



COMMISSION ON
TEACHER CREDENTIALING
Ensuring Educator Excellence

Academic Years 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011

Institution	University of San Diego
Date report is submitted	September 15, 2011
Program documented in this report	Multiple Subject and Single Subject
Name of Program	Multiple Subject Credential Single Subject Credential
Credential awarded	Multiple Subject and Single Subject
Is this program offered at more than one site? No	
If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered	
Program Contact	Steven Gelb, Ph.D., Associate Dean
Phone #	619-260-4893
E-Mail	sgelb@sandiego.edu
If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:	
Name:	Helene T. Mandell, Ed.D., Paula S. Krist, Ph.D.
Phone #	691-260-7817, 619 – 260 - 4270
E-mail	hmandell@sandiego.edu, pkrist@sandiego.edu

**UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO
SCHOOL OF LEADERSHIP AND EDUCATION SCIENCES**

OVERVIEW

At the University of San Diego, the School of Leadership and Education Sciences offers four credential programs. K-12 multiple subjects and single subject credential candidates, and candidates in special education credential areas are within the Department of Learning and Teaching. Administration credential candidates are part of the Educational Leadership Development Academy in the Department of Leadership Studies. Candidates seeking the credential in school counseling are served by the Department of Counseling and Marriage and Family Therapy.

All of the credential programs are aligned with the overarching School of Leadership and Education Sciences conceptual framework called ACE: academic excellence, critical inquiry, reflection; community and service; and, ethics, values and diversity. The ACE themes are an integral part of the program and candidate assessment system.

All of the credential programs are administered on campus at the University of San Diego, except for the Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing Credential. The DHH credential is administered at the John Tracy Clinic in Los Angeles, a facility renowned for its work with families of the deaf and hard of hearing. Although candidates are admitted to credential programs through a common process, their progress toward the credential is overseen and maintained by the appropriate department. Each program has distinct midpoint and endpoint assessments that emphasize the specialized skills appropriate to that credential area. Records are kept in each department and summarized with assistance from the Office of Assessment Support.

Because USD became part of the first cohort of universities involved in NCATE's Transformation Initiative option, the Commission changed our cohort placement from Orange to Red. Therefore, in this Biennial Report, we are presenting summaries for the past three years, 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. Section B is included in each report

The first section is the biennial report for the multiple subject and single subject credential programs. The supporting assessment documentation for both programs appear in Appendix A.

SECTION A – MULTIPLE AND SINGLE SUBJECT CREDENTIAL PROGRAM INFORMATION

Part I. Contextual Information

The rationale for the Multiple and Single Subject preparation programs at USD is based upon the "ACE" School of Leadership and Education Sciences ethics outcomes: academic excellence, critical inquiry, reflection; community and service; and, ethics, values and diversity. The 'ACE' themes undergird program and candidate in multiple and single subjects credential programs.

The Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential programs are housed in the Department of Learning and Teaching. Credential candidates can take a traditional credential program, or a "fast-track" combined credential and masters program. There is a department chair who has leadership responsibility for all programs in the department and each credential program has a coordinator.

Below are the numbers of credential candidates for the Academic Years 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11.

	<i>Multiple Subject New and Continuing Candidates</i>	<i>Multiple Subject Completers</i>
2008 - 2009	Graduate = 26 Undergraduate = 54	18
2009 - 2010	Graduate = 30 Undergraduate = 75	25
2010 - 2011	Graduate = 30 Undergraduate = 68	15

	<i>Single Subject New and Continuing Candidates</i>	<i>Single Subject Completers</i>
2008 - 2009	Graduate = 38 Undergraduate = 30	25
2009 - 2010	Graduate = 38 Undergraduate = 25	20
2010 - 2011	Graduate = 35 Undergraduate = 17	17

The two most significant changes in the multiple and single subject credential programs since the last biennial report have been the changes made in preparing candidates for PACT and changing the nature of the early field experiences (practicum). The specific actions taken, include:

- Strengthening candidate preparation for teaching and modeling academic language;
- Creation of a SOLES PACT website where sample teaching events reside;
- Obtaining funding for faculty supervision during practicum
- Assigning subject-specific “experts” for supervision of single subject candidates
- Building stronger and deeper relationships with fewer schools

Details about these changes are discussed in the section on analysis of candidate assessment data.

II. Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

There are multiple means of candidate assessment throughout the multiple and single subject programs. A rich assessment system supports candidates to become self-reflective, life-long learners, traits that are identified as important in the adult education and teacher development literature.

The table below lists the various instruments and experiences on which all multiple and single subject credential candidates are assessed:

Multiple and Single Subject Credential Candidate Assessments

<i>When</i>	<i>What</i>	<i>Who</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
Group orientation meeting for beginning candidates	Discussion of various assessments, TPEs and PACT	Faculty, Program Administrators and Candidates	Knowledge of assessment during program, TPEs and PACT
Continuing assessment in coursework	Embedded signature assignments (ESAs)	Course Instructors	Development of knowledge/skills measured against PACT rubrics
Midpoint Admission to student teaching	Advancement to student teaching interview	2 Interviewers (Program Faculty University Supervisors and/or Cooperating Teachers)	Admit or deny entrance to student teaching; provide support for remediation or reapplication
	Embedded signature assignments	Course Instructors	
	Practicum evaluations reviewed,	Program Coordinator, Faculty	
	Roundtable discussion	Program Coordinator, Faculty	
Student teaching	Midterm and final assessment	Cooperating Teacher; University Supervisor	Formative and summative student teaching assessment
	PACT Teaching Event	Trained PACT Assessors	
Exit assessment	Comprehensive evaluation of teacher candidates	Credential Analyst; Program Coordinator; Student Teaching Seminar Instructor; Cooperating Teacher; University Supervisor	Recommendation or non-recommendation for credential

III. Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

The University of San Diego Multiple and Single Subject preparation programs utilize the PACT Teaching Event (plus additional PACT subject tasks for multiple subject candidates) for its Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA). PACT produces significant data that is disaggregated by the Director of Assessment Support and presented to the program faculty for review at the semi-annual retreats. Also data is collected and reviewed relative to practicum evaluations and student teaching evaluations. For practicum and student teaching, each of the stakeholder groups evaluates all of the other groups. Links to the assessment instruments appear below. (See Appendix A for data from the candidate assessments.)

