School Of Education
Core Competencies (CDS Teacher Ed TUG) Fa2020 - Sp2021

Core Competency: Critical Thinking
Students will be able to examine, critique and synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions.

Outcome Measure:
ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):
75% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Reading/Critical Thinking.
80% of the students passing the READING section of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (i.e., earning a scaled score of 41 on a scale ranging from 20 to 80) beginning AY20-21.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):
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:

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient							
	2013-14	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**2017-18**	**2018-19**	**2019-20**	**2020-21**
Number of students	--	--	14	19	26	19	27	23
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Critical Thinking	81.0%	75.0%	78.6%	73.7%	73.1%	57.9%	55.6%	43.5%

	Target: 80% passing the READING section of the CBEST (earning a 41 on a scale ranging from 20-80)			
	2020-21				
Number of students	12				
Passage of CBEST Reading Section	91.7%				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
The ETS target (75% proficiency) is not met. The School of Education has seen decreases in the reading/critical thinking proficiency of our candidates over the past several years, as evident by the ETS test results. Unfortunately, students' performances in AY20-21 hit an all-time low (43.5%). This is also the first year that our CDS students' reading proficiency was *below* that of their mathematics proficiency (which has historically been the lowest of the three ETC metrics for CDS students).

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
To further explore our CDS students' performance in reading and critical thinking, in AY 2021, we added a second outcome measure to assess this area. Specifically, we added the metric of earning a passing score (41 or above) on the reading/critical thinking subtest of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST). The CBEST is a skills test required by the state of California for all candidates seeking a preliminary teaching credential. Passage of all 3 subsections of the CBEST is *already* a required component for students seeking admittance to their third EDU credential course (typically EDU 3006), and students must submit their scores through TaskStream to verify their passage.

- **NOTE #1:** A 41 is considered a "passing" score on the reading subsection according to the state of California. However, if students do not earn a 41 on this subsection, but earn a combined score of at least 123 across all three subsections and at least a 37 on each subsection, they STILL "pass" their CBEST, according to the state of California guidelines.

- **NOTE #2:** Students are able to waive taking the CBEST, if they have earned satisfactory scores on their SAT, ACT, or AP examinations during high school. Thus, these "high achieving" students scores' are not captured in the CBEST outcome measure reported here.

- **NOTE #3:** If students do NOT pass their CBEST subtests, they may NOT elect to submit their scores via TaskStream until they do. Therefore, students may have taken the CBEST at an earlier date and did not submit their data to us.

According to the new metric (80% passing the CBEST reading subtest with a score of 41 or above), our CDS students have met the target outcome in AY 20-21.

It is of concern that the CDS students have performed poorly on the ETS reading/critical thinking section over the past several years. While the most recent scores may be due, in part, to the students taking the test online during the COVID pandemic, the fact that the scores have remained low year-after-year is concerning. Plans are now in place to explore next year's senior class' perceptions of the ETS examination following its administration in the fall and spring. The students' input may help us determine what additional writing supports we can implement in future years.

Rubric Used
No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile and CBEST test results.

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Core Competencies

Core Competency: Written
Students will be able to effectively express ideas and information to others through written communication.

Outcome Measure:
ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):
80% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Writing.
80% of the students passing the WRITING section of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (i.e., earning a scaled score of 41 on a scale ranging from 20 to 80) beginning AY20-21.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):
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:

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient							
	2013-14	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**2017-18**	**2018-19**	**2019-20**	**2020-21**
Number of students	--	--	14	19	26	19	27	23
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Writing	85.7%	100.0%	85.7%	100.0%	80.8%	78.9%	66.7%	52.2%

	Target: 80% passing the WRITING section of the CBEST (earning a 41 on a scale ranging from 20-80)				
	2020-21				
Number of students	12				
Passage of CBEST Writing Section	91.7%				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
The ETS target (80% proficiency) is not met. The School of Education has seen decreases in the writing proficiency of our candidates over the past several years, as evident by the ETS test results. Unfortunately, this past year saw a continued decrease from that of last year.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
To further explore our CDS students' performance in written communication, in AY 2021, we added a second outcome measure to assess this area. Specifically, we added the metric of earning a passing score (41 or above) on the writing subtest of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST). The CBEST is a skills test required by the state of California for all candidates seeking a preliminary teaching credential. Passage of all 3 subsections of the CBEST is *already* a required component for students seeking admittance to their third EDU credential course (typically EDU 3006), and students must submit their scores through TaskStream to verify their passage.

