

## Assessment Data Template

### Learning Outcome:

**Cross-Disciplinary Studies Outcome 1.a. Candidates will demonstrate effective presentation skills, one-on-one and with groups.**

### Outcome Measure:

EDU306 Signature Assessment (each year)

### Criteria for Success (if applicable):

Average score for the group is 3.5 or higher (on a scale of 1-4 with 1 being low) on rubric criteria 7, "The oral presentation displays sound communication skills through proper usage of grammar, voice quality and presentation demeanor that is effective one-on-one and in groups".

### Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

### Longitudinal Data:

	Target: Average Score for the Group is 3.5 or higher			
	2012	2013	2014	2015
Outcome 1a: Effective Oral Communication	3.69	3.74	3.94	3.79

### Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target it met. Students are performing at a high level in their oral communication skills, though the average score has decreased slightly from the previous year. Such a decrease can be expected after such a high average in the prior year, especially with an increase of students in the department.

### Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Because of the systematic efforts made after last year's assessments, there are no changes to be made based on this data.

After last year, faculty shared the rubric criteria for this signature assessment with students at the very beginning of the semester, emphasizing the various opportunities during the course to practice communication skills through assignments during the semester.

Because we recalibrated as assessors on this assessment, we believe these scores are even more valid and reliable. We will continue these same efforts in the 2016-17 year.

### Rubric Used

	value: 1.00	value: 2.00	value: 3.00	value: 4.00
Adaptation to instructional strategy is effective for meeting the specific learning needs of the English learner in content knowledge and English language development.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing adaptation	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected adaptation	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected adaptation	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear and purposefully connected adaptation
Two specific learning needs of the English learner were correctly identified through careful analysis of the case study	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing identifiable learning needs	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected identifiable learning needs	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected identifiable learning needs	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear and purposefully connected identifiable learning needs
The adaptation would be effective for the student in making progress toward English language development specific to this student's English proficiency	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing adaptation	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected adaptation	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, connected, and effective adaptation	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clearly connected, and effective adaptation
The progress monitoring assessment chosen provides feedback to the student for achieving the learning goal at the student's English proficiency level.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing progress monitoring	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected progress monitoring	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected progress monitoring with feedback	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clearly connected progress monitoring with feedback
Next steps in planning are effective to facilitate specific growth in the student's English language development	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing next steps for planning	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected next steps for planning	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected next steps for planning	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clearly connected next steps for planning

<p>The written product displays effective communication skills through sound grammar, spelling, language and word use.</p>	<p>Inappropriate, inaccurate or unidentifiable written communication</p>	<p>Limited, cursory or inconsistent written communication</p>	<p>Appropriate, relevant and accurate written communication</p>	<p>Detailed, appropriate, and clearly connected use of written communication</p>
<p>The oral presentation displays sound communication skills through proper usage of grammar, voice quality and presentation demeanor that is effective one-on-one and in groups.</p>	<p>Inappropriate, inaccurate or unidentifiable oral communication</p>	<p>Limited, cursory or inconsistent oral communication</p>	<p>Appropriate, relevant and accurate oral communication</p>	<p>Detailed, appropriate, and clearly connected use of oral communication</p>

## Assessment Data Template

### Learning Outcome:

Cross Disciplinary Studies Outcome 1.b. Candidates will produce effective written communication.

### Outcome Measure:

EDU306 Signature Assessment (each year)

### Criteria for Success (if applicable):

Average score for the group is 3.5 or higher (on a scale of 1-4 with 1 being low) on rubric criteria 6, "The written product displays effective communication skills through sound grammar, spelling, language and word use".

### Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

- 6. Specialized Knowledge
- 7. Broad Integrative Knowledge
- 8. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
- 9. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
- 10. Civic and Global Learning

### Longitudinal Data:

	Target: Average Score for the Group is 3.5 or higher			
	2012	2013	2014	2015
Outcome 1b: Effective Written Communication	3.72	3.74	4.00	3.78

### Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target is met. Students are performing at a high level in their written communication skills, though the average score has decreased slightly from the previous year. Such a decrease can be expected after such a high average in the prior year, and with a significant increase of students in the major.

### Changes to be Made Based on Data:

There are no changes to be made at this time. In order to avoid inflated scoring, we had a calibration activity with all full-time and adjunct faculty to clarify the criteria for each score level. We calibrated specifically on grammar, spelling and usage as the rubric indicates to assure accurate scoring. Because we recalibrated as assessors on this assessment, we believe these scores are even more valid and reliable. We attribute the high individual and averaged scores to our course sequence which calls for this course to follow a required upper-division literature course in our program, LIT325. We will continue these same practices in the 2016-17 year.