[Elementary Practicum Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form](#)
[Practicum Teacher Candidate Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher](#)
[Practicum Teacher Candidate Evaluation of University Supervisor](#)
[Practicum Cooperating Teacher Evaluation of University Supervisor](#)
[Practicum University Supervisor Evaluation Of Cooperating Teacher](#)

[Midterm Multiple Subject Student Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form](#)
[Midterm Single Subject Student Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form](#)
[Final Multiple Subject Student Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form](#)
[Final Single Subject Student Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form](#)
[Student Teacher Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher](#)
[Student Teacher Evaluation of University Supervisor](#)
[Student Teaching Cooperating Teacher Evaluation of University Supervisor](#)
[Student Teaching University Supervisor Evaluation Of Cooperating Teacher](#)

Review of PACT data pointed to a need to improve instruction for teacher candidates regarding academic language. Subsequently faculty who teach the sequence of methods courses have enhanced their syllabi and course assignments to better prepare candidates to teach academic language during practicum and student teaching as well as to be more accurate in their own use of academic language. Faculty noted that during the mid-term Advancement to Student Teaching interview, assessors are rating candidates on their use of academic language. (All of the data from the instruments above are summarized in the first three tables in Appendix A.)

In order to better support teacher candidates in their PACT teaching event, the program leadership developed a website using Google docs with sample of USD credential candidates' teaching events. This site is used during the Student Teaching Seminars to teach candidates how to assemble the teaching event documents.

The Department of Learning and Teaching identified the need to improve its candidates' clinical experiences and took many steps to accomplish this. Information from multiple sources indicated that the department's need was to identify optimal placements and create and maintain stronger and deeper relationships with schools. Additionally, when several candidates struggled in student teaching we learned that we had failed to identify their weaknesses early enough. This turned the department's focus toward improving the quality, supervision and assessment of early practicum field experiences linked with teaching methods courses.

Many of the problems the research literature identifies with university clinical experiences had become evident. Data indicated that field placements, particularly the early ones, had become less connected with university classes. In the field, candidates enacted university-provided practices rather than engaging in learning communities where faculty, candidates and school personnel engaged together in learning. These issues were even more pronounced in early field experiences than in student teaching.

As a result, the program began to take steps to improve early clinical experiences. A major step occurred in fall, 2008, with the hiring of Dr. Helene Mandell as Director of Professional Services (now Director of Field Experiences) to oversee the clinical experiences of elementary and secondary candidates. Dr. Mandell was able to hire two pathway managers who serve as liaisons with area schools for placement of candidates in clinical experiences, particularly student teaching placements. In collaboration with the department chair and program faculty she developed clear criteria for field placement sites and developed demographic profiles of participating schools. These changes facilitated individual placement decisions that were more purposeful. Finally, she made two major improvements in clinical supervision: 1) supervisors were assigned to candidates in early practicum experiences; and 2) only appropriate subject specific specialists were assigned to supervise secondary candidates during student teaching.

Moreover, the department wanted to not only provide field experiences that are carefully and systematically chosen, but also to transform its relationship with school partners to bridge the traditional dichotomies of academic and practitioner knowledge, theory and practice, and university and school cultures.

In fall 2009, the department succeeded in establishing the prototype of such a relationship with San Diego Unified District's Balboa Elementary School. A key element of the Balboa program is the "Power Hour," which is an all-school, interdisciplinary approach focused on analyzing struggling students and then crafting individualized interventions at the students' reading level. All credentialed adults (e.g., speech and language pathologists, education specialists) are responsible for providing reading instruction at this time. To date there are additional schools where models such as the relationship with Balboa are being cultivated.

The next step in this process is to expand the model and further develop relationships similar to the one with Balboa Elementary, especially with secondary schools. Relationships at the following schools are in process

- DMD Kearny High School
- Point Loma High School
- Pacific Beach Middle School
- Explorer Elementary School
- Pride Academy

IV. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

The following represents a full range of changes that have been made based on multiple sources of data, including embedded signature assignments, midpoint interviews, practicum evaluations, student teaching evaluations, exit surveys and alumni surveys.

Changes for Multiple and Single Subject Programs

2008-2011

- Hired new supervisors who increase the diversity of the pool
- Added MCC programs (summer 2008 secondary; summer 2011 elementary)
- Added new position, Director of Professional Services (now Director of Field Experiences)
- Added Program Coordinators
- Added 2 part-time Field Experience Managers to assist with multiple and single subject student teacher placement
- Implemented more comprehensive supervision during field experience practicum with improved assessments for practicum candidates
- Clearly identified field placement criteria and began the process of profiling schools and making more purposeful placements
- Fully implemented online evaluations for candidates, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers in practica and student teaching
- Expanded the pool of interviewers for the Advancement to Student Teaching Interviews by adding classroom teachers
- Assigned content specialists as single subject supervisors
- Started Balboa Elementary School Practicum Project
- Prepared Preferred Course Sequence for credential programs
- Operationalized use of TaskStream for “blind” scoring of PACT
- Worked closely with Director of Liberal Studies to “bridge” relations between Multiple Subject Program and Undergraduate candidates
- Supported an “employment” panel of local school administrators to assist teacher candidates in obtaining teaching positions
- Director of Professional Services (MS/SS Coordinator) teaches Student Teaching seminar
- Began “Faculty Roundtable” to review prospective student teachers
- Greater use of electronic tools in all aspects of program management
- Focusing on fewer school sites with deeper relationships, (example: Balboa Elementary)

SECTION B: ALL PROGRAMS

There have been changes for the School of Leadership and Education Sciences that have affected all of the credential programs at the University of San Diego. The most important are summarized on the following table:

SOLES changes	
2008-2009	Electronic delivery of teacher candidate and counseling intern evaluations.
2008-2009	Revision of Task Stream DRF for teacher candidate embedded signature assignments
2008-2009	Electronic delivery of teacher candidate and counseling intern evaluations
Spring 2009 Fall 2010	SOLES hosted PACT assessor training for USD and other San Diego area assessors, including some USD supervisors
Summer 2010	SOLES PEU approved to be part of first cohort in NCATE’s Transformation Initiative Option
Fall 2009	School Counseling Program hired two tenure-track faculty members
2009-2010	Liberal Studies Program Review
2009-2010	Creation of Liberal Studies Liberal Studies Advisory Council (to replace the TEG) comprised of faculty from SOLES and the College of Arts and Science faculty
2009-2010	Revision of assignments and rubrics for embedded signature assignments in teacher credential programs to better align with PACT
2010-2011	First Administrative Credential Candidates trained as PACT assessors
Spring 2010	Migration of all surveys and evaluations to Qualtrics survey software to increase efficiency of administration, data analysis and program improvement
Spring 2010	Course evaluations moved to electronic format, SurveyDig
Fall 2010	SOLES hosted PACT/TPAC conference

