



**Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report Fall 2014
Academic Years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014**

| | |
|---|---|
| Institution | Point Loma Nazarene University School of Education |
| Cohort | none |
| Date report is submitted | 11/14/14 |
| Program documented in this report | Master in Teaching: Single Subject |
| Please identify all delivery options through which this program is offered (Traditional, Intern, Other) | Traditional Intern |
| Credential awarded | Single Subject Preliminary Credential |
| Is this program offered at more than one site? Yes | |
| If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered | Bakersfield Inland Empire Mission Valley |
| Program Contact | Jill Hamilton-Bunch, Initial Teacher Preparation |
| Title | Associate Dean |
| Phone # | 661.321.3487 |
| E-Mail | JillHamilton-Bunch@pointloma.edu |
| If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below: | |
| Name | This individual is no longer with the university. |
| Title | |
| Phone # | |
| E-mail | |

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION
SINGLE SUBJECT PRELIMINARY CREDENTIAL

PART I – Contextual Information:

PLNU's Single Subject 2042 Program was approved by the CTC in 2003. The University's School of Education offers the Preliminary Single Subject credential program for candidates who have completed their undergraduate degrees from Point Loma Nazarene University and other institutions.

The program has a Program Director who is responsible for collaborating with all the centers to ensure that the program is coherent and aligned. A team of PLNU full-time faculty and approximately 24 adjunct faculty served this cohort of Preliminary Single Subject candidates with close communication and collaboration among them regarding candidate proficiency, data collection, and analysis. The Single Subject program falls under the responsibility of the Associate Dean for Initial Teacher Education.

Through the 2012-2013 school year, three regional centers (Arcadia, Bakersfield and Mission Valley) were in operation with full-time faculty responsible for supporting the program at each site. An additional regional center in Inland Empire was supported by adjunct. For the 2013-2014 school year, only three regional centers (Bakersfield, Mission Valley, and Inland Empire) continued offering credential programs. The Arcadia regional center was closed.

| Program Specific Candidate Information | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported | | | | |
| | 2012-2013 | | 2013-2014 | |
| Site (If multiple sites) Delivery Option | Number of Candidates | Number of Completers/ Graduates | Number of Candidates | Number of Completers/ Graduates |
| Arcadia Regional Center | 4 | 0 Interns 4 Traditional | 1 | 0 Interns 1 Traditional |
| Bakersfield Regional Center | 57 | 2 Intern 13 Traditional | 51 | 5 Interns 7 Traditional |
| Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center | 0 | 0 Intern 0 Traditional | 1 | 0 Interns 1 Traditional |
| Mission Valley Regional Center | 63 | 3 Intern 23 Traditional | 67 | 1 Intern 20 Traditional |

Changes Since Last Accreditation Activity (Biennial Report, Program Assessment or Site Visit).

Point Loma Nazarene School of Education (SOE) has undergone several changes since the last accreditation activity.

The SOE received NCATE/CAEP accreditation as a result of the last accreditation site visit in the fall of 2012. A new Dean, Dr. Deb Erickson, has been leading the SOE efforts since July of 2013. The SOE has experienced a decrease in the number of candidates enrolled, as well as a reduction in force in full-time faculty. Additional changes include the revision in the number of *Dispositions of Noble Character* that are assessed for each candidate several times a year from eight to four. Several courses are offered in an on-line format to serve candidates across regional centers, and there has been a university-wide

commitment to increase transparency in the data collection process, analysis of data and program improvement plans.

Our regional center in Arcadia has closed. All candidates were finished out with individual plans of completion, with several candidates now in their final culminating project toward completion.

Since the last report, the Disposition Assessment Instrument was modified. Faculty changed the indicators to provide more specificity and required candidates to provide a rationale on ratings of each indicator. This was developed to further enhance the specificity of responses to the Disposition Data. Prior to this modification candidates did not consistently provide a rationale when they rated themselves high on the instrument. The instrument needed improvement to understand candidate self-perception on the Dispositions

Faculty recommended that the EDU 620 Key/Signature Assignment be revised to include candidate learning outcomes that are aligned to program standards and increase the degree of rigor of the instrument. The rubric for the key assessment now includes descriptors and indicators that reflect that instrument and CLO alignment.

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

SINGLE SUBJECT PRELIMINARY CREDENTIAL

PART II – Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

a) What are the primary candidate assessment(s) the program uses up to and through recommending the candidate for a credential?

The School of Education collects a wide range of data on an annual basis from current students, graduates, master teachers and other teachers who host preliminary candidates, and from state-mandated assessments. Since the School of Education implemented the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) in 2008, TPA data has been collected on Preliminary Single Subject Credential candidates.

As a result of that decision, the key assessments designated for the biennial report for Preliminary Single Subject credential candidates are the four CalTPA assessments, and two “signature assignments” in courses designed by the SOE faculty.

Each of the courses within the Preliminary Single Subject Credential program is designed to lead candidates to high levels of understanding and mastery centered on each of the common program standards as well as the program specific standards for teachers. The CalTPA tasks are uploaded to TaskStream and assessed by approved and calibrated assessors allowing for them to be assessed anonymously. The signature assignments are uploaded by the candidates onto the TaskStream website where they are assessed by the professor using a four point rubric. Both TPA and Signature Assignment scores and data are archived on TaskStream for data analysis and program improvement purposes.

TPA 1: The first task, TPA 1, *Subject-Specific Pedagogy*, was completed by candidates during their initial courses: *EDU 600 Foundations of Teaching and Learning Theory*, *EDU 601 Language Acquisition and Diverse Populations*, and *EDU 602 Foundations of Special Education*. Candidates completed this first task (one case study at a time) with final submittal after completing all three courses.

Task 2: TPA 2, *Designing Instruction*, was completed after the candidates’ methods course, *EDU 621 General Methods for Secondary Teachers*.

Task 3: TPA 3, *Assessing Learning*, was completed during candidates’ first phase (8 weeks) of clinical practice (EDU 640).

Task 4: Candidates submitted the final task, TPA 4, *Culminating Teaching Experience*, upon completion of their second Clinical Practice experience (EDU 644), as a cumulative demonstration of their knowledge and skills at the end of their teaching credential program.

The signature assignments include the following:

- EDU 600 Signature Assignment *Demonstrating Knowledge of Learning Theory* wherein the candidate examines in-depth one of the research theories from the course.
- EDU 620 Signature Assignment *Literacy Case Study* that focuses on a student who is an English Learner from the vantage point of the Plan, Teach, Reflect, and Apply cycle.

| Evaluation Instrument (Direct) | Description | Data Collected: 2 years | CTC Standards Assessed |
|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| TPA 1 | Subject Specific Pedagogy | 2012 and 2013 | TPE Standards 1,3,4,6,7,9 |
| TPA 2 | Designing Instruction | 2012 and 2013 | TPE Standards 1,4,6,7,8,9,13 |
| TPA 3 | Assessing Learning | 2012 and 2013 | TPE Standards 3,6,7,8,9,13 |
| TPA 4 | Culminating Teaching Experience | 2012 and 2013 | TPE Standards 1-11, 13 |
| EDU 600 Signature Assignment | Foundations of Education & Learning Theory | 2012 and 2013 | 3,4,5,6,11 |
| EDU 620 Signature Assignment | Literacy Instruction for Secondary Teachers | 2012 and 2013 | 5,6,7B,8B |

b) What additional information about candidate and program completer performance or program effectiveness is collected and analyzed that informs programmatic decision making?

