Assessment Data Template

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:
Outcome 1a. Written: Students will be able to effectively express ideas and information to others through written communication.

Outcome Measure:
ETS (each year)

Criteria for Success (if applicable):
TBD

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 _____ or higher			
	2016			
Outcome 1a: Written Communication	Available Spring 2017			

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Rubric Used:
ETS scores, so no rubric.

Assessment Data Template

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:
Outcome 1b. Oral: Students will be able to effectively express ideas and information to others through oral communication.

Outcome Measure:
Clinical Practice Interview (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).

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 3.0 or higher			
	2015			
Outcome 1b: Oral Communication	3.5			

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
Target is met. Students are performing at a high level in their oral communication skills, as measured by the interview conducted after 2 semesters of coursework where candidates need to cogently explain their understanding of a variety of educational practices.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
There are no changes to be made at this time, and we feel the scores are accurate. Because we have many new faculty, and in order to avoid inflated scoring in the future, we will have another calibration activity with all full-time and adjunct faculty who sit on the panel for this interview to clarify the criteria for each score level. We will calibrate specifically on grammar, usage and use of the academic vocabulary expected during this interview, as the rubric indicates, to assure accurate scoring.

Rubric Used (page 1 of 2)

Clinical Practice Interview Rubric

Content	Little or No Evidence Value: 1	Limited Evidence Value: 2	Appropriate Evidence Value: 3	Detailed and Appropriate Evidence Value: 4	Score/ Level
Knowledge of classroom planning and design	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing knowledge	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, or ambiguous knowledge	Appropriate, relevant, accurate knowledge	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear knowledge	
Understanding of role of student learning in lesson planning	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate understanding of language or special needs	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weak understanding of language or special needs	Appropriate, relevant, accurate understanding of language or special needs	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear understanding of language or special needs	
Understanding of role of teacher in creating independent learners	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate understanding	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weak understanding	Appropriate, relevant, accurate understanding	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate and clear understanding	
Understanding of how to meet the needs of all students	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate understanding of diverse needs	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weak understanding of diverse needs	Appropriate, relevant, accurate understanding of diverse needs	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear understanding of diverse needs	

Note: A minimum average score of 3 is required for advancement to Clinical Practice

Clinical Practice Interview Rubric

Rubric Used (page 2 of 2)

Dispositions	Little or No Evidence value: 1	Limited Evidence value: 2	Appropriate Evidence value: 3	Detailed and Appropriate Evidence value: 4	Score/ Level
Understanding of dispositional goals for students	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate understanding	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weak understanding	Appropriate, relevant, accurate understanding	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear understanding	
Understanding of conflict resolution	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate understanding	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weak understanding	Appropriate, relevant, accurate understanding	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear understanding	
Understanding of how convictions guide teaching and their relationship to classroom instruction	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate understanding	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weak understanding	Appropriate, relevant, accurate understanding	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear understanding	
Understanding of how to build community in the classroom	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate understanding	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weak understanding	Appropriate, relevant, accurate understanding	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear understanding	
Knowledge of skills and dispositions necessary for teaching	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate knowledge	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weak knowledge	Appropriate, relevant, accurate knowledge	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear knowledge	
Knowledge of need for personal growth	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate knowledge	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weak knowledge	Appropriate, relevant, accurate knowledge	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear knowledge	

Note: A minimum average score of 3 is required for advancement to Clinical Practice.

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:
Outcome 1c. Information Literacy: Students will be able to access and cite information as well as evaluate the logic, validity, and relevance of information from a variety of sources.

Outcome Measure:
EDU410 Signature Assessment (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).

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 3.0 or higher		
	2015			
Outcome 1c: Information Literacy	3.95			

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
Target is met. We attribute the high individual and averaged scores to our course sequence which calls for this course to follow the more foundational courses in our program, EDU302, 404 and 306. We will continue these same practices in the 2016-17 year.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
In order to be sure we are not experiencing inflated scoring, we will have a calibration activity with all full-time and adjunct faculty who score these assessments across both regional centers to further clarify the criteria for each score level. Also, after last year's data analysis of other credential candidate groups showed lower scores in this area, we placed special emphasis in this course on critical analysis of

information 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 for all credential candidate populations.

Rubric Used

EDU410 Teaching Reading (Revised 8.9.2011)

created with 🆂 taskstream

	value: 1.00	value: 2.00	value: 3.00	value: 4.00	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	
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	
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	
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	
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	

Assessment Data Template

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:
Outcome 1d. Critical Thinking: Students will be able to examine, critique and synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions.

Outcome Measure:
Teaching Performance Assessment Task 1 (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 1.

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 3.0 or higher			
	2015			
Outcome 1d. Critical Thinking	2.74			

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
Target is not met. Although the group average is close to the target, candidates are scoring below the proficient level (3.0) in the area of "examine, critique and synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions.". We credit this low score to the early stage in the program where this assessment occurs, in the second 8 weeks of instruction. For this assessment, students need to determine appropriate instructional strategies given information about a diverse student population.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
Students need additional experience analyzing case studies in order to examine, critique and synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions. We will make this a required course activity 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 1 - Subject Specific Pedagogy

	1 - Far Below Standard	2 - Below Standard	3 - Meets Standard	4 - Exceeds Standard	Score/Level
Using subject-specific, developmentally appropriate pedagogy.	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.	
Planning for assessment.	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.	
Comments:					

Assessment Data Template

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:
Outcome 1e. Quantitative Reasoning: Students will be able to solve problems, that are quantitative in nature.

