

Undergraduate Teacher Education Center California Educator Credentialing Examinations (CSETs) Passage

ASSESSMENT REPORT ACADEMIC YEAR 2019 – 2020 **REPORT DUE DATE: 12/4/20**

- Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), as well as graduate and non-degree granting certificate programs of the College of Arts and Sciences.
- Programs can combine assessment reports for a major and a minor program into one aggregate report as long as the mission statements, program learning outcome(s) evaluated, methodology applied to each, and the results are clearly delineated in separate sections.
- Undergraduate, graduate and certificate programs must submit separate reports
- It is recommended that each assessment report not exceed 10 pages. Additional materials (optional) can be added as appendices.
- A curricular map should be submitted along with each assessment report (we suggest that the curricular map should be informed by recent assessment outcomes).

Some useful contacts:

1. Prof. Alexandra Amati, FDCD, Arts – adamati@usfca.edu
2. Prof. John Lendvay, FDCD, Sciences – lendvay@usfca.edu
3. Prof. Mark Meritt, FDCD, Humanities – meritt@usfca.edu
4. Prof. Michael Jonas, FDCD, Social Sciences – mrjonas@usfca.edu
5. Prof. Suparna Chakraborty, AD Academic Effectiveness – schakraborty2@usfca.edu

Academic Effectiveness Annual Assessment Resource Page:

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/arts-sciences/faculty-resources/academic-effectiveness/assessment>

Email to submit the report: assessment_cas@usfca.edu

Important: Please write the name of your program or department in the subject line.

For example: FineArts_Major (if you decide to submit a separate report for major and minor);

FineArts_Aggregate (when submitting an aggregate report)

I. LOGISTICS

1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent (usually Chair, Program Director, or Faculty Assessment Coordinator).

Michael Rozendal, UTEC Academic Director, marozendal@usfca.edu &

Mary Coen, UTEC Administrative Director, mlcoen@usfca.edu

2. Please indicate if you are submitting report for (a) a Major, (b) a Minor, (c) a Major and Minor aggregated report (in which case, each should be explained in a separate paragraph as in this template), (d) a Graduate or (e) a Certificate Program

Undergraduate Teacher Credentialing Programs

3. Please note that a Curricular Map should accompany every assessment report. Have there been any revisions to the Curricular Map?

No revisions. Map included in supporting documents.

II. MISSION STATEMENT & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2019? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.” Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor programs

No changes.

The Undergraduate Teacher Education Center fosters a culture of collaborative learning and critical pedagogies, preparing tomorrow’s teachers to thrive in urban classrooms and to be agents of social justice in their communities.

2. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2019? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.” Please provide the current PLOs below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current PLOs for both the major and the minor programs.

Note: It is expected that PLOs will vary in level of mastery between different programs in the same discipline (e. g., a major and minor in the same subject area). Major revisions in the program learning outcomes need to go through the College Curriculum Committee (contact: Professor Joshua Gamson, gamson@usfca.edu). Minor editorial changes are not required to go through the College Curriculum Committee.

No changes.

Students will:

1. Discuss the California primary or secondary education system
 2. Navigate the teacher preparation process
 3. Employ effective teaching practices in primary or secondary educational settings
 4. Design lessons that intertwine social justice engagement and subject matter competence
- 3. State the particular program learning outcome(s) you assessed for the academic year 2019-2020. What rubric did you use?**

The Role of Rubrics

The rubric is the single most important thing you need for assessment, and putting time and thinking into designing a good rubric is going to make the entire process a lot easier, faster, and meaningful. Your rubric should break down your chosen PLO into the smallest measurable components, so that the assessment of each piece of work becomes linear and easy, and the calibration among different faculty assessing more objective. If you still have to debate a while whether that one line of the rubric has been fulfilled or not, chances are your rubric item is still an aggregate and can be broken down further into smaller components. Once you have made a detailed rubric, then not only the “grading” work will be faster and straightforward, but at the end of it you will have data that is significantly more meaningful. For example, some parts of the PLO may be in tiptop shape while others may need to be massaged or tweaked, with more attention given to that particular item in class. Conversely, your data may show you that the PLO itself is not what you thought it should be—it may be that it duplicates something other PLOs include or that a crucial part of what you teach is getting lost in the cracks between your PLOs. So do make sure that the rubric is as detailed and thorough as you possibly can manage (a short rubric in fact makes the grading longer, as counterintuitive as that seems).

Rubrics:

There are no rubrics for this assessment. We analyzed the performance of students on state standardized tests (CSETs). CSET passage analysis was done in pursuit of supporting our diverse students achieving a California teaching credential.