With a commitment to the principle of ongoing assessment and data analysis driving continuous improvement, the School of Education collects data in two additional areas: 1) candidate Dispositions of Noble Character and 2) exit surveys from program completers. Candidates are introduced to the Dispositions in EDU 600 *Foundations of Education and Learning Theory*. At the end of the course, candidates self-assess their Dispositions and are verified by the professor of record. Candidates conduct self-assessments in EDU 621 *General Methods for Secondary Teachers* and in both phases of clinical practice. The professors-of-record, clinical practice university supervisors and cooperating teachers also assess candidates on dispositions.

The purpose of the exit survey is to give program completers an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the School of Education's preparation program. The exit survey probed candidates' overall satisfaction with the program, course of study, course content, and instructional delivery.

| Additional Evaluation Instruments (Indirect) | Description | Data Collected: 2 years | Use |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Disposition Assessment | Form-based Author Responses | 2012 and 2013 | Monitor candidates' development of professional dispositions, assessed by candidates themselves, professors, and cooperating teachers |
| Exit Survey | Form-based Author Responses | 2012 and 2013 | Feedback used for quality assurance and program improvement |

c) Include aggregated data from 4-6 instruments that were described in (a) and (b).

The School of Education collects a wide range of data on an annual basis from current students, graduates, and via state-mandated assessments.

The primary candidate assessments are known as signature assignments. The evaluation mechanism currently in place to assess signature assignments uses a four point scale: 1 = No Evidence; 2 = Some Evidence; 3 = Adequate Evidence; and 4 = Clear Evidence. Summaries and interpretation of these measures are reported in Part III.

It is important to note that at times, courses are populated with candidates from other programs (change in program, taken as an elective, not properly identified in the system, option of dual credentialing, etc.). If these candidates have submitted a signature assignment using a different program's folio (DRF) based on one of these situations, the data would be reported as such and result in uneven numbers of participants in the program's assessment.

CALIFORNIA TEACHER PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENTS

Table 1

Tasks 1-3: Preliminary Single Subject Candidates (2012-2013)

| TPAs Single Subject 2012 | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----|------|-----------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | N | Mean | Std. Dev. | Pass 1 st Rate | Pass 2 nd Rate | Pass 3 rd Rate | Pass 4 th Rate |
| Task 1 | 50 | 3.08 | .38 | 76% | 98% | 100% | N/A |
| Task 2 | 120 | 3.08 | .47 | 82% | 95% | 99% | 100% |
| Task 3 | 104 | 3.11 | .34 | 89% | 98% | 100% | N/A |

| TPAs Single Subject 2013 | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----|------|-----------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | N | Mean | Std. Dev. | Pass 1 st Rate | Pass 2 nd Rate | Pass 3 rd Rate | Pass 4 th Rate |
| Task 1 | 36 | 3.11 | .46 | 86% | 97% | 100% | N/A |
| Task 2 | 121 | 3.23 | .54 | 87% | 98% | 99% | 100% |
| Task 3 | 98 | 3.08 | .31 | 82% | 96% | 100% | N/A |

Table 2

Task 4: Preliminary Single Subject Candidates (2012-2013)

| Task 4 – Culminating Teaching Experience Year: 2012 | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| N | Criterion 1 - Establishing Goals and Standards | Criterion 2 - Learning About Students | Criterion 3 - Describing Classroom Environment | Criterion 4 - Planning for Instruction | Criterion 5 - Making Adaptations | Criterion 6- Using Subject- specific Pedagogical Skills | Criterion 7- Analyzing student evidence and assessment | Criterion 8 - Reflecting | Average Overall Score |
| 104 | Average Mean 3.11 | Average Mean 3.30 | Average Mean 3.39 | Average Mean 3.31 | Average Mean 2.99 | Average Mean 3.25 | Average Mean 3.19 | Average Mean 3.25 | 3.22 |

| Task 4 – Culminating Teaching Experience Year: 2013 | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| N | Criterion 1 - Establishing Goals and Standards | Criterion 2 - Learning About Students | Criterion 3 - Describing Classroom Environment | Criterion 4 - Planning for Instruction | Criterion 5 - Making Adaptations | Criterion 6- Using Subject- specific Pedagogical Skills | Criterion 7- Analyzing student evidence and assessment | Criterion 8 - Reflecting | Average Overall Score |
| 95 | Average Mean 3.06 | Average Mean 3.25 | Average Mean 3.38 | Average Mean 3.24 | Average Mean 3.03 | Average Mean 3.22 | Average Mean 3.25 | Average Mean 3.26 | 3.21 |

In 2013, candidates in the Preliminary Single Subject program had a significantly higher pass rate on their first attempt on Task 1 and 2, and their mean scores were higher than in 2012. However, in Task 3,

the first passage rate decreased slightly, and the mean score decreased slightly. The scores in general for 2013 were higher in the aggregate for Tasks 1, 2, and 3, but the scores for Tasks 3 were slightly lower. As there was no change in the manner/location/timing of the Task 3 assessment, it would be an important area for program reflection.

For Task 4, although candidates had passing scores in all criteria in 2013, in every area except for Making Adaptations, Analyzing Student Evidence and Assessment, and Reflecting, scores were lower than the previous year. Based on a decrease of .05 or greater, the unit will reflect upon Establishing Goals and Standards, Learning about Students, and Planning for Instruction.

EDU 600: FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING THEORY

The signature assignment for *EDU 600 Foundations of Education and Learning Theory* requires credentialing candidates to demonstrate their ability to do the following:

- Communicate their beliefs about education as related to students, learning, teaching, and schools
- Communicate their personal philosophy of education
- Communicate their reasons for choosing the field of education as a career choice
- Reflect on the development of their personal philosophies
- Demonstrate their ability to organize their thoughts in writing with correct grammar and spelling

Table 3

Signature Assignment EDU 600: Preliminary Single Subject Candidates (2012)

| Key Assessment: EDU 600 Year: 2012 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|------|----------|-----------------------------|------|----------|--------------------------------------|------|----------|--------------------------------|------|----------|
| Criteria | Arcadia Regional Center | | | Bakersfield Regional Center | | | Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center | | | Mission Valley Regional Center | | |
| | N | Mean | St. Dev. | N | Mean | St. Dev. | N | Mean | St. Dev. | N | Mean | St. Dev. |
| Knowledge of research-based theories and principles of human learning and development | 1 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.9 | .32 |
| knowledge about how these theories affect classroom practice | 1 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 3.93 | .26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.9 | .32 |
| Reflection on how these theories affect and resonate with candidates' beliefs | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 3.6 | .63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.8 | .42 |
| Presentation is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized | 1 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 3.87 | .35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 0 |

