

**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Core Competencies**

Learning Outcome:

Critical Thinking: Students will be able to examine, critique and synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions.

Outcome Measure:

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

75% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Reading/Critical Thinking.

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:

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient					
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Critical Thinking	81.0%	75.0%	78.6%	73.7%	73.1%	57.9%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

This target is not met. The percentage of students scoring proficient in critical thinking has decreased in the last few years, with just over a 15% drop in the last year. It has been noted that this is the lowest percentage of students scoring at the marginal or proficient level in the past 6 years.

Our students take only four courses in the School of Education, with the majority of their education delivered through other departments. For this reason, the four courses in our major must incorporate intentional opportunities for students to examine, critique and synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

It is unclear why these students scored dramatically lower in this area during the 2018-2019 year. The School of Education places emphases in each of four courses on critical thinking and problem solving, specifically that which is related to developing student awareness and instructional expertise, in order to plan effective lessons.

In the 2019-2020 year, there will be two new professors instructing for EDU3002 and EDU4004 (formerly EDU 302 and 404). The department will work closely with both of these instructors to underline the importance of incorporating opportunities for critical thinking, and allowing students to reflect upon those opportunities. By placing an intentional focus on these

opportunities and assignments, and by calling attention to them, we hope to see an improvement in the students' scores on this outcome measure next year.

Rubric Used

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile test results.

**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Core Competencies**

Learning Outcome:

Written: Students will be able to effectively express ideas and information to others through written communication.

Outcome Measure:

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

80% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Writing.

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:

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient					
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Writing	85.7%	100.0%	85.7%	100.0%	80.8%	78.9%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

This target is nearly met. The School of Education has seen an interesting pattern of results over the years in these test results. This year, 79% of our candidates scored marginal or proficient on the written communication ETS Proficiency Profile, which is close to the target at 80%.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

The efforts in the School of Education to require effective writing will go unchanged. We will continue to implement the practice of sharing clear criteria and anchor papers for writing assignments, and we plan to include rubrics with dimensions for writing clarity and accuracy for many of our writing assignments.

Rubric Used

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile test results.

**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Core Competencies**

Learning Outcome:

Quantitative Reasoning: Students will be able to solve problems that are quantitative in nature.

Outcome Measure:

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Outcome Measure:

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

70% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Math.

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:

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient					
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Math	81.0%	75.0%	57.1%	78.9%	80.8%	57.9%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

This target is not met. The School of Education has seen large differences in the math proficiency of our candidates over the years as evident by the ETS test. Our majors' coursework, only four courses, has only minimal content involving quantitative problem solving, so we rely on careful programming to ensure our candidates are required to take an intentional series of math courses, offered through the mathematics department, to graduate with our degree.

Currently, our math series exceeds what is required by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and what is expected by most undergraduate majors. However, these ETS data demonstrate that there are students who need additional support to further develop their quantitative reasoning skills.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

To help address a recognizable need for more quantitative support for our students, we implemented two hour-long optional workshops in mid-Spring 2019, designed to support students weak in mathematics content. The student feedback on these workshops was very positive, and we plan to offer similar math workshops in future academic years to our CDS majors (possibly 1-2 such workshops a semester). These math-based workshops will hopefully

raise our students' individual and collective quantitative reasoning skills, as well as the students' confidence in their mathematics proficiency. If successful, we may see a rise in our students' quantitative reasoning proficiency (as measured by the ETS test) in the coming years.

Rubric Used

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile test results.

**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Core Competencies**

Learning Outcome:

Oral Communication: Students will demonstrate effective oral communication, one-on-one and with groups.

Outcome Measure:

- A. EDU306 Signature Assessment, criterion 7 (each year through 2017-18).
- B. EDU 306 Mirrors, Windows, Sliding Glass Doors Diversity, criterion 4 (each year, beginning 2018-19)

Criteria for Success (if applicable):

- A. Average score for the group is 3.5 or higher (on a scale of 1-4 with 1 being low) on rubric criteria 7, "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".
- B. 80% or more of students earn a 3 (on a scale of 1-3, with 1 being low) on **rubric criterion 4**, "Oral presentation of the 6 resources/books with an explanation of the criteria used to select the source and how you would use/apply it in your classroom."

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 (Criteria for Success A):

Oral Communication	Target: Average Score for the Group is 3.5 or higher			
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Effective Oral Presentation	3.94	3.79	3.85	3.59

Longitudinal Data (Criteria for Success B):

Oral Communication	Target: 80% or more earn a 3 (on 3-point rubric)			
	2018-19			
Effective Oral Presentation	100%			

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target it met. Students are performing at a high level in their oral communication skills. This is encouraging, as good oral communication is a key characteristic of effective teachers. The score is affirming of the efforts made in EDU306 (and in the two prior EDU courses) which prepare candidates in this area by consistent practice presenting to their classmates and instructor, with feedback.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

EDU 306 faculty have designed a new assignment that requires all students to present to their peers. This offers us a new assessment measure, believed to better evaluate students' oral presentation skills than the previous assessment. We will use this new assessment again next year and intend to re-evaluate the efficacy of this particular assessment for this core competency.

