

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 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 Multiple Subject Teacher Preparation 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 process 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 one 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.

The passing standard is a score of 2 on both rubrics. The passing standard was set by the PACT Consortium.

Attached are the rubrics for History Social Science. These particular rubrics are the same across all content areas.



SS Assessment HSS PACT Rubrics.doc
43 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: |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3. In the student handbook/advising handbook |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. In the university catalogue |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 10. Other, specify: <input type="text" value="There is also a PACT handbook that all candidates receive and use"/> |

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 Fundamentals course (EDSS 365 C/D), the candidates complete an assessment assignment as the course's signature assignment (summative assessment). The assessment assignment includes the PLO and standard in it. The task that the candidates complete is very similar to Task 4 of the PACT Teaching Event and is scores using a scoring guide similar to the PACT rubrics.

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 assignments which are "key assessments" in required program courses.

The two 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 PACT Teaching Event is uploaded to and scored through our electronic portfolio platform, Taskstream, whereas the course assessment assignment is submitted directly to the course instructor and scores with a common scoring guide that is based on the PACT rubrics.

I have attached the PACT Teaching Event directions. These same directions are used for both signature assignments however, they are modified for the course assessment assignment. For both the EDSS 365 C/D course assessment assigning, some of the prompt are posed to the candidates for response whereas for 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 only.



SS Assessment Report Direct Measure.doc
63 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 single subject faculty member

Q3.5.1.

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

15 faculty members scored PAC..

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 must submit a PACT Teaching Event, so we have data from each candidate in the Single Subject Program who was completing their final semester of the program.

Q3.6.1.

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

Samples from all 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 PACT Teaching Event 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?

98

Q3.6.3.

How many samples of student work did you evaluated?

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 of the data is attached. along with the findings and conclusions.



SS S16 PACT Assessment Rubric Data.xlsx
14.78 KB



SS Assessment Report Data narrative.docx
14.27 KB

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 and Fundamentals faculty discussed providing the candidates with additional specific examples of "next steps" based on example data results. The Fundamental faculty discussed providing more specific feedback on the candidates' assessment assignment so that the candidates could use the feedback in preparation for the PACT Teaching Event.

The program will assess the impact of the changes next Spring when the completing candidates submit their 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 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. Modifying curriculum | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. Improving advising and mentoring | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 4. Revising learning outcomes/goals | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 6. Developing/updating assessment plan | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 7. Annual assessment reports | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 8. Program review | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 9. Prospective student and family information | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 10. Alumni communication | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 12. Program accreditation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 13. External accountability reporting requirement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 15. Strategic planning | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 16. Institutional benchmarking | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 17. Academic policy development or modifications | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 18. Institutional improvement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 19. Resource allocation and budgeting | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 20. New faculty hiring | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 21. Professional development for faculty and staff | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 22. Recruitment of new students | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |

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. Seminar instructor who also support candidates through their PACT Teaching Event 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:

SS Assessnebt HSS PACT Rubrics

SS Assessment Report Data narrative

SS Assessment Report Direct Measure

SS S16 PACT Assessment Rubric Data

Key Program Assessments _fall 2015

Program Information (**Required**)

P1.

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

Cred. Single-Subject Instruction

P1.1.

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

Select...

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):

328

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?

Don't know

P10.1. List all the names:

The pull down menu above will not allow me to enter "0". My academic unit has ONLY credential programs.

| 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? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| P11.1. last updated? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |

P11.3.

Please attach your latest **assessment plan**:



Key Program Assessments_fall 2015.docx
14.38 KB

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**)

HISTORY-SOCIAL SCIENCE RUBRICS

2015-2016

| ASSESSMENT | | ANALYZING STUDENT WORK FROM AN ASSESSMENT | |
|---|---|---|---|
| H6: 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 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The criteria/rubric and analysis have little connection with the identified standards/objectives. OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Student work samples do not support the conclusions in the analysis. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The criteria/rubric and analysis focus on patterns of student errors, skills, and understandings to analyze student learning in relation to standards/objectives.• Specific patterns are identified for individuals or subgroup(s) in addition to the whole class. | All components of Level 3 plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The criteria/rubric and analysis focus on partial understandings as well.• The analysis is clear and detailed. |

| ASSESSMENT | | USING ASSESSMENT TO INFORM TEACHING | |
|--|---|--|--|
| H7: 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 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Next steps are vaguely related to or not aligned with the identified student needs. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Next steps are not described in sufficient detail to understand them. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Next steps are based on inaccurate conclusions about student learning from the assessment analysis. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Next steps demonstrate a strong understanding of both the identified content and language standards/objectives and of individual students and/or subgroups. |

