



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		
Program documented in this report	Single Subject Credential Program	
Name of Program	Single Subject Credential Program	
Please identify all delivery options through which this program is offered (Traditional, Intern, Other)	Intern Traditional	
Credential awarded	Single Subject Credential	
Is this program offered at more than one site? No		
If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered		
Program Contact	Jody Daughtry	
Title	Professor	
Phone #	559-278-0307	
E-Mail	jodyd@csufresno.edu	
If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:		
Name	N.A.	
Title		
Phone #		
E-mail		

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART I – Contextual Information

Program Specific Candidate Information				
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported				
	2010-11		2011-2012	
Site (If multiple sites) Delivery Option	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates
<u>Traditional</u>	<u>131</u>	<u>230</u>	<u>123</u>	<u>167</u>
<u>Interns</u>		<u>5</u>		<u>15</u>

1. We are in the planning stage for incorporating a Linked Learning emphasis or lens throughout the Single Subject Credential Program in Fall of 2013 This means we will prepare all candidates to work in schools or programs that blend college preparation with career/technical education. We initiated a single Linked Learning cohort in Fall of 2009 and continued with single cohorts in Fall of 2010 and Fall of 2011. A fourth cohort is planned for Fall of 2012.
2. We are in the early stages of implementing a co-teaching model in our Single Subject field experience. Co-teaching focuses on actively engaging both master teacher and student teacher in planning and instruction throughout student teaching experiences. Faculty training began in Spring of 2011. Implementation began in Fall of 2011 both training and implementation will continue in 2012-2013.
3. Beginning in Spring of 2011 and continuing throughout 2011-2012, the Single Subject faculty and various constituent representatives met to plan a major revision of the program based on data regarding candidate performance, advise from school practitioners, and current professional literature. The newly revised program will emphasize connections among courses and fieldwork, use of common texts, incorporation of 21st century skills, collaboration, Linked Learning, improved preparation for Fresno Assessment of Student Teacher tasks, improved alignment with Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) and program standards, and increased uniformity among syllabi format. The new program will be submitted for approval at various levels in Fall of 2012 and implemented in Fall of 2013.

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART II – Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

Single Subject Program Biennial Report – Questions/Answers related to TPA: FAST

1. Number of Assessors: 51 scorers from Fall 2010 through Spring 2012
2. Assessor Initial and Recalibration: 27 scorers went through initial training; 38 scorers recalibrated
3. Data on Reliability Related to Double Scoring (from report by David Tanner)

A. *Inter-rater Reliability.*

A sample of the projects completed by the single 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:

1. Single Subject Program

a. Holistic Lesson Plan Project.

26 of the projects were double-scored, with 6 TPE categories in each.

Number of decisions by each scorer = 156

Number of exact agreements: 91, which is 58.3%

Number of disagreements over whether the student passed: 7 (4.5%)

Number of disagreements by more than 1 point: 10 (6.4%)

b. Teaching Sample Project.

31 of the projects were double-scored, with 7 TPE categories on each.

Number of decisions by each scorer = 217

Number of exact agreements: 147, which is 67.7%

Number of disagreements over whether the student passed: 4 (1.8%)

Number of disagreements by more than 1 point: 4 (1.8%)

c. Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project

40 of the projects were double-scored, with 4 TPE categories on each.

Number of decisions by each scorer = 160

Number of exact agreements: 134, which is 83.8%

Number of disagreements over whether the student passed: 5 (3.1%)

Number of disagreements by more than 1 point: 3 (1.9%)

d. Site Visitation Project

20 of the projects were double-scored, with 5 TPE categories on each.

Number of decisions by each scorer = 100

Number of exact agreements: 67, which is 67%

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

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

Those scoring the single subject projects made 633 decisions. They disagreed about whether the students had passed an individual TPE 17 times (2.7%). There were 18 disagreements (2.8%) by more than 1 point. The scoring reliability for F.A.S.T. projects continues to be very good.