Table 4

Signature Assignment EDU 600: Preliminary Single Subject Candidates (2013)

| Key Assessment: EDU 600 Year: 2013 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|------|----------|-----------------------------|------|----------|--------------------------------------|------|----------|--------------------------------|------|----------|
| Criteria | Arcadia Regional Center | | | Bakersfield Regional Center | | | Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center | | | Mission Valley Regional Center | | |
| | N | Mean | St. Dev. | N | Mean | St. Dev. | N | Mean | St. Dev. | N | Mean | St. Dev. |
| Knowledge of research-based theories and principles of human learning and development | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 3.83 | .58 |
| knowledge about how these theories affect classroom practice | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3.61 | .78 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 3.83 | .58 |

| Key Assessment: EDU 600 Year: 2013 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|------|----------|-----------------------------|------|----------|--------------------------------------|------|----------|--------------------------------|------|----------|
| Criteria | Arcadia Regional Center | | | Bakersfield Regional Center | | | Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center | | | Mission Valley Regional Center | | |
| | N | Mean | St. Dev. | N | Mean | St. Dev. | N | Mean | St. Dev. | N | Mean | St. Dev. |
| Reflection on how these theories affect and resonate with candidates' beliefs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3.61 | .6 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 3.83 | .58 |
| Presentation is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3.89 | .33 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 |

It is clear that the average overall scores at all regional centers were strong, with the performance ranging between 3.6 to 4.0 (outlier data removed). Candidate scores decreased across in the criterion Knowledge about How these Theories Affect Classroom Practice in 2013, but overall showed little significant change.

EDU 620: LITERACY INSTRUCTION FOR SECONDARY TEACHERS

The signature assignment in *EDU 620 Literacy Instruction for Secondary Teachers* requires each candidate to choose an English Language Learner as a focus student during the field experience. The assignment requires candidates to perform the following tasks.

- Collect data through anecdotal observation and student conferences
- Collect data to determine the student's ELD abilities
- Collect data through the administration of literacy assessment instruments
- Reflect on the student's strengths and areas for growth
- Set learning goals or next steps for student growth

Table 5

Signature Assignment EDU 620: Preliminary Single Subject Candidates (2012)

| Key Assessment: EDU 620 Year: 2012 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|------|----------|-----------------------------|------|----------|--------------------------------------|------|----------|--------------------------------|------|----------|
| Criteria | Arcadia Regional Center | | | Bakersfield Regional Center | | | Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center | | | Mission Valley Regional Center | | |
| | N | Mean | St. Dev. | N | Mean | St. Dev. | N | Mean | St. Dev. | N | Mean | St. Dev. |
| Data collection through anecdotal observation and conferences with students | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 3.83 | .38 |
| Data collection to determine student language abilities or special needs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3.91 | .3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 3.44 | .7 |
| Data collection through the administration of literacy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 3.78 | .55 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|----|------|----|---|---|---|----|------|-----|
| assessments | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reflection on student strengths and areas for growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3.91 | .3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 3.61 | .78 |
| Learning goals or next steps for student growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3.91 | .3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 3.72 | .75 |

Table 6
Signature Assignment EDU 620: Preliminary Single Subject Candidates (2013)

| Key Assessment: EDU 620 Year: 2013 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|------|----------|-----------------------------|------|----------|--------------------------------------|------|----------|--------------------------------|------|----------|
| Criteria | Arcadia Regional Center | | | Bakersfield Regional Center | | | Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center | | | Mission Valley Regional Center | | |
| | N | Mean | St. Dev. | N | Mean | St. Dev. | N | Mean | St. Dev. | N | Mean | St. Dev. |
| Data collection through anecdotal observation and conferences with students | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3.88 | .35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3.64 | .5 |
| Data collection to determine student language abilities or special needs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3.88 | .35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3.36 | 1.03 |
| Data collection through the administration of literacy assessments | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3.75 | .71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 |
| Reflection on student strengths and areas for growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3.63 | .74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3.32 | 1.01 |
| Learning goals or next steps for student growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3.63 | .74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3.09 | 1.14 |

In 2013, while scores remained high, nearly all scores in all criteria in both Mission Valley and Bakersfield decreased, although the Mission Valley campus showed an increased score in the criterion of Data Collection through the Administration of Literacy Assessments in 2013 (from 3.78 in 2012 to 4.0 in 2013). This change may be explained by a more rigorous calibration system utilized in the SOE. However, an increased emphasis on instructional strategies for improving candidate knowledge and competence in these criteria is important in the upcoming years.

Special TPA Section for Preliminary Credentials:

- 1) **Number of Assessors:** The total number of assessors the program uses is seven. These assessors actively scored in the years for which the biennial report data is being submitted.
- 2) **Assessor Initial Training and Recalibration:** All assessors must successfully complete the initial training. All assessors are recalibrated on an annual basis. They must also evaluate and score all (1-4) TPA's throughout the year.
- 3) **Data on Reliability Related to Double Scoring (% of score agreement):**

15% of all first-try passing tasks are re-sent to different assessors for score agreement. 78% of these tasks gained score agreement on the first attempt of double scoring. The task continues to be sent until there is score agreement. If three attempts result in three different scores, the TPA coordinator becomes the final and fourth reader to obtain score agreement.

All non-passing tasks (scores of 1 or 2) are re-sent to different assessors for score agreement. 91% of these tasks gained score agreement on this first attempt of double scoring. The task continues to be sent until there is score agreement. If three attempts result in three different scores, the TPA coordinator becomes the final and fourth reader to obtain score agreement.

4) Modifications made to assessor selection, training, recalibration.

No modifications have been made.

DISPOSITION ASSESSMENT

Candidates were assessed on their Dispositions of Noble Character beginning in the initial class within the MAT Preliminary Single Subject Credential Program. Candidates are introduced to the Dispositions in EDU 600 *Foundations of Education and Learning Theory*. At the end of the course, candidates self-assess their Dispositions, which are verified by the professor of record. Candidates conduct self-assessments in EDU 621 *General Methods for Secondary Teachers* and in both phases of Clinical Practice. The professors-of-record, clinical practice university supervisors and cooperating teachers also assess candidates on dispositions.

Table 7
Dispositional Assessment of Preliminary Single Subject Credential Candidates (2012-2013)

| Disposition Data 2012 | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------------|
| Rated Item | Total | Distribution % | | | | Average |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Indicator 1: Dignity and Honor. The candidate honors and respects the worthiness of all individuals in word and deed based on PLNU's Wesleyan heritage: We are individuals created in the image of God, committed to civility, respect, hospitality, grace, and service. | 39 | 2.56 | 0.00 | 35.90 | 61.54 | 3.56 |
| Indicator 2: Honesty and Integrity. The candidate demonstrates honesty, integrity, and coherence in attitudes, and actions, and is accountable to the norms and expectations of the learning community | 39 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20.51 | 79.49 | 3.79 |
| Indicator 3: Caring, Patience, and Respect. The candidate demonstrates caring, patience, fairness and respect for the knowledge level, diversity, and abilities of others, ensuring that all students have the opportunity to achieve. | 39 | 0.00 | 5.13 | 35.90 | 58.97 | 3.54 |
| Indicator 4: Spirit of Collaboration, Flexibility and Humility. The candidate actively participates in and contributes to the achievement of the learning community, explaining own thought process with humility and considers those of others with a positive, open-minded attitude. | 39 | 0.00 | 10.26 | 58.97 | 30.77 | 3.21 |
| Indicator 5: Harmony in Learning Community. The candidate takes responsibility for resolving conflicts or issues with others, and teaches students those skills, in a way that sustains and enhances a healthy and safe learning community. | 39 | 0.00 | 17.95 | 38.46 | 43.59 | 3.26 |
| Indicator 6: Self-Awareness/Calling. The candidate shows awareness of areas of strength, interests, learning style, and areas for continuing growth; generates and follows through on personalized growth plans. The candidate demonstrates that serving as a professional educator is a confirmed calling to equip, to transform and to empower every student to fulfill his or her full potential. | 39 | 0.00 | 5.13 | 41.03 | 53.85 | 3.49 |
| Indicator 7: Perseverance with Challenge. The candidate perseveres, remains engaged, and persists as a life-long learner, especially when academic and professional assignments are perceived as challenging. | 39 | 0.00 | 2.56 | 48.72 | 48.72 | 3.46 |
| Indicator 8: Diligence in Work Habits & Responsibility for Learning. The candidate attends to the roles and responsibilities of the learning community, and is well-prepared and on time. The candidate completes required assignments on time and is reflective and receptive to formative feedback. | 39 | 0.00 | 17.95 | 46.15 | 35.90 | 3.18 |