PLO(s) being assessed:

2. Navigate the teacher preparation process

III. METHODOLOGY

Describe the methodology that you used to assess the PLO(s).

For example, “the department used questions that were inputted in the final examination pertaining directly to the <said PLO>. An independent group of faculty (not teaching the course) then evaluated the responses to the questions and gave the students a score for responses to those questions.”

Important Note – WSCUC advises us to use “direct methods,” which consist of a direct evaluation of a student work product. “Indirect methods” like exit interviews or student surveys can be used only as additional complements to a direct method.

For any program with fewer than 10 students: If you currently have fewer than 10 students in your program (rendering your statistical analysis biased due to too few data points), it is fine to describe a multi-year data collection strategy here. It would be important to remember that every 3 years, we would expect you to have enough data to conduct a meaningful analysis.

Important: Please attach, at the end of this report, a copy of the rubric used for assessment

Rubric

No rubric (see above notes)

Methodology used:

As part of a larger process of evaluating the challenges our students face in navigating the California Teacher Credentialing process, UTEC undertook a comprehensive review of our students' historic passage of the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSETs) with the goal of highlighting areas and tests that have been problematic for our students. In order to target particular groups that might benefit from particular interventions, we culled a number of demographic figures from our extensive, in-house database.

Link to Data: Multiple Subject candidates' CSET Passage data: <https://bit.ly/33xvNQs>
Single Subject candidates' CSET Passage data: <https://bit.ly/39MS7K3>

Since this is a project aimed to highlight successful early interventions and ongoing areas of difficulty, we also recorded all of our current CSET supports and interventions in the 2019-20 year.

Link to Data: 2019-20 Multiple Subject and Single Subject passage data: <https://bit.ly/2VuH13I>

The CSETs taken vary depending on the type of credential that a student is pursuing: Multiple Subjects or Single Subjects in particular subject areas (e.g., English, History, Science, Math)..

What follows are excerpts from the report generated by our Graduate Student Assistant, Molly Strout, in coordination with our Program Manager, Amy Joseph. We are still examining this substantial corpus as part of a multi-year assessment project. We plan to use this material to reassess our CSET interventions next year. We are also sharing this data set with colleagues in the Teacher Education Department who are writing about the CSETs, in the hope that it will fuel change not just locally but also more broadly.

Here, in the words of Molly Strout & Amy Joseph, are the methodologies for our assessment:

Students' overall completion or incompleteness of their CSET exams was assessed using the information recorded in the UTEC's custom FileMaker Pro database. The students assessed extended from Fall 2009 to the Spring 2020 cohorts. We tracked the passage of the exams taken by the Multiple and Single Subject students by using a Google spreadsheet. The spreadsheet assessed the students using the following components:

1. **Cohort:** The cohort the students belonged to is listed in their database record.
2. **Didn't Complete:** If checked, these students' files indicated that they didn't complete all of the required exams they were supposed to complete for the program.
3. **Completed:** If checked, these students' files indicated that they did complete all the required exams they were supposed to complete for the program.
4. **No Retakes:** If checked, these students' files indicate that they passed their exams in the first try or take.

5. **1 Retake & Test:** If checked, these students' files indicated that they had to retake one or more exams one more time than the initial take before passing. Next to these checked boxes lists the exam(s) they had to retake.
6. **2 Retakes & Test:** If checked, these students' files indicated that they had to retake one or more exams two more times than the initial take before passing. Next to these checked boxes lists the exam(s) they had to retake.
7. **3+ Retakes & Test:** If checked, these students' files indicated that they had to retake one or more exams three or more times than the initial take before passing. Next to these checked boxes lists the exam(s) they had to retake.

Note: Some students are listed as not completing their exams but still have one or more retakes. This indicates that they retook certain exams, but never completed all of the required exams they were supposed to complete for the program.

IV. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise? This section asks you to highlight the results of the exercise. Pertinent information here would include:

- a. how well students mastered the outcome at the level they were intended to
- b. any trends noticed over the past few assessment cycles
- c. the levels at which students mastered the outcome based on the rubric used

Results, Major Findings, Areas for Improvement

Links to Data: Multiple Subject candidates' CSET Passage data: <https://bit.ly/33xvNQs>
Single Subject candidates' CSET Passage data: <https://bit.ly/39MS7K3>
2019-20 Multiple Subject and Single Subject passage data:
<https://bit.ly/2VuH13l>

- Summer 2011 CSET changes from paper-based tests to computer-based tests. Content areas remained the same. No other information was found about the actual test changing from search done on April 13, 2020.
https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/coded/2011/1108.pdf?sfvrsn=576c221_0
- In examining the exam passages for the students recorded, we see an increase in the number of student retakes after computer-based tests were implemented.

