

2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our [website](#)
or [contact us](#) for more help.

Report:

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?** [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 assessed PLOs not included above:

a.

b.

c.

Q1.2.

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

Monitoring student learning during instruction (Teaching Performance Expectation 2): The Special Education Dual Mild/Moderate and Multiple Subject Program is a post-baccalaureate, non-degree, credential program accredited by the Commission on Teaching Credentialing (CTC). As such, the program must adhere to the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) that serve as our own PLOs. In order to be accredited in California, each program must provide evidence of how the program addresses each of the TPEs. Since the Special Education Dual Mild/Moderate and Multiple Subject Program is a post-baccalaureate program, the TPEs are not explicitly linked to the Sac State BLGs. The closest link would be to inquiry and analysis since monitoring student learning involves informal and formal assessment (inquiry) which then would need to be analyzed (analysis) in order to determine the next steps of instruction. The TPE states, "Candidates use multiple measure for progress monitoring throughout instruction to determine whether all students, including English learners and students with special needs, are understanding content and making progress toward identified key concepts from state-adopted academic standards."

Interpretation and use of assessments (TPE 3): As stated above, the TPEs guide our program. Again, this particular TPE is linked to the inquiry and analysis Sac State BLG. In this case, the focus is on interpreting assessments as appropriate for students in order to "determine students' progress and plan instruction." Continuing with the TPE verbiage, candidates "know how to accurately interpret assessment results of individuals and groups in order to develop and modify instruction."

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
☐ 4. N/A
☐ 5. Other, specify:

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 Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No (skip to **Q1.5**)
☐ 3. Don't know (skip 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?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

(**Remember:** Save your progress)

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

Q2.1.

Select **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the correct box* for this PLO in Q1.1):

Select PLO from list

Q2.1.1.

Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

"Other" was not a choice above:

The one chosen for this is "Interpretation and use of assessments" (TPE 3). The full TPE from the Commission on Teacher Credentialing is copied below, but since the TPE is vast in nature, for this assessment report, the highlighted area will be the focus since it encompasses much of the details of the rest of the TPE:

"Candidates understand and use a variety of informal and formal, as well as formative and summative assessments, at varying levels of cognitive demand to determine students' progress and plan instruction. Candidates understand the purposes and uses of different types of diagnostic instruments, including entry level, progress-monitoring and summative assessments. They use multiple measures, including information from families, to assess student knowledge, skills, and behaviors. They know when and how to use specialized assessments based on students' needs. Candidates know about and can appropriately use informal classroom assessments and analyze student work, including the types and quality of student work samples as well as performance-based real-world applications of learning. They teach students how to use self-assessment strategies. Candidates provide guidance and time for students to practice these strategies.

Candidates understand how to familiarize students with the format of state-adopted assessment program. They know how to appropriately administer the assessment program, including implementing accommodations for students with special needs. They know how to accurately interpret assessment results of individuals and groups in order to develop and modify instruction. Candidates interpret assessment data to identify the level of proficiency of English language learners in English as well as in the students' primary language. They give students specific, timely feedback on their learning, and maintain accurate records summarizing student achievement. They are able to explain, to students and to their families, student academic and behavioral strengths, areas for academic growth, promotion and retention policies, and how a grade or progress report is derived. Candidates can clearly explain to families how to help students understand the results of assessments to help students achieve the academic curriculum."

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 **standards of performance** that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix.

The attached rubric is from the program Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) which is the Performance Assessment for California Teaching (PACT). Each teacher preparation program is required to have a CTC-approved TPA in order to be accredited. Our TPA is the PACT. It was developed by a consortium at Stanford University and was adopted many years ago by Sacramento State.



Assessment PACT Rubrics.doc
44 KB



No file attached

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdrrd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the PLO , the standard of performance, and the rubric that was used to measure the PLO:
☐	☐	☐	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
☒	☒	☒	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
☐	☐	☐	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
☒	☒	☐	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: There is also a PACT handbook that all candidates receive

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?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
- ☐ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.1.1.

