

**School Of Education**  
**Core Competencies (CDS Teacher Ed TUG) Fa2021 - Sp2022**

**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) for AY20-21.

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

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

**Longitudinal Data:**

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient								2021-22
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	
<b>Number of students</b>	--	--	14	19	26	19	27	23	22
<b>ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Critical Thinking</b>	81.0%	75.0%	78.6%	73.7%	73.1%	57.9%	55.6%	43.5%	68.2%

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

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

The ETS target (75% proficiency) is nearly met; CDS student performance on this metric is higher this year than it has been since AY2017-18. This is exciting news for CDS students, and we hope that this marks an upward trend in scores for next year and beyond.

- **NOTE #1:** We did NOT continue to use the passage of the Reading subtest of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) as a second metric. Due to the fact that the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) has expanded the ways credential seeking students can show competency in the area of Basic Skills, the vast majority of our TUG students (within the CDS major and those majoring with our Single Subject disciplinary partners) do NOT take the CBEST exam anymore.
- **NOTE #2:** In AY2020-2021, it was decided that a few CDS senior ETS test takers would be interviewed to explore their experiences with the ETS exam and determine if additional supports need to put in place to prepare our CDS students for this exam. Two such interviews were conducted in Spring 2022 by the department chair (Jen Lineback). Interviewed students shared that very little was said about the exam prior to the test date by the adjunct professor teaching the class in which the ETS test was embedded (EDU 4017). Their general sentiment was that the exam didn't really matter and, as a result, very few students "took it seriously." Furthermore, the interviewed students shared that several of students were unable to finish answering all of the questions in the timeframe allotted.

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

As mentioned above, ETS exam scores in the area of Reading and Critical thinking improved this year. With the \*apparent\* sunset of COVID-19 pandemic and the corresponding release of stringent rules and regulations, students may be coping with less general anxiety and stress. This may have resulted in students performing better on this exam. If so, it is anticipated that students will perform better on this section of the ETS exam again next year. Plans are NOT to identify a second metric (to take the place of the CBEST subtest score) at this time; however, it is possible that another metric might be established in future years.

Since interviewed students stated that very little was shared about the exam prior to its administration in EDU 4017, one change that will take place next year will be that the chair (Jen Lineback) will brief the adjunct professor who teaches the capstone class about the purpose, structure, and timing of the exam. In addition, it is now permitted for students to bring a scientific calculator with them to the exam. The use of a calculator can shorten the time needed to complete simple calculations, which may free up additional time to complete the rest of the exam questions. [This year, few students brought a calculator with them to the exam session.] Collectively, this information should help the adjunct faculty member better prepare the students in her capstone class for the exam and, thereby, encourage students to take it more “seriously” than in years past.

**Rubric Used**

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile.

## 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) in AY20-21.

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

1. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
2. Specialized Knowledge
3. Applied and Collaborative Learning
4. Broad Integrative Knowledge
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	2021-22
<b>Number of students</b>	--	--	14	19	26	19	27	23	22
<b>ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Writing</b>	85.7%	100.0%	85.7%	100.0%	80.8%	78.9%	66.7%	52.2%	72.7%

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

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

The ETS target (80% proficiency) is nearly met; CDS student performance on this metric is higher this year than it has been since AY2018-19. This is good news for CDS students, and we hope that this marks an upward trend in scores for next year and beyond.

- **NOTE #1:** We did NOT continue to use the passage of the Writing subtest of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) as a second metric. Due to the fact that the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) has expanded the ways credential seeking students can show competency in the area of Basic Skills, the vast majority of our TUG students (within the CDS major and those majoring with our Single Subject disciplinary partners) do NOT take the CBEST exam anymore.
- **NOTE #2:** In AY2020-2021, it was decided that a few CDS senior ETS test takers would be interviewed to explore their experiences with the ETS exam and determine if additional supports need to put in place to prepare our CDS students for this exam. Two such interviews were conducted in Spring 2022 by the department chair (Jen Lineback). Interviewed students shared that very little was said about the exam prior to the test date by the adjunct professor teaching the class in which the ETS test was embedded (EDU 4017). Their general sentiment was that the exam didn't really matter and, as a result, very few students "took it seriously." Furthermore, the interviewed students shared that several of students were unable to finish answering all of the questions in the timeframe allotted.