In our 2008 Biennial Report, SOLES identified five areas that all of the SOLES credential programs targeted for improvement during the next two years:

1. The three departments in the School of Leadership and Education Sciences that offer and oversee credential programs have recognized the fact that increased communication among the programs would benefit all of the credential candidates. The programs indicate they plan to develop stronger ties among candidates in different credential programs. We will examine the standards for each credential area to determine common courses, shared experiences and opportunities for collaborative interdisciplinary activities. The Associate Dean will lead monthly meetings of the credential areas to expedite this process; the first meeting will be in November 2008.
 - Since 2008 a great deal of structured collaboration between the school counseling program and the department of teaching and learning has occurred around action research. The annual conference to showcase both programs candidates’ action research projects has required close collaboration between faculty and candidates across programs. In addition, Dr. Rowell from the school counseling program, and Dr. Inoue from the department of learning and teaching, have co-taught a combined section of research methods for candidates from both programs. More recently

faculty from the administrative services credential have begun collaborating with faculty from the department of learning and teaching around USD's Transformation Initiative (TI) that features mentorship of preliminary multiple and single subject credential candidates by administrative services level one candidates.

2. All areas have started to examine their mechanisms for assessing and documenting student learning. Increased effort will be placed on the organization and recording of direct evidence of student learning. In addition, the increased dialogue across the programs noted above will provide an opportunity for faculty to share best practices in teaching and assessment.
 - The cross-program activities in action research and the Transformation Initiative feature collaborations around the assessment of student learning. In the past three years the department of learning and teaching has developed and piloted the use of a rigorous action research project rubric to support and critique candidates' projects aimed at documenting increases in student learning. The TI collaboration between administrative services and teacher education candidates focuses on improving teacher candidates' lessons and increasing student learning.
3. All SOLES programs will increase dialogue and training for full-time and part-time faculty regarding "ACE" themes and performance indicators associated with the themes.
 - Full and part-time faculty in the department of learning and teaching have been in dialogue regarding the development and assessment of embedded signature assignments derived from objectives linked to "ACE" themes in the multiple and single subject credential courses. More work needs to be done to increase dialogue with the school counseling and administrative services full and part-time faculty.
4. SOLES programs will work to refine the documentation of assessment activities and faculty actions based on assessment data. SOLES Director of Assessment is examining electronic management systems to determine the best way for the school to record its more coordinated program assessment data in a SOLES Director of Assessment is examining electronic management systems to determine the best way for the school to record its program assessment data, analysis, and actions via a centralized system.
 - We have made three important improvements in terms of electronic management of data. First, we have migrated all surveys and evaluations for teacher and school counselor fieldwork to Qualtrics survey software. Survey implementation and data analysis are facilitated by the Office of Assessment Support. Second, we moved our course evaluations to SurveyDig, which is a tool that allows candidates to evaluate courses and instructors through their university email accounts. Third, the Office of Assessment Support adopted the use of Task Stream's Accountability Management System (AMS) system to document program level assessment for non-credential programs.
5. Full time faculty will provide leadership, support and mentorship for part-time faculty. This will include the appointment of lead faculty for each course and the development of standardized syllabi and assessments.
 - The last three years have seen a number of personnel and organization changes in the leadership of credential programs, and because of this, monitoring of the quality of leadership by lead faculty has been spotty. The newly appointed chairs of the department

of learning and teaching and the new department of counseling and marital family are committed to supervising this process closely. Under the leadership of Dr. Paula Krist, Assistant Dean of Assessment Support, standardization of assessments and use of electronic data tracking systems has continued to move forward.

In the next two years SOLES will focus on the following areas of development across the professional education unit:

1. Development of SOLES Strategic Plan 2012-2017
2. Unit-wide assessment of candidate dispositions.
3. Faculty involvement in the use of TaskStream AMS. Ideally, the Office of Assessment Support will create a faculty team who will be able to work together to assess the assessment plans and results of SOLES programs.
4. Continued enhancement of electronic documentation and assessment of candidate performance. Administrative Services programs have decided to adopt FolioTec to collect candidate artifacts and portfolios electronically beginning in 2011-2012.

APPENDIX A
Assessment Data for
Multiple Subject and Single Subject Programs

Multiple and Single Subject
TPE Assessment System
2008-2009

Embedded Signature Assignments

		Teaching Performance Expectation (TPE)													
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
		Pedagogical Skills	Monitoring Language	Interpretation, Use of Assessment	Making Content Accessible	Student Engagement	Dev. App. Teach. Prac.	Teaching English Learners	Learning about Students	Instructional Planning	Instructional Time	Social Environment	Prof. Leg., Ethical Obligations	Prof. Growth	Incorp. Technology
	# assessed														
EDUC 381/581	24								6.00			5.84	5.50		
EDUC 382/582	51					4.02	3.98	4.41	3.98			3.93			
EDUC 342/542 (BCLAD)															
EDUC 384/584	41							4.41	4.54						
EDSP 389/589	49				5.26										
EDUC 383/583	14	3.36		3.57						3.57					
EDUC 332/532	29	4.45			4.21					4.66					3.38
EDUC 334/534	21			3.43						3.67					3.24
		Planning: Estab. Balanced Inst. Focus				Planning: Making Content Accessible			Planning: Designing Assessments						
EDUC 385/585 (Mini PACT Sci.)	23	2.43			2.48			2.53							
EDUC 385/585 (Mini PACT S.S.)	23	2.22			2.48			2.53							

Benchmark Assessments

Advancement Interview	#assessed	Context	Planning	Instruction	Assessment	Reflection	Acad. Lang.	Modeling Lang.
	51	Q.1	Q.2		Q.3	Q.4	Q.5	Q.6
		3.39	3.22		3.10	3.39	2.92	3.18