4. Modifications to Assessor Selection, Training, and Recalibration:

No changes to assessor selection. In Spring 2012, training and recalibration for Single Subject Teaching Sample Project (TSP) was done in discipline groups, using TSP produced by students from that discipline, rather than a generic TSP. This change was in response to Single Subject supervisors who felt the generic TSP did not meet their needs for training and calibration. The response from the supervisors and faculty who went through this new format was overwhelmingly positive.

Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST):

1. Site Visitation Project - This task assesses the candidate's ability to perform, document, and reflect upon his/her own instruction. This is a field-based assessment. It assesses the following TPEs: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, and 13). This assessment takes place in the first semester of student teaching (initial student teaching).
2. Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project - This task assesses the candidate's ability to plan, implement and reflect upon his/her own instruction. This is an on-demand written assessment. It assesses TPEs 1[ELA], 6, 7, 8, 9. This assessment takes place during the first semester of student teaching (initial student teaching).
3. Teaching 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. It assesses the following TPEs: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13. This assessment takes place during the second semester of student teaching (final student teaching).
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. It assesses the following TPEs: 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 12. This assessment takes place during the second semester of student teaching (final student teaching).

Assessments 1-4 are administered at set points in the program, as previously indicated, and are scored using rubrics by trained and calibrated assessors. Assessments 1 and 2 are conducted in initial student teaching. Assessments 3 and 4 are conducted in final student teaching. All scores earned by the teacher candidate are recorded electronically on TaskStream. The data are aggregated on an annual basis and the results are presented to faculty at a program faculty meeting.

FAST Data Scoring Trends

Single Subjects Programs: Fall 2010-Spring 2012

There are data reported here for Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project, the Teaching Sample Project, the Holistic Proficiency Project, and the Teaching Sample Project for students from the Single Subject Curriculum Programs for Fall, 2010, Spring, 2011, Fall, 2011, and 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

A. Central Tendency Measures

Because the data are ordinal scale, mode and median values were calculated for each TPE on each of the four projects for the single subjects programs. Table 1 below indicates the result:

**Table 1
Project Scoring Patterns**

Program	Comp Lesson					Site Visit	Holistic Profic	Teach Sample
	TPEs							
	1E/LA	6B	7	8	9	All TPEs	All TPEs	All TPEs
Single Subject	N/A	Mo=3 Mdn=3.0	Mo=3 Mdn=3.0	Mo=2 Mdn=2.0	Mo=2 Mdn=2.0	Mo = 3 Mdn = 3.0	Mo = 3 Mdn = 3.0	Mo = 3 Mdn = 3.0

As was the case for earlier analyses, there continues to be very little scoring variability across TPEs and across projects. A score of “3” generally constitutes between 45 and 55% of all scores. While this contributes to the high scoring reliability when it is calculated as a percentage of agreement as it for this report, if some alternative value were calculated, such as coefficient alpha, reliability would appear to be quite low since high alpha values require some scoring variability. The sole exception to making “3” the most common score and also the middle-most score is the comprehensive lesson plan project where single subjects students appear to do less well than on the other three and some of the TPEs had modes and median values of 2.

Data Patterns across Semesters

The rarity of failing scores is particularly evident when the data are collapsed across the three semesters. For Single Subjects Students, failure rates reach to 4.2% for the Comprehensive Lesson Plan, and range to 6.6% for the Holistic Proficiency Project. For the Site Visitation and Teaching Sample Projects they are the more typical 1.5 and 1.4% failing, respectively. Speaking generally, these are higher failure rates than in past analyses. With high levels of inter-rater reliability, the increase scoring variability provides support for the reliability and validity of the data.

