College of Education and Affiliated Programs
Annual Assessment Report
For Single Subject Program

Note: this report presents and analyzes data from the 2007-08 academic year. During that year, the College of Education and Affiliated Programs engaged in extensive efforts to refine and extend their assessment system. In many cases, data collected starting in Fall 2008 and beyond will look substantially different from the data being presented in this report.

Background

1. Describe your program (general goals, how these connect to the college conceptual framework, enrollment, and number of faculty). Describe any program changes since your last CED Annual Report?

   Program Goals

   The Single Subject Credential Program (SSCP) rests on the bedrock principle clarified by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF, 1996, p.5): *What teachers know and can do makes the crucial difference in what children learn*. Building on this core principle, the program has as its overarching purpose the preparation of high quality beginning teachers who possess the knowledge, aptitudes and dispositions that will enable them to provide the conditions for meaningful, instrumental learning for all students so that they can become active citizens in a democratic, increasingly global, technology-driven society.

   The SSCP has three components: subject matter preparation, professional pedagogical preparation, and student teaching. The program has ten Commission-approved subject matter programs: Art, English, Family and Consumer Sciences, Health Science, Languages Other Than English, Mathematics, Music, Physical Education, Science and Social Science. Subject matter programs vary in length from 35 to 75 units, and are essentially undergraduate majors. Professional preparation is accomplished through a 44-unit set of courses, with 27 units dedicated to foundational and pedagogical preparation and 17 units associated with the culminating student teaching experience. The program offers an Internship track within the same structure and unit load.

   The SSCP is a university-wide program. As such it has a shared governance structure among the ten constituent subject matter programs (housed in four colleges: Arts, Health and Human Services, Liberal Arts and Natural Sciences and Mathematics) and the University Coordinator (based in the College of Education). The University Coordinator reports to the Dean of the College of Education. A Credential Coordinator and/or a Credential Advisor is responsible for each of the subject matter programs. Each has a committee of faculty that determines subject matter program policy and reviews applications to the program, among other responsibilities.

   All courses in the professional education sequence integrate course activities and structured fieldwork. Fieldwork is designed to give candidates a variety of experiences in contemporary classrooms ranging from back-of-the-class observation through case studies and mini ethnographies to whole class teaching. Course activities and field experiences are closely tied to the Teaching

Performance Expectations (TPEs). The Teaching Performance Expectations serve as the SSCP student learning outcomes.

Table 1
Program Student Learning Outcomes and Relevant Standards

SLOs	**Outcome 1:** Makes subject matter comprehensible to students	**Outcome 2:** Assesses student learning	**Outcome 3:** Engages and supports all students in learning	**Outcome 4:** Plans instruction and designs learning experiences for all students	**Outcome 5:** Creates and maintains an effective environment for student learning	**Outcome 6:** Develops as a professional educator
Signature Assignment(s)	Teaching lesson, Course grade, TPA 1	Course grade, TPA 3	Lesson plans, Course grade, TPA 1-3	Curriculum unit map, Course grade, TPA 1-3	Demographic paper, Course grade	Reflective paper, Course grade, TPA 1-3
National Standards						
State Standards	Makes subject matter comprehensible to students	Assesses student learning	Engages and supports all students in learning	Plans instruction and designs learning experiences for all students	Creates and maintains an effective environment for student learning	Develops as a professional educator
Conceptual Framework	Promotes Growth	Research and Evaluation	Promotes Growth	Promotes Growth, Service and Collaboration	School Improvement, Values Diversity	Values Diversity, Research and Evaluation, School Improvement
NCATE Elements	Content Knowledge	Student Learning	Pedagogical Content Knowledge	Professional Knowledge & Skills	Professional Knowledge & Skills	Professional Dispositions

Enrollment

Program enrollment is determined by comparing candidates admitted over the previous 7 years with candidates who have yet to complete the program. There are approximately 1,393 current candidates who are in one stage or another of the program. This number may be slightly inflated, since candidates do not necessarily inform us if they choose to withdraw from the program and, consequently, show up as still in the program even thought they have drifted away and have not completed the program or officially withdrawn. In 2007-2008, the SSCP admitted 485 students to the program. During the same time, we had 384 students enrolled in the culminating experience, student teaching. The rest of the students are taking the professional preparation coursework.

Table 2
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)

Category	Transition Point 1			Transition Point 2	Transition Point 3
	Admission to Program			Advancement to Culminating Experience #	Exit #
	Applied #	Accepted #	Matriculated #[1]		
TOTAL	485	485		385	363

[1] We are unable to determine the number of students matriculated. To do so would require looking up every student who applied to the program, one by one in people soft, and tracking them over several semesters to see if they enrolled in SSCP program courses.

