School of Education
Core Competencies Data for ISEE, FA22-SP23

Outcome 1a. Written: Students will be able to express ideas and information to others through written communication.

Outcome Measure: EDT3006 Signature Assessment, Rubric Element 10 (Writing Quality)

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

	Average of EDT3006 Signature Assessment, Element 10 (Writing Quality).			
	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	27	20	25	3.88 (.35)
EDT3006 Sig. Assess Element 10	3.97	3.67	3.96	

*2022-23 data collected 6/01/23, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

Conclusions Drawn from Data: Criteria is met. ISEE candidates demonstrated writing quality through their performance on the outcome measure. In 2022-23 the average candidate score on the outcome measure exceeded the target of 3.5. The score trended down over the previous three academic years 2019-20 to 2021-22. This down trend fell just short of the 3yr SD and began at the ceiling of the scale (4.0) in 2019-20. The change from 2021-22 to 2022-23 is approaching the 3yr SD and should be viewed as a real positive outcome given the number of students in the measure and size of the change. In this light, 2021-22 scores may be more an exception than a norm.

Changes to be Made Based on Data: SOE leadership does not plan any changes based on this data alone. The return toward the ceiling of the scale suggests strong instruction and student performance. SOE will examine the underlying data in preparation for the 2023-24 academic year during its summer retreat.

Rubric Used

	value: 1.00 **value: 1.00**	**value: 2.00** **value: 2.00**	**value: 3.00** **value: 3.00**	**value: 4.00** **value: 4.00**	**Score/Level**
The written product displays effective communication skills through sound grammar, spelling, language and academic vocabulary specific to this Assignment.	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or unidentifiable written communication skills	Limited, cursory, or inconsistent written communication skills	Appropriate, relevant, and accurate written communication skills	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate and clearly connected use of written communication skills	

Outcome 1b. Oral: Students will be able to express ideas and information to others through oral communication.

Outcome Measure: Teacher Performance Assessment 1 Teach and Assess Rubrics (steps 1.5 and 1.6)

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards): Average score for the group on the two rubric steps (elements) is 2.5 or higher (on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being low). Note: Averaging 2.5 or higher on all eight TPA1 rubric steps, yields a total score that exceeds the California Teachers Commission (CTC) passing requirement of 19.

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:

	Average of TPA 1 Teach and Assess Rubrics (steps 1.5 and 1.6)			
	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	25	18	11	2.64 (.54)
TPA 1 Teach and Assess Rubrics	2.54	2.50	2.77	

*2022-23 data collected 6/01/23, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

Conclusions Drawn from Data: Criteria for success is met. 2022-23 average candidate scores exceeded the criteria of 2.5 and have generally held steady over the last three academic years. Change over time does not near the three-year standard deviation of .54.

Note: This dataset includes multiple scores for some students. These may occur within a single academic year, or across multiple academic years. Passing scores on TPA1 and TPA2 are required to enter the profession. SOE candidates who do not pass TPA1 or TPA2 on their first attempt retake the test until they pass it. Scores displayed in this table include the highest score for each of the TPA1 tests taken in any academic year by any student in the group. If candidates have more than one score, only their highest score is included in the average.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
In preparation for the 2023/24 academic year SOE is working to develop more real time reporting of TPA data at the individual student and test score levels to drive decision making at program (instructional) and individual (support/remediation) levels. This work is underway and will be in place for the 2023/24 academic year. The program recognizes the value in shifting more of SOE's indicators toward externally standardized and scored measures such as TPA1 and TPA2. Doing so will bring more utility to our measures and help us focus on supporting our candidates to achieve success on the exams that serve as gatekeepers to the profession.

Rubric Used:

