

California State University, Fresno (07-08)
Section A-1
Contextual Information

Multiple Subject Program

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 16 programs. Our last joint accreditation (NCATE/CCTC) visit was in March 2006.

The Multiple Subject Credential Program consists of 21 units in teacher education courses and 13 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 foundational classes and content-specific pedagogy coursework while concurrently practicing the application of these concepts and teaching skills in a field placement setting that is aligned with the reading class in which they are enrolled.

Candidates are expected to apply the theoretical and scholarly concepts, knowledge, and teaching skills in planning and implementing effective and appropriate lesson and units of study. The program provides extensive opportunities for candidates to learn to teach using the state adopted K-12 academic content standards to all students. All content-specific courses are based on the CCTC Standards and the state-adopted content standards and frameworks. Fieldwork placements are made in diverse settings, many are high need, urban schools. Different program options are offered including cohorts that are university site-based, partnership school site-based, cohorts with an early childhood emphasis, the Dual program (earning both Multiple Subject and Education Specialist credentials), and the internship program.

<u>Changes Since Commission Approval of Current Program Document</u>	<u>Date</u>
Added partnership sites in school districts	2006-8
Developed and Revised Action Plan	2007-8
Teacher Performance Assessment approved – Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST)	2008

California State University, Fresno (07-08)

Section A-2

Candidate Assessment/Performance & Program Effectiveness Information

Multiple Subject Program

A. Candidate Assessments the program used to and through recommending credential

Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST):

1. **Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project** – 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.
(*TPEs 1[ELA], 6B, 7, 8, 9*)
2. **Site Visitation Project** - This task assesses the candidate’s ability to plan, implement, and reflect upon his/her own instruction. This is a field-based assessment.
(*TPEs 1[ELA]2, 4, 5, 11, 13*)
3. **Teacher Sample Project** - This task assesses the candidate’s ability to plan and teach a one to four week unit, to assess student learning related to the unit, and to document their teaching and their students’ learning. This is a comprehensive, written assessment. (*TPEs 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13*)
4. **Holistic Proficiency Project** - 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 assessment. (*TPEs 1[H-SS, M, Sc],3, 5, 6, 10, 12*)

Assessments 1-4 are administered at set points in the program and are scored on rubrics by trained and calibrated assessors. All scores earned by the teacher candidate will be recorded electronically (currently on TaskStream).

Disposition Survey:

This survey assesses the candidate’s perception of their skills in the KSOEHD dispositions (collaboration, reflection, valuing diversity, critical thinking, ethical professional, & life long learning). It is administered at entrance and exit of the program. These scores are documented on a database.

B. Addition information collected on completer performance and program effectiveness

1. CSU System-wide Evaluation – Exit Survey:
This survey is given to program completers as they apply for their credential.
2. CSU System-wide Evaluation – Teaching Graduates (one year from graduation)
3. CSU System-wide Evaluation – Employers Assessment (one year from graduation)

Summary of Data

Multiple Subject Program Data:

(July 1, 2007 –June 30, 2008)

Multiple Subject 2007-2008 Candidates, Completers, and Credentials

Number of students **applied** to the program: 243

Number of students **admitted** to the program:

Classified: 194

Special Consideration: 35

TOTAL 229

Number of students **admitted to Final Student Teaching:** 285

Number of **program completers:** 278

Number of First Time Credential Recommendations:

Prelim MS 2042: 444

Prelim MS Ryan: 7

Clear MS Ryan: 2

TOTAL Multiple Subject CREDENTIALS: 453

Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) Distribution Tables:

The Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project, Fall 2007

The maximum number (n) = 95 for all TPEs.

Responses	TPEs					
	1E/LA	1H/SS	4	6	7	9
	Mdn =3 Mo = 3	Mdn =3 Mo = 3	Mdn =2 Mo=2	Mdn=2 Mo=3	Mdn=3 Mo=3	Mdn=2 Mo=2
1	8	4	11	25	3	29
2	35	30	39	33	31	35
3	47	55	38	34	49	27
4	5	6	7	3	12	4

The Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project, Spring 2008

The maximum number (n) = 101 for all TPEs except 8 which had n = 100.

