



**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: Multiple Subject
Please identify all delivery options through which this program is offered (Traditional, Intern, Other)	Traditional Intern
Credential awarded	Multiple 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
Title	Associate Dean, Initial Teacher Preparation
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

MULTIPLE SUBJECT PRELIMINARY CREDENTIAL

PART I – Contextual Information:

PLNU's Multiple Subject 2042 Program was approved by the CTC in 2003. The University's School of Education offers the Preliminary Multiple 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 Multiple Subject candidates with close communication and collaboration among them regarding candidate proficiency, data collection, and analysis. The Multiple 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	7	0 Interns 6 Traditional	1	0 Interns 0 Traditional
Bakersfield Regional Center	40	1 Intern 19 Traditional	37	8 Interns 16 Traditional
Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center	5	0 Intern 5 Traditional	2	0 Interns 1 Traditional
Mission Valley Regional Center	61	0 Intern 21 Traditional	78	0 Intern 30 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 610 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
MULTIPLE 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 Multiple Subject Credential candidates.

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

Each of the courses within the Preliminary Multiple 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 612 Differentiated Math Instruction for Learners*.

Task 3: TPA 3, *Assessing Learning*, was completed during candidates’ first phase (8 weeks) of clinical practice (EDU 630).

Task 4: Candidates submitted the final task, TPA 4, *Culminating Teaching Experience*, upon completion of their second Clinical Practice experience (EDU 634), 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 610 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.
- EDU 611 Signature Assignment *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Teaching the Content Areas, an instructional unit plan that focuses on the content areas (e.g., social studies, science, P.E., etc.).*

Evaluation Instrument (Direct)	Description	Data Collected: 2 years	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	Learning Instruction	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 610 (Signature Assignment)	Teaching Reading and Writing	2012 and 2013	5,6,7, 16
EDU 611 (Signature Assignment)	Interdisciplinary Approaches to Teaching the Content Areas	2012 and 2013	1,6,9,11

b) 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 612 *Differentiated Mathematics Instruction for All Learners* 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
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) for two years.

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 Multiple Subject Candidates (2012-2013)

TPAs Multiple Subject 2012							
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Pass Rate 1 st attempt	Pass Rate 2 nd attempt	Pass Rate 3 rd attempt	Pass Rate 4 th attempt t
Task 1	93	3.04	.33	73%	99%	100%	N/A
Task 2	120	3.08	.47	82%	96%	99%	100%
Task 3	104	3.11	.34	89%	98%	100%	N/A

TPAs Multiple Subject 2013							
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Pass Rate 1 st attempt	Pass Rate 2 nd attempt	Pass Rate 3 rd attempt	Pass Rate 4 th attempt t
Task 1	105	3.17	.43	84%	98%	100%	N/A
Task 2	121	3.23	.54	87%	90%	99%	100%
Task 3	98	3.08	.31	82%	96%	100%	N/A

Table 2

Task 4: Preliminary Multiple 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 Instructio n	Criterion 5 - Making Adaptations	Criterion 6- Using Subject- specific Pedagogical Skills	Criterion 7- Analyzing student evidence and assessment	Criterion 8 - Reflecting	Average Rubric 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 Environmen t	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 Rubric 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 Multiple Subject program had a 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 Multiple 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	M	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Knowledge of research-based theories and principles of human learning and development	1	4.00	0.00	19	4.00	0.00	0	0	0	2	4.00	0.00
Knowledge about how these theories affect classroom practice	1	4.00	0.00	19	3.84	0.50	0	0	0	2	4.00	0.00
Reflection on how these theories affect and resonate with candidates' beliefs	1	4.00	0.00	19	3.63	0.60	0	0	0	2	4.00	0.00
Presentation is grammatically correct, layout is organized	1	4.00	0.00	19	3.84	0.37	0	0	0	2	4.00	0.00

Table 4
Signature Assignment EDU 600: Preliminary Multiple 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	M	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Knowledge of research-based theories and principles of human learning and development	0	0	0	14	4.00	0.00	1	4.00	0.00	6	4.00	0.00
Knowledge about how these theories affect classroom practice	0	0	0	14	3.64	0.60	1	4.00	0.00	6	4.00	0.00
Reflection on how these theories affect and resonate with candidates' beliefs	0	0	0	14	3.36	0.60	1	4.00	0.00	6	4.00	0.00
Presentation is grammatically correct, layout is organized	0	0	0	14	3.57	0.39	1	4.00	0.00	6	4.00	0.00

It is clear that the average overall scores at all regional centers were strong, with the performance ranging between 3.36 to 4.0. In the criterion *Knowledge of Research-Based Theories and Principles of Human Learning and Development*, candidates from all regional centers scored 4 out of 4 in 2012 and 2013. In the criteria Knowledge about How these Theories Affect Classroom Practice, Reflection on How These Theories Affect and Resonate with Candidates' Beliefs, and Presentation is Grammatically Correct, scores decreased in 2013. This change may be explained by a more rigorous calibration system utilized in the SOE.

