2016-2017
Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our **website**
or **contact us** for more help.

Please begin by selecting your program name in the drop down. If the program name is not listed, please enter it below:

Cred. Multi-Subject Instruction

OR

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1.

Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs), and emboldened Graduate Learning Goals (GLGs) **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, Competency, and Perspectives**

☐ 13. Ethical Reasoning

☐ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning

☐ 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**

☐ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning

☐ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge

☐ 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**

☐ 19. **Professionalism**

☑ 20. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a. Monitoring student learning during instruction

b. Interpretation and use of assessments

c.

Q1.2.

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

Monitoring student learning during instruction (Teaching Performance Expectation 2): The Multiple Subject Program is a postbaccalaureate, nondegree, c redential program accredited by the Commission on Teaching Credentialing (CTC). As s uch, 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 postbaccalaureate 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 stateadopted 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 a nd 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", see http://degreeprofile.org) 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 **OR** type in **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):

Other PLO (Type in below)

If your PLO is **not listed, please enter it here**:

Interpretation and use of assessments

Q2.1.1.

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

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, progressmonitoring 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 performancebased realworld applications of learning. They teach students how to use selfassessment strategies. Candidates provide guidance and time for students to practice these strategies.

Candidates understand how to familiarize students with the format of stateadopted 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.

📎 emr.pdf
15.9 KB   📎 No file attached

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdrd	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 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?
3

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 MiniPACT as the course's signature assignment (summative assessment). The MiniPACT includes the PLO and standard in it. The MiniPACTs 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 3 and 4 which is the Instruction and 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 (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) 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 **provide** the direct measure (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) you used to collect data, THEN **explain** how it assesses the PLO:

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 from task 3 and task 4. The directions are used for the signature assignments for the MiniPACT, the candidates address prompts in instruction task only. 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.

emte.pdf
29.32 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: The rubric is provided by the PACT Consortium and used by al programs imp…   (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 Multiple Subject faculty
members

Q3.5.1.
How many faculty members participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

Nine faculty members particip…

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 and monitoring students' learning in the instructional 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.

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 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?

82 candidates

Q3.6.3.
How many samples of student work did you evaluated?

79 candidates completed the PACT during spring 2017.

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: The rubric is provided by the PACT Consortium and used by al programs impleti…

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 in **Q2.1**:

> The table of the data is attached.
>
> Our candidates average rubric scores are 2.38 and 2.43 out of 4 point scale on two PLOs.

| 📎 Sp17 Elem Math R5 & R6.xlsx 14.48 KB | 📎 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 monitoring student understanding during instruction. While the candidates are able to articular general approaches to assessment, they struggle to assess specific aspects of the state standards that the students did not fully achieve, especially in the area of reasoning and problem solving.

As a result, the methods faculty discussed providing the candidates with additional specific examples of monitoring students' higher order thinking during instruction. 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.

The program will assess the impact of the changes next Spring when the completing candidates submit their new TPA.

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.

Since your last assessment report, **how have the assessment data from then been used** so far?	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:

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. Next year, there will be a new assessment called edTPA. We will use the data above to support the areas of need for the candidates in new edTPA in all method courses so that the edTPA support instructors do no shoulder most of the burden of supporting the candidates.

Q5.3.
To what extent did you apply **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in the following areas?

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Program Learning Outcomes	○	○	◉	○	○
2. Standards of Performance	○	○	○	◉	○
3. Measures	○	○	○	◉	○
4. Rubrics	○	○	○	◉	○
5. Alignment	○	○	○	◉	○
6. Data Collection	○	○	○	◉	○
7. Data Analysis and Presentation	○	○	○	◉	○
8. Use of Assessment Data	○	○	○	◉	○
9. Other, please specify: [_____]	○	○	○	○	◉

Q5.3.1.
Please share with us an example of how you applied **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in any of the areas above:

Last year's feedback suggested to set a program standard such as setting a perfomance stanadard like percentage of candidates will score at a certian numeric rubric score. We have set our goal to have all of our candidates complete and pass the PACT.

