

**APPENDIX B:**  
**Program Effectiveness Data**

## Evaluation File 2-B

### CSU Multiple-Subject Teacher Preparation Programs: Item-Specific Evidence of Effectiveness



- **Teacher Responses and Supervisor Responses to Evaluation Questions.**
- **All Multiple-Subject Credential Programs Combined.**
- **Focus on Campuswide Findings and Systemwide Findings in 2013.**
- **Percentages of Graduates Who Were Well- and Adequately-Prepared.**
- **Ns, Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Every Evaluation Question.**

**Systemwide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation  
Center for Teacher Quality  
The California State University  
2013**

**Table 1**

***General Concepts and Practices of Teaching: The Effectiveness of CSU Multiple Subject Teaching Credential Programs During 2011-12 as Evaluated in 2013 by the Employment Supervisors of the Programs' First-Year Teaching Graduates***

**(For Comparable Findings about Program Effectiveness During 2010-11, Please See Your 2012 File 2-B, Table 1.)**

<i>Evaluation Questions Answered by the K-8 Employment Supervisors of Teaching Graduates of CSU Multiple Subject Credential Programs:</i>		<b>This CSU Campus: Multiple Subject Programs</b>					<b>All CSU Campuses: Multiple Subject Programs</b>				
		(1) <i>N</i>	(2) Well or Adequately Prepared	(3) Somewhat or Not Prepared	(4) <b>Mean</b>	(5) <b>SD</b>	(6) <i>N</i>	(7) Well or Adequately Prepared	(8) Somewhat or Not Prepared	(9) <b>Mean</b>	(10) <b>SD</b>
1	... know and understand the subjects of the curriculum at her/his grade level.	14	86%	14%	2.57	.94	252	87%	13%	2.40	.74
2	... organize and manage a class or a group of pupils for instructional activities.	14	86%	14%	2.50	.76	249	80%	20%	2.31	.83
3	... organize and manage student behavior and discipline satisfactorily.	14	93%	7%	2.64	.63	247	77%	23%	2.25	.89
4	... prepare lesson plans and make prior arrangements for class activities.	14	93%	7%	2.57	.65	248	88%	12%	2.45	.70
5	... use an effective mix of teaching strategies and instructional activities.	13	92%	8%	2.54	.66	249	83%	17%	2.33	.77
6	... meet the instructional needs of students who are English language learners.	13	77%	23%	2.38	.87	237	80%	20%	2.15	.76
7	... meet the instructional needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds.	13	85%	15%	2.46	.78	241	82%	18%	2.25	.77
8	... meet the instructional needs of students with special learning needs.	13	92%	8%	2.46	.66	243	74%	26%	2.05	.81
9	... communicate effectively with the parents or guardians of his/her students.	13	85%	15%	2.38	.77	243	86%	14%	2.34	.73
10	... maintain positive rapport and foster students' motivation and excitement.	14	93%	7%	2.64	.63	249	89%	11%	2.47	.72
11	... think about problems that occur in teaching and try out various solutions.	11	91%	9%	2.64	.67	239	83%	17%	2.26	.77

**Table 2**

***General Concepts and Practices of Teaching: The Effectiveness of CSU Multiple Subject Teaching Credential Programs During 2011-12 as Evaluated in 2013 by the Employment Supervisors of the Programs' First-Year Teaching Graduates***

**(For Comparable Findings about Program Effectiveness During 2010-11, Please See Your 2012 File 2-B, Table 2.)**

<i>Evaluation Questions Answered in 2013 by the K-8 Employment Supervisors of Teaching Graduates of CSU Multiple Subject Credential Programs:</i>		<b>This CSU Campus: Multiple Subject Programs</b>					<b>All CSU Campuses: Multiple Subject Programs</b>				
		(1) <i>N</i>	(2) Well or Adequately Prepared	(3) Somewhat or Not Prepared	(4) Mean	(5) SD	(6) <i>N</i>	(7) Well or Adequately Prepared	(8) Somewhat or Not Prepared	(9) Mean	(10) SD
12	. . . understand child development, human learning and the purposes of schools.	13	92%	8%	2.46	.88	244	86%	14%	2.26	.72
13	. . . understand how personal, family & community conditions may affect learning.	13	92%	8%	2.62	.65	244	85%	15%	2.33	.73
14	. . . learn about students' interests and motivations, and how to teach accordingly.	13	92%	8%	2.54	.66	246	83%	17%	2.33	.78
15	. . . get students involved in engaging activities and to sustain on-task behavior.	13	100%	0%	2.69	.48	249	82%	18%	2.31	.82
16	. . . use computer-based applications to help students learn curriculum subjects.	12	92%	8%	2.67	.65	228	86%	14%	2.36	.73
17	. . . use computer-based technology in class activities and to keep class records.	12	92%	8%	2.67	.65	223	85%	15%	2.35	.77
18	. . . monitor student progress by using formal and informal assessment methods.	13	92%	8%	2.54	.66	248	84%	16%	2.27	.75
19	. . . assess pupil progress by analyzing a variety of evidence including test scores.	13	92%	8%	2.54	.66	243	84%	16%	2.26	.74
20	. . . assist individual students in areas of their instructional needs in reading/math.	12	92%	8%	2.58	.67	243	82%	18%	2.23	.74
21	. . . adjust teaching strategies so all pupils have chances to understand and learn.	13	85%	15%	2.54	.78	245	80%	20%	2.26	.81
22	. . . adhere to principles of educational equity in the teaching of all students.	13	92%	8%	2.62	.65	244	87%	13%	2.37	.72
23	. . . use class time efficiently by relying on daily routines and planned transitions.	11	91%	9%	2.55	.69	241	87%	13%	2.41	.73
24	. . . know about resources in the school & community for at-risk students/families.	10	80%	20%	2.40	.84	231	67%	33%	1.95	.84