EDU 610: METHODS OF TEACHING READING AND WRITING

The signature assignment in *EDU 610 Methods of Teaching Reading and Writing* 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 610: Preliminary Multiple Subject Candidates (2012)

Key Assessment: EDU 610 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	M	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Data collection through anecdotal observation and conferences with students	7	3.50	0.65	18	4.00	0.00	1	4.00	0.00	26	3.85	0.46
Data collection to determine language abilities or special needs	7	3.50	0.58	18	3.94	0.24	1	4.00	0.00	26	3.85	0.46
Data collection through the administration of literacy assessments	7	3.14	0.56	18	4.00	0.00	1	4.00	0.00	26	3.85	0.80
Reflection on student strengths and areas for growth	7	3.43	0.61	18	3.83	0.38	1	4.00	0.00	26	3.65	.80
Setting of learning goals or next steps for student growth	7	3.57	0.61	18	3.72	0.46	1	4.00	0.00	26	3.58	3.90

Table 6
Signature Assignment EDU 610: Preliminary Multiple Subject Candidates (2013)

Key Assessment: EDU 610 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	M	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Data collection through anecdotal observation and conferences with students	0	0	0	23	4.00	0.00	1	3.00	0.00	34	3.84	0.38
Data collection to determine language abilities or special needs	0	0	0	23	4.00	0.00	1	4.00	0.00	34	3.53	0.76
Data collection through the administration of literacy assessments	0	0	0	23	4.00	0.00	1	4.00	0.00	34	3.79	0.52
Reflection on student strengths and areas for growth	0	0	0	23	3.91	0.29	1	3.00	0.00	34	3.31	0.69
Setting of learning goals or next steps for student growth	0	0	0	23	3.96	0.21	1	1.00	0.00	34	3.13	0.89

In 2013, performance on the criterion Data Collection to Determine Language Abilities or Special Needs increased at all centers. In Bakersfield, scores increased for the criteria Reflection on Student Strengths and Areas for Growth, and Setting of Learning Goals or Next Steps for Student Growth, while they decreased in Mission Valley. A commitment of focus on servicing English Learners and differentiation may explain the increased scores in Determining Language Abilities and Special Needs. Next steps for reflection as a unit include dialog across centers to align instructional practices for candidates regarding Reflection on Student Strengths and Areas for Growth, and Setting of Learning Goals or Next Steps for Student Growth.

EDU 611: INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES TO TEACHING IN THE CONTENT AREAS

The signature assignment in EDU 611 *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Teaching in the Content Areas* requires each candidate to design an instructional unit plan based on the California Content Standards as well as the Common Core Standards. This unit is thematic and includes lesson objectives and lesson planning for both the unit and individualized lessons. Both long-range and short-term objectives and lessons, as well as a variety of instructional methods, are required in the unit plan. Candidates include differentiation, assessments, and resources.

Table 7
Signature Assignment EDU 611: Preliminary Multiple Subject Candidates (2012)

Key Assessment: EDU 611 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	M	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Rationale – The candidate provides clear, coherent rationales for the unit, the California Content Standards/Common Core Standards selected, as well as the way the Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction fits with the instruction both prior and subsequent to the unit of instruction	6	3.92	0.20	19	3.97	0.11	0	0	0	32	3.72	0.37
California State Content Standards/Common Core Standards and Lesson Objectives – The candidate is able to identify the California State Standards/Common Core Standards for the Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction for both the unit and lesson planning and lists	6	4.00	0.00	19	4.00	0.00	0	0	0	32	3.86	0.41

Key Assessment: EDU 611 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	M	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
appropriate objectives for both the unit and each individual lesson.												
Planning for Instruction – The Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction demonstrates the candidates' ability to plan both long-range and short-term through both the unit plan itself as well as in individual lessons, using a variety of instructional methods.	6	3.83	0.41	19	3.50	0.44	0	0	0	32	3.77	0.43
Differentiation - The candidate shows competence in planning instruction that will provide quality instruction to all students including, but not limited to: Gifted, ELL, Special Needs and At-Risk students. Must have plans for an ELL student, Gifted student and a student who presents a learning challenge.	6	3.50	0.84	19	3.39	0.39	0	0	0	32	3.48	0.61
Assessments – Formative and Summative - The Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction demonstrates the candidates' knowledge and plan for application of effective formative and summative assessments.	6	3.67	0.52	19	3.68	0.34	0	0	0	32	3.72	0.51
Resources – The Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction demonstrates the candidates' ability to gather and use meaningful, pertinent and reliable resources to support the effectiveness of the	6	3.92	0.20	19	4.00	0.00	0	0	0	32	3.83	0.37