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

As mentioned above, ETS exam scores in the area of writing improved this year. With the \*apparent\* sunset of COVID-19 pandemic and the corresponding release of stringent rules and regulations, students may be coping with less general anxiety and stress. This may have resulted in students performing better on this exam. If so, it is anticipated that students will perform better on this section of the ETS exam again next year. Plans are NOT to identify a second metric (to take the place of the CBEST subtest score) at this time; however, it is possible that another metric might be established in future years.

Since interviewed students stated that very little was shared about the exam prior to its administration in EDU 4017, one change that will take place next year will be that the chair (Jen Lineback) will brief the adjunct professor who teaches the capstone class about the purpose, structure, and timing of the exam. In addition, it is now permitted for students to bring a scientific calculator with them to the exam. The use of a calculator can shorten the time needed to complete simple calculations, which may free up additional time to complete the rest of the exam questions. [This year, few students brought a calculator with them to the exam session.] Collectively, this information should help the adjunct faculty member better prepare the students in her capstone class for the exam and, thereby, encourage students to take it more “seriously” than in years past.

**Rubric Used**

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile.

**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) in AY20-21.

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

1. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
2. Specialized Knowledge
3. Applied and Collaborative Learning
4. Broad Integrative Knowledge
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	2021-22
<b>Number of students</b>	--	--	14	19	26	19	27	23	22
<b>ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Math</b>	81.0%	75.0%	57.1%	78.9%	80.8%	57.9%	63.0%	52.2%	81.8%

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

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

The ETS target (70% proficiency) is exceeded; CDS student performance on this metric is the highest it's been in the past 9 years. This is excellent news for CDS students, and we hope that this marks an upward trend in scores for next year and beyond.

- **NOTE #1:** We did NOT continue to use the passage of the Math subtest of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) as a second metric. Due to the fact that the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) has expanded the ways credential seeking students can show competency in the area of Basic Skills, the vast majority of our TUG students (within the CDS major and those majoring with our Single Subject disciplinary partners) do NOT take the CBEST exam anymore.
- **NOTE #2:** In AY2020-2021, it was decided that a few CDS senior ETS test takers would be interviewed to explore their experiences with the ETS exam and determine if additional supports need to put in place to prepare our CDS students for this exam. Two such interviews were conducted in Spring 2022 by the department chair (Jen Lineback). Interviewed students shared that very little was said about the exam prior to the test date by the adjunct professor teaching the class in which the ETS test was embedded (EDU 4017). Their general sentiment was that the exam didn't really matter and, as a result, very few students "took it seriously." Furthermore, the interviewed students shared that several of students were unable to finish answering all of the questions in the timeframe allotted.



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

As mentioned above, ETS exam scores in the area of mathematics improved this year. With the \*apparent\* sunset of COVID-19 pandemic and the corresponding release of stringent rules and regulations, students may be coping with less general anxiety and stress. This may have resulted in students performing better on this exam. If so, it is anticipated that students will perform better on this section of the ETS exam again next year. Plans are NOT to identify a second metric (to take the place of the CBEST subtest score) at this time; however, it is possible that another metric might be established in future years.

Since interviewed students stated that very little was shared about the exam prior to its administration in EDU 4017, one change that will take place next year will be that the chair (Jen Lineback) will brief the adjunct professor who teaches the capstone class about the purpose, structure, and timing of the exam. In addition, it is now permitted for students to bring a scientific calculator with them to the exam. The use of a calculator can shorten the time needed to complete simple calculations, which may free up additional time to complete the rest of the exam questions. [This year, few students brought a calculator with them to the exam session.] Collectively, this information should help the adjunct faculty member better prepare the students in her capstone class for the exam and, thereby, encourage students to take it more “seriously” than in years past.

**Rubric Used**

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile.