How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?

Q3.2.

Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
- ☐ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.2.1.

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:

In the candidates' Math Methods course (EDMS 314), the candidates complete a Mini-PACT as the course's signature assignment (summative assessment). The Mini-PACT includes the PLO and standard in it. The Mini-PACTs are collected on or about the 13th week of the semester. They are uploaded to our online electronic portfolio (Taskstream).

In addition, the candidates in their Science Methods Course (EDMS 316) complete the assessment task for PACT as their signature assignment for the course.

At the end of the program, all candidates must complete a PACT Teaching Event that includes the PLO. It is embedded into Task 4 which is the Assessment task for PACT. Two rubrics of the 12 PACT rubrics assesses the PLO.

For this assessment report, only the data from the PACT Teaching Event was included and analyzed.

(**Remember:** Save your progress)

Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

Q3.3.

Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q3.7**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q3.7**)

Q3.3.1.

Which of the following direct measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 1. Capstone project (e.g. 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 assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques
- ☒ 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects
- ☒ 6. E-Portfolios
- ☐ 7. Other Portfolios

☐ 8. Other, specify:

Q3.3.2.

Please **explain** and **attach** the direct measure you used to collect data:

The PLO is part of two signature assignments which are "key assessments" in required program courses.

The two signature assignments are "performance assessments" in that the assessments are distributed to the candidates' students in their field placements.

The performance assessment is "external" in nature because it is required by the CTC and it is implemented through the candidates' field placement.

The signature assignments and the PACT Teaching Event are uploaded to and scored through our electronic portfolio platform, Taskstream.

I have attached the PACT Teaching Event directions. These same directions are used for both signature assignments - for the Mini-PACT, the candidates address prompts #1-3. For both the science methods signature assignment and the PACT Teaching Event, the candidates address all of the prompts.

The data sample used for this assessment report is from the PACT Teaching Event.



MS Assessment Report Direct Measure.doc
71 KB



No file attached

Q3.4.

What tool was used to evaluate the data?

- ☐ 1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☒ 7. Used other means (Answer **Q3.4.1.**)

Q3.4.1.

If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☒ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☒ 4. Other, specify: (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

Q3.4.2.

Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

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

Q3.4.3.

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

Q3.4.4.

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

Q3.5.

How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

All Special Education and Multiple

Q3.5.1.

How many faculty members participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

Eleven faculty members partici...

Q3.5.2.

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
- ☐ 4. N/A

Q3.6.

How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?

Because the PACT Teaching Event is the program's Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) and all teacher preparation programs accredited by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) are required to have a TPA, the PACT Teaching Event was selected. The focused was narrowed to the assessment task because historically the candidates have scored relatively poorly on the assessment task as compared to the other PACT tasks (e.g. planning, reflection). All candidates in the Special Education Dual Mild/Moderate and Multiple Subject program must submit a PACT Teaching Event, so we have data from each candidate.

Q3.6.1.

How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

Samples from all Special Education Dual Mild/Moderate and Multiple Subject candidates completing the PACT Teaching Event were reviewed since the assignments/PACT Teaching Event are required to be submitted by all candidates. In addition, the candidates submit their work into their electronic portfolio (Taskstream) which is where the faculty score the work. Both the directions and rubrics are present in Taskstream as well. Finally, it is quite straight forward to run score reports from Taskstream.

Q3.6.2.

How many students were in the class or program?

Q3.6.3.

How many samples of student work did you evaluated?

4

Q3.6.4.

Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

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

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 3B: 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 (skip to **Q3.8**)

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 or focus groups
- ☐ 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:

Q3.7.1.1.

Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:



No file attached



No file attached

Q3.7.2.

If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

Q3.7.3.

If surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:

Q3.7.4.

If surveys were used, what was the response rate?

