



COMMISSION ON
TEACHER CREDENTIALING
Ensuring Educator Excellence

**Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report**
(For Institutions in the Yellow, Blue, and Violet Cohort Due Summer/Fall 2012)
Academic Years 2010-11 and 2011-12

| | |
|---|---|
| Institution | California State University, Fresno |
| Date report is submitted | August 1, 2012 |
| Program documented in this report | Multiple Subject |
| Name of Program | Kremen School of Education and Human Development |
| Please identify all delivery options through which this program is offered (Traditional, Intern, Other) | Multiple Subject: General Multiple Subject: Dual Early Childhood Internship |
| Is this program offered at more than one site? Yes | |
| If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered | California State University, Fresno (campus) Partnership Schools Early Childhood College of the Sequoias |
| Program Contact | Lisa M. Nyberg, Ph.D. |
| Title | Professor and Multiple Subject Coordinator |
| Phone # | 559.278.0236 |
| E-Mail | lnyberg@csufresno.edu |
| If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below: | |
| Name | |
| Title | |
| Phone # | |
| E-mail | |

Biennial Report: Purpose and Process for Review

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART I – Contextual Information

California State University, Fresno is one of twenty-three universities in the California State University system. Fresno State began as a normal school in 1911 and has a strong history of service and preparation of education professionals. The Dean of the Kremen School of Education and Human Development is the Unit Head that oversees sixteen programs. The Multiple Subject Program prepares teacher candidates for service as elementary teachers (primarily grades K-6). Our last joint accreditation (NCATE/CCTC) visit was in March 2006.

The Multiple Subject Credential Program consists of twenty-four units in teacher education courses and thirteen units of fieldwork completed in three phases/semesters. The Multiple Subject Credential Program is based on a clearly stated rationale that requires candidates to complete foundation classes and content-specific methods coursework while concurrently practicing the application of these concepts and teaching skills in field placement settings.

Candidates are expected to apply the theoretical and scholarly concepts, knowledge, and teaching skills in planning and implementing effective and appropriate lessons and units of study. The program provides extensive opportunities for candidates to learn to teach using the state adopted K-12 academic content standards with all students. Fieldwork placements are made in diverse settings including many high need, urban schools. Program cohort options include: university site-based, partnership school site-based, early childhood emphasis, and College of the Sequoias. We also offer a Dual program (earning both Multiple Subject and Education Specialist credentials) and an internship program.

Program Specific Candidate Information

| Academic Year | Admitted | Completers |
|---------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| 2010-2011 | 171 | 163 |
| 2011-2012 | 153 | 130 (reported July 3, 2012) |

Changes Since Commission Approval of Current Program Document

Date

Strengthened Methods of Teaching English Learners

2010-2012

Participated in CSU wide *English Learner* webinar coordinated by dean.
LEE 172 professors added English Learner resources to course.
LEE 172 professors enhanced emphasis on content reading and strategies to support literacy.

Strengthened Methods of Teaching Students with Special Needs

2010-2012

Participated in CSU wide *Students with Special Needs* webinar coordinated by dean.
SPED 179 professors have added new assignments related to EDI and PLCs.

Strengthened Methods of Teaching Resources for At-Risk Students 2011-2012
 Data indicated we met the chancellor’s goal of 85% satisfaction of supervisors.

Strengthened Methods of Teaching Social Studies 2010-2012
 Revised LEE 173 Syllabus

Strengthened Applied Technology 2012
 CI 100 course: **Educational Applications of Technology** was added as a pre/co-requisite to the program.