Responses	TPEs				
	1	6B	7	8	9
	Mdn =2 Mo = 2	Mdn =2 Mo = 2	Mdn =2 Mo=2	Mdn=2 Mo=2	Mdn=2 Mo=3
1	24	10	6	27	13
2	34	45	57	41	39
3	31	38	35	29	45
4	12	8	3	3	4

The Site Visitation Project, Fall 2007

The middle-most score (the median) and the most frequently-occurring score (the mode) are both 3.0 for all TPEs. A few instructors assigned 2.5 and 3.5 scores. They were treated as 3s and 4s respectively.

Responses	TPEs							
	1 n = 128	2 n = 126	3 n = 128	4 n = 128	5 n = 126	6 n = 126	11 n = 128	13 n = 126
1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4
2	25	34	32	30	32	18	26	18
3	95	84	91	90	86	101	91	77
4	8	8	5	8	8	5	10	27

The Site Visitation Project, Spring 2008

The middle-most score (the median) and the most frequently-occurring score (the mode) are both 3.0 for all TPEs.

Responses	TPEs					
	1, n = 80	2 n = 84	4 n = 84	5 n = 83	11 n = 84	13 n = 83
1	1	1	0	0	0	0
2	15	20	28	26	21	24
3	60	55	52	52	58	53
4	4	8	4	5	5	6

The Teaching Sample Project, Fall 2007 & Spring 2008

TPEs for the Teaching Sample Data remained consistent from Fall to Spring so the data are aggregated. The middle-most score (the median) and the most frequently-occurring score (the mode) are both 3.0 for all TPEs. There were 279 total students and there are data for all 279 on all TPEs.

Responses	TPEs						
	8, 10, 11	1, 9	2, 3	7, 8, 9	2, 9	3, 12	12, 13
1	1	5	4	4	3	3	4
2	77	97	108	87	99	92	81
3	179	163	149	166	155	160	164
4	22	14	18	22	22	24	30

The Holistic Project Project, Fall 2007

The middle-most score (the median) and the most frequently-occurring score (the mode) are both 3.0 for all TPEs.

Responses	TPEs								
	1 n = 101	1 n = 99	3 n = 101	5 n = 100	7 n = 100	8 n = 99	10 n = 96	11 n = 97	12 n = 96
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	4	3	6	3	8	4	6	6	4
3	80	76	84	65	76	79	69	74	79
4	17	20	11	32	16	16	21	17	13

The Holistic Project Data, Spring 2008

The middle-most score (the median) and the most frequently-occurring score (the mode) are both 3.0 for all TPEs.

Responses	TPEs							
	1m n = 137	1s n = 137	1h n = 119	3 n = 138	5 n = 138	6 n = 120	10 n = 135	12 n = 133
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	14	14	24	21	14	18	17	17
3	111	110	83	101	91	82	99	96
4	12	13	12	16	33	20	19	20

Disposition Survey

Disposition	Semester			
	Fall 2007		Spring 2008	
	Higher Scores, Pre or Post?	Statistical Significance?	Higher Scores Pre or Post?	Statistical Significance?
Reflection	Post	No, p = .090	Post	Yes, p<.001
Critical Thinking	Post	Yes, p<.001	Post	Yes, p<.001
Professional Ethics	Post	Yes, p<.001	Post	Yes, p<.001
Valuing Diversity	Post	Yes, p<.001	Post	Yes, p<.001
Collaboration	Post	Yes, p<.001	Post	No, p = .310
Life-long Learning	Post	Yes, p<.001	Post	Yes, p<.001

CSU System-wide Evaluation Scores

Exit Survey

Chancellor's Report:

Chancellor's Report:

Teaching Graduates (one year from graduation)

Employers (one year from graduation)

California State University, Fresno (07-08)
Section A-3
Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

Multiple Subject Program

ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION IN SECTION A-2

Recommendations are based on the **Spring 2008**, data because these assessment components were included as the final draft of the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers approved by CCTC's Assessment Design Task Force.

**A. Candidate Assessments the Program Used to and through
Recommending Credential**

Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST):

Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project:

Teacher candidates are in the first phase of their program. All of the instructional content and practice is new.