Rubric 1.5 — Step 2: Teach and Assess

Essential Question: How does the candidate establish clear learning expectations based on an understanding of students' prior knowledge and maintain a positive learning environment* that supports all students to access and meet the content-specific learning goal(s)?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Candidate does not set clear learning expectations during the opening of the lesson. **OR** Candidate does not connect lesson to prior learning or explain how it fits in the larger unit of instruction. **OR** Candidate's annotations do not explain why or how a positive and safe learning environment is established.	Candidate sets vague learning expectations during the opening of the lesson and minimally connects lesson to prior learning. Candidate's annotations minimally explain strategy(ies) attempted to establish a positive and safe learning environment. It is not clear that strategies will support students to access and meet content-specific learning goal(s).	Candidate sets learning expectations during the opening of the lesson, directly connects the lesson to prior learning of content, and explains how this lesson fits in the larger unit of instruction. Candidate's annotations explain how a positive and safe learning environment was established. Strategies seen in video(s) support students to access and meet content-specific learning goal(s).	**All of Level 3, plus:** Candidate and students interact with each other through questioning and conversation that demonstrates positive and respectful rapport with each other and reinforces deep learning of content.	**All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:** Candidate's annotations explain how and why the UDL strategy(ies) used establish an inclusive environment that supports all students to learn and how these strategies provide equitable access to content.

TPEs and Elements: TPE 2, Elements 2, 3, 5, 6; TPE 4, Element 4

Primary Source of Evidence:

- 3 Annotated Video Clips

* For example: setting clear expectations, framing the lesson, creating a safe and welcoming environment, greeting students, establishing central question(s) and/or lesson hook, engaging students, establishing positive rapport

Rubric 1.6 — Step 2: Teach and Assess

Essential Question: How does the candidate actively engage students in deep learning of content and monitor/assess their understanding?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Instruction and assessment demonstrate lack of attention to the levels of student engagement with content and/or classroom management necessary for student learning. **OR** There are inaccuracies in presented content.	Instruction and assessment require students to engage in lower-order thinking about content, **AND/OR** strategies engage students in passive learning of content during the lesson (e.g., primarily the candidate talks throughout the lesson while students sit and listen or take notes).	Instruction and assessment require students to actively engage in higher-order thinking/deep learning (analysis, synthesis, evaluation, interpretation, transfer) about content. Candidate monitors student learning to check for understanding throughout the lesson.	**All of Level 3, plus:** Students have opportunities to actively develop their own understandings linked to lesson goal(s). Candidate monitors student learning throughout the lesson and adjusts instruction for whole class.	**All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:** Instruction and assessment promote inclusion for all students through providing opportunities to participate in classroom discourse and as members of the community. Students independently facilitate their own work either in a whole group, small group, pairs, or individually, choosing how to advance their learning.

TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Elements 5, 8; TPE 2, Element 5; TPE 4, Element 4

Primary Sources of Evidence:

- 3 Annotated Video Clips

Content-Specific Pedagogy

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: EDT4010 Signature Assessment Rubric

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards): Average score for the group is 3.0 or higher (on a scale of 1-4 with 1 being low) on EDT4010 Signature Assessment.

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:

	Average of EDT4010 Signature Assessment Rubric Overall Score.			
	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	22	20	7	3.64 (.39)
EDT4010 Signature Assessment Rubric	3.61	3.63	3.75	

*2022-23 data collected 6/01/23, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

Conclusions Drawn from Data: Criteria is met. ISEE candidates demonstrated information literacy through their performance on the outcome measure. In 2022-23 the average candidate score on the outcome measure exceeded the target of 3.0. The score has trended up over the last three academic years though the total change from 2020-21 to 2022-23 falls well short of the 3yr SD.

Changes to be Made Based on Data: No immediate plan for change is being made based on this data.

Rubric Used

EDU 4010 Signature Assessment Rubric

	1 value: 1.00	2 value: 2.00	3 value: 3.00	4 value: 4.00	Score/Level
Demonstrate and give examples of how to deliver a developmentally appropriate comprehensive program of direct systematic instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, decoding skills, word analysis, fluency, vocabulary development, and reading comprehension.	Describes two components of reading literacy instruction in reference to the reading process of a struggling student in a general context. Briefly discusses the instructional context and provides one example of the comprehensive components of systematic instruction.	Describes three components of reading literacy instruction in reference to the reading process of a struggling student at a stated grade level. Briefly discusses the instructional context and provides few examples of the comprehensive components of systematic instruction.	Describes four components of reading literacy instruction in reference to the reading process of a struggling student at a stated grade level. Details the instructional context and provides some examples of the comprehensive components of systematic instruction.	Describes five components of reading literacy instruction in reference to the reading process of a struggling student at a stated grade level. Details the instructional context and provides explicit examples of the comprehensive components of systematic instruction.	
Give examples of how to deliver a comprehensive program of systematic instruction with a focus on literary response and analysis with extensive practice in text-dependent writing.	Includes no specific examples of grade level text-dependent writing assignments. Loosely describes one cognitive process or literacy strategy which will need to be taught in order to help students develop proficiency in text-dependent writing.	Includes one specific example of grade level text-dependent writing assignments. Describes in detail one cognitive process and literacy strategy which will need to be explicitly taught in order to help students develop proficiency in text-dependent writing.	Includes two specific examples of grade level text-dependent writing assignments. Describes in detail two types of cognitive processes and literacy strategies which will need to be explicitly taught in order to help students develop proficiency in text-dependent writing.	Includes three or more specific examples of grade level text-dependent writing assignments. Describes in detail three or more types of cognitive processes and literacy strategies which will need to be explicitly taught in order to help students develop proficiency in text-dependent writing.	

