# School of Education PLO Data for ISEE, FA24-SP25

**Learning Outcome:** PLO 1 - Evaluate the educational, cultural, interpersonal and social environments within the professional workplace from an ethical and Christian context.

Outcome Measure: Teacher Performance Assessment 1 Rubric 1 Score

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards): Average score for the group is 2.5 or higher (on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being low) on TPA task 1. Note: Averaging 2.5 or higher on all eight TPA1 rubric steps, yields a total score that exceeds the California Teachers Commission (CTC) passing requirement of 19.

### 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:**

	Average of TPA 1 Rubric 1 Score.				
	2022-23	2023-24	<mark>202</mark> 4-25*	3 yr Avg (SD)	
Number of Students	21	18	12	2.74 ( 20)	
TPA 1 Overall Avg	2.80	2.72	2.65	2.74 (.30)	

<sup>\*2024-25</sup> data collected 6/02/25, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:** Criteria for success is met. 2024-25 average candidate scores dipped slightly from 2023-24 levels and continuing the trend from the previous years. Two consecutive years of small decreases collectively yield a change that is more noteworthy. At the same time, scores have been above 2.5 over the last three academic years. Change over time does not near the three-year standard deviation of .30.

Note: This dataset includes multiple scores for some students. These may occur within a single academic year, or across multiple academic years. Passing scores on TPA1 and TPA2 are required to enter the profession. SOE candidates who do not pass TPA1 or TPA2 on their first attempt retake the test until they pass it. Scores displayed in this table include the highest score for each of the TPA1 tests taken in any academic year by any student in the group. If candidates have more than one score, only their highest score is included in the average.

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

In preparation for the 2025-26 academic year SOE is working to develop more real time reporting of TPA data at the individual student and test score levels to drive decision making at program (instructional) and individual (support/remediation) levels. This work is underway and will be in place for the 2025/26 academic year. The program recognizes the value in shifting more of SOE's indicators toward standardized performance measures such as TPA1 and TPA2. This data will drive programmatic analysis and subsequent revision as it aims to identify specific rubric elements where SOE candidates might be struggling as a group.

**Rubric Used:** There are 8 different rubrics utilized for the scoring of this outcome measure. The table below overviews them and is offered as a sample. The individual rubrics can be shared upon request.

CalTPA Performance Assessment Guide Single Subject Instructional Cycle 1
Learning About Students and Planning Instruction

### Instructional Cycle 1 Rubrics

#### **Essential Questions**

<u>Rubrics</u> are aligned to the pedagogical steps of plan, teach and assess, reflect, and apply. Each rubric is framed by an essential question that outlines the knowledge, skills, and abilities assessed within the rubric. The table below is a summary of the essential questions for the eight rubrics of Cycle 1.

	Plan
Rubric 1.1	How does the candidate's proposed learning goal(s) connect with prior knowledge and define specific outcomes for students? How do proposed learning activities and instructional strategies support, engage, and challenge all students to meet the learning goal(s)?
Rubric 1.2	How does the candidate plan instruction using knowledge of FS1's (English learner) assets and needs to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific lesson goal(s)?
Rubric 1.3	How does the candidate plan instruction using knowledge of FS2's (student with identified special needs) assets and needs to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific lesson goal(s)?
Rubric 1.4	How does the candidate plan instruction using knowledge of FS3's assets and needs to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific lesson goal(s) and address the student's well-being by creating a safe and positive learning environment during or outside of the lesson?
	Teach and Assess
Rubric 1.5	How does the candidate establish clear learning expectations based on an understanding of students' prior knowledge and maintain a positive learning environment that supports all students to access and meet the content-specific learning goal(s)?
Rubric 1.6	How does the candidate actively engage students in deep learning of content and monitor/assess their understanding?
	Reflect
Rubric 1.7	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?
	Apply
Rubric 1.8	How will the candidate apply what they have learned in Cycle 1 about students' learning to future instructional design to strengthen and extend students' understanding of content and develop academic language?