Strengths:

Teacher candidates are performing best on TPE 7: Teaching English Learners. This is encouraging because this has been a primary area of emphasis in our action plan and professional development for faculty and supervisors. The median and mode scores were both at a level "2: Meets Expectations" for every TPE except TPE 9 where the mode was "3: Meets Expectations at a High Level."

Weaknesses:

A high percentage of teacher candidates were performing at a "1: Does Not Meet Expectations" on more than one TPE. These teacher candidates needed to retake these sections of the Teacher Performance Assessment to raise their level of performance. The TPEs that had the lowest teacher candidate performance included TPE 1: English-Language Arts (grades 4-8), TPE 6B: Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices, TPE 8: Learning About Students; and TPE 9: Instructional Planning.

Site Visitation Project:

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 terms presented during the first phase may be reinforced.

Strengths:

Teacher candidate performance improved in TPE 1: English-Language Arts (grades K-3). Please note this is a different grade level focus than in the Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project. The median and mode for all TPEs was “3: Meets Expectations at a High Level.”

Weaknesses:

Most teacher candidates performed very well on this assessment. Very few teacher candidates performed at a level “1: Does Not Meet Expectations.” The TPE with the broadest range is TPE 13: Professional Growth. This area focuses on a candidate’s ability to evaluate his/her own teaching practice. The area is also the focus of a professional disposition: reflection.

Teacher Sample Project:

Teacher candidates are in the third and final phase of the program.

Strengths:

A score of “3: Meets Expectations at a High Level” was the median and mode for all TPEs in this assessment. Overall, teacher candidates are performing well on a much more complex assessment task.

Weaknesses:

The weakest TPE performances were in TPE 2: Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction and TPE 3: Interpretation and Use of Assessments. This assessment requires the teacher candidates to increase their level of complexity in developing pre, post, and formative assessments with increased specificity and attention to EL and special needs adaptations.

Holistic Project:

Strengths:

A score of “3: Meets Expectations at a High Level” was the median and mode for all TPEs in this assessment. Overall, teacher candidates are performing well on a much more comprehensive assessment task that spanned the entire semester. The highest frequency of “3s” were in the areas of TPE 1: Math, TPE 1: Science, and TPE 3: Interpretation and Use of Assessments. Note: TPE 3 was a weakness in the same semester but with a paper work product assessment. Assessment work conducted during their fieldwork was stronger.

Weaknesses:

TPE 1: History/Social Science was the area with the highest number of “2s.” A “2: Meets Expectations” is adequate for passing the assessment.

Disposition Survey:

Our assessment analyst provided the following comments:

Pretest scores were compared to posttest scores from both semesters. The statistical test was the Mann-Whitney U, a test for significant differences between two groups when the data are of ordinal scale (rankings).

In every case for the six “teacher candidate professional dispositions,” scores at the end of the semester were higher than those at the beginning. In all but two of 12 circumstances where the comparison was made, the differences were statistically significant. Students consistently scored higher on the TDI at the end of these two terms than at the beginning.

CSU System-wide Evaluation:**Exit Survey:****Strengths:**

Overall the majority of the program completers reported that they were “Well or Adequately Prepared.” The following areas were highlighted with a 90% or above in the “Well or Adequately Prepared” score: preparation of lesson plans; classroom management; effective mix of teaching strategies; understanding of community connections to the classroom; motivating students; engaging on-task behavior; formal and informal assessment methodology, analysis of exam scores, equity in the teaching of all students; collaboration; problem solving; understanding professional, legal, and ethical obligations; and, reflection for personal growth.

In addition when asked “how well prepared are you...” the following areas were highlighted as “Well or Adequately Prepared” with a 90% or above: understanding subjects at my current grade level, teach reading-language arts, child development, mathematics, science, and history/social studies, physical education, and hands on classroom activities that suit the attention spans of my students.

When addressing the area of value or helpfulness of instruction the areas of 90% or greater included: human learning and motivation; classroom teaching and management; English language learner, cultural diversity and multicultural education; teaching students with special needs; supervised teaching experience; field work and observations; and, guidance and assistance of field supervisors and supervising teachers. Value of subject pedagogy included reading-language arts, mathematics and science.