Rubric used (Criteria for Success A):

	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

**EDU306 - Mirrors, Windows, and Sliding Glass Doors Diversity Assignment
Scoring Rubric**

	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3
<p>1. Explains the importance of schools and teachers supporting diverse and cross-cultural communities, as well as specifies ways for schools and teachers to demonstrate a commitment do so.</p>	<p>Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous, or weakly connected identifiable reasons to support diverse and cross-cultural communities.</p> <p>Does not include specific ways for schools and teachers to demonstrate this commitment.</p>	<p>Appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected identifiable reasons to support diverse and cross-cultural communities.</p> <p>Limited/minimal inclusion of specific ways for schools and teachers to demonstrate this commitment.</p>	<p>Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected identifiable reasons to support diverse and cross-cultural communities.</p> <p>Includes specific ways for schools and teachers to demonstrate this commitment.</p>
<p>2. Specifies the important role that multicultural / cross-cultural books and instructional materials play in supporting diverse and cross-cultural communities. Refers to the concept of “mirrors, windows, and sliding class doors.”</p>	<p>Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous, or weak explanation for the important role that multicultural and cross-cultural books and instructional materials play in supporting diverse communities.</p> <p>Minimal / no reference to the concept of “mirrors, windows, and sliding glass doors.”</p>	<p>Appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the important role that multicultural and cross-cultural books and instructional materials play in supporting diverse communities.</p> <p>Limited/minimal reference to the concept of “mirrors, windows, and sliding glass doors.”</p>	<p>Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the important role that multicultural and cross-cultural books and instructional materials play in supporting diverse communities.</p> <p>Refers to the concept of “mirrors, windows, and sliding glass doors.”</p>
<p>3. Identify 6 resources/ books (title, author, publisher, date) with an explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in your classroom.</p>	<p>Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing logical explanation for the selection of fewer than 4 multicultural and cross-cultural books.</p> <p>Minimal/no explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.</p>	<p>Appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of fewer than 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books.</p> <p>Limited/minimal explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.</p>	<p>Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of the 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books.</p> <p>Includes a comprehensive explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.</p>

<p>4. Oral presentation of the 6 resources/books with an explanation of the criteria used to select the source and how you would use/ apply it in your classroom.</p>	<p>Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing logical explanation for the selection of fewer than 4 multicultural and cross-cultural books.</p> <p>Minimal/no explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.</p> <p>Presentation was unprepared and unprofessionalism.</p>	<p>Appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of fewer than 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books.</p> <p>Limited/minimal explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.</p> <p>Presentation lacked preparation and professionalism.</p>	<p>Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of the 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books.</p> <p>Includes a comprehensive explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.</p> <p>Professional, well-prepared presentation.</p>
<p>5. Discussion Board Posting/Small Group Discussion of the 6 resources/books with an explanation of the criteria used to select the source and how you would use/apply it in your classroom</p>	<p>Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing logical explanation for the selection of fewer than 4 multicultural and cross-cultural books.</p> <p>Minimal/no explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.</p>	<p>Appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of fewer than 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books.</p> <p>Limited/minimal explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.</p>	<p>Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of the 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books.</p> <p>Includes a comprehensive explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.</p>
<p>Total _____/15</p>			

**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Core Competencies**

Learning Outcome:

Information Literacy: Students will utilize specific content information from a variety of sources for instructional planning.

Outcome Measure:

- A. Teaching Performance Assessment Task 2 (each year, through 2017-18)
- B. Assignment #5 – Lesson Plan, Presentation, and Reflection (from 2018-19 onward)

Criteria for Success (if applicable):

- A. Average score for the group is 3.0 or higher (on a scale of 1-4 with 1 being low) on TPA task 2, criterion three on “Planning for Instruction”.
- B. 85% of students earn 85/100 points or higher on Assignment #5 – Lesson Plan, Presentation, and Reflection

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 (Criteria for Success A):

Information Literacy:	Target: Average Score for the Group is 3.0 or higher			
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Teaching Performance Assessment Task 2	2.93	3.07	2.96	3.04

Longitudinal Data (Criteria for Success B):

Information Literacy:	Target: 85% of students earn a 85/100 on this assignment			
	2018-19			
Assignment #5 – Lesson Plan, Presentation, and Reflection	86.4%			

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target is met. With the California CTC decision to modify the current teacher performance assessments, we've had to change our outcome measurement for this core competency. While students are still gaining exposure and experience with integrating content, practice, assessment data, and student knowledge into their lesson planning as part of this course, they are no longer assessed in this competency by a state generated performance assessment. We are presently using an instructor generated assessment – and rubric – for this competency. The current outcome measure and criteria for success seem appropriate.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

At this point, there are no plans to change the assessment, outcome measure, or target. We will collect data on this competency using the same outcome measure next year, which will provide us with additional data to determine whether changes should be made in the future.