Table 3
Program Specific Candidate Information (by subject), 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)

Category	Transition Point 1				Transition Point 2	Transition Point 3
	Admission to Program				Applied to Culminating Experience #	Credentials Recommended #
	Enrolled in EDSS 300 #	Applied #	Accepted #	Matriculated #		
Art	45	35	35		30	31
English	147	109	109		84	79
Family & Consumer Science	5	5	5		9	11
Health Science	19	20	20		10	9
Languages Other than English	56	55	55		44	43
Math	110	89	89		53	50
Music	26	17	17		12	11
Physical Education	42	33	33		20	19
Science	68	44	44		26	27
Social Science	107	99	99		96	83
TOTAL	625	485	485		384	363

Note that on occasion, students do not file for a credential immediately after completing student teaching. If students postpone filing for a credential they are counted in the following years count. Additionally, some high need subject areas (Science & Math) have students with multiple subject credentials come back and add on a single subject credential. These students are not required to repeat student teaching. This may explain why Art, Family & Consume Science and Science each recommended more credentials than they had students who completed student teaching.

Table 4
Program Specific Candidate Information (by subject), 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)

	Transition Point 2
	Applied to Culminating Experience #
Art	30
English	84
Family & Consumer Science	9
Health Science	10
Languages Other than English	44
Math	53

Table 4
Program Specific Candidate Information (by subject), 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)

	Transition Point 2
	Applied to Culminating Experience #
Music	12
Physical Education	20
Science	26
Social Science	96
TOTAL	384

Table 5
Program Specific Candidate Information (by subject), 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)

	Transition Point 3[2]
	Credentials Recommended #
Art	31
English	79
Family & Consumer Science	11
Health Science	9
Languages Other than English	43
Math	50
Music	11
Physical Education	19
Science	27
Social Science	83
TOTAL	363

Faculty

Strictly speaking, for university budget purposes the Single Subject Credential Program has a single faculty, the University Coordinator. Subject matter program advisors, teaching faculty, and the student teaching supervisors are members of the colleges and departments housing the subject matter programs and the Department of Teacher Education. They are "loaned" to the Single Subject Program. Table 3 displays the 07-08 profile of these faculty.

[2] Note that on occasion, students do not immediately file for a credential immediately after completing student teaching. If students postpone filing for a credential they are counted in the following years count. Additionally, some high need subject areas (Science & Math) have students with multiple subject credentials come back and add on a single subject credential. These students are not required to repeat student teaching. This may explain why Art, Family & Consumer Science and Science each recommended more credentials than they had students who complete student teaching.

Table 6
Faculty Profile 2007-08

Status	Number
Full-time TT & Lecturer	28
Part-time Lecturer	96
Total:	124

A number of part-time and full-time faculty both teach and supervise in the SSCP which is why the numbers that appear on the chart don't exactly match the number presented in the narrative.

There have been no major changes in the SSCP since the last CCTC report submitted for Spring 2007 accreditation review.

2. How many of the total full- and part-time faculty in the program reviewed and discussed the assessment findings described in this document? Please attach minutes and/or completed worksheets/artifacts to document this meeting.

   All coordinators and advisors at the SSCP meeting (12 full-time faculty, including the 10 program coordinators, the EDSE representative on the committee and the SSCP coordinator) reviewed and discussed the assessment findings described in this document at the October 1, 2008 SSCP coordinators meeting. In past years, many of the coordinators brought the data back to their programs but we did not keep the minutes related to data discussion. Beginning fall 2008, each of the 10 program coordinators will take the data to their program faculty for discussion and will provide minutes related to the data discussion and action plans. Additionally, the discussion will be brought to the Single Subject Advisory Council which consists of faculty, secondary public school personnel and community member. See Appendix A for data discussion minutes from the October 1, 2008 SSCP coordinators meeting (highlighted in yellow, page 2).

Data

3. Question 3 is in 2 main parts focused on *primary* data sources related to: student learning and program effectiveness/student experience:

   a. Candidate Performance Data: Provide *direct* evidence for the student learning outcomes assessed this year and describe how they were assessed (the tools, assignments, etc. used). Describe the process used for collection and analysis. Present descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, percentage passing as appropriate for each outcome.

      Prior to Fall 2008, the SSCP used one signature assignment (pre/post assessment for SLO 2), the CalTPA and the TPE (through the student teaching evaluations) to analyze candidate performance data.

