I. Mission statement

A. The following mission statement has for many years guided the work of the Education Department at Westmont:

*Within the Christian liberal arts context, the Westmont teacher education program strives to develop reflective teachers who meet the needs of all learners through integrated and balanced instruction, who embrace the moral dimensions of teaching, and who desire to grow professionally.*

The Department has discussed with the Teacher Advisory Board the possibility of writing a new mission statement. For a range of reasons, we have chosen not to write a new statement at this time, but may do so early in the tenure of our new faculty hires (Fall 2009).

The paragraphs that follow (written Spring 2008) serve to unpack themes and emphases in the current mission statement, and to relate these to the larger institutional context.

The Liberal Arts Context:

*Academic and personal preparation befitting a complex profession*

Central to the work of the department, consistent with the context introduced above, and consistent with major documents on the education of teachers, is the belief that effective professional practice grows out of a rigorous liberal and humanistic education (*A Nation Prepared*, 1986; NCTAF, 2003; Darling-Hammond and Bransford, 2005). Although teacher preparation includes the development of specific professional knowledge, skills, and habits of mind, we recognize that such professional preparation rests on larger educational foundations. Especially given the complexity of our 21st-century world and the complexities and ambiguities inherent in the teaching profession itself, we do not wish to approach the task of preparing teachers in a narrowly technical manner.

Four specific ideals associated with the notion of a liberal education and which guide our efforts in the Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs, in addition to our administration of the Liberal Studies major, are as follows.

1. We are committed to developing future teachers as whole persons, multi-dimensional human beings whose moral, aesthetic, and interpersonal sensitivities have been developed
along with their intellectual skills and perspectives. In the Multiple Subjects program, in particular, this commitment is expressed in our challenge to candidates (insofar as it is within their power) to offer even elementary students a well-rounded “liberal arts,” curriculum. At a time when education is so often reduced in practice to instruction in the basic skills of literacy and numeracy, we challenge candidates to strive to offer students experiences in the arts, science, history, and the moral dimensions of life.

2. A central preoccupation of the liberal arts tradition is developing critical/appreciative lenses on the world, including critical lenses on one’s self and one’s own assumptions. In the Westmont education program, similarly, we emphasize habits of critical reflection on current K-12 practice, on their own K-12 experience, on their education at Westmont itself, and their own emerging professional practice.

3. Related to the above, we emphasize in our professional preparation the traditional liberal arts value of seeing situations from multiple perspectives. We remind candidates frequently to see situations from the point of view of individual parents, fellow educators, administrators, and students; as well as the habit of seeing situations from the perspective of other cultural groups. Our professional courses that deal with culturally-responsive pedagogy are building, then, on a larger academic foundation of acknowledging and legitimating multiple cultures, and multiple ways of perceiving and interacting with the world.

4. In keeping with time-honored traditions of liberal learning, we continually emphasize with candidates the skills of oral and written communication. Oral communication in particular is stressed throughout the Westmont program, including frequent opportunities for peer teaching.

Other core beliefs pertinent to the preparation of teachers:

The following beliefs of the Westmont Education faculty serve to flesh out and extend the statement of mission and statement concerning the centrality of a liberal education, above.

1) Teaching is an extraordinarily complex and demanding profession, and necessitates a high level of personal commitment and engagement accordingly. As a program, then, we do not apologize for insisting on a high level of commitment and focus from our candidates throughout their professional preparation. In recognition of the complexity of teaching, we emphasize the need for constant attentiveness, imagination, openness to new approaches, and a problem-solving disposition in a role for which often there are no universal prescriptions or black-and-white rules (Darling-Hammond & Bratz-Snowden, 2005; Broudy, 1980, in Howey & Zimpher, 1989; Ayers, 2001; Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Labaree, 2004).
2) Teaching is a collaborative and communal enterprise. Throughout the program, we emphasize that learning and teaching are done in community. This applies both to the process of teacher education, and to the teaching and learning that our candidates will facilitate in their own classrooms. Candidates are expected to learn from one another, to assist one another through peer critique and peer coaching, both giving and receiving constructive criticism in a gracious and professional manner. In emphasizing the role of peers in growing professionally, we strive to develop habits of collaboration that candidates will display throughout their working lives (Palmer, 1998; NCTAF, 2003).

3) Teaching is a deeply personal and human enterprise. Although there is an emerging knowledge base about teaching and learning, ultimately it is not simply propositional knowledge or the implementation of discrete, disconnected skill-sets that lead to instructional effectiveness. The teacher as a whole person is a major factor in his or her impact for good and ill. The teacher’s personal character and professional dispositions are thus critical elements to be considered in preparing for teaching (Palmer, 1998). Teaching is in part an act of effective, informed, and holistic human caring (Noddings, 2005). Narrative accounts of teaching that provide compelling personal models for candidates—including not only traditional published narratives (e.g., Ashton-Warner, 1963; Kidder, 1989; Gruwell, 2007) but also our own narratives and those of our graduates, are instrumental in helping to inform candidates as to the nature of teaching and to inspire them to bring their entire person and individual personality to the task of teaching (Schubert and Ayers, 1992; Costigan and Crocco, 2004).

4) Teaching is inherently a moral enterprise. As Hansen (in Richardson, 2001) has expressed it, “moral matters do not have to be imported into the classroom as if teaching were itself devoid of moral significance…Rather the activity of teaching is itself saturated with moral significance…Teaching comprises infinitely varied acts that are bound up with familiar and desirable qualities of human relation: being patient with others, attentive to them, respectful of them, open-minded to their views, and so forth.” In keeping with larger institutional ideals, above, we challenge our candidates to recognize and confront issues of respect, justice, equity, and to be instruments of redemption for individuals and their families, schools, and larger societal systems.