Outcome Measure:
ETS (each year)

Criteria for Success (if applicable):
TBD

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 3.0 or higher			
	2016			
Outcome 1.e. Quantitative Reasoning	Available Spring 2017			

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Rubric Used:
ETS test so no rubric used.

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:
Outcome 2a. Students will develop an understanding of self that fosters personal wellbeing.

Outcome Measure:
Dispositions Assessment criteria 4 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).

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 3.0 or higher			
	2015			
Outcome 2a. Students will develop an understanding of self that fosters personal wellbeing.	3.39			

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 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 continue to make sure there is a point value assigned to its completion, as this is the assessment that is sometimes missing from our data.

Rubric Used

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.	-Articulates and models his/her calling to the profession -Understands personal strengths and demonstrates consistent performance in given activities -Takes responsibility for his/her own learning -Develops and monitors a plan that balances personal and professional growth -Looks at an incident/activity to analyze what worked and targets areas for improvement -Asks questions, seeks support and guidance -Uses journals or reflections to record thinking and improve practice

RUBRICS FOR PERFORMANCE LEVEL

4 – Exceptional - 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.

3.5 - Advanced - Demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct without prompting.

3 –Appropriate - Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher.

2.5 - Improvement Needed – Lack of this indicator has been evident to peers or teacher. Demonstrates the ability to accept feedback, reflect and improve.

2 – Area of Concern – Demonstration of this indicator is frequently missing. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher.

1 – Inappropriate - Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all. No indication of desire to improve.

Assessment Data Template

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:
Outcome 2b. Students will understand and appreciate diverse forms of artistic expression.

Outcome Measure:
Host teacher survey from fieldwork courses (every year)

Criteria for Success (if applicable):
90% of candidates will receive a rating of "strong" on a rating scale that includes "weak", "adequate" and "strong".

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: 90% of students will be rated as "strong" in their understand and appreciation of diverse forms of artistic expression			
	2015			
Outcome 2b. Students will understand and appreciate diverse forms of artistic expression.	100%			

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
Target is met. All host teachers reported that their fieldwork candidates showed understanding and appreciation for the variety of ways their students express themselves artistically.

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. In order to assure that the host teachers report on our students thoughtfully, we have begun the practice of visiting the host sites to explain the assessment measure and the meaning of each criterion. We also explain to our candidates how they will be assessed at their fieldwork site.

Rubric Used

Candidate Name _____ PLNU ID # _____ Course # _____

Semester _____ Quad _____ Year _____ Host Teacher Name _____
Fieldwork School _____ Minimum Hours Required _____

CANDIDATE ATTENDANCE　(The **candidate** is expected to track fieldwork hours. Please verify the days and number of hours served)

Week/Date	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Total Hours	Description of Fieldwork Activity *
					TOTAL HOURS		*Examples: assisted teacher, observed, case study, taught a small group, etc.*

CANDIDATE EVALUATION　(The **host teacher** is expected to complete the following information based on experience with this candidate)

	Weak 1	Acceptable 2	Strong 3	Exceptional 4
1. *Cultural Sensitivity:* Demonstrates respect and appreciation toward ethnically and culturally diverse students in				

==their academic, social and artistic expression==				
2. *Basic Skills:* Models appropriate literacies (reading, writing, listening, speaking)				
3. *Attendance:* Punctuality and Dependability				
4. *Cooperation:* Fulfills assignments/follows instructions				
5. *Initiative:* Anticipates needs/assumes responsibilities				
6. *Attitude:* Maintains poise and positive interaction with students				
7. *Interest:* Shows enthusiasm/communicates with supervisors				
8: *Appearance:* Dresses appropriately				
Please provide specifics concerning the quality of candidate's observation and participation in your classroom:				

Your signature indicates that you agree that the totaled hours are correct as recorded on the Candidate Attendance chart.

Host Teacher Signature X _____   **Candidate Signature** X _____

Assessment Data Template

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:
Outcome 2c. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the complex issues faced by diverse groups in global and/or cross-cultural contexts.

Outcome Measure:
TPA task 1, criteria 4 on "Making Adaptations for Diverse Learners" (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 4 of TPA task 1, "Making Adaptations".

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 3.0 or higher			
	2015			
Outcome 2c. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the complex issues faced by diverse groups in global and/or cross-cultural contexts.	2.95			

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
Target is not met. Although the group average is close to the target, candidates are scoring below the proficient level (3.0) in the area of "understanding the complex issues faced by diverse groups in global and/or cross-cultural contexts". We credit this low score to inexperience determining appropriate scaffolds and instructional supports given information about a diverse student population.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
Students need additional experience analyzing case studies and actual students in order to better understand the complex issues faced by diverse groups in global and/or cross-cultural contexts. We will add additional case study examinations as an EDU306 course activity in the 2016-17 school year. We will also include more fieldwork assignments with host teachers to give candidates experience for acquisition of this skill set.

Rubric Used

TPA Task 1 - Subject Specific Pedagogy

	1 - Far Below Standard	2 - Below Standard	3 - Meets Standard	4 - Exceeds Standard	Score/Level
Using subject-specific, developmentally appropriate pedagogy.	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.	
Planning for assessment.	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.	
Comments:					

Assessment Data Template

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:
Outcome 3. Students will demonstrate an understanding of Christian Scripture, Tradition and Ethics, including engagement in acts of devotion and works of mercy.

Outcome Measure:
BST 304 Biblical Perspectives, signature assessment (each year)

Criteria for Success (if applicable):
TBD

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:			
	2016			
Outcome 3. Students will demonstrate an understanding of Christian Scripture, Tradition and Ethics, including engagement in acts of devotion and works of mercy.	Available Spring 2017			

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Rubric Used
TBD