College of Education and Affiliated Programs
Annual Assessment Report Template – Fall 2012

Multiple Subject Credential Program

Background

1. Describe your program (enrollment, number of faculty, general goals). Have there been any major changes since your last report?

The Multiple Subject Credential Program (MSCP) is based in the Department of Teacher Education in the College of Education at California State University, Long Beach. The program prepares candidates to be credentialed in California for elementary and middle school instruction, grades K-8. The Multiple Subject Credential Program has four tracks:

- Track 1: Preliminary Multiple Subject Credential Program
- Track 2: Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD)
- Emphasis in Spanish and Asian Languages
- Track 3: Multiple Subject Internship
- Track 4: Integrated Teacher Education Program (ITEP)

The Multiple Subject program reflects the mission of the College of Education to prepare educators for life-long learning, professional growth and social responsibility. Program goals are consistent with the vision of the Department of Teacher Education: to prepare knowledgeable, caring, reflective and highly competent teachers who are advocates for children, adolescents and families. Its inquiry-and experience-based program promotes education equity and excellence in contemporary, inclusive urban classrooms.

Objectives of the program include the following:

- prepare entry level teachers according to SB 2042 Teacher Performance Expectations
- prepare entry level teachers to use technology effectively in order to enhance instruction
- promote social responsibility and child advocacy among K-8 teachers
- collaborate with K-8 educators in order to promote school improvement

The program design is a spiraled curriculum combining content knowledge, pedagogy, and fieldwork based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. It guides candidates through practice
and mastery of 13 Teaching Performance Expectations over time, resulting in competent developing professional educators and reflective practitioners. The program’s Student Learning Outcomes are mapped to the Teaching Performance Expectations and are identified as follows:

- **Outcome 1**: (TPE 1) Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction
- **Outcome 2**: (TPE 2) Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction
- **Outcome 3**: (TPE 3) Interpretation and Use of Assessments
- **Outcome 4**: (TPE 4) Making Content Accessible
- **Outcome 5**: (TPE 5) Student Engagement
- **Outcome 6**: (TPE 6) Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices
- **Outcome 7**: (TPE 7) Teaching English Learners
- **Outcome 8**: (TPE 8) Learning about Students
- **Outcome 9**: (TPE 9) Instructional Planning
- **Outcome 10**: (TPE 10) Instructional Time
- **Outcome 11**: (TPE 11) Social Environment
- **Outcome 12**: (TPE 12) Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations
- **Outcome 13**: (TPE 13) Professional Growth
| Program Student (Candidate) Learning Outcomes and Relevant Standards |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SLOs | Outcome 1 | Outcome 2 | Outcome 3 | Outcome 4 | Outcome 5 | Outcome 6 | Outcome 7 | Outcome 8 | Outcome 9 | Outcome 10 | Outcome 11 | Outcome 12 | Outcome 13 |
| (TPE 1) Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction | (TPE 2) Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction | (TPE 3) Interpretation and Use of Assessments | (TPE 4) Making Content Accessible | (TPE 5) Student Engagement | (TPE 6) Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices | (TPE 7) Teaching English Learners | (TPE 8) Instructional Planning | (TPE 9) Instructional Time | (TPE 10) Social Environment | (TPE 11) Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations | (TPE 12) Professional Growth |
| State Standards | CSTP Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning | CSTP Assessing Student Learning | CSTP Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning | CSTP Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning | CSTP Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning | CSTP Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning | CSTP Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students | CSTP Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students | CSTP Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students | CSTP Creating and Maintaining Effective Environment for Student Learning | CSTP Developing as a Professional Educator | CSTP Developing as a Professional Educator |
| NCATE Elements | Professional Knowledge and Skills | Student Learning | Pedagogical Content Knowledge | Professional Knowledge and Skills | Professiona 1 Knowledge and Skills | Professiona 1 Knowledge and Skills | Professiona 1 Knowledge and Skills | Professiona 1 Knowledge and Skills | Professiona 1 Knowledge and Skills | Professional Knowledge and Skills | Professional Knowledge and Skills | Professional Dispositions | Professional Disposition |

1 Outcome 6 (TPE 6) was added to the assessment plan in 2009-2010.
Table 2
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2011-2012 (snapshot taken Su12) – Transition Point 1 (Admission to Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Applied</th>
<th>Number Accepted</th>
<th>Number Matriculated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2011-2012 (snapshot taken Su12) – Transition Point 2 (Advancement to Culminating Experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Subject Student Teaching</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2011-2012 (snapshot taken Su12) – Transition Point 3 (Exit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credential</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Faculty Profile 2011-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time TT/Lect.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Lecturer</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Data are reported Summer term through Spring term (e.g., Summer 2011-Spring 2012 for the 2011-12 academic year.)

