2017 - 2018
Annual Program Assessment Report

The Office of Academic Program Assessment
California State University, Sacramento

For more information 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 enter program name:

Section 1: Report All of the Program Learning Outcomes Assessed

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**
- ☐ 20A. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a. | Providing Feedback to Guide Learning for the Students |

b. | Using Assessment to Inform Instruction |

c. | |

- ☐ 20B. **Check here if your program has not collected any data for any PLOs**. Please go directly to Q6 (skip Q1.2 to Q5.3.1.)

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**:

The Multiple Subject credential program is required by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) to use a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) as a summative assessment. We use the "EdTPA" which meets all the CTC requirements and assesseses GLG #19 "Overall Disciplinary Knowledge." The EdTPA is a comprehensive assessment (designed by Stanford University and administered by Pearson) that requires candidates to demonstrate their abilities as begining teachers to Plan, Instruct, and Assess in the subject area in which they are seeking a Single Subject Credential. The edTPA is research-based, and aligned to national teaching standards. It is scored using 15 rubrics (five per category: Planning, Instructing, and Assessing) We have
identified 2 specific Program Learning Outcomes that corrlate to rubrics 12 and 15 of the EdTPA. Both of these rubrics are in the area of assessing student learning.   This is an area we would like to focus on because it is a challenge for our candidates and can be a stumbling block for novice teachers. Therefore we are using data from EdTPA rubrics 12 and 15 as PLOs.   The total score on the edTPA will be used to assess GLG #19 "Overall Disciplinary Knowledge" because taken as a whole the EdTPA assesses novice teachers practical knowledge across the major domains of the discipline of teaching: Planning, Instructing, Assessment.

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)

Section 2: Report One Learning Outcome in Detail

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**:

> Using Assessment to Inform Instruction

Q2.1.1.

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

> Beginning teachers develop, implement, and use a range of effective classroom assessments to inform and improve instructional design and practice. Beginning teachers demonstrate knowledge of student assessment design principles, such as test construction, test question development, and scoring approaches, including rubric design. They explain the importance of validity and reliability in assessment and know how to mitigate potential bias in question development and in scoring. Beginning teachers demonstrate knowledge of a variety of types of assessments and their appropriate uses, including diagnostic, large-scale, norm-referenced, criterion-referenced, and teacher-developed formative and summative assessments. They effectively select and administer assessments to inform learning.

Q2.2.

Has the program developed or adopted ***explicit program standards of performance/expectations*** for this PLO? (e.g. "We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 or higher in all dimensions of the Written Communication VALUE rubric.")

   🔘 1. Yes

   ◯ 2. No

   ◯ 3. Don't know

   ◯ 4. N/A

Q2.3.

Please **1) provide and/or attach the rubric(s) <u>AND</u> 2) the standards of performance/expectations** that you have developed for *the selected PLO* here:

The attached rubric 15 is from the edTPA. The passing standard is at level 3.

Our program standards performance will be 85% of our candidates will attain the level 3 or better on rubric 15.

📎 edTPA rubric15.pdf
208.7 KB   📎 No file attached

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdrd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the **PLO**, the **standard (stdrd)** 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 edTPA handbook that ll candidtates receive and use and have acce…

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?
`1`

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:

> I used the external assesment (edTPA) to collect the data.

(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:

> edTPA rubric 15

Q3.3.2.
Please **1) provide and/or attach the direct measure** (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) you used to collect data, **THEN 2) explain here** how it assesses the PLO:

> The prompts related to the edTPA rubric 15 are directly related to the PLO. The PLO is "Using Assessment to Inform Instruction." The prompt asks, "Based on your analysis of student learning, describe next steps for instruction to impact student learning." An additional prompt asks, "Explain how these next steps follow from your analysis of student learning."

edTPA rubric 15 prompt.pdf
72.45 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.
Please enter the number (#) of faculty members who participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

All program faculty support candidates submissio…

Q3.5.1.
Please enter the number (#) of faculty members who participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for

the selected PLO?

No faculty evaluated our own candidates.

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 EdTPA is the program's Teaching Performance Assessment as required by the CTC we chose the EdTPA as the sample of student work. Specifically we are focussing on rubric 15 which assesses "Using assessment to inform instruction" as our sample PLO. Students submit a evidence in the form of a narrative commentary that details relevant background information about their students, lesson plans, video-taped instrcution, formative and summative assessments administered, and analysis of student performance to address ths PLO.