5) Teaching is learned in large part by doing—along with appropriate reflection on the same (Schon, 1995). Wherever possible in our program, we emphasize preparation for teaching by actual teaching. In addition to traditional field experience and applications, candidates are given relatively extensive opportunities in their own Westmont classes to practice their instructional skills through teaching professional knowledge and skills to one another. Candidates are continually challenged to reflect on their practice, to set professional goals, and to demonstrate continuous improvement.
6) In preparing candidates for effective teaching, we want to be mindful always that content and pedagogical content knowledge are critical—and all too often neglected—components in becoming a professional educator (Borrowman, 1956; Sedlak, in Soltis, 1987; Mullen, 2002; Labaree, 2004; Darling-Hammond and Bransford, 2005). We want our candidates and graduates to appropriate commercial curriculum materials critically and to be active shapers of curriculum rather than passive agents of what others have constructed.

7) Even as we introduce candidates to scholarly perspectives on teaching and the larger social ecology of educational systems, preparation for teaching must be aligned as much as possible with the real world (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Shulman & Mesa-Bains, 1993). Throughout our program, we remind candidates of the realities of contemporary California and contemporary Santa Barbara. We emphasize the need for teachers to work within and in partnership with larger school cultures, including formal and covert structures of governance. Relative to many programs, we spend a disproportionate amount of time as faculty members in local schools, and constantly refer in our teaching to the challenges of implementation in the particular context of our state and local schools (Wisniewski & Ducharme, 1989). Relative to many programs, we emphasize practical strategies, procedures, and ideas for immediate application (e.g., Wong and Wong, 2004).

8) Related to the above, we believe strongly that effective classroom management is a major component in effective teaching, especially at the beginning of a teacher’s career. We introduce approaches to classroom management early in candidate’s professional preparation and build on this foundation throughout candidates’ program (Darling-Hammond & Bratz-Snowden, 2005; Charles, 2005).

9) We want our candidates and graduates consistently to be characterized as valuing and responding positively to diversity and exceptionality. Particularly in a city and county where over half of the public school enrollment is Latino, and where a significant share of the school population are English Language Learners, we are relentless in insisting on the need to make instruction routinely accessible and meaningful for students for whom English is not the first or primary language (California Department of Education, 1999; Cary, 2000). Continually we remind candidates to be attentive to the multiple and subtle ways in which their lenses on the world may or may not conform to the lenses of their students, families, or fellow educators (Valdes, 1996; Payne, 2005).

10) Even as we develop in candidates critical lenses on schools and teachers, and a commitment to on-going reform, we also want to value practitioner wisdom and emphasize the importance for candidates of a teachable spirit (Jackson, 1990; Kagan, 1993). While we believe our graduates are equipped to participate in bringing society’s ideals more and more to fruition in the nation’s schools, we encourage our candidates and beginning teachers initially to appreciate and
understand how veteran teachers might approach an issue, rather than encouraging an attitude of judging or superiority.

11) As part of candidates preparation for a pluralistic society, we want to value in our own program an openness to diverse professional orientations and emphases. We do not want there to be a single ideological litmus test that all professors have to conform to in order to teach in, or contribute to, the program.

12) Finally, and less explicit in the current professional literature but important to articulate nonetheless, is the following. We want to sustain as one of our continuing hallmarks our emphasis on the critical role of personal coaching and mentoring in candidates’ overall preparation. Thus again, our commitment that all supervision be carried out by full-time faculty, and a corresponding commitment to work one-on-one with candidates wherever needed to call out their personal and professional best.

B. Student Learning Outcomes

1. As explained in previous annual reports, the department is committed foremost to ensuring that graduates of the Credential Program are able to demonstrate the thirteen sets of skills identified as Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). Our ability as a program to demonstrate that our graduates have acquired these skills is a primary condition of our program’s accreditation by the CTC.

While the TPE’s do not capture fully all of our aspirations for our graduates (there is nothing here, for instance, about the Christian faith; and like the Westmont Student Learning Outcomes, there seems to be insufficient attention to mastery of subject matter), the task of demonstrating that our graduates have these skills is sufficiently demanding that the Department has for the time being focused its assessment energies here.

The Department does work with the Westmont Student Learning Outcomes more directly in its assessment of the Liberal Studies major, reported on separately.

**Teaching Performance Expectations**

*This articulation of the TPE’s is a much abbreviated itemization adapted from an observation form used during student teaching observations.*

**TPE 1A: Subject-Specific Instruction** (In what ways did teacher demonstrate ability to teach effectively one or more of the following?)
- Reading/Language Arts
- Math
- Science
- History/Social Science
- Visual/Performing Arts
- Physical Education
### TPE 2: Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction
*(How did teacher check for understanding and respond to students’ needs during instruction?)*

### TPE 3: Interpretation and Use of Assessments
*(Following instruction, how did teacher gather and make use of information about student learning?)*

### TPE 4: Making Content Accessible
*(How did teacher make information and skills clear and meaningful to students?)*

### TPE 5: Student Engagement
*(To what extent did teacher give clear directions and assist students in staying on-task?)*

### TPE 6: Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices
*(Were activities, instructional strategies, and language grade-appropriate?)*

### TPE 7: Teaching English Learners
*(What strategies were used to address the needs of English Language Learners or other students with special needs?)*

### TPE 8: Learning about Students
*(In what ways did teacher show understanding of students’ backgrounds, interests, and abilities?)*

### TPE 9: Instructional Planning
*(How thoroughly and skillfully did teacher plan instruction?)*

### TPE 10: Instructional Time
*(How effectively did teacher make use of time?)*

### TPE 11: Social Environment
*(How effectively did teacher manage student behavior so as to create a positive classroom atmosphere?)*

### TPE 12: Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations
*(In what ways did teacher demonstrate professionalism, or demonstrate knowledge of professional responsibilities?)*

### TPE 13: Professional Growth
*(In what way is teacher demonstrating on-going professional growth?)*

A sense of the correlation between TPEs and assessment strategies currently in place may be demonstrated by the following chart:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Relevant TPEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluation of Student Teachers by Master Teachers</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Master Teacher Evaluations of Program</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Early Field Experience</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluations of Pre-Professional Experience (ED 100/101)</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Survey of First Year Graduates</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Survey of Employers of First Year Graduates</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reading Instruction Competency Assessment</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching Portfolio</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Correlation between the thirteen California TPEs and Westmont’s Six Learning Outcomes

While there is no exact correlation between any given set of outcomes, there is some broad overlap of concern, skill, or disposition between selected outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Westmont’s Six Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>California Teaching Performance Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Societal and Intellectual Engagement</td>
<td>TPE 12, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>TPE 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written and Oral Communication</td>
<td>TPE 4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Data and Interpretation

1. Assessment methods employed

In other documents prepared for the CTC, the department has articulated how specific TPEs are measured, i.e., within specific courses or through specific assignments.

