiry and analysis |
| ☐ | 7. Creative thinking |
| ☐ | 8. Reading |
| ☐ | 9. Team work |
| ☐ | 10. Problem solving |
| ☐ | 11. Civic knowledge and engagement |
| ☐ | 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency |
| ☐ | 13. Ethical reasoning |
| ☐ | 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning |
| ☐ | 15. Global learning |
| ☐ | 16. Integrative and applied learning |
| ☐ | 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge |
| ☐ | 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline |
| ☐ | 19. Other, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above: |
| ☐ | a. |
| ☐ | b. |
| ☐ | c. |

Q8. Have you attached any appendices? If yes, please list them all here:

A and B

Program Information

P1. Program/Concentration Name(s):
Single Subject Teaching Credential

P2. Program Director:
Pia Wong

P1.1. Report Authors: Pia Wong				P2.1. Department Chair: Pia Wong						
P3. Academic unit: Department, Program, or College: Teaching Credentials				P4. College: Education						
P5. Fall 2014 enrollment for Academic unit (See Department Fact Book 2014 by the Office of Institutional Research for fall 2014 enrollment: Fact Book does not reflect new college structure. Fall enrollment in the single subject program was 125.				P6. Program Type: [Select only one] ☐ 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major ☒ 2. Credential ☐ 3. Master's degree ☐ 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.d) ☐ 5. Other. Please specify:						
Undergraduate Degree Program(s): P7. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: P7.1. List all the name(s): P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?				Master Degree Program(s): P8. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: P8.1. List all the name(s): P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program?						
Credential Program(s): P9. Number of credential programs the academic unit has: 6 P9.1. List all the names: Multiple subject, single subject, special education-mild/moderate, special education-moderate/severe, special education-early childhood, bilingual authorization				Doctorate Program(s) P10. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: P10.1. List all the name(s):						
When was your assessment plan?	1. Before 2007-08	2. 2007-08	3. 2008-09	4. 2009-10	5. 2010-11	6. 2011-12	7. 2012-13	8. 2013-14	9. 2014-15	10. No formal plan
P11. Developed										
P12. Last updated								x		
								1. Yes	2. No	3. Don't Know
P13. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?								x		
P14. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment of student learning occurs in the curriculum?								x		
P15. Does the program have any capstone class?									x	
P16. Does the program have ANY capstone project?								Sort of		

Appendix A: Rubric for assessing candidates' ability to conduct inquiry and analysis

ASSESSMENT		ANALYZING STUDENT WORK FROM AN ASSESSMENT	
EM6: How does the candidate demonstrate an understanding of student performance with respect to standards/objectives? (TPEs 1,3)			
Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
• The criteria/rubric and analysis have little connection with the identified standards/objectives. OR • Student work samples do not support the conclusions in the analysis.	• The criteria/rubric and analysis focus on what students did right or wrong in relationship to identified standards/objectives. • The analysis of whole class performance describes some differences in levels of student learning for the content assessed.	• The criteria/rubric and analysis focus on patterns of student errors, skills, and understandings to analyze student learning in relation to standards and learning objectives. • Specific patterns are identified for individuals or subgroup(s) in addition to the whole class.	All components of Level 3 plus: • The criteria/rubric and analysis focus on partial understandings as well. • The analysis is clear and detailed.

ASSESSMENT		USING ASSESSMENT TO INFORM TEACHING	
EM7: How does the candidate use the analysis of student learning to propose next steps in instruction? (TPEs 3,4)			
Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
- Next steps are vaguely related to or not aligned with the identified student needs. OR - Next steps are not described in sufficient detail to understand them. OR - Next steps are based on inaccurate conclusions about student learning from the assessment analysis.	- Next steps focus on improving student performance through general support that addresses some identified student needs. - Next steps are based on accurate conclusions about student performance on the assessment and are described in sufficient detail to understand them.	- Next steps focus on improving student performance through targeted support to individuals and groups to address specific identified-needs. - Next steps are based on whole class patterns of performance and some patterns for individuals and/or subgroups and are described in sufficient detail to understand them.	All components of Level 3 plus: Next steps demonstrate a strong understanding of both the identified content and language standards/objectives and of individual students and/or subgroups.