School of Education: PLO Data - ISEE, 2024-25

**Learning Outcome:** PLO 2 - Demonstrate problem solving and decision-making skills within the context of a diverse educational environment.

**Outcome Measure: EDT3006 Signature Assessment Overall Score** 

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards): Average score for the group is 3.0 or higher (on a scale of 1-4 with 1 being low) on EDT3006 Signature Assessment.

## 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:**

	Average of EDT3006 Signature Assessment Overall Score.					
	2022-23	2022-23 2023-24 2024-25* 3 yr Avg (S				
Number of Students	25	16	33			
EDT3006 Sig. Ass.	3.96	3.98	3.85	3.92 (.27)		
Overall Score				, ,		

<sup>\*2024-25</sup> data collected 6/02/25, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:** Criteria is met. ISEE candidates demonstrated problem-solving and decision-making skills within the context of a diverse learning environment. In 2024-25 the average candidate score on the outcome measure exceeded the target of 3.0. The 2024-25 dipped below the 2023-24 score and the three year average while remaining well withing the three-year standard deviation.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:** SOE leadership does not plan to make any changes based on this data alone. We will continue to monitor performance on EDT3006 signature assessments.

# Rubric Used: EDT/EDU 3006 Signature Assessment Rubric sample elements 1-4. EDU 3006/6001 Signature Assessment Rubric (2018)

	value: 1.00 value: 1.00	value: 2.00 value: 2.00	value: 3.00 value: 3.00	value: 4.00 value: 4.00	Score/Level
Two specific learning needs identified, based on the case profile.	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	
One instructional strategy or student activity identified, that could be challenging for the student, based on the case profile.	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	
Explanation of why the instructional strategy or student activity was chosen as challenging for the student. Included knowledge of ELLs and analysis of student's learning needs.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing adaptation  Did not mention any knowledge of ELLs and did not connect to student's learning needs	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected adaptation  Mentioned irrelevant knowledge of ELLs but did not connect to student's learning needs	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, connected, and effective adaptation  Mentioned relevant knowledge of ELLs but did not connect to student's learning needs	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clearly connected, and effective adaptation  Mentioned relevant knowledge of ELLs connected to student's learning needs	
Description of how to adapt instructional strategy or student activity to meet the student's learning needs. Included specific subject matter	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing progress monitoring  Did not mention any specific subject matter pedagogy in response	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected progress monitoring  Mentioned irrelevant specific subject matter pedagogy in response	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected progress monitoring with feedback  Mentioned relevant specific subject matter pedagogy in response	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clearly connected progress monitoring with feedback  Mentioned relevant and detailed specific subject matter pedagogy in response	

School of Education: PLO Data - ISEE, 2024-25

**Learning Outcome:** PLO 3 - Distinguish how the role of a teacher-leader needs to continually adapt in relation to individual student needs, social and cultural influence, and school context.

Outcome Measure: EDT3006 Signature Assessment Rubric Element 4 (adapt)

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards): Average score for the group is 3.0 or higher (on a scale of 1-4 with 1 being low) on EDT3006 Signature Assessment Rubric Element 4.

## 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:**

	Average of EDT3006 Signature Assessment Rubric Element 4.				
	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25*	3 yr Avg (SD)	
Number of Students	25	16	33		
Element 4: How to adapt instructional strategy or student activity	3.92	4.0	3.88	3.92 (.32)	

<sup>\*2024-25</sup> data collected 6/02/25, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:** Criteria is met. ISEE candidates demonstrated continuous adaptation in their educational contexts through their performance on the outcome measure. In 2024-25 the average candidate score on the outcome measure far exceeded the target of 3.0. The score dropped down from the ceiling (4.0) of the scale in 2023-24 settling just below the 2022-23- and three-year average of 3.92. This decrease is likely regression to the mean, in this case the 2023-24 score would be considered an outlier – which makes sense as it is at the highest possible score.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:** SOE leadership does not plan to make any changes based on this data alone. We will continue to monitor performance on EDT3006 signature assessments.