2 Data for Initial and Advanced Credential Programs reflects students who have filed for their credential with the Credential Office. These data generally include students who have completed the program 1 or more years prior to filing their credential request, particularly related to the advanced credential programs. Data are reported for Summer 2011, Fall 2011, and Spring 2012.

3 Faculty numbers reflect headcounts of any faculty member teaching a course in the program for the prior academic year (Summer through Spring). Faculty who teach across multiple programs will be counted in each program.
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.

Sixteen full-time faculty participated in the data discussion on November 19, 2012 in preparation for this report.

Data

3. Question 3 is in 2 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.

Table 6
Program Student Learning Outcomes and Signature Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Description of the Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| EDEL 442: Developmental Spelling-Writing Assessment and Instruction | • SLO 3: (TPE 3) Interpretation and Use of Assessments  
• SLO 4: (TPE 4) Making Content Accessible  
• SLO 7: (TPE 7) Teaching English Learners | Candidates conduct assessments of developmental spelling of two students (one ELL and one student with special learning challenges. |
| EDEL 452: Case Study Report                     | • SLO 3: (TPE 3) Interpretation and Use of Assessments  
• SLO 5: (TPE 5) Student Engagement | Candidates write a case study report based on a variety of assessments that are conducted with a student. |
| EDEL 462: Lesson Plan                           | • SLO 2: (TPE 2) Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction  
• SLO 9: (TPE 9) Instructional Planning  
• SLO 10: (TPE 10): Instructional Time | Candidates identify content standards at a specific grade level and write academic learning goals that are connected with these standards. Candidates prepare a written lesson plan including instructional strategies and assessments. |
| EDEL 472: Standards-based summative assessment  | • SLO 1: (TPE 1) Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students  
• SLO 2: (TPE 2) Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction  
• SLO 6: (TPE 6) Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices  
• SLO 7: (TPE 7) Teaching | Candidates develop a standards-based summative assessment for a complete instructional unit. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCED 475: Science Lesson</th>
<th>English Learners</th>
<th>Candidates develop a standards-based science lesson in the 5E format.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SLO 1: (TPE 1) Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students</td>
<td>• SLO 1: (TPE 1) Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students</td>
<td>• SLO 4: (TPE 4) Making Content Accessible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Student Teaching Evaluations | SLO’s/TPE’s 1-13 | Candidates demonstrate their knowledge and application of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession through formative and summative evaluations of the student teaching experience by University Supervisors and Master Teachers. |

| EDEL 472: Teacher Performance Assessment #1: Subject Specific Pedagogy | SLO’s/TPE’s 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, & 9 | Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of the principles of content-specific and developmentally appropriate pedagogy by analyzing case studies and developing instructional strategies appropriate for English Learners and students with special needs. |

| Teacher Performance Assessment #2: Designing Instruction | SLO’s/TPE’s 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13 | Candidates demonstrate their ability to learn important details about a classroom of students, including English learners and students with special needs and to apply that knowledge to the design of appropriate instructional strategies. |

| Student Teaching: Teacher Performance Assessment #3: Assessing Learning | SLO’s/TPE’s 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, & 13 | Candidates demonstrate their ability to select a unit of study, identify related learning goals, and plan standards-based, developmentally appropriate student assessment activities for a group of students. |

| Student Teaching Teacher Performance Assessment #4: Culminating Teaching Experience Task | SLO’s 1-11 & 13 (TPE’s 1-11 & 13) | Candidates demonstrate their ability to design a standards-based lesson for a class of students, implementing that lesson while making appropriate use of class time and instructional resources, meeting the differing needs of individuals within the class, and managing instruction and student interaction. Candidates will also assess student learning related to the lesson and analyze the overall strengths and weaknesses of the lesson implementation. |
Outcome 1: (TPE 1) Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction

Figure 2
AY11-12 Criteria Score Means-SLO 1 SCED 475
Outcome 2: (TPE 2) Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction

Figure 3
AY11-12 Criteria Score Means-SLO 2 EDEL 462

Outcome 3: (TPE 3) Interpretation and Use of Assessments

Figure 4
AY11-12 Criteria Score Means-SLO 3 EDEL 442
Outcome 4: (TPE 4) Making Content Accessible