For the purposes of our Annual Reporting to the PRC, as well as our preparation of Biennial Reports to the CTC, we have focused more holistically on how a range of assessment instruments speak to the TPEs as a whole.

The following chart describes the primary evaluation mechanisms currently in place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)</td>
<td>Westmont piloted one or more components of the CTC’s TPA beginning with Multiple Subject candidates in 2003. Official implementation of all four tasks for Multiple and Single Subject candidates began with the current cohort (2007-08). The program’s response to Standards 19-21 describing institutional procedures and policies for the TPA was submitted to the CTC in December 2007 and approved in April 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluation of Student Teachers by Master Teachers</td>
<td>This form, closely based on the CTC’s 13 Teaching Performance Expectations, is completed by master teachers at the end of full-time student teaching. The completed form is discussed with the college supervisor. A preliminary version of the same assessment is completed mid-way through the student teaching placement and discussed in a three-way conference with the candidate and college supervisor. MS candidates receive a single evaluation. SS candidates working with more than one master teacher typically receive multiple evaluation forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Master Teacher Evaluations of Program</td>
<td>Master teachers complete this brief form at the end of each candidate’s student teaching experience. Although the individual candidate is referenced, the emphasis of the exercise is the opportunity for the master teacher to comment on the quality of supervision and communication with Westmont’s Department of Education. Typically master teachers include additional narrative material on this form, material which is not referenced here in the biennial report but will be available to a site visit team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Early Field Experience</td>
<td>During the fall semester of the Credential Program, candidates complete a pre-student-teaching early field experience. The experience is evaluated by the host teacher on a range of qualities, based on a three-point scale, as shown in the summary below. In addition to the material summarized here, teachers document the pre-professional’s total time in the classroom and typically include a narrative commentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluations of Pre-Professional Experience (ED 100/101)</td>
<td>Teachers hosting a pre-professional (typically students in their third or fourth year of undergraduate study) complete an evaluation form to document their student’s classroom experience. In addition to the material summarized here, teachers document the pre-professional’s total time in the classroom and typically include a narrative commentary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Instrument | Description
--- | ---
6. **Survey of First Year Graduates** | Approximately one year after graduation, program completers receive a comprehensive two-part survey, to be completed anonymously. The component that is focused completely on the CTC’s 13 TPEs and which is strictly quantitative is tabulated here. A second and broader-ranging component which includes narrative material will be available to a site visit team. Return rates from graduates have varied. We continue to explore ways to boost and sustain the response rate.

7. **Survey of Employers of First Year Graduates** | At the end of the graduate’s first year of employment, supervisors receive a survey linked to the 13 TPEs but including other questions as well. Only the quantitative component of the survey is included here. Additional material will be available to a site visit team. Only employers of graduates in classroom teaching positions or closely related jobs receive surveys. As with the survey of graduates, we continue to explore ways to boost and sustain the response rate from employers.

8. **Reading Instruction Competency Assessment** | In addition to overall pass rates, candidates’ scores on each of the four components are averaged to determine relative strengths in preparation.

---

*The following six items are also part of the Department of Education’s larger system of quality assurance and continual improvement, but results of these measures are not included in the biennial report itself.*

| Instrument | Description |
--- | --- |
Course Evaluations | Most courses in the Education Department are evaluated every time they are taught. Department chair reviews with particular care all evaluation forms from students in courses taught by part-time faculty, and discusses overall patterns with the faculty member one-on-one. Student evaluations are one major factor in a decision whether to renew a part-time faculty member’s contract. |
Senior Interviews | Selected seniors each year complete a one-on-one interview with all full-time faculty members. Interview has a written as well as oral component. Interview is focused on the college’s six institution-wide Student Learning Outcomes, but these are discussed in relation to the candidate’s experience in the Liberal Studies and/or credential programs. |
Student Teaching Portfolio | All candidates prepare a comprehensive portfolio focusing on their full-time student teaching experience and structured around the CTC’s six domains of professional teaching competency. |
Developmental Continuum of Teacher Abilities Self-Assessment | At regular intervals throughout the credential program, candidates complete a self-assessment exercise using this instrument created by the New Teacher Center at the University of California—Santa Cruz. Candidates are asked to take this self-assessment with them as they enter a BTSA program. |
Candidate evaluations of master teachers | At the end of full-time student teaching, candidates write a narrative evaluation of their master teacher. These evaluations are one factor in determining whether (and how) to use a particular master teacher for future placements. |
Candidate evaluations of supervisors | At the end of full-time student teaching, candidates write a narrative evaluation of their college supervisor. These are used to explore issues among the full-time faculty and as one additional set of data for continual program improvement. |
Data from Items #1-3, and #6-8 have been included on previous Annual Reports to the CTC. At least one Annual Report has also included departmental reflection on Senior Interviews.