Signature assignments for each SLO were chosen by the SSCP faculty spring 08 and Implemented fall 08. The only signature assignment that was in existence for spring 08 was the pre/post assessment completed by SSCP candidates in EDSS 473, assessing SLO 2, Assessing Student Learning. What follows is the signature assignment for SLO 2.

Data Source #1: Measuring SLO #2 "Assess Student Learning" on Pre/Post Assessment Signature Assignment

Description of the Signature Assignment
The purpose of this assignment is to assess EDSS 473 students' ability to 1) develop a lesson that includes a Pre/Post-assessment appropriate to the demographics of the class, 2) interpret/analyze data, and then 3) formulate an Action/Intervention Plan to re-teach.

Data Source # 2: The CalTPAs

Assignment Description: The CalTPA is a series of four tasks that assess student competence as classroom teachers. Each CalTPA is tied to multiple TPEs.

Method: During the 2007-2008 academic year, CalTPAs were done throughout the SSCP as a low-stakes course assignment. Although all instructors used the state designed rubric, during the 2007-2008 academic year not all instructors were calibrated in its use. Additionally, since it was a low-stakes assignment, instructors used the assignment in different ways: Some instructors provided feedback and allowed rewrites while others gave only summative feedback and did not allow rewrites. During the 2007-2008 academic year only the 4 core subject approved CalTPA Task 1's were available. The 6 instructors for the other subjects developed their own TPA-like assignments.

Table 7
CalTPA Data for 2007-2008

CalTPA Task	Semester	Score 1 or 2 (not passing)	Score 3 or 4 (passing)	Total
1. Subject Specific Pedagogy	Fall 2007 Spring 2008	7% n=18 5% n=12	93% n=237 95% n=215	225 227
2. Designing Instruction	Fall 2007 Spring 2008	25% n=26 25% n=44	75% n=117 75% n=131	155 175
3. Assessing Learning	Fall 2007 Spring 2008	13% n=26 29% n=57	87% n=167 71% n=142	193 199
4. Culminating Teaching Experience	Fall 2007 Spring 2008	14% n=21 15% n=29	85% n=126 85% n=166	147 195

***** Note – The huge change in not passing scores for TPA 3 may be explained by the fact that we used this TPA as a pilot for high stakes and the assignment did not count as part of the class grade. We believe students may have been less motivated to do well.

Data Source # 3: Teaching Performance Expectations measured by Student Teaching Evaluations

Assignment Description: Student teachers are evaluated by their University Supervisor (US) and Cooperating Teachers (CT) twice during their student teaching experience. The Student Teaching Evaluation Form is mapped directly to the TPEs, allowing the SSCP to analyze data along specific skill expectations.

Methods: The University Supervisors observe the student teacher a minimum of six times during the student teaching experience. The observations provide an opportunity for the University Supervisor to give the candidate detailed formative performance feedback orally, at mid-point of the semester, on the evaluation form. Similarly, the school-based Cooperating Teacher observes the student teacher on a daily basis during the student teaching experience, converses with the student regularly, and also completes a mid-semester formal evaluation. Both the supervisor and the cooperating teacher also complete a summative evaluation for the student teacher using the same TPE-based evaluation form.

Table 8
07-08 Final Student Teaching Evaluation Data (measuring the Teaching Performance Expectations)

	E		P		D		NC		NO	
	US	**CT**	**US**	**CT**	**US**	**CT**	**US**	**CT**	**US**	**CT**
Category A: Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students	81 42%	85 45%	90 47%	79 42%	15 8%	20 11%	2 1%	1 0.5%	4 2%	4 2%
Category B: Assessing Student Learning	60 30%	79 41%	101 51%	80 42%	25 13%	23 12%	1 0.05%	1 0.05%	12 6%	9 4%
Category C: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning	78 41%	87 45%	88 46%	76 39%	17 9%	21 11%	2 1%	1 0.05%	5 3%	8 4%
Category D: Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students	75 40%	85 42%	87 46%	76 38%	17 9%	31 15%	3 2%	2 1%	7 4%	7 3%
Category E: Creating and Maintaining an Effective Environment for Students	80 43%	89 46%	82 44%	71 37%	14 7%	22 11%	2 1%	1 0.05%	9 5%	9 5%
Category F: Developing as a Professional Educator	93 49%	103 51%	72 38%	73 36%	10 5%	14 7%	1 0.05%	1 0.05%	14 7%	12 6%
Category G: Overall Teaching Effectiveness Assessment	88 47%	96 49%	82 44%	82 42%	13 7%	16 8%	4 2%	1 0.05%	0 0%	0 0%