Q3.6.1.
How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

Since all of our candidates are required to take the edTPA, we have the data from every candidate in our Multiple Subject program.

Q3.6.2.
Please enter the number (#) of students that were in the class or program?

68

Q3.6.3.
Please enter the number (#) of samples of student work that you evaluated?

68

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, please enter 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 tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO in **Q2.1** (see Appendix 12 in our Feedback Packet Example):

Data Summary for edTPA for the program is attached.

The passing score for "Rubric 15 Using Assessment to Inform Instruction" is at level 3. We had 63 out of 68 students received the level 3 or higher. One student received at level 2.5 and 4 students received at level 2. 92.6% of students met the PLO in their edTPA submission.

📎 Data Summary .docx
13.09 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?

Yes

📎 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.

Q5.1.2.

Do you have a plan to assess the **impact of the changes** that you anticipate making?

- ⚪ 1. Yes, describe your plan:

- ⚪ 2. No
- ⚪ 3. Don't know

Q5.2.

To what extent did you apply **previous assessment results** collected through your program in the following areas?	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
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:

We have increased our emphasis on the role of assessment to inform teaching. This is a holistic process and requires candidates to become knowledgeable about individual strengths of their students as well as weaknesses in their background knowledge and skills so that our candidates can then strategically address these areas in their instruction. This may include remediation if needed. Assessment can provide evidence to our candidates that students are ready for more challenging material.

Q5.3. To what extent did you apply **previous assessment 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 **previous 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 85% of candidates have the passing scores.

(Remember: Save your progress)

Section 3: Report Other Assessment Activities

Other Assessment Activities

Q6.
If your program/academic unit conducted assessment activities that are **not directly related to the PLOs** for this year (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.), please provide those activities and results here:

N/A

🔘 No file attached   🔘 No file attached

Q6.1.
Please explain how the assessment activities reported in **Q6** will be linked to any of your PLOs and/or PLO assessment in the future and to the mission, vision, and the strategic planning for the program and the university:

N/A

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. Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs

b.

c.

Q8.
Please explain how this year's assessment activities help you address recommendations from your department's last program review?

We increased our focus on the role of assessment in informing candidates' planning for teaching and their ability to identify and respond to evidence of student learning or non-learning.

Q9. Please attach any additional files here:

📎 No file attached	📎 No file attached
📎 No file attached	📎 No file attached

Q9.1.
If you have attached **any** files to this form, please list **every** attached file here:

edTPA Rubric 15 Prompt

Data Summary

multi-single subjt Key Program Assessments_Fall 2015

Section 4: Background Information about the Program

Program Information (**Required**)

Program:

(If you typed in your program name at the beginning, please skip to **Q11**)

Q10.
Program/Concentration Name: [skip if program name is already selected or appears above]

Cred. Multi-Subject Instruction

Q11.
Report Author(s):

Brian Lim

Q11.1.
Department Chair/Program Director:

Stephanie Biagetti

Q11.2.
Assessment Coordinator:

n/a

Q12.
Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit (select):

Education - Credential

Q13.
College:

College of Education

Q14.
What is the total enrollment (#) for Academic Unit during assessment (see Departmental Fact Book):

100

Q15.
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:

Q16. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

Q16.1. List all the names:

Q16.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

0

Q17. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

Q17.1. List all the names:

Q17.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

0

Q18. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

7

Q18.1. List all the names:

Multiple Subject

Single Subject

Special Education: Mild/Moderate

Special Education: Dual Mild/Moderate with Multiple
Subject

Special Education: Moderate/Severe

Special Education: Dual Moderate/Severe with
Multiple Subject

Early Childhood Special Education

Q19. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

Q19.1. List all the names:

When was your **Assessment Plan**...	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
	Before 2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	No Plan	Don't know
Q20. Developed?	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○
Q20.1. Last updated?	○	○	○	○	○	●	○	○

Q20.2. (Required)
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **assessment plan**:

> 📎 **Key Program Assessments_fall 2017.docx**
> **13.33 KB**

Q21.
Has your program developed a **curriculum map?**
- ● 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

Q21.1.
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **curriculum map**:

> 📎 MS_Matrix-Courses_Candidate Development.docx
> 18.89 KB

Q22.
Has your program indicated explicitly in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?
- ○ 1. Yes
- ● 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

Q23.
Does your program have a capstone class?
- ○ 1. Yes, specify:

- ● 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

Q23.1.
Does your program have a capstone project(s)?
- ○ 1. Yes
- ● 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

(**Remember**: **Save your progress**)

Save When Completed!

ver. 10.**31**.17

edTPA®

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	
EM15: How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?	