- *2019 & 2020 Cohorts*

Multiple Subject Students

The exams that were retaken the most were CSETs II & III from these two cohorts.

Single Subject Students

There were no retakes indicated by the student files.

- There was a noticeable uptick of repeat tests in 2015, but this went down in 2016. It then went back up for 2017 and has more or less stayed at that level since, including cohorts 2019 and 2020.

UTEC CSET Support and Interventions 2019-20:

CSET intervention/preparation has always been a key goal/factor in any teacher preparation program. At UTEC, just like other institutions with similar programs, our students have struggled when it comes to studying and preparing themselves for their CSET exams. One of UTEC's primary supports for the CSETs has been in advising students to take particular, targeted courses that satisfy USF requirements (core, major) while also supporting passage of the CSETs in particular areas. This has been supplemented with a library of CSET preparation material for our students, and targeted support for struggling students, particularly in Math.

With the support of Graduate Student Assistant Molly Strout, UTEC piloted some CSET interventions in Fall 2019. At that time, Molly focused on creating weekly practice problems for the Math for Educators class. She worked closely with a current student, who was a TA for the class, to distribute the preparation materials to the enrolled students. These weekly practice problems primarily focused on the Math section of the CSET for Multiple Subject students and were dispersed out with five practice problems per week.

Moving into Spring 2020, Molly was tasked with supporting a few Multiple Subjects students to help them prepare for particular CSET exams. To get an understanding for what kind of support they needed, she requested a copy of their last exam scores. This document gives a breakdown of what students particularly need to work on for both the multiple choice and constructed response questions for the particular exams they have taken. Each student Molly supported in the Spring 2020 semester varied in the content in which they needed support. Below is a list of the ways she supported these particular students:

1. Created a Google Folder shared with that particular student to store the necessary documents to aid in test preparation
 - a. These folders included 15 weeks worth of practice problems (5 problems/week) for MS Subtests I, II, and III.

Subtest I

→ Reading, Language, and Literature

→ History & Social Science

Subtest II
→ Math
→ Science

Subtest III

→ Human Development
→ Physical Education
→ Visual & Performing Arts

- b. Adapted a document from the CTC website that breaks down what each candidate taking the Multiple Subjects CSET must know to pass the exams. Created three separate documents for each subtest.
2. Reached out to all the current students through email to provide them with the opportunity to receive additional one-on-one support.

Molly focused on CSET intervention for Multiple Subject students, not Single Subject students, as she had a background in and direct experience with the content on the Multiple Subject CSET exams.

The students Molly supported focused mainly on the subtests for Math, Science, History and Social Science, and Reading, Language and Literature. While supporting the students in these content areas, Molly also created practice problems for Subtest III.

Molly noted that the Math for Educators students did not take advantage of any of the CSET interventions. For example, the students had access to practice problems, but not the answers. The answers would be given upon request by the students, but Molly never received any communication from the students to get the answers.

For Subtests I and II, students needed the most support in History and Math. Molly noted that the History test in particular requires students to remember numerous facts off the top of their heads without knowing which of these facts they will be tested on.

Finally, Molly noted that despite a significant number of students expressing interest in CSET support, no students took advantage of the support offered.

V. CLOSING THE LOOP: ACTION PLAN BASED ON ASSESSMENT RESULTS

1. Based on your analysis in Section 4, what are the next steps that you are planning in order to achieve the desired level of mastery in the assessed learning outcome? This section could also address more long-term planning that your department/program is considering and does not require any changes to be implemented in the next academic year itself.

From the minimal uptake of the pilot intervention in 2019-20, we will spend the next assessment focusing on extending and developing CSET support that might be more effective or widely used. We have already made a connection with 240 Tutoring, an online CSET support service, to help our students in their passage of these mandated tests.

2. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2018-2019, submitted in Spring 2020)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in the more recent assessment discussed in this report?

Suggestions:

Not applicable.

VI. BIG PICTURE

What have you learned about your program from successive rounds of assessment? Is a picture of the whole program starting to emerge? For example, what areas of strength have emerged? What opportunities of improvement have you identified?

Lessons learned:

- In education, we all know that standardized testing is often a “gate-keeping” process, and that these processes are most effective in keeping those “outside the gates” who have been kept out in the past. To be blunt, they reinscribe exclusion. Many excellent candidates who could contribute to diversifying California’s schools have struggled with these tests, so we want to be sure that we are fully supporting our students in passing them through early, targeted interventions.

Opportunities include:

- We are in a moment of transition, as the pandemic disruptions have forced both implicit and explicit reevaluation of the role of the CSETs in teacher preparation. While there is hope that this will bear long-term fruit, perhaps even in the elimination of these exams, we want to be sure that we are fully supporting our students in the present so that they face the least obstacles to being transformative educators.