| Disposition Data 2013 | | | | | | |
|--|-------|----------------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| Rated Item | Total | Distribution % | | | | Average |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Indicator 1: Dignity and Honor. The candidate honors and respects the worthiness of all individuals in word and deed based on PLNU's Wesleyan heritage: We are individuals created in the image of God, committed to civility, respect, hospitality, grace, and service. | 10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10.00 | 90.00 | 3.90 |
| Indicator 2: Honesty and Integrity. The candidate demonstrates honesty, integrity, and coherence in attitudes, and actions, and is accountable to the norms and expectations of the learning community | 10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10.00 | 90.00 | 3.90 |
| Indicator 3: Caring, Patience, and Respect. The candidate demonstrates caring, patience, fairness and respect for the knowledge level, diversity, and abilities of others, ensuring that all students have the opportunity to achieve. | 10 | 0.00 | 30.00 | 30.00 | 70.00 | 3.70 |
| Indicator 4: Spirit of Collaboration, Flexibility and Humility. The candidate actively participates in and contributes to the achievement of the learning community, explaining own thought process with humility and considers those of others with a positive, open-minded attitude. | 10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 40.00 | 60.00 | 3.60 |
| Indicator 5: Harmony in Learning Community. The candidate takes responsibility for resolving conflicts or issues with others, and teaches students those skills, in a way that sustains and enhances a healthy and safe learning community. | 10 | 0.00 | 10.00 | 30.00 | 60.00 | 3.50 |
| Indicator 6: Self-Awareness/Calling. The candidate shows awareness of areas of strength, interests, learning style, and areas for continuing growth; generates and follows through on personalized growth plans. The candidate demonstrates that serving as a professional educator is a confirmed calling to equip, to transform and to empower every student to fulfill his or her full potential. | 10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10.00 | 90.00 | 3.90 |
| Indicator 7: Perseverance with Challenge. The candidate perseveres, remains engaged, and persists as a life-long learner, especially when academic and professional assignments are perceived as challenging. | 10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20.00 | 80.00 | 3.80 |
| Indicator 8: Diligence in Work Habits & Responsibility for Learning. The candidate attends to the roles and responsibilities of the learning community, and is well-prepared and on time. The candidate completes required assignments on time and is reflective and receptive to formative feedback. | 10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 30.00 | 70.00 | 3.70 |

Table 8
Dispositional Assessment of Preliminary Single Subject Credential Candidates (New Disposition Criteria, 2013)

| Disposition Data (New Dispositions effective 08.27.13) | | | | | | |
|--|-------|----------------|------|-------|-------|---------|
| Rated Item | Total | Distribution % | | | | Average |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Indicator 1: Honor . The candidate honors and respects the worthiness of all individuals in word and deed based on PLNU's Wesleyan heritage: We are individuals created in the image of God, committed to civility, respect, hospitality, grace, and service, demonstrating coherence in attitudes and actions. | 18 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 44.44 | 55.56 | 3.56 |

Disposition Data (New Dispositions effective 08.27.13)

| Rated Item | Total | Distribution % | | | | Average |
|---|-------|----------------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Indicator 2: Spirit of Harmony and Collaboration. The candidate actively contributes to the learning community with caring, patience and respect for the diversity of learners. The candidate takes responsibility for resolving conflicts or issues with others, and teaches students those skills, in a way that sustains and enhances a healthy and safe learning community. The candidate's flexibility and humility assures that all students have the opportunity to achieve to their potential. | 18 | 0.00 | 5.56 | 38.89 | 55.56 | 3.50 |
| Indicator 3: Reflective Learner. The candidate shows awareness of areas of strength, interests, learning style, and areas for continuing growth; generates and follows through on personalized growth plans. The candidate demonstrates that serving as a professional educator is a confirmed calling to equip, to transform and to empower every student to fulfill his or her full potential. | 18 | 0.00 | 5.56 | 50.00 | 44.44 | 3.39 |
| Indicator 4: Professional and Positive Perseverance. The candidate displays passion for teaching and learning by remaining positive, engaged and accountable to the norms and expectations of the learning community, especially when academic or professional assignments are perceived as challenging. The candidate is reflective and receptive to formative feedback. | 18 | 0.00 | 11.11 | 50.00 | 38.89 | 3.28 |

In every indicator, candidates' scores on the 8 Dispositions were higher in 2013 than in 2012. Scores were significantly higher in The Spirit of Collaboration, Harmony and Learning Community, Perseverance with a Challenge, and Diligence in Work Habits and Responsibility for Learning in 2013 than in 2012. Candidates scored the highest in both 2012 and 2013 in Honesty and Integrity.

For the newly revised 4 Dispositions, candidates rated themselves highest on the indicator of Honor and lowest on Professional and Positive Perseverance. In viewing the data from the two sets of measures, in general, candidates score themselves lower when using the second measure (4 Dispositions). This broader, more sophisticated, rubric allows for deeper reflection among candidates.

EXIT SURVEY 2012

The exit survey for 2012 is presented below. The exit survey, which, upon program completion, probed candidates' overall satisfaction with the program, course of study, course content, and instructional delivery, is uploaded into Task Stream.

Table 9
Exit Survey Preliminary Single Subject Candidates

Equip

* [Formal Preparation for Teaching:](#) 🔍

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 32 Author Response(s)

| Rated Item(s) | Total | Distribution % <u>Display as</u> | | | | Average |
|--|-------|----------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|---------|
| | | <u>Count</u> | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| <u>Construct effective lesson plans.</u> | 32 | 81.25% | 9.38% | 3.12% | 6.25% | 1.34 |
| <u>Incorporate adaptations in lesson planning for English Language Learners and students with special needs.</u> | 32 | 59.38% | 34.38% | 3.12% | 3.12% | 1.50 |
| <u>Plan a classroom management strategy for your classroom.</u> | 32 | 50.00% | 46.88% | 3.12% | 0.00% | 1.53 |
| <u>Draw upon a variety of management strategies according to student/classroom needs.</u> | 32 | 53.12% | 43.75% | 3.12% | 0.00% | 1.50 |
| <u>Use a variety of tools to keep parents informed of their child's progress in the classroom.</u> | 32 | 46.88% | 34.38% | 15.62% | 3.12% | 1.75 |
| <u>Understand the importance of communicating regularly with parents.</u> | 32 | 68.75% | 18.75% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 1.44 |
| <u>Conduct a parent/teacher conference.</u> | 32 | 40.62% | 21.88% | 31.25% | 6.25% | 2.03 |
| Response Legend: 1 = Well Prepared 2 = Adequately Prepared 3 = Somewhat Prepared 4 = Unprepared | | | | | | |

