<u>**School Of Education**</u>
Core Competencies (CDS Teacher Ed TUG) Fa2022 - Sp2023

<u>**Core Competency: Critical Thinking**</u>
Students will be able to examine, critique and synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions.

Outcome Measure:
ETS Proficiency Profile Exam
CBEST 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.
80% of the students passing the READING section of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (i.e., earning a scaled score of 41 on a scale ranging from 20 to 80) for AY20-21.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):
1. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
2. Specialized Knowledge
3. Applied and Collaborative Learning
4. Broad Integrative Knowledge
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient					
	2017-18	**2018-19**	**2019-20**	**2020-21**	**2021-22**	**2022-23**
Number of students	26	19	27	23	22	22
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Critical Thinking	73.1%	57.9%	55.6%	43.5%	68.2%	63.6%

	Target: 80% passing the READING section of the CBEST (earning a 41 on a scale ranging from 20-80) *
	2020-21
Number of students	12
Passage of CBEST Reading Section	91.7%

* The CBEST is no longer taken by the vast majority of CDS students. This outcome measure was dropped after AY 2020-21.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
The ETS target (75% proficiency) is NOT met; CDS student performance on this is below our criteria for success.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
We are pleased that the ETS exam will no longer be used as the metric by which we are measuring this Core Competency beginning AY2023-24, as we do not feel it is an accurate representation of our students' knowledge. CDS students know that their individual results will not be reported and, as such, some may not have taken it seriously. Furthermore, due to the practical nature of much of our education coursework/assessments, CDS students have limited experience with multiple-choice testing beyond their first two years of study. Additionally, the students may not have been appropriately prepared for the exam context in the past. On a recent exit survey, students reported that didn't feel prepared for the type(s) of questions on the exam, didn't know what to bring (e.g., a calculator), and didn't understand the purpose of this exam.

Next year, we will be piloting a new outcome measure for this Core Competency. CDS students will take a modified CBEST practice test in the areas of Reading/Critical Thinking and Quantitative Reasoning in their EDU 4017 capstone course. The full-length California Basic Education Skills Test (CBEST) has traditionally been administered to all students interested in seeking a California Teaching credential. However, the state of California recently opened additional ways for candidates to satisfy their Basic Skills requirement, including SAT scores, ACT scores, or satisfactory completion of collegiate level coursework. As a result, most CDS students no longer take the CBEST. In AY 2022-23, 11 students met their Reading/Critical Skills requirement via SAT scores, 6 met with ACT scores, and 13 met through college coursework (e.g., LIT 3050). Only 1 student will likely have to take the CBEST to meet their Basic Skills Requirement.

Students seeking a teaching credential in the state of California are responsible for mastering "basic skills" (e.g., reading, quantitative reasoning)– yet most are no longer are required to take the CBEST. Thus, we believe that having CDS students take a set of CBEST *practice questions* from the Reading subtest will be a *relevant* and *appropriate* Outcome Measure by which to assess this core competency. Pilot data from the first administration will be reported in AY2023-24.

Rubric Used
No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile.

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Core Competencies

Core Competency: 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.
80% of the students passing the WRITING section of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (i.e., earning a scaled score of 41 on a scale ranging from 20 to 80) in AY20-21.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):
1.   Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
2.   Specialized Knowledge
3.   Applied and Collaborative Learning
4.   Broad Integrative Knowledge
5.   Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient					
	2017-18	**2018-19**	**2019-20**	**2020-21**	**2021-22**	**2022-23**
Number of students	26	19	27	23	22	22
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Writing	80.8%	78.9%	66.7%	52.2%	72.7%	45.5%

	Target: 80% passing the WRITING section of the CBEST (earning a 41 on a scale ranging from 20-80)
	2020-21
Number of students	12
Passage of CBEST Writing Section	91.7%

* The CBEST is no longer taken by the vast majority of CDS students. This outcome measure was dropped after AY 2020-21.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
The ETS target (80% proficiency) is not met; CDS student performance on this is below our criteria for success.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
We are pleased that the ETS exam will no longer be used as the metric by which we are measuring this Core Competency beginning AY2023-24, as we do not feel it is an accurate representation of our students' knowledge. CDS students know that their individual results will not be reported and, as such, some may not have taken it seriously. Furthermore, due to the practical nature of much of our education coursework/assessments, CDS students have limited experience with multiple-choice testing beyond their first two years of study. Additionally, the students may not have been appropriately prepared for the exam context in the past. On a recent exit survey, students reported that didn't feel prepared for the type(s) of questions on the exam, didn't know what to bring (e.g., a calculator), and didn't understand the purpose of this exam.