Single Subjects *Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project*

t	Scoring	Fall 10	Spr 11	Fall 11	Spr 12
6	N	129	66	137	70
	Mode	2	3	3	3
	Median	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	3.9	6.1	3.8	8.6
	2s (%)	55.0	37.9	40.6	27.1
	3s (%)	35.7	42.4	51.9	55.7
	4s (%)	5.4	13.6	3.8	8.6
7	N	129	3.0	137	70
	Mode	3	3	2	2
	Median	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	1.5	1.5	0
	2s (%)	41.1	37.9	37.9	47.1
	3s (%)	54.3	54.5	54.5	45.7
	4s (%)	4.7	6.1	6.1	7.1
8	N	129	3.0	137	70
	Mode	2	2	2	2
	Median	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
	1s (%)	2.3	3.0	3.0	1.4
	2s (%)	52.7	60.6	60.6	52.9
	3s (%)	33.3	33.3	33.3	40.0
	4s (%)	11.6	3.0	3.0	5.7
9	N	129	3.0	137	70
	Mode	2	2	3	2
	Median	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0
	1s (%)	2.3	0	0	8.6
	2s (%)	65.1	63.6	63.6	51.4
	3s (%)	27.1	27.3	27.3	37.1
	4s (%)	5.4	9.1	9.1	2.9

Single Subjects *Site Visitation Project*

type	Scoring	Fall 10	Spr 11	Fall 11	Spr 12
2	N	126	67	135	67
	Mode	3	3	3	3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	1.5	0	0
	2s (%)	20.6	14.9	20.0	25.7
	3s (%)	44.4	59.7	55.6	48.6
	4s (%)	34.9	23.9	24.4	21.4
4	N	126	67	135	67
	Mode	3	3	3	3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	1.5	0	0
	2s (%)	25.4	13.4	22.2	25.7
	3s (%)	38.1	70.1	49.6	40.0
	4s (%)	36.5	14.9	28.1	30.0
5	N	126	67	135	67
	Mode	3	3	3	3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	1.5	0	0
	2s (%)	24.6	9.0	25.2	35.7
	3s (%)	55.6	70.1	67.4	38.6
	4s (%)	19.8	19.4	7.4	21.4
11	N	126	67	135	67
	Mode	3	3	3	2
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	1.5	0	1.4
	2s (%)	27.0	17.9	28.1	35.7
	3s (%)	42.1	64.2	45.9	34.3
	4s (%)	31.0	16.4	25.9	24.3
13	N	126	66	135	67
	Mode	4	3	3	3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	3.0	2.2	2.9
	2s (%)	19.0	7.6	21.5	30.0
	3s (%)	36.5	50.0	45.9	37.1
	4s (%)	44.4	39.4	30.4	25.7

Single Subjects *Teaching Sample Project*

TPE	Scoring	Fall 10	Spr 11	Fall 11	Spr 12
10,11	N	53	118	51	108
	Mode	3	3	3	3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	1.7	0	8.3
	2s (%)	1.9	11.9	17.6	21.3
	3s (%)	83.0	76.3	74.5	63.0
	4s (%)	15.1	10.2	7.8	7.4
1,9	N	53	118	51	1.8
	Mode	3	3	3	3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	2.5	0	5.6
	2s (%)	20.8	23.7	31.4	25.9
	3s (%)	71.7	61.9	56.9	63.0
	4s (%)	7.5	11.9	11.8	5.6
2,3	N	53	118	51	108
	Mode	3	3	3	3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	1.7	0	6.5
	2s (%)	32.1	28.0	33.3	38.0
	3s (%)	64.2	57.6	58.8	52.8
	4s (%)	3.8	12.7	7.8	2.8
7-9	N	53	118	51	108
	Mode	3	3	3	3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	.8	0	5.6
	2s (%)	15.1	16.1	23.6	20.4
	3s (%)	64.2	61.0	62.7	59.3
	4s (%)	20.8	22.0	13.7	14.8
2-4,9	N	53	118	51	108
	Mode	3	3	3	3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	.8	2.0	.9
	2s (%)	17.0	19.5	31.4	25.9
	3s (%)	62.3	66.1	52.9	66.7
	4s (%)	20.8	13.6	13.7	6.5
3,12	N	53	118	51	108
	Mode	3	3	3	3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	1.7	2.0	4.6
	2s (%)	17.0	21.2	25.5	25.9
	3s (%)	71.7	59.3	58.8	61.1
	4s (%)	11.3	17.8	13.7	8.3
12,13	N	53	118	51	108
	Mode	3	3	3	3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	0	0	2.0	5.6
	2s (%)	20.8	28.8	39.2	29.6
	3s (%)	66.0	52.5	47.1	44.4
	4s (%)	13.2	18.6	11.8	20.4

