

SPED MILD/MOD PRELIMINARY CREDENTIAL
Traditional and Intern Pathways
EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING

Assessment Instruments

A signature assignment is required for each course. Data collected through the assignment is uploaded to Task Stream. Also collected is on-going formative data on Dispositions of Noble Character. Additional assessments are conducted by each professor and utilized to formulate a grade for each candidate. Data is analyzed biennially resulting in ongoing changes for program improvement. In the 2014-2015 school year there was no biennial report due to the California Teacher for Credentialing. The following cites a summary of evidence of the student learning which has been used for continued improvement.

Evaluation Instrument (Direct)	Description	Standards Assessed
TPA 1	Subject Specific Pedagogy	TPE Standards 1,3,4,6,7,9
TPA 2	Designing Instruction	TPE Standards 1,4,6,7,8,9,13
TPA 3	Assessing Learning	TPE Standards 3,6,7,8,9,13
TPA 4	Culminating Teaching Experience	TPE Standards 1-11, 13
EDU 600 Signature Assignment	Foundations of Education & Learning Theory	3,4,5,6,11
EDU 610 Signature Assignment	Teaching Reading Fall '09	5,6,7, 16
EDU 650 Signature Assignment	Assessment and Services for Students with Disabilities	1,4, 5, 6,7
EDU 652 Signature Assignment	Co-Teaching Lesson Plan	3,5,6,8, 10, 12, 13, 22, 23

Summary: Evidence and Analysis of Candidate and Program Data

CalTPA for Mild/ Moderate Education Specialist Candidates

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Task 1	While most candidates are unfamiliar with 'pedagogy' upon entering our program, 100 % of our candidates are passing Task 1 on their second attempt after typically taking just three classes.	Equipping candidates with pedagogical approaches to making adaptations will require an adjustment of course content and intentional modeling of these approaches by the course professors.

Task 2	The candidates gave considerable effort to learning about their students. The candidates are receiving solid exposure to and practice of how to design effective instruction. 82% of our candidates passed this task on the first attempt.	Our program needs to continue encouraging the practice of making appropriate instructional and content adaptations to meet the needs of students.
Task #3	Candidates are gaining proficiency in planning developmentally appropriate activities and reflecting on evidence of student learning based on those assessments. 83% of our candidates passed this task on the second attempt.	Candidates continue to be challenged in making adaptations to their instruction, content, and assessment in the effort to meet the needs of their English Learners and children who pose different learning challenges.
Task #4	The criteria in Task 4 became one of the higher scoring criteria. Candidates passed this task on the first attempt, with an average mean score of 3.21/4	Candidates are in the final clinical practice experience and they continue to be challenged with developing appropriate adaptations to meet the learning needs of all students.

EDU 600 Philosophy of Education Signature Assignment

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Knowledge of research-based theories and principles of human learning and development	Candidates passed this criteria with a mean score of 4.0/4	No improvement needed
Knowledge about how these theories affect classroom practice.	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.0/4 – 3.83/4.	No improvement needed but continued emphasis recommended.
Reflection on how these theories affect and resonate with candidates' beliefs.	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.0/4 – 4.0/4.	No improvement needed but continued emphasis recommended.
Presentation is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized.	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.89/4 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed.

EDU 610 Methods of Teaching Reading and Writing signature assignment

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Data collection through anecdotal observation and student conferences	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.04/4 – 3.92/4.	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.
Data collection to determine student language abilities and special needs	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.25/4 – 3.75/4.	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.
Data collection through administration of literacy assessment instruments	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.50/4 – 3.92/4	No improvement needed.
Reflection on student strengths and areas for growth	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.67/4 – 3.83/4	No improvement needed.
Setting learning goals or next steps for student growth	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.63/4 – 3.67/4	No improvement needed.

EDU 650 Assessment and Services for Students with Disabilities signature assignment

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Ecological Inventory	Candidates passed this criteria with means scores ranging from 3.47/4 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.
Target behavior interfering with learning	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 2.86/4 – 4.0/4	The program team needs to review this signature assignment to determine its overall efficacy.

Data collection of presence and absence of behavior	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 2.89/4 – 4.0/4	The program team needs to review this signature assignment to determine its overall efficacy.
Functional analysis of data with hypothesis and rationale	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.28/4 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.
Goal development: reduce behavior interfering with learning	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 2.83/4 – 4.0/4	The program team needs to review this signature assignment to determine its overall efficacy.
Goal development: teach a replacement behavior that is socially acceptable and leads to self-regulation	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 2.83/4 – 4.0/4	The program team needs to review this signature assignment to determine its overall efficacy.
Goal development: access to an activity that enhances the quality of one's life.	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 2.89/4 – 4.0/4	The program team needs to review this signature assignment to determine its overall efficacy.
Reflection	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 2.94/4 – 4.0/4	The program team needs to review this signature assignment to determine its overall efficacy.

EDU 652 Consultation and Collaboration for IEPs signature assignment

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Common core standards and lesson plan objectives	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.06/4 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed but continued emphasis recommended.
Additional considerations for students	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.17/4 – 3.71/4	No improvement needed but continued emphasis recommended.

Considerations for enhancing, materials (content) and assessment (student product) with co-teaching staff	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.20/4 – 3.79/4.	No improvement needed but continued emphasis recommended.
Considerations for enhancing instruction (process) with co-teaching staff	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.06/4 – 3.86/4	No improvement needed but continued emphasis recommended.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:

ALL PROGRAM COURSES: All syllabi and accompanying assignments will be reviewed to ensure adequate instruction of the common core standards at the graduate level.

ALL PROGRAM DATA Candidates enrolled in the Masters in Teaching (MAT) degree program often enter with the goal of receiving one preliminary credential. Many candidates are now choosing to seek two credentials. This requires that candidates enter into a second Taskstream Direct Response Folio (DRF). This impacts the consistent number of participants in a program. Key Assessment data may be in one folio or the other.