(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, Competency, and Perspectives**

[ ] 13. Ethical Reasoning

[ ] 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning

[ ] 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**

[ ] 16. Integrative and Applied Learning

[ ] 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge

☐ 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**

☐ 19. **Professionalism**

☑ 20. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

a. How does the candidate support students to understand and use the feedback to guide their further learning?

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:

Program Information (Required)

Program:

(If you typed your program name at the beginning, please skip to Q10)

Q9.
Program/Concentration Name: [skip if program name appears above]
Cred. Multi-Subject Instruction

Q10.
Report Author(s):
Brian Iim

Q10.1.
Department Chair/Program Director:
Stephanie Biagetti

Q10.2.
Assessment Coordinator:
n/a

Q11.
Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit
Education - Credential

Q12.
College:
College of Education

Q13.
Total enrollment for Academic Unit during assessment semester (see Departmental Fact Book):
116

Q14.
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: [   ]

Q15. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?
[0   ]

Q15.1. List all the names:

Q15.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?
[0   ]

Q16. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?
[0   ]

Q16.1. List all the names:

Q16.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?
[0   ]

Q17. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?
[8   ]

Q17.1. 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

Q18. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

Don't know

Q18.1. List all the names:

When was your **assessment plan**...	1. Before 2011-12	2. 2012-13	3. 2013-14	4. 2014-15	5. 2015-16	6. 2016-17	7. No Plan	8. Don't know
Q19. developed?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Q19.1. last updated?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉

Q19.2. (REQUIRED)
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **assessment plan**:

📎 **Key Program Assessments_fall 2016.docx**
13.21 KB

Q20.
Has your program developed a **curriculum map?**

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Q20.1.
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **curriculum map**:

📎 MS_Matrix-Courses_Candidate Development.docx
18.89 KB

Q21.
Has your program indicated in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Q22.
Does your program have a capstone class?

○ 1. Yes, indicate: [   ]

◉ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Q22.1.
Does your program have **any** capstone project?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

(**Remember**: Save your progress)

ver. 5.15/17

ELEMENTARY MATHEMATICS RUBRICS

INSTRUCTION MONITORING STUDENT LEARNING DURING INSTRUCTION EM5: How does the candidate monitor student learning during instruction and respond to student questions, comments, and needs? (TPEs 2,5)			
Level 1	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Level 4**
• The candidate primarily monitors student understanding by asking **surface-level questions** and evaluating student responses as **correct or incorrect**. • Candidate responses are **not likely to promote student thinking**. OR • Materials or candidate responses include **significant content inaccuracies** that will lead to student misunderstandings.	• The candidate monitors student understanding by **eliciting student responses that require mathematical reasoning or problem solving strategies**. • Candidate responses represent **reasonable attempts** to improve student understanding of **mathematical concepts and discourse**.	• The candidate monitors student understanding by eliciting student responses that require mathematical reasoning or problem solving strategies. • Candidate responses **build on student input to guide improvement** of students' understanding of mathematical concepts and discourse.	All components of Level 3 plus: • The candidate **elicits explanations** of students' mathematical reasoning or problem solving strategies, and uses these explanations to **further the understanding** of all students.

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.**

Task 3. Instructing Students & Supporting Learning

Purpose

The Instructing Students & Supporting Learning task illustrates how you work with your students to improve their understanding of mathematical concepts and their ability to engage in mathematical discourse. It provides evidence of your ability to engage students in meaningful mathematics tasks and monitor their understanding.

Overview of Task

- Examine your plans for the learning segment and identify learning tasks in which students are actively engaged in understanding mathematical concepts and participating in mathematical discourse.
- Videotape one or more of these tasks.
- View the video(s) to check the quality, analyze your teaching, and select the most appropriate video clip(s) to submit.

What Do I Need to Do?