Enhanced university/school district partnerships:

| | |
|-----------------|-----------|
| Central Unified | 2010 |
| Sanger Unified | 2011/2012 |
| Clovis Unified | 2011 |

PART II – Candidate Competence and Program Effectiveness Data

a. Primary candidate assessments the program uses to and through recommending the candidate for the credential:

Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST)

| Instrument | Description | When Given |
|--|---|-------------------|
| Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project (TPEs 1 [ELA], 6B, 7, 8, 9) | This task assesses the candidate’s ability to analyze a lesson plan designed for all students in a classroom with a significant number of English learners. This is an on-demand written assessment. | Phase 1 |
| Site Visitation Project (TPEs 1 [ELA], 2, 4, 5, 11, 13) | This task assesses the candidate’s ability to plan, implement, and reflect upon instruction. This is a field-based performance assessment. | Phase 2 |
| Teaching Sample Project (TPEs 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13) | This task assesses the candidate’s ability to plan and teach a one to four week unit, and to document their teaching and their students’ learning. This is a field-based comprehensive, written assessment. | Phase 3 |
| Holistic Proficiency Project (TPEs 1 [H-SS, Math, Science], 3,5,6, 10, 12] | This task assesses the candidate’s ability to perform, document, and reflect upon teaching responsibilities over an entire semester. This is a comprehensive, field-based performance assessment. | Phase 3 |

The Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) is a TPA system approved by CCTC (2008) and specifically designed for use by California State University, Fresno, teacher candidates. The

Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) are taught in the coursework and applied and practiced in the coursework and fieldwork. The FAST includes the four tasks listed above.

b. Additional information collected on completer performance and program effectiveness:

| Instrument | Description | When Given |
|--|---|---------------------------|
| CSU System-wide Evaluation: Chancellor’s Survey: Employer’s Assessment | This survey is given to employers who supervise the teaching graduates to assess program effectiveness. | One year after graduation |

c. Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) Distribution Tables:

Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project

| TPE | Scoring | Fall 10 | Spr 11 | Fall 11 | Spr12 |
|------|---------|---------|--------|---------|-------|
| ELA1 | N | 109 | 67 | 98 | 49 |
| | Mode | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 14.7 | 10.4 | 11.2 | 8.2 |
| | 2s (%) | 43.1 | 59.7 | 33.7 | 42.9 |
| | 3s (%) | 40.4 | 26.9 | 48.0 | 46.9 |
| | 4s (%) | 1.8 | 3.0 | 7.1 | 2.0 |
| 6b | N | 109 | 67 | 98 | 49 |
| | Mode | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| | Median | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 5.5 | 10.4 | 4.1 | 4.1 |
| | 2s (%) | 49.5 | 49.3 | 48.0 | 38.8 |
| | 3s (%) | 36.7 | 38.8 | 48.0 | 57.1 |
| | 4s (%) | 8.3 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | N | 109 | 67 | 98 | 49 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 1.8 | 4.5 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| | 2s (%) | 36.7 | 38.8 | 44.9 | 42.9 |
| | 3s (%) | 58.7 | 52.2 | 51.0 | 51.0 |
| | 4s (%) | 2.8 | 4.5 | 3.1 | 4.1 |
| 8 | N | 109 | 67 | 98 | 49 |
| | Mode | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | Median | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 6.4 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| | 2s (%) | 55.0 | 58.2 | 65.3 | 65.3 |
| | 3s (%) | 32.1 | 34.3 | 27.6 | 32.7 |
| | 4s (%) | 6.4 | 1.5 | 5.1 | 0 |
| 9 | N | 109 | 67 | 98 | 49 |
| | Mode | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | Median | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 1.8 | 7.5 | 3.1 | 18.4 |
| | 2s (%) | 74.3 | 68.7 | 51.0 | 59.2 |
| | 3s (%) | 21.1 | 22.4 | 41.8 | 22.4 |
| | 4s (%) | 2.8 | 1.5 | 4.1 | 0 |