Next year, we are pleased that we will be piloting a new outcome measure for this Core Competency. Specifically, we plan to assess a writing assignment already embedded within the EDU 4017 capstone course using an instructor-generated rubric.

Rubric Used
No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile.

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Core Competencies

Core Competency: 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.
70% of the students passing the MATH section of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (i.e., earning a scaled score of 41 on a scale ranging from 20 to 80) in AY20-21.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):
1. <mark>Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies</mark>
2. Specialized Knowledge
3. Applied and Collaborative Learning
4. Broad Integrative Knowledge
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient					
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Number of students	26	19	27	23	22	22
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Math	80.8%	57.9%	63.0%	52.2%	81.8%	50%

	Target: 80% passing the MATH section of the CBEST (earning a 41 on a scale ranging from 20-80)
	2020-21
Number of students	12
Passage of CBEST Math Section	83.3%

* The CBEST is no longer taken by the vast majority of CDS students. This outcome measure was dropped after AY 2020-21.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
The ETS target (70% proficiency) NOT met; CDS student performance on this is below our criteria for success.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
We are pleased that the ETS exam will no longer be used as the metric by which we are measuring this Core Competency beginning AY2023-24, as we do not feel it is an accurate representation of our students' knowledge. CDS students know that their individual results will not be reported and, as such, some may not have taken it seriously. Furthermore, due to the practical nature of much of our education coursework/assessments, CDS students have limited experience with multiple-choice testing beyond their first two years of study. Additionally, the students may not have been appropriately prepared for the exam context in the past. On a recent exit survey, students reported that didn't feel prepared for the type(s) of questions on the exam, didn't know what to bring (e.g., a calculator), and didn't understand the purpose of this exam.

Next year, we will be piloting a new outcome measure for this Core Competency. CDS students will take a modified CBEST practice test in the areas of Reading/Critical Thinking and Quantitative Reasoning in their EDU 4017 capstone course. The full-length California Basic Education Skills Test (CBEST) has traditionally been administered to all students interested in seeking a California Teaching credential. However, the state of California recently opened additional ways for candidates to satisfy their Basic Skills requirement, including SAT scores, ACT scores, or satisfactory completion of collegiate level coursework. As a result, most CDS students no longer take the CBEST. In AY 2022-23, 8 students met their Quantitative Reasoning requirement via SAT scores, 4 met

with ACT scores, and 17 met through college coursework (e.g., MTH 2013, MTH 3003). Only two students of our current students will likely need to take the CBEST to fulfill their Basic Skills requirement.

Students seeking a teaching credential in the state of California are responsible for mastering "basic skills" (e.g., reading, quantitative reasoning)– yet most are no longer are required to take the CBEST. Thus, we believe that having CDS students take a set of CBEST *practice questions* from the Quantitative Reasoning subtest will be a *relevant* and *appropriate* Outcome Measure by which to assess this core competency. Pilot data from the first administration will be reported in AY2023-24.

Rubric Used
No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile.

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Core Competencies

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

Outcome Measure:
   A. EDU 306 Signature Assessment, criterion 7 (each year through 2017-18).
   B. EDU 306/3006 Mirrors, Windows, Sliding Glass Doors Diversity, criterion 4 (each year, beginning 2018-19)

Criteria for Success:
   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. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
   2. Specialized Knowledge
   3. Applied and Collaborative Learning
   4. Broad Integrative Knowledge
   5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data (Criteria for Success A):

Oral Communication	Target: Average Score for the Group is 3.5 or higher
	2017-18
Effective Oral Presentation	3.59

Longitudinal Data (Criteria for Success B):

Oral Communication	Target: 80% or more earn a 3 (on 3-point rubric)				
	2018-19	**2019-20**	**2020-21**	**2021-22**	**2022-2023**
Number of students	--	--	43	1	2
Effective Oral Presentation	100%	100%	97.7%	1	2

[1] In AY2021-22, the adjunct faculty member incorporated the Mirrors, Windows, and Sliding Glass Doors assignment, but did NOT utilize a multi-tiered scoring rubric. Thus, this assessment could not be used to measure this CC.