Data and interpretation of several of these items for 2007-08 is still in process. We recently sent a reminder to employers and alumni who did not respond to the original survey request, and are accordingly holding off on those calculations. Data available as of September 10, 2008 has been summarized as follows:

1. Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007-2008 Cohort</th>
<th>Multiple Subject</th>
<th>Single Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st time pass rate</td>
<td>Mean 1st time scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=10 N=1

Interpretation:

Data from the initial year of full implementation of the TPA indicates that candidates are well prepared to demonstrate the specific competencies required of beginning teachers in the state of California. The primary external scorer for Tasks 1 and 2—one who has scored for a number of different institutions for several years—indicated that the Westmont responses were consistently among the best she had seen. All candidates passed Tasks 1, 2, and 4 on their first attempt. All candidates eventually passed all four components, in no case with more than two attempts. Task 3, focusing on assessment of student learning, had the lowest mean score for the initial set of responses, and was the only task requiring some multiple subject candidates to re-submit. Department faculty have discussed these results and identified ways to strengthen candidates’ knowledge base in the area of assessment, including additional practice in item analysis, identifying more precise criteria for what constitutes individual and class success on a particular instrument, and using on a routine basis a wider range of assessment strategies.
On the surface, and with respect to a single year’s cohort, the Single Subject program might initially appear to be more successful than the Multiple Subject program overall, and with particular respect to Task 3. In this area, however, as with all subsequent instruments, small n’s, overall and with special reference to the Single Subject program, mean that it may be difficult to generalize from these results.
# 2. Evaluation of Student Teachers by Master Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale:</th>
<th>1=poor</th>
<th>2=below average</th>
<th>3=average</th>
<th>4=very good</th>
<th>5=outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## TPE 1: Subject-specific Pedagogical skills

### a. Reading/Language Arts

- Demonstrates familiarity with, and an ability to teach in accord with, state-adopted reading standards
  - 2008: 4.8
  - 2007: 4.4
  - 2008: 5.0
  - 2007: 4.3

- Delivers a comprehensive reading/language arts program that includes reading skills and comprehension, writing, speaking, and listening
  - 2008: 4.7
  - 2007: 4.3
  - 2008: 4.5
  - 2007: 4.7

- Uses a range of instructional materials, including quality literature
  - 2008: 4.4
  - 2007: 4.2
  - 2008: 4.5
  - 2007: 4.3

- Uses a range of assessments to determine that students are making adequate progress
  - 2008: 4.4
  - 2007: 4.2

### b. Mathematics

- Demonstrates familiarity with, and an ability to teach in accord with, state-adopted math standards
  - 2008: 4.7
  - 2007: 4.4
  - 2008: ND
  - 2007: ND

- Recognizes and teaches connections from one mathematical topic or concept to another, and helps students apply mathematical procedures to real-life situations
  - 2008: 4.6
  - 2007: 4.2
  - 2008: ND
  - 2007: ND

- Helps students develop multiple strategies for approaching and solving problems
  - 2008: 4.6
  - 2007: 4.1
  - 2008: ND
  - 2007: ND

- Anticipates and addresses student misunderstandings
  - 2008: 4.7
  - 2007: 3.9
  - 2008: ND
  - 2007: ND

### c. Science

- Demonstrates familiarity with, and an ability to teach in accord with, state-adopted science standards
  - 2008: 4.6
  - 2007: 4.5
  - 2008: ND
  - 2007: 4.5

- Teaches developmentally-appropriate science content
  - 2008: 4.7
  - 2007: 4.4
  - 2008: ND
  - 2007: ND

- Includes opportunities for students to do laboratory or field exercises, in which students become active inquirers
  - 2008: 4.6
  - 2007: 4.3
  - 2008: ND
  - 2007: ND

### d. History-Social Science

- Demonstrates familiarity with, and an ability to teach in accord with, state-adopted history-social science standards
  - 2008: 4.6
  - 2007: 4.4
  - 2008: ND
  - 2007: ND

- Enriches historical and cross-cultural study through the use of literature, art, music, drama, cooking, and other cultural components
  - 2008: 4.4
  - 2007: 4.0
  - 2008: ND
  - 2007: ND

- Encourages students’ development as citizens, through building awareness of and participation in classroom, school, neighborhood, state, national, and/or world communities
  - 2008: 4.6
  - 2007: 3.9
  - 2008: ND
  - 2007: ND

- Uses a wide range of subject-appropriate strategies, such as role playing, group projects, independent research, debates, and so forth
  - 2008: 4.4
  - 2007: 4.1
  - 2008: ND
  - 2007: ND

### e. Visual and Performing Arts

- Demonstrates familiarity with, and an ability to teach in accord with state-adopted standards in the arts
  - 2008: 4.4
  - 2007: 4.1
  - 2008: ND
  - 2007: ND

- Plans a variety of activities in art, music, theater, and dance, as school schedule and instructional responsibilities permit
  - 2008: 4.3
  - 2007: 3.9
  - 2008: ND
  - 2007: ND

- Makes connections between the arts and other subjects
  - 2008: 4.3
  - 2007: 4.2
  - 2008: ND
  - 2007: ND

### f. Physical Education

- Demonstrates familiarity with, and an ability to teach in accord with, state-adopted standards in physical education
  - 2008: 4.9
  - 2007: 4.2
  - 2008: ND
  - 2007: ND

- Develops motor skills and teamwork, promotes awareness of practices leading to health and safety, and helps to build positive attitudes toward physical activity
  - 2008: 4.9
  - 2007: 3.9
  - 2008: ND
  - 2007: ND

## TPE 2

- Regularly checks for understanding, and makes appropriate instructional decisions about re-teaching when necessary. Anticipates and addresses common student misconceptions
  - 2008: 4.6
  - 2007: 4.2
  - 2008: 4.5
  - 2007: 4.6

## TPE 3

- Uses a variety of assessment strategies, formal and informal. Understands the purpose and use of different assessments in the instructional cycle, including baseline exercises, progress-monitoring, and summative assessments. Teaches students self-assessment strategies
  - 2008: 4.4
  - 2007: 4.0
  - 2008: 4.5
  - 2007: 4.2

- Helps orient students to standardized tests and appropriately administers tests, including providing accommodations for students with special needs
  - 2008: 4.5
  - 2007: 4.3
  - 2008: 4.0
  - 2007: 4.4