### Rubric Used

	value: 1.00	value: 2.00	value: 3.00	value: 4.00
Adaptation to instructional strategy is effective for meeting the specific learning needs of the English learner in content knowledge and English language development.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing adaptation	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected adaptation	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected adaptation	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear and purposefully connected adaptation
Two specific learning needs of the English learner were correctly identified through careful analysis of the case study	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing identifiable learning needs	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected identifiable learning needs	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected identifiable learning needs	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear and purposefully connected identifiable learning needs
The adaptation would be effective for the student in making progress toward English language development specific to this student's English proficiency	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing adaptation	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected adaptation	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, connected, and effective adaptation	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clearly connected, and effective adaptation
The progress monitoring assessment chosen provides feedback to the student for achieving the learning goal at the student's English proficiency level.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing progress monitoring	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected progress monitoring	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected progress monitoring with feedback	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clearly connected progress monitoring with feedback
Next steps in planning are effective to facilitate specific growth in the student's	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and

English language development	or missing next steps for planning	weakly connected next steps for planning	connected next steps for planning	clearly connected next steps for planning
The written product displays effective communication skills through sound grammar, spelling, language and word use.	Inappropriate, inaccurate or unidentifiable written communication	Limited, cursory or inconsistent written communication	Appropriate, relevant and accurate written communication	Detailed, appropriate, and clearly connected use of written communication
The oral presentation displays sound communication skills through proper usage of grammar, voice quality and presentation demeanor that is effective one-on-one and in groups.	Inappropriate, inaccurate or unidentifiable oral communication	Limited, cursory or inconsistent oral communication	Appropriate, relevant and accurate oral communication	Detailed, appropriate, and clearly connected use of oral communication

## Assessment Data Template

### Learning Outcome:

Cross Disciplinary Studies Outcome 1.c. Candidates will employ critical thinking and logic to solve problems in a variety of environments, to include the K-6 classroom.

### Outcome Measure:

Teaching Performance Assessment Task 2 (each year)

### Criteria for Success (if applicable):

Average score for the group is 3.0 or higher (on a scale of 1-4 with 1 being low) on TPA task 2.

### Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

- 11. Specialized Knowledge
- 12. Broad Integrative Knowledge
- 13. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
- 14. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
- 15. Civic and Global Learning

### Longitudinal Data:

	Target: Average Score for the Group is 3.0 or higher			
	2012	2013	2014	2015
Outcome 1c: Employ critical thinking and logic to solve problems	2.72	2.94	2.89	2.98

### Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target not met. Some candidates are not passing each component of the assessment at a level 3 (proficient), bringing the class average below our criteria for success. Although the average score increased from last year, proficient critical thinking and problem solving is required in each of the rubric criterion to meet this target. Three of the 6 criteria in this assessment have an average score below 3.0.

### Changes to be Made Based on Data:

After last year's data analysis we placed special emphasis in each of four courses on critical thinking and problem solving related to teaching strategies and learning about students in order to plan effective lessons. This emphasis seems to have made a positive difference in the overall average from 2.89 to 2.98. We will add additional experiences on making teaching decisions for diverse students to each course EDU302, EDU404, EDU306 and in EDU324 where this Task 2 assessment occurs.

### Rubric Used

#### TPA Task 2 - Designing Instruction

created with  taskstream

 Export to Word

	1 - Far Below Standard	2 - Below Standard	3 - Meets Standard	4 - Exceeds Standard	Score/Level
Establishing Goals and Standards.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Learning about Students.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Planning for Instruction.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Making Adaptations.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Using Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Reflecting.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Comments:					

## Assessment Data Template

### Learning Outcome:

**Cross Disciplinary Studies Outcome 1.d. Candidates will utilize specific content information from a variety of sources for instructional planning.**

### Outcome Measure:

Teaching Performance Assessment Task 2 (each year)

### Criteria for Success (if applicable):

Average score for the group is 3.0 or higher (on a scale of 1-4 with 1 being low) on TPA task 2, criterion three on “Planning for Instruction”.

### Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

- 16. Specialized Knowledge
- 17. Broad Integrative Knowledge
- 18. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
- 19. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
- 20. Civic and Global Learning

### Longitudinal Data:

	Target: Average Score for the Group is 3.0 or higher			
	2012	2013	2014	2015
Outcome 1.d. Candidates will utilize specific content information from a variety of sources for instructional planning.	2.85	3.0	2.93	3.07

### Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target is met. Our candidates scored higher in this criterion, in the area of “instructional planning using a variety of content and sources” than in the past 3 years. With the Common Core Standards now in place, more emphasis was needed in our series of Education courses on the types of content and sources to be used when planning for instructional experiences, and our scores seemed to benefit. We have added intentional content to each Education course that focuses on a specific part of the lesson planning process with the Common Core State Standards as the foundation.