Site Visitation Project

| TPE | Scoring | Fall 10 | Spr 11 | Fall 11 | Spr 12 |
|-----|---------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| 1 | N | 79 | 90 | 82 | 75 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 0 | 0 | 6.1 | 1.3 |
| | 2s (%) | 15.2 | 21.0 | 34.1 | 30.7 |
| | 3s (%) | 68.4 | 70.0 | 45.1 | 62.7 |
| | 4s (%) | 16.5 | 8.9 | 14.6 | 5.3 |
| 2 | N | 79 | 90 | 82 | 75 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 0 | 0 | 3.7 | 0 |
| | 2s (%) | 26.6 | 27.8 | 36.6 | 41.3 |
| | 3s (%) | 65.8 | 65.6 | 43.98 | 54.7 |
| | 4s (%) | 7.6 | 6.7 | 15.9 | 4.0 |
| 4 | N | 79 | 90 | 82 | 75 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 0 | 1.1 | 3.7 | 1.3 |
| | 2s (%) | 22.8 | 20.0 | 36.6 | 32.0 |
| | 3s (%) | 59.5 | 64.4 | 46.3 | 53.3 |
| | 4s (%) | 17.7 | 14.4 | 13.4 | 13.3 |
| 5 | N | 79 | 90 | 82 | 75 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 1.3 | 2.2 | 4.9 | 0 |
| | 2s (%) | 27.8 | 38.9 | 26.8 | 46.7 |
| | 3s (%) | 69.6 | 56.7 | 51.2 | 45.3 |
| | 4s (%) | 1.3 | 2.2 | 17.1 | 8.0 |
| 11 | N | 79 | 90 | 82 | 75 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 0 | 1.1 | 3.7 | 0 |
| | 2s (%) | 25.3 | 28.9 | 32.9 | 37.3 |
| | 3s (%) | 67.1 | 63.3 | 56.1 | 50.7 |
| | 4s (%) | 7.6 | 6.7 | 7.3 | 12.0 |
| 13 | N | 79 | 90 | 82 | 75 |
| | Mode | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 0 | 0 | 6.1 | 1.3 |
| | 2s (%) | 20.3 | 21.1 | 31.7 | 32.0 |
| | 3s (%) | 36.7 | 62.2 | 37.8 | 57.3 |
| | 4s (%) | 43.0 | 16.7 | 24.4 | 9.3 |

Teaching Sample Project

| TPE | Scoring | Fall 10 | Spr 11 | Fall 11 | Spr 12 |
|-------|---------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| 10,11 | N | 106 | 80 | 80 | 79 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 0 | 2.5 | 0 | 1.3 |
| | 2s (%) | 16.0 | 21.3 | 17.5 | 19.0 |
| | 3s (%) | 72.6 | 61.3 | 63.8 | 73.4 |
| | 4s (%) | 11.3 | 15.0 | 18.8 | 6.3 |
| 1,9 | N | 106 | 80 | 80 | 79 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 0 | 0 | 1.3 | 0 |
| | 2s (%) | 22.6 | 41.3 | 31.3 | 46.85 |
| | 3s (%) | 67.9 | 47.5 | 61.3 | 50.6 |
| | 4s (%) | 9.4 | 11.3 | 6.3 | 2.5 |
| 2,3 | N | 106 | 80 | 80 | 79 |
| | Mode | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0 |
| | 2s (%) | 26.4 | 35.0 | 46.3 | 40.5 |
| | 3s (%) | 65.1 | 53.8 | 45.0 | 54.4 |
| | 4s (%) | 8.5 | 8.8 | 7.5 | 5.1 |
| 7,8,9 | N | 106 | 80 | 80 | 79 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 0 | 1.3 | 0 | 0 |
| | 2s (%) | 20.8 | 26.3 | 31.3 | 35.4 |
| | 3s (%) | 60.4 | 53.8 | 48.8 | 50.6 |
| | 4s (%) | 18.9 | 18.8 | 20.0 | 13.9 |
| 2-4,9 | N | 106 | 80 | 80 | 79 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | .9 | 0 | 1.3 | 0 |
| | 2s (%) | 15.1 | 35.0 | 22.5 | 30.4 |
| | 3s (%) | 73.6 | 50.0 | 57.5 | 59.5 |
| | 4s (%) | 10.4 | 15.0 | 18.8 | 10.1 |
| 3,12 | N | 106 | 80 | 80 | 79 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 0 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 0 |
| | 2s (%) | 15.1 | 22.5 | 30.0 | 30.4 |
| | 3s (%) | 66.0 | 61.3 | 53.8 | 54.4 |
| | 4s (%) | 18.9 | 13.8 | 15.0 | 15.2 |
| 12,13 | N | 106 | 80 | 80 | 79 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0 |
| | 2s (%) | 20.8 | 30.0 | 31.3 | 36.7 |
| | 3s (%) | 66.0 | 53.8 | 45.0 | 53.2 |
| | 4s (%) | 13.2 | 15.0 | 22.5 | 10.1 |