Single Subjects *Holistic Proficiency Project*

TPE	Scoring	Fall 10	Spr 11	Fall 11	Spr 12
1	N	55	115	56	108
	Mode	3	3	3	3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	1.8	1.7	0	1.9
	2s (%)	21.8	19.1	37.5	37.0
	3s (%)	67.3	69.6	57.1	58.3
	4s (%)	9.1	9.6	5.4	2.8
3	N	55	115	56	108
	Mode	3	2	3	3
	Median	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	3.6	4.3	1.8	13.9
	2s (%)	29.1	24.3	48.2	33.3
	3s (%)	52.7	60.1	37.5	47.2
	4s (%)	14.5	11.3	12.5	5.6
5	N	55	115	56	108
	Mode	3	3	3	2,3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	5.5	3.5	1.8	4.6
	2s (%)	25.51	25.2	46.4	43.5
	3s (%)	56.4	53.9	50.0	43.5
	4s (%)	12.7	17.4	1.8	8.3
6c	N	55	115	56	108
	Mode	3	3	3	3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	1.8	3.5	0	5.6
	2s (%)	23.6	20.9	39.3	36.1
	3s (%)	60.0	64.3	53.6	50.0
	4s (%)	14.5	11.3	7.1	7.4
10	N	55	115	56	108
	Mode	3	3	3	3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	3.6	2.6	0	4.6
	2s (%)	14.5	30.4	39.3	34.3
	3s (%)	63.6	55.7	50.0	55.6
	4s (%)	18.2	11.3	10.7	5.6
12	N	55	115	56	108
	Mode	3	3	3	3
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1s (%)	5.5	7.0	7.1	14.6
	2s (%)	16.4	27.0	41.1	33.3
	3s (%)	70.9	46.1	44.6	44.4
	4s (%)	7.3	20.0	7.1	7.4

A. Equity Analysis

The equity analysis is based on significant differences in scoring related to students' ethnic group membership, whether English was their first language, and their gender. Results for the Comprehensive Lesson Plan, the Site Visitation, the Teaching Sample, and the Holistic Proficiency Projects are as follows:

Single Subjects Students

The data include the Fall 2010 to Fall 2011.

1. The Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project

i. Ethnic Group Differences

Testing for students' differences by ethnic group yielded significant χ^2 values for TPE seven. Hispanic students scored significantly higher than Native American and Asian students. The number of Native American and Asian students was very low, however.

ii. Language Group Differences

There were no significant differences related to language status.

iii. Gender Group Differences

There were no significant gender differences.

2. The Site Visitation Project

i. Ethnic Group Differences

There were no significant differences in scoring related to ethnic group membership on the Site Visitation project.

ii. Language Group Differences

There were no significant differences in TPE scores related to language differences.

iii. Gender Group Differences

There were no significant differences on any of the TPEs related to gender.

3. The Teaching Sample Project

i. Ethnic Group Differences

There were no significant differences in Teaching Sample Project scores on any of the TPEs.

ii. Language Group Differences

There were significant differences related to language status on the student learning TPEs 2-to-4 and 9.

iii. Gender Group Differences

There were significant differences in Teaching Sample Project scores favoring female students on TPEs 2 and 3, and 7 to 9.