Key Assessment: EDU 611 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	M	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
unit.												
Final Product is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized	6	4.00	0.00	19	3.87	0.28	0	0	0	32	3.91	0.30

Table 8

Signature Assignment EDU 611: Preliminary Multiple Subject Candidates (2013)

Key Assessment: EDU 611 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	M	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Rationale – The candidate provides clear, coherent rationales for the unit, the California Content Standards/Common Core Standards selected, as well as the way the Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction fits with the instruction both prior and subsequent to the unit of instruction	1	4.00	0.00	28	3.81	0.45	2	4.00	0.00	42	3.76	0.48
California State Content Standards/Common Core Standards and Lesson Objectives – The candidate is able to identify the California State Standards/Common Core Standards for the Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction for both the unit and lesson planning and lists appropriate objectives for both the unit and each individual lesson.	1	4.00	0.00	28	3.73	0.65	2	3.00	0.00	42	3.76	0.48
Planning for Instruction – The Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction	1	4.00	0.00	28	3.70	0.61	2	4.00	0.00	42	3.71	0.68

Key Assessment: EDU 611 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	M	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
demonstrates the candidates' ability to plan both long-range and short-term through both the unit plan itself as well as in individual lessons, using a variety of instructional methods.												
Differentiation - The candidate shows competence in planning instruction that will provide quality instruction to all students including, but not limited to: Gifted, ELL, Special Needs and At-Risk students. Must have plans for an ELL student, Gifted student and a student who presents a learning challenge.	1	4.00	0.00	28	3.56	0.61	2	3.5	0.71	42	3.27	0.68
Assessments – Formative and Summative - The Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction demonstrates the candidates' knowledge and plan for application of effective formative and summative assessments.	1	4.00	0.00	28	3.57	0.54	2	4.00	0.00	42	3.73	.50
Resources – The Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction demonstrates the candidates' ability to gather and use meaningful, pertinent and reliable resources to support the effectiveness of the unit.	1	4.00	0.00	28	3.88	0.34	2	3.50	0.71	42	3.52	0.51
Final Product is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized	1	4.00	0.00	28	3.96	0.13	2	4.00	0.00	42	3.95	0.22

Although scores were consistently high in 2012 and 2013, with all criteria scored above 3.5 (with the exception of Differentiation in Mission Valley in 2013), there was no discernible trend at either campus in performance level (either greater or lesser). In addition, although there were fewer clear trends in scores, all scores on this signature assignment were higher than scores on other signature assignments in other courses. These are points of reflection for continuous program improvement.

Special TPA Section for Preliminary Credentials:

- 1) **Number of Assessors:** There are seven (7) assessors for the program. These assessors actively scored in the years reported in this document.
- 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 each year in order to retain calibration certification.
- 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 Multiple 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 612 *Differentiated Mathematics Instruction for All Learners* and in both phases of Clinical Practice. The professors-of-record, clinical practice university supervisors and cooperating teachers also assess candidates on dispositions.

Table 9

Dispositional Assessment of Preliminary Multiple 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.	25	0.00%	0.00%	52.00%	48.00%	3.48
Indicator 2: Honesty and Integrity. The candidate demonstrates honesty, integrity, and coherence in attitudes, and actions, and is accountable to the norms and	25	0.00%	0.00%	28.00%	72.00%	3.72

Disposition Data 2012						
Rated Item	Total	Distribution %				Average
		1	2	3	4	
expectations of the learning community						
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.	25	0.00%	0.00%	28.00%	72.00%	3.72
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.	25	0.00%	8.00%	48.00%	44.00%	3.36
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.	25	0.00%	4.00%	56.00%	40.00%	3.36
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.	25	0.00%	8.00%	56.00%	36.00%	3.28
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.	25	0.00%	0.00%	48.00%	52.00%	3.52
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.	25	0.00%	8.00%	28.00%	64.00%	3.56

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.	17	0.00%	0.00%	47.06%	52.94%	3.53
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	17	0.00%	0.00%	17.65%	82.35%	3.82
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.	17	0.00%	0.00%	23.53%	76.47%	3.76
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.	17	0.00%	5.88%	35.29%	58.82%	3.53
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.	17	0.00%	0.00%	47.06%	52.94%	3.53