Outcome 1d. Critical Thinking: Students will be able to synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions.

Outcome Measure: Teacher Performance Assessment 1 Reflect Rubric (Step 1.7)

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards): Average score for the group is 2.5 or higher (on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being low) on TPA Reflect Rubric (Step 1.7). Note: Averaging 2.5 or higher on all eight TPA1 rubric steps, yields a total score that exceeds the California Teachers Commission (CTC) passing requirement of 19.

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:

	Average of Teacher Performance Assessment 1 Reflect Rubric (Step 1.7)			
	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	25	19	12	2.57 (.68)
TPA 1 Reflect Rubric (Step 1.7)	2.44	2.58	2.83	

*2022-22 data collected 6/01/23, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

Conclusions Drawn from Data: Criteria for success is met. 2022-23 average candidate scores meet the criteria of 2.5 and have generally held steady over the last three academic years. Change over time does not near the three-year standard deviation of .68.

Note: This dataset includes multiple scores for some students. These may occur within a single academic year, or across multiple academic years. Passing scores on TPA1 and TPA2 are required to enter the profession. SOE candidates who do not pass TPA1 or TPA2 on their first attempt retake the test until they pass it. Scores displayed in this table include the highest score for each of the TPA1 tests taken in any academic year by any student in the group. If candidates have more than one score, only their highest score is included in the average.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
In preparation for the 2023/24 academic year SOE is working to develop more real time reporting of TPA data at the individual student and test score levels to drive decision making at program (instructional) and individual (support/remediation) levels. This work is underway and will be in place for the 2023/24 academic year. The program recognizes the value in shifting more of SOE's indicators toward externally standardized and scored measures such as TPA1 and TPA2. Doing so will bring more utility to our measures and help us focus on supporting our candidates to achieve success on the exams that serve as gatekeepers to the profession.

Rubric Used

Step 3 Rubric

Rubric 1.7 — Step 3: Reflect

Essential Question: How does the candidate analyze and describe the impact of their asset and needs-based lesson planning, teaching, and assessment of student learning and provide next steps to advance instruction for this group of students?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Candidate's reflection provides no connection between student assets and needs and impact on their planning, teaching, and monitoring of student learning. **OR** Candidate does not describe next steps for instruction.	Candidate's reflection demonstrates a minor or narrow understanding of what was learned about planning, teaching, **AND/OR** monitoring student learning in regard to students' assets or needs. Candidate describes next steps for instruction that are unconnected to what was learned about students.	Candidate connects the importance of knowing students' assets and needs to student learning, and analyzes and describes how knowing this information can lead to the development of instruction that is engaging, challenging, and motivating to learners. Candidate provides next steps for instruction, citing evidence of student learning assessed during the lesson.	**All of Level 3, plus:** Candidate provides a clear rationale for how and why adaptations to instruction were or were not made during the lesson to meet whole class, group, and/or individual student needs.	**All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:** Candidate demonstrates a clear understanding of the principles of UDL regarding the development of flexible learning environments that can support individual learning differences, allowing for an inclusive classroom, and applies that understanding to an analysis of the planning and implementation of this lesson.

TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Element 1; TPE 6, Element 1

Primary Source of Evidence:

- Written Narrative: Reflection on What You Learned

Outcome 1e. Quantitative Reasoning: Students will be able to solve problems, that are quantitative in nature.

Outcome Measure: Teacher Performance Assessment 2 Reflect Rubric (Step 2.8)

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards): Average score for the group is 2.5 or higher (on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being low) on TPA Reflect Rubric (Step 2.8). Note: Averaging 2.5 or higher on all nine TPA2 rubric steps, yields a total score that exceeds the California Teachers Commission (CTC) passing requirement of 20.