4. The Holistic Proficiency Project

i. Ethnic Group Differences

There were no significant differences in Holistic Proficiency scores related to students' ethnic group membership on any of the TPEs. .

ii. Language Group Differences

There were no significant differences in Holistic Proficiency scores related to students' language status on any of the TPEs.

iii. Gender Group Differences

There were no significant differences on any of the TPEs related to student gender.

Among single subjects students, Caucasian and Hispanic students scored significantly higher than African American, Native American, and Asian students on the Comprehensive Lesson Plan project, TPE 7. On the Teaching Sample project, native English speakers outperformed non-native speakers on TPEs 2-4, 9, and female students out-performed males on TPEs 2/3, 7-9, 3&12.

Although there are TPEs on individual projects that manifest significant scoring differences related to ethnicity, to gender, or to language status, as a proportion of the whole, these differences are comparatively minor. There appears to be little to be concerned with regarding performance or scoring inequities.

CSU System-wide Evaluation – Teaching Graduates (1 year)

After one year of teaching, program graduates evaluate the program on key aspects of their preparation to teach.

Table 3

General Concepts and Practices of Teaching: The Effectiveness of CSU Single Subject Teaching Credential Programs During 2010-11 as Evaluated by the Programs' First-Year Teaching Graduates in 2011 While They Taught in Grades 7-12

(For Comparable Findings about Program Effectiveness During the 2007-08 Academic Year, Please See Your 2010 File-Set 3-B, Table 3.)

<i>Evaluation Questions Answered in 2011 by Teachers in Grades 7-12 Who Completed CSU Single Subject Credential Programs in 2010-11:</i>		<i>CSU Fresno: Single Subject Programs</i>					<i>CSU System: Single Subject Programs</i>				
		(1) <i>N</i>	(2) Well or Adequately	(3) Somewhat or Not	(4) Mean	(5) SD	(6) <i>N</i>	(7) Well or Adequately	(8) Somewhat or Not	(9) Mean	(10) SD
1	... know and understand the subjects of the curriculum at your grade level(s).	58	93%	7%	2.57	.68	556	87%	13%	2.46	.78
2	... organize and manage a class or a group of pupils for instructional activities.	59	69%	31%	1.95	.92	570	74%	26%	2.09	.88
3	... organize and manage student behavior and discipline satisfactorily.	59	61%	39%	1.75	1.01	570	60%	40%	1.80	.94
4	... prepare lesson plans and make prior arrangements for class activities.	59	83%	17%	2.24	.77	565	86%	14%	2.39	.76
5	... use an effective mix of teaching strategies and instructional activities.	59	69%	31%	2.02	.84	567	77%	23%	2.15	.81
6	... meet the instructional needs of students who are English language learners.	58	76%	24%	2.07	.88	560	74%	26%	2.05	.88
7	... meet the instructional needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds.	58	76%	24%	2.05	.83	563	78%	22%	2.13	.83
8	... meet the instructional needs of students with special learning needs.	58	78%	22%	1.95	.83	558	64%	36%	1.82	.91
9	... communicate effectively with the parents or guardians of your students.	58	57%	43%	1.69	.98	555	60%	40%	1.78	.96
10	... maintain positive rapport and foster students' motivation and excitement.	59	78%	22%	2.07	.85	560	80%	20%	2.21	.85
11	... think about problems that occur in teaching and try out various solutions.	58	72%	28%	1.95	.93	554	69%	31%	1.99	.92

Table 4

General Concepts and Practices of Teaching: The Effectiveness of CSU Single Subject Teaching Credential Programs During 2010-11 as Evaluated by the Programs' First-Year Teaching Graduates in 2011 While They Taught in Grades 7-12

(For Comparable Findings about Program Effectiveness During the 2007-08 Academic Year, Please See Your 2010 Fil-Set e 3-B, Table 4.)