Disposition Data 2013						
Rated Item	Total	Distribution %				Average
		1	2	3	4	
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.	17	0.00%	5.88%	35.29%	58.82%	3.53
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.	17	0.00%	0.00%	29.41%	70.59%	3.71
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.	17	0.00%	5.88%	23.53%	70.59%	3.65

Table 10

Dispositional Assessment of Preliminary Multiple 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.	13	0.00%	0.00%	30.77%	69.23%	3.69
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.	13	0.00%	0.00%	61.54%	38.46%	3.38
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.	13	0.00%	0.00%	53.85%	46.15%	3.46
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 <i>(narrative continued next page)</i>	13	0.00%	0.00%	46.15%	53.85%	3.54

Disposition Data (New Dispositions effective 08.27.13)						
Rated Item	Total	Distribution %				Average
		1	2	3	4	
(continued from previous page) when academic or professional assignments are perceived as challenging. The candidate is reflective and receptive to formative feedback.						

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, and Perseverance with a Challenge 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 rate themselves highest on the indicator of Honor and lowest on the Spirit of Harmony and Collaboration. 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 11
Exit Survey Preliminary Multiple Subject Candidates

Equip

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

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 36 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % Display as				Average
		Count				
		1	2	3	4	
Construct effective lesson plans.	36	80.56%	13.89%	0.00%	5.56%	1.31
Incorporate adaptations in lesson planning for English Language Learners and students with special needs.	36	75.00%	16.67%	5.56%	2.78%	1.36
Plan a classroom management strategy for your classroom.	36	58.33%	30.56%	8.33%	2.78%	1.56
Draw upon a variety of management strategies according to student/classroom needs.	36	66.67%	25.00%	2.78%	5.56%	1.47
Use a variety of tools to keep parents informed of their child's progress in the classroom.	36	55.56%	22.22%	13.89%	8.33%	1.75
Understand the importance of communicating regularly with parents.	36	69.44%	13.89%	8.33%	8.33%	1.56
Conduct a parent/teacher conference.	36	38.89%	36.11%	13.89%	11.11%	1.97

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): 36 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % <u>Display as</u>				Average
		<u>Count</u>				
		1	2	3	4	
<u>Effectively implement a variety of strategies to assess student learning.</u>	36	77.78%	13.89%	0.00%	8.33%	1.39
<u>Use assessment data to inform instructional planning.</u>	36	72.22%	16.67%	2.78%	8.33%	1.47
<u>Effectively implement a variety of EL strategies.</u>	36	66.67%	19.44%	5.56%	8.33%	1.56
<u>Effectively implement a variety of strategies to meet the needs of students with special needs.</u>	36	61.11%	19.44%	11.11%	8.33%	1.67
<u>Effectively implement a variety of differentiated instructional strategies to meet the learning needs of the full range of students in a typical classroom.</u>	36	66.67%	19.44%	8.33%	5.56%	1.53
<u>Effectively implement a variety of classroom management strategies.</u>	36	66.67%	22.22%	5.56%	5.56%	1.50

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): 36 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % <u>Display as</u>				Average
		<u>Count</u>				
		1	2	3	4	
Exposing you to the diversity of settings in CA schools.	36	61.11%	19.44%	11.11%	8.33%	1.67
Helping you gain a better understanding of the daily routines and responsibilities of a classroom teacher.	36	75.00%	16.67%	0.00%	8.33%	1.42
Supporting you in the clinical practice experience via university supervision.	36	66.67%	22.22%	2.78%	8.33%	1.53
Supporting you in the clinical practice experience via the clinical practice seminar.	36	61.11%	22.22%	11.11%	5.56%	1.61
Assessing your teaching performance in the clinical practice placement.	36	75.00%	8.33%	11.11%	5.56%	1.47
Supporting you in the completion of Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) tasks.	36	58.33%	19.44%	11.11%	11.11%	1.75

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

Empower

*Professional Attributes:

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 36 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % <u>Display as</u>				Average
		<u>Count</u>				
		1	2	3	4	
Collaborate with teachers in the school setting.	36	77.78%	13.89%	2.78%	5.56%	1.36
Collaborate with school administrators in the school setting.	36	55.56%	27.78%	11.11%	5.56%	1.67
Contribute to discussions of educational issues.	36	61.11%	27.78%	2.78%	8.33%	1.58
Reflect upon your own teaching and make changes based upon that reflection.	36	86.11%	5.56%	0.00%	8.33%	1.31