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:

	Average Teacher Performance Assessment 2 Reflect Rubric (Step 2.8)			
	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23*	3 yr Avg (SD)
Number of Students	20	17	10	2.98 (.77)
TPA2 Reflect Rubric (Step 2.8)	3.40	2.47	3.0	

*2022-23 data collected 6/01/23, prior to the conclusion of the summer term.

Conclusions Drawn from Data: Criteria for success is met. 2022-23 average candidate scores exceeded the criteria of 2.5 and have been mixed over the last three academic years. Change from 2020-21 to 2021-22 exceeded the three-year standard deviation of .77. That change was real. The change from 2021-22 to 2022-23 does not exceed the three-year standard deviation but suggests a regression toward the mean from the low levels of 2021-22.

Note: This dataset includes multiple scores for some students. These may occur within a single academic year, or across multiple academic years. Passing scores on TPA1 and TPA2 are required to enter the profession. SOE candidates who do not pass TPA1 or TPA2 on their first attempt retake the test until they pass it. Scores displayed in this table include the highest score for each of the TPA1 tests taken in any academic year by any student in the group. If candidates have more than one score, only their highest score is included in the average.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
In preparation for the 2022/23 academic year these tables and underlying source data was shared with instructional leadership to analyze student and course level data as the program worked to better support its candidates and report TPA data in the most useful format. That discussion focused on recognizing the value in shifting more of SOE's indicators toward externally standardized and scored measures such as TPA1 and TPA2. Doing so will bring more utility to our measures and help us focus on supporting our candidates to achieve success on the exams that serve as gatekeepers to the profession.

The specific underlying data from this indicator was verified as real. The leadership team concluded the 2020-21 candidates scored exceptionally highly on this outcome measure and that the decrease in 2021-22 was more a regression to the norm than a dramatic change in

instructional outcome. 2022-23 scores suggest the mean was somewhere between the highs of 2020-21 and lows of 2021-22.

In preparation for the 2023/24 academic year SOE is working to develop more real time reporting of TPA data at the individual student and test score levels to drive decision making at program (instructional) and individual (support/remediation) levels. This work is underway and will be in place for the 2023/24 academic year. The program recognizes the value in shifting more of SOE's indicators toward externally standardized and scored measures such as TPA1 and TPA2. Doing so will bring more utility to our measures and help us focus on supporting our candidates to achieve success on the exams that serve as gatekeepers to the profession.

Rubric Used

CalTPA Performance Assessment Guide
Single Subject

Instructional Cycle 2
Assessment-Driven Instruction

Step 3 Rubric

Rubric 2.8 — Step 3: Reflect

Essential Question: How does the candidate analyze the formal assessment results based on the scoring criteria and identify and describe emerging learning patterns and trends for the whole class in relation to the learning goal(s)?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Candidate does not analyze formal assessment results, or analysis is inaccurate. **OR** Assessment scoring criteria or rubric does not measure content-specific learning goal(s).	Candidate's analysis of formal assessment results is incomplete and results in a minimal or cursory description of whole class performance in relation to the learning goal(s). Individualized feedback is not provided. Formal assessment is used to identify deficits or lack in students' learning capacity and is not educative (e.g., students do not advance their knowledge by completing the assessment, no application or transfer is evidenced; students demonstrate rote knowledge or lower-order thinking skill[s]).	Candidate's analysis of the formal assessment results accurately describes performance for the whole class in relation to the scoring criteria/rubric and identifies general patterns and trends in relation to the learning goal(s). Assessment scoring criteria/rubric align with the learning goal(s) and enable the candidate to score student work consistently.	**All of Level 3, plus:** Candidate accurately describes learning patterns or trends for individuals, citing clear evidence from the student work samples. Candidate identifies students' partial and developing understanding of content.	**All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:** Formal assessment is used to advance and deepen students' learning through analysis and transfer of knowledge. Assessment is administered in a transparent and intellectually safe way that celebrates student progress, allows students to take risks, and clearly supports growth for all students as they strive to meet the learning goal(s).

TPE and Elements: TPE 5, Elements 2, 8
Primary Sources of Evidence:
- Scored Formal Assessments from 3 Students
- Narrative: Analysis of Assessment Results and Reflection