Student Teaching Evaluation Form Key:
E = Exceptional Beginning Practice (The student teacher provides consistent, extensive, high quality evidence of effective teaching practice)
P = Proficient Beginning Practice (The student teacher provides substantial evidence of effective teaching practice in this category)
D = Developing Beginning Practice (The student teacher provides some evidence of effective teaching practice in this category)
NC = Not Consistent with Standard Expectations for Beginning Practice (The student teacher provides little or no evidence of effective teaching practice in this category)
US = University Supervisor (university based mentor)
CT = Cooperative Teacher (school based mentor)

b. Program Effectiveness Data: What data were collected to determine program effectiveness and how (e.g., post-program surveys, employer feedback, focus groups, retention data)? This may be indirect evidence of student learning, satisfaction data, or other indicators or program effectiveness. Describe the process used for collection and analysis. Present descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, or summarized qualitative data, for each outcome.

The SSCP collects a range of data on an annual basis from exiting students, graduates, employers of graduates and master teachers.

Data Source # 4: CSU Exit Survey

The CSU Center for Teacher Quality administers a 23-item, CSU exit Survey of Student Teachers and distributes annual reports to campuses. The number of respondents for 2006-2007 was 312. The mean score and standard deviation for each item are reported in Appendix F. A summary of the strengths and weaknesses follows.

Table 9
Identified Strengths as revealed in the CSU Exit Survey of Student Teachers

As a new teacher, I am *well or adequately prepared* to begin...	**Graduated 06-07**	**Graduated 07-08**
to evaluate and reflect on my own teaching and to seek out assistance that leads to professional growth.	94% n=312	97.4% n=235
to prepare lesson plans and make prior arrangements for students' class activities.	93% n=312	95.8% n=236
to adhere to principles of educational equity in the teaching of all students.	91% n=312	93.1% n=232
to use class time efficienty by relying on daily routines and planned transitions.	91% n= 312	95.3% n=234

Table 10
Identified Weaknesses as revealed in the CSU Exit Survey of Student Teachers

As a new teacher, I am ***well or adequately prepared*** to begin…	Graduated 06-07	Graduated 07-08
to meet the instructional needs of student with special learning needs.	70% n=308	71.5% n=235
to know about resources in the school & community for at-risk students and families.	70% n=312	74.7% n=233
to meet the instructional needs of students who are English language learners.	71% n=312	76.4% n=233

Data Source # 5: CSU Survey of Program Graduates

The CSU Center for Teacher Quality annually surveys 1st year teachers who graduated from CSU programs. The data is presented alongside the data from the survey of Supervisors in Appendix G. What follows is a summary of strengths and weaknesses.

Table 11
Identified Strengths as Revealed in the CSU Survey of Graduates in their First Year of Teaching

The First Year Teaching Graduate was ***well or adequately prepared*** to…	Graduated 05-06	Graduated 06-07
Monitor students progress by using informal assessments methods.	86% n=92	86% n=96
know and understand the subjects of the curriculum at her/his grade level.	88% n=93	91% n=96
Prepare lesson plans and make prior arrangements for class activities.	84% n=93	95% n=96

Table 12
Identified Weaknesses as Revealed in the CSU Survey of Graduates in their First Year of Teaching

The First Year Teaching Graduate was ***well or adequately prepared*** to…	Graduated 05-06	Graduated 06-07
Organize and manage student behavior and discipline satisfactorily.	58% n=93	73% n=96
Meet the instructional needs of students who are English language learners.	58% n=93	72% n=95
Meet the instructional needs of students with special learning needs.	65% n=92	72% n=95

Data Source # 6: CSU Survey of Supervisors of Program Graduates

The CSU Center for Teacher Quality annually surveys supervisors of 1st year teaching graduates of CSU programs. The data is presented alongside the data from the 1-year out graduates in Appendix G. What follows is a summary of the strengths and weaknesses.

Table 13
Identified Strengths as revealed in the CSU Survey of Employers

The First Year Teaching Graduate was ***well or adequately prepared*** to...	Graduated 05-06	Graduated 06-07
know and understand the subjects of the curriculum at her/his grade level.	100% n=45	95% n=88
Prepare lesson plans and make prior arrangements for class activities.	98% n=45	91% n=90
Learn about students' interest and motivations, and how to teach accordingly.	98% n=43	80% n=89
Use computer-based technology in class activities and to keep class records.	98% n=40	88% n=81

Table 14
Identified Weaknesses as revealed in the CSU Survey of Employers

The First Year Teaching Graduate was ***well or adequately prepared*** to...	Graduated 05-06	Graduated 06-07
Meet the instructional needs of students with special learning needs.	77% n=43	74% n=86
Communicate effectively with the parents or guardians of your students.	84% n=44	78% n=89
Meet the instructional needs of students who are English language learners.	86% n=42	77% n=90
Assess pupil progress by analyzing a variety of evidence including test scores	86% n=43	82% n=89

Data Source # 7: Survey of Cooperating Teachers

Each year the SSCP surveys our cooperating teachers about how well our programs helped prepare their student teachers. Overall, the cooperating teachers who returned the surveys were satisfied with the education our student teachers received. See Appendix H for survey results. What is shown below is a summary of data collected.