- Gives students timely and appropriate feedback on their achievement. Maintains appropriate records of learning. Explains to students and their families the meaning of grades and appropriate strategies for improvement
  - 2008: 4.4
  - 2007: 4.1
  - 2008: 5.0
  - 2007: 4.6

## TPE 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TPE</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Plans instruction logically and sequentially, taking into account state-adopted academic standards and students’ current levels of achievement.</td>
<td>4.6 4.3 5.0 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses a variety of instructional strategies.</td>
<td>4.5 4.4 4.0 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explains material to students in meaningful terms, using examples and analogies pertinent to the classroom and students’ lives outside the classroom.</td>
<td>4.7 4.4 5.0 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Makes instructional goals clear to students.</td>
<td>4.7 4.3 5.0 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensures active and equitable participation from all students. Poses questions that challenge students to think deeply. Engages in genuine conversation with students. Encourages students to articulate questions of their own.</td>
<td>4.6 4.4 4.0 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Plans instruction appropriate to students’ current developmental needs and interests, taking into account (as applicable) student attention spans, needs for concrete examples and activities, and the development of students’ responsibility for their own learning</td>
<td>4.4 4.4 5.0 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Has a theoretical background for identifying and analyzing issues pertinent to English Language Development, as these issues surface in actual individuals.</td>
<td>4.4 3.9 4.5 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actively seeks knowledge about students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds, including results of students’ previous language assessments and the characteristics of students’ first language.</td>
<td>4.4 3.7 4.0 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses this information in helping students’ progress in English.</td>
<td>4.4 3.7 5.0 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborates effectively with other professionals, para-professionals, and families in supporting students’ language development.</td>
<td>4.6 3.7 5.0 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supports students’ acquisition of English and students’ comprehension of academic content through a wide variety of instructional strategies, including visual support, facial expressions, gestures, and other body movements; and the clarity of teacher’s own spoken English.</td>
<td>4.5 4.5 4.0 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Appropriately learns about students’ interests, backgrounds, abilities, and health considerations, and takes this information into account in planning and supporting instruction. Works with other educators in identifying students with special needs and making appropriate accommodations, as necessary.</td>
<td>4.6 4.1 5.0 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans instruction consistent with state-adopted academic standards.</td>
<td>4.9 4.5 5.0 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans effectively both short-term and long-term, taking into consideration students’ current level of achievement. Plans include accommodations for students with special needs. Uses support personnel, including aides and parent volunteers, to advance instructional goals.</td>
<td>4.3 4.2 4.5 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes appropriate connections from one day to another, helping students understand how material relates to prior and subsequent content.</td>
<td>4.9 4.5 5.0 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Uses time effectively to maximize student learning. Establishes efficient routines and transitions quickly from one activity to another.</td>
<td>4.9 4.7 4.0 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Communicates clearly expectations for student behavior. Creates a positive environment for student learning. Establishes rapport with students and families. Is sensitive to individual student needs. Helps students take responsibility for their own behavior.</td>
<td>4.9 3.7 4.5 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Takes responsibility for what transpires in the classroom. Maintains high standards of professionalism with respect to attendance and punctuality, preparedness, and mental and physical vigor and alertness</td>
<td>4.9 4.4 5.0 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is aware of personal values and biases, and recognizes how these may affect teaching and learning. Is committed to racial, ethnic, and gender equity, and assists students in developing ideals of justice. Models appropriate attitudes and behaviors in the classroom</td>
<td>4.9 4.5 5.0 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understands key elements of national and state laws pertinent to education, and their application in the classroom, including laws and procedures concerning the education of English Language learners, students with disabilities. Identifies suspected cases of child abuse or neglect and works with other professional to report such cases</td>
<td>4.8 4.2 5.0 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respects confidentiality of students, families, and fellow educators.</td>
<td>5.0 4.8 5.0 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Engages in appropriate self-reflection about processes of teaching and learning. Actively seeks feedback from others, including fellow educators, families, and students, as appropriate. Responds graciously to feedback, and makes appropriate adjustments in teaching, accordingly</td>
<td>4.8 4.3 5.0 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates initiative and constant improvement.</td>
<td>4.8 4.5 5.0 5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretation:

This was an exceptionally strong cohort of Multiple Subject Candidates. For the first time since we began calculating mean ratings, no area was scored on average below 4.0.

The single lowest item is under TPE 8, dealing with getting parents and families involved in learning. This is difficult even for regular teachers, and particularly difficult for student teachers. Not surprisingly, it has traditionally been among the lowest mean scores. We will continue to watch this area and discuss how to help candidates develop and implement a wider range of strategies in this area.

A single candidate (with two different master teachers’ evaluations) in the Single Subject program for this cohort makes generalizing difficult. In any case, only a single item (parent and family involvement) dipped below the departmental benchmark of 4.0, and again, this may be largely a function of student teachers being given limited control in this area.

3. Master Teacher Evaluations of Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Multiple Subject</th>
<th>Single Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=10</td>
<td>N=11</td>
<td>N=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of content area preparation</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of professional preparation</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of communication with the department</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of classroom observation</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation:

Scores in this area continue to be very strong (5 point scale, and 5 is labeled “outstanding). Narrative comments from teachers are equally affirming.

The one area of complaint or question from master teachers is a comment about the maturity of the candidates as a whole. This is the second year that this concern has been raised by one or more teachers. At one time, most elementary and secondary student teachers were fifth-year students. Over the past ten years, the proportion of “fast-track”
(4th-year) candidates in the elementary program, in particular, has risen to the point that they represent about 85% of our student teachers. The department cannot fully address the issues here—that is, we will not attempt to discourage students from completing the program in four years. On the other hand, we can continue to discuss ways the student teachers can project a sense of maturity beyond their years.