History/Social Science Teaching Event Candidate Handbook 2015-16

**Performance
Assessment for
California
Teachers**

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 correct identification of key historical facts or people, supportive evidence for an argument or interpretation, or appropriate application of specific concepts.
- ✓ 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.

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.

- ✓ Label these work samples as “Work Sample 1”, “Work Sample 2”, and “Work Sample 3”. 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. 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)

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.

| Candidates | Subject | Rubric 6 | Rubric 7 |
|------------|---------|----------|----------|
| 1 | ART | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | ART | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | ART | 2 | 2 |
| 4 | ART | 2 | 2 |
| 5 | ART | 4 | 4 |
| 6 | ART | 4 | 4 |
| 7 | ART | 4 | 4 |
| 8 | ART | 2 | 2 |
| 9 | ELA | 3 | 2 |
| 10 | ELA | 3 | 3 |
| 11 | ELA | 3 | 2 |
| 12 | ELA | 3 | 3 |
| 13 | ELA | 3 | 3 |
| 14 | ELA | 3 | 3 |
| 15 | ELA | 3 | 3 |
| 16 | ELA | 2 | 2 |
| 17 | ELA | 4 | 3 |
| 18 | ELA | 2 | 1 |
| 19 | ELA | 2 | 2 |
| 20 | ELA | 3 | 3 |
| 21 | ELA | 3 | 2 |
| 22 | ELA | 3 | 2 |
| 23 | HSS | 2 | 2 |
| 24 | HSS | 3 | 3 |
| 25 | HSS | 2 | 2 |
| 26 | HSS | 2 | 2 |
| 27 | HSS | 2 | 2 |
| 28 | HSS | 3 | 3 |
| 29 | HSS | 3 | 3 |
| 30 | HSS | 3 | 3 |
| 31 | HSS | 2 | 2 |
| 32 | HSS | 1 | 1 |
| 33 | HSS | 2 | 2 |
| 34 | HSS | 3 | 2 |
| 35 | HSS | 2 | 1 |
| 36 | HSS | 2 | 2 |
| 37 | HSS | 4 | 4 |
| 38 | HSS | 2 | 2 |
| 39 | HSS | 3 | 2 |
| 40 | MTH | 2 | 2 |
| 41 | MTH | 2 | 2 |
| 42 | MTH | 2 | 2 |
| 43 | MTH | 2 | 2 |
| 44 | MTH | 2 | 2 |
| 45 | MTH | 2 | 2 |
| 46 | MTH | 3 | 3 |