Table 15
Survey of Cooperating Teachers (Fall 2007 & Spring 2008)

Question: The Student Teacher was able to:						
	Below Average Rating Sp 08	**Below Average Ratings Fall 07**	**Average Rating Sp 08**	**Average Rating Fall 07**	**Above Average Rating Sp 08**	**Above Average Rating Fall 07**
Establish a classroom environment that promotes learning	7%		15.7%	9.6%	77.4%	90.4%
Develop appropriate curriculum for subject and students	5.2%		20%	8.2%	73%	91.7%
Write appropriate unit and lesson plans	5.2%	2.7%	17.4%	5.5%	76.5%	91.7%
Utilize a variety of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies to address students with diverse needs	7%	4.1%	22.6%	11%	69.6%	85%
Motivate & sustain student interest	12.1%	1.4%	18.3%	24.7%	69.5%	74%
Communicate effectively	10.4%	2.7%	17.4%	9.6%	72.2%	87.6%
Identify students prior attainments	12.2%	2.8%	27.8%	19.2%	56.5%	78.1%
Achieve significant instructional objectives	7.8%	1.4%	17.4%	6.8%	73.1%	91.8%
Assess student progress	6.1%	2.7%	13.9%	6.8%	81%	90.4%
Improve students ability to evaluation, analyze and reach sound conclusions	9.5%	1.4%	24.3%	23.3%	66%	74%
Foster positive student attitudes	8.7%	1.4%	21.7%	15.1%	69.5%	83.5%
Teach diverse students	5.2%	1.4%	18.3%	6.8%	75.7%	91.8%

Question: The Student Teacher was able to:						
	Below Average Rating Sp 08	**Below Average Ratings Fall 07**	**Average Rating Sp 08**	**Average Rating Fall 07**	**Above Average Rating Sp 08**	**Above Average Rating Fall 07**
Teaching limited-English	8.7%	4.1%	23.5%	17.8%	58.3%	68.4%
Professional conduct	7.8%		12.2%	4.1%	79.2%	94.5%
Use of technology	10.4%		19.1%	15.5%	67%	82.2%
The student was adequately prepared to begin student teaching	10.4%	1.4%	13.9%	6.8%	74.8%	91.8%
The student possessed a sound knowledge base in content area	7.9%	1.4%	13%	6.8%	79.1%	91.8%
Question:	Highly ineffective/ ineffective Sp 08	Highly ineffective/ Ineffective Fall 07	Acceptable Sp 08	Acceptable Fall 07	Effective/ highly effective Sp 08	Effective/ highly effective Fall 07
Please rate the Single Subject Credential Program in terms of how it prepares candidates to be a beginning teacher	6.9%		8.7%	12.3%	82.6%	84.9%

Data Source # 8: Student Teacher Feedback on Cooperating Teachers

Each year the SSCP surveys exiting student teachers, requesting feedback on their K-12 cooperating teachers. Overall, the student teachers who returned the surveys were satisfied with the supervision they received from their K-12 cooperating teachers. Please note that the intern student teacher data is not separated out from the cooperating teacher data. This may skew the percentages because intern student teachers are the teacher of record and do not necessarily receive the same amount or type of supervision received by traditional student teacher. See Appendix H for survey results. What is shown below is a summary of data collected.

Table 16
Student Teacher Feedback on Cooperating Teachers (Fall 2007& Spring 2008)

Question: Which of the following topics were addressed in your orientation:								
	Never S08	Never F07	Within 4 wks S08	Within 4 wks F07	Within 2 wks S08	Within 2 wks F07	Within 1 wk S08	Within 1 wk F07
I was given	6.8%	1.9%	2.9%	8.7%	7.3%	5.8%	80.6%	79.6%

an introduction to my classroom by my cooperating teacher								
	No S08	No F07	Yes S08	Yes F07				
Intro to department & school personnel	11.7%	5.8%	88.3%	94.2%				
Overview of curriculum	12.6%	17.5%	87.4%	82.5%				
Overview of classroom management	15.5%	17.5%	84.5%	82.5%				
Overview of grading policies	18.4%	16,5%	81.6%	83.5%				
Overview of school policies	21.8%	11.7%	78.2%	87.4%				