[2] In AY2022-23, we shifted to using an outcome measure associated with an assignment administered in the senior capstone course (EDU 4017). Although the adjunct professor DID incorporate a culminating assignment that included an oral component (e.g., an oral presentation), she did NOT create a rubric dimension to assess the oral communication element of that assignment. Thus, this assessment could not be used to measure this CC.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
Since the adjunct faculty member for EDU 4017 did not assess the oral communication component of the assignment[2], we were not able to collect data on this Core Competency in AY2022-23.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
The Program Chair has been in communication with the adjunct professor who will be returning to teach EDU 4017 in AY2023-24. The faculty member will assess the oral communication element of her culminating assignment (not just the content of that assignment) in future iterations of the course. In AY2023-24, we intend to add one or more rubric dimensions to assess the oral communication component of the assignment.

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
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.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous, or weakly connected identifiable reasons to support diverse and cross-cultural communities. Does not include specific ways for schools and teachers to demonstrate this commitment.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected identifiable reasons to support diverse and cross-cultural communities. Limited/minimal inclusion of specific ways for schools and teachers to demonstrate this commitment.	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected identifiable reasons to support diverse and cross-cultural communities. Includes specific ways for schools and teachers to demonstrate this commitment.
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."	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. Minimal / no reference to the concept of "mirrors, windows, and sliding glass doors."	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. Limited/minimal reference to the concept of "mirrors, windows, and sliding glass doors."	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. Refers to the concept of "mirrors, windows, and sliding glass doors."
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.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing logical explanation for the selection of fewer than 4 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Minimal/no explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of fewer than 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Limited/minimal explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of the 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Includes a comprehensive explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.

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.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing logical explanation for the selection of fewer than 4 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Minimal/no explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom. Presentation was unprepared and unprofessionalism.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of fewer than 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Limited/minimal explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom. Presentation lacked preparation and professionalism.	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of the 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Includes a comprehensive explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom. Professional, well-prepared presentation.
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	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing logical explanation for the selection of fewer than 4 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Minimal/no explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of fewer than 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Limited/minimal explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected explanation for the selection of the 6 multicultural and cross-cultural books. Includes a comprehensive explanation of the criteria used to select the source and application in the classroom.
Total _____/15			

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Core Competencies

Core Competency: 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, up though 2017-18)
    B. UDL Lesson Plan, Presentation, and Reflection assignment (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 total points or higher (AY18-19 and 19-20); 85% of students earn 68/80 total points or higher (AY20-21 onward) on the UDL Lesson Plan, Presentation, and Reflection [EDU 3024 course assignment].

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):
    1. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
    2. Specialized Knowledge
    3. Applied and Collaborative Learning
    4. Broad Integrative Knowledge
    5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data (Criteria for Success A):

Information Literacy:	Target: Average Score for the Group is 3.0 or higher
	2017-18
Teaching Performance Assessment Task 2	3.04

Longitudinal Data (Criteria for Success B):

Information Literacy:	Target: 85% of students earn 85/100 or higher (AY2018-19, 2019-20) Target: 85% of students earn 68/80 or higher (AY 2020-21 onward)[1]				
	2018-19	**2019-20**	**2020-21**	**2021-22**	**2022-23**
Number of students	--	--	33	23	26
Outcome 1.d. Candidates will utilize specific content information from a variety of sources for instructional planning.	86.4%	83.9%	90.9%	95.7%	80.8%

[1] The "In-class Presentation" dimension was modified in AY2020-21, with the 20 points distributed across a video presentation and other incremental submissions. Thus, the total for the UDL Lesson Plan and Reflection FINAL assessment was 80 points total, beginning in AY2020-21.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
Target is nearly met, with only 5 out of the 26 students not achieving at least a 68/80 on this outcome measure. The current outcome measure and criteria for success seem appropriate. The current outcome measure is authentic, well-scaffolded, and aligned to the competencies associated with EDU 3024 (Differentiated Instruction for All Learners), the students' major (Cross-Disciplinary Studies – Teacher Education), and the SOE credential program as a whole.

This course was taught by an adjunct faculty member in Spring 2023, as the full-time faculty member who typically teaches the course was on Sabbatical leave. It is possible that this adjunct faculty member may have applied the scoring rubric differently than the traditional instructor for this course. Next year, the course will once again be taught by the full-time faculty.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
There are no plans to change the assessment, outcome measure, or target. We will collect data on this core 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

	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 allows for activities and learning to build throughout the lesson. (10 points)	Learning activities are somewhat age appropriate, somwhat 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[1]	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)	

[1] The "In-class Presentation" dimension was modified in AY2020-21, with the 20 points were distributed across a video presentation and other incremental submissions. Thus, the total for the UDL Lesson Plan and Reflection FINAL assessment was 80 points total, beginning in AY2020-21.