Weaknesses:

The following area was highlighted with an 80% or below in the “Well or Adequately Prepared” score: meeting the instructional needs of students with special learning needs. The value or helpfulness of health instruction was 72.8% as “Very or Somewhat Helpful.” Program completers scored 69.2% “seeing evidence that university faculty and administrators work closely with educators in K-12 schools” “true or Mostly True.”

Teaching Graduates (1 year):

This Chancellor's Report data represents candidates who were not instructed with the revised accredited program scope and sequence. 2005-2006 data is the latest data reported.

Strengths:

Generally first year teachers scored themselves lower than their supervisors. Top areas highlighted included: motivating students, adhering to principles of educational equity, preparing lesson plans, teaching reading, teaching math, and meeting the needs of English learners.

Weaknesses:

Lowest areas highlighted included: English learners, teaching special needs student sin inclusive classrooms, classroom management, communicating with parents, knowing resources for students at-risk, and teaching science & social studies.

Employer's Assessment (1 year):

This Chancellor's Report data represents candidates who were not instructed with the revised accredited program scope and sequence. 2005-2006 data is the latest data reported.

Strengths:

Generally supervisors scored the teachers higher than the new teachers scored them. Top areas highlighted: understanding of subjects and curriculum, classroom management, preparing lesson plans, adhering to principles of educational equity, and efficient use of class time.

Weaknesses:

Lowest areas highlighted included: teaching English learners, teaching students with special needs, teaching science, and knowing resources for students at-risk.

**California State University, Fresno (07-08)
Section A-4**

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate & Program Performance

Multiple Subject Program

Recommendations are based on the Spring 2008, data because these assessment components were included as the final draft of the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers approved by CCTC's Assessment Design Task Force.

Data Source	Data Focus	Action(s)	Contact Person	Timeline
CSU survey TPA scoring	English Learners	First Step: ELD Seminars Advanced Seminars: Front Loading Language Systematic ELD Induction Support Systematize Strategies >> Across Courses Inventory Terms and Correlate with Teacher Performance Assessments Seminars for All Faculty and Supervisors Course Alike Faculty Meetings	Dr. Arenas Dr. Nyberg	2007- 2009
CSU Survey	At-Risk Students	First Step: Common Terms in SPED 179 Handbook of Resources in Fresno Health Seminar Character and Education Conference	Dr. Torgerson Ms. Quisenberry	2007- 2009

Data Source	Data Focus	Action(s)	Contact Person	Timeline
CSU Survey	Classroom Management	First Step: SPED 179 Phase 1: Seminar Team Building Phase 2: Seminar Elective: CI 123 Character and Civic Education	Dr. Torgerson Dr. Nyberg Dr. Lomeli Dr. Lane-Garon Ms. Quisenberry	2007- 2009

Additional Action Items:

Multiple Subject Phase Alike Meeting (August 2008)

Multiple Subject faculty and supervisors met to discuss the “state of the program” to coordinate efforts and services to the teacher candidates. One focus of the discussion included a need to have a greater alignment of terms presented in program classes in reference to the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) prompts and rubrics.

Faculty and supervisors received a copy of the FAST student manual. Terminology was referenced. Dates of FAST were presented. Faculty and staff were informed what instructional content needed to be presented and formatively assessed prior to the FAST date. Instructors were reminded of the needed depth of inquiry and the required elements of each of the Teacher Performance Expectations. For example by the administration of the first assessment teacher candidates needed to know how to analyze a lesson plan. Instructors could duplicate the assessment process by analyzing strategies in a lesson plan. The instructors and supervisors also received a copy of the matrix so they could see where their class and fieldwork fit into the scope and sequence of the TPE/FAST sequence.

Multiple Subject Program Review Committee (Fall 2008)

Data was presented to the Multiple Subject Program Review Committee to share strengths and weaknesses. Action items will be re-evaluated and refined.

Multiple Subject Phase Alike and Course Alike Meeting (scheduled for January 2009)

A meeting is scheduled at the beginning of the Spring 2009 term to encourage faculty and supervisors to share effective strategies and resources and coordinate efforts to better support the teacher candidates. One area of focus may include supporting teacher candidates in the area of reflection. The **purpose, strength, and limitations** of teaching strategies will be explored.