Question: During the first 15 weeks my cooperating teacher observed me:

Less than bi-wkly S08	Less than bi-wkly F07	1-hr every other wk S08	1-hr every other wk F07	1-2 hrs per wk S08	1-2 hrs per wk F07	3-4 hrs per wk S08	3-4 hrs per wk F07	Daily S08	Daily F07
2.4%	11.7	3.4%	13.6%	8.7%	8.7%	15.5 %	7.8%	69.9 %	57.8 %

Question: On average, my cooperating teacher conferred with me:

Less than bi-wkly S08	Less than bi-wkly F07	1-hr every other wk S08	1-hr every other wk F07	1-2 hrs per wk S08	1-2 hrs per wk F07	3-4 hrs per wk S08	3-4 hrs per wk F07	Daily S08	Daily F07
2.9%	9.7%	4.4%	9.7%	18.4%	17.5%	17.5 %	11.7 %	56.8 %	51.5 %

Question: My cooperating teacher's oral and written feedback was:

Did not occur	Did not occur F07	Unsatisfactory S08	Unsatisfactory F07	Satisfactory S08	Satisfactory F07	Useful S08	Useful F07	Highly usefu	Highly usef

S08								l S08	ul F07
1.9%	1.9%	2.4%	2.9%	8.7%	7.8%	17.5 %	21.4 %	69.4 %	65%
Question: Overall, supervision and feedback from my cooperating teacher was:									
Did not occur S08	Did not occur F07	Unsatisfactor y S08	Unsatisfa ctory F07	Satisfacto ry S08	Satisfacto ry F07	Usefu l S08	Usef ul F07	Highl y usefu l S08	High ly usef ul F07
1.0%	1.0%	4.4%	3.9%	7.8%	11.7%	17.5 %	16.5 %	69.4 %	65%

Data Source # 9: Student Teacher Feedback on University Supervisors

Each year the SSCP surveys our exiting student teachers, requesting feedback on their University Supervisors. Overall, the student teachers who returned the surveys were satisfied with the supervision they received from their University Supervisors. See Appendix H for survey results. What is shown below is a summary of data collected.

Table 17
Student Teacher Feedback on University Supervisors (Fall 2007 & Spring 2008)

Question: Supervisor explained program expectations:									
Never S08	Never F07	Within 4 wks S08	Within 4 wks F07	Within 3 wks S08	Within 3 wks F07	Within 2 wks S08	Within 2 wks F07	Within 1 wk S08	Within 1 wk F07
7.2%	1.2%	0.7%	4.8%	2.9%	4.8%	12.3%	12.3%	75.4%	76.2%
Question: Supervisor observed me teaching:									
3 or fewer times S08	3 or fewer times F07	4 times S08	4 times F07	5 times S08	5 times F07	6 times S08	6 times F07	More than 6 times S08	More than 6 times F07
2.9%	4.8%	5.8%	7.1%	16.7%	22.6%	49.3%	40.5%	25.4%	25%
Question: Supervisor conferred with me:									
Never S08	Never F07	1-2 times S08	1–2 times F07	After half or more observations S08		After half or more observations F07		After every observation S08	After every observation F07
0.7%		2.2%	2.4%	1.2%		11.9%		90.6%	84.5%
Question: Supervisor's oral and written feedback:									
Did not occur S08	Did not occur F07	Unsatisfactory S08	Unsatisfactory F07	Satisfactory S08	Satisfactory F07	Useful S08	Useful F07	Highly useful S08	Highly useful F07
0.7%		1.4%	2.4%	11.6%	8.3%	21%	19%	65.2%	70.2%
Question: 3-way conference with my supervisor and cooperating teacher:									
Never S08	Never F07	Once S08	Once F07	2-3 times S08	2–3 times F07	4 times S08	4 times F07	More than 4 times S08	More than 4 times F07
18.1 %	27.7%	20.3%	17.9%	25.4%	23.8%	10.1%	19.7%	24.6%	19.3%
Question: Overall supervision of my student teaching semester was:									
Very poor Sp 08	Very poor F07	Unsatisfactory S08	Unsatisfactory F07	Satisfactory S08	Satisfactory Fall 07	Useful S08	Useful F07	Highly useful S08	Highly useful F07
1.4%		2.2%	3.6%	10.9%	9.5%	21.7%	19%	63.8%	67.9%

Analysis and Actions

5. What do the data for each outcome say regarding candidate performance and program effectiveness? Please note particular areas of strength or areas in need of improvement.