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): 36 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % <u>Display as</u>				Average
		<u>Count</u>				
		1	2	3	4	
Encouraging you to explore teaching as a calling.	36	86.11%	5.56%	2.78%	5.56%	1.28
Encouraging you to consider God's grace in your life.	36	80.56%	8.33%	5.56%	5.56%	1.36
Raising your awareness of how dispositional characteristics impact a teacher's professional performance.	36	80.56%	8.33%	0.00%	11.11%	1.42

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 12

Exit Survey Preliminary Multiple Subject Candidates

Equip

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

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 9 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>	9	77.78%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	1.22
<u>Incorporate adaptations in lesson planning for English</u>	9	88.89%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	1.11

[Language Learners and students with special needs.](#)

[Plan a classroom management strategy for your classroom.](#)

9 77.78% 22.22% 0.00% 0.00% 1.22

[Draw upon a variety of management strategies according to student/classroom needs.](#)

9 66.67% 33.33% 0.00% 0.00% 1.33

[Use a variety of tools to keep parents informed of their child's progress in the classroom.](#)

9 55.56% 33.33% 11.11% 0.00% 1.56

[Understand the importance of communicating regularly with parents.](#)

9 55.56% 44.44% 0.00% 0.00% 1.44

[Conduct a parent/teacher conference.](#)

9 33.33% 22.22% 44.44% 0.00% 2.11

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): 9 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.	9	77.78%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	1.22
Use assessment data to inform instructional planning.	9	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	1.33
Effectively implement a variety of EL strategies.	9	88.89%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	1.11
Effectively implement a variety of strategies to meet the needs of students with special needs.	9	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	1.33
Effectively implement a variety of differentiated instructional strategies to meet the learning needs of the full range of students in a typical classroom.	9	88.89%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	1.11
Effectively implement a variety of classroom management strategies.	9	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	1.33

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): 9 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.	9	55.56%	33.33%	11.11%	0.00%	1.56
Helping you gain a better understanding of the daily routines and responsibilities of a classroom teacher.	9	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00
Supporting you in the clinical practice experience via	9	77.78%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	1.22

[university supervision.](#)

[Supporting you in the clinical practice experience via the clinical practice seminar.](#)

[Assessing your teaching performance in the clinical practice placement.](#)

[Supporting you in the completion of Teacher Performance Assessment \(TPA\) tasks.](#)

9	66.67%	11.11%	11.11%	11.11%	1.67
9	77.78%	11.11%	11.11%	0.00%	1.33
9	55.56%	22.22%	11.11%	11.11%	1.78

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

Empower

[Professional Attributes:](#)

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 9 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % Display as				Average
		Count				
		1	2	3	4	
Collaborate with teachers in the school setting.	9	77.78%	11.11%	11.11%	0.00%	1.33
Collaborate with school administrators in the school setting.	9	33.33%	44.44%	11.11%	11.11%	2.00
Contribute to discussions of educational issues.	9	44.44%	44.44%	11.11%	0.00%	1.67
Reflect upon your own teaching and make changes based upon that reflection.	9	77.78%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	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): 9 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % Display as				Average
		Count				
		1	2	3	4	
Encouraging you to explore teaching as a calling.	9	77.78%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	1.22
Encouraging you to consider God's grace in your life.	9	55.56%	33.33%	11.11%	0.00%	1.56
Raising your awareness of how dispositional characteristics impact a teacher's professional performance.	9	55.56%	33.33%	11.11%	0.00%	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 (36). An analysis of the responses from the 2012 Exit Survey indicates strong confidence (“Well Prepared” and “Adequately Prepared” with greater than 90% agreement) in skills acquired in the program: Constructing Lesson Plans, Adaptations and Lesson Planning, Management Strategies, Strategies for Assessment, and Daily Routines and Responsibilities of a Teacher. In the areas of Conducting a Parent Interview, Effectively

Implementing Strategies for Students with Special Needs, and Using a Variety of Tools to Keep Parents Informed, candidates responded at 19% or greater that they were “Somewhat Prepared” or “Underprepared.”

Analysis of the 2013 is more limited with a much smaller N (9). 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: Constructing Lesson Plans, Adaptations for English Learners and Special Needs, Classroom Management, Importance of Communicating with Parents, Instructional Strategies, Assessment for Instruction, Daily Routines for Classroom Teaching, Support in Clinical Practice, Reflection, and Teaching as a Calling.

