

## MAT Multiple Subject Analysis of Candidate and Program Data

Table 11

Analyses of Candidate and Program Assessment data from Tables 2, 7-11.  
CalTPA for Multiple Subject Candidates

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Areas for Improvement</b>
Task #1 (Table 2)	While most candidates are unfamiliar with 'pedagogy' upon entering our program, more than 82% of our candidates are passing Task 1 on their first attempt after typically taking just three classes. The highest criterion passed on the 1 <sup>st</sup> attempt was "using subject specific developmentally appropriate pedagogy."	Equipping candidates with pedagogical approaches to making adaptations and planning for instruction (the 2 lowest criteria) will require an adjustment of course content and intentional modeling of these approaches by the course professors. A plan of action is currently being developed to address these areas.
Task #2 (Table 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. More than 86% of the 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 those students. Candidates make a considerable effort learning about students but fail to make the appropriate adaptations for them based on that information. A more concerted effort needs to occur in courses regarding this connection between students needs and making appropriate adaptations. A plan of action is currently being developed to address this issue.
Task #3 (Table 2)	Candidates are gaining proficiency in planning developmentally appropriate activities and reflecting on evidence of student learning based on those assessments. Close to 97% candidates passed this task on the first attempt.	Candidates continue to struggle with making adaptations to their instruction, content, and assessment in the effort to meet the needs of their English Learners and students who pose different challenges. Furthermore, candidates struggled with learning about students and making the connections to necessary adaptations for students.
Task #4 (Table 2)	Planning for instruction was the lowest mean score for Task 1, but by the time the candidates submitted Task 4, this criteria was no longer the lowest. More than 94% candidates passed this task on the first attempt, with 21% (13) receiving a score of 4. Also, learning about students was the lowest criterion in Task 3, but was the highest criterion in Task 4.	Candidates are in the final clinical practice experience and they continue to struggle with developing appropriate adaptations to meet the needs of students. A plan of action is currently being developed to address this issue as it continues to be an issue throughout the candidates program.

### EDU 600 Philosophy of Education Signature Assignment

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Areas for Improvement</b>
Knowledge of research-based theories and principles of human learning and development	100% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 3.0 or 4.0.	No improvement needed

Knowledge about how these theories affect classroom practice.	75% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 4.0. Additionally, 23.3% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 3.0.	One (1) candidate received a score of 2.0.
Reflection on how these theories affect and resonate with candidates' beliefs.	71.67% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 4.0. 21.67% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 3.0.	5%, or three (3) of the candidates received a score of 2.0. One candidate received a score of 1.0.
Presentation is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized.	80% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 4.0., and 18.33% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 3.0.	1.67%, or 1 candidate, received a score of 1.0, whereas, no candidates received a score of 2.0.

### EDU 610 Methods of Teaching Reading and Writing signature assignment

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Areas for Improvement</b>
Data collection through anecdotal observation and student conferences	89.19% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 4.0. 8.11%, or 9 candidates, demonstrated proficiency with a score of 3.0.	2.7%, or 3 candidates demonstrated "limited evidence" of this criterion with a score of 2.0.
Data collection to determine student ELD abilities	91.89% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 4.0. 7.21% of candidates demonstrated proficiency with a score of 3.0.	0.9%, or 1 candidate demonstrated "limited evidence" of this criterion with a score of 2.0.
Data collection through administration of literacy assessment instruments	90.09% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 4.0. 6.31% of candidates demonstrated proficiency with a score of 3.0.	1.8%, or 2 candidates demonstrated "limited evidence" of this criterion with a score of 2.0. Additionally, 1.8%, or 2 candidates, scored a 1.0.
Reflection on student strengths and areas for growth	77.48% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 4.0. 20.72% of candidates demonstrated proficiency with a score of 3.0.	1.8%, or 2 candidates demonstrated "limited evidence" of this criterion with a score of 2.0.
Setting learning goals or next steps for student growth	72.97% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 4.0. 19.82% of candidates demonstrated proficiency with a score of 3.0.	7.21%, or 8 candidates demonstrated "limited evidence" of this criterion with a score of 2.0.

### EDU 611 Interdisciplinary Approaches and Methods of Teaching in the Content Areas signature assignment

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Areas for Improvement</b>
-----------------	------------------	------------------------------

The candidate provides clear, coherent rationales for the unit, the California Content Standards selected, as well as the way the Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction fits with the instruction both prior and subsequent to the unit of instruction.	85.95% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 4.0. 9.09% of candidates demonstrated proficiency with a score of 3.0.	3.31%, or 4 candidates demonstrated “limited evidence” of this criterion with a score of 2.0.
The candidate is able to identify the California State Standards for the Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction for both the unit and lesson planning and lists appropriate objectives for both the unit and each individual lesson.	93.39% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 4.0. 4.13% of candidates demonstrated proficiency with a score of 3.0.	0.83%, or 1 candidate demonstrated “limited evidence” of this criterion with a score of 2.0. Additionally, 0.83%, or 1 candidate, scored a 1.0.
The Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction demonstrates the candidates’ ability to plan both long-range and short-term through both the unit plan itself as well as in individual lessons.	85.95% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 4.0. 12.4% of candidates demonstrated proficiency with a score of 3.0.	0.83%, or 1 candidate demonstrated “limited evidence” of this criterion with a score of 2.0.
The candidate shows competence in planning instruction that will provide quality instruction for all students, including, but not limited to GATE, ELL, Special needs, and At-Risk students.	66.12% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 4.0. 26.45% of candidates demonstrated proficiency with a score of 3.0.	7.44%, or 9 candidates demonstrated “limited evidence” of this criterion with a score of 2.0.
The Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction demonstrates the candidates’ knowledge and plan for application of effective formative and summative assessments.	72.73% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 4.0. 26.45% of candidates demonstrated proficiency with a score of 3.0.	0.83%, or 1 candidate demonstrated “limited evidence” of this criterion with a score of 2.0.
The Integrated, Thematic Unit of Instruction demonstrates the candidates’ ability to gather and use meaningful, pertinent and reliable resources to support the effectiveness of the unit.	90.91% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 4.0. 7.44% of candidates demonstrated proficiency with a score of 3.0.	1.65%, or 2 candidates demonstrated “limited evidence” of this criterion with a score of 2.0.
Presentation is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized.	91.74% of candidates demonstrated proficiency of this criterion with a score of 4.0. 6.61% of candidates demonstrated proficiency with a score of 3.0.	1.65%, or 2 candidates demonstrated “limited evidence” of this criterion with a score of 2.0.

