## Multiple and Single Subject Credentials Assessment data

Data Table Explanation/Summary: The Multiple and Single Subject credential programs had been using the CalTPAs as the program key assessments for measuring the TPEs. The program would review both the course enrollment and grade along with the assessment measurement 1) to determine compliance of the assessment and to assess if there were any correlations between overall course performance and key assessment performance. With the redevelopment of the program to align with the new TPEs, the program also redesigned the key assessment for measuring the TPEs. The program still reviews both the course enrollment and grade along with the assessment measurement 1) to determine compliance of the assessment and to assess if there were any correlations between overall course performance and key assessment and to assess if there were any correlations between overall course performance and key assessment and to assess if there were any correlations between overall course performance and key assessment performance.

The program also reviews the <u>Multiple Subject</u> and <u>Single Subject</u> CTC credential completer survey results (Included in Common Standards submission).

The program includes assessment of clinical observation, the use of portfolios, and focused teaching experiences to determine the readiness of our teacher candidates. Each of these components meet the standard for assessment. The program relies on four key Teaching Performance Assessments (TPAs) to assess our teacher candidate readiness.

We transitioned from a prior program structure beginning in Fall 2017 and have completed the transition from the prior program of study to the current one as of Fall 2019 for all campuses. There were some delays in content transition at the regional campuses for a few reasons. First, we were not using a consistent cohort model and needed to make sure that we allowed students to complete based on the program that reflected their catalogue year. Second, we required some extended training time to make sure that our faculty were prepared to adjust the content in each course. Finally, we did not launch new cohorts on each regional campus in every academic year, which would naturally not require that we offer the new program in a given term.

To work towards validity and reliability within our assessment practices and findings, the Multiple and Single Subject credential programs faculty meets monthly to discuss fidelity to the content and delivery of the program, as well as review findings from TPA and other in class assessments. Our on campus and regional faculty leads connect with faculty regularly to discuss student and program concerns; we have a "shadowing" policy so that all first time instructors in our program spend a semester or term shadowing our ULV faculty to make sure that they understand our curriculum and its delivery. Additionally, as of Fall 2019, we are also implementing a mid-term evaluation system so that we can hear back from students about any concerns that they might have in their classroom and fieldwork experiences and make adjustments in a more timely manner.

For example, there is strengthening in the passage rates of the key assessments. The passage rate of key assessment 4 increases from key assessment 1 and there is an increase in performance on key assessments after the implementation of the new program. As these patterns have emerged, we have been able to identify instructor level data and support those faculty in improved their pedagogical and content based approaches to increase student learning and performance. We have also identified that collaborating with our regional online campus peers needs more consistent attention.

Our 2018 program completer survey data suggested that our students feel more prepared to supporting students with IEPs, attend to their prior knowledge and work to improve their individual outcomes, and

develop least restrictive learning environments for their students in comparison to their peers in the state. Our students rated themselves a 4.44 out of 5 in terms of overall preparation for the field; other alum throughout the state rated themselves at a 4.31 in comparison. Our areas of possible improvement, based on program completer and our own assessment is related to the use of technology in teaching and increased practice in curriculum development.

Because we are working towards continuous improvement in all areas of our program, we have continued to review our practices within these courses, as well as throughout our coursework. To do so, we have more closely partnered with our colleagues in our Center for Neurodiversity, Learning, and Wellness to understand the needs of neurodiverse learners in our classrooms and our colleagues in our Center for Educational Equity and Intercultural Research to consider more inclusive pedagogical practices. This led to the creation of a lab based Center for Learning Innovation that will strengthen our faculty practices and directly impact the preparation of our teaching candidates.