We began the data analysis/discussion by looking at the types of data we currently collect and plan to collect in future semesters. We are currently satisfied with the data being collected and the data to be collected in future semester. We then turned our focus to each of the individual assessment items.

Pre/Post signature assignment for SLO 2: In past years, although all EDSS 473 instructors gave the signature assignment to students, instructors used a variety of rubrics and the assignment itself varied from class to class. Spring 08 was the first time all instructors used the same assignment with the same rubric for scoring assignments. Although the results show that the majority of students met SLO 2, the data is statistically insignificant. One important outcome from the data discussion was that the instructors were not trained in the use of the rubric and therefore data had to be read / interpreted with this in mind. To address this concern, the SSCP will hold a workshop for EDSS 437 instructors in the near future to share student work and to try to come to some agreement as to what a 4, 3, 2, and 1 score point should look like.

CalTPA analysis/discussion brought about similar concerns when analyzing data. Although the SSCP has been using the CalTPAs as low-stakes assignments in classes and all instructors used the associated rubric, since they were not yet high-stakes, each instructor used the assignment differently. Some instructors allowed students to work together, turn the assignment in, in part and rewrite sections after receiving feedback while others used the CalTPA as a mid-term or final with no editing or re-writing allowed. Once again, this makes the statistical analysis insignificant. One important outcome from the data discussion was that the semester that CalTPA 3 was used as a pilot for high-stakes TPAs (spring 08) and no longer counted for a class grade, the scores dropped significantly. It was suggested that the students knew the assignment would not count as either high-stakes or toward their grade so did not take the assessment as seriously as they did other assignments. There was also a concern stated about the percentage of students earning a non-passing score on CalTPA task 2. We plan to revisit the issue of CalTPA task 2 next year, once the TPA is high-stakes and being scores anonymously by trained, calibrated assessors.

We did not have the opportunity to discuss the TPE data in our October 2008 meeting. This data discussion was postponed until fall 09 however, the summary of strengths and weaknesses that will guide our discussion is presented below.

Table 18
Identified Strengths & Weaknesses of TPEs as Revealed in the Student Teaching Evaluations

A. Identified strengths of the TPEs as revealed in the Student Teaching Evaluations	**Based on student teaching evaluations**
F5: Exhibits dependability, initiative and enthusiasm (72% of University Supervisors and 69% of Cooperating Teachers rated our student teachers as Exceptional)	Student teaching evaluations
F1: Models ethical behaviors for students and maintains a positive, equitable and tolerant classroom environment (71% of University Supervisory and 63% of Cooperating Teachers rated our student teachers as Exceptional)	Student teaching evaluations
F4: Demonstrates strong self-esteem, flexibility and positive response to constructive feedback (67% of University Supervisors and 65% of Cooperating Teachers rated our student teachers as Exceptional)	Student teaching evaluations
B. Identified weaknesses of the TPEs as revealed in the student teaching evaluations	**Based on student teaching evaluations**
D 3: Designs unit and lesson plans that reflect long-term goals and are in alignment with state academic content standards (2% of University Supervisors and 1.5% of Cooperating Teachers rated our students as not being consistent with standard expectations for beginning practice)	Student teaching evaluations
D 8: Allocates instructional time to maximize student achievement in relation to instructional goals for state-adopted academic content standards, provides time to practice and apply learning (2% of University Supervisors and 1.5% of Cooperating Teachers rated our students as not being consistent with standard expectations for beginning practice)	Student teaching evaluations
D 1: Understands the purposes, strengths and limitations of a variety of instructional strategies: develops, sequences and modifies instructional activities and materials to maximize learning (2% of University Supervisors and .5% of Cooperating Teachers rated our students as not being consistent with standard expectations for beginning practice)	Student teaching evaluations

We were satisfied with the areas of strength in all CSU administered surveys, the Exit Survey, 1-Year Out Survey and the Employer Survey. All 3 surveys pointed out that our program needs improvement in the areas of working with English Learners and special needs students.

Table 19
Identified Strengths & Weaknesses as Revealed in the CSU Survey of Employers