**Table 3**

***General Concepts and Practices of Teaching: The Effectiveness of CSU Multiple Subject Teaching Credential Programs During 2011-12 as Evaluated by the Programs' First-Year Teaching Graduates in 2013 While They Taught in Grades K-8***

**(For Comparable Findings about Program Effectiveness During 2010-11, Please See Your 2012 File 2-B, Table 3.)**

<i>Evaluation Questions Answered in 2013 by Teachers in Grades K-8 Who Completed CSU Multiple Subject Credential Programs During 2011-12:</i>		<b>This CSU Campus: Multiple Subject Programs</b>					<b>All CSU Campuses: Multiple Subject Programs</b>				
		(1) <i>N</i>	(2) Well or Adequately Prepared	(3) Somewhat or Not Prepared	(4) Mean	(5) SD	(6) <i>N</i>	(7) Well or Adequately Prepared	(8) Somewhat or Not Prepared	(9) Mean	(10) SD
1	... know and understand the subjects of the curriculum at your grade level(s).	21	71%	29%	2.00	.77	452	75%	25%	2.09	.79
2	... organize and manage a class or a group of pupils for instructional activities.	21	62%	38%	1.90	.83	453	77%	23%	2.17	.83
3	... organize and manage student behavior and discipline satisfactorily.	21	43%	57%	1.52	.93	456	65%	35%	1.90	.92
4	... prepare lesson plans and make prior arrangements for class activities.	21	90%	10%	2.33	.66	452	86%	14%	2.37	.74
5	... use an effective mix of teaching strategies and instructional activities.	21	81%	19%	2.19	.75	452	82%	18%	2.22	.79
6	... meet the instructional needs of students who are English language learners.	21	76%	24%	2.10	.77	450	79%	21%	2.19	.81
7	... meet the instructional needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds.	20	75%	25%	2.10	.79	450	81%	19%	2.21	.79
8	... meet the instructional needs of students with special learning needs.	20	55%	45%	1.70	.86	444	58%	42%	1.75	.94
9	... communicate effectively with the parents or guardians of your students.	21	57%	43%	1.86	1.06	447	66%	34%	1.90	.96
10	... maintain positive rapport and foster students' motivation and excitement.	21	76%	24%	2.14	.79	454	83%	17%	2.25	.80
11	... think about problems that occur in teaching and try out various solutions.	21	62%	38%	1.86	.91	447	71%	29%	2.00	.88

**Table 4**

***General Concepts and Practices of Teaching: The Effectiveness of CSU Multiple Subject Teaching Credential Programs During 2011-12 as Evaluated by the Programs' First-Year Teaching Graduates in 2013 While They Taught in Grades K-8***

**(For Comparable Findings about Program Effectiveness During 2010-11, Please See Your 2012 File 2-B, Table 4.)**

<i>Evaluation Questions Answered in 2013 by Teachers in Grades K-8 Who Finished CSU Multiple Subject Credential Programs in 2011-12:</i>		<b>This CSU Campus: Multiple Subject Programs</b>					<b>All CSU Campuses: Multiple Subject Programs</b>				
		(1) <i>N</i>	(2) Well or Adequately Prepared	(3) Somewhat or Not Prepared	(4) Mean	(5) SD	(6) <i>N</i>	(7) Well or Adequately Prepared	(8) Somewhat or Not Prepared	(9) Mean	(10) SD
12	. . . understand child development, human learning & the purposes of schools.	21	71%	29%	1.90	.83	448	78%	22%	2.10	.84
13	. . . understand how personal, family & community conditions affect learning.	21	81%	19%	2.14	.73	454	81%	19%	2.22	.79
14	. . . learn about pupils' interests & motivations, and how to teach accordingly.	21	81%	19%	2.10	.70	455	82%	18%	2.21	.79
15	. . . get students involved in engaging activities and sustain on-task behavior.	21	71%	29%	1.95	.86	454	77%	23%	2.11	.83
16	. . . use computer-based applications so students learn curriculum subjects.	21	57%	43%	1.76	1.00	440	61%	39%	1.78	.98
17	. . . use computer-based technology in class activities and keep class records.	21	52%	48%	1.62	.92	440	57%	43%	1.71	1.03
18	. . . monitor student progress by using formal & informal assessment methods.	21	86%	14%	2.29	.85	450	80%	20%	2.20	.81
19	. . . assess pupil progress by analyzing varied evidence including exam scores.	21	76%	24%	2.10	.89	446	78%	22%	2.13	.83
20	. . . assist individual students in areas of instructional needs in reading/math.	21	81%	19%	2.14	.73	448	79%	21%	2.15	.81
21	. . . adjust teaching strategies so all pupils have chances to understand & learn.	21	71%	29%	2.14	.85	450	80%	20%	2.15	.81
22	. . . adhere to principles of educational equity in the teaching of all students.	21	86%	14%	2.14	.65	446	84%	16%	2.27	.77
23	. . . use class time efficiently by relying on daily routines and transitions.	21	71%	29%	2.00	.77	451	76%	24%	2.14	.84
24	. . . know about resources in the school and community for at-risk pupils.	21	43%	57%	1.52	.93	446	59%	41%	1.72	.96