### **Rubric Used**

	value: 1.00 value: 1.00	value: 2.00 value: 2.00	value: 3.00 value: 3.00	value: 4.00 value: 4.00	Score/Level
Description of how to adapt instructional strategy or student activity to meet the student's learning needs. Included specific subject matter pedagogy in description.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing progress monitoring  Did not mention any	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	
	specific subject matter pedagogy in response	Mentioned irrelevant specific subject matter pedagogy in response	Mentioned relevant specific subject matter pedagogy in response	Mentioned relevant and detailed specific subject matter pedagogy in response	

School of Education: PLO Data - ISEE, 2024-25

**Learning Outcome:** PLO 4 - Evaluate personal, inter-personal social strengths and weaknesses, and incorporate personal style to effectively and ethically influence the workplace.

Outcome Measure: EDT4009 Dispositions Overall Score

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards): Average score for the group is 3.0 or higher (on a scale of 1-4 with 1 being low) on EDT4009 Dispositions Overall Score.

# 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
- Civic and Global Learning

### **Longitudinal Data:**

	Average of EDT4009 Dispositions Overall Score.			
2022-23 2023-24 2024-25* 3 yr Avg (S				
Number of Students	8	8	9	2.75 / 20\
EDT4009 Dispositions Overall Score	3.68	3.97	3.61	3.75 (.38)

<sup>\*2024-25</sup> data collected 6/02/25, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:** Criteria is met. ISEE candidates effectively and ethically influenced their workplace through their performance on the outcome measure. In 2024-25 the average candidate score on the outcome measure exceeded the target of 3.0. The score decreased observably in 2024-25 dropping down below the 2023-24 and 2022-23 levels.

Changes to be Made Based on Data: SOE leadership does not plan to make any changes based on this data alone. Along with other PLO data, SOE leadership had targeted this outcome measure as one that might benefit from shifting toward an externally administered and validated performance measure like TPA1 or TPA2 as both offer indicators that could be mapped to this PLO. We will continue to monitor this data seeking to improve the indicator as consistent measures with utility to the program are identified.

# Rubric Used

# Dispositions and Indicators of Noble Character



	Inappropriate value: 1.00	Area of Concern value: 2.00	Appropriate value: 3.00	Exceptional value: 4.00	Score/ Level
Honor;     The candidate honors and respects the worthiness of all individuals in word and deed based on PLNU's Wesleyan heritage: We are individuals created in the image of God, committed to civility, respect, hospitality, grace and service, demonstrating coherence in attitudes and actions.	Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all. No indication of desire to improve.	Demonstration of this indicator is frequently missing. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher.	Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher.	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.	
2. Spirit of Harmony and Collaboration; The candidate actively contributes to the learning community with caring, patience and respect for the diversity of learners. The candidate takes responsibility for resolving conflicts or issues with others, and teaches students those skills, in a way that sustains and enhances a healthy and safe learning community. The candidate's flexibility and humility assures that all students have the opportunity to achieve to their potential.	Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all. No indication of desire to improve.	Demonstration of this indicator is frequently missing. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher.	Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher.	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. 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 sexving as a professional educator is a confirmed calling to equip, to transform and to empower every student to fulfill his or her full potential.	Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all. No indication of desire to improve.	Demonstration of this indicator is frequently missing. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher.	Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher.	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.	
Professional and Positive Perseverance; The candidate displays passion for teaching and learning by remaining positive, engaged and accountable to the norms and expectations of the learning community, especially when academic or professional assignments are perceived as challenging. The candidate is reflective and receptive to formative feedback.	Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all. No indication of desire to improve.	Demonstration of this indicator is frequently missing. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher.	Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher.	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.	