

ISEE (ADC) 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	2016		
Outcome 1a: Written Communication	3.38	3.5		

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target is met. Students are performing at a high level in their written communication skills, and the average score has increased slightly from the previous year, again. In order to avoid inflated scoring, we had a calibration activity in 2016 with all full-time and adjunct faculty to clarify the criteria for each score level. Because we recalibrated, we believe these scores are even more valid and reliable.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Our plan is to review the rubric criteria with the candidates at the beginning of the semester, and to do so in all of our Education courses to highlight the importance of strong writing skills. We will share anchor papers with candidates. Assignments that occur before this signature assessment will also have rubric criteria about clear writing message, use of grammar, spelling, language and academic vocabulary as well.

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 (ADC) Core Competencies Assessment Data

ISEE CC Learning Outcome:

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

Outcome Measure:

Clinical Practice Interview (each year)

Criteria for Success (if applicable):

Average score for the group is 3.0 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	2016		
Outcome 1b: Oral Communication	3.5	3.5		

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

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

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

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

Rubric Used

(See next page)

**Rubric Used
(page 1 of 2)**

Clinical Practice Interview Rubric

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

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

Rubric Used
(page 2 of 2)

Clinical Practice Interview Rubric

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

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

ISEE (ADC) 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	2016		
Outcome 1c: Information Literacy	3.95	3.32		

Conclusions Drawn from Data:


Target is met. We attribute the high individual and averaged scores to our course sequence which calls for this course to follow the more foundational courses in our program, EDU302, 404 and 306. We will continue these same practices in the 2017-18 year. We also we had a calibration activity with all full-time and adjunct faculty who score these assessments across both regional centers to further clarify the criteria for each score level, perhaps resulting in more accurate scores this year.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

In order to be sure we are not experiencing inflated scoring year to year, we will continue to have a calibration activity with all full-time and adjunct faculty who score these assessments across both regional centers to further clarify the criteria for each score level. Also, we will increase our focus with students on critical analysis of information related to teaching strategies and learning about students, a critical skill for correctly matching student need and teaching pedagogy. Enhanced emphasis in this area should have a positive difference in the overall average for all credential candidate populations.

Rubric Used

EDU410 Teaching Reading (Revised 8.9.2011)

created with  taskstream

	value: 1.00	value: 2.00	value: 3.00	value: 4.00	Score/Level
Data collection through anecdotal observation and conferences with students	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing anecdotal evidence	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected anecdotal evidence	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected anecdotal evidence	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected anecdotal evidence	
Data collection to determine language abilities or special needs	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing data to determine language abilities or special needs	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected data to determine language abilities or special needs	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected data to determine language abilities or special needs	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected data to determine language abilities or special needs	
Data collection through the administration of literacy assessments	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing student work samples	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected student work samples	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected student work samples	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate and clearly connected student work samples	
Reflection on student strengths and areas for growth	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate and missing data to connect to student strengths and areas for growth	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected data to student strengths and areas for growth	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected data to student strengths and areas for growth	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate and clearly connected data to student strengths and areas for growth	
Setting of learning goals or next steps for student growth	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate and missing learning goals or next steps for student growth	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected learning goals or next steps for student growth	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected learning goals or next steps for student growth	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate and clearly connected learning goals or next steps for student growth	

ISEE (ADC) 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:

Teaching Performance Assessment Task 1 (each year)

Criteria for Success (if applicable):

Average score for the group is 3.0 or higher (on a scale of 1-4 with 1 being low) on TPA task 1.

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

- 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	2016		
Outcome 1d. Critical Thinking	2.74	3.0		

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target is met. Candidates are scoring at the proficient level (3.0) in the area of “examine, critique and synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions”, an increase from last year. For this assessment, students need to determine appropriate instructional strategies given information about a diverse student population. We credit this higher score to adherence to a structured course sequence where learning is developmental and scaffolded by taking courses in order.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

To further increase this score, students need additional experience analyzing case studies in order to examine, critique and synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions. We will include case study analysis as a required course activity in the 2017-18 school year once again. We will also include more formative assessments during the semester to monitor candidate acquisition of this skill set.

Rubric Used**TPA Task 1 - Subject Specific Pedagogy**

	1 - Far Below Standard	2 - Below Standard	3 - Meets Standard	4 - Exceeds Standard	Score/Level
Using subject-specific, developmentally appropriate pedagogy.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Planning for instruction.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Planning for assessment.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Making adaptations.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Comments:					

ISEE (ADC) 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	2016		
Outcome 1.e. Quantitative Reasoning	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 2 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.