- **NOTE #1:** A 41 is considered a "passing" score on the writing subsection according to the state of California. However, if students do not earn a 41 on this subsection, but earn a combined score of at least 123 across all three subsections and at least a 37 on each subsection, they STILL "pass" their CBEST, according to the state of California guidelines.

- **NOTE #2:** Students are able to waive taking the CBEST, if they have earned satisfactory scores on their SAT, ACT, or AP examinations during high school. Thus, these "high achieving" students scores' are not captured in the CBEST outcome measure reported here.

- **NOTE #3:** If students do NOT pass their CBEST subtests, they may NOT elect to submit their scores via TaskStream until they do. Therefore, students may have taken the CBEST at an earlier date and did not submit their data to us.

According to the new metric (80% passing the CBEST writing subtest with a score of 41 or above), our CDS students have met the target outcome in AY 20-21. This may be in part due to our initial offering of an optional CBEST writing workshop in the spring of 2021. This workshop, modeled after our successful math support workshop, was designed to support students weak in their writing skills. The student feedback on this workshop was positive, and we plan to offer similar workshops in future academic years.

Since the CBEST writing workshop was offered ONLY for the first time this past spring, any participants in this workshop would NOT have taken the ETS exam yet. Therefore, we will review the ETS scores in the coming years, to see whether this metric is elevated (possibly as a result of students participating in the CBEST writing workshop). Furthermore, plans are now in place to explore next year's senior class' perceptions of the ETS examination following its administration in the fall and spring. The students' input may help us determine what additional writing supports we can implement in future years.

Rubric Used
No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile and CBEST test results.

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Core Competencies

Core Competency: Quantitative Reasoning
Students will be able to solve problems that are quantitative in nature.

Outcome Measure:
ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Outcome Measure:
ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):
70% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Math.
70% of the students passing the MATH section of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (i.e., earning a scaled score of 41 on a scale ranging from 20 to 80) beginning AY20-21.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):
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:

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient							
	2013-14	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**2017-18**	**2018-19**	**2019-20**	**2020-21**
Number of students	--	--	14	19	26	19	27	23
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Math	81.0%	75.0%	57.1%	78.9%	80.8%	57.9%	63.0%	52.2%

	Target: 80% passing the MATH section of the CBEST (earning a 41 on a scale ranging from 20-80)				
	2020-21				
Number of students	12				
Passage of CBEST Math Section	83.3%				

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
The ETS target (70% proficiency) is not met. Unfortunately, the Cross-Disciplinary Studies program (SOE) has seen low student performances on the ETS outcome measure for the past 3 years, with this year's outcome the lowest of all. In our CDS program, students are required to take three math content courses: MTH 1013, MTH 2013, and MTH 2023 – in addition to the General Education requirement of Problem-Solving (which students typically satisfy with MTH 3003). The MTH 2013/2023 series focuses on the math content associated with teaching elementary school students (predominantly K-5). While the ETS exam includes some of the basic skills associated with these "lower" grade levels, it also includes some additional content. It appears as if our students are still struggling with their quantitative reasoning skills according to this ETS metric.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
To further explore our CDS students' performance in quantitative reasoning, in AY 2021, we added a second outcome measure to assess this area. Specifically, we added the metric of earning a passing score (41 or above) on the math subtest of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST). The CBEST is a skills test required by the state of California for all candidates seeking a preliminary teaching credential. Passage of all 3 subsections of the CBEST is *already* a required component for students seeking admittance to their third EDU credential course (typically EDU 3006), and students must submit their scores through TaskStream to verify their passage.

- **NOTE #1:** A 41 is considered a "passing" score on the mathematics subsection according to the state of California. However, if students do not earn a 41 on this subsection, but earn a combined score of at least 123 across all three subsections and at least a 37 on each subsection, they STILL "pass" their CBEST, according to the state of California guidelines.

