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Note: Annual Report on Liberal Studies Program is being submitted separately.  

Further note to Director of Assessment: This is a work in progress. I greatly underestimated how much work we had to do on this in terms of compiling this material.  

A. Goals  

Students completing Westmont’s Teaching Credential Program will demonstrate at a high level the 13 sets of competencies identified by the state of California’s Commission on Teacher Credentialing as essential for the classroom.  

The thirteen Teaching Performance Expectations (or TPEs) were identified by the state in 2001, and have been the basis for much of our evaluation of individual student teachers since then.  

Among other places, these 13 sets of competencies are listed on the Student Teacher Summative Evaluation of Professional Competencies form, used by Master Teachers in the field to evaluate our student teachers (attached).  

What constitutes a “high level” will vary according to the instrument. For example, in the case of the Master Teacher Evaluation form, we have defined “High level” as an average score of 4.00 (“Very Good”) on our five-point survey scale. In the case of the Teaching Performance Assessment, our target is to have 100% of our candidates score at a level of 3 or above on a 4-point scale. Similarly, on the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment, our goal is to have 100% of our students receive a passing score.  

B, C & D. Data, interpretation, and implications for the department  

As indicated in both the Department of Education’s Assessment Plan and the September 2005 special update, we have a long tradition of collecting a range of data on our candidates for teaching. Such data include the following. Categories of data to be summarized and reflected on in this reporting cycle are listed in bold.
1) **Master Teacher evaluations of Student Teaching.** The evaluation form is based directly on the 13 TPEs (annually since at least the 1980s; summary and written interpretation available beginning ‘05).

2) **Master Teacher Evaluations of Program** (annually beginning ’06).

3) **First Year Graduates Survey, including a new component tied to the State of California’s TPEs, introduced in 2004-05** (annually since at least the 1980s: summary and written interpretation available since ’05)

4) **Employers of First Year Graduates Survey.** This form likewise is based directly on the TPEs (annually since at least the 1980s; summary and written interpretation available since ’05)

5) **Senior Interviews,** linked to the College’s six learning standards but which overlap to some degree the 13 TPEs (annually, beginning with May 2004 graduates). While the Interviews speak to both the Liberal Studies program and the Credential program, we have chosen to provide written reflection on these interviews (’04 and ’05) in the separate report on the Liberal Studies major.

6) **Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) results** (Multiple Subject program only; annually. Written analysis available beginning ’05).

7) **Students’ Student Teaching Portfolios,** including candidates’ essays reflecting on performance and achievement in each of the State of California’s six evaluative domains, with related artifacts (selected outstanding portfolios saved annually since at least 2004)

8) **One or more components of the State of California’s Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA).** This has been administered informally since 2002; a more formal assessment of TPA Tasks #3 and #4, with archived results, began in spring of 2007.

9) **Teacher and principal comments on program quality from meetings of the Westmont Teacher Education Advisory Board** (some gaps, but typically one annual meeting; written comments, using informal surveys, begin Fall of 2005).

*Department archive: All of these sources of data are on file and available through the Department’s Program Assistant.*

***

1) **Master Teacher evaluations of Student Teaching.** The evaluation form is based directly on the 13 TPEs (annually since at least the 1980s; summary and written interpretation available beginning ‘05).

Multiple Subject (Elementary) student teachers:

As noted above, the departmental target on this instrument is an average rating of 4.00 (Very Good) on a 5.00 scale. Unlike the two previous two years, when master teachers scored candidates 4.00 or above on average in 45 of the 47 total categories, for this year’s
cohort 38 of the 47 categories were scored at 4.00 or above. In the following 9 areas (including items classified under TPE 1, 7, 8, and 11) master teachers scored Westmont elementary student teachers on average below 4.00.

TPE 1: Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills

b) Mathematics: Anticipates and addresses student misunderstandings 3.9
d) History-Social Science: Encourages students’ development as citizens… 3.9
e) Visual/Performing Arts: Plans a variety of activities in the arts… 3.9
f) Physical Education: Develops motor skills and teamwork…. 3.9

TPE 7: Teaching English Learners

Has theoretical background for identifying and analyzing issues… 3.9
Actively seeks knowledge about students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds… 3.7
Collaborates effectively with other professionals, para-professionals, and family…3.7

TPE 8: Learning about Students

Gets parents and families involved in learning 3.7

TPE 11: Social Environment

Communicates clearly expectations for student behavior… 3.7

Interpretation:

Seven of these nine areas are new, and in fact fall in some cases into areas where Westmont candidates have traditionally been judged superior (e.g., TPE 11).

Lower scores in the Visual/Performing Arts and in Learning about Students (italicized above) are recurring. However, they may reflect more on the nature of schools as currently structured, and/or the nature of the student teaching experience, than on Westmont’s program per se.

Action:

As in the past we will continue to remind student teachers that these have been identified as areas of weaker composite performance by their immediate predecessors, and that they
will need to be extra vigilant. For example, we regularly remind student teachers that if they are to display proficiency in teaching the arts, they are typically the one who will have to take the initiative.

This year’s scores under *Teaching English Learners*, while slightly lower than in the past, have traditionally been lower relative to other TPE’s. On the whole, it is our belief that such scores may reflect more the inherent difficulty of the task—and the increasing proportion of such students in the classroom—than a particular deficiency in our program. Nonetheless, we continue to emphasize this across our coursework. Likewise, we will continue to discuss this area with our Teacher Advisory Board.

**Single Subject student teachers (tabulation of results in process)**

We had a total two secondary student teachers this year, as follows.

English: 1  
Biology: 1  

2) **Master Teacher Evaluations of Program**

This is the second year we have asked master teachers to complete, in addition to the lengthy evaluation of their own individual student teacher, a brief evaluation of the PROGRAM.

What we have found is that master teachers have a great deal of difficulty disentangling their assessment of a particular student teacher from their assessment of the program. How valid an instrument it is, then, remains in doubt.

The exercise does include, however, one element not addressed elsewhere—*Quality of communication with department (To what extent were the college’s expectations for you as a master teacher made clear prior to and throughout the semester?)*. A total of ___ evaluations was received this year, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of forms received</th>
<th>Average rating on Communication/Clarity of Expectations (5 pt scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected master teacher comments:
3) **First Year Graduates Survey**, including a new component tied to the State of California’s TPEs, introduced in 2004-05 (annually since at least the 1980s; summary and written interpretation available since ’05). *(In process as of September 2007)*

4) **Employers of First Year Graduates Survey**. This form likewise is based directly on the TPEs (annually since at least the 1980s; summary and written interpretation available since ’05). *(In process as of September 2007)*

6) **Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) results** (Multiple Subject program only; annually. Written analysis available beginning ’05).

Since the RICA was created, Westmont has maintained a 100% average pass rate, as the rates are calculated for federal reporting purposes. This year for the first time, we had one student who—although ultimately successful—did not re-take the test in time for us to report a 100% pass rate.

We have continued to analyze the data available for each of the four domains of the RICA. Although the average scores are extremely close, the area of assessment appears to be slightly lower again this year than the other three domains—a result consistent with what we have seen on the Teaching Performance Assessment for skills in assessment across the board. [Is this ok to include in the report, Ruth?]

8) **One or more components of the State of California’s Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)**. This has been administered informally since 2002; a more formal assessment of TPA Tasks #3 and #4, with archived results, began in spring of 2007. *(In process as of September 2007)*