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. Single-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 studetn learning during instruction

b. Interpretation and use of assesment data

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 Single Subject Program is a postbaccalaureate, nondegree, 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 Single 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 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", see http://degreeprofile.org) to develop your PLO(s)?

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No, but I know what the DQP is

2016-2017 Assessment Report Site - Cred. Single-Subject Instruction

Page 3 of 18

○ 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):

Select PLO

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

Q2.1.1.
Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

Monitoring student learning during instruction (TPE 2): and Interpretation and use of assessments (TPE 3)are the chosen PLOs and are explained in great detail below.

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 self assessment 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 CTCApproved 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.

📎 PACT Rubrics assessing PLOs.docx
218.85 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:

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?

2

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. Students also receive support on monitoring student learning on a continuous basis in their field placement. This is recorded in observation notes and in a formal evaluation at the end of the Fall and the Spring semesters.

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 Assessment task for PACT. Two rubrics of the 12 PACT rubrics assesses the PLO (rubric 5 and rubric 6)

(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 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.

PACT Task 3 and Task 4 .docx
155.08 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

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

15 faculty members scored PACT

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 monitoring studetn learning which is often referred to as formative assessment and summative assessments that are embedded in Task 3 and 4 of the PACT. Other PACT tasks focus on related competencies (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?

144

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

130

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 in **Q2.1**:

Our studetns are solidly passing the PACT assessment The data show that 91% of them have a score of 2 or better on rubric 5 and 97% of them have a score of 2 or better on rubric 6. I conclude that we have gotten very good at preparing students for this particular assessment and that as instructors we are very familar with how it is scored.

Next year we will be using a new assessment (the edTPA) with more detailed and rigorous rubrics that draw heavily from evidence provided in the video tape candidates submit. It will be interesting to see how our candidates do on this given that the level of relative unfamilariarity instructors may have with the scoring rubrics. I anticipate an initial drop in scores although I am confident that our students will still have a very high chance of passing this external assessment given the course work we offer.

📎 Data on Candidate performance Rubric 5 and 6.docx
114.01 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

Rubric 5

Ind. Scores

N= 137

AVERAGE for Rubric 5 = 2.214814815

Score of 4 = 5/137 or 3%

Score of 3 = 31/137 or 23%

Score of 2 = 89/137 or 65%

Score of 1 = 12/137 or 9%

Rubric 6

Ind. Scores

N= 137

AVERAGE for Rubric 6 =2.348148148

Score of 4 = 2/137 or 1%

Score of 3 = 48/137 or 35%

Score of 2 = 83/137 or 61%

Score of 1 = 4/37 or 3%

Attached here are new rubrics for the EdTPA that will be used in AY17-18. These will provide finer grain data and require clear video evidence of our candidates enacting the skill set not just describing it.

Rubric12EdTPA.jpeg
2.01 MB

Rubric15EdTPA.jpeg
2.02 MB

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.

In AY17-18 we will be uisng a new Teaching Performance Assessment -- previously we have been using the PACT (Performance Assessment of California Teachers) and we will begin using the edTPA which is an updated verion of the PACT that is used beyond California. It is similar enough to the PACT that we will be able to map the major content and skill sets that we teach in our program from PACT to edTPA. Notable differences are that the edTPA has 15 rubrics instead of the 12 PACT used and the rubrics are scored on a 5 point scale instead of a 4 point scale that PACT used. This will give us finer grain data. This data will be useful in program assessment and program improvement.

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					

	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	○	○	◉
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:

Revisions to curriculum included having our candidate video-tape themselves teaching in the Fall semester and then analyze this recording with a structured data analysis tool and with a narrative reflection.   This assignment was part of a "signature assignment" for our program and did support studetns with some of the technical
difficulties and affective barriers involved in PACT completed in the Spring (which requires approx. 20 min. of taped teaching).

Next year we will be doing even more to prpare studetns to demonstrate specific skills sets within a taped portion of their teaching as video evidence is a larger part of edTPA thna it was in PACT which relied on written commentary as a primary evidence source.

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:

In preparing this year's report the example of last year's was useful a were the training sessions provided by the Office of Academic Program Assessment.

