



**Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report**

**California State University, Fresno
Kremen School of Education and Human Development
Academic Years 2008-09 and 2009-10**



**Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report**

Academic Years 2008-09 and 2009-10

Institution	California State University, Fresno
Date report is submitted	October 15, 2010
Program documented in this report	Multiple Subject
Name of Program	Multiple Subject
Credential awarded	Preliminary Multiple Subject
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.
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:	
Phone #	
E-mail	

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

II. 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. This year we celebrate our centennial with 100 years of service. 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 an elementary teacher (primarily grades K-6). Our last joint accreditation (NCATE/CCTC) visit was in March 2006.

The Multiple Subject Credential Program consists of twenty-one 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
2008-2009	204	192
2009-2010	203	187

<u>Changes Since Commission Approval of Current Program Document</u>	<u>Date</u>
Strengthened Methods of Teaching English Learners Content Specialists Presented	2007-2009
Advanced English Learner Seminars to Faculty and Supervisors	
Strengthened Methods of Teaching Students with Special Needs Revised SPED 179 Syllabus	2009-2010
Strengthened Methods of Teaching Social Studies (LEE 173) Revised LEE 173 Syllabus	2009-2010
Strengthened Classroom Management Content in SPED 179 and Added Fieldwork Seminars (EHD 174/178)	2007-2008
Strengthened Applied Technology, Revised CI 175 Syllabus, Surveyed Use of Technology Across Program	2008-2009
Added Health At-Risk Resources Seminar (EHD 170)	2008
Enhanced university/school district partnerships:	
	Central Unified 2009
	Sanger Unified 2010

II. Candidate Competence and Program Effectiveness Data

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.

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

Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) Distribution Tables:

Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project

TPE	Scoring	Fall 08	Spr 09	Fall 09	Spr 10
n		102	93	134	62
ELA1	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
	1s (%)	1.0	0	7.4	11.1
	2s (%)	42.7	40.4	34.1	49.2
	3s (%)	47.6	41.5	47.4	39.7
	4s (%)	8.7	18.1	11.1	0
6b	Median	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
	1s (%)	2.9	0	4.4	9.5
	2s (%)	29.1	47.9	51.9	54.0
	3s (%)	49.5	43.6	40.7	28.6
	4s (%)	18.4	8.5	3.0	7.9
7	Median	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	0	2.2	0
	2s (%)	52.4	53.2	68.9	28.6
	3s (%)	40.8	38.3	25.9	63.5
	4s (%)	6.8	8.5	3.0	7.9
8	Median	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
	1s (%)	2.9	0	6.7	3.2
	2s (%)	57.3	60.6	47.4	55.6
	3s (%)	35.9	37.2	42.2	34.9
	4s (%)	3.9	2.1	3.7	6.3
9	Median	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0
	1s (%)	1.9	0	1.5	4.8*
	2s (%)	42.7	41.5	54.1	27.0*
	3s (%)	47.6	54.3	39.3	65.1*
	4s (%)	7.8	4.3	5.2	1.6*

*Entry of an invalid number results in a non-100% sum.

Site Visitation Project

TPE	Scoring	Fall 08	Spr 09	Fall 09	Spr 10
n		113	83	93	110
1	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	0	1.1	2.7
	2s (%)	19.3	17.9	23.4	17.1
	3s (%)	70.2	70.2	69.1	71.2
	4s (%)	10.5	11.9	6.4	9.0
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0

2	1s (%)	0	0	2.1	0
	2s (%)	27.2	28.6	20.2	21.6
	3s (%)	62.3	61.9	74.5	71.2
	4s (%)	10.5	9.5	3.2	7.2
4	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	0	2.1	0
	2s (%)	31.6	34.5	36.2	33.3
	3s (%)	58.8	52.4	57.4	57.7
	4s (%)	9.6	13.1	4.3	9.0
5	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	.9	0	2.1	0
	2s (%)	29.8	32.1	37.2	30.6
	3s (%)	58.8	58.3	58.5	63.1
	4s (%)	10.5	9.5	2.1	6.3
11	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	.9	0	1.1	0
	2s (%)	24.6	44.0	38.3	33.3
	3s (%)	65.8	44.0	55.3	61.3
	4s (%)	8.8	11.9	5.3	5.4
13	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	1.2	3.2	2.7
	2s (%)	36.0	22.6	24.5	17.1
	3s (%)	50.0	46.4	53.2	68.5
	4s (%)	14.0	29.8	19.1	11.7