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

MULTIPLE SUBJECT PRELIMINARY CREDENTIAL

PART III – Analyses and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

Analyses of Candidate and Program Assessment Data from Tables 1 – 12

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, 98.5% 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. The candidates are receiving solid exposure to and practice of how to design effective instruction. 84.5% of candidates passed this task on the first 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. 97% 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	Candidates scored well in all criteria on Task 4, with most criteria having an average score of at least 3.2 or above.	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 EDU 600 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 a mean score of 4.0/4	No improvement needed
Knowledge about how these theories affect classroom practice.	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.64/4 – 4/4.	No improvement needed but continued emphasis recommended.
Reflection on how these theories affect and resonate with candidates' beliefs.	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.36/4 – 4.0/4.	No improvement needed but continued emphasis recommended.
Presentation is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized.	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.57/4 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed.

Signature Assignment: EDU 610 (Reading):

The overall mean scores for 2012 and 2013 for the Key Assessment in EDU610 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 3.0/4 – 4/4.	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.
Data collection to determine language abilities or special needs	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.5/4 – 4/4.	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 3.14/4 – 4/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.
Reflection on student strengths and areas for growth	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.31/4 – 4/4	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 3.13*/4 – 3.96*/4 *Outlier data removed	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.

Signature Assignment: EDU 611 (Content Methodology):

The overall mean scores for 2012 and 2013 for the Key Assessment in EDU610 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
Rationale – The candidate provides clear, coherent rationales for the unit, the California Content Standards/Common Core Standards selected, as well as the way the Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction fits with the instruction both prior and subsequent to the unit of instruction	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.72/4 – 4/4.	No improvement needed.
California State Content Standards/Common Core Standards and Lesson Objectives – The candidate is able to identify the California State Standards/Common Core Standards for the Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction for both the unit and lesson planning and lists appropriate objectives for both the unit and each individual lesson.	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.0/4 – 3.86*/4. *Outlier data removed	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.
Planning for Instruction – The Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction demonstrates the candidates' ability to plan both long-range and short-term through both the unit plan itself as well as in individual lessons, using a variety of instructional methods.	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.5/4 – 4/4	No improvement needed.
Differentiation - The candidate shows competence in planning instruction that will provide quality instruction to all students including, but not limited to: Gifted, ELL, Special Needs and At-Risk students. Must have plans for an ELL student, Gifted student and a student who presents a learning challenge.	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.27/4 – 3.56/4	Examine instruction and assessment in this area. This data reflects candidate TPA data, as well.

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Assessments – Formative and Summative - The Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction demonstrates the candidates' knowledge and plan for application of effective formative and summative assessments.	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.57/4 –4/4	No improvement needed.
Resources – The Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction demonstrates the candidates' ability to gather and use meaningful, pertinent and reliable resources to support the effectiveness of the unit.	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.57/4 –4/4	No improvement needed.
Final Product is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.87/4 –4/4	No improvement needed.

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 student self-assessment and faculty assessment, indicates 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
MULTIPLE 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 82.83% and 100% passage rate. Multiple 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>	<p>Common Standard 9</p>
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 610 – 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>EDU 611 – Recommendation: Provide an emphasis on</p>	<p>Common Standards 2, 7 and 9</p> <p>Program Standard 7a</p>

Data Source	Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made	Applicable Program or Common Standard(s)
	instruction for candidates regarding differentiation for students. In addition, examine rubric for measurement and to guide future instruction.	
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, and Perseverance with a Challenge 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 rate themselves highest on the indicator of Honor and lowest on the Spirit of Harmony and Collaboration. 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 Harmony and Collaboration and emphasizing the need to exhibit humility as well as learning how to manage conflicts and/or issues with others. 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>	Common Standard 2 and 9
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 skills acquired in the program: Constructing Lesson Plans, Adaptations and Lesson Planning, Management Strategies, Strategies for Assessment, and Daily Routines and Responsibilities of a Teacher. In the areas of Conducting a Parent Interview, Effectively Implementing Strategies for Students with Special Needs, and Using a Variety of Tools to Keep Parents Informed, candidates responded at 19% or greater that they were "Somewhat Prepared" or "Underprepared."</p> <p>Analysis of the 2013 data is more limited with a much</p>	Common Standard 9 and 7

Data Source	Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made	Applicable Program or Common Standard(s)
	<p>smaller N (9). An analysis of the responses from the 2013 Exit Survey indicates strong confidence (“Well Prepared” and “Adequately Prepared” with greater than 90% agreement) in skills acquired in the program: Constructing Lesson Plans, Adaptations for English Learners and Special Needs, Classroom Management, Importance of Communicating with Parents, Instructional Strategies, Assessment for Instruction, Daily Routines for Classroom Teaching, Support in Clinical Practice, Reflection, and Teaching as a Calling. According to 2013 data, candidates felt least prepared for communicating with parents, sharing assessments with parents, and did not report that the clinical practice seminar was useful to them.</p> <p>Recommendation: Examine clinical practice seminar model and make necessary adjustments; implement co-teaching model for clinical practice with an emphasis on parent partnerships.</p>	
Course Data Disposition Data Exit Survey Data	<p>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.</p>	Not applicable.
Signature Assignment Course Data	<p>Recommendation: All syllabi and accompanying assignments will be reviewed to ensure adequate instruction of the Common Core Standards at the graduate level.</p>	Common Standards 2, 7 and 9
Lack of consistent collection of disposition data	<p>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.</p>	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 Standard: Program Standard 6: Pedagogy and Reflective Practice				
Presentation is grammatically correct, spelling is correct,	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)				