## Dispositions

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Indicator 1: Dignity and Honor.	80% of candidates rated themselves in this criterion with a score of 4.0. Additionally, 17.2% of candidates rated themselves in this criterion with a score of 3.0.	1.08%, or 1 candidate, rated themselves with a score of 1.0, whereas, 2 candidates rated themselves with a score of 2.0.
Indicator 2: Honesty and Integrity.	Clearly the highest average disposition, 84% of candidates rated	1.08%, or 1 candidate, rated themselves with a score of 1.0,

	themselves in this criterion with a score of 4.0. Additionally, 14% of candidates rated themselves in this criterion with a score of 3.0.	whereas, 2 candidates rated themselves with a score of 2.0.
Indicator 3: Caring, Patience, and Respect.	80% of candidates rated themselves in this criterion with a score of 4.0. Additionally, 17.2% of candidates rated themselves in this criterion with a score of 3.0.	1.08%, or 1 candidate, rated themselves with a score of 1.0, whereas, 2 candidates rated themselves with a score of 2.0.
Indicator 4: Spirit of Collaboration, Flexibility and Humility.	65% of candidates rated themselves in this criterion with a score of 4.0. Additionally, 29% of candidates rated themselves in this criterion with a score of 3.0.	This disposition was the lowest one where the candidates felt more practical experience was needed to actively participate in and contributes to the achievement of the learning community. This area needs to be addressed more in coursework.
Indicator 5: Harmony in Learning Community.	64.5% of candidates rated themselves in this criterion with a score of 4.0. Additionally, 31% of candidates rated themselves in this criterion with a score of 3.0.	Having the same average as Disposition #4, this disposition had candidates taking 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. This area needs to be addressed in coursework. A plan of action is being developed for both this and Disposition #4 as to improve our candidates' views.
Indicator 6: Self-Awareness/Calling.	72% of candidates rated themselves in this criterion with a score of 4.0. Additionally, 25.8% of candidates rated themselves in this criterion with a score of 3.0.	1.08%, or 1 candidate, rated themselves with a score of 1.0, and 1 candidates rated themselves with a score of 2.0.
Indicator 7: Perseverance with Challenge.	74.2% of candidates rated themselves in this criterion with a score of 4.0. Additionally, 22.6% of candidates rated themselves in this criterion with a score of 3.0.	1.08%, or 1 candidate, rated themselves with a score of 1.0, whereas, 2 candidates rated themselves with a score of 2.0.
Indicator 8: Diligence in Work Habits & Responsibility for Learning.	75.3% of candidates rated themselves in this criterion with a score of 4.0. Additionally, 121.5% of candidates rated themselves in this criterion with a score of 3.0.	1.08%, or 1 candidate, rated themselves with a score of 1.0, whereas, 2 candidates rated themselves with a score of 2.0.

## Follow up Surveys

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Equip: Formal Preparation for Teaching	More than 96% of candidates felt adequately prepared to construct lesson plans. More than 93% felt adequately prepared to incorporate adaptations in lesson plans for EL students and students with special needs as well as developing as	Although candidates felt adequately prepared for making adaptations, this did not transfer to successfully making the connection on the TPAs. This was typically the lowest or 2 <sup>nd</sup> lowest average criterion. More than 32% also felt they needed more

	planning for classroom management strategies.	assistance in conducting parent-teacher conferences.
Transform: Classroom Skills	Of all the required elements in the survey, classroom skills were the most consistent in terms of how candidates felt adequately prepared. An average of 93% felt prepared in each of the 6 rated items in this category.	Even though more than 88% of the candidates felt prepared in effectively implementing strategies for EL and special needs students, it was still some of the lowest criteria on the Tasks 2, 3 and 4.
Transform: Functionality of Program	An overwhelming majority, over 96%, felt they were helped in gaining a better understanding of the daily routines and responsibilities of a classroom teacher.	More than 35% of the candidates stated that they did not feel support in the clinical practice experience via the clinical practice seminar. This is significant and a plan needs to be developed as to how to bridge this gap. Also, 21% of candidates did not feel supported in the completion of the TPA, which is interesting since passage was extremely high on the first submission.
Empower: Professional Attributes	All of the rated items in this element scored high, especially the ability to reflect upon a candidate's own teaching and be able to make changes based on that reflection.	No areas of improvement are evident as the total percentage of candidates feeling any inadequacies was less than 10%, or 3 candidates.
Empower: Teaching as a Calling	All of the rated items in this element scored relatively even throughout.	No areas of improvement are evident as the total percentage of candidates feeling any inadequacies was less than 10%, or 3 candidates.