6. Survey of First-Year Graduates (quantitative self-assessment component only)

9/10/08: We are still compiling this data for 2007-08.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TPE 1A Subject-specific instruction</th>
<th>MS Program</th>
<th>SS Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Language Arts/English</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Social Science</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative/Performing Arts</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 2: Monitoring student learning</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 3: Assessment</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 4: Making content accessible</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 5: Student engagement</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 6: Developmentally-appropriate practices</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 7: Teaching English learners</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 8: Learning about students</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 9: Instructional planning</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 10: Instructional time</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 11: Social environment</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 12: Professional, legal, and ethical obligations</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE 13: Professional growth</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Due to administrative error, not all MS graduates from this cohort received the quantitative component of the survey.

Interpretation:

[Will be provided upon receipt of 2nd round of surveys, and complete processing of the same.]
7. Survey of Employers of First Year Graduates

9/10/08: We are still compiling this data for 2007-08.

| Rating scale: 1= Below average  
| 2= Average  
| 3= Above average  
| 4= Very good  
| 5= Outstanding |

| MS Program | SS Program |
| May 08 | May 07 | May 08 | May 07 |
| N=6 | N=4 |
| Subject matter knowledge (TPE 1) | 3.33 | 3.25 |
| Ability to communicate (TPE 4, 5) | 4.00 | 3.25 |
| Classroom management (TPE 11) | 3.67 | 2.25 |
| Planning & organization skills (TPE 9) | 3.50 | 3.50 |
| Instructional effectiveness (TPE 4, 5, 6) | 3.67 | 2.50 |
| Use of instructional time (TPE 10) | 3.67 | 3.25 |
| Ability to assess student learning (TPE 2, 3) | 3.83 | 2.75 |
| Teaching diverse learners (TPE 7, 8) | 3.50 | 3.33 |
| Fulfillment of professional, legal, and ethical responsibilities (TPE 12) | 3.67 | 3.50 |
| Commitment to professional growth (TPE 13) | 3.83 | 3.00 |
| Interpersonal relations | 3.50 | 3.50 |
| Health and vitality | 4.50 | 3.75 |
| Overall teaching competence | 3.59 | 2.50 |

Interpretation:

[Will be provided upon receipt of 2\textsuperscript{nd} round of surveys, and complete processing of the same.]

8. Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA)

9/10/08: We are still waiting on 1 score to complete the tabulation of this data.

<p>| Component areas of the RICA are scored on a scale of 1-4 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| N=11 | N=11 | N=10 |
| Total pass rate | 100% | 100% | 100% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and organizing reading instruction based on ongoing</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing phonological and other</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linguistic processes related to reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing reading comprehension and promoting independent</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting reading through oral and language development</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation:**

Again, Westmont students perform extremely well on the RICA. Anecdotally, our students have spoken of hearing UCSB students at the test center talk about having to take the test several times, and/or talk about how difficult the test was. In contrast, our students consistently report that they felt well prepared for the test.

Scores in three of the four areas were up this year over last. Two components are in fact the highest this year of the three years we’ve computed means in each area. This probably reflects not so much changes in instruction or approach in the courses relevant to the RICA, but rather the competence of an unusually capable cohort during ‘07-08.

Of the four components, the area dealing with assessment and the use of assessment data in planning a reading program is (as it has been each of the three years) the lowest of the four. This may reflect the inherent challenge of that area of the exam (no statewide data on candidate performance elsewhere is available). In any case, it is an additional cue that we as a program should continue to emphasize assessment strategies, the interpretation of assessment data, and the use of assessment data in subsequent instruction and overall curriculum design (parallel—as an astute reader will note—to what we are attempting to do right now in this report).

2. Where and how data are stored

Most data is filed by year, and sorted according to Multiple Subject (elementary) and Single Subject (chiefly secondary) candidates. Copies of most surveys have been placed in three-ring binders in the Program Assistant’s Office. The long-term goal is to have data summaries filed with the raw data in the binders as well, but this has not been fully implemented.
This is mainly a Liberal Studies assessment issue, but it’s worth noting here for our own records that we have not been entirely consistent in how Senior Interviews have been saved. We also need to be more systematic in deciding exactly how many Liberal Studies portfolios we want to save each year, and in what form.

3. How external voices and constituencies are involved in the assessment process

(1) As of 2008, the department is required to send a Biennial summary of outcome data to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing in Sacramento, in addition to updates of changes in the program, documentation of how the CTC’s standards are being fulfilled, and a site visit with peers from other IHEs and representatives of the Commission every seven years.

(2) Master Teachers evaluate all student teachers. Secondary student teachers receive evaluations from at least two master teachers.

(3) Master Teachers also evaluate selected aspects of the program in written form, including the effectiveness of communication with the department and effectiveness of supervision.

(4) Employers of graduates are asked to complete a written evaluation toward the end of the graduate’s first full-time year of teaching. As noted in past Annual Reports, we have struggled with the return rate of these surveys, and continue to experiment with strategies for boosting that rate.

(5) Local teachers and principals from a variety of public and private schools serve on Westmont’s Teacher Advisory Board, which meets at least once a year, and periodically reviews summaries of outcome data.

(6) Local teachers and principals, as well as the entire Westmont community, are invited to see work samples from student teachers, to review their cumulative portfolios, and to hear them share oral highlights of their experience during the department’s Celebration of Teaching Day in April.

4. Evidence of group processing of data

All annual reports are discussed prior to submitting to the PRC. In addition the department thoroughly processes as a group the results of the Teaching Performance Assessment (Tasks 1 and 2 in February; Tasks 3 and 4 in June).

During the 2007-08 academic year, the department worked together on rubrics for a series of designated “signature assignments.” Although we have some initial complete sets of student assignments with rubrics, we still have a fair amount of work to do on this
project. We intend to share initial sets of data, copies of rubrics, and the overall design of this Signature Assignment strategy with our visiting site team in April 2009, and hope to get some additional direction from them on where we might go with this. We are also happy to review with representatives of the PRC the list of assignments, rubrics, and student work samples collected thus far.

III. Using the results and next steps

As noted in the Department’s Biennial Report to the CTC in August of 2008, recent assessment results are directing current program improvement efforts in the following three areas.