- **NOTE #2:** Students are able to waive taking the CBEST, if they have earned satisfactory scores on their SAT, ACT, or AP examinations during high school. Thus, these "high achieving" students scores' are not captured in the CBEST outcome measure reported here.

- **NOTE #3:** If students do NOT pass their CBEST subtests, they may NOT elect to submit their scores via TaskStream until they do. Therefore, students may have taken the CBEST at an earlier date and did not submit their data to us.

According to the new metric (80% passing the CBEST mathematics subtest with a score of 41 or above), our CDS students have met the target outcome in AY 20-21. This may be in part due to our continued offering of optional CBEST math workshops (two offered every semester), designed to support students weak in mathematics content. The student feedback on these workshops has continued to be positive, and we plan to offer similar math workshops in future academic years.

Unfortunately, we have continued to see a drop in quantitative reasoning proficiency (as measured by the ETS test), despite these workshop offerings. Plans are now in place to explore next year's senior class' perceptions of the ETS examination following its administration in the fall and spring. The students' input may help us determine what additional writing supports we can implement in future years.

Rubric Used
No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile and CBEST test results.

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Core Competencies

Core Competency: Oral Communication
Students will demonstrate effective oral communication, one-on-one and with groups.

Outcome Measure:
   A.   EDU 306 Signature Assessment, criterion 7 (each year through 2017-18).
   B.   EDU 306/3006 Mirrors, Windows, Sliding Glass Doors Diversity, criterion 4 (each year, beginning 2018-19)

Criteria for Success:
   A.   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".
   B.   80% or more of students earn a 3 (on a scale of 1-3, with 1 being low) on **rubric criterion 4**, "Oral presentation of the 6 resources/books with an explanation of the criteria used to select the source and how you would use/apply it in your classroom."

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):
   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 (Criteria for Success A):

Oral Communication	Target: Average Score for the Group is 3.5 or higher			
	2014-15	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**2017-18**
Effective Oral Presentation	3.94	3.79	3.85	3.59

Longitudinal Data (Criteria for Success B):

	Target: 80% or more earn a 3 (on 3-point rubric)				
Oral Communication	**2018-19**	**2019-20**	**2020-21**		
Number of students	--	--	43		
Effective Oral Presentation	100%	100%	97.7%		

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
Target is met. CDS students continue to perform at a high level in their oral communication skills. This is encouraging, as good oral communication is a key characteristic of effective teachers. The score affirms of the instructional efforts made in **EDU 3006** (Principles of Language Acquisition), as well as the two prior EDU courses: **EDU 3002** (Foundations of Education and Learning Theory) and **EDU 4004** (Foundations of Special Education), all three of which provide opportunities for students to orally present to their classmates and instructor and receive constructive feedback.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
In AY18-19, EDU 3006 faculty designed a new assignment that required all students to present to their peers. This new assignment has allowed us to consistently measure the oral communication skills within the context of an educational assignment. While the adjunct professor (Dr. Suzanne Roy) who has taught this course for the past three years is not returning in the fall, we are confident that Dr. Cecelia Fernandez (our new adjunct instructor) will be able to implement and assess this assignment in a manner consistent with that which has been done in the past three academic years.

Rubric used (Criteria for Success A):

	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	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected next steps for planning	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clearly

	steps for planning	next steps for planning		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