Teaching Sample Project

TPE	Scoring	Fall 08	Spr 09	Fall 09	Spr 10
n		84	118	93	94
10,11	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	2.4	1.7	0	1.1
	2s (%)	24.7	12.6	22.3	16.8
	3s (%)	67.1	70.6	68.1	65.3
	4s (%)	5.9	15.1	9.6	16.8
1,9	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	1.7	1.1	1.1
	2s (%)	44.7	22.7	20.2	28.4
	3s (%)	52.9	62.2	74.5	56.8
	4s (%)	2.4	13.4	4.3	13.7
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	1.7	1.1	3.2

2,3	2s (%)	51.8	22.7	31.9	27.4
	3s (%)	41.2	61.3	58.5	61.1
	4s (%)	7.1	14.3	8.5	8.4
7,8,9	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	.8	0	0
	2s (%)	40.0	21.0	19.1	32.6
	3s (%)	48.2	49.6	67.0	52.6
	4s (%)	11.8	28.6	13.8	14.7
2-4,9	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	1.2	.8	0	0
	2s (%)	45.9	21.0	26.6	26.3
	3s (%)	48.2	62.2	61.7	56.8
	4s (%)	4.7	16.0	11.7	16.8
3,12	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	1.2	1.7	1.1	0
	2s (%)	43.5	18.5	29.8	26.3
	3s (%)	50.6	49.6	55.3	60.0
	4s (%)	4.7	30.3	13.8	13.7
12,13	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	2.4	1.7	1.1	1.1
	2s (%)	36.5	16.0	25.5	27.4
	3s (%)	54.1	60.5	62.8	58.9
	4s (%)	7.1	21.8	10.6	12.6

Holistic Proficiency Project

TPE	Scoring	Fall 08	Spr 09	Fall 09	Spr 10
n		89	114	95	92
1Math	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	0	0	1.1
	2s (%)	11.1	7.0	10.4	19.4
	3s (%)	65.6	74.8	71.9	68.8
	4s (%)	23.3	18.3	17.7	10.8
1Sci	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	0	0	1.1
	2s (%)	10.0	9.6	14.6	23.7
	3s (%)	68.9	72.2	65.6	61.3
	4s (%)	21.1	18.3	19.8	14.0
1H/SS	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	0	0	1.1
	2s (%)	14.4	8.7	10.4	22.6
	3s (%)	67.8	71.3	72.9	64.5

	4s (%)	17.8	20.0	16.7	11.8
3	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	0	0	0
	2s (%)	14.4	7.0	18.8	19.4
	3s (%)	66.7	67.0	69.8	67.7
	4s (%)	18.9	26.1	11.5	12.9
5	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	0	0	0
	2s (%)	13.3	6.1	12.5	18.3
	3s (%)	50.0	59.1	70.8	66.7
	4s (%)	36.7	34.8	16.7	15.1
6a	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	0	0	1.1
	2s (%)	13.3	14.8	9.4	21.5
	3s (%)	57.8	61.7	67.7	63.4
	4s (%)	28.9	23.5	22.9	14.0
10	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	1.1	0	0	0
	2s (%)	15.6	8.7	11.5	18.3
	3s (%)	55.6	67.0	70.8	68.8
	4s (%)	27.8	24.3	17.7	12.9
12	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	0	0	1.1
	2s (%)	16.7	9.6	14.6	22.6
	3s (%)	50.0	66.1	69.8	58.1
	4s (%)	33.3	24.3	15.6	18.3

CSU System-Wide Evaluation Data

Chancellor's Report: Employers (one year after graduation)

Note: These data include extensive lists of tables.

Please see Chancellor's Report (disk and hard copy).