1. Assessment

Based on the TPA results, in particular, we will be giving even greater emphasis to Assessment in both Multiple and Single Subject programs. We recently added one major assignment to the Multiple Subject Program related to using K-12 student assessment data during full-time student teaching. Effective Fall 2008, we have altered the syllabus in ED 120: Teaching Social Studies and Science in the Elementary School to include an additional hour and a half related to developing and interpreting assessment instruments, emphasizing the role of assessment in shaping subsequent instruction. ED 110/111: Educational Psychology and ED 121: Curriculum Planning & Instruction in the Secondary School already devote considerable attention to assessment, but effective Fall 2008 these courses will be even more intentional in emphasizing readings, assignments, and activities that address assessment issues.

2. Art and Physical Education in the Multiple Subject programs

Given that master teachers and first-year graduate surveys have at times both scored art and physical education lower than the core areas of the curriculum, we will be emphasizing the student teacher’s need to take greater initiative in ensuring that he or she receives adequate opportunities to practice teaching in these subjects. Effective 2008-09, these two areas will be specifically mentioned in the letter of acceptance into student teaching as areas where past cohorts felt they needed more experience. Student teaching college supervisors will flag these areas at the time of the mid-semester three-way conference, and develop with the individual master teachers and student teacher a plan, when necessary, to ensure proper opportunity to lead in these subjects during the student teaching experience.

3. Boosting return rates for first-year graduates and employers of first-year graduates
We have experimented in one or both of the last two years with (a) making available to employers of our graduates an on-line version of the evaluation instrument; and (b) sending a second mailing to graduates or employers who did not respond to the first request. We have also talked with faculty at other institutions as to how they carry out evaluation activities on their graduates. Our efforts seem to have led to a small improvement in the return rates, but we would like to continue to improve in this area, aiming for consistent return rates on both surveys exceeding fifty per cent of alumni. This year we will e-mail graduates and their employers who do not respond to the first and second mailings. We are also exploring the possibility of offering some tangible incentive for those who return surveys (e.g., entering a drawing for a contribution to a charity of their choice).

**Additional “next steps” beyond what was reported to the CTC in August 2008:**

We want to continue to discuss the “maturity” issue (or perceptions about maturity level) among our elementary teachers, and help our candidates as a whole to project an even more professional image.

We do not anticipate needing to make changes to our Assessment Strategy as a whole, nor do we anticipate setting new or revised goals at this time.

**IV. Data for Program Review**

A. We have distributed the Faculty Responsibilities Form and collected information for the 2008-2009 year. (For previous years, we will have to reconstruct this data from other sources.

B. We recently conducted a comprehensive alumni survey of all credential program completers for the last ten years—in addition to our on-going annual surveys. We had a very respectable return rate, and will be analyzing and discussing this material prior to December of 2008. We hope that we will be able to work out smoother procedures in our collaboration with the Alumni Office, especially now that we have a new Alumni Office Director.

C. As requested in PRC response to Annual Report #3 (2006-07), we are collecting a packet of all the different evaluation forms we use in our program. We will provide this as part of our updated Annual Report #4, the date for which we will be negotiating with the Director of Assessment.
V. Timeline for Completion of the Six Year Report

We know that we need to provide a Six Year Report for September 15, 2008. An outline of our strategy for completing that was provided to the PRC earlier, but is pasted here below:

To: Marianne Robins, Director of Assessment  
Members of the Program Review Committee

From: Andrew Mullen, Chair, Department of Education

Date: March 1, 2008

Re: Proposal for Departmental Assessment Activities during 2008-09

**Specific Request:** 1 course release to be awarded to the chair during the Spring 2009 semester

**Context:**

This is a momentous year ahead for the Department of Education. The current plan is to conduct a search for two full-time positions, in preparation for two impending retirements.

It is also the year in which we have a site visit from the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (early April 2009).

We also will continue to work with administrators in strategic long-term planning on a range of critical questions relevant to the overall shape of teacher education at Westmont.

**A critical question before going any further:**

(?) With respect to the internal Assessment process, the department chair made a choice last year to separate out the reporting for Liberal Studies and the Credential Program. We have not ever had an explicit conversation about the implications of this separation for the Six Year Report. The chair’s preference would be to submit a brief Annual Report for Liberal Studies, but to wait another year for reporting on that program more comprehensively. This matter probably calls for some one-on-one conversations before the PRC weighs in on the matter.

**Goals:**
**Major goals:**

1. Refine and articulate an annual assessment calendar, ensuring that all routines and procedures required for both internal and external purposes, including collective reflection and response, are carried out in a systematic and predictable manner.

2. Refine existing or develop new rubrics for each of the “Signature Assignments” demonstrating candidates’ skills in the six domains identified by the CTC.

3. Review our departmental mission, including our current formal mission statement and continue to work with college administrators and relevant academic departments on clarifying the place of the Education Department within the college as a whole.

4. Identify more precisely the categories of data we need for purposes of long-range strategic planning.

**Minor goals:**

5. Deliberate as a department more intentionally our priorities with respect to Library resources supporting our programs, and develop some strategic goals for allotting our own and the Library’s annual budgets.

6. Work with the Office of Life Planning to review our existing procedures for preparing our graduates for seeking and securing employment.

**With respect to Liberal Studies:**

(7.) To the extent that Liberal Studies issues may come under the purview of this six-year report, the department needs to clarify with other departments the purpose, policies, and procedures for administering the nine academic concentrations.