### Changes to be Made Based on Data:

We will continue the same efforts as last year, which seemed to be effective. Because we will have new faculty in each of the Education courses that prepares students for this assessment, our change is to increase the number of structured meetings together to review and refine the content in each Education course to focus on specific parts of lesson planning. Each course must cover the lesson planning components in a developmental and systematic way.

### Rubric Used

#### TPA Task 2 - Designing Instruction

	1 - Far Below Standard	2 - Below Standard	3 - Meets Standard	4 - Exceeds Standard	Score/Level
Establishing Goals and Standards.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Learning about Students.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Planning for Instruction.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Making Adaptations.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Using Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Reflecting.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Comments:					

## Assessment Data Template

### Learning Outcome:

**Cross Disciplinary Studies Outcome 2.a. Candidates will apply an interdisciplinary understanding of content appropriate for diverse and cross-cultural communities.**

### Outcome Measure:

Teaching Performance Assessment Task 2 (each year)

### Criteria for Success (if applicable):

Average score for the group is 3.0 or higher (on a scale of 1-4 with 1 being low) on TPA task 2, criterion four on “Making Adaptations”.

### Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

- 21. Specialized Knowledge
- 22. Broad Integrative Knowledge
- 23. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
- 24. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
- 25. Civic and Global Learning

### Longitudinal Data:

	Target: Average Score for the Group is 3.0 or higher			
	2012	2013	2014	2015
Outcome 2.a. Candidates will apply an interdisciplinary understanding of content regarding diverse and cross-cultural communities.	2.46	2.81	2.64	2.8

### Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target not met. Although the group average shows a good increase, candidates are scoring below the proficient level (3.0) in the area of “making adaptations to content and instructional delivery for diverse and cross-cultural students”. We credit this increase to more intentional focus during EDU306 on instructional strategies appropriate for a diverse student population.

### Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Additional refinement on instructional strategies appropriate for a diverse student population will be a major focus during department meetings in the 2016-17 school year. We will also include more formative assessments during the semester to monitor candidate acquisition of this skill set.

### Rubric Used

#### TPA Task 2 - Designing Instruction

	1 - Far Below Standard	2 - Below Standard	3 - Meets Standard	4 - Exceeds Standard	Score/Level
Establishing Goals and Standards.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Learning about Students.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Planning for Instruction.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Making Adaptations.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Using Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Reflecting.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Comments:					

## Assessment Data Template

### Learning Outcome:

**Cross Disciplinary Studies Outcome 2.b. Candidates will apply faith-based influences and beliefs within educational settings.**

### Outcome Measure:

Host teacher survey from final fieldwork course (every year)

### Criteria for Success (if applicable):

90% of students will be reported as “often” or “consistently” applying positive dispositions and/or faith-based influences in the school setting.

### Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

26. Specialized Knowledge

27. Broad Integrative Knowledge

28. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies

29. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and

30. Civic and Global Learning

### Longitudinal Data:

	Target: 90% of Students Will Apply Faith-Based Influences Often or Consistently			
	2012	2013	2014	2015
Outcome 2.b. Candidates will apply faith-based influences and beliefs within educational settings.	81%	100%	95%	83%

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Target not met. The feedback from host teachers in this area had improved in recent years meeting our target, but this year saw a dramatic drop. Although we have made it more clear to our candidates over the years that this quality needs to be evident in their work, the department experienced a 40% increase in student body and multiple professors delivering this message in different ways. More students also means more diversity in attitudes and skill levels. Anecdotally, we did experience an increase of students who received negative comments from host teachers on their feedback forms.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

We will continue to emphasize the areas upon which our candidates will be assessed by their host teachers, which includes not only curricular and academic content but personal, dispositional and faith-based qualities as well. This topic will be emphasized in our more regular department meetings with our new and veteran faculty. Further, our plan is to meet personally with any candidate who does not score at the proficient level in any category rated by the host teacher and craft an improvement plan with follow up meetings.