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
layout is organized	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				

EDU610 Teaching Reading Fall '09 (Revised 8.9.2011)

created with  taskstream

	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- CTC Standards of Quality & Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs Program Standard: Program Standard 7: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts Sub-standard: Standard 7-A: Multiple Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction in English The professional preparation program provides substantive, research-based instruction that effectively prepares each candidate for a Multiple Subject (MS) Teaching Credential to deliver a comprehensive program of systematic instruction in reading, writing and related language arts aligned with the state adopted English Language Arts Academic Content Standards for Students and the Reading/Language Arts Framework. The program provides candidates with systematic and explicit instruction in teaching basic reading skills, including comprehension strategies, for all students, including students with varied reading levels and language backgrounds. The Multiple Subject preparation program includes a significant practical experience component in reading, writing, and language arts that is connected to the content of coursework and that takes place throughout the program during each candidate's field experience(s), internship(s), and/or student teaching assignment(s). The preparation program provides each candidate for a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential with experience in a classroom where beginning reading is taught. The program places all candidates in field experience sites and student teaching assignments with teachers whose instructional approaches and methods in reading are consistent with a comprehensive, systematic program, and who collaborate with institutional supervisors and instructors. Program Element: 7A(h) As a specific application of Common Standard 7, field experiences, student teaching assignments, and internships are designed to establish cohesive connections among the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) content specifications, reading methods coursework, and the practical experience components of the program, and include ongoing opportunities to participate in effective reading instruction that complies with current provisions of the California Education Code.					
Data collection to determine 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- CTC Standards of Quality & Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs Program Standard: Program Standard 7: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts Sub-standard: Standard 7-A: Multiple Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction in English The professional preparation program provides substantive, research-based instruction that effectively prepares each candidate for a Multiple Subject (MS) Teaching Credential to deliver a comprehensive program of systematic instruction in reading, writing and related language arts aligned with the state adopted English Language Arts Academic Content Standards for Students and the Reading/Language Arts Framework. The program provides candidates with systematic					

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	<p>and explicit instruction in teaching basic reading skills, including comprehension strategies, for all students, including students with varied reading levels and language backgrounds. The Multiple Subject preparation program includes a significant practical experience component in reading, writing, and language arts that is connected to the content of coursework and that takes place throughout the program during each candidate's field experience(s), internship(s), and/or student teaching assignment(s). The preparation program provides each candidate for a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential with experience in a classroom where beginning reading is taught. The program places all candidates in field experience sites and student teaching assignments with teachers whose instructional approaches and methods in reading are consistent with a comprehensive, systematic program, and who collaborate with institutional supervisors and instructors.</p> <p>Program Element: 7A(f) For each candidate, the study of reading and language arts includes the phonological/morphological structure of the English language, and methodologically sound research on how children learn to read, including English language learners, students with reading difficulties, and students who are proficient readers.</p>				
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	
	<p>Standards CA- CTC Standards of Quality & Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs Program Standard: Program Standard 7: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts Sub-standard: Standard 7-A: Multiple Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction in English The professional preparation program provides substantive, research-based instruction that effectively prepares each candidate for a Multiple Subject (MS) Teaching Credential to deliver a comprehensive program of systematic instruction in reading, writing and related language arts aligned with the state adopted English Language Arts Academic Content Standards for Students and the Reading/Language Arts Framework. The program provides candidates with systematic and explicit instruction in teaching basic reading skills, including comprehension strategies, for all students, including students with varied reading levels and language backgrounds. The Multiple Subject preparation program includes a significant practical experience component in reading, writing, and language arts that is connected to the content of coursework and that takes place throughout the program during each candidate's field experience(s), internship(s), and/or student teaching assignment(s). The preparation program provides each candidate for a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential with experience in a classroom where beginning reading is taught. The program places all candidates in field experience sites and student teaching assignments with teachers whose instructional approaches and methods in reading are consistent with a comprehensive, systematic program, and who collaborate with institutional supervisors and instructors.</p> <p>Program Element: 7A(e) For each candidate, the study of reading and language arts includes knowledge of the roles of home and community literacy practices, instructional uses of ongoing diagnostic strategies that guide teaching and assessment, early intervention techniques in a classroom setting, and guided practice of these techniques.</p>				
Reflection on student strengths and areas for 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 data to student strengths and areas for growth	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate and clearly connected data to student strengths and areas for growth	