Figure 5
AY11-12 Criteria Score Means-SLO 3 EDEL 452

SLO 3 Rubric Criteria Score Means (0-4)
AY11-12
N=173 (EDEL 452)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Criterion 1</th>
<th>Criterion 2</th>
<th>Criterion 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description of Background Information</td>
<td>Identification of Reading Strengths</td>
<td>Identification of Reading Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome Rate:
- Criterion 1: 95.63%
- Criterion 2: 88.44%
- Criterion 3: 86.99%

Figure 6
AY11-12 Criteria Score Means-SLO 4 EDEL 442

SLO 4 Rubric Criteria Score Means (0-4)
AY11-12
N=190 (EDEL 442)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Criterion 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 2:
Recommended Strategies and Activities
83.31%
Outcome 5: (TPE 5) Student Engagement

Figure 7
AY11-12 Criteria Score Means-SLO 4 EDEL 475

![Bar Chart for SLO 4 Rubric Criteria Score Means (0-4)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4 Understanding and Use of the 5E Model</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>94.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5 Instructional Strategies and Materials</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>86.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 6 Level of Student Participation</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>90.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 7 Teacher Questioning to Monitor Student Progress</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>87.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8
AY11-12 Criteria Score Means-SLO 5 EDEL 452

![Bar Chart for SLO 5 Rubric Criteria Score Means (0-4)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4 Identification of Reading Content Standards</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>78.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5 Description of Instructional Strategies and Materials</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>87.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 6 Description of Student Participation and of Monitoring Student Progress</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>73.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome 6: (TPE 6) Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices

Figure 9
AY11-12 Criteria Score Means-SLO 6 EDEL 472

![SLO 6 Rubric Criteria Score Means (0-4) AY11-12 N=231 (EDEL 472)](image)

Criterion 1
Assessment Instruction as Presented to the Students
97.87%
Outcome 7: (TPE 7) Teaching English Learners

Figure 10
AY11-12 Criteria Score Means-SLO 7 EDEL 442

![SLO 7 Rubric Criteria Score Means (0-4) AY11-12 N=190 (EDEL 442)](chart1)

- Criterion 3
  - Reflection Demonstrates Insight and Understanding of Using Differentiated
  - 89.42%

Figure 11
AY11-12 Criteria Score Means-SLO 7 EDEL 472

![SLO 7 Rubric Criteria Score Means (0-4) AY11-12 N=231 (EDEL 472)](chart2)

- Criterion 2
  - Adaptations to the Assessment Plan to Meet Students’ Special Needs
  - 96.23%
Outcome 8: (TPE 8) Learning about Students

Figure 12
*AY11-12 Criteria Score Means-SLO 8 EDEL 462*

![Chart showing SLO 8 Rubric Criteria Score Means (0-4) for AY11-12 with N=241 (EDEL 462). Criterion 1: Student Academic Learning Goal(s) with a mean of 3.57 and 89.22%.]

Outcome 9: (TPE 9) Instructional Planning

Figure 13
*AY11-12 Criteria Score Means-SLO 9 EDEL 462*

![Chart showing SLO 9 Rubric Criteria Score Means (0-4) for AY11-12 with N=241 (EDEL 462). Criterion 2: Instructional Strategies and Learning Activities with a mean of 3.59 and 89.81%.]
### Table 7
**Summative Student Teaching Evaluations by Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor**
**Percent Proficient or Exceptional on CSTP Standards Fall 2011 Final Assignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSTP 1</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>1.3</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaging &amp; Supporting All Students in Learning</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96.44</td>
<td>98.98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTP 2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating &amp; Maintaining an Effective Environment</td>
<td>99.49</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>97.46</td>
<td>98.48</td>
<td>99.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTP 3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding &amp; Organizing Subject Matter Knowledge</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98.99</td>
<td>98.978</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTP 4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Instruction &amp; Designing Learning Experiences</td>
<td>98.48</td>
<td>99.49</td>
<td>99.49</td>
<td>97.97</td>
<td>92.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTP 5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Student Learning</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98.99</td>
<td>99.49</td>
<td>98.99</td>
<td>85.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTP 6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing as a Professional Educator</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8
**Summative Student Teaching Evaluations by Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor**
**Percent Proficient or Exceptional on CSTP Standards Spring 2012 Final Assignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSTP 1</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>1.3</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaging &amp; Supporting All Students in Learning</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTP 2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating &amp; Maintaining an Effective Environment</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTP 3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding &amp; Organizing Subject Matter Knowledge</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTP 4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Instruction &amp; Designing Learning Experiences</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTP 5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Student Learning</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTP 6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing as a Professional Educator</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching Performance Assessments (TPA's)