	#assessed	Planning: Est. Bal. Instruc. Focus	Planning: Making Content Acc	Planning: Designing Assess	Instruct: Engage Students in Learning	Instruct: Monitor Stu Learn During Instr	Assess: Analyze Stu Work from Asses	Assess: Using Assess to Inform Teaching	Monitor Student Progress	Reflection: Reflecting on Learning	Reflection: Reflecting on Learning	Acad Lang: Understand Lang Demands	Support Acad Lang Dev	Acad Lang: Support Acad Lang Dev
PACT Teaching Event	0													
Elementary Literacy	0													
Elementary Math	11	2.73	2.55	2.64	2.55	2.55	2.45	2.55	2.55	2.36	2.18	2.18	2.18	2.18
Multiple Subject Total	11	2.73	2.55	2.64	2.55	2.55	2.45	2.55	2.55	2.36	2.18	2.18	2.18	2.18
English Language Arts	5	3.20	3.20	3.00	3.00	3.20	3.20	3.20	2.80	3.20	3.00	3.20	3.00	3.00
History/Social Science	12	2.97	2.76	2.76	2.70	2.76	2.80	2.76	2.82	2.64	2.57	2.52	3.09	3.09
Mathematics	1	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Music	1	2.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00
Science	5	2.40	2.20	2.60	2.20	2.60	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.40	2.00	2.00	2.00
Single Subject Total	24	2.71	2.54	2.46	2.46	2.42	2.58	2.58	2.38	2.54	2.46	2.25	2.38	2.38
Grand Total	35	2.71	2.54	2.51	2.49	2.46	2.54	2.57	2.38	2.54	2.43	2.23	2.31	2.31

		Teaching Performance Expectation (TPE)													
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
		Pedagogical Skills	Monitoring Language	Interpretation, Use of Assessment	Making Content Accessible	Student Engagement	Dev. App. Teach. Prac.	Teaching English Learners	Learning about Students	Instructional Planning	Instructional Time	Social Environment	Prof. Leg., Ethical Obligations	Prof. Growth	Incorp. Technology
Multiple Subject															
Single Subject															
Total	25	5.43	5.46	5.43	5.61	5.53	5.58	5.36	5.69	5.54	5.62	5.71	5.70	5.72	5.60

TPEs and Domains are scored on a 6-point developmental rubric. A score of 5 is passing on the student teaching evaluation. Advancement Interview and PACT Teaching Event Criteria are scored on a 4 point rubric. A score of 2 is passing. There is no passing score before that. However, candidates should earn 3s and 4s the semester before student teaching.

Multiple and Single Subject
TPE Assessment System
2009-2010

Embedded Signature Assignments

		Teaching Performance Expectation (TPE)													
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
		Pedagogical Skills	Monitoring Language	Interpretation, Use of Assessment	Making Content Accessible	Student Engagement	Dev. App. Tong. Prac.	Teaching English Learners	Learning about Students	Instructional Planning	Instructional Time	Social Environment	Prof. Lggs. Ethical Obligations	Prof. Growth	Incorp. Technology
	# assessed														
EDUC 381/581	40								3.20			3.20	3.40		
EDUC 382/582	19														
EDUC 384/584	37							3.30	3.41	3.24					
EDSP 389/589	39				2.97					2.97					
EDUC 383/583															
EDUC 332/532	29	4.45			4.21					4.66					3.38
EDUC 334/534	12			3.50						3.50					4.00
		Planning: Estab. Balanced Inst. Focus			Planning: Making Content Accessible			Planning: Designing Assessments							
EDUC 385/585 (Mini PACT Sci.)	27		2.74			2.78			2.56						
EDUC 385/585 (Mini PACT S.S.)	27		2.74			2.85			2.52						

Advancement Assessment

Advancement Interview	# assessed	Context	Planning	Instruction	Assessment	Reflection	Acad. Lang.	Modeling Lang.
		Q.1	Q.2		Q.3	Q.4	Q.5	Q.6
	48	3.02	2.88		2.69	2.75	2.58	3.04

Final Assessment

PACT Teaching Event	# assessed	Planning: Est. Bal. Instruct. Focus	Planning: Making Content Acc.	Planning: Designing Assesses	Instruct: Engage Students in Learning	Instruct: Monitor Stu Learn During Instr	Assess: Analyze Stu Work from Assesses	Assess: Using Assesses to Inform Teaching	Assess: Using Feedback to Promote Stu Learn	Reflection: Monitor Stu Progress	Reflection: Reflecting on Learning	Acad Lang: Understand Lang Demands	Acad Lang: Support Acad Lang Dev
Multiple Subject: Elem. Math	23	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.6
PACT Teaching Event	# assessed												
Art	1	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
English Language Arts	8	2.88	2.75	2.88	2.75	2.88	2.50	2.50	2.63	2.38	2.88	2.50	2.75
History/Social Science	2	2.50	2.00	2.50	2.00	1.50	2.50	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.00	1.50	2.00
Mathematics	6	2.83	2.50	2.83	2.17	2.00	3.00	2.67	2.67	2.67	2.50	2.00	2.33
World Languages	3	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.67	2.67	2.67	3.33	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.33	3.00
Single Subject Total	19	2.80	2.60	2.80	2.45	2.40	2.65	2.50	2.70	2.60	2.65	2.20	2.55
Grand Total	42	2.84	2.83	2.83	2.64	2.56	2.72	2.62	2.71	2.69	2.76	2.49	2.60

		Teaching Performance Expectation (TPE)													
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
		Pedagogical Skills	Monitoring Student Learning	Interpretation, Use of Assessment	Making Content Accessible	Student Engagement	Dev. App. Tong. Prac.	Teaching English Learners	Learning about Students	Instructional Planning	Instructional Time	Social Environment	Prof. Lggs. Ethical Obligations	Prof. Growth	Incorp. Technology
Multiple Subject	24	3.30	3.17	3.27	3.34	3.33	3.48	3.16	3.35	3.35	3.29	3.46	3.66	N/O	3.56
Single Subject	27	3.57	3.81	3.52	3.43	3.43	3.70	3.42	3.60	3.55	3.53	3.54	3.88	3.69	3.83
Total	51	3.44	3.28	3.54	3.43	3.38	3.59	3.29	3.48	3.45	3.41	3.50	3.77	3.69	3.70

In 2009-2010 rubric scales were changed to mirror the PACT. TPEs and Domains are scored on a 4-point developmental rubric. A score of 2 is passing on the student teaching evaluation.