**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. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
- 2. Specialized Knowledge
- 3. Applied and Collaborative Learning
- 4. Broad Integrative Knowledge
- 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):**

Oral Communication	Target: 80% or more earn a 3 (on 3-point rubric)				
	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	
Number of students	--	--	43	**	
Effective Oral Presentation	100%	100%	97.7%	**	

\*\* In AY2021-22, a new adjunct faculty member taught EDU 3006. While she did incorporate the Mirrors, Windows, and Sliding Glass Doors assignment into her course, she did NOT utilize a multi-tiered scoring rubric, as had been implemented in the past. Thus, we were not able to utilize this particular assessment method to measure this CC. Plans are in place to resume measuring this CC using a specified rubric in years to come.

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Due to the fact that our new adjunct faculty member did not use a grading rubric to assess the outcome measure, we were not able to collect data on this particular Core Competency this year.

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

We have recently decided that it is not ideal to measure this Core Competency in EDU 3006. Many of our CDS students are now completing their Multiple Subject teaching credential within four years; thus, more students are taking EDU 3006 earlier in their undergraduate trajectory (as early as second semester sophomore year). As such, it seems less appropriate to measure a Core Competency with assessment data taken from a course taken so early in the students' program.

With the help of the adjunct faculty member that teaches EDU 4017 (our Teacher Education capstone "senior-level" course), we have determined that this Core Competency can be appropriately assessed using a current assignment in EDU 4017 that includes an oral presentation. Thus, beginning in AY2022-23, we intend to assess this core competency using this assignment.

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

		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. <b>Explains</b> the importance of schools and teachers supporting diverse and cross-cultural communities, as well as <b>specifies</b> 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. <b>Specifies</b> the important role that multicultural / cross-cultural books and instructional materials play in supporting diverse and cross-cultural communities. <b>Refers</b> to the concept of “mirrors, windows, and sliding glass 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. <b>Identify</b> 6 resources/ books (title, author, publisher, date) with an <b>explanation</b> of the criteria used to select the source and <b>application</b> 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. <b>Oral presentation</b> 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.	<p>Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing logical explanation for the selection of fewer than 4 multicultural and cross-cultural books.</p> <p>Minimal/no explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.</p> <p>Presentation was unprepared and unprofessionalism.</p>	<p>Appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of fewer than 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books.</p> <p>Limited/minimal explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.</p> <p>Presentation lacked preparation and professionalism.</p>	<p>Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of the 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books.</p> <p>Includes a comprehensive explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.</p> <p>Professional, well-prepared presentation.</p>
5. <b>Discussion Board Posting/Small Group Discussion</b> 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	<p>Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing logical explanation for the selection of fewer than 4 multicultural and cross-cultural books.</p> <p>Minimal/no explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.</p>	<p>Appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of fewer than 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books.</p> <p>Limited/minimal explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.</p>	<p>Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of the 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books.</p> <p>Includes a comprehensive explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.</p>
<b>Total</b> ____/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, up through 2017-18)
- B. UDL Lesson Plan, Presentation, and Reflection assignment (from 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 starting in AY20-21 on the UDL Lesson Plan, Presentation, and Reflection [EDU 3024 course assignment].

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

- 1. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
- 2. Specialized Knowledge
- 3. Applied and Collaborative Learning
- 4. Broad Integrative Knowledge
- 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 and beyond)			
	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Number of students	--	--	33	23
UDL Lesson Plan	86.4%	83.9%	90.9%	95.7%

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Target is exceeded, 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. The current outcome measure is authentic, well-scaffolded, and aligned tightly to the purpose of EDU 3024 – Differentiated Instruction for All Learners and the students' major (Cross-Disciplinary Studies – Teacher Education).

**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
<b>Identification of the CaCCSS standard for lesson</b>	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)	
<b>Learning Objectives</b>	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)	

<b>Assessments</b>	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)	
<b>Differentiation strategies</b>	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)	
<b>Opportunities for sharing mathematical ideas</b>	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)	
<b>Learning Activities</b>	Learning activities are not age appropriate, ambiguously described, and do not align with the standard specified. The learning sequence does not allow 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)	

<b><i>In-class Presentation**</i></b>	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)	
<b><i>Reflection</i></b>	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.