Question 3C: 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 (skip to **Q3.8.2**)
- ☐ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

Q3.8.1.

Which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☒ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
- ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.)
- ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.)
- ☒ 4. Other, specify:

Q3.8.2.

Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

Q3.8.3.

If other measures were used, please specify:

 No file attached

 No file attached

(**Remember:** Save your progress)

Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

Q4.1.

Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO for **Q2.1**:

The table/graph is attached.

 No file attached

 No file attached

Q4.2.

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

The passing standard for the rubric as set by the PACT Consortium is a score of 2. On average, our candidates score above that mark, so they are meeting the program standard.

 No file attached

 No file attached

Q4.3.

For the 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/standard has been specified
- ☐ 6. Don't know

Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

Q4.4.

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

Q4.5.

Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

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

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

Q5.1.

As a result of the assessment effort and based on 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 (skip to **Q5.2**)

☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q5.2**)

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.

Looking at the data results, the candidates struggle a bit with articulating next steps based on the analysis of the student assessment results. While the candidates are able to articular general approaches to next steps, they struggle to detail how they will address specific aspects of the state standards that the students did not fully achieve, especially when small groups of students did not meet various parts of different standards.

As a result, the methods faculty discussed providing the candidates with additional specific examples of "next steps" based on example data results. The math and science methods faculty discussed providing more specific feedback on the candidates' signature assignments so that the candidates could use the feedback in preparation for the PACT Teaching Event.

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

Q5.2.

How have the assessment data from the last annual assessment been used so far? [**Check all that apply**]

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improving specific courses	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
2. Modifying curriculum	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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. WSCUC 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 modifications	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
18. Institutional improvement	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
20. New faculty hiring	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
22. Recruitment of new students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

23. Other, specify:

Q5.2.1.

Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above:

Last year, our assessment report was not as detailed as this year's. As a result, our efforts were not as cohesive as they could have been. PACT support instructors shouldered much of the burden of making changes to approaches and curriculum to support the candidates in their analysis of student work and planning instruction based on the analysis. However, focusing on supporting the candidates WHILE the candidates are completing their PACT Teaching Events is too late.

(Remember: Save your progress)

Additional Assessment Activities

Q6.

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

n/a



No file attached



No file attached

Q7.

What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? [**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 not included above:

a. Monitoring student learning during instruction

b.

c.

Q8. Please attach any additional files here:

 No file attached

 No file attached

 No file attached

 No file attached

Q8.1.

Have you attached any files to this form? If yes, please list every attached file here:

Assessment PACT Rubrics

MS Assessment Report Direct Measure

Program Information (**Required**)

P1.

Program/Concentration Name(s): [by degree]

Cred. Dual MM-Multi Subj

P1.1.

Program/Concentration Name(s): [by department]

Multi-Subject Instruction Cred.

P2.

Report Author(s):

Stephanie Biagetti

P2.1.

Department Chair/Program Director:

Stephanie Biagetti

P2.2.

Assessment Coordinator:

n/a

P3.

Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit

Education - Credential

P4.

College:

College of Education

P5.

Total enrollment for Academic Unit during assessment semester (see Departmental Fact Book):

P6.

Program Type:

- ☐ 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
- ☒ 2. Credential
- ☐ 3. Master's Degree
- ☐ 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)
- ☐ 5. Other, specify:

P7. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

P7.1. List all the names:

P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

0

P8. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

P8.1. List all the names:

P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

0

P9. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

8

P9.1. List all the names:

Multiple Subject

Multiple Subject with Bilingual Authorization

Single Subject

Single Subject with Bilingual Authorization

Special Education: Mild/Moderate

Special Education: Dual Mild/Moderate with Multiple Subject

Special Education: Moderate/Severe

Special Education: Dual Moderate/Severe with Multiple Subject

P10. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

P10.1. List all the names:

When was your assessment plan ...	1. Before 2010-11	2. 2011-12	3. 2012-13	4. 2013-14	5. 2014-15	6. No Plan	7. Don't know
P11. developed?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
P11.1. last updated?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

P11.3.