Advancement Interview and PACT Teaching Event Criteria are scored on a 4 point rubric. A score of 2 is passing.

Multiple and Single Subject
TPE Assessment System
2010-2011

Embedded Signature Assignments

	# assessed	Teaching Performance Expectation (TPE)													
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
		Pedagogical Skills	Monitoring Language	Interpretation, Use of Assessment	Making Content Accessible	Student Engagement	Dev. App. Tech. Prac.	Teaching English Learners	Learning about Students	Instructional Planning	Instructional Time	Social Environment	Prof., Leg., Ethical, Obligations	Prof. Growth	Incorp. Technology
EDUC 381/581	54								3.50				3.50		
EDUC 381/581(Summer 2010)	18								2.72				2.72		
EDUC 382/582	54					3.00/3	2.29/3		2.20/3				3.00/3		
EDUC 384/584															
EDSP 389/589	35				2.97					2.94					
EDUC 383/583	1	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00										3.38
EDUC 332/532	29	4.45			4.21					4.66					4.00
EDUC 334/534															
		Planning: Estab. Balanced Inst. Focus			Planning: Making Content Accessible			Planning: Designing Assessments							
EDUC 385/585 (Mini PACT Sci.)	19	2.58			2.68			2.37							
EDUC 385/585 (Mini PACT S.S.)	19	2.42			2.79			2.47							

Advancement Assessment

Advancement Interview	# assessed	Context	Planning	Instruction	Assessment	Reflection	Acad. Lang.	Modeling Lang.
		Q.1	Q.2		Q.3	Q.4	Q.5	Q.6
July 2010 - June 2011	45	3.20	3.09		2.78	3.11	2.73	3.24

Final Assessment

PACT Teaching Event	# assessed	Planning: Est. Bal. Instruc. Focus	Planning: Making Content Acc	Planning: Designing Assess	Instruct: Engage Students in Learning	Instruct: Monitor Stu Learn During Instr	Assess: Analyze Stu Work from Asses	Assess: Using Assess to Inform Teaching	Assess: Using Feedback to Promote Stu Learn	Reflection: Monitor Stu Progress	Reflection: Reflecting on Learning	Acad Lang: Understand Lang Demands	Acad Lang: Support Acad Lang Dev
Multiple Subject: Elem. Math	30	2.68	2.57	2.37	2.40	2.28	2.57	2.50	2.58	2.52	2.66	2.37	2.37
PACT Teaching Event	# assessed	Planning: Est. Bal. Instruc. Focus	Planning: Making Content Acc	Planning: Designing Assess	Instruct: Engage Students in Learning	Instruct: Monitor Stu Learn During Instr	Assess: Analyze Stu Work from Asses	Assess: Using Assess to Inform Teaching	Assess: Using Feedback to Promote Stu Learn	Reflection: Monitor Stu Progress	Reflection: Reflecting on Learning	Acad Lang: Understand Lang Demands	Acad Lang: Support Acad Lang Dev
English Language Arts	6	2.83	3.00	2.83	2.33	2.50	2.33	2.33	2.17	2.33	2.00	2.33	2.17
History/Social Science	9	2.56	2.00	2.56	2.11	1.78	2.33	2.00	2.22	2.33	2.44	2.11	2.00
Mathematics	5	2.20	2.60	2.40	2.20	2.40	2.40	2.20	2.20	2.40	2.40	2.20	2.00
Science	2	2.50	3.50	2.50	2.50	2.00	2.50	2.50	3.00	2.50	2.00	2.50	2.00
World Languages	2	3.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	3.00	2.50	2.50	3.00	2.50
Single Subject Total	24	Mean	2.58	2.54	2.63	2.29	2.13	2.38	2.25	2.33	2.38	2.29	2.08
Grand Total	54												

Student Teaching Evaluations		Teaching Performance Expectation (TPE)														USD TPE
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13		
		Pedagogical Skills	Monitoring Language	Interpretation, Use of Assessment	Making Content Accessible	Student Engagement	Dev. App. Tech. Prac.	Teaching English Learners	Learning about Students	Instructional Planning	Instructional Time	Social Environment	Prof., Leg., Ethical, Obligations	Prof. Growth	Incorp. Technology	
Midterm																
Multiple Subject	31	3.27	2.92	3.14	3.15	3.12	3.29	2.80	3.06	3.18	3.20	3.27	3.46	3.45	3.32	
Single Subject	32	3.56	3.30	3.35	3.42	3.38	3.47	3.18	3.49	3.46	3.40	3.48	3.76	3.75	3.6	
Final																
Multiple Subject	24	3.63	3.55	3.34	3.67	3.66	3.66	3.62	3.67	3.69	3.67	3.72	3.88	3.90	3.74	
Single Subject	36	3.81	3.64	3.67	3.73	3.71	3.83	3.60	3.69	3.59	3.63	3.75	3.86	3.93	3.91	

In 2009-2010 rubric scales were changed to mirror the PACT. TPEs and Domains are scored on a 4-point developmental rubric. A score of 2 is passing on the student teaching evaluation.

Advancement Interview and PACT Teaching Event Criteria are scored on a 4 point rubric. A score of 2 is passing.

IV. 2008-2011 Multiple Subject Exit Survey Summary

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about program faculty?