Table 9
Teaching Performance Assessment Data Spring 2011-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CalTPA Task</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent passing</th>
<th>Percent of Eligible Test Takers Non-Submitting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Figure 14
Composite A-1: Overall Effectiveness of Multiple Subject Credential Programs

![Composite A-1: Overall Effectiveness of Multiple Subject Credential Programs](image)

*Total number of test takers does not include non-submitters.*
Figure 15
Composite B-1: Preparation to Understand and Teach Reading-Language Arts

Figure 16
Composite B-2: Preparation to Understand and Teach Math
Figure 17
Composite C-1: Preparation to Plan Instruction for All Students and Subjects

Figure 18
Composite C-2: Preparation to Motivate Students to be Active Learners
Figure 19
Composite C-3: Preparation to Manage Instruction for Learning

Composite C-3: Preparation to Manage Instruction for Learning
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Figure 20
Composite C-4: Preparation to Use Technology Effectively

Composite C-4: Preparation to Use Technology Effectively
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Figure 21
Composite C-5: Preparation to Use Good Pedagogy Across the Curriculum

Figure 22
Composite C-6: Preparation to Assess and Reflect on K-12 Teaching
Figure 23
Composite D-1: Preparation for Equity and Diversity in K-12 Education

Figure 24
Composite D-2: Preparation to Teach Young Children in Grades K-3
Figure 25  
Composite D-3: Preparation to Teach Middle-grade Students in Grades 4-8

![Composite D-3 bar graph](image1)

Figure 26  
Composite D-5: Preparation to Teach English Learners in Grades K-12

![Composite D-5 bar graph](image2)
Figure 27
Composite D-7: Preparation to Teach Special Learners in Inclusive Schools

Figure 28
Composite E-1: Overall Value of CSU Professional Coursework in Education
Figure 29
Composite E-2: Overall Value and Quality of Fieldwork Experiences in Education

4. OPTIONAL: You may provide additional information (e.g., other data, copies of letters of support from granting agencies or school staff, etc.) about candidate performance, the student experience or program effectiveness used to inform programmatic decision making. This may include quantitative and qualitative data sources.

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.

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

Student data from signature assignments indicates that students generally perform well on these coursework embedded assessments. Mean scores on each of the areas range from 3.23 to 3.81 for the years analyzed. Candidates performed very well on:

- TPE/SLO 1: Specific Pedagogical Skill for Subject Matter Instruction – 3.81
- TPE/SLO2: Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction – 3.66
- TPE/SLO3: Interpretation and Use of Assessments -- 3.64
- TPE/SLO 7: Learning about Students – 3.65

Relative to these scores, students tended to score the lowest in the following TPE/SLO’s:

- TPE/SLO 5: Student Engagement – 3.19

Student Teaching Formative and Summative Evaluations

Summative student teaching evaluations were reviewed reflecting the percentage of candidates rated at Proficient Beginning Practice or Exceptional Beginning Practice at the end of each semester. Each score reflects an element of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and aggregate scores indicated that between 74.11% and 100% of candidates met the proficient rating or above. The most notable area of weakness as reflected in both semesters of data focuses on:

- CSTP 5.6: Using available technologies to assist in assessment, analysis, and communication of student learning (74.11% for the Fall Semester and 86% for the Spring Semester).

Teaching Performance Assessments

The vast majority of students pass all tasks with a score of 3 or 4, with the majority of failing scores in TPA Tasks 2 and 3(14% failure rate). Additionally, it is important to note that a higher percentage of candidates are choosing not to submit their TPAs, particularly those that are completed during student teaching.

Analysis of Program Effectiveness

The measures of program effectiveness utilized in this report include two years of data from the CSU Chancellor’s Office Survey. The survey measured perceived levels of preparation of former students after completing one year of teaching and the immediate supervisors/evaluators of 1st year teachers from CSULB.

Perceptions of Program Completers at the end of the First-year of Teaching

In general, program completers indicated at a minimum rate of 80% in each category that they felt well or adequately prepared by the Multiple Subject Credential Program to provide instruction in K-8 classrooms. Additionally, between the years 2009 and 2010, program completers indicated at a higher level than in previous survey administrations that they felt adequately or well prepared to motivate students to be active learners, and prepared to teach middle-grades students in grades 4-8. Program completers continued to feel a high level of preparedness to teach in a variety of subject areas, lesson planning, and assessment of student learning.
The most noted areas where former students indicated a lower level of preparedness than in previous survey administrations included preparation to include technology for instructional and management purposes, preparation for addressing equity and diversity in K-12 education, and strategies to meet the needs of English language learners.