Response Legend: 1 = Well Prepared 2 = Adequately Prepared 3 = Somewhat Prepared 4 = Unprepared

Transform

* [Classroom Skills:](#) 🔍

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 32 Author Response(s)

| Rated Item(s) | Total | Distribution % Display as | | | | Average |
|---|-------|---|--------|-------|-------|---------|
| | | Count | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Effectively implement a variety of strategies to assess student learning. | 32 | 71.88% | 18.75% | 3.12% | 6.25% | 1.44 |
| Use assessment data to inform instructional planning. | 32 | 62.50% | 28.12% | 3.12% | 6.25% | 1.53 |
| Effectively implement a variety of EL strategies. | 32 | 59.38% | 31.25% | 6.25% | 3.12% | 1.53 |
| Effectively implement a variety of strategies to meet the needs of students with special needs. | 32 | 53.12% | 37.50% | 6.25% | 3.12% | 1.59 |

| Rated Item(s) | Total | Distribution % Display as | | | | Average |
|---|-------|---|--------|-------|-------|---------|
| | | Count | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Effectively implement a variety of differentiated instructional strategies to meet the learning needs of the full range of students in a typical classroom. | 32 | 62.50% | 28.12% | 6.25% | 3.12% | 1.50 |
| Effectively implement a variety of classroom management strategies. | 32 | 53.12% | 40.62% | 3.12% | 3.12% | 1.56 |
| Response Legend: 1 = Well Prepared 2 = Adequately Prepared 3 = Somewhat Prepared 4 = Unprepared | | | | | | |

✳ [Functionality of Program:](#) 🔍

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 32 Author Response(s)

| Rated Item(s) | Total | Distribution % Display as | | | | Average |
|--|-------|---|--------|--------|-------|---------|
| | | Count | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Exposing you to the diversity of settings in CA schools. | 32 | 59.38% | 28.12% | 3.12% | 9.38% | 1.63 |
| Helping you gain a better understanding of the daily routines and responsibilities of a classroom teacher. | 32 | 68.75% | 21.88% | 6.25% | 3.12% | 1.44 |
| Supporting you in the clinical practice experience via university supervision. | 32 | 56.25% | 21.88% | 12.50% | 9.38% | 1.75 |
| Supporting you in the clinical practice experience via the clinical practice seminar. | 32 | 46.88% | 37.50% | 12.50% | 3.12% | 1.72 |
| Assessing your teaching performance in the clinical practice placement. | 32 | 53.12% | 31.25% | 9.38% | 6.25% | 1.69 |
| Supporting you in the completion of Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) tasks. | 32 | 53.12% | 31.25% | 12.50% | 3.12% | 1.66 |
| Response Legend: 1 = Extremely Effective 2 = Effective 3 = Somewhat Effective 4 = Ineffective | | | | | | |

Empower

✳ [Professional Attributes:](#) 🔍

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 32 Author Response(s)

| Rated Item(s) | Total | Distribution % Display as | | | | Average |
|---|-------|---|--------|-------|-------|---------|
| | | Count | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Collaborate with teachers in the school setting. | 32 | 65.62% | 28.12% | 6.25% | 0.00% | 1.41 |
| Collaborate with school administrators in the school setting. | 32 | 59.38% | 28.12% | 9.38% | 3.12% | 1.56 |
| Contribute to discussions of educational issues. | 32 | 62.50% | 28.12% | 9.38% | 0.00% | 1.47 |
| Reflect upon your own teaching and make changes based upon that reflection. | 32 | 84.38% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 3.12% | 1.22 |

Response Legend: 1 = Well Prepared 2 = Adequately Prepared 3 = Somewhat Prepared 4 = Unprepared

* [Teaching as a Calling/Christian Worldview:](#)

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 32 Author Response(s)

| Rated Item(s) | Total | Distribution % Display as | | | | Average |
|--|-------|---|--------|--------|-------|---------|
| | | Count | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Encouraging you to explore teaching as a calling. | 32 | 68.75% | 28.12% | 0.00% | 3.12% | 1.38 |
| Encouraging you to consider God's grace in your life. | 32 | 65.62% | 18.75% | 12.50% | 3.12% | 1.53 |
| Raising your awareness of how dispositional characteristics impact a teacher's professional performance. | 32 | 65.62% | 25.00% | 6.25% | 3.12% | 1.47 |

Response Legend: 1 = Extremely Effective 2 = Effective 3 = Somewhat Effective 4 = Ineffective

EXIT SURVEY 2013

The exit survey for 2013 is presented below. The exit survey, which, upon program completion, probed candidates' overall satisfaction with the program, course of study, course content, and instructional delivery, is uploaded into Task Stream.

Table 10

Exit Survey Preliminary Single Subject Candidates

Equip

* [Formal Preparation for Teaching:](#)

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 16 Author Response(s)

| Rated Item(s) | Total | Distribution % Display as | | | | Average |
|---|-------|---|--------|--------|-------|---------|
| | | Count | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Construct effective lesson plans. | 16 | 81.25% | 6.25% | 6.25% | 6.25% | 1.38 |
| Incorporate adaptations in lesson planning for English Language Learners and students with special needs. | 16 | 68.75% | 25.00% | 6.25% | 0.00% | 1.38 |
| Plan a classroom management strategy for your classroom. | 16 | 56.25% | 31.25% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 1.56 |
| Draw upon a variety of management strategies according to student/classroom needs. | 16 | 50.00% | 37.50% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 1.63 |
| Use a variety of tools to keep parents informed of their child's progress in the classroom. | 16 | 50.00% | 18.75% | 31.25% | 0.00% | 1.81 |
| Understand the importance of communicating regularly with parents. | 16 | 56.25% | 18.75% | 25.00% | 0.00% | 1.69 |
| Conduct a parent/teacher conference. | 16 | 31.25% | 31.25% | 31.25% | 6.25% | 2.13 |

Response Legend: 1 = Well Prepared 2 = Adequately Prepared 3 = Somewhat Prepared 4 = Unprepared

Transform

Classroom Skills:

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 16 Author Response(s)

| Rated Item(s) | Total | Distribution % Display as | | | | Average |
|---|-------|---|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| | | Count | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Effectively implement a variety of strategies to assess student learning. | 16 | 68.75% | 18.75% | 0.00% | 12.50% | 1.56 |
| Use assessment data to inform instructional planning. | 16 | 56.25% | 25.00% | 6.25% | 12.50% | 1.75 |
| Effectively implement a variety of EL strategies. | 16 | 62.50% | 25.00% | 6.25% | 6.25% | 1.56 |
| Effectively implement a variety of strategies to meet the needs of students with special needs. | 16 | 68.75% | 25.00% | 0.00% | 6.25% | 1.44 |
| Effectively implement a variety of differentiated instructional strategies to meet the learning needs of the full range of students in a typical classroom. | 16 | 62.50% | 25.00% | 6.25% | 6.25% | 1.56 |
| Effectively implement a variety of classroom management strategies. | 16 | 56.25% | 25.00% | 12.50% | 6.25% | 1.69 |

