Master of Arts in Teaching: Single Subject
Preliminary Credential
Evidence of Candidate Learning
From 2012-13

The tables below show results of **signature assignment data** for the 4 courses included in the Clear credential. All candidates are expected to be at the "proficient" level of performance with a score of "3" or above in each rubric criteria noted below. Values for Tasks 2, 3, and 4 are for both multiple and single subject MAT programs as the data were not disaggregated by program.

Table 1: Single Subject TPA tasks

Task 1 Name	Criteria	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Art	Using subject-specific, developmentally appropriate pedagogy	1	3.0	0
	Planning for instruction	1	3.0	0
	Planning for assessment	1	3.0	0
	Making adaptations	1	4.0	0
English	Using subject-specific, developmentally appropriate pedagogy	9	3.0	0
	Planning for instruction	9	3.0	.33
	Planning for assessment	9	2.89	.33
	Making adaptations	9	2.67	.50
Math	Using subject-specific, developmentally appropriate pedagogy	13	3.08	.64
	Planning for instruction	13	2.92	.64
	Planning for assessment	13	2.92	.49
	Making adaptations	13	2.92	.51
Music	Using subject-specific, developmentally appropriate pedagogy	5	3.2	.45
	Planning for instruction	5	3.0	.71
	Planning for assessment	5	3.2	.45
	Making adaptations	5	2.8	.45
Physical Education	Using subject-specific, developmentally appropriate pedagogy		No Students	
	Planning for instruction			
	Planning for assessment			
	Making adaptations			
Science--	Using subject-specific,	3	3.0	.58

		N	Mean	SD
Biology	developmentally appropriate pedagogy			
	Planning for instruction	3	3.0	.58
	Planning for assessment	3	3.0	.58
	Making adaptations	3	4.0	.58
Social Science	Using subject-specific, developmentally appropriate pedagogy	12	3.0	.41
	Planning for instruction	12	2.92	.49
	Planning for assessment	12	2.92	.28
	Making adaptations	12	2.83	.69

Score Level	Range	N	% 1st time pass
4	76-100%	2	13.5
3	51-75%	11	73.0
2	26-50%	2	13.5
1	0-25%	0	0

Plan for Improvement:

On the whole, improvement was made toward making appropriate instructional and content adaptations to meet the needs of students, by our candidates this year. The area which saw a significant drop over last year's report was in the area of "Planning for Assessment." A more concerted effort needs to occur in courses regarding this connection between teaching and assessing learning in the classroom.

Table 2: TPA 2 Designing Instruction

Criteria	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Establishing goals and standards	150	3.0	.45
Learning about students	150	3.0	.60
Planning for instruction	150	3.0	.60
Making adaptations	150	3.0	.63
Using pedagogical skills	150	3.0	.62
Reflecting	150	3.0	.59

Score Level	Range	N	% 1st time pass
4	76-100%	38	25.0
3	51-75%	102	68.0
2	26-50%	10	7.0
1	0-25%	0	0

Plan for Improvement:

The information provided shows an almost exact alignment to last year's report. The program needs to continue to encourage moving upward in all areas regarding elements in TPA 2.

Table 3: TPA 3 Assessing Learning

Criteria	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Establishing goals and standards	109	3.0	.51
Planning for assessment	109	3.0	.49
Learning about students	109	3.0	.47
Making adaptations	109	3.0	.66
Analyzing evidence	109	3.0	.59
Reflecting	109	3.0	.46

Score Level	Range	N	% 1st time pass
4	76-100%	12	11.0
3	51-75%	95	87.0
2	26-50%	2	2.0
1	0-25%	0	0

Plan for Improvement:

In comparing this current report to last year (2011-2012) there is significant overall improvement in the area of "Learning about Students." It is encouraging that our candidates show empathy and understanding while in the classroom towards struggling students. Our candidates also showed improvement in "Analyzing evidence" for this TPA Task. This lead to higher 1st time passage rates for our standard of excellence which is a "3" for any task. We need to continue to encourage candidates to work on better reflection and assessment techniques.