**EDU306 - Mirrors, Windows, and Sliding Glass Doors Diversity Assignment
Scoring Rubric**

	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3
1. **Explains** the importance of schools and teachers supporting diverse and cross-cultural communities, as well as **specifies** ways for schools and teachers to demonstrate a commitment do so.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous, or weakly connected identifiable reasons to support diverse and cross-cultural communities. Does not include specific ways for schools and teachers to demonstrate this commitment.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected identifiable reasons to support diverse and cross-cultural communities. Limited/minimal inclusion of specific ways for schools and teachers to demonstrate this commitment.	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected identifiable reasons to support diverse and cross-cultural communities. Includes specific ways for schools and teachers to demonstrate this commitment.
2. **Specifies** the important role that multicultural / cross-cultural books and instructional materials play in supporting diverse and cross-cultural communities. **Refers** to the concept of "mirrors, windows, and sliding class doors."	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous, or weak explanation for the important role that multicultural and cross-cultural books and instructional materials play in supporting diverse communities. Minimal / no reference to the concept of "mirrors, windows, and sliding glass doors."	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the important role that multicultural and cross-cultural books and instructional materials play in supporting diverse communities. Limited/minimal reference to the concept of "mirrors, windows, and sliding glass doors."	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the important role that multicultural and cross-cultural books and instructional materials play in supporting diverse communities. Refers to the concept of "mirrors, windows, and sliding glass doors."
3. **Identify** 6 resources/ books (title, author, publisher, date) with an **explanation** of the criteria used to select the source and **application** in your classroom.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing logical explanation for the selection of fewer than 4 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Minimal/no explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of fewer than 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Limited/minimal explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of the 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Includes a comprehensive explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.

4. **Oral presentation** of the 6 resources/books with an explanation of the criteria used to select the source and how you would use/ apply it in your classroom.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing logical explanation for the selection of fewer than 4 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Minimal/no explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom. Presentation was unprepared and unprofessionalism.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of fewer than 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Limited/minimal explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom. Presentation lacked preparation and professionalism.	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of the 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Includes a comprehensive explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom. Professional, well-prepared presentation.
5. **Discussion Board Posting/Small Group Discussion** of the 6 resources/books with an explanation of the criteria used to select the source and how you would use/apply it in your classroom	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing logical explanation for the selection of fewer than 4 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Minimal/no explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of fewer than 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Limited/minimal explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of the 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Includes a comprehensive explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.
Total _____/15			

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Core Competencies

Core Competency: Information Literacy
Students will utilize specific content information from a variety of sources for instructional planning.

Outcome Measure:
   A. Teaching Performance Assessment Task 2 (each year, through AY2017-18)
   B. UDL Lesson Plan (from AY 2018-19 onward)

Criteria for Success (if applicable):
   A. 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".
   B. 85% of students earn 85/100 total points or higher in AY18-19 and 19-20, and 85% earn 68/80 total points or higher in AY20-21 on the UDL Lesson Plan [EDU 3024 final assessment].

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 (Criteria for Success A):

Information Literacy:	Target: Average Score for the Group is 3.0 or higher			
	2014-15	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**2017-18**
Teaching Performance Assessment Task 2	2.93	3.07	2.96	3.04

Longitudinal Data (Criteria for Success B):

Information Literacy:	Target: 85% of students earn 85/100 or higher (AY2018-19, 2019-20) Target: 85% of students earn 68/80 or higher (AY 2020-21)			
	2018-19	**2019-20**	**2020-21**	
Number of students	--	--	33	
UDL Lesson Plan	86.4%	83.9%	90.9%	

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
Target is met, despite setting a high criterion for success. The current outcome measure and criteria for success seem appropriate, and students seem to be doing well on this Learning Outcome.

NOTE: The "oral presentation" element was removed from the UDL (**U**niversal **D**esign for **L**earning) Lesson Plan rubric in AY 2020-21. This is <u>not</u> because the oral presentation of a lesson segment was removed from the UDL Lesson Plan. Rather, in AY 2020-21, the UDL Lesson Plan assignment was elevated to serve as the culminating assessment for EDU 3024. As a result of this shift, additional scaffolding for the assessment was put in place during AY 2020-21. This scaffolding was spread across three weeks and included opportunities for students to share their initial ideas for their lesson and submit an interim progress report, both having opportunities for feedback. The Lesson Plan Presentation component was shifted from a synchronous presentation to an asynchronous Discussion Board video submission, providing peers with an opportunity to provide each other with constructive feedback on their presentations. The 20 points originally awarded by the instructor for the presentation were, instead, distributed across the Discussion Board Presentation assignment and the previous *initial* assignments for this assessment. The final UDL Lesson Plan, which included the plan itself and a reflection of the presentation and writing process (worth total of 80 points), was due during final exam week.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
There are no plans to change the assessment, outcome measure, or target. We will collect data on this competency using the same outcome measure next year, which will provide us with additional data to determine whether changes should be made in the future.