Response Legend: 1 = Well Prepared 2 = Adequately Prepared 3 = Somewhat Prepared 4 = Unprepared

Functionality of Program:

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 16 Author Response(s)

| Rated Item(s) | Total | Distribution % Display as | | | | Average |
|--|-------|---|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| | | Count | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Exposing you to the diversity of settings in CA schools. | 16 | 56.25% | 25.00% | 6.25% | 12.50% | 1.75 |
| Helping you gain a better understanding of the daily routines and responsibilities of a classroom teacher. | 16 | 56.25% | 31.25% | 6.25% | 6.25% | 1.63 |
| Supporting you in the clinical practice experience via university supervision. | 16 | 75.00% | 12.50% | 6.25% | 6.25% | 1.44 |
| Supporting you in the clinical practice experience via the clinical practice seminar. | 16 | 37.50% | 43.75% | 12.50% | 6.25% | 1.88 |
| Assessing your teaching performance in the clinical practice placement. | 16 | 62.50% | 25.00% | 0.00% | 12.50% | 1.63 |
| Supporting you in the completion of Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) tasks. | 16 | 62.50% | 25.00% | 6.25% | 6.25% | 1.56 |

Response Legend: 1 = Extremely Effective 2 = Effective 3 = Somewhat Effective 4 = Ineffective

Empower

Professional Attributes:

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 16 Author Response(s)

| Rated Item(s) | Total | Distribution % Display as | | | | Average |
|---|-------|---|--------|-------|--------|---------|
| | | Count | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Collaborate with teachers in the school setting. | 16 | 68.75% | 18.75% | 6.25% | 6.25% | 1.50 |
| Collaborate with school administrators in the school setting. | 16 | 62.50% | 25.00% | 6.25% | 6.25% | 1.56 |
| Contribute to discussions of educational issues. | 16 | 62.50% | 18.75% | 6.25% | 12.50% | 1.69 |
| Reflect upon your own teaching and make changes based upon that reflection. | 16 | 75.00% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 12.50% | 1.50 |

Response Legend: 1 = Well Prepared 2 = Adequately Prepared 3 = Somewhat Prepared 4 = Unprepared

 [Teaching as a Calling/Christian Worldview:](#)

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 16 Author Response(s)

| Rated Item(s) | Total | Distribution % Display as | | | | Average |
|--|-------|---|--------|-------|--------|---------|
| | | Count | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Encouraging you to explore teaching as a calling. | 16 | 75.00% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 12.50% | 1.50 |
| Encouraging you to consider God's grace in your life. | 16 | 75.00% | 6.25% | 6.25% | 12.50% | 1.56 |
| Raising your awareness of how dispositional characteristics impact a teacher's professional performance. | 16 | 68.75% | 18.75% | 0.00% | 12.50% | 1.56 |

Response Legend: 1 = Extremely Effective 2 = Effective 3 = Somewhat Effective 4 = Ineffective

An analysis of the 2012 Exit Survey data can be informative due to the robust N (32). An analysis of the responses from the 2012 Exit Survey indicates strong confidence (“Well Prepared” and “Adequately Prepared” with greater than 90% agreement) in the following skills acquired in the program: Constructing Lesson Plans, Adaptations and Lesson Planning, Management Strategies, Collaborating with Other Teachers, Teaching as a Calling, Reflection, and Daily Routines Responsibilities of a Teacher. In the areas of working with parents and support in student teaching from the university supervisor, candidates responded at 19% or greater that they were “Somewhat Prepared” or “Underprepared.”

An analysis of the responses from the 2013 Exit Survey indicates strong confidence (“Well Prepared” and “Adequately Prepared” with greater than 90% agreement) in the following skills acquired in the program: Adaptations for English Learners and Special Needs, and Instructional Strategies. Some areas for future reflection include lesson planning, implementing strategies for students with special needs, and support from the university supervisor.

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION
SINGLE SUBJECT PRELIMINARY CREDENTIAL

PART III – Analyses and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

Analyses of Candidate and Program Assessment Data from Tables 1 – 10

Cal TPA:

Candidates' results show that of all criteria (1-8), criterion number 5 "Making Adaptations" is where candidates are least prepared. Candidates are best prepared in criterion number 3, "Describing Classroom Environment. Overall, candidates performed very well, scoring 3.22 out of 4.0.

| Assessment | Strengths | Areas for Improvement |
|------------|--|--|
| Task 1 | While most candidates are unfamiliar with 'pedagogy' upon entering the program, 97.5% of candidates pass Task 1 on their second attempt after typically completing only three courses. | Equipping candidates with pedagogical approaches to making adaptations will require an adjustment of course content and intentional modeling of these approaches by the course professors. |
| Task 2 | The candidates gave considerable effort to learning about their students. Candidates are receiving exposure to and practice of instructional design. 96.5% of candidates passed this task on the second attempt. | As with Task 1, candidates' greatest area of need was making adaptations for student learning. The program needs to continue encouraging the practice of making appropriate instructional and content adaptations to meet the needs of students. |
| Task 3 | Candidates are gaining proficiency in planning developmentally appropriate activities and reflecting on evidence of student learning based on those assessments. 96.5% of our candidates passed this task on the second attempt. | As in Task 1 and 2, candidates continue to be challenged in making adaptations to their instruction, content, and assessment in the effort to meet the needs of their English Learners and children who pose different learning challenges. In addition, passage rates on Task 3 decreased in 2013 on the first attempt, demonstrating a need for a renewed focus on instruction strategies for assessment in all courses. |
| Task 4 | In 2012, candidates scored in the acceptable range in all criteria, with the exception of Making Adaptations. In 2013, candidates scored in the acceptable range in all criteria, with the lowest score a 3.03. | Candidates are in the final clinical practice experience and they continue to be challenged with developing appropriate adaptations to meet the learning needs of all students. Certain criteria decreased in score average from 2012 to 2013 (e.g. Establishing Goals and Objectives), demonstrating specific needs for target instruction in all coursework. |

Signature Assignment: EDU 600 (Foundations):

Across Regional Centers, the overall mean scores for 2012 and 2013 for the Key Assessment in EDU600 indicate that candidates successfully met the program and course outcomes, and the candidate learning outcomes.

| Criteria | Strengths | Areas for Improvement |
|---|--|-----------------------|
| Knowledge of research-based theories and principles of human learning and development | Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.83*/4 – 4/4 *Outlier data removed | No improvement needed |
| Knowledge about how these theories affect classroom practice. | Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.61*/4 – 3.93/4. *Outlier data removed | No improvement needed |
| Reflection on how these theories affect and resonate with candidates' beliefs. | Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.6/4 – 4/4. | No improvement needed |
| Presentation is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized. | Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.87*/4 – 4.0/4 *Outlier data removed | No improvement needed |

Signature Assignment: EDU 620 (Reading):

The overall mean scores for 2012 and 2013 for the Key Assessment in EDU620 across Regional Centers indicate that candidates successfully met the program and course outcomes, as well as the candidate learning outcomes.

| Criteria | Strengths | Areas for Improvement |
|---|--|--|
| Data collection through anecdotal observation and student conferences | Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.64/4 – 4/4. | No improvement needed |
| Data collection to determine language abilities or special needs | Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.36/4 – 3.91/4. | No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended. |

| Criteria | Strengths | Areas for Improvement |
|---|---|--|
| Data collection through administration of literacy assessment instruments | Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.75/4 – 4/4 | No improvement needed |
| Reflection on student strengths and areas for growth | Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.32/4 – 3.91/4 | No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended. |
| Setting learning goals or next steps for student growth | Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.09/4 – 3.91/4 | No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended. |

ALL PROGRAM COURSES:

All syllabi and accompanying assignments will be reviewed to ensure adequate instruction of the common core standards at the graduate level.