#	SCALE: Strongly Agree-5 Agree-4 Neutral-3 Disagree-2 Strongly Disagree-1	2008 Mean (n=11)	2010 Mean (n=10)	2011 Mean (n=5)
1	Overall, the quality of instruction in my courses was good.	N/A	4.30	4.60
2	There is good communication between faculty and students.	3.73	3.60	4.00
3	There are appropriate opportunities outside the classroom for interaction between students and faculty.	3.73	3.40	4.20
4	Faculty members in my program were helpful and supportive in my search for professional employment.	3.36	3.20	3.60
5	Faculty members set high learning expectations.	4.27	3.90	4.60
6	Faculty members respect diverse talents and ways of learning.	4.27	4.10	4.60
7	Faculty members encourage students to be actively involved learners.	4.09	4.30	4.60
8	Faculty members give you frequent and prompt feedback.	3.45	3.60	4.60
9	Faculty members care about the academic success and welfare of the students.	4.09	4.00	4.60
10	Faculty members develop opportunities for you to learn cooperatively with fellow students.	4.09	3.60	4.60
2008	<i>Faculty members prepare carefully for their graduate courses.</i>	4.00	N/A	N/A
2008	<i>The courses I took were well taught.</i>	4.09	N/A	N/A
2008	<i>Faculty members in my program were interested in the welfare and professional development of graduate students.</i>	4.13	N/A	N/A
2008	<i>Faculty members were well qualified to teach their courses.</i>	4.18	N/A	N/A
2008	<i>Faculty members encourage student-faculty interaction.</i>	3.82	N/A	N/A
2008	<i>Faculty members encourage you to devote sufficient time and energy to your coursework.</i>	4.36	N/A	N/A
2008	<i>Faculty members were accessible outside of class</i>	3.55	N/A	N/A

2. To what degree has your learning and teaching course work enhanced your ability to

#	SCALE: Extremely Well-5 Fairly Well-4 Moderately-3 Poorly-2 Not at All-1	2008 Mean (n=11)	2010 Mean (n=10)	2011 Mean (n=5)
1	Design and conduct original research.	N/A	3.38	4.40
2	Understand group dynamics.	N/A	4.11	4.40
3	Recognize and resolve ethical issues.	N/A	4.00	4.00
4	Understand organizational behavior, especially the role of leadership in fostering intentional change.	N/A	3.89	4.40
5	Communicate orally.	N/A	4.20	4.40
6	Communicate in writing.	N/A	3.80	4.40
7	Think critically about contemporary leadership issues.	N/A	3.89	4.00

3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the intellectual climate within the program?

#	SCALE: Strongly Agree-5 Agree-4 Neutral-3 Disagree-2 Strongly Disagree-1	2008 Mean (n=11)	2010 Mean (n=10)	2011 Mean (n=5)
1	The intellectual climate in the department is stimulating.	3.64	4.20	4.60
2	I feel that I am part of a university learning community.	3.56	4.40	4.60
3	Students from diverse backgrounds are encouraged to share their knowledge and their experiences and views are valued.	3.90	4.40	4.80
4	Professional values and ethnics were modeled by the program community.	3.64	4.40	4.60

4. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the program-level support and communication?

#	SCALE: Strongly Agree-5 Agree-4 Neutral-3 Disagree-2 Strongly Disagree-1	2008 Mean (n=11)	2010 Mean (n=10)	2011 Mean (n=5)
1	I knew who to go to for information and help.	3.18	3.60	3.80
2	Information on program requirements was readily available.	3.27	3.30	3.20
3	The information I received was consistent.	2.73	3.10	3.00
4	When I had a problem, I was satisfied with the help I received in solving it.	3.00	3.40	3.20
5	Administrative staff members were available and helpful.	3.36	3.90	3.60
6	Courses listed in the catalog are offered frequently enough for timely completion of the degree requirements.	2.73	3.50	3.80
7	My advisor was knowledgeable about my degree/credential requirements.	3.64	3.30	4.60
8	My advisor was accessible (spent the time necessary to advise me on academic matters).	3.45/ 3.55	2.90	4.60
9	My advisor critiqued my work in ways that helped my work progress.	3.38	3.00	4.40

5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about university support services?

#	SCALE: Strongly Agree-5 Agree-4 Neutral-3 Disagree-2 Strongly Disagree-1	2008 Mean (n=11)	2010 Mean (n=10)	2011 Mean (n=5)
1	Technology services were satisfactory.	3.45	4.50	4.60
2	Library services met my course and research needs.	3.82	4.30	4.00
3	I was aware of the availability of career services.	3.45	3.11	4.00
4	I utilized career services.	3.33	2.57	3.60
5	Student organization functions were appropriate for needs.	3.33	3.50	4.33

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding overall satisfaction with the program?

#	SCALE: Strongly Agree-5 Agree-4 Neutral-3 Disagree-2 Strongly Disagree-1	2008 Mean (n=11)	2010 Mean (n=10)	2011 Mean (n=5)
1	My education experience fulfilled my expectations.	4.00	4.00	4.60
2	I believe that my program provided me with a good preparation for my career.	4.18	4.20	4.40
3	The investment I made in the program compares favorably with the quality of the experience.	3.82	3.80	4.40
4	I would recommend this program to prospective students.	4.00	3.90	4.40

12. What are your plans after program completion? Choose all that apply.

#	Answer	Response
1	Work in K-12 education.	23
2	Work in higher education.	5
3	Work in a field not related to the program.	0
4	Continue my education.	12
5	Other (please specify)	0

13. Which of the following best describes your present employment situation? Choose all that apply.

#	Answer	Response
1	I am presently employed.	4
2	I am currently seeking employment.	22
3	I have a job offer to start in the near future.	1
4	Other (please specify)	0

14. Have you obtained a new job because of your degree? (Not Asked in 2008)

#	Answer	Response
1	Yes	1
2	No	13
	Total	14

15. Will you be seeking a new job as a result of having this degree? (Not Asked in 2008)

#	Answer	Response
1	Yes	14
2	No	1
	Total	15

V. 2008-2011 Single Subject Exit Survey Summary

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about program faculty?

SCALE:		Strongly Agree 5	Agree 4	Neutral 3	Disagree 2	Strongly Disagree 1				
#	Question				2008 Data (n=6)	2010 Data (n=17)	2011 Data (n=7)			
1	Overall, the quality of instruction in my courses was good.				N/A	4.53	4.43			
2	There is good communication between faculty and students.				3.33	4.25	4.43			
3	There are appropriate opportunities outside the classroom for interaction between students and faculty.				3.17	4.29	4.43			
4	Faculty members in my program were helpful and supportive in my search for professional employment.				4.00	3.88	4.00			
5	Faculty members set high learning expectations.				4.50	4.53	4.43			
6	Faculty members respect diverse talents and ways of learning.				4.50	4.53	4.29			
7	Faculty members encourage students to be actively involved learners.				4.50	4.53	4.57			
8	Faculty members give you frequent and prompt feedback.				4.00	4.41	4.14			
9	Faculty members care about the academic success and welfare of the students.				4.67	4.76	4.57			
10	Faculty members develop opportunities for you to learn cooperatively with fellow students.				4.00	4.65	4.29			
2008	<i>Faculty members prepare carefully for their graduate courses.</i>				4.60	N/A	N/A			
2008	<i>The courses I took were well taught.</i>				4.17	N/A	N/A			
2008	<i>Faculty members in my program were interested in the welfare and professional development of graduate students.</i>				4.60	N/A	N/A			
2008	<i>Faculty members were well qualified to teach their courses.</i>				4.50	N/A	N/A			
2008	<i>Faculty members encourage student-faculty interaction.</i>				4.00	N/A	N/A			
2008	<i>Faculty members encourage you to devote sufficient time and energy to your coursework.</i>				4.17	N/A	N/A			
2008	<i>Faculty members were accessible outside of class</i>				3.83	N/A	N/A			