Perceptions of Employers/Supervisors of 1st Year Teachers/Program Completers

Employers/supervisors indicated that 84% of program completers appeared to be well or adequately prepared to provide instruction in K-8 classrooms. The most noted areas of strength were preparedness to teach reading/language arts and non-core subject areas. Significant increases in satisfaction over previous survey administrations were seen in the following areas:

- motivating students to be active learners
- preparation to manage instruction for learning
- preparation to use technology effectively
- preparation to use good pedagogy across the curriculum
- preparation for equity and diversity in K-12 education
- preparation to teach middle grade students in grades 4-8
- preparation to teach English learners in grades K-12
- preparation to teach special learners in inclusive schools

In contrast to the survey data of program completers, employment supervisors expressed a significant increase in satisfaction with the ability of the Multiple Subject Credential program to prepare teachers during the 2010 survey administration. Most notably, this increased satisfaction was most dramatic in the areas of motivation, classroom management, preparation to teach middle grade students, and preparation to teach English learners and students with special needs, and technology. The most noted area of concern was preparation to understand and teach reading-language arts.

Summary of Data Analysis

Overall, a strong alignment across the data sources regarding strengths of the program exists. Data indicates the program is strong in developing pedagogical knowledge, enabling students to know and understand subjects of the curriculum at the grade level(s), and to prepare lesson plans and appropriate activities for instruction. Data also revealed the program is very strong in preparing candidates to adhere to principles of educational equity. These strengths successfully impact our student (candidate) learning outcomes. These strengths also demonstrate that the program adheres to the College of Education mission to prepare knowledgeable and highly competent teachers, while reflecting Multiple Subject Credential Program goals to prepare entry-level teachers according to SB 2042 Teaching Performance Expectations, as well as to promote social responsibility and child advocacy.

Summarizing program weaknesses was more challenging, due to discrepancies across the various data sources. Technology appears to be an area where teacher candidates have inconsistent preparation and access to the resources to implement strategies in the practicum experience.
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.

As a result of data discussions with the faculty of the Department of Teacher Education, the findings indicate that the program performs well in most measures of student performance and perceptions of program effectiveness. While there are several areas identified for program improvement, it has been determined that a focus on two specific areas receive priority over the next year. Triangulation of the data sources suggest that the student experience in the Multiple Subject Program would be enhanced by greater emphasis and preparation in the following areas:

- Meeting the instructional needs of students with special learning needs and English learners
- Using technology for assessment, and instructional and management purposes.

**Meeting the Instructional Needs of Students with Special Learning Needs and English Learners and Strategies to Enhance Student Engagement and Motivation**

Through data analysis of the student teaching formative evaluations and the CSU Systemwide Survey of Program Completers and Employers, it was determined that students need to develop more skills to support students with special learning needs and English learners, in addition to enhancing engagement and motivation for all students in the classroom. Faculty agree that a greater emphasis on differentiated instructional approaches throughout the program would support students in this area. The following plan will be implemented to improve student outcomes in this area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Action or Proposed Changes To Be Made</th>
<th>By Whom?</th>
<th>By When?</th>
<th>CTC Program Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching formative evaluations</td>
<td>Realign program curriculum from the pre-requisite stage through student teaching that provides students with a spiraled curriculum that revisits content and pedagogical strategies at increasing higher levels of understanding and application. Create a curriculum map that identifies where issues related to students with special needs, English learners, and motivation are covered in the program and how students demonstrate their learning in this area.</td>
<td>Teacher Education Department Chair</td>
<td>Spring, 2013</td>
<td>1, 6, 7-A, 8-A, 9, 12, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Systemwide Survey of Program Completers</td>
<td>Enhance instruction by highlighting specific strategies in each course, spiraled throughout the program. Additionally, refine field work assignments to allow for greater application of these strategies in real-world settings.</td>
<td>MSCP Coordinator &amp; Department Chair</td>
<td>Spring, 2013</td>
<td>1, 6, 7-A, 8-A, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Systemwide Survey of Employers</td>
<td>Create a recommended/required program course sequence that ensures that students complete their coursework and Teaching Performance Assessments in a manner that is conducive to a scaffolded learning experience.</td>
<td>MSCP Coordinator, Department Chair, Area Coordinators</td>
<td>Spring, 2013</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 16, 17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Align program assessment strategies to provide better formative feedback to program leadership</td>
<td>MSCP Coordinator, Department Chair</td>
<td>Spring, 2013</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 16, 17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>Action or Proposed Changes To Be Made</td>
<td>By Whom?</td>
<td>By When?</td>
<td>CTC Program Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in terms of candidate preparedness. This will require a review of the program’s signature assignments, Teaching Performance Assessments, and Student Teaching evaluation procedures; a mapping of each assessment and rubric to the program’s Student Learning Outcomes and Teaching Performance Expectations; mechanisms to review the assessment data by program track; and make recommendations for enhanced alignment of each measure.</td>
<td>Assessment Office, Program Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use of Technology to Support Instruction and Management**