Rubric Used (Criteria for Success A)

TPA Task 2 - Designing Instruction

created with 

 Export to Word

	1 - Far Below Standard	2 - Below Standard	3 - Meets Standard	4 - Exceeds Standard	Score/Level
Establishing Goals and Standards.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Learning about Students.	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.	
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.	
Using Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Reflecting.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous.	Appropriate, relevant, or accurate.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed.	
Comments:					

Rubric Used (Criteria for Success B)

	Level 1 Developing	Level 2 Emerging	Level 3 Competency	Level 4 Mastery	TOTAL
Identification of the CaCCSS standard for lesson	Standard is NOT identified (0 points)	Standard that is identified is not appropriately aligned with the lesson that is planned. (2 points)	Standard that is identified is appropriate for the lesson planned. Standard that is identified is not from CaCCSS. (3 points)	Standard that is identified is appropriate for the lesson planned. Standard that is noted is from CaCCSS. (5 points)	
Learning Objectives	Learning objectives are NOT included (0 points)	Learning objectives are vague or not aligned well with the lesson planned nor the standard specified. (2 points)	Learning objectives are mostly clear, somewhat aligned with the lesson planned and the standard specified. (3 points)	Learning objectives are very clear, and clearly align with the lesson planned and the standard specified. (5 points)	

Assessments	Minimal opportunity for assessment is included. Assessments that are included are vaguely described. (2 points)	Some formative and summative assessments are included. Assessments are somewhat clear and are partially aligned with the lesson activities. (4 points)	Formative and summative assessments are included. Assessments are described and mostly aligned with the lesson activities. (7 points)	Excellent integration of formative and summative assessments. Assessments are clearly described. (10 points)	
Differentiation strategies	NO methods of differentiation are explicitly included. (0 points)	Some methods of differentiation are included. Differentiation that is included is vaguely described and only applies to one group of learners. (4 points)	Several methods of differentiation are included. Differentiation that is included is mostly clear. Differentiation applies to at least two groups of learners. (7 points)	Many methods of differentiation are included. Differentiation that is included is clearly described. Differentiation applies at least 3 groups of learners. (10 points)	
Opportunities for sharing mathematical ideas	Lesson does not provide opportunity for students to share and represent their mathematical ideas with one another. (0 points)	Lesson provides only limited opportunity for students to share and represent their mathematical ideas with one another as well as with their instructor. (2 points)	Lesson provides some opportunities for students to share and represent their mathematical ideas with one another as well as with their instructor. (3 points)	Lesson provides multiple opportunities for students to share and represent their mathematical ideas with one another as well as with their instructor. (5 points)	
Learning Activities	Learning activities are not age appropriate, ambiguously described, and do not align with the standard specified. The learning sequence does not allow for activities and learning to build throughout the lesson. (10 points)	Learning activities are somewhat age appropriate, somewhat described, and partially align with the standard specified. The learning sequence somewhat allows for activities and learning to build throughout the lesson. (15 points)	Learning activities are mostly age appropriate, mostly clear, and align with the standard specified. The learning sequence mostly allows for activities and learning to build throughout the lesson. (20 points)	Learning activities are age appropriate, clearly described, and clearly align with the standard specified. The learning sequence allows for activities and learning to build from opening to closing. (25 points)	
In-class Presentation	Presentation was carried out with numerous interruptions. Limited interaction with and between learners. Activity instructions were ambiguous. Many materials were not present. (5 points)	Presentation was carried out with several interruptions. Some interaction with and between learners. Activity instructions were somewhat clear. Some materials were present. (10 points)	Presentation was carried out with minimal interruptions. Interaction with and between learners was good. Activity instructions were mostly clear. Most materials were present. (15 points)	Presentation was well carried out. Interaction with and between learners was excellent. Activities were clearly introduced. All materials were present. (20 points)	

Reflection	Reflection was poorly written. Suggestions for improvement showed minimal thought and were not aligned with presentation. (5 points)	Reflection was somewhat vague or ambiguous. Suggestions for improvement showed minimal thought and were somewhat aligned with presentation. (10 points)	Reflection was mostly clear. Suggestions for improvement showed some thought and were mostly aligned with presentation. (15 points)	Reflection was well written. Suggestions for improvement showed clear thought and were aligned with presentation. (20 points)	
-------------------	--	---	---	---	--