<i>Evaluation Questions Answered in 2011 by Teachers in Grades 7-12 Who Completed CSU Single Subject Credential Programs During 2010-11:</i>		<i>CSU Fresno: Single Subject Programs</i>					<i>CSU System: Single Subject Programs</i>				
		(1) <i>N</i>	(2) <i>Well or Adequately</i>	(3) <i>Somewhat or Not</i>	(4) <i>Mean</i>	(5) <i>SD</i>	(6) <i>N</i>	(7) <i>Well or Adequately</i>	(8) <i>Somewhat or Not</i>	(9) <i>Mean</i>	(10) <i>SD</i>
12	... understand adolescent growth, human learning and the purposes of schools.	59	71%	29%	1.98	.80	560	75%	25%	2.11	.86
13	... understand how personal, family and community conditions affect learning.	59	69%	31%	1.98	.86	562	76%	24%	2.13	.89
14	... learn about students' interests and motivations, and how to teach accordingly.	59	73%	27%	2.00	.83	563	75%	25%	2.11	.89
15	... get students involved in engaging activities and to sustain on-task behavior.	59	69%	31%	1.88	.91	563	74%	26%	2.05	.87
16	... use computer-based applications to help students learn curriculum subjects.	58	66%	34%	1.81	1.12	538	65%	35%	1.88	1.00
17	... use computer-based technology in class activities and to keep class records.	57	67%	33%	1.82	1.05	538	69%	31%	1.98	.97
18	... monitor student progress by using formal and informal assessment methods.	58	81%	19%	2.17	.86	556	81%	19%	2.28	.82
19	... assess pupil progress by analyzing a variety of evidence including test scores.	56	77%	23%	2.09	.92	551	76%	24%	2.14	.91
20	... assist individual students in areas of their instructional needs in reading/math.	59	83%	17%	2.20	.76	550	79%	21%	2.21	.83
21	... adjust teaching strategies so all pupils have chances to understand and learn.	59	81%	19%	2.12	.74	560	78%	22%	2.16	.83

22	. . . adhere to principles of educational equity in the teaching of all students.	59	81%	19%	2.19	.73	558	83%	17%	2.27	.78
23	. . . use class time efficiently by relying on daily routines and planned transitions.	59	76%	24%	2.08	.88	555	81%	19%	2.23	.84
24	. . . know about resources in the school & community for at-risk students/families.	59	66%	34%	1.78	.98	547	56%	44%	1.67	1.00

Table 6

Concepts and Practices for Single Subject Teaching (K-8): The Effectiveness of CSU Single Subject Programs During 2010-11 as Evaluated by the Programs' First-Year Teaching Graduates in 2011 While They Taught in Grades 7-12

(For Comparable Findings about Program Effectiveness During the 2007-08 Academic Year, Please See Your 2010 File-Set 3-B, Table 6.)

<i>Evaluation Questions Answered in 2011 by First-Year 7-12 Teachers Who Completed CSU Single Subject Credential Programs During 2010-11:</i>		<i>CSU Fresno: Single Subject Programs</i>					<i>CSU System: Single Subject Programs</i>				
		(1) <i>N</i>	(2) <i>Well or Adequately</i>	(3) <i>Somewhat or Not</i>	(4) <i>Mean</i>	(5) <i>SD</i>	(6) <i>N</i>	(7) <i>Well or Adequately</i>	(8) <i>Somewhat or Not</i>	(9) <i>Mean</i>	(10) <i>SD</i>
Once you finished your CSU credential program in 2009-10, and when you were a 7-12 teacher in 2010-11, how well prepared were you to . . .											
A. General Preparation for Teaching Major Subjects in Grades 7-12											
1	. . . teach your primary subject according to State Academic Content Standards.	59	78%	22%	2.25	.84	521	82%	18%	2.34	.84
2	. . . use textbooks and other materials aligned with State Content Standards.	59	75%	25%	2.05	.95	514	71%	29%	2.03	.94
3	. . . contribute to students' reading skills including vocabulary and comprehension.	59	64%	36%	1.86	.88	522	66%	34%	1.90	.89
4	. . . recognize adolescence as a period of pressure for students to be like their peers.	59	75%	25%	2.03	.79	528	79%	21%	2.17	.83
5	. . . anticipate and address the needs of students who are at-risk of dropping out.	56	55%	45%	1.71	1.09	513	52%	48%	1.58	1.03
6	. . . establish academic expectations that are intellectually challenging for students.	58	71%	29%	1.97	.84	516	75%	25%	2.11	.88