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	Standards CA- PLNU/Multiple 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				
Setting of learning goals or next steps for student growth	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate and missing learning goals or next steps for student growth	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected learning goals or next steps for student 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/Multiple 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 Standard: Program Standard 16: Learning, Applying, and Reflecting on the Teaching Performance Expectations				

EDU 611 Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction (rev 8.26.13)

created with  taskstream

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
Rationale – The candidate provides clear, coherent rationales for the unit, the California Content Standards/Common Core Standards selected, as well as the way the Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction fits with the instruction both prior and subsequent to the unit of instruction.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing rationales for the unit, the California Standard, and/or the unit fit within the year-long curriculum.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected rationales for the unit, the California Standard, and/or the unit fit within the year-long curriculum.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected rationales for the unit, the California Standard, and/or the unit fit within the year-long curriculum.	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected rationales for the unit, the California Standard, and/or the unit fit within the year-long curriculum.	
Standards CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 1: Program Design					
California State Content Standards/Common Core Standards and Lesson Objectives – The candidate is able to identify the California State Standards/Common Core Standards for the Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction for both the unit and lesson planning and lists appropriate objectives for both the unit and each individual lesson.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing California State Content Standards/Common Core Standards and Lesson Objectives.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected California State Content Standards/Common Core Standards and Lesson Objectives.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected California State Content Standards/Common Core Standards and Lesson Objectives.	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected California State Content Standards/Common Core Standards and Lesson Objectives.	
Standards CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 1: Program Design					
Planning for Instruction – The Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction demonstrates the candidates' ability to plan both long-range and short-term through both the unit plan itself as well as in individual lessons, using a variety of instructional methods.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or lack of meaningful, effective planning for instruction.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous planning for effective instruction.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and meaningful planning for effective instruction.	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear and purposeful planning for effective instruction.	
Standards CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 1: Program Design Standard: Program Standard 6: Pedagogy and Reflective Practice Standard: Program Standard 9: Equity, Diversity and Access to the Curriculum for All Children					
Differentiation - The candidate shows competence in planning instruction that will provide quality instruction to	Inappropriate, irrelevant, or missing plan for assisting all students in meeting the learning objectives of the	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, or ambiguous plan for assisting all students in meeting the learning	Appropriate, relevant, accurate plan for assisting all students in meeting the learning objectives of the	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate plan for assisting all students in meeting the learning	

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
all students including, but not limited to: Gifted, ELL, Special Needs and At-Risk students. Must have plans for an ELL student, Gifted student and a student who presents a learning challenge.	Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction.	objectives of the Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction.	Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction.	objectives of the Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 6: Pedagogy and Reflective Practice Standard: Program Standard 9: Equity, Diversity and Access to the Curriculum for All Children				
Assessments – Formative and Summative - The Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction demonstrates the candidates' knowledge and plan for application of effective formative and summative assessments.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, or missing formative and summative assessments.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, or ambiguous formative and summative assessments.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate formative and summative assessments.	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate formative and summative assessments.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 1: Program Design Standard: Program Standard 6: Pedagogy and Reflective Practice Standard: Program Standard 9: Equity, Diversity and Access to the Curriculum for All Children				
Resources – The Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction demonstrates the candidates' ability to gather and use meaningful, pertinent and reliable resources to support the effectiveness of the unit.	Inappropriate, inaccurate, irrelevant, or missing resources that would support the Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, or ambiguous resources that would support the Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate resources that would support the Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction.	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate resources that would support the Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 6: Pedagogy and Reflective Practice Standard: Program Standard 9: Equity, Diversity and Access to the Curriculum for All Children Standard: Program Standard 11: Using Technology in the Classroom				
Final Product is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized	Major grammar and/or spelling errors and/or lack of organization	Several grammar and/or spelling errors; minimal organization	A few grammar and spelling errors and clearly organized layout	No grammar and spelling errors; a clearly detailed and organized layout.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 1: Program Design				

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	Standard: Program Standard 6: Pedagogy and Reflective Practice Standard: Program Standard 9: Equity, Diversity and Access to the Curriculum for All Children Standard: Program Standard 11: Using Technology in the Classroom				

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	