Holistic Proficiency Project

| TPE | Scoring | Fall 10 | Spr 11 | Fall 11 | Spr 12 |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| 1 Math | N | 108 | 80 | 82 | 77 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.3 |
| | 2s (%) | 9.3 | 10.0 | 22.0 | 18.2 |
| | 3s (%) | 61.1 | 47.5 | 62.2 | 58.4 |
| | 4s (%) | 29.6 | 42.5 | 15.9 | 22.1 |
| 1 Science | N | 108 | 80 | 82 | 77 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 0 | 0 | 1.2 | 2.6 |
| | 2s (%) | 8.3 | 13.8 | 22.0 | 19.5 |
| | 3s (%) | 63.0 | 52.5 | 65.9 | 62.3 |
| | 4s (%) | 28.7 | 33.8 | 11.0 | 15.6 |
| 1 History/Social Science | N | 108 | 80 | 82 | 77 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 0 | 0 | 1.2 | 2.6 |
| | 2s (%) | 13.9 | 15.0 | 24.4 | 19.5 |
| | 3s (%) | 60.2 | 47.5 | 54.9 | 57.1 |
| | 4s (%) | 25.9 | 37.5 | 19.5 | 20.8 |
| 3 | N | 108 | 80 | 82 | 77 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | .9 | 0 | 2.4 | 1.3 |
| | 2s (%) | 12.0 | 11.3 | 35.4 | 20.8 |
| | 3s (%) | 50.9 | 62.5 | 51.2 | 53.2 |
| | 4s (%) | 36.1 | 26.3 | 11.0 | 24.7 |
| 5 | N | 108 | 80 | 82 | 77 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | .5 | 0 | 0 | 2.6 |
| | 2s (%) | 10.2 | 7.5 | 24.4 | 9.1 |
| | 3s (%) | 54.6 | 57.5 | 64.6 | 68.8 |
| | 4s (%) | 34.3 | 35.0 | 11.0 | 19.5 |
| 6a | N | 108 | 80 | 82 | 77 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | .9 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 1.3 |
| | 2s (%) | 7.4 | 6.3 | 29.3 | 13.0 |
| | 3s (%) | 63.9 | 47.5 | 46.3 | 66.2 |
| | 4s (%) | 27.8 | 43.8 | 23.2 | 19.5 |
| 10 | N | 108 | 80 | 82 | 77 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 0 | 1.3 | 0 | 1.3 |
| | 2s (%) | 10.2 | 13.8 | 28.0 | 13.0 |
| | 3s (%) | 62.0 | 56.3 | 54.9 | 67.5 |
| | 4s (%) | 27.8 | 28.8 | 17.1 | 18.2 |
| 12 | N | 108 | 80 | 82 | 77 |
| | Mode | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| | 1s (%) | 1.9 | 3.8 | 601 | 6.5 |
| | 2s (%) | 9.3 | 15.0 | 20.7 | 22.1 |
| | 3s (%) | 60.2 | 43.8 | 56.1 | 51.9 |
| | 4s (%) | 28.7 | 37.5 | 17.1 | 19.5 |

Number of Assessors: The total number of assessors the program uses and the number of assessors who scored in the years for which the biennial report data is being submitted.

56 Total Assessors during the Fall, 2010 – Spring, 2012, period.

Assessor Initial Training and Recalibration: The number of assessors who successfully completed initial training and the number who recalibrated for the applicable biennial report years.

12 Assessors who had their initial training during the Fall, 2010 – Spring, 2012, period.

40 Assessors were recalibrated during the Fall, 2010 – Spring, 2012 period.

Data on Reliability Related to Double Scoring (% of score agreement):

There are data reported here for Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project, the Site Visitation, the Holistic Proficiency Project, and the Teaching Sample Project for the Multiple Subject Program for Fall, 2010, Spring, 2011, and Fall, 2011, Spring 2012. For each component of the student's work, there are four possible scores ranging from 1, which is a fail (does not meet expectations), to 4 (exceeds expectations). A "1" indicates that before continuing the student must repeat the particular component until a passing score of 2, 3, or 4 is achieved. The initial question in this report is of the technical quality of the data.