7	. . . provide opportunities for students to develop advanced problem-solving skills.	59	68%	32%	1.83	.89	517	70%	30%	1.95	.93
8	. . . communicate your course goals and requirements to students and their parents.	58	78%	22%	2.12	.80	517	78%	22%	2.18	.83
9	. . . develop fair criteria for course grades and explain these to students/parents.	58	74%	26%	2.02	.91	515	76%	24%	2.12	.92
10	. . . help students realize connections between your subject and life beyond school.	38	76%	24%	2.11	.83	337	79%	21%	2.19	.87
11	. . . encourage/enable pupils to assume increasing responsibility for their learning.	38	84%	16%	2.26	.72	336	76%	24%	2.12	.90

Table 8

CSU Coursework and Fieldwork in Learning to Teach: The Value and Helpfulness of Single Subject Credential Programs When the Programs' 2010-11 Graduates Served as Single-Subject Classroom Teachers (Grades 7-12) During 2010-11

(For Comparable Findings about Program Effectiveness During the 2007-08 Academic Year, Please See Your 2010 File-Set 3-B, Table 8.)

<i>Questions Answered by Graduates of Single Subject Credential Programs:</i>	CSU Fresno: Single Subject Programs					CSU System: Single Subject Programs				
	(1) N	(2) Very or Somewhat Valuable	(3) A Little or Not Valuabl	(4) Mean	(5) SD	(6) N	(7) Very or Somew	(8) A Little or Not	(9) Mean	(10) SD
Based on your experience as a 7-12 teacher this year, how valuable or helpful was coursework and fieldwork in your CSU credential program?										
A. How Valuable or Helpful was CSU Instruction in General Pedagogy?										
1. Instruction in how children and adolescents grow and develop.	55	67%	33%	1.85	.80	508	74%	26%	2.08	.88
2. Instruction in the implications of human learning and motivation.	55	80%	20%	2.02	.80	512	81%	19%	2.16	.87
3. Instruction in school purposes, organization, issues and history.	56	68%	32%	1.82	1.01	498	70%	30%	1.90	.92
4. Instruction in methods of classroom teaching and management.	55	78%	22%	2.11	.83	510	83%	17%	2.30	.86
5. Instruction in the teaching of English language learners (ELL).	56	75%	25%	2.14	.88	520	80%	20%	2.20	.87
6. Instruction in cultural diversity and multicultural education.	55	71%	29%	2.02	.91	521	77%	23%	2.17	.92
7. Instruction in teaching students with special learning needs.	55	89%	11%	2.25	.75	514	80%	20%	2.15	.86
8. Instruction in ways to communicate effectively with parents.	55	51%	49%	1.58	.88	500	64%	36%	1.85	.99
9. Instruction in ways to reflect on and improve my teaching practices.	56	77%	23%	2.07	.87	516	83%	17%	2.32	.84