ALL PROGRAM DATA:

Candidates enrolled in the Masters in Teaching (MAT) degree program often enter with the goal of receiving one preliminary credential. Many candidates are now choosing to seek two credentials. This requires that candidates enter into a second Taskstream Direct Response Folio (DRF). This impacts the consistent number of participants in a program. Key Assessment data may be in one folio or the other.

DISPOSITION ASSESSMENT:

The average in the Disposition Data for 2012 and 2013, which includes both candidate self-assessment and faculty assessment, indicate that candidates rate themselves very high and faculty rate them high as well. There is no statistically significant difference between the 2012 and 2013 Disposition Data.

EXIT SURVEY:

The Data for this Survey consistently shows for both 2012 and 2013, that candidates rated themselves not as highly prepared in the area of conducting a parent/teacher conference. Survey results for both years, 2012 and 2013, indicate that, candidates overall, rated the program as having improved in the degree of support from University Supervisors and in the areas of constructing lesson plans, reflecting on their own teaching and being able to make changes based on that reflection and more able to collaborate with teachers in the school setting. The School of Education faculty contends that with the implementation of a Co-teaching Model for Clinical Practice, candidates will begin to feel more prepared to partner with parents. In addition, a parent-teacher conference component has been implemented during the seminar in Clinical Practice Phase II.

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION
SINGLE SUBJECT PRELIMINARY CREDENTIAL

PART IV – Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

| Data Source | Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made | Applicable Program or Common Standard(s) |
|----------------|---|--|
| TPA 1,2 ,3,& 4 | <p>Minor Changes/Continue to Monitor</p> <p>Tasks 1-3 were passed at a relatively high rate, between 83.6% and 100% passage rate. Single Subject candidates' overall mean scores are consistent over the course of Tasks 1-4, indicating that candidate skill and knowledge remains strong as the rigor of the performance tasks increases. This is also a finding that can be considered a program strength.</p> <p>In 2013, Task 2 was passed with an 87% passage rate on the first attempt. While this is high, Instructional Design will be an area of focus for the program over the coming years. Task 3 also presents more of a challenge with 82% passing on the 1st attempt. This indicates a need to focus on assessment and assessment practices for candidates to use in the classroom.</p> <p>The range of passing scores is high and provides useful information about the quality of preparation provided by the SOE. No significant difference was apparent among the four regional centers. Continued intentional work on the TPAs embedded in coursework would assist candidates in their preparation for TPAs. The MAT Coordinator, Associate Dean for Initial Teacher Preparation, and TPA coordinator will continue regular monitoring of each candidate's progress throughout the program.</p> | Common Standard 9 |

| Data Source | Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made | Applicable Program or Common Standard(s) |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| Signature Assignments | <p>Candidates performed strongly on the signature assignments.</p> <p>Minor changes/Continue to Monitor.</p> <p>EDU 600 - Continuation of activities and assignments in this course that support candidate development of how learning theories affect and resonate with their beliefs.</p> <p>EDU 620 – Recommendation: With the implementation of Common Core and candidates’ performance on the measure, a strong emphasis will be placed on literacy with regard to content to meet this standard. Continuation of activities and assignments in this course that support candidate development of how reading, reading comprehension, and literacy skills develop to a competency level in students.</p> | <p>Common Standards 2, 7 and 9</p> <p>Program Standard 7b</p> |
| Dispositions | <p>Between 2012 and 2013 the Dispositions were revised and condensed from 8 to 4 criteria. A review of the implementation process for the 4 Dispositions will occur throughout the coming years.</p> <p>In every indicator, candidates’ scores on the 8 Dispositions were higher in 2013 than in 2012. Scores were significantly higher in The Spirit of Collaboration, Harmony and Learning Community, Perseverance with a Challenge, and Diligence in Work Habits and Responsibility for Learning in 2013 than in 2012. Candidates scored the highest in both 2012 and 2013 in Honesty and Integrity.</p> <p>For the newly revised 4 Dispositions, candidates rated themselves highest on the indicator of Honor and lowest on Professional and Positive Perseverance. In viewing the data from the two sets of measures, in general, candidates score themselves lower when using the second measure (4 Dispositions). This broader, more sophisticated, rubric allows for deeper reflection among candidates.</p> <p>Recommendation: As a result, faculty need to discuss ways to assist candidates by increasing their confidence in Professional and Positive Perseverance and emphasizing the need to be reflective practitioners and receptive to formative feedback. The faculty need to develop a “plan of action” as to how to address these areas for future candidates to include discussion and role play.</p> | <p>Common Standard 2 and 9</p> |

| Data Source | Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made | Applicable Program or Common Standard(s) |
|--|--|--|
| Exit Survey | <p>As with the disposition data, this data requires discussion and follow-up by faculty. An analysis of the responses from the 2012 Exit Survey indicates strong confidence (“Well Prepared” and “Adequately Prepared” with greater than 90% agreement) in the following skills acquired in the program: Constructing Lesson Plans, Adaptations and Lesson Planning, Management Strategies, Collaborating with Other Teachers, Teaching as a Calling, Reflection, and Daily Routines Responsibilities of a Teacher. In the areas of working with parents and support in student teaching from the university supervisor, candidates responded at 19% or greater that they were “Somewhat Prepared” or “Underprepared.”</p> <p>An analysis of the responses from the 2013 Exit Survey indicates strong confidence (“Well Prepared” and “Adequately Prepared” with greater than 90% agreement) in the following skills acquired in the program: Adaptations for English Learners and Special Needs, and Instructional Strategies. Some areas for future reflection include lesson planning, implementing strategies for students with special needs, and support from the university supervisor.</p> <p>Recommendation: Examine how lesson planning strategies are taught in single subject-specific courses and to renew the use of the single subject content rubric for clinical practice supervision.</p> | Common Standard 9 and 7 Program Standard 8b |
| Course Data Disposition Data Exit Survey Data | Recommendation: Candidates who are pursuing two credentials enter into a second DRF on Taskstream. This impacts the consistent number of participants (n) in the assessments of a program. A committee will work with Taskstream to ensure that there is a “crosswalk” so that consistent numbers are represented in each credential program. | Not applicable. |
| Signature Assignment Course Data | Recommendation: All syllabi and accompanying assignments will be reviewed to ensure adequate instruction of the Common Core Standards at the graduate level. | Common Standards 2, 7 and 9 |
| Lack of consistent collection of disposition data | Recommendation: Simplify method of data collection for dispositions to specific courses aligned with other SOE programs. Course professors assess dispositions in the same courses that candidates complete their disposition self-assessment. | Common Standards 2 and 9 |