APPENDIX B: Instructions for assignment related to inquiry and analysis

CSUS Single Subject Teacher Preparation Program

Task 4. Assessing Student Learning

Purpose

The Assessment of Student Learning task illustrates how you diagnose student learning needs through your analysis of student work samples. It provides evidence of your ability to 1) select an assessment tool and criteria that are aligned with your central focus, student standards, and learning objectives; 2) analyze student performance on an assessment in relation to student needs and the identified learning objectives; 3) provide feedback to students; and 4) use the analysis to identify next steps in instruction for the whole class and individual students.

Overview of Task

- Summarize and analyze meaningful patterns in whole class performance on a selected student assessment **from the learning segment**. The assessment should be the work of individuals, not groups.
- Demonstrate a variety of student performances for the assessment using three student work samples, including any feedback you wrote directly on the work.
- Analyze the performance of two individual students and diagnose individual learning needs.

What Do I Need to Do?

- ✓ Provide a copy of the directions/prompt for the assessment, if these are not apparent from the student work samples.
- ✓ Collect student work from your entire class. Analyze the student work to identify patterns in understanding across the class.
- ✓ Provide any **evaluative criteria (or rubric)** that you used to assess the student work. Evaluative criteria are performance indicators that you use to assess student learning. Categories of evaluative criteria include computational accuracy, understanding properties of a triangle, or translating a word problem into mathematical symbols.
- ✓ Select three student work samples which together represent what students generally understood and what a number of students were still struggling to understand. At least one of these students should be an English Learner¹. If multiple drafts of the assessment were collected, you may include all drafts as the work sample.
- ✓ Label these work samples as “Work Sample 1”, “Work Sample 2”, and “Work Sample 3”. If your students use invented spelling, please write a translation directly on the work sample. Be sure that reviewers can distinguish any written feedback to students from the students’ written work.
- ✓ Document your feedback to these three students, either as individuals or as part of a larger group. If it is not written directly on the work sample, provide a copy of any written feedback or write a summary of oral feedback (summary may be included with Commentary prompt #5 below).
- ✓ Respond to each of the prompts in the Assessment Commentary.

Assessment Commentary

Write a commentary of **5-8 single-spaced pages** (including prompts) that addresses the following prompts. You can address each prompt separately, through a holistic essay, or a combination of both, as long as all prompts are addressed.

¹ If you do not have any English Learners, select a student who is challenged by academic English. Examples may include students who speak varieties of English or special needs learners with receptive or expressive language difficulties.

1. Identify the specific standards/objectives measured by the assessment chosen for analysis. You may just cite the appropriate lesson(s) if you are assessing all of the standards/objectives listed.
2. Create a summary of student learning across the whole class relative to your evaluative criteria (or rubric). Summarize the results in narrative and/or graphic form (e.g., table or chart). Attach your rubric or evaluative criteria, and note any changes from what was planned as described in Planning commentary, prompt 6. (You may use the optional chart provided following the Assessment Commentary prompts to provide the evaluative criteria, including descriptions of student performance at different levels.) (TPEs 3, 5)
3. Discuss what most students appear to understand well, and, if relevant, any misunderstandings, confusions, or needs (including a need for greater challenge) that were apparent for some or most students. Cite evidence to support your analysis from the three student work samples you selected. (TPE 3)
4. From the three students whose work samples were selected, choose two students, at least one of which is an English Learner. For these two students, describe their prior knowledge of the content and their individual learning strengths and challenges (e.g., academic development, language proficiency, special needs). What did you conclude about their learning during the learning segment? Cite specific evidence from the work samples and from other classroom assessments relevant to the same evaluative criteria (or rubric). (TPE 3)
5. What oral and/or written feedback was provided to individual students and/or the group as a whole (refer the reviewer to any feedback written directly on submitted student work samples)? How and why do your approaches to feedback support students' further learning? In what ways does your feedback address individual students' needs and learning goals? Cite specific examples of oral or written feedback, and reference the three student work samples to support your explanation.
6. Based on the student performance on this assessment, describe the next steps for instruction for your students. If different, describe any individualized next steps for the two students whose individual learning you analyzed. These next steps may include a specific instructional activity or other forms of re-teaching to support or extend continued learning of objectives, standards, central focus, and/or relevant academic language for the learning segment. In your description, be sure to explain how these next steps follow from your analysis of the student performances. (TPEs 2, 3, 4, 13)