VII. Feedback to your Assessment Team

What suggestions do you have for your assessment team (the Faculty Directors of Curriculum Development and the Associate Dean for Academic Effectiveness)? What can we do to improve the process?

None.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

(Any rubrics used for assessment, relevant tables, charts and figures should be included here)

Links to Data

Multiple Subject candidates' CSET Passage data: <https://bit.ly/33xvNQs>

Single Subject candidates' CSET Passage data: <https://bit.ly/39MS7K3>

2019-20 Multiple Subject and Single Subject passage data: <https://bit.ly/2VuH13I>

Undergraduate Teacher Education Center Curriculum Map 2020

Program Learning Outcomes	Courses		
	Introduction to the Teaching Profession (INTD 110)	First Fieldwork (INTD 385, 387)	Second Fieldwork (INTD 386, 387)
1. Discuss the California primary or secondary education system	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced
2. Navigate the teacher preparation process	Beginning	Advanced Beginning	Intermediate
3. Employ effective teaching practices in primary or secondary educational settings		Beginning	Intermediate
4. Design lessons that intertwine social justice engagement and subject matter competence		Beginning	Intermediate

SS CSET Report Tallies

Single Subject

Key

MC ~ Multiple Choice Only

CR ~ Constructed Response Only

Across All Cohorts/Years

Single Subject English

Subtest I → Reading Literature and Information Texts; Composition and Rhetoric (MC)

Subtest II → Language, Linguistics, and Literacy (MC)

Subtest III → Reading Literature and Information Texts; Composition and Rhetoric (CR)

Subtest IV → Communications: Speech, Media, and Creative Performance (CR)

Subtest	Retaken Once	Retaken Twice	Retaken Three+ Times	Totals
I	4	1	-	5
II	1	1	-	2
III	2	2	-	4
IV	7	-	1	7

Single Subject History/Social Science

Subtest I → World History; World Geography

Subtest II → US History; US Geography

Subtest III → Civics; Economics; California History

Subtest	Retaken Once	Retaken Twice	Retaken Three+ Times	Totals
I	9	1	3	13
II	4	2	2	8
III	3	4	2	9

Single Subject Mathematics

Subtest I → Number and Quantity; Algebra

Subtest II → Geometry; Probability and Statistics

Subtest III → Calculus

Subtest	Retaken Once	Retaken Twice	Retaken Three+ Times	Totals
I	2	1	1	4
II	2	1	-	3
III	3	1	-	4

Single Subject Science

Subtest I → Scientific Practices, Engineering Design and Application, and Crosscutting Concepts;

Physical

Sciences; Life Sciences; Earth and Space Sciences

Subtest II → One of the following concentrations: Life Sciences; Chemistry; Earth and Space Sciences;

Physics

Subtest	Retaken Once	Retaken Twice	Retaken Three+ Times	Totals
I	1	1	1	3
II	1	1	-	2

Individual Cohorts (Retakes Undifferentiated)

English

Subtest	'09	'10	'11	'12	'13	'14	'15	'16	'17	'18	'19	'20
I	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-
II	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
III	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-
IV	-	-	2	1	-	2	1	2	-	-	-	-
Totals	0	0	2	4	0	5	1	2	1	2	2	0

History/Social Science

Subtest	'09	'10	'11	'12	'13	'14	'15	'16	'17	'18	'19	'20
I	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	3	4	2	-	-
II	-	-	1	1	-	-	3	2	1	1	-	-
III	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	2	2	1	-	-
Totals	0	0	3	2	1	0	6	7	7	4	0	0

Mathematics

Subtest	'09	'10	'11	'12	'13	'14	'15	'16	'17	'18	'19	'20
I	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	-
II	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
III	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-
Totals	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	2	0	3	0

Science

Subtest	'09	'10	'11	'12	'13	'14	'15	'16	'17	'18	'19	'20
I	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-
II	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
Totals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	0

Multiple Subject

Across All Cohorts/Years

Test	Retaken Once	Retaken Twice	Retaken Three+ Times	Totals
CSET I	23	10	6	39
CSET II	20	7	9	36
CSET III	22	13	5	40
Writing Skills	12	2	3	17

Individual Cohorts (Retakes Undifferentiated)

Test	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
CSET I				3	4	3	6	3	6	4	3	3
CSET II			1	1	4	1	5	3	7	1	5	4
CSET III				5	5	4	7	2	6	4	2	4
WS				3	5	3	1	1	0	0	2	1
Totals			1	12	18	11	19	9	19	9	12	12