| | | | |
|---------|-----|----------|----------|
| 47 | MTH | 2 | 2 |
| 48 | MTH | 3 | 2 |
| 49 | MTH | 2 | 1 |
| 50 | MUS | 3 | 4 |
| 51 | MUS | 3 | 2 |
| 52 | MUS | 3 | 3 |
| 53 | PE | 2 | 2 |
| 54 | PE | 2 | 2 |
| 55 | PE | 2 | 2 |
| 56 | PE | 2 | 2 |
| 57 | PE | 2 | 2 |
| 58 | PE | 2 | 2 |
| 59 | PE | 1 | 2 |
| 60 | PE | 2 | 2 |
| 61 | PE | 3 | 3 |
| 62 | PE | 1 | 2 |
| 63 | PE | 2 | 3 |
| 64 | PE | 2 | 2 |
| 65 | SCI | 2 | 2 |
| 66 | SCI | 3 | 3 |
| 67 | SCI | 2 | 2 |
| 68 | SCI | 2 | 2 |
| 69 | SCI | 2 | 2 |
| 70 | SCI | 3 | 2 |
| 71 | SCI | 3 | 2 |
| 72 | SCI | 2 | 2 |
| 73 | SCI | 2 | 2 |
| 74 | SCI | 2 | 2 |
| 75 | SCI | 3 | 2 |
| 76 | SCI | 3 | 4 |
| 77 | SCI | 3 | 3 |
| 78 | SCI | 3 | 2 |
| 79 | SCI | 3 | 2 |
| 80 | SCI | 3 | 3 |
| 81 | SCI | 2 | 2 |
| 82 | SCI | 2 | 2 |
| 83 | SCI | 3 | 2 |
| 84 | WL | 3 | 3 |
| 85 | WL | 3 | 3 |
| 86 | WL | 4 | 4 |
| 87 | WL | 2 | 2 |
| 88 | WL | 3 | 3 |
| 89 | WL | 3 | 2 |
| 90 | WL | 3 | 3 |
| Average | Art | Rubric 6 | Rubric 7 |
| | | 2.88 | 2.88 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----------|------|------|
| Average | English | 2.85 | 2.46 |
| Average | History | 2.41 | 2.24 |
| Average | Math | 2.20 | 2.00 |
| Average | Music | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| Average | PE | 1.92 | 2.17 |
| Average | Science | 2.53 | 2.26 |
| Average | Wrld Lang | 3.00 | 2.86 |
| Overall Average | Sing Subj | 2.52 | 2.37 |

| | Rubric 6 | Rubric 7 |
|------------|----------|----------|
| Score of 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Score of 2 | 43 | 56 |
| Score of 3 | 37 | 22 |
| Score of 4 | 6 | 7 |

SS Assessment Report June, 2016
Analysis of Reported Data

For the Single Subject Program, the Teaching Performance Expectation (TPE) that serves as our Program Learning Outcome (PLO) is Interpretation and Use of Assessment. As a program summative assessment, all of the candidates complete the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) which serves as the Single Subject Program's Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA). All teacher preparation programs in California must have a TPA in order to be accredited by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Our TPA is PACT. PACT was developed by the PACT Consortium at Stanford University and is comprised of prompts that the candidates address and rubric that scorers use to evaluate the candidates' PACT Teaching Event.

There are five tasks associated with the PACT Teaching Event. Task 4 focuses on assessment. The rubrics that most closely align with the TPE that serves as our PLO for the purposes of this assessment report are rubric 6 (Analyzing Student Work From An Assessment) and rubric 7 (Using Assessment to Inform Teaching).

In Spring 2016, 90 candidates competed PACT Teaching Events across 8 different subject areas. The candidates earned an average score of 2.52 on rubric 6 and 2.37 on rubric 7. The passing standard for PACT is a score of 2. Consequently, the candidates scored above the passing standard.

By subject area, the following were the results

The range of scores was 1-4 with the frequency counts for each score within the rubrics:

| | Rubric 6 | Rubric 7 |
|------------|----------|----------|
| Score of 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Score of 2 | 43 | 56 |
| Score of 3 | 37 | 22 |
| Score of 4 | 6 | 7 |

While the most frequent score in each rubric is 2, there are nearly as many scores of 3 for rubric 6. Fewer scores of 3 were earned for rubric 7. This indicates that the candidates are achieving above the passing standard. However, this does not mean that there is no room for improvement. Although the passing standard is a score of 2, we know that excellent initial teaching is representative of a score of 3. While many of the candidates are achieving at or above a score of 3, our goal is to raise this number.

The PACT rubric data is also reported by subject area so that faculty can look across subject areas to assist us in understanding to what extent we have variability in student learning outcomes based on subject area. The results are below:

| | Rubric 6 | Rubric 7 |
|-------------------|----------|----------|
| Art (n = 8) | 2.88 | 2.88 |
| English (n = 14) | 2.85 | 2.46 |
| History (n = 17) | 2.41 | 2.24 |
| Math (n = 10) | 2.20 | 2.00 |
| Music (n = 3) | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| PE (n = 12) | 1.92 | 2.17 |
| Science (n = 19) | 2.53 | 2.26 |
| Wrld Lang (n = 7) | 3.00 | 2.86 |

In examining this data, the faculty recognized that the difference between the highest and lowest average scores were over 1 level for rubric 6 and 0.83 for rubric 7. Physical Education students scored the lowest on each of these rubrics. This prompted discussions about sharing the results of this assessment with the PE Methods and PE Seminar instructors so that they could be apprised of the results. The instructor reside in the Kinesiology department and typically do not attend the Single Subject Program meetings which is where assessment results are discussed.