Table 4: TPA 4 Culminating Teaching Experience

Criteria	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Establishing goals and standards	118	3.0	.29
Learning about students	118	3.0	.57
Describing classroom environment	118	3.0	.50
Planning for instruction	118	3.0	.53
Making adaptations	118	3.0	.66

Using pedagogical skills	118	3.0	.53
Analyzing student evidence	118	3.0	.60
Reflection	118	3.0	.48

Score Level	Range	N	% 1st time pass
4	76-100%	36	30.0
3	51-75%	81	69.0
2	26-50%	1	1.0
1	0-25%	0	0

Plan for Improvement:

There is very little significant change from last year's report. (2011-2012) The program needs to continue to encourage candidates to improve all skills on this task, especially in reflection.

Table 5: EDU 600 Signature Assignment

Criteria	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Knowledge of research-based theories and principles of human learning and development	18	4.0	0
Knowledge about how these theories affect classroom practice	18	4.0	.24
Reflection on how these theories affect and resonate with candidates' beliefs	18	4.0	.86
Presentation is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized	18	4.0	.32

Candidates are scored on four (4) separate criteria. Scores are based on whole numbers with one (1) as the lowest possible score and four (4) as the highest possible score on a 4-point rubric. The average rubric score for this signature assignment is 4 on a 4-point rubric

Plan for Improvement:

The MAT program director, along with the EDU600 course instructors will review the informational sources currently provided to the students, as well as how the expected outcome of the above criteria is taught. It will be determined what additional current and appropriate information sources are available and how students learn to access them and assess their appropriateness as sources.

Table 6: EDU 620 Case Study Signature Assignment

Criteria	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Data collection through anecdotal observation and student conferences	31	4.0	.34
Data collection to determine student ELD or special needs abilities	31	4.0	.61
Data collection through administration of literacy assessment instruments	31	4.0	.54
Reflection on student strengths and areas for growth	31	4.0	.70
Setting learning goals or next steps for student growth	31	4.0	.68

Plan for Improvement:

The MAT Program Director along with the EDU620 course professors will review the rubric criteria results and discuss the consistency of highs cores throughout the Rubric Criteria for this course, as well as address the need to review criteria for any lower scores.

Table 7: Disposition Assessment Data

Criteria	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Indicator 1: Dignity and 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.	18	4	0
Indicator 2: Honesty and Integrity. The candidate demonstrates honesty, integrity, and coherence in attitudes, and actions, and is accountable to the norms and expectations of the learning community	18	4	.32
Indicator 3: Caring, Patience, and Respect. The candidate demonstrates caring, patience, fairness and respect for the knowledge level, diversity, and abilities of others, ensuring that all students have the opportunity to achieve.	18	4	0
Indicator 4: Spirit of Collaboration, Flexibility	18	4	.32

and Humility. The candidate actively participates in and contributes to the achievement of the learning community, explaining own thought process with humility and considers those of others with a positive, open-minded attitude.			
Indicator 5: Harmony in Learning Community. 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.	18	4	.24
Indicator 6: Self-Awareness/Calling. 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 serving as a professional educator is a confirmed calling to equip, to transform and to empower every student to fulfill his or her full potential.	18	4	.32
Indicator 7: Perseverance with Challenge. The candidate perseveres, remains engaged, and persists as a life-long learner, especially when academic and professional assignments are perceived as challenging.	18	4	.32
Indicator 8: Diligence in Work Habits & Responsibility for Learning. The candidate attends to the roles and responsibilities of the learning community, and is well-prepared and on time. The candidate completes required assignments on time and is reflective and receptive to formative feedback.	18	4	.61

Plan for Improvement:

As was noted in last year's report (2011-2012) the disposition scores remain very high. The need to encourage honesty and reflection remains paramount in obtaining correct and true information. Because the disposition process is changing for the 2013-2014 school year, it is hoped that this will result not only in improved honesty and reflection, but will encourage professors, cooperating teachers, supervisors in Clinical Practice and Candidates, to be consistent in filling out the dispositions and posting them to Taskstream. This report is somewhat inaccurate because there was a great amount of missing information due to dispositions not being posted or completed. The MAT program director along with MAT faculty should make every effort to encourage candidates to fill out the dispositions and make sure if they are a faculty

member who is required to submit dispositions, that it is being done in a timely and efficient manner.