ISEE Core Competencies Assessment Data

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

Outcome Measure:
EDU306 Signature Assessment, criterion 6 (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):
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			
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Outcome 1a: Written Communication	3.38	3.5	3.23	3.71

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
Target is met. Students are performing at a high level in their written communication skills. 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. Because we calibrate, we believe these scores are valid and reliable.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
In Spring 2018 SOE initiated a committee of full-time faculty to examine writing instruction and performance in SOE. The committee recommended adding a writing-quality indicator to all SOE signature assessments to improve our ability to identify and monitor students with needs for additional writing support. This indicator was approved by the faculty in Fall 2018. A heightened awareness of the importance of strong writing skills in education is clear. Data from the new writing indicator will be analyzed and reported to department and faculty.

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
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

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

Outcome Measure:
*Outgoing Outcome: Clinical Practice Interview (each year)
Incoming Outcome: Signature Assessment Oral Presentation

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):
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 3.0 or higher			
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Outcome 1b: Oral Communication	3.5	3.5	3.48	3.33*

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 given the imminent change in indicator. We feel the scores are accurate and look forward to continued strong performance on the new indicator in the 2019-20 academic year. Our practice of annual calibration with full-time and adjunct faculty maintains reliability from year to year. We calibrate on teaching content, dispositions and use of the academic vocabulary expected during this interview, as the rubric indicates, to assure accurate scoring.

*This is the last year this Learning Outcome will be tied to this indicator. The Clinical Practice Interview has changed. In 2019/20 Outcome 1b will be measured using a standardized oral presentation in all EDU 306, EDU 601 and EDU 653 courses.

Rubric Used

ISEE Core Competencies Assessment Data

ISEE CC Learning Outcome:
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):
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			
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Outcome 1c: Information Literacy	3.95	3.32	3.58	3.58

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
Target is met. We attribute consistent scores to our course sequence which calls for this course to follow the foundational courses in our program, EDU302, 404 and 306. Consistently high scores on this indicator suggest candidates are well prepared to access and consume sources of information.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
In order to guard against score inflation, we will continue active calibration among all full-time and adjunct faculty who score these assessments across both regional centers. These results and their continued importance for our students will be shared in faculty meetings and in bulletins with faculty members to reinforce the importance of focusing on digital literacy and its role in matching student need and teaching pedagogy.

Rubric Used

EDU410 Teaching Reading (Revised 8.9.2011)

	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	

ISEE Core Competencies Assessment Data

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

Outcome Measure:
*Outgoing Measure: Teaching Performance Assessment Task 1 (each year). *TPA format and administration changed at the State level in 2018. The new TPA was piloted and calibrated to align with the old version.

^Incoming Measure: Teaching Performance Assessment Step 3 Reflect Rubric 1.7 Analyze & describe the impact of planning, teaching and assessment of student learning (TPA 1.7).

Criteria for Success (if applicable):
*Outgoing Criteria: Average score for the group is 3.0 or higher (on a scale of 1-4 with 1 being low) on TPA task 1.
^Incoming Criteria: Average score for the group is 3.0 or higher (on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being low) on TPA 1.7.

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			
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Outcome 1d. Critical Thinking	2.74	3.0	3.03	NA^

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target score is suppressed. The 2018-19 number of participants for this indicator is very small (N=1). This low N is a product of a testing gap as SOE and our students adjust to TPA administration occurring later in the instructional program. As we move through the transition to the new indicator and collect more data we will have perspective on its value.

Candidates historically score at or above the proficient level (3.0) in the area of "examine, critique and synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions". We expect that to be the case going forward.

For the incoming assessment, part of the new two-part Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA), students submit a sample lesson where they teach to a class of students while also focusing in on three "focus" students who each represent diverse teaching needs: one social-emotional, one English learner, and a student with special needs. Our adherence to a structured course sequence where learning is developmental and scaffolded by drives this competency.

As noted above, the indicator for this outcome changed in Fall 2018. This State-level change has resulted in a testing gap as SOE and students adjust to students participating in TPA later in their program. The State undertook an extensive piloting and refinement process as it developed the new test, concluding the new test was comparable to the old. We will look to confirm this within SOE as scores come in over the next reporting cycles. Accordingly, as we move further into the transition we will gain perspective on its value as an indicator.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

We are not making curricular adjustments based on 2018-19 TPA data. Instead we are looking back seeing this score has been stable for the last three years. To further increase it in the year to come, and help students adjust to the new TPA formate we are focused on getting students additional experience and feedback in case study analysis. We piloted and are now implementing video technology that will streamline this process. This technology provides faculty and supervisors access to student instructional footage and expedites the feedback process as they work toward TPA.

Rubric Used

Teaching Performance Assessment Step 3 Reflect Rubric 1.7 Analyze & describe the impact of planning, teaching and assessment of student learning (TPA1.7)

Step 3 Rubric

Rubric 1.7 — Step 3: Reflect

Essential Question: How does the candidate analyze and describe the impact of their asset and needs-based lesson planning, teaching, and assessment of student learning and provide next steps to advance instruction for this group of students?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Candidate's reflection provides no connection between student assets and needs and impact on their planning, teaching, and monitoring of student learning. **OR** Candidate does not describe next steps for instruction.	Candidate's reflection demonstrates a minor or narrow understanding of what was learned about planning, teaching, **AND/OR** monitoring student learning in regard to students' assets or needs. Candidate describes next steps for instruction that are unconnected to what was learned about students.	Candidate connects the importance of knowing students' assets and needs to student learning, and analyzes and describes how knowing this information can lead to the development of instruction that is engaging, challenging, and motivating to learners. Candidate provides next steps for instruction, citing evidence of student learning assessed during the lesson.	**All of Level 3, plus:** Candidate provides a clear rationale for how and why adaptations to instruction were or were not made during the lesson to meet whole class, group, and/or individual student needs.	**All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:** Candidate demonstrates a clear understanding of the principles of UDL regarding the development of flexible learning environments that can support individual learning differences, allowing for an inclusive classroom, and applies that understanding to an analysis of the planning and implementation of this lesson.

TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Element 1; TPE 6, Element 1

Primary Source of Evidence:

- Written Narrative: Reflection on What You Learned

ISEE Core Competencies Assessment Data

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

Outcome Measure:
California Basic Skills Test (CBEST) passage rate by second semester in the program

Criteria for Success (if applicable):
All candidates in the ISEE program will have passed the CBEST by the time they enter semester 2 of the program.

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			
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Outcome 1.e. Quantitative Reasoning	100%	100%	100%	100%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
Target is met. Any student who has not been able to pass this standardized test by semester 2 is removed from coursework until they pass. We have not had to eliminate any candidate from our program in the last 3 years based on non-passage. We provide CBEST preparation courses to any interested candidates.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
No changes are necessary at this time.

Rubric Used:
All three sections of test must be passed (reading, writing and math), in order to pass the CBEST. Raw scores can range from 1-50, which are then converted to scaled scores ranging from 20-80. The passing scaled score on each section of the test is 41, and a minimum total score of 123 for all three sections must be achieved to pass.