2. To what degree has your learning and teaching course work enhanced your ability to

SCALE:		Extremely Well	Well	Moderately	Poorly	Not At All			
		5	4	3	2	1			
#	Question						2008 Data (n=)	2010 Data (n=17)	2011 Data (n=7)
1	Design and conduct original research.						N/A	4.29	3.00
2	Understand group dynamics.						N/A	4.29	4.14
3	Recognize and resolve ethical issues.						N/A	4.13	3.86
4	Understand organizational behavior, especially the role of leadership in fostering intentional change.						N/A	4.19	3.71
5	Communicate orally.						N/A	4.12	4.14
6	Communicate in writing.						N/A	4.29	4.14
7	Think critically about contemporary leadership issues.						N/A	4.24	3.86

3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the intellectual climate within the program?

SCALE:		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree			
		5	4	3	2	1			
#	Question						2008 Data (n=6)	2010 Data (n=17)	2011 Data (n=7)
1	The intellectual climate in the department is stimulating.						4.17	4.35	4.14
2	I feel that I am part of a university learning community.						3.83	4.53	4.14
3	Students from diverse backgrounds are encouraged to share their knowledge and their experiences and views are valued.						4.33	4.53	4.14
4	Professional values and ethnics were modeled by the program community.						4.00	4.47	4.14

4. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the program-level support and communication?

SCALE:		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree				
		5	4	3	2	1				
#	Question					2008 Data (n=6)	2010 Data (n=17)	2011 Data (n=7)		
1	I knew who to go to for information and help.					2.33	4.18	4.29		
2	Information on program requirements was readily available.					2.00	4.24	4.14		
3	The information I received was consistent.					1.83	4.00	3.71		
4	When I had a problem, I was satisfied with the help I received in solving it.					2.00	4.12	4.14		
5	Administrative staff members were available and helpful.					2.50	4.44	4.00		
6	Courses listed in the catalog are offered frequently enough for timely completion of the degree requirements.					3.00	4.43	4.00		
7	My advisor was knowledgeable about my degree/credential requirements.					3.67	4.27	4.29		
8	My advisor was accessible (spent the time necessary to advise me on academic matters).					3.67	4.27	3.86		
9	My advisor critiqued my work in ways that helped my work progress.					3.83	4.20	3.80		

5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about university support services?

SCALE:		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree				
		5	4	3	2	1				
#	Question					2008 Data (n=6)	2010 Data (n=17)	2011 Data (n=7)		
1	Technology services were satisfactory.					4.00	4.25	4.14		
2	Library services met my course and research needs.					3.75	4.40	3.83		
3	I was aware of the availability of career services.					3.33	3.24	4.14		
4	I utilized career services.					2.33	2.92	3.67		
5	Student organization functions were appropriate for needs.					2.75	3.62	3.33		

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding overall satisfaction with the program?

SCALE:		Strongly Agree 5	Agree 4	Neutral 3	Disagree 2	Strongly Disagree 1	2008 Data (n=6)	2010 Data (n=17)	2011 Data (n=7)
#	Question								
1	My education experience fulfilled my expectations.						3.33	4.29	4.29
2	I believe that my program provided me with a good preparation for my career.						3.67	4.65	4.29
3	The investment I made in the program compares favorably with the quality of the experience.						3.00	4.29	4.00
4	I would recommend this program to prospective students.						3.33	4.41	4.00

12. What are your plans after program completion? Choose all that apply.

#	Answer	Response
1	Work in K-12 education.	26
2	Work in higher education.	8
3	Work in a field not related to the program.	
4	Continue my education.	10
5	Other (please specify)	3

Other (please specify)

I plan to move overseas to teach either through Peace Corps or other alternatives.

Farming

work as a middle school math teacher

13. Which of the following best describes your present employment situation? Choose all that apply.

#	Answer	Response
1	I am presently employed.	5
2	I am currently seeking employment.	22
3	I have a job offer to start in the near future.	5
4	Other (please specify)	1

14. Have you obtained a new job because of your degree? (Not Asked in 2008)

#	Answer	Response
1	Yes	6
2	No	18
	Total	

15. Will you be seeking a new job as a result of having this degree? (Not Asked in 2008)

#	Answer	Response
1	Yes	23
2	No	1
	Total	

VI. Alumni Survey (2007-2009 Credential Completers)

Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist Credential Completers 2007-2009 Alumni Survey

1. At what level were you first hired after earning your credential?

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Preschool	2	3%
2	Elementary, K-6	7	10%
3	Middle School, Junior High School	13	18%
4	High School	12	16%
5	Special Education: Early Childhood	2	3%
6	Special Education: Deaf & Hard of Hearing	6	8%
7	Special Education: Mild/Moderate	9	12%
8	Special Education: Moderate/Severe	5	7%
9	Not employed as a teacher	17	23%
	Total	73	100%

2. Year in which you were first hired as a teacher:

#	Answer	Response	%
3	2006	4	13%
4	2007	5	16%
5	2008	7	22%
6	2009	8	25%
7	2010	8	25%
8	2011	0	0%
9	2012	0	0%
10	2013	0	0%
11	2014	0	0%
	Total	32	100%