Inter-rater Reliability:

A sample of the projects completed by the Multiple Subject students was scored a second time in order to determine inter-rater reliability. The numbers of projects involved in each case and the double-scoring results are as follows for the four semesters from Fall 2010 to Spring 2012:

a. Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project

42 projects were double-scored, with 5 TPE categories.

Number of decisions by each scorer = 210

Number of exact agreements: 174, which are 82.9%

Number of disagreements over whether the student passed: 9 (4.3%)

Number of disagreements by more than 1 point: 0

b. Site Visitation Project

20 projects were double-scored, with 5 TPE categories.

Number of decisions by each scorer = 120

Number of exact agreements: 93, which are 77.5%

Number of disagreements over whether the student passed: 4 (3.3%)

Number of disagreements by more than 1 point: 8 (6.7%)

c. Holistic Lesson Plan Project

23 of the projects were double-scored, with 8 TPEs on each.

Number of decisions by each scorer = 184

Number of exact agreements: 132, which are 72.7%

Number of disagreements over whether the student passed: 2 (1%)

Number of disagreements by more than 1 point: 0

d. Teaching Sample Project

39 of the projects were double-scored, with 7 TPE categories.

Number of decisions by each scorer = 273

Number of exact agreements: 143, which are 52.4%

Number of disagreements over whether the student passed: 0

Number of disagreements by more than 1 point: 8 (2.9%)

By way of summary, those scoring the Multiple Subject projects made 787 decisions. There were just 15 instances (1.9%) in which scorers disagreed about whether the student had passed a particular TPE. Just 26 (3.3%) of the disagreements were by more than 1 point on the 1-4 range. The scoring reliability for F.A.S.T. projects continues to be very good.

Modifications made to assessor selection, training, and recalibration.

(May also be addressed in Section A, Part IV)

The FAST system was approved to have recalibration every two years. We are now recalibrating every year.

PART III – Analyses and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST)

The review of the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 FAST data is very positive. The FAST scores include four levels: 1: Does not meet expectations; 2: Meets expectations; 3: Meets expectations at a high level; and, 4: Exceeds expectations. The median scores for all of the assessments are “2” and “3.”

Teacher candidates are “meeting expectations” or “meeting expectations at a high level” on all the TPEs as determined by this CCTC approved instrument. Comments regarding strengths and weakness are relative considering the documented success of the teacher candidates to meet the expectations of performance as specified by the CCTC.

Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project (CLPP)

This is an on-demand written assessment.

Strengths:

Reading-Language Arts (TPE 1A)

Teaching English Learners (TPE 7)

Weaknesses:

Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices in Grades 4-8 (TPE 6B)

Learning about Students (TPE 8)

Discussion:

Teacher candidates are in the first phase of their program. All of the instructional content and practice is new. The median scores are split between “2s” and “3s.” Developmentally these teacher candidates appear to be performing as expected considering it is their first

semester/phase and their initial field opportunity this semester is approximately six contact hours per week.

Assessment of strengths and weaknesses of this instrument is relative because teacher candidates are “meeting expectations” or “meeting expectations at a high level” according to the standards of this CCTC approved assessment. Relative strengths include TPE 1A and TPE 7. There has been a concentrated program focus on Teaching English Learners (TPE 7) and there is a heavy emphasis on competencies in reading-language arts (TPE 1A).

The relative weaknesses listed above with TPE 6B and TPE 8 may be a reflection of the limited student contact time the teacher candidates have in this first phase/semester of the program. They may not have had as many opportunities to learn about their students and apply appropriate teaching practices with them.

Site Visitation Project (SVP)

This is a field-based performance assessment.