Another trend that the faculty recognized is that average scores for rubric 7 were lower (or in the case of ART equal to) the average scores for rubric 6. Rubric 7 is focused on planning next steps for instruction based on assessment results. This skill is vital for teachers to develop. As such, faculty discussed having candidates bring in samples of student work so collectively by subject area, the candidates could view, analyze, and interpret the student work using the content standards aligned with the assessment as a guide. Then together the candidates could brainstorm “next steps” for instruction with feedback from instructor perhaps during the content methods class.

Key Program Assessments – Fall 2015

| Program | Guidelines in TS? | Evaluation Criteria or Format in TS? | When submitted? | Who scores and/or has access? | Goes In Candidate DRF? |
|--|---|---|--|--|------------------------|
| Multiple Subject – New 2 and 3 semester candidates **Question: Include EL Case Study from EDBM272** | | | | | |
| Community Study ALL MS | Yes | Yes-Rubric (it is very basic, could be fleshed out more) | End of fall semester | Owens, Daly, Nowell, Baker | Yes |
| CATs-LL & Science ALL MS | Yes | Yes-Rubric | After week 9 during Spring Semester | LL: Baker, Loeza, Lozano, Chaplin Science: Porter, Huang, R. Rodriguez | Yes |
| Mini PACT Fall for 2 semester; Spring for 3 semester | Yes | Yes-Rubric | 2 sem - end of fall semester 3 sem – end of spring semester | Ives, Pan, Lim | Yes |
| 2 sem - field Experience final eval | Yes-double check that it is the <u>modified</u> student teaching eval (lmted items) | Yes - rubric (select items only) | End of fall semester | All MS supervisors, including Lynn Solari | Yes |
| Multiple Subject – Exiting 3 semester candidates | | | | | |
| CAT-Science | Yes | Yes-rubric | After week 9 | Huang, Owens | Yes |
| Student teaching mid term and final evaluation | Yes | Student teaching rubric (all items) | Mid term – about Oct 21 Final - early Dec | All CTs and Tom Owens | Yes |
| PACT Teaching Event | Yes | Yes-rubrics | After week 11 | All scorers | Yes |
| Single Subject – all new candidates **Question: Include Transcript Analysis from EDBM279** | | | | | |
| Classroom Environment | Yes | Yes-Rubric | After mid semester | Arellano, Coughlin, Brewer, Allender score; Access for all SS faculty: Baker, Berta Avila, , Loeza, Nowell, Gunston Parks, Merrill, Lim, | Yes |

| Program | Guidelines in TS? | Evaluation Criteria or Format in TS? | When submitted? | Who scores and/or has access? | Goes In Candidate DRF? |
|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------|
| | | | | Huang, Pitta, Michals, Porter | |
| School Ethnography | Yes | Yes | End of fall semester | Cintron, MBA, Coughlin, Allender score; All SS faculty need access | Yes |
| Field Experience mid term and final eval | Yes-make sure to use <u>modified</u> student teaching eval (Imtd items) | Yes-Student teaching rubric (select items only) | Mid term about Oct 21 and final during early December | All SS supervisors | Yes |
| EDS Mild/Mod | | | | | |
| Field exp and student teaching evaluations | Yes | Yes-rubric | Throughout the semester | All EDS faculty and supervisors | Yes |
| NO SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS IN TS | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| EDS-Mild Mod + Multiple Subject | | | | | |
| All CATs | Yes | Yes-rubrics | Various deadlines | Confer with Linda Lugea about instructors assigned for Science and Math. Duran (L/L) and Cho (H/SS) score | Yes |
| Field exp and student teaching evaluations | Yes | Yes-rubric | Throughout the semester | All EDS faculty and supervisors | Yes |
| | | | | | |
| EDS-Mod/Severe | | | | | |
| No information yet in TS | | | | | |