EDU600 Foundations of Education & Learning Theory (rev 8.9.11)

| | Far Below Standards | Below Standards | Meets Standards | Exceeds Standards | Score/Level |
|---|--|---|--|---|-------------|
| Knowledge of research-based theories and principles of human learning and development | Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing evidence. | Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected evidence. | Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected evidence. | Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected evidence. | |
| | Standards CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 3: Foundational Educational Ideas and Research Standard: Program Standard 4: Relationships Between Theory and Practice Standard: Program Standard 11: Using Technology in the Classroom | | | | |
| knowledge about how these theories affect classroom practice | Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing evidence . | Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected data to determine ELD abilities. | Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected data to determine ELD abilities. | Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected data to determine ELD abilities. | |
| | Standards CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 4: Relationships Between Theory and Practice Standard: Program Standard 5: Professional Perspectives Toward Student Learning and the Teaching Profession | | | | |
| Reflection on how these theories affect and resonate with candidates' beliefs | Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate and missing connection between theory and beliefs. | Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected student work samples. | Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected student work samples. | Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected abilities to student work sample. | |
| | Standards CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 3: Foundational Educational Ideas and Research Standard: Program Standard 4: Relationships Between Theory and Practice | | | | |

| | Far Below Standards | Below Standards | Meets Standards | Exceeds Standards | Score/Level |
|---|--|---|--|---|-------------|
| | Standard: Program Standard 6: Pedagogy and Reflective Practice | | | | |
| Presentation is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized | Multiple grammar and/or spelling errors and/or lack of organization, and few or no references. | A few grammar and/or spelling errors and/or lack of organization, and few references. | Accurate spelling, clearly organized layout, and list of references. | Accurate grammar and spelling, clear and creative layout, and comprehensive list of references. | |
| | Standards CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 3: Foundational Educational Ideas and Research Standard: Program Standard 4: Relationships Between Theory and Practice Standard: Program Standard 11: Using Technology in the Classroom | | | | |

EDU 620 Literacy Instruction For Secondary Teachers (rev 8.9.11)

| | Far Below Standards | Below Standards | Meets Standards | Exceeds Standards | Score/Level |
|---|--|--|---|--|-------------|
| Data collection through anecdotal observation and conferences with students | Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing anecdotal evidence | Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected anecdotal evidence | Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected anecdotal evidence | Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected anecdotal evidence | |
| | Standards CA- PLNU/Single Subject Preliminary Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 7B: Single Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction Standard: Program Standard 8-B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject (SS) Candidates | | | | |
| Data collection to determine student language abilities or special needs | Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing data to determine language abilities or special needs | Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected data to determine language abilities or special needs | Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected data to determine language abilities or special needs | Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected data to determine language abilities or special needs | |
| | Standards CA- PLNU/Single Subject Preliminary Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 7B: Single Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction Standard: Program Standard 8-B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject (SS) Candidates | | | | |
| Data collection through the administration of literacy assessments | Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing student work samples | Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected student work samples | Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected student work samples | Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate and clearly connected student work samples | |
| | Standards CA- PLNU/Single Subject Preliminary Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 7B: Single Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction Standard: Program Standard 8-B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject (SS) Candidates | | | | |
| Reflection on | Inappropriate, irrelevant, | Minimal, limited, cursory, | Appropriate, relevant, | Detailed, appropriate, | |

| | Far Below Standards | Below Standards | Meets Standards | Exceeds Standards | Score/Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| student strengths and areas for growth | inaccurate and missing data to connect to student strengths and areas for growth | inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected data to student strengths and areas for growth | accurate and connected data to student strengths and areas for growth | relevant, accurate and clearly connected data to student strengths and areas for growth | |
| | Standards CA- PLNU/Single Subject Preliminary Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 5: Professional Perspectives Toward Student Learning and the Teaching Profession Standard: Program Standard 6: Pedagogy and Reflective Practice | | | | |
| Learning goals or next steps for student growth | Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate and missing data to connect to student strengths and areas for growth | Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected data to student strengths and areas for growth | Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected learning goals or next steps for student growth | Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate and clearly connected learning goals or next steps for student growth | |
| | Standards CA- PLNU/Single Subject Preliminary Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 5: Professional Perspectives Toward Student Learning and the Teaching Profession Standard: Program Standard 6: Pedagogy and Reflective Practice | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| 1. Dignity & Honor: The candidate honors and respects the worthiness of all individuals in word and deed based on PLNU's Wesleyan heritage: We are individuals created in the image of God, committed to civility, respect, hospitality, grace, and service. | Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all. | Demonstrates indicator with direct prompting from peers or teacher. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher. | Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher. | Consistently and spontaneously demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct or demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from peers or teacher if areas for improvement are discussed | |
| 2. Honesty & Integrity: The candidate demonstrates honesty, integrity, and coherence in attitudes, and actions, and is accountable to the norms and expectations of the learning community. | Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all. | Demonstrates indicator with direct prompting from peers or teacher. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher. | Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher. | Consistently and spontaneously demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct or demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from peers or teacher if areas for improvement are discussed | |
| 3. Caring, Patience, and Respect: The candidate demonstrates caring, patience, fairness and respect for the knowledge level, diversity, and abilities of others, ensuring that all students have the opportunity to achieve. | Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all. | Demonstrates indicator with direct prompting from peers or teacher. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher. | Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher. | Consistently and spontaneously demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct or demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from peers or teacher if areas for improvement are discussed | |
| 4. Spirit of Collaboration, Flexibility and Humility: The candidate actively participates in and contributes to the achievement of the learning community, explaining own thought process with humility and considers those of others with a positive, open-minded attitude. | Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all. | Demonstrates indicator with direct prompting from peers or teacher. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher. | Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher. | Consistently and spontaneously demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct or demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from peers or teacher if areas for improvement are discussed | |
| 5. Harmony in Learning Community: The candidate takes responsibility for resolving conflicts or issues with others, and teaches students those skills, in a way that sustains and enhances a healthy and safe learning community. | Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all. | Demonstrates indicator with direct prompting from peers or teacher. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher. | Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher. | Consistently and spontaneously demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct or demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from peers or teacher if areas for improvement are discussed | |
| 6. Self-Awareness/Calling: The candidate shows awareness of areas of strength, interests, learning style, and areas for continuing growth; generates and follows through on personalized growth plans. The candidate demonstrates that serving as a professional educator is a confirmed calling to equip, to transform and to empower every student to fulfill his or her full potential. | Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all. | Demonstrates indicator with direct prompting from peers or teacher. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher. | Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher. | Consistently and spontaneously demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct or demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from peers or teacher if areas for improvement are discussed | |
| 7. Perseverance with Challenge: | Demonstrates | Demonstrates indicator with | Demonstrates indicator | Consistently and spontaneously | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| The candidate perseveres, remains engaged, and persists as a life-long learner, especially when academic and professional assignments are perceived as challenging. | indicator infrequently if at all. | direct prompting from peers or teacher. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher. | with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher. | demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct or demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from peers or teacher if areas for improvement are discussed | |
| 8. Diligence in Work Habits & Responsibility for Learning: The candidate attends to the roles and responsibilities of the learning community, and is well-prepared and on time. The candidate completes required assignments on time and is reflective and receptive to formative feedback. | Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all. | Demonstrates indicator with direct prompting from peers or teacher. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher. | Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher. | Consistently and spontaneously demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct or demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from peers or teacher if areas for improvement are discussed | |