Strengths:

Reading-Language Arts (TPE 1A)
Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction (TPE 2)
Making Content Accessible (TPE 4)
Student Engagement (TPE 5)
Social Environment (TPE 11)
Professional Growth (TPA 13)

Weaknesses:

None

Discussion:

Teacher candidates are in the second phase of their program. In this phase teacher candidates have many more opportunities to practice theories presented in class. This is also the second phase where academic language and pedagogy presented during the first phase are reinforced. Teacher candidates get an opportunity to have more extensive fieldwork contact: approximately twelve hours a week. The median scores are “3s: meets expectations at a high level” for all TPEs. This is encouraging because teacher candidates have an opportunity to put the theory into practice during their fieldwork with students.

Assessment of strengths and weaknesses of this instrument is relative because teacher candidates are “meeting expectations at a high level” according to the standards of this CCTC approved assessment. In this second phase/semester teacher candidates are involved in their second reading methods course that reinforces concepts learned in the first phase/semester. Teacher candidates are also given opportunities for reflection in their courses and TPA that would support professional growth.

Teacher Sample Project (TSP)

This is a comprehensive, written assessment.

Strengths:

Instructional Time (TPE 10)
Social Environment (TPE 11)

Weaknesses:

Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction (TPE 2)
Interpretation and Use of Assessments (TPE 3)

Discussion:

Teacher candidates are in the third and final phase of their program. Teacher candidates teach all day/every day. In this phase teacher candidates have many more opportunities to practice theories presented in class. Teacher candidates systematically assume the responsibility of the class until they independently teach for a minimum of two weeks and then the teaching responsibility is gradually transferred back to the master teacher.

The median scores for all TPEs are “3s: meets expectations at a high level.” This is encouraging because teacher candidates have an opportunity build on the instruction and fieldwork of the previous two semesters.

Assessment of strengths and weaknesses of this instrument is relative because teacher candidates are “meeting expectations at a high level” on all TPEs according to the standards of this CCTC approved assessment. Relative strengths include: Instructional Time (TPE 10) and Social Environment (TPE 11). Teacher candidates are demonstrating that with additional practice during their final student teaching semester they are learning to allocate instructional time to maximize student achievement and develop a classroom management plan.

The relative weaknesses listed above includes TPE 2: Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction and TPE 3: Interpretation and Use of Assessments. These relative weaknesses may reflect a stronger performance with developing plans and procedures for instruction as reflected above (TPE 10 and TPE 11). TPE 2 and TPE 3 require a higher level of analysis and evaluation. Again, these are relative weaknesses, because teacher candidates are performing with a median score of “3: meets expectations at a high level” on all of the TPEs of this assessment.

Holistic Proficiency Project (HPP)

This is a comprehensive, field-based performance assessment.

Strengths:

TPE 1: Math
TPE 5: Student Engagement
TPE 6A: Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices

Weaknesses:

TPE 3: Interpretation and Use of Assessments
TPE 12: Professional, Legal and Ethical Obligations

Discussion:

Teacher candidates are in the third and final phase of their program. Teacher candidates teach all day/every day with a co-teaching model of instruction. In this phase teacher candidates have many more opportunities to practice theories presented in class. Teacher candidates systematically assume the responsibility of the class until they assume full responsibility for planning and implementation of the plan for a minimum of two weeks and then the teaching responsibility is gradually transferred back to the master teacher.

The median scores are “3s: meets expectations at a high level” for all TPEs. This is encouraging because teacher candidates have an opportunity build on the instruction and fieldwork of the previous two semesters.

Assessment of strengths and weaknesses of this instrument is relative because teacher candidates are “meeting expectations at a high level” on all TPEs according to the standards of this CCTC approved assessment. Relative strengths include: TPE 1: Math, TPE 5: Student Engagement, and TPE 6A: Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices. Teacher candidates are demonstrating strengths in their performance of student engagement with developmentally appropriate teaching practices and in the area of teaching mathematics.

The relative weakness listed above includes: TPE 3: Interpretation and Use of Assessments and TPE 12: Professional, Legal and Ethical Obligations Again, these are relative weaknesses, because teacher candidates are performing with a median score of “3: meets expectations at a high level” on all of the TPEs of this assessment.

Chancellor’s Report: Employers Survey

This is a survey given to supervisors of program graduates one year after graduation to determine program effectiveness.