how true was each of the following statements about the program?		<i>N</i>	True or Mostly True	Some-what Or Not	Mean	SD	<i>N</i>	True or Mostly True	Some-what Or Not	Mean	SD
1.	The program had a sequence of courses and school experiences that addressed the complexities of teaching gradually over time.	55	60%	40%	1.69	.88	506	68%	32%	1.95	.94
2.	The program provided an appropriate mixture of theoretical ideas and practical strategies, and I learned about links between them.	55	58%	42%	1.64	.97	507	66%	34%	1.93	.99
3.	During the program, I saw evidence that university faculty and administrators worked closely with educators in K-12 schools.	54	44%	56%	1.48	1.04	500	61%	39%	1.83	1.07
4.	At each stage of the teaching credential program, I felt ready to assume a little more responsibility for K-12 student instruction.	54	67%	33%	1.98	.94	502	77%	23%	2.20	.93
5.	I taught in at least one school that was a good environment for practice teaching and for reflecting on how I was teaching students.	53	85%	15%	2.57	.75	500	90%	10%	2.60	.75
6.	My supervising teacher(s) frequently observed my teaching, met with me and offered suggestions and advice about my teaching.	53	81%	19%	2.49	.85	500	84%	16%	2.46	.88
7.	My university supervisor(s) occasionally observed my class, met with me and offered suggestions and advice about my teaching.	53	77%	23%	2.28	.82	501	83%	17%	2.45	.83
8.	During supervised teaching, my university-based supervisor and cooperating teacher communicated effectively with each other.	55	71%	29%	2.16	.90	483	73%	27%	2.17	.99
9.	Over time, the credential program and its curriculum met my needs as I prepared myself to become a good teacher.	55	58%	42%	1.75	.99	508	74%	26%	2.10	.98

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART III – Analyses and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

The program was rated on 80 factors by students who were at the end of their first year of teaching. These are the factors on which the program received 85 percent or better. This is the level at which the CSU considers the program to have been successful.

Know and understand the subjects of the curriculum

Fresno 93% System 83%

Instruction in teaching students with special needs

Fresno 89% System 83%

Your supervised field experiences

Fresno 87% System 89%

Instruction in teaching mathematics

Fresno 88% System 85%

Instruction in teaching history and social science

Fresno 100% System 90%

Instruction in teaching physical education in grades 7–12

Fresno 100% System 90%

I taught in at least one school that was a good environment for practice teaching and for reflecting on how I was teaching

Fresno 85% System 90%

Also, out of the 80 factors these are the ones on which the program received below a 60.

Communicate effectively with the parents or guardians of your student

Fresno 57% System 60%

Anticipate and address the needs of students who are dropping out

Fresno 56% System 52%

Instruction in ways to communicate effectively with parents

Fresno 51% System 64%

Off-campus fieldwork assignment in my reading class

Fresno 50% System 58%

Instruction in ways of teaching art, music, drama or dance
Fresno 50% System 91%

Instruction in using technology for classroom instruction
Fresno 59% System 70%

Instruction in helping students use computers for class assignments
Fresno 56% System 64%

Instruction in computer terminology and operating procedures
Fresno 50% System 62%

Instruction in ways to use electronic media and educational websites
Fresno 52% System 66%

Instruction in ways to use software programs for group presentations
Fresno 52% System 64%

The program provided an appropriate mixture of theoretical and practical strategies, and I learned about links between them
Fresno 58% System 66%

During the program, I saw evidence that university faculty and administrators worked closely with educators in K-12 schools
Fresno 44% System 61%

Over time, the credential program and its curriculum met my needs as I prepared myself to become a good teacher
Fresno 58% System 74%

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

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

Data Source	Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made	Applicable Program or Common Standard(s)
CSU Survey	<i>In the Fall of 2013, a revised program will be put into effect. The factors shown as being in need of improvement should be improved by this process. CI 151 will be improved by addressing communicating with families more completely. SPED 121 will be expanded to cover students who are at risk of dropping out. All five factors which dealt with computers should be improved with our new course CI 149 which deals with, among other things, education and computers. This new program will hopefully mix theory and practice more appropriately. Our new program will feature seminars which will accompany both student teaching semesters that are based at the schools. This should improve candidates perception concerning the degree to which administrators and faculty work together.</i>	