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. Single-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. | Provide feedback to guide learning for students (EdTPA rubric 12) |

b. | Using assessment to inform instruction (EdTPA rubric 15) |

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 Single 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 novice 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 beginning 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):

Overall Disciplinary Knowledge

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

Specifially we will focus on "Using assessment to inform instruction (EdTPA rubric 15)"

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.

Beginning teachers use multiple measures to make an informed judgment about what a student knows and is able to do. Beginning teachers analyze data to inform instructional design, self-reflect, reteach, provide resources, and accurately document student academic and developmental progress. They support students in learning how to peer-and self-assess work using identified scoring criteria and/or rubrics. Beginning teachers provide students with opportunities to revise or reframe their work based on assessment feedback, thus leading to new learning. They implement fair grading practices, share assessment feedback about performance in a timely way, utilize digital resources to inform instruction, analyze data, and communicate learning outcomes.
Beginning teachers utilize assessment data and collaborate with specialists to learn about their students. They apply this information to make accommodations and/or modifications of assessment for students whose first language is English, English learners, and Standard English learners. They also utilize this process for students with identified learning needs, students with disabilities, and advanced learners. Beginning teachers are informed about student information in plans such asIEPs, IFSPs, ITPs, and 504 plans and participate as appropriate.

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) AND 2) the standards of performance/expectations** that you have developed for *the selected PLO* here:

> Our program standard is that 85% of our candidates will score 3 or better on rubric 15.

📎 edTPA rubric15.pdf
207.65 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: Student receivea an EdTPA handbook and have access to the Pearson website

---

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:

> The candidates uploaded their edTPA work to their program electronic portfolio located in Taskstream. Taskstream connects with Pearson. As such, by uploading their work to Taskstream, they essentially submitted their edTPA to Pearson. Once the work is submitted to Pearson, external edTPA scorers provide a rubric score for rubric 15 to assess the PLO.

(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 -- which is a comprehensive external performance assessment administered by Pearson -- spe… |

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:

Prompts related to rubric 15 of the edTPA directly the PLO because candidates are required to provide evidence of thier ability to use assessment of their students to inform their instruction.

📎 **No file attached**   📎 **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 candidate submission…

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 evaluate our own candidates' edTPA s…

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 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?

Data from all single subject candidates who submitted an EdTPA for the April deadline are represented in this analysis (n=117).

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

117

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

117

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):

See attached

📎 Table 1 Program Assess. .docx   📎 Table 1 Program Assess. .docx
52.56 KB   53.54 KB

Q4.2.
Are students doing well and meeting the program standard? **If not**, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

Yes -- we have met our program standard for this PLO.

☐ 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. 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 incresed 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 report and the feedback provided guided our process this year and especially helped clarify the role of the program standard e.g. 85% score of 3 or better on edTPA rubric 15 which was our targeted PLO.

(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:

[ ]

☐ 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:

[ ]

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
>
> Table 1
>
> 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. Single-Subject Instruction

Q11.
Report Author(s):
Mimi Coughlin

Q11.1.
Department Chair/Program Director:
Stephanie Biagetti

Q11.2.
Assessment Coordinator:
[   ]

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):

130 in Single Subject Cred.

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?

N/A

Q16.1. List all the names:

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

N/A

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

N/A

Q17.1. List all the names:

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

N/A

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

7

Q18.1. List all the names:

Multiple Subject

Single Subject

Special Education: Mild/Moderate (with and without Multiple Subject)

Special Education: Moderate/Severe (with and without Multiple Subject)

Early Childhood Special Education

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

N/A

Q19.1. List all the names:

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

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

> **multi-single subjt key program assessments_fall 2015.pdf 159.2 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**:

No file attached

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 at Level 3**: • **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 below 3**: • 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

SCALE
Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, & Equity

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>

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:

1. Next steps **do not follow from** the analysis.
2. Next steps are **unrelated to the standards and learning objectives** assessed.
3. Next steps are **not described in sufficient detail** to understand them, e.g., "more practice" or "go over the test."

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Above 3**</td>
<td>

Evidence that demonstrates performance <u>above 3</u>:
- 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.

</td>
</tr>
</table>

SCALE
Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, & Equity

Rubric level 5= highest 1=lowest	# of candidates with this score	% of candidates with this score
Rubric level: 5	2	1.7
Rubric level: 4	25	21.3
Rubric level: 3	74	63.2
Rubric level: 2	16	13.7
Rubric level: 1	0	0

Program standard: 85% or more of our candidates will have a score of 3 or better on the PLO	# of candidates with score of 3 or better (meeting or exceeding program standard)	% of candidates with score of 3 or better (meeting or exceeding program standard)
	101	86%

Key Program Assessments – Fall 2015

Program	Guidelines in TS?	Evaluation Criteria or Format in TS?	When submitted?	Who scores and/or has access?	Goes In Candidate DRF?
Multiple Subject – New 2 and 3 semester candidates ****Question: Include EL Case Study from EDBM272****					
Community Study ALL MS	Yes	Yes-Rubric (it is very basic, could be fleshed out more)	End of fall semester	Owens, Daly, Nowell, Baker	Yes
CATs-LL & Science ALL MS	Yes	Yes-Rubric	After week 9 during Spring Semester	LL: Baker, Loeza, Lozano, Chaplin Science: Porter, Huang, R. Rodriguez	Yes
Mini PACT Fall for 2 semester; Spring for 3 semester	Yes	Yes-Rubric	2 sem - end of fall semester 3 sem – end of spring semester	Ives, Pan, Lim	Yes
2 sem - field Experience final eval	Yes-double check that it is the modified 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
Single Subject – all new candidates ****Question: Include Transcript Analysis from EDBM279?****					
Classroom Environment	Yes	Yes-Rubric	After mid semester	Arellano, Coughlin, Brewer, Allender score; Access for all SS faculty: Baker, Berta Avila, , Loeza, Nowell, Gunston Parks, Merrill, Lim,	Yes

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