**Rubric Used**

<b>Survey Question:</b>	<b>1- Far below standard</b>	<b>2- Below standard</b>	<b>3- Meets standard</b>	<b>4- Exceeds standard</b>
<b>To what degree did you witness the PLNU candidate apply positive dispositions and/or faith-based influences in the school setting?</b>	<b>These traits were rarely evident</b>	<b>These traits were sometimes evident</b>	<b>These traits were often evident</b>	<b>These traits were consistently evident</b>

## Assessment Data Template

### Learning Outcome:

**Cross Disciplinary Studies Outcome 3.a. Candidates will reflect on and engage in spiritual and professional growth opportunities in personal and educational settings.**

### Outcome Measure:

Disposition Assessment, criteria 3 on “Reflective Learner” (each year)

### Criteria for Success (if applicable):

Average score for the group is 3.0 or higher (on a scale of 1-4 with 1 being low) on criteria 3 of the Dispositions assessment, “Reflective Learner”.

### Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

- 31. Specialized Knowledge
- 32. Broad Integrative Knowledge
- 33. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
- 34. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
- 35. Civic and Global Learning

### Longitudinal Data:

	Target: Average Score for the Group is 3.0 or higher			
	2012	2013	2014	2015
Outcome 3.a. Candidates will reflect on and engage in spiritual and professional growth opportunities in personal and educational settings.	3.60	3.71	3.75	4.0

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Target is met. The average score level for this criterion in our dispositions assessment is generally high, because so much of the Education curriculum is centered on being reflective of your practice and making changes based on that reflection. This year it seems every candidate was a reflective learner at a proficient level.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

We will continue to focus on collecting valid and plentiful data on this measure from both candidates and their professors each year by discussing the rubric at department meetings and encouraging thoughtful scoring. Another change will be to have an assignment in EDU302 particular to this assessment so we are training both faculty and students on its meaning. Lastly, we will have a mid-point assessment experience for the students to self-assess, and receive an assessment from a faculty member as a midterm score.

**Rubric Used**

<p><b>3. Reflective Learner</b> 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Articulates and models his/her calling to the profession</li> <li>-Understands personal strengths and demonstrates consistent performance in given activities</li> <li>-Takes responsibility for his/her own learning</li> <li>-Develops and monitors a plan that balances personal and professional growth</li> <li>-Looks at an incident/activity to analyze what worked and targets areas for improvement</li> <li>-Asks questions, seeks support and guidance</li> <li>-Uses journals or reflections to record thinking and improve practice</li> </ul>
---	---

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>RUBRICS FOR PERFORMANCE LEVEL</b></p> <p><b>4 – Exceptional</b> - 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.</p> <p><b>3.5 - Advanced</b> - Demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct without prompting.</p> <p><b>3 –Appropriate</b> - Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher.</p> <p><b>2.5 - Improvement Needed</b> – Lack of this indicator has been evident to peers or teacher. Demonstrates the ability to accept feedback, reflect and improve.</p> <p><b>2 – Area of Concern</b> – Demonstration of this indicator is frequently missing. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher.</p> <p><b>1 – Inappropriate</b> - Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all. No indication of desire to improve.</p>
---

## Assessment Data Template

### Learning Outcome:

**Cross Disciplinary Studies Outcome 3.b. Candidates will serve effectively within their communities and in educational settings.**

### Outcome Measure:

Host Teacher Survey Question 6 on “the candidate’s attitude of service to students while in your classroom”. (each year)

### Criteria for Success (if applicable):

90% of students will be reported as “often” or “consistently” displaying an attitude of willing service in the classroom.

### Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

- 36. Specialized Knowledge
- 37. Broad Integrative Knowledge
- 38. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
- 39. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
- 40. Civic and Global Learning

### Longitudinal Data:

	Target: 90% Percentage of Students Will Serve Willingly “Often” or “Consistently”			
	2012	2013	2014	2015
Outcome 2.b. Candidates will apply faith-based influences and beliefs within educational settings.	95%	100%	94%	86%

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Target not met. The feedback from host teachers in this area has remained high each year, but this year shows a significant drop. Although we have made it more clear to our candidates over the years that this quality needs to be evident in their work, the department experienced a 40% increase in student body and multiple professors delivering this message in different ways. More students also means more diversity in attitudes and skill levels.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

We will continue to emphasize the areas upon which our candidates will be assessed by their host teachers, which includes not only curricular and academic content but personal, dispositional and faith-based qualities as well. This topic will be emphasized in our more regular department meetings with our new and veteran faculty. Further, our plan is to meet personally with any candidate who does not score at the proficient level in any category rated by the host teacher and craft an improvement plan with follow up meetings.

**Rubric Used**

<b>Survey Question:</b>	<b>1- Far below standard</b>	<b>2- Below standard</b>	<b>3- Meets standard</b>	<b>4- Exceeds standard</b>
<b>How would you rate the PLNU candidate's attitude of service to students while in your classroom?</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>	<b>Often</b>	<b>Consistently</b>