Videotape your classroom teaching

- ✓ Provide **one or two video clips of no more than fifteen minutes total**. Select clip(s) that demonstrate how you engage students in understanding mathematical concepts and participating in mathematical discourse. (You may select conceptual understanding either as the primary focus of instruction or integrate it with the development of your students' understanding of a computation or procedure.) The clip(s) should include interactions among you and your students and your responses to student comments, questions, and needs. (TPEs 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 11)

Videotape Guidelines

- A video clip should be continuous and unedited, with no interruption in the events. If you elect to use two clips, they should portray key events that cannot be portrayed in a fifteen minute clip. **The two clips should come from the same lesson.**
- The clip(s) can feature either the whole class or a small group of students.
- Both you and your students should be visible and clearly heard on the video submitted.
- Tips for videotaping your class are available on the PACT website, **www.pacttpa.org**.
- Before you videotape, ensure that you have the appropriate permission from the parents/guardians of your students and from adults that appear on the videotape.

✓ Respond to each of the prompts in the Instruction Commentary.

Instruction Commentary

Write a commentary of **4-7 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. Other than what is stated in the lesson plan(s), what occurred immediately prior to and after the video clip(s) that is important to know in order to understand and interpret the interactions between and among you and your students? Please provide any other information needed to interpret the events and interactions in the video clip(s).

2. Describe any routines or working structures of the class (e.g., group work roles, class discussion norms) that were operating in the learning task(s) seen on the video clip(s). If specific routines or working structures are new to the students, how did you prepare students for them? (TPE 10)

3. In the instruction seen in the clip(s), how did you further the students' knowledge and skills and engage them intellectually in understanding mathematical concepts and participating in mathematical discourse? Provide examples of both general strategies to address the needs of all of your students and strategies to address specific individual needs. (TPEs 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 11)

4. Given the language abilities of your students as described in Task 1. Context for Learning, provide examples of language supports seen in the clips that help your students understand the content and/or academic language central to the lesson. (TPEs 4, 7)

5. Describe the strategies you used to monitor student learning during the learning task shown on the video clip(s). Cite one or two examples of what students said and/or did in the video clip(s) or in assessments related to the lesson that indicated their progress toward accomplishing the lesson's learning objectives. (TPEs 2, 3)

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 Learner[1]. 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.

✓ 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)

Key Program Assessments – Fall 2016

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.	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> stu dent teaching eval (lmtd 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

Last	First	P/F	Inst 2	Asmt 1
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	4	4
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	3	3
		Pass	4	3
		Pass	3	3
		Pass	2	3
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	3	2
		Pass	3	4
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	3	3
		Pass	2	3
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	3	4
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	3
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	4	3
		Pass	3	4
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	3	3
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	3	3
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	3	3
		Pass	2	3
		Pass	3	3
		Pass	4	3
		Pass	3	4
		Pass	3	3
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	3	2
		Pass	3	2
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	3
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	3
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	3

	Pass	2	2
	Pass	2	3
	Pass	3	3
	Pass	3	3
	Pass	3	2
	Pass	3	3
	Pass	2	2
	Pass	1	2
	Pass	4	2
	Pass	2	2
	Pass	3	3
	Pass	2	2
	Pass	3	2
	Fail-1	1	2
	Pass-1	2	2
	Rec		
	Fail-1	1	2
	Pass-1	2	2
	Rec		
	Fail-1	2	1
	Pass-1	2	2
	PASS	2	2
	Fail-1	1	2

Spring 2017 Bilingual Elementary Mathematics PACT

		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	3	3
		Pass	3	2
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	2	2
		Pass	3	3

Average	2.379747	2.43038

MATRIX OF CANDIDATE OUTCOME DEVELOPMENT

Outcome	Introduced	Deepened/ Broadened	Applied	Assessed	Refined	Comments
Standards: CA plus CCSS, content, structure, history, uses	PT	Methods – focus on scope and sequence, relationship to adopted materials & textbooks	Methods Field Exp (FE) and St tchng (ST)	Methods CSSTs (LPs submitted before teaching) PACT TE FE and ST evals	PT: compare scope/sequence for different units of time (lesson, unit, year) & grades	Where can we assess candidates on knowledge of content in standards? All methods? Science does a bit of this. Just BC they passed CSET does not mean they actually have full understanding, esp conceptual.
Objectives	PT- but how much and how deep?	Methods FE + ST	Methods Methods-CSSTs FE + ST	FE + ST	FE + ST	PT needs exemplars from content methods faculty. Candidates need more scaffolding for planning – the 5 minute lesson idea.
Assessment -Big ideas -Why assess? -Types/forms -What to do with it (feedback, next steps)? -Role of student reflection -SBAC	PT:	Methods: how? FE + ST	L/L CAT Math Mini TE L/L Semester 2 FE+ST	FE + ST L&L Case Study	FE + ST L&L CAT	Need to be more explicit about kinds of assessments and when and where to utilize; more on CFU; switch Science CAT to assessment? Can L/L CAT be made more complex (e.g., candidates create their own rubric?)