A. Identified strengths as revealed in the CSU Survey of Employers	**Based on (survey, table, line, data)**
Know and understand the subjects of the curriculum at his/her grade level: 100% of supervisors felt that our graduates were well or adequately prepared	CSU Survey of Employers
Prepare lesson plans and make prior arrangements for class activities: 98% of supervisors felt that our graduates were well or adequately prepared	CSU Survey of Employers
Learn about students' interest and motivations and how to teach accordingly: 98% of supervisors felt that our graduates were well or adequately prepared Use computer-based technology in class activities and to keep class records: 98% of supervisors felt that our graduates were well or adequately prepared	CSU Survey of Employers
B. Identified weaknesses as revealed in the CSU Survey of Employers	**Based on (survey, table, line, data)**
Meet instructional needs of students with special learning needs: 77% of supervisors felt that our graduates were well or adequately prepared	CSU Survey of Employers
Communicate effectively with the parents or guardians of your students: 84% of supervisors felt that our graduates were well or adequately prepared	CSU Survey of Employers
Meet the instructional needs of students who are English Language Learners: 86% of supervisors felt that our graduates were well or adequately prepared Assess pupils progress by analyzing a variety of evidence including test scores: 86% of supervisors felt that our graduates were well or adequately prepared	CSU Survey of Employers

Table 20
Identified Strengths & Weaknesses as Revealed in the CSU Exit Survey of Student Teachers

A. Identified strengths as revealed in the CSU Exit Survey	**Based on (survey, table, line, data)**
Evaluate and reflect on my own teaching and to seek out assistance that leads to professional growth – 94% of students felt they were well or adequately prepared	CSU Exit Survey
Prepare lesson plans and make prior arrangements for students' class activities – 93% of students felt they were well or adequately prepared	CSU Exit Survey
Adhere to principles of education equity in the teaching of all students: 91% of students felt they were well or adequately prepared Use class time efficiently by relying on daily routines and planned transitions: 91% of students felt they were well or adequately prepared	CSU Exit Survey
B. Identified weaknesses as revealed in the CSU Exit Survey	**Based on (survey, table, line, data)**
To meet the instructional needs of student with special learning needs: 70% of students felt they were well or adequately prepared	CSU Exit Survey
Know about resources in the school & community for students and families: 70% of students felt they were well or adequately prepared	CSU Exit Survey
Meet the instructional needs of students who are English Language Learners: 71% of students felt they were well or adequately prepared	CSU Exit Survey

Table 21
Identified Strengths & Weaknesses as Revealed in the CSU Survey of Graduates in Their First Year of Teaching

A. Identified strengths as revealed in the CSU Survey of Graduates in their first year of teaching	**Based on (survey, table, line, data)**
Monitor students progress by using informal assessments methods: 86% of students felt they were well or adequately prepared	CSU 1-year out survey
Know and understand the subjects of the curriculum and her/his grade level: 88 % of students felt they were well or adequately prepared	CSU 1-year out survey
Prepare lesson plans and make prior arrangements for class activities: 84% of students felt they were well or adequately prepared	CSU 1-year out survey
B. Identified weaknesses as revealed in the CSU Survey of Graduates	**Based on (survey, table, line, data)**
Organize and manage student behavior and discipline satisfactorily: 58% of students felt they were well or adequately prepared	CSU 1-year out survey
Meet the instructional needs of students who are English language learners: 58% of students felt they were well or adequately prepared	CSU 1-year out survey
Meet the instructional needs of students with special learning needs: 65% of students felt they were well or adequately prepared	CSU 1-year out survey

6. How do these findings compare to past assessment findings regarding: a) candidate performance and, b) program effectiveness?

Our areas of strength and weakness have remained consistent over the past couple of years. This trend was the motivation behind writing a grant to improve our impact on candidates' ability to work with English Learners and our upcoming conversations related to our candidates' ability to work with students with special needs.

7. What steps, if any, will be taken with regard to curriculum, programs, practices, assessment processes, etc. based on these findings in Questions 5 and 6? Please link proposed changes to data discussed in Q5 and prioritize the action items.

To address the needs of English Learns, the SSCP is currently involved in a 5-year grant called STEELI. The STEELI grant is a 1.5 million dollar Title II grant from the US Department of Education. In summary, the grant is two fold: a professional development project for faculty from various colleges teaching courses in the Single Subject Credential Program and a curricular and instructional project for our pre-service candidates. The overarching and immediate goal of the project is to improve our teacher education faculty's and candidates' understanding of the academic needs of English Learners (EL), and their ability to model and implement instruction that supports English Learners' acquisition of language, literacy, and content. To date, 15 SSCP faculty have successfully completed the professional development and revised their syllabi and teaching to better address English Learners and 15 students have successfully completed the new course. Our hope is that over the next few years, students, 1-year out graduates and employers will report more satisfaction with students' preparation in the area of English Learners. It will, however, be several years before we will be able to see the results of our efforts in this area.

In Spring 09 we will begin to address our students' preparation to teach special needs students. We have invited a faculty representation from the department that teaches the Education of Exceptional Individuals course to speak with us in March, 2009. From there we will begin to develop an action plan for addressing this concern. This action plan aligns well with the IAP plan given to us by the chancellor's office.