4. PREPARATION: Please indicate how well prepared you were in each of the following areas:

#	Question	Well prepared	Adequately prepared	Minimally prepared	Not prepared	Responses	Mean
1	classroom management for instruction.	13	19	8	3	43	2.98
2	student motivation and classroom management of student behavior.	14	21	5	3	43	3.07
3	lesson plans development	25	17	1	0	43	3.56
4	knowledge of teaching strategies.	22	19	2	0	43	3.47
5	teaching English learners.	15	15	7	4	41	3.00
6	teaching culturally diverse students.	20	17	5	1	43	3.30
7	teaching students with special needs.	17	15	9	1	42	3.14
8	effective communication with parents and guardians.	18	16	7	2	43	3.16
9	working collaboratively with other teachers on school issues.	17	20	5	1	43	3.23
10	thinking about problems in teaching and using alternative solutions.	19	19	3	2	43	3.28
11	engaging students and sustaining on-task behavior.	18	15	9	0	42	3.21
12	understand how personal, family, and community conditions may affect learning	23	13	5	2	43	3.33
13	use of computer-based applications as appropriate to assist student learning.	13	16	13	1	43	2.95
14	use of computer-based technology to maintain student records.	10	15	13	5	43	2.70
15	monitoring student progress by using formal and informal assessment methods.	23	14	4	1	42	3.40
16	assessment of student progress by analyzing a variety of evidence, including test scores.	14	21	6	2	43	3.09
17	how to use class time efficiently by relying on daily routines and planned transitions.	18	12	9	4	43	3.02
18	how to find resources in the school and community for at-risk students/families.	14	13	11	5	43	2.84
19	principles of educational equity in the teaching of all students.	25	13	4	1	43	3.44

5. Based on your first year of teaching, please assess how well prepared you were to:

#	Question	Well prepared	Adequately prepared	Minimally prepared	Not prepared	Responses	Mean
1	know the content of the curriculum at your grade level.	0	3	1	1	5	2.40
2	understand child development and human learning.	1	2	2	0	5	2.80
3	foster academic skills of students at different levels of proficiency.	1	2	2	0	5	2.80
4	assist individual students in areas of instructional need in reading/math.	1	2	1	0	4	3.00
5	use language to facilitate student understanding of oral and written English.	1	3	1	0	5	3.00
6	teach grammar, punctuation, spelling and structure.	1	2	1	1	5	2.60
7	teach vocabulary and concept development.	2	1	1	1	5	2.80
8	foster students' listening comprehension and oral speaking skills.	2	1	2	0	5	3.00
9	develop students' reading fluency.	0	4	0	1	5	2.60
10	teach computational and procedural skills in math.	1	2	0	1	4	2.75
11	teach conceptual understanding and the logic of math.	1	2	0	1	4	2.75
12	use multiple strategies to teach math problem solving skills.	1	1	1	1	4	2.50
13	use electronic media, websites and software to enhance classroom instruction.	0	2	0	2	4	2.00
14	teach reading-language arts according to California Standards in Reading.	1	2	0	1	4	2.75
15	teach mathematics according to California Standards in Math.	1	1	1	1	4	2.50
16	teach science according to California Standards in Science.	1	1	0	1	3	2.67
17	teach history and social studies according to California Content Standards.	1	1	0	1	3	2.67
18	teach visual and performing arts according to California Content Standards.	1	1	0	1	3	2.67

6. Based on your first year of teaching, please assess how well prepared you were to:

#	Question	Well prepared	Adequately prepared	Minimally prepared	Not prepared	Responses	Mean
1	know the content in your primary subject.	6	6	4	1	17	3.00
2	understand adolescent development and human learning.	5	9	3	0	17	3.12
3	foster academic skills of students at different levels of proficiency.	4	6	7	0	17	2.82
4	assist individual students in areas of instructional need in the subject area.	6	8	3	0	17	3.18
5	contribute to students' reading skills including vocabulary and comprehension.	3	9	4	1	17	2.82
6	establish academic expectations that are intellectually challenging.	6	9	2	0	17	3.24
7	provide opportunities for students to develop advanced problem-solving skills	4	8	4	1	17	2.88
8	communicate course goals and requirements to students.	7	6	4	0	17	3.18
9	communicate course goals and requirements to parents or guardians.	6	8	2	0	16	3.25
10	develop fair criteria for course grades and explain these to students/parents.	7	7	3	0	17	3.24
11	anticipate and address the needs of students at risk of dropping out.	2	4	9	2	17	2.35
12	help students realize connections between the subject and life beyond school.	5	7	4	1	17	2.94
13	use electronic media, websites and software to enhance classroom instruction.	5	8	4	0	17	3.06
14	teach your primary subject area according to the California State Academic Content Standards.	4	10	1	1	16	3.06
15	use textbooks and other materials aligned with California State Content Standards.	5	6	1	3	15	2.87

7. Based on your first year of teaching, please assess how well you felt prepared to:

#	Question	Well prepared	Adequately prepared	Minimally prepared	Not prepared	Responses	Mean
1	interpret and apply federal and state laws that govern special education	5	8	1	0	14	3.29
2	assess students' abilities using multiple assessment methods.	8	5	1	0	14	3.50
3	adapt the curriculum to meet the needs of students with disabilities.	10	3	1	0	14	3.64
4	develop and implement IEPs with parents/guardians, teachers, and administrators.	7	4	3	0	14	3.29
5	use individual and group assessment data in planning appropriate lessons.	8	4	2	0	14	3.43
6	plan instructional activities in integrated settings for students with disabilities.	8	5	1	0	14	3.50
7	use teaching strategies suggested by the research with special ed. students.	8	5	1	0	14	3.50
8	use positive behavioral support techniques.	9	4	1	0	14	3.57
9	monitor outcomes and modify instruction based on individual student accomplishments..	9	4	1	0	14	3.57
10	develop student assessments that indicate progress toward IEP objectives.	6	5	3	0	14	3.21

11	conduct educational assessments as defined in students' IEPs.	8	4	2	0	14	3.43
12	consult with regular ed. teachers about teaching special ed. students.	6	6	1	0	13	3.38
13	work with other teachers in inclusive school environments.	6	7	1	0	14	3.36
14	collaborate with para-educators in meeting students instructional needs.	9	2	3	0	14	3.43
15	teach reading-language arts according to California Standards in Reading.	5	5	3	0	13	3.15
16	teach mathematics according to California Standards in Math.	5	5	3	0	13	3.15
17	teach science according to California Standards in Science.	5	5	3	0	13	3.15
18	teach history and social studies according to California Content Standards.	5	5	3	0	13	3.15