(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:

📎 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. | We will look at the feedback our candiates provide their students on assessment and what students are expected to d… |

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:

PACT Rubrics Assessing PLOs

PACT TASK 3 + 4

Data on SS Cred Student Performance (Rubric 5 +6)

EdTPA Rubrics 12 + 15 (wil be used AY17-18)

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. Single-Subject Instruction

Q10.
Report Author(s):
Mimi Coughlin

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):

420

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?
Don't know

Q16. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?
Don't know

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**:

📎 **No file attached**

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**:

📎 No file attached

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

Candidate #	Rubric 5 Ind. Scores N= 137	Rubric 6 Ind. Scores N= 137
	AVERAGE for Rubric 5 2.214814815 Score of 4 = 5/137 or 3% Score of 3 = 31/137 or 23% Score of 2 = 89/137 or 65% Score of 1 = 12/137 or 9%	AVERAGE for Rubric 6 2.348148148 Score of 4 = 2/137 or 1% Score of 3 = 48/137 or 35% Score of 2 = 83/137 or 61% Score of 1 = 4/37 or 3%
1	2	2
2	2	2
3	2	2
4	3	2
5	2	2
6	1	2
7	2	3
8	3	3
9	2	2
10	2	2
11	2	2
12	2	2
13	3	3
14	2	3
15	2	3
16	2	2
17	2	2
18	2	3
19	2	3
20	3	2
21	2	2
22	2	3
23	2	3
24	2	2
25	2	2
26	2	2
27	2	2
28	2	2
29	2	2
30	2	2
31	2	3
32	3	3
33	2	2
34	2	2
35	1	2
36	1	2

37	2	2
38	2	2
39	2	2
40	2	2
41	2	3
42	2	3
43	2	2
44	3	2
45	4	3
46	2	2
47	2	2
48	3	3
49	4	3
50	3	3
51	2	2
52	2	2
53	2	2
54	2	2
55	3	2
56	2	3
57	2	1
58	2	3
59	2	2
60	4	2
61	2	2
62		
63	3	3
64	2	2
65	2	3
66	3	1
67	2	2
68	1	1
69	2	2
70	1	2
71	2	2
72	2	2
73	2	2
74	3	2
75	3	3
76	3	2
77	3	2
78	4	4
79	2	3
80	3	3
81	2	2
82	3	2
83	2	2

84	3	2
85	2	2
86	3	2
87	3	2

88	2	2
89	2	3
90	1	1

91	1	2
92	2	2
93	1	2
94	3	4
95	3	3
96	2	3
97	3	2
98	3	2
99	2	3
100	2	3
101	2	2
102	3	3
103	4	3
104	2	2
105	2	2
106	2	2
107	2	2
108	2	2
109	2	2
110	2	2
111	2	2

112	2	2
113	1	2
114	2	3
115	2	3
116	2	3
117	3	3
118	2	2
119	2	2
120	2	3
121	2	2
122	2	3
123		
124	2	3
125	1	3
126	2	2
127	2	2
128	2	3

129	1	2

130	1	3
131	3	3
132	**3**	**3**
133	**3**	**3**
134	**2**	**2**
135	**2**	**3**
136	**3**	**3**
137	**3**	**3**
	AVERAGE for Rubric 5 2.214814815	AVERAGE for Rubric 6 2.348148148

PACT Rubric assessing PLO Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction
H5 Instruction (Related to Task 3)

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
• 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/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.

PACT Rubric assessing PLO Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction
H6 Assessment (Related to Task 4)

INSTRUCTION	MONITORING STUDENT LEARNING DURING INSTRUCTION		
H5: 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 evaluations of history/social science accounts or interpretations. • Candidate responses represent reasonable attempts to improve student abilities to critically evaluate accounts or interpretations about an historical event or social science phenomenon and to defend their judgments.	• The candidate monitors student understanding by eliciting student responses that require evaluations of history/social science accounts or evaluations of interpretations. • Candidate responses build on student input to guide improvement of students' abilities to critically evaluate accounts or interpretations about an historical event or social science phenomenon and to defend their judgments.	All components of Level 3 plus: • The candidate elicits explanations of student evaluations or interpretations, and uses these explanations to further the understanding of all students.

Task 3. Instructing Students & Supporting Learning

Purpose

<mark>The Instructing Students & Supporting Learning task illustrates how you work with your students to improve their ability to critically evaluate accounts or interpretations about an historical event or social science phenomenon and to defend their judgments. It provides evidence of your ability to engage students in meaningful history/social science tasks and monitor their understanding.</mark>

Overview of Task

- Examine your plans for the learning segment and identify learning tasks in which students are actively engaging in evaluating sources of information, forming individual interpretations of the event or phenomenon, and defending their judgments.
- Videotape one or more of these tasks.
- View the video(s) to check the quality, analyze your teaching, and select the most appropriate video clips to submit.