Please attach your latest **assessment plan**:

 No file attached

P12.

Has your program developed a **curriculum map**?

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

P12.1.

Please attach your latest **curriculum map**:

 No file attached

P13.

Has your program indicated in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

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

P14.

Does your program have a capstone class?

- ☐ 1. Yes, indicate:
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

P14.1.

Does your program have **any** capstone project?

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

(**Remember: Save your progress**)

ELEMENTARY MATHEMATICS RUBRICS
2015-2016

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.

Elementary Mathematics Teaching Event Candidate Handbook 2015-16

**Performance
Assessment for
California
Teachers**

Overview of Elementary Mathematics Teaching Event

Teaching Event Task	What to Do	What to submit
1. Context for Learning (TPEs 7,8)	✓ Provide relevant information about your instructional context and your students as learners of mathematics.	☐ Context Form ☐ Context Commentary
2. Planning Instruction & Assessment (TPEs 1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9,10,12)	✓ Select a learning segment of 3-5 lessons (or, if teaching mathematics within a large time block, about 3-5 hours of connected instruction) that support students in building conceptual understanding, computational/procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning skills. ✓ Create an instruction and assessment plan for the learning segment and write lesson plans. ✓ Write a commentary that explains your thinking in writing the plans. ✓ Record daily reflections, to submit in the reflection section of the Teaching Event.	☐ Lesson Plans for Learning Segment ☐ Instructional Materials ☐ Planning Commentary
3. Instructing Students & Supporting Learning (TPEs 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,10,11)	✓ Review your plans and prepare to videotape your class. Identify opportunities to develop your students' ability to engage in mathematical discourse and understand mathematical concepts. ✓ Videotape the lesson you have identified. ✓ Review the videotape to identify one or two video clips portraying the required features of your teaching. The total running time should not exceed 15 minutes. ✓ Write a commentary that analyzes your teaching and your students' learning in the video clip(s).	☐ Video Clip(s) ☐ Video Label Form ☐ Instruction Commentary
4. Assessing Student Learning (TPEs 2,3,4,5,13)	✓ Select one student assessment from the learning segment and analyze student work. ✓ Identify three student work samples that illustrate class trends in what students did and did not understand. ✓ Write a commentary that analyzes the extent to which the class met the standards/objectives, analyzes the individual learning of two students represented in the work samples, describes feedback to students, and identifies next steps in instruction.	☐ Student Work Samples ☐ Evaluative Criteria or Rubric ☐ Assessment Commentary
5. Reflecting on Teaching & Learning (TPEs 7,8,13)	✓ Provide your daily reflections. ✓ Write a commentary about what you learned from teaching this learning segment.	☐ Daily Reflections ☐ Reflective Commentary

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

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.

sample. Be sure that reviewers can distinguish any written feedback to students from the students' written work.

- ✓ 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. 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. 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)

Task 4. Summary of Student Learning Chart

List the categories of evaluative criteria as well as the corresponding characteristics of student work and the percent of students in the class at levels of performance that increase in quality. This chart is designed to be completed electronically, so the blank space does not represent the space needed. Use as much space and as many rows as you need.

Evaluative Criteria Category	Characteristics of Student Work		
	Performance Level 1	Performance Level 2	Performance Level 3, etc. (Insert more columns if needed)
	(provide description of student performance) & % of class)	(provide description of student performance & % of class)	(provide description of student performance & % of class)
	(provide description of student performance) & % of class)	(provide description of student performance & % of class)	(provide description of student performance & % of class)
	(provide description of student performance) & % of class)	(provide description of student performance & % of class)	(provide description of student performance & % of class)

The boxes indicating levels of student performance should include key characteristics of student work at that level, as well as the approximate percentage of the class performing at that level.