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate uses conclusions from the analysis of student work and research or theory to propose the next steps of instruction. Next steps should be related to the standards/objectives assessed and based on the assessment that was analyzed. They should also address the whole class, groups with similar needs, and/or individual students.

Key Concepts of Rubric:
N/A

Primary Sources of Evidence:
Assessment Commentary **Prompts 1 and 4**

Scoring Decision Rules	
Multiple Criteria	• Criterion 1 (**primary**): Next steps for instruction • Criterion 2: Connections to research/theory • Place greater weight or consideration on criterion 1 (next steps for instruction).
AUTOMATIC 1	• None

Unpacking Rubric Levels	
Level 3	**Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>at Level 3</u>:** • *Primary Criterion:* The next steps focus on support for student learning that is general for the whole class, not specifically targeted for individual students. The support addresses learning related to the learning objectives that were assessed. For example, Based on the analysis of student work, the candidate identified that the students struggled with finding a common denominator and stated that the class would be continue to work on creating factor trees to more easily identify common denominators when adding fractions. • *Secondary Criterion:* The candidate refers to research or theory when describing the next steps. The connections between the research/theory and the next steps are vague/not clearly made. ➤ If evidence meets the primary criterion at Level 3, the rubric is scored at Level 3 **regardless of the evidence for the secondary criterion.** ➤ If evidence meets the primary criterion at Level 4, and candidate has NO connection to research/theory, the rubric is scored at Level 3.
Below 3	**Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>below 3</u>:** • The next steps are not directly focused on student learning needs that were identified in the analysis of the assessment. • Candidate does not explain how next steps are related to student learning. **What distinguishes Level 2 from Level 3:** At Level 2, • The next steps are related to the analysis of student learning and the standards and learning objectives assessed. • The next steps address improvements in teaching practice that mainly focus on how the candidate

S C A L E
Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, & Equity

	structures or organizes learning tasks, with a superficial connection to student learning. There is little detail on the changes in relation to the assessed student learning. Examples include repeating instruction or focusing on improving conditions for learning such as pacing or classroom management, with no clear connections to how changes address the student learning needs identified. **What distinguishes Level 1 from Level 2:** There are **three different ways** that evidence is scored at Level 1: - Next steps **do not follow from** the analysis. - Next steps are **unrelated to the standards and learning objectives** assessed. - Next steps are **not described in sufficient detail** to understand them, e.g., "more practice" or "go over the test."
Above 3	**Evidence that demonstrates performance above 3**: - Next steps are based on the assessment results and provide scaffolded or structured support that is directly focused on specific student learning needs related to conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and/or problem-solving/reasoning skills, based on the assessment results. - Next steps are supported by research and/or theory. **What distinguishes Level 4 from Level 3:** At Level 4, - The next steps are clearly aimed at supporting specific student needs for either individuals (2 or more students) or groups with similar needs related to one or more of the three areas of mathematical learning (conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND/OR mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills). Candidate should be explicit about how next steps will strategically support individuals or groups and explain how that support will address each individual or group's needs in relation to the area of mathematical learning. - The candidate discusses how the research or theory is related to the next steps in ways that make some level of sense given their students and central focus. They may cite the research or theory in their discussion, or they may refer to the ideas from the research. Either is acceptable, as long as they clearly connect the research/theory to their next steps. - Scoring decision rules: To score at Level 4, the candidate must meet the primary criterion at Level 4 and make at least a fleeting, relevant reference to research or theory (meet the second criterion at least at Level 3). **What distinguishes Level 5 from Level 4:** At Level 5, - The next steps are clearly aimed at supporting specific student needs for <u>both</u> individuals AND groups with similar needs related to all three areas of mathematical learning (conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND/OR mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills). Candidate should be explicit about how next steps will strategically support individuals and groups and explain how that support will address each individual's and group's needs in relation to the areas of mathematical learning. - The candidate explains how principles of research or theory support the proposed changes, with clear connections between the principles and the next steps. The explanations are explicit, well-articulated, and demonstrate a thorough understanding of the research or theoretical principles involved.

