

ISEE (ADC) GELO Assessment Data

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:

Outcome 1a. 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	2017	
Outcome 1a: Written Communication	3.38	3.5	3.68	

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 2017 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

<p>The written product displays effective communication skills through sound grammar, spelling, language and word use.</p>	<p>Inappropriate, inaccurate or unidentifiable written communication</p>	<p>Limited, cursory or inconsistent written communication</p>	<p>Appropriate, relevant and accurate written communication</p>	<p>Detailed, appropriate, and clearly connected use of written communication</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Inappropriate, inaccurate or unidentifiable oral communication</p>	<p>Limited, cursory or inconsistent oral communication</p>	<p>Appropriate, relevant and accurate oral communication</p>	<p>Detailed, appropriate, and clearly connected use of oral communication</p>

ISEE (ADC) GELO Assessment Data

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:

Outcome 1b. 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	2017	
Outcome 1b: Oral Communication	3.5	3.5	3.48	

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) GELO Assessment Data

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:

Outcome 1c. 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	2017	
Outcome 1c: Information Literacy	3.95	3.32	3.8	

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 2018-19 year. We also 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. We will also 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)



	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) GELO Assessment Data

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:

Outcome 1d. 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	2017	
Outcome 1d. Critical Thinking	2.74	3.0	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 2018-19 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) GELO Assessment Data

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:

Outcome 1e. 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	2017	
Outcome 1.e. Quantitative Reasoning	100%	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 3 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.

ISEE (ADC) GELO Assessment Data

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:

Outcome 2a. Students will develop an understanding of self that fosters personal wellbeing.

Outcome Measure:

Dispositions Assessment criteria 4 on "Reflective Learner" (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	2017	
Outcome 2a. Students will develop an understanding of self that fosters personal wellbeing.	3.39	4.0	3.65	

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target is met. The average score level for this criterion in our dispositions assessment is generally high, because so much of the Education curriculum is centered on being reflective of your practice and making changes based on that reflection. Again this year, every candidate was a reflective learner at an above proficient level.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

We will continue to focus on collecting valid and plentiful data on this measure from both candidates and their professors by discussing the rubric at department meetings and encouraging thoughtful scoring. Another change will be to have an assignment in EDU302 particular to this assessment so we are training both faculty and students on its meaning. Lastly, we will continue to make sure there is a point value assigned to its completion, as this is the assessment that is sometimes missing from our data.

Rubric Used

<p>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 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Articulates and models his/her calling to the profession-Understands personal strengths and demonstrates consistent performance in given activities-Takes responsibility for his/her own learning-Develops and monitors a plan that balances personal and professional growth-Looks at an incident/activity to analyze what worked and targets areas for improvement-Asks questions, seeks support and guidance-Uses journals or reflections to record thinking and improve practice
<p style="text-align: center;">RUBRICS FOR PERFORMANCE LEVEL</p> <p>4 – Exceptional - 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.</p> <p>3.5 - Advanced - Demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct without prompting.</p> <p>3 – Appropriate - Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher.</p> <p>2.5 - Improvement Needed – Lack of this indicator has been evident to peers or teacher. Demonstrates the ability to accept feedback, reflect and improve.</p> <p>2 – Area of Concern – Demonstration of this indicator is frequently missing. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher.</p> <p>1 – Inappropriate - Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all. No indication of desire to improve.</p>	

ISEE (ADC) GELO Assessment Data

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:

Outcome 2b. Students will understand and appreciate diverse forms of artistic expression.

Outcome Measure:

Host teacher survey from fieldwork courses (every year)

Criteria for Success (if applicable):

90% of candidates will receive a rating of “strong” on a rating scale that includes “weak”, “adequate” and “strong”.