Through data analysis of the student teaching evaluations, and the CSU Systemwide Survey of Program Completers and Employers, it was determined that students need to develop more strategies for implementing technology in their work, particularly in the areas of assessment and communication. Improving candidate readiness in this area will require collaboration between the program and the local school districts in terms of identifying specific resources at the local level. The following plan will be implemented to improve student outcomes in this area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Action or Proposed Changes To Be Made</th>
<th>By Whom?</th>
<th>By When?</th>
<th>CTC Program Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching Evaluations</td>
<td>Work with faculty to identify where these concepts and strategies are taught and assessed within the program.</td>
<td>MSCP Coordinator</td>
<td>Spring, 2013</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Systemwide Survey of Program Completers</td>
<td>Work with local school districts to identify the types of resources that are available for implementing technology for instruction and management</td>
<td>MSCP Coordinator</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Systemwide Survey of Employers</td>
<td>Implement a workshop for the student teacher professional development day that highlights technological resources for use in the classroom</td>
<td>MSCP Coordinator</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis and Actions

Names of Discussant(s):

Hong Nguyen, Celine Martinez, Dunleth Herrera, Xia Li, T. Jamie Yuen, Leslie Paule

Courses Focused on During the Discussion:

EUSM 700 + 471 431

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

1. Program (300)
   - Outcome 11: Social Environment
   - Outcome 12: Professional Development

1. Program 471 431
   - Outcome 5: 18, 11, 13, 11, 14
   - All taught in summer of 2011/12

2. How do these findings compare to past assessment findings?

EDU Z 200 + 471 431 → rethink these?

Believe that 200 E + 471 (200) could use feedback overhand of curriculum. Content to meet state standards should be in these but is not clearly delineated.

3. What steps, if any, will be taken with regard to curriculum, program practices, assessment processes?

431 + 300 not reflected in the data
Analysis and Actions

Names of Discussant(s):

Courses Focused on During the Discussion:

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

   These appear quite strong throughout the program. Technology probably needs some improvement but because the supervisors rate our students high in this area, the slight deficit isn't that great.

2. How do these findings compare to past assessment findings?

   It appears that they are going up. And I can assure that with some confidence because I used to be the one in charge of doing those assessments.

3. What steps, if any, will be taken with regard to curriculum, programs, practices, assessment processes?

   Keep on track, use should address technology a bit more.
Analysis and Actions

Names of Discussant(s):

Betina Hsieh, Tony Shin, Shely Xue

Courses Focused on During the Discussion:

201L 442 & 202L 452

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

442: Strengths:
(1) Formative and summative assessment
(2) Reflection

Needs: (3) Recommended strategies & contexts.

452: Strengths: (1) Background info.
(2) Identification of strengths
(3) Monitoring progress
(4) Identification of needs
(5) Strategies & materials.

2. How do these findings compare to past assessment findings?

452: Criterion 6 performance is consistent with the results of our last year.

3. Current Standards (We've put a weight on each criterion and this one receives a lower weight. Students may not want to spend time on locating the standards (even though it's easy to do so.)

4. What steps, if any, will be taken with regard to curriculum, programs, practices, assessment processes?

442 & 452: Pay more attention to helping teacher candidates to focus more on monitoring student performance.

(1) We'll do more in-class activities
(2) Be explicit about how to monitor student performance.
Analysis and Actions

Names of Discussant(s):

Courses Focused on During the Discussion:

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

2. How do these findings compare to past assessment findings?

3. What steps, if any, will be taken with regard to curriculum, programs, practices, assessment processes?

   Research TPEIs and Eigenvector Assignments side by side. We need to fill the void here to interpret the data. (Graph it online?) We could improve alignment.

   Assessing: Assessing learning goals.

   Learning about students.