Outcome	Introduced	Deepened/Broadened	Applied	Assessed	Refined	Comments
Language Objectives – discipline specific	272	272 FE+ST	Methods Methods-CSSTs FE+ST	Methods-CSSTs FE+ST	FE+ST	Need exemplars from content methods faculty
Lesson structure: GRR	PT	?	Methods FE + ST	Methods-CSST FE + ST	FE+ST	What activities do they do so that they know their students?
Unit planning		Solo teaching (optional)	Solo teaching (optional)			When and where does this get taught? Can we distinguish clearly between the unit plan and the TE lesson sequence? Is it realistic to include this?
How to create an essential question						Would love to have a whole session where we all work with candidates on this; require that integrated curriculum be developed around this during the solo period
Year-long overview						Tie to CCSS and CA Content
How to set up a classroom and develop classroom routines						
How to create a classroom culture and environment						

Outcome	Introduced	Deepened/ Broadened	Applied	Assessed	Refined	Comments
Ideas for classroom management and student behavior support	-PT: Mackenzie book -Structured activities for field exp observations, etc. (who assigns these?) PT: internal, external control	L/L: content must be engaging, content selections are relevant, pacing is important (e.g., Read Alouds) PT: Learning theories	LPT: Collaboration PT: PTHVP H/SS: decision making, democracy, consensus – live these in the classroom FE/ST: overplan			Intentionally help candidates examine different systems in place in schools; they should analyze what works and under what circumstances – no silver bullets! They should do research. RtI
Professional ethics						Bring in a speaker (HR Director, OCR, etc.) at orientation and again in January
Instructional decision making						Link to theoretical frameworks
Dispositions						What are they? Are we in agreement? What's our evidence? What do we do when a candidate does not have them?
Differentiation	PT: RtI 272: ELs PT: IEPs	Methods: ELs, how to implement IEPS 272: by language levels				Behavior and learning
IEPs, SSTs, working with para-educators						

Learning theories: What are the KEY theorists/theories that are foundational to our vision of effective teaching?	PT: motivation, developmental, others?	L/L: reading theories informed by learning theories Math: applications of learning theories **(StBi send PPT)**				What is presented? Are there general theorists? Are there content-specific theorists? How do we share this across components of the program so we are explicit with our connections?
Multicultural education and educational equity	PT: concepts (isms) and realities L/L: their conceptions of what is a teacher?	PT: society of the future and guest speakers (from different groups or experiences) Math: relevance (CSI clip)	PT: architects of the future, inequities		• Advocacy would be a skill here – where do they learn that? • Teaching them to always ask: whose story is being told, what needs to be told? Always present a range of perspectives. • Be: open minded, interested in learning about the community,	We need to all model how to integrate MC themes into instruction of any content area – more think alouds Use legislation to further our goals: Day of Service (Chavez), LGBT, etc.

					willing to explore their own identity	

Key instructional strategies:
- **structured opportunities** for students to **actively develop** their own understanding of subject matter concepts and discourse – these strategies reflect **attention to student characteristics, learning needs, and/or language needs**.
- monitors student understanding by eliciting student responses that require reasoning or problem solving strategies – candidate responses build upon student **input to guide improvement** of students' understanding of concepts and discourse.
- Creates and administers assessments with clear criteria. Analyzes whole class performance and targets trends in performance by group or individual. Identifies instructional next steps that 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

Key instructional strategies….						
Nitty Gritty: report cards, parent communication, school/district procedures, etc.						