**Timeline:**

**August 2008**

- Discuss draft of Annual Assessment Reports #4 (Education & Liberal Studies)
- Reflect on what we have learned—substantively and procedurally—from the process of completing the annual reports thus far
- Submit Biennial Report to CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing
- Continue with search process for two departmental positions
September

- Finalize and submit AAR #4

October/November/December

- Be working on Statements of Department Mission
- Complete section on Statistical Information
- Refine rubrics for the six “Signature Assignments” demonstrating candidates’ skills in the six domains identified by the CTC (drafts of these should already have been developed no later than the Spring of 2008
- Submit drafts of documents to CTC liaison by 11/30 for formative feedback

January/February/March

- Study and respond to appropriate institutional data relevant to our programs
- Continue with analysis of/reflection on/response to data we have collected
- Complete draft of CTC documents for site visit
- Prepare supplementary exhibits for site visit
- Fine-tune site visit logistical arrangements

April

- Site visit from California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

May/June/July

- Complete draft of Six Year Reports by May 31, to discuss with current faculty

August

- Discuss draft of Six Year Reports with in-coming faculty, and produce final drafts for the September 15, 2009 deadline
B. Calendar

This is a draft of our annual assessment-related activities, designed not only to share with others, but to remind ourselves of what needs to be done, and to ensure that each aspect of our assessment strategy is carried out consistently at roughly the same time each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Instrument or Task</th>
<th>Process in brief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Course evaluations from previous Spring term</td>
<td>Department Chair reviews course summaries and student narrative comments. Chair schedules follow-up discussion, as appropriate, with individual faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Submit Biennial Report to CTC on August 15 (alternate years)</td>
<td>Draft of report prepared by Department Chair no later than August 1, and discussed by all full-time faculty before submission to PRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summative review of Evaluation of Pre-professional Experience</td>
<td>Individual evaluations are reviewed by course professor at the end of the relevant term. Program assistant copies and collates forms. Summative review occurs biennially as part of the preparation for submitting Biennial Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICA</td>
<td>Individual evaluations are reviewed by relevant faculty as they arrive. Program assistant copies and collates forms. Department chair prepares analysis of aggregate results and discusses with faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey of First-year Graduates (initiated previously)</td>
<td>Program Assistant sends reminders to non-respondents from initial solicitation in March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey of Employers of First-year Graduates (initiated previously)</td>
<td>Program Assistant sends reminders to non-respondents from initial solicitation in May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Annual Assessment Report to PRC (due September 15)</td>
<td>Draft of report prepared by Department Chair no later than September 1, and discussed by all full-time faculty before submission to PRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As part of the preparation of Annual Assessment Report, Program Assistant collates and Department Chair analyzes the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Master Teacher Evaluation of Student Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Survey of Master Teachers evaluating the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Discuss Annual Assessment Report (submitted previously) with PRC and/or Director of Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Assessment and/or designee confers with Department Chair and attends meeting with all full-time faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Initial Informal Assessment of Candidate Likelihood of Success in Student Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All full-time faculty discuss candidates for student teaching the following spring, and arrange individual conferences with candidates, as appropriate, identifying departmental concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Teaching Performance Assessment (Tasks 1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate responses are scored by external scorer, and double-scored for calibration purposes by either another external scorer or program faculty. Candidate responses are scored by external scorer, and double-scored for calibration purposes by either another external scorer or program faculty. Aggregate review of responses is done initially by Department Chair and discussed in February by all full-time faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Evaluation of Early Field Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual evaluations are reviewed by course professor. Program assistant copies and collates forms. Summative review occurs biennially as part of the preparation for submitting Biennial Report (August).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Meeting to accept candidates into full-time student teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time faculty meet and consider each candidate’s likelihood for success in full-time student teaching. Candidates are officially accepted or not-accepted at this time, and officially notified in writing by Program Assistant. Conferences arranged for candidates whose acceptance is conditional or otherwise of concern.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Course evaluations from Fall term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chair reviews course summaries and student narrative comments, and schedules follow-up discussion, as appropriate, with individual faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Survey of First-year Graduates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Assistant requests data and collates responses. Department Chair prepares appropriate summary/analysis and discusses with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Survey of Master Teachers evaluating the Program</td>
<td>In conjunction with student teaching supervisors, Program Assistant requests data and collates responses. Department Chair prepares appropriate summary/analysis and discusses with full-time faculty in September, as part of preparation for submitting Annual Assessment Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Teacher Evaluation of Student Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>In conjunction with student teaching supervisors, Program Assistant requests data and collates responses. Department Chair prepares appropriate summary/analysis and discusses with full-time faculty in September, as part of preparation for submitting Annual Assessment Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Performance Assessment (Tasks 3 and 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate responses are scored by external scorer, and double-scored for calibration purposes by either another external scorer or program faculty. Aggregate review of responses is done initially by Department Chair and discussed in June by all full-time faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Comprehensive Student Teaching Portfolios</td>
<td>Candidates submit a comprehensive portfolio documenting their achievements during student teaching and documenting at the same time their achievement of the six competency domains identified in the CTC’s Teaching Performance Expectations. Portfolios are reviewed by master teacher and college supervisor. Multiple Subject portfolios are reviewed by at least one other full-time faculty member. All portfolios are available at a public exhibition in late April.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Selected seniors complete a one-on-one interview with all full-time faculty members. Highlights of interviews and copies of relevant forms to be discussed in department meetings by full-time faculty in June.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of Employers of First-year Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Assistant requests data and collates responses. Department Chair prepares appropriate summary/analysis and discusses with full-time faculty in September, as part of preparation for submitting Annual Assessment Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Continuum of Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual self-assessments are reviewed by the full-time faculty member responsible for teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abilities Self-Assessment | the Student Teaching Seminar. Individual self-assessments are reviewed informally as works-in-progress throughout the year, and (cumulatively) as part of the review of candidate portfolios in May.

Candidate evaluations of master teachers | Individual evaluations are reviewed by the College supervisor, and shared with department chair, as appropriate.

Candidate evaluations of supervisors | Individual evaluations are reviewed by the College supervisor and are also available to the department chair.

June

For the record:

For the record, this is going to be an unusual year for the Department of Education. In addition to a site visit from the Accreditation Team in April of 2009, we are conducting searches for two of the three full-time faculty positions. Even as we identify potential implications of the data we have collected and potential directions we may wish to go as a department, our ability to follow through on these directions will depend in great measure on the individuals we end up hiring.