Mechanism for Summarizing and Utilizing Data for Program Evaluation

Data from Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) and Chancellor's Report Scores are shared with faculty. The Assessment Coordinator and Multiple Subject Coordinator present the FAST data to the Multiple Subject Program Review Committee. The Dean presents the Chancellor's Report data to faculty at the faculty assembly meeting, department meetings, and the Multiple Subject Program Review Committee.

Representatives from each academic content and field area are on the Multiple Subject Program Review Committee (MSPRC). The MSPRC discusses the results of evaluations and develops an

action plan. Specific examples of articulation in course and fieldwork occur during the Phase Alike/Course Alike meetings.

III. Analyses and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST)

The review of the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 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)

(Note: There was a drop in performance in Spring 2010 semester)

Instructional Planning (TPE 9)

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 9. The candidates get many opportunities to practice instructional planning (TPE 9) and there is a heavy emphasis on competencies in reading-language arts (TPE 1A). **Note:** TPE 7: Teaching English Learners had lower percentage performance in Fall ‘08, Spring ‘09, and Fall ‘09; however, there was a marked increase in Spring ‘10. This is encouraging because this has been a primary area of emphasis in our action plan and professional development for faculty and supervisors.

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)

Professional Growth (TPA 13)

Weakness:

Social Environment (TPA 11)

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. Relative strengths include: Reading-Language Arts: TPE 1A and Professional Growth (TPA 13). 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.

The relative weaknesses listed above with TPE 11: Social Environment may be a reflection of increased student contact time where the teacher candidates must manage the academic and social environment in the classroom. In the previous Phase 1 teacher candidates were responsible for one-on-one and small group instruction. Teacher candidates are new to the management of whole class instruction that occurs in Phase 2.

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). These results are encouraging because in the previous phase, TPE 11: Social Environment was a relative weakness. 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 5: Student Engagement

TPE 10: Instructional Time

Weakness:

TPE 1: Science

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 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 5: Student Engagement and TPE 10: Instructional Time. Teacher candidates are demonstrating strength in their performance of managing instructional time to keep students engaged and focused on the goals and objectives of the lesson.

The relative weakness listed above includes TPE 1: Science. Teacher candidates need to be able to teach a science lesson with a balance of science information, concepts, and investigations. 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)

- Content Knowledge
- Instructional Planning
- Motivation of Students
- Computer-Based Technology Applications
- Educational Equity

Weaknesses:

The CSU Deans of Education identified the areas of improvement.

- Instruction of English Learners
- Resources for At-Risk Students
- Teaching Strategies for Students with Special Needs in Inclusive Settings
- Teaching of History/Social Science to California Standards

Discussion:

The Chancellor’s survey strengths identified by employers present a program graduate who: has the content knowledge to teach the subjects; knows how to develop lessons; knows how to motivate students, understands computer-based technology applications; and works to provide learning opportunities for all students. The focal areas of weakness (as identified by the CSU deans) has received specific action plan items as defined by our Improvement and Accountability Plan (IAP).

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.

Note: In response to the feedback received from the previous biennial report the format of this report has changed. This report contains a more in-depth examination of a fewer number of data sources. The examination includes a specific TPE item analysis of the FAST Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project, Site Visitation Project, Teacher Sample Project, and Holistic Proficiency Project.

This analysis has provided some interesting findings. For example, as a part of the last biennial report action plan faculty increased support for teaching English learners. Teaching English Learners had lower percentage performance in Fall '08, Spring '09, and Fall '09; however, there was a marked increase in Spring '10. This is encouraging because this has been a primary area of emphasis in our action plan and professional development for faculty and supervisors.

When examining the data sources it is important to note when in the teacher candidate/teacher's academic career the assessments are administered. The FAST assessments show a more immediate response to program change because we have new teacher candidates joining the program each semester. The assessments can immediately reflect program changes. The CSU Chancellor's Report is administered one year after graduation. As a result, there is some contradiction in strengths and weaknesses listed for our program. Teaching English learners appears as strength in the FAST Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project due to the marked performance increase in Spring 2010. Teaching English learners appears as a weakness in the CSU Chancellor's Report; however, we would expect to see a lag time in the evidence of the program improvement because the candidates who have received the enhanced focus on the teaching of English learners will not be evaluated until a year after graduation.

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

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

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