Strengths:

(Score: 85% or above: Well or Adequately Prepared)

Plan Instruction

Use of Educational Technology

Pedagogical Practices Across the Curriculum

Teach Young Children (K-3)

Teach Middle Grade Pupils (4-8)

Teach English Learners

Resources for At-Risk Students

Weaknesses:

The CSU Deans of Education identified the areas of improvement.

Teaching Strategies for Students with Special Needs in Inclusive Settings

Teaching of History/Social Science to California Standards

Resources for At-Risk Students (The goal of 85% supervisor satisfaction has been met.)

Instruction of English Learners (The goal of 85% supervisor satisfaction has been met.)

Discussion:

The Chancellor’s survey strengths identified by employers present a program graduate who: knows how to plan instruction, how to use educational technology, how to demonstrate pedagogical practices across the curriculum, how to teach young children (K-3) and middle grade pupils (4-8), how to teach English learners, and how to identify resources for at-risk students.

The focal areas of weaknesses (as identified by the CSU deans) have received specific action plan items as defined by our Improvement and Accountability Plan (IAP). As a result our program has met the goals of identifying resources for at-risk students and provide instruction for English learners. We are continuing to develop our teaching strategies for students with special needs and our teaching of history/social science to California Standards.

PART IV – Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

Assessment results are used to improve candidate and program performance in many different dimensions. Individual faculty/supervisors use course assessments to determine candidate performance and assess the effectiveness of their instruction.

Data from the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) is presented to the Multiple Subject Program Review Committee to analyze and determine an initial action plan focus. Faculty and supervisors meet for Course Alike/Phase Alike large and small group meetings to articulate the specifics of the action plan focus. In these meetings the faculty and supervisors discuss teaching strategies and make modifications to their course syllabi.

Data from the CSU Chancellor’s Report (CSUC) is shared with the Faculty Assembly, Department Meetings, and the Multiple Subject Program Review Committee. The specifics of the action plan are developed and articulated in the Course Alike/Phase Alike meetings. An Improvement and Accountability Plan (IAP) is written and implemented following the guidelines of the Chancellor’s Office.

Data Sources:

- Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST)
- CSU Chancellor’s Report (CSUC): Employer Survey

Focus: Teaching English Learners

| Data Source | Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made | Applicable Program or Common Standard(s) |
|--------------|---|--|
| FAST CSUC | Program-specific plan developed to address the instruction of English learners. | TPE 4, 5, 6, 7 |
| FAST CSUC | English learner faculty amended the Lesson Observation Tool for use of Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). | TPE 2, 3, 7, 8, 9 |
| FAST CSUC | Emphasis on the purpose of the English learner teaching strategies will be emphasized in all classes/supervision. | TPE 2, 4, 5, 9 |

Although this goal was met at a level of 85% satisfaction for supervisors of graduates of our program, our faculty continues to support the development of English learner teaching strategies. Many of the students of our region are English learners so we are working to continue professional development in this area.

**Focus: Teaching Students with Special Needs in an Inclusive Classroom
Resources for At-Risk Students**

| Data Source | Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made | Applicable Program or Common Standard(s) |
|--------------------|---|---|
| FAST CSUC | Program-specific plan developed to address the instruction of students with special needs. | TPE 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 |
| CSUC | Seminars presented to teacher candidates to teach at-risk resources to serve their students. | TPE 8, 11, 12, 13 |
| FAST CSUC | Emphasis on the purpose of the special needs teaching strategies will be emphasized in all classes/supervision. | TPE 2, 4, 5, 9 |

SPED 179 is the anchor course for this content area. Changes have been made in the syllabus to support the teaching of students with special needs in SPED 179 as well as other content courses and TPA tasks.

Focus: Teaching of History/Social Science to California Standards

| Data Source | Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made | Applicable Program or Common Standard(s) |
|--------------------|--|---|
| FAST CSUC | Program-specific plan developed to address the Social Science standards, concept coverage, and assignments in LEE 173. | TPE 1, 2, 4, 9 |

Course changes have been made in the LEE 173 syllabus. The teaching of the social science standards are embedded in the LEE 173 course. Additional areas of emphasis include social science resources, methodology and teacher candidate assessments.