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: 90% of students will be rated as “strong” or “exceptional” in their understanding and appreciation of diverse forms of artistic expression			
	2015	2016	2017	
Outcome 2b. Students will understand and appreciate diverse forms of artistic expression.	100%	95%	100%	

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target is met. Host teachers reported that 100% of their fieldwork candidates showed “strong” or “exceptional” understanding and appreciation for the variety of ways their students express themselves artistically. In fact, 75% of students earned the highest rating of “exceptional”.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

We will continue to emphasize the areas upon which our candidates will be assessed by their host teachers, which includes not only curricular and academic content but appreciation for diversity and artistic expression. In order to assure that the host teachers report on our students thoughtfully, we have begun the practice of visiting the host sites to explain the assessment measure and the meaning of each criterion, and will continue this practice. We also explain to our candidates how they will be assessed at their fieldwork site.

Rubric Used

Candidate Name _____ PLNU ID # _____ Course # _____

Semester _____ Quad _____ Year _____ Host Teacher Name _____

Fieldwork School _____ Minimum Hours Required _____

CANDIDATE ATTENDANCE (The candidate is expected to track fieldwork hours. Please verify the days and number of hours served)							
Week/Date	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Total Hours	Description of Fieldwork Activity *
TOTAL HOURS							<i>*Examples: assisted teacher, observed, case study, taught a small</i>

group, etc.

CANDIDATE EVALUATION (The **host teacher** is expected to complete the following information based on experience with this candidate)

	Weak 1	Acceptable 2	Strong 3	Exceptional 4
1. Cultural Sensitivity: Demonstrates respect and appreciation toward ethnically and culturally diverse students in their academic, social and artistic expression				
2. <i>Basic Skills:</i> Models appropriate literacies (reading, writing, listening, speaking)				
3. <i>Attendance:</i> Punctuality and Dependability				
4. <i>Cooperation:</i> Fulfills assignments/follows instructions				
5. <i>Initiative:</i> Anticipates needs/assumes responsibilities				
6. <i>Attitude:</i> Maintains poise and positive interaction with students				
7. <i>Interest:</i> Shows enthusiasm/communicates with supervisors				
8. <i>Appearance:</i> Dresses appropriately				

Please provide specifics concerning the quality of candidate's observation and participation in your classroom:

Your signature indicates that you agree that the totaled hours are correct as recorded on the Candidate Attendance chart.

Host Teacher Signature X _____ Candidate Signature X _____

ISEE (ADC) GELO Assessment Data

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:

Outcome 2c. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the complex issues faced by diverse groups in global and/or cross-cultural contexts.

Outcome Measure:

TPA task 1, criteria 4 on “Making Adaptations for Diverse Learners” (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 criteria 4 of TPA task 1, “Making Adaptations”.

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	2017	
Outcome 2c. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the complex issues faced by diverse groups in global and/or cross-cultural contexts.	2.95	2.96	2.78	

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target is not met. Although the group average is close to the target, candidates are scoring slightly below the proficient level (3.0) in the area of “understanding the complex issues faced by diverse groups in global and/or cross-cultural contexts”. We credit this below target score to the complexity of determining appropriate scaffolds and instructional supports for a diverse student population.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Students need additional experience analyzing case studies and actual students in order to better understand the complex issues faced by diverse groups in global and/or cross-cultural contexts. We will add additional case study examinations as an EDU306 course activity in the 2018-19 school year. We will also include more fieldwork assignments with host teachers to give candidates experience for 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) GELO Assessment Data

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:

Outcome 3. Students will demonstrate an understanding of Christian Scripture, Tradition and Ethics, including engagement in acts of devotion and works of mercy.

Outcome Measure:

BST 304 Biblical Perspectives, signature assessment (each year)

Criteria for Success (if applicable):

90% of the students score proficient or higher on Signature Assessment for this course.

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

- 21. Specialized Knowledge
- 22. Broad Integrative Knowledge
- 23. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
- 24. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
- 25. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Target:			
	2015	2016	2017	
Outcome 3. Students will demonstrate an understanding of Christian Scripture, Tradition and Ethics, including engagement in acts of devotion and works of mercy.		These scores are reported in aggregate form across ADC programs.		

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Rubric Used