Table 8

**CSU Coursework and Fieldwork in Learning to Teach: Value and Helpfulness of Multiple Subject Credential Programs When the Programs' 2011-12 Graduates Served as Multiple-Subject Classroom Teachers (Grades K-8) During 2012-13**

(For Comparable Findings about Program Effectiveness During 2010-11, Please See Your 2012 File 2-B, Table 8.)

<i>Questions Answered by Graduates of Multiple Subject Credential Programs:</i>	<b>This CSU Campus: Multiple Subject Programs</b>					<b>All CSU Campuses: Multiple Subject Programs</b>				
	(1) N	(2) Very or Somewhat Valuable	(3) A Little or Not Valuable	(4) Mean	(5) SD	(6) N	(7) Very or Somewhat Valuable	(8) A Little or Not Valuable	(9) Mean	(10) SD
<b>Based on your experience as a K-8 teacher this year, how valuable or helpful was coursework and fieldwork in your CSU credential program?</b>										
<b>A. How Valuable or Helpful was CSU Instruction in General Pedagogy?</b>										
1. Instruction in how children and adolescents grow and develop.	20	70%	30%	1.75	.72	403	77%	23%	2.09	.87
2. Instruction in the implications of human learning and motivation.	20	65%	35%	1.85	.75	415	79%	21%	2.18	.86
3. Instruction in school purposes, organization, issues and history.	19	47%	53%	1.42	.90	416	71%	29%	1.94	.89
4. Instruction in methods of classroom teaching and management.	19	79%	21%	2.37	.83	423	88%	12%	2.48	.77
5. Instruction in the teaching of English language learners (ELL).	20	85%	15%	2.35	.75	426	90%	10%	2.53	.70
6. Instruction in cultural diversity and multicultural education.	20	90%	10%	2.25	.79	425	87%	13%	2.39	.80
7. Instruction in teaching students with special learning needs.	20	85%	15%	2.20	.70	419	80%	20%	2.19	.85
8. Instruction in ways to communicate effectively with parents.	19	58%	42%	1.74	.73	412	73%	27%	2.05	.93
9. Instruction in ways to reflect on and improve my teaching practices.	20	85%	15%	2.20	.83	417	88%	12%	2.53	.73
<b>B. How Valuable or Helpful Were Fieldwork Assignments in CSU Programs?</b>										
<b>10. Your supervised teaching experiences in K-12 schools.</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>.68</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>.59</b>
11. Your school visits and observations prior to supervised teaching.	20	60%	40%	2.05	.94	410	83%	17%	2.36	.85
12. Off-campus fieldwork assignments in my reading methods class.	20	60%	40%	1.65	1.18	361	78%	22%	2.13	.93
<b>13. Guidance and assistance provided by field supervisor(s) from the CSU.</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>.95</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>.80</b>
<b>14. Guidance and assistance provided by supervising teacher(s) in K-12 schools.</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>.75</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>2.66</b>	<b>.69</b>
<b>C. How Valuable or Helpful Was CSU Instruction in K-8 Subject Pedagogy</b>										
15. Instruction in the <i>teaching</i> of reading-language arts in grades K-8.	20	85%	15%	2.45	.76	419	91%	9%	2.50	.72
16. Instruction in the <i>teaching</i> of mathematics in grades K-8.	20	65%	35%	1.85	1.18	418	89%	11%	2.47	.76
17. Instruction in the <i>teaching</i> of science in grades K-8.	20	90%	10%	2.50	.69	414	85%	15%	2.33	.80
18. Instruction in the <i>teaching</i> of history-social studies in grades K-8.	20	85%	15%	2.40	.75	415	79%	21%	2.21	.88
19. Instruction in the <i>teaching</i> of art, music, drama, and/or dance K-8.	17	59%	41%	1.76	1.03	386	66%	34%	1.91	1.00
20. Instruction in the <i>teaching</i> of physical education in grades K-8.	20	65%	35%	1.95	.94	384	62%	38%	1.87	.99