Rubric Used (Criteria for Success A)

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:					

Rubric Used (Criteria for Success B)

	Level 1 Developing	Level 2 Emerging	Level 3 Competency	Level 4 Mastery	TOTAL
Identification of the CaCCSS standard for lesson	Standard is NOT identified (0 points)	Standard that is identified is not appropriately aligned with the lesson that is planned. (2 points)	Standard that is identified is appropriate for the lesson planned. Standard that is identified is not from CaCCSS. (3 points)	Standard that is identified is appropriate for the lesson planned. Standard that is noted is from CaCCSS. (5 points)	
Learning Objectives	Learning objectives are NOT included (0 points)	Learning objectives are vague or not aligned well with the lesson planned nor the standard specified. (2 points)	Learning objectives are mostly clear, somewhat aligned with the lesson planned and the standard specified. (3 points)	Learning objectives are very clear, and clearly align with the lesson planned and the standard specified. (5 points)	

Assessments	Minimal opportunity for assessment is included. Assessments that are included are vaguely described. (2 points)	Some formative and summative assessments are included. Assessments are somewhat clear and are partially aligned with the lesson activities. (4 points)	Formative and summative assessments are included. Assessments are described and mostly aligned with the lesson activities. (7 points)	Excellent integration of formative and summative assessments. Assessments are clearly described. (10 points)	
Differentiation strategies	NO methods of differentiation are explicitly included. (0 points)	Some methods of differentiation are included. Differentiation that is included is vaguely described and only applies to one group of learners. (4 points)	Several methods of differentiation are included. Differentiation that is included is mostly clear. Differentiation applies to at least two groups of learners. (7 points)	Many methods of differentiation are included. Differentiation that is included is clearly described. Differentiation applies at least 3 groups of learners. (10 points)	
Opportunities for sharing mathematical ideas	Lesson does not provide opportunity for students to share and represent their mathematical ideas with one another. (0 points)	Lesson provides only limited opportunity for students to share and represent their mathematical ideas with one another as well as with their instructor. (2 points)	Lesson provides some opportunities for students to share and represent their mathematical ideas with one another as well as with their instructor. (3 points)	Lesson provides multiple opportunities for students to share and represent their mathematical ideas with one another as well as with their instructor. (5 points)	
Learning Activities	Learning activities are not age appropriate, ambiguously described, and do not align with the standard specified. The learning sequence does not allows for activities and learning to build throughout the lesson. (10 points)	Learning activities are somewhat age appropriate, somewhat described, and partially align with the standard specified. The learning sequence somewhat allows for activities and learning to build throughout the lesson. (15 points)	Learning activities are mostly age appropriate, mostly clear, and align with the standard specified. The learning sequence mostly allows for activities and learning to build throughout the lesson. (20 points)	Learning activities are age appropriate, clearly described, and clearly align with the standard specified. The learning sequence allows for activities and learning to build from opening to closing. (25 points)	

In-class Presentation*	Presentation was carried out with numerous interruptions. Limited interaction with and between learners. Activity instructions were ambiguous. Many materials were not present. (5 points)	Presentation was carried out with several interruptions. Some interaction with and between learners. Activity instructions were somewhat clear. Some materials were present. (10 points)	Presentation was carried out with minimal interruptions. Interaction with and between learners was good. Activity instructions were mostly clear. Most materials were present. (15 points)	Presentation was well carried out. Interaction with and between learners was excellent. Activities were clearly introduced. All materials were present. (20 points)	
Reflection	Reflection was poorly written. Suggestions for improvement showed minimal thought and were not aligned with presentation. (5 points)	Reflection was somewhat vague or ambiguous. Suggestions for improvement showed minimal thought and were somewhat aligned with presentation. (10 points)	Reflection was mostly clear. Suggestions for improvement showed some thought and were mostly aligned with presentation. (15 points)	Reflection was well written. Suggestions for improvement showed clear thought and were aligned with presentation. (20 points)	

** NOTE: The "In-class Presentation" criterion was removed from this rubric in the AY2020-21. These 20 points were distributed across a video presentation submission and earlier scaffolded assignments for this final assessment. Thus, the total for the UDL Lesson Plan and Reflection FINAL assessment resulted in 80 points total, beginning in AY2020-21.