Assessment Task 3: Assessing Student Learning

4. **Using Assessment to Inform Instruction**

   a. Based on your analysis of student learning presented in prompts 1b–c, describe next steps for instruction to impact student learning:

   - For the whole class

   - For the 3 focus students and other individuals/groups with specific needs

   Consider the <u>variety of learners</u> in your class who may require different strategies/support (e.g., students with IEPs or 504 plans, English language learners, struggling readers, underperforming students or those with gaps in academic knowledge, and/or gifted students needing greater support or challenge).

   b. Explain how these next steps follow from your analysis of student learning. Support your explanation with principles from research and/or theory.

Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction

How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?				
Level 1	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Level 4**	**Level 5**
Next steps **do not follow** from the analysis. **OR** Next steps are **not relevant to the learning objectives** assessed. **OR** Next steps are **not described in sufficient detail** to understand them.	Next steps primarily **focus on changes to teaching practice that are superficially related to student learning needs, for example, repeating instruction, pacing, or classroom management issues**.	Next steps **propose general support that improves student learning related to assessed learning objectives**. Next steps are **loosely connected with research and/or theory**.	Next steps **provide targeted support to individuals or groups to improve their learning relative to** • conceptual understanding, • procedural fluency, **AND/OR** • mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills. Next steps are **connected** with research and/or theory.	Next steps provide targeted support to individuals **AND** groups to improve their learning relative to • conceptual understanding, • procedural fluency, **AND/OR** • mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills. Next steps are **justified with principles from** research and/or theory.

Raw Data Summary for edTPA (Rubric 12 and Rubric 15 are the PLOs) for the program

Different Levels / Rubric	1	2	3	4	5	Total (N=68)
Rubric 1	0	3	49	15	0	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 2	0	2	46	7	0	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 3	0	0	46	20	0	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 4	0	3	42	20	0	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 5	0	3	55	7	0	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 6	0	1	56	10	0	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 7	0	1	54	12	0	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 8	0	6	47	10	0	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 9	0	1	49	15	0	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 10	0	10	51	3	0	(100%, N=68)
Rubric11	0	2	43	18	0	(100%, N=68)
Rubric12	1	2	29	30	1	(100%, N=68)
Rubric13	0	8	50	9	0	(100%, N=68)
Rubric14	0	8	51	6	1	(100%, N=68)
Rubric15	0	4	47	16	0	(100%, N=68)

Data Summary for edTPA (Rubric 12 and Rubric 15 are the PLOs) for the program

Different Levels / Rubric	1	2	3	4	5	Total (N=68)
Rubric 1	0%	4%	72%	22%	0%	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 2	0%	3%	68%	25%	0%	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 3	0%	0%	68%	29%	0%	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 4	0%	4%	62%	29%	0%	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 5	0%	4%	81%	10%	0%	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 6	0%	1%	82%	15%	0%	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 7	0%	1%	79%	18%	0%	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 8	0%	9%	69%	15%	0%	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 9	0%	1%	72%	22%	0%	(100%, N=68)
Rubric 10	0%	15%	75%	4%	0%	(100%, N=68)
Rubric11	0%	3%	63%	26%	0%	(100%, N=68)
Rubric12	1%	3%	43%	44%	1%	(100%, N=68)
Rubric13	0%	12%	74%	13%	0%	(100%, N=68)
Rubric14	0%	12%	75%	9%	1%	(100%, N=68)
Rubric15	0%	6%	69%	24%	0%	(100%, N=68)

Key Program Assessments – Fall 2017

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
LL & Science ALL MS	Yes	Yes-Rubric	After week 9 during Spring Semester	LL: Baker, Loeza, Lozano, Chaplin Science: Porter, Huang, R.	Yes
Mini-edTPA Fall for 2 semester; Spring for 3 semester	Yes	Yes-Rubric	2 sem - end of fall semester 3 sem – end of spring semester	Ives, Pan, Lim	Yes
2 sem - field Experience final eval	Yes-double check that it is the <u>modified</u> student teaching eval (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

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:	PT: motivation,	L/L: reading				What is presented? Are

What are the KEY theorists/theories that are foundational to our vision of effective teaching?	developmental, others?	theories informed by learning theories Math: applications of learning theories **(StBi send PPT)**				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, willing to	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.

					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.						