What Do I Need to Do?

Videotape your classroom teaching

- ✓ Please provide **two video clips of no more than ten minutes each**. The first clip should illustrate what you did as a teacher to help students critically evaluate a source of an account or interpretation of an historical event or social science phenomenon. Sources include such things as the textbook, a map, a documentary film, or a political cartoon. The second clip should focus on what you did to support students as they offered and defended their judgments about the event or phenomenon. (This should not be a discussion of students' personal opinions, but of judgments informed by facts, social science concepts, and scholarly interpretations.) The clips 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.
- The clips 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.

✓ Provide a copy of any relevant writing on the board, overhead, or walls if it is not clearly visible on the video. Attach this document to the Instruction Commentary.

✓ Complete the Video Label Form and either attach it to the videotape or put it in a folder with the video files. The form is located after the instructions for this task.

✓ 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 each video clip 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 clips.

2. Describe any routines or working structures of the class (e.g., group work roles, class discussion norms) that were operating in the learning tasks seen on the video clips. 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 clips, how did you further the students' knowledge and skills and engage them intellectually in evaluating sources of information, forming individual interpretations of the historical event or social science phenomenon, and defending their judgments? 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 clips. Cite one or two examples of what students said and/or did in the video clips or in assessments related to the lesson(s) that indicated their progress toward accomplishing the lesson(s)' learning objectives. (TPEs 2, 3)

Task 4. Assessing Student Learning

Purpose

<mark>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.</mark>

Overview of Task

- <mark>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.</mark>
- 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 Learner[1]. 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)

PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: evidence of feedback (written, audio/video); Assessment Commentary Prompts 2a-b

What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students?

EMERGING PERFORMANCE	PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE	ADVANCED PERFORMANCE
Feedback is unrelated to the learning objectives OR is developmentally inappropriate. OR Feedback contains significant content inaccuracies. OR No feedback is provided to one or more focus students.	Feedback is general and addresses needs AND/OR strengths related to the learning objectives.	Feedback is specific and addresses either needs OR strengths related to the learning objectives.	Feedback is specific and addresses both strengths AND needs related to the learning objectives.	Level 4 plus: Feedback for one or more focus students • provides a strategy to address an individual learning need OR • makes connections to prior learning or experience to improve learning.

LOOK FORs:

- General feedback on needs AND/OR strengths (e.g., "Good detail!")
- Unequal feedback given (e.g., 1 sample with feedback and 1 sample without)
- No relation to objectives or analysis (e.g., feedback on grammar when objective on causes of WWII)
- Feedback is inaccurate (e.g., numerous or essential items are marked incorrect when correct or vice versa)

LOOK FORs:

- Specific feedback connected to objectives (e.g., "As you explain the causes of WWII, remember to include key nations involved")
- Feedback emphasizes strengths OR needs

LOOK FORs:

- Specific feedback addresses strengths AND needs
- At least one focus student receives feedback to address a specific learning need or feedback to connect to previous learning

Evidence:

Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction

PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Assessment Commentary Prompt 4

How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?

EMERGING PERFORMANCE	PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE	ADVANCED PERFORMANCE
Next steps **do not follow** from the analysis.	Next steps propose general support that improves student learning related to assessed learning objectives.	Next steps provide targeted support to **individuals or groups** to improve their learning relative to
OR		• **facts and concepts,**
Next steps are **not relevant to the learning objectives** assessed.		OR
OR		• **inquiry, interpretation, or analysis,**
Next steps are **not described in sufficient detail** to understand them.		OR
		• **building and supporting arguments or conclusions.**
	Next steps are **loosely connected to** research and/or theory.	Next steps are **connected** with research and/or theory.
		Next steps provide targeted support to **individuals AND groups** to improve their learning relative to
		• facts and concepts,
		• inquiry, interpretation, or analysis,
		AND
		• building and supporting arguments or conclusions.
		Next steps are **justified with principles from** research and/or theory.
LOOK FORs:	**LOOK FORs:**	**LOOK FORs:**
Next steps	• Next steps generally attend to whole class needs in relation to content (e.g., "Use a Venn diagram to support writing of research paper")	• Strategic support for individuals and/or groups related to subject - specific knowledge
• Do not make sense (e.g., students need more support on writing arguments and candidate focuses next steps on vocabulary definitions)	• Discussions of research/theory are surface level	• Next steps are grounded in research/theory
• Are not aligned to learning objectives		
• Present vague information (e.g., "will provide more support for objectives")		

Evidence: