DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 357 386   CS 213 845

AUTHOR   White, John O.; Denham, Carolyn H.
TITLE   Subject Matter Assessment of Prospective English
                Teachers. Report of the California State University
                Workgroup on Assessment of Prospective English
                Teachers.
INSTITUTION   California State Univ. and Colleges, Long Beach.
                Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE   Oct 87
NOTE   51p.; This document is part of a collection produced
                under the auspices of the California State University
                Institute for Teaching and Learning. The CSU/ITL,
                created in 1988, facilitates a 20-campus systemwide
                network of faculty affiliates in response to the
                demand for improved teaching and learning in the
                college classroom.
AVAILABLE FROM CSU Academic Publications Program, 400 Golden Shore,
                Suite 132, Long Beach, CA 90802 ($7).
PUB TYPE   Guides - General (050) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Assessment Centers (Personnel); Competency Based
                Teacher Education; Educational Assessment; Elementary
                Secondary Education; *English Teacher Education;
                Higher Education; Knowledge Level; Language Arts;
                *Measures (Individuals); Models; State Standards;
                Teacher Education; *Teacher Evaluation; Teaching
                Skills; Vocational Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS   *California; *College Teaching and Learning
                Collection; English Teachers

ABSTRACT
        This publication is a guide to assessing the
competence of prospective English teachers in the California public
schools. The guide was developed as a part of a state-wide response
to legislated entry and exit standards for teachers in elementary and
secondary schools. An introduction describes the regulations and
Executive Orders which are the basis for the guide, and the
conference at which it was developed. A section on the principles of
assessment in English outlines and describes unity of purpose among
the diversity of programs, assessment design (process, features,
scheduling), and the role of subject matter assessment in educational
reform. The next section establishes two categories--first, personal
and professional attributes of attitude, understanding and valuing
which are generic competencies fundamental to all disciplines, and,
second, competencies specific to English under four categories:
literature, composition, language, and oral communication. A section
on sources of information for assessments discusses general
guidelines and methods of assessment information gathering including
classroom activities, interviews, portfolios, testing, and a capstone
course. A following section offers three model assessment formats. A
final section treats recommendations related to resource and
administrative issues. (JB)

CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning
and
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education

The California State University Institute for Teaching and
Learning (CSU/ITL) facilitates a 20-campus network of teaching
and learning programs in the CSU system. ERIC/HE has entered
into an agreement with CSU/ITL to process documents produced
by the system and create a mini-collection within the ERIC
database.

Major objectives of this initiative are as follows:

- increase awareness of the work of the CSU Institute
  for Teaching and Learning;

- increase access to the work of CSU/ITL affiliates;

- begin to build a subset of information on teaching and
  learning that supports *The National Teaching and
  Learning Forum (NTLF)*, ERIC/HE's newsletter;

- encourage use of the ERIC system by CSU/ITL member
  affiliates and the *NTLF* readership; and

- test a model for collaboration between ERIC/HE and a
  major higher education system.

All CSU/ITL ERIC RIE citations are tagged with the following
identifiers appearing in the IDEN:Field:

- College Teaching and Learning Collection; and

- California State University for Teaching and Learning.

All CSU/ITL citations carry the following statement in the
Note Field:

> This document is part of a collection produced under the
> auspices of the California State University Institute for
> Teaching and Learning. The CSU/ITL, created in 1988,
> facilitates a 20-campus systemwide network of faculty
> affiliates in response to the demand for improved teaching
> and learning in the college classroom.

SUBJECT MATTER ASSESSMENT

OF

PROSPECTIVE ENGLISH TEACHERS

Report of the California State University Workgroup
on Assessment of Prospective English Teachers

Chaired by

John O. White
Professor of English

CSU, Fullerton

Carolyn H. Denham
Associate Dean of
Education
CSU, Long Beach

October 1987

WORKSHOP ON ASSESSMENT OF SUBJECT MATTER COMPETENCY FOR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

IRVINE HILTON HOTEL
AUGUST 17-20, 1987

PARTICIPANT LIST

Dr. Edward J. Borowiec
Associate Professor
English Department
California State University, Long Beach

Dr. Carolyn H. Denham
Associate Dean
Graduate School of Education
California State University, Long Beach

Dr. John W. Gillis, Director
Testing and Research
California State University, Fullerton

Dr. Jane Gurko
Associate Dean
School of Humanities
San Francisco State University

Mr. Larry Haukedalen
English Teacher
East Side Union High School District
San Jose, California

Dr. Shirley Hazlett
Consultant
State Department of Education
Sacramento, California

Dr. Vernon T. Hornback, Chair
Department of English
California State University, Sacramento

Dr. Louise Jensen
Professor of English
California State University, Chico

Dr. Helen C. Lodge
Professor
Secondary Education
California State University, Northridge

Dr. Catharine Lucas
Assistant Professor
Department of English
San Francisco State University

Ms. Jan Mendelsohn
Associate Dean
CSU, Chancellor's Office
Academic Programs & Policy Studies

Dr. Bonnie Neumann, Dean
Undergraduate Studies
San Diego State University

Mr. Dick Peterson
Field Service Representative
Educational Testing Service
Emeryville, California

Ms. Pauline Rivers
English Mentor Teacher
Crenshaw High School
Los Angeles Unified School District

Mr. Bob Salley, Consultant
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Sacramento, California

Mr. Kenneth Simms
Assistant Dean
CSU, Chancellor's Office
Academic Programs & Policy Studies

Dr. George C. Stanton
Director of Testing
CPSU, San Luis Obispo

Dr. John O. White
Professor of English and
Comparative Literature
California State University, Fullerton

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Executive Order 476 was issued on March 1, 1987 to implement Title 5 requirements, adopted by the Board of Trustees of The California State University, for admission to and exit from teaching credential programs. One provision of the executive order places the responsibility for certifying the subject matter competence of prospective teachers with the academic departments:

> The department or program for single-subject or multiple-subject waiver programs shall certify, prior to admission of a student to student teaching, that the student has mastery of the subject matter appropriate to the credential objective and is prepared for student teaching. This responsibility extends to assessing the competence in subject matter, not only of students in the waiver program on the campus, but also of those candidates who have completed the waiver program elsewhere or who have passed the NTE. The appropriate departments or programs shall establish criteria and procedures for the certification of subject matter competence of the candidate. These departments and programs should maintain close communication with the School of Education as they develop procedures. (Executive Order 476)

Accordingly, representatives of California State University English departments, education faculty, administration, testing officers, the State Department of Education, the public schools, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and the Chancellor's Office met on August 17-20, 1987 to consider subject matter competencies, assessment models, and principles and strategies for assessment.

The report, which includes the principles developed by the workgroup, discusses assessment strategies and sources of information, and contains a sample list of competencies in the subject of English. In addition, suggested models for assessment are presented. The report reflects the participants' belief that multiple assessment measures provide for the best assessment of subject matter competencies.

The workgroup participants recognize the necessity for various CSU programs to devise their own assessment procedures; therefore, this report was developed to serve as a resource document for campus assessment programs. The following section on background provides a chronology of events leading up to the development of this report.

Background

* CSU concern regarding the subject matter competency of K-12 teachers has been reflected in numerous reports, including <u>Excellence in the Preparation of Teachers</u> (1984), which offered recommendations regarding the rigor, breadth and depth of subject matter preparation. Concerns about the subject matter preparation of teachers have been voiced by many external to the CSU, including Superintendent Honig and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

- In 1986 and 1987, numerous bills were introduced to establish State standardized tests of subject matter for credential candidates. Although the CSU and Superintendent Honig have recommended campus-based assessment of credential candidates as an alternative to state standardized testing, this option has not been acceptable to many key legislators ncr to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC).

- Title 5, Section 41102 and Executive Order 476 require academic departments of the University to assess the subject matter competency of prospective teachers prior to their admission to student teaching. APPS 86-34 (All-University Responsibility for Teacher Education), Attachment A, provided general guidance to the campuses regarding implementation of Executive Order 476 as it relates to assessment of subject matter competency.

- Campus responses to AA 86-02 and formal and informal dialog with campus representatives indicated some progress has been made on implementation of procedures for subject matter assessment; however, campuses were experiencing difficulties with several aspects of implementation. The Academic Senate passed a resolution suggesting the Office of the Chancellor foster inter-campus discussions about models and procedures for certification of subject matter competence and asking Senates and All-University Teacher Education Councils to support intra-campus discussions in this area.

- This process for assisting campuses in the implementation of the subject matter competency requirement was discussed and welcomed at regional meetings with Associate Academic Vice Presidents and campus representatives and at a meeting of the Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs.

- To assist campuses in implementing the subject matter competency requirement of Executive Order 476, a process was developed that includes for each designated discipline:

    1. A workgroup comprised of faculty from the academic disciplines and other campus representatives from the academic administration and schools of education, as well as public school and state agency representatives, will develop a resource report including

        a. sample subject matter competencies,
        b. models for assessing those competencies, and
        c. recommendations for administrative and resource issues;

    2. Dissemination of the workgroup report;

    3. Systemwide discipline-based conferences will be held to

        a. discuss the resource report,
        b. gather information on assessment strategies, and
        c. provide a forum for campuses to share successes and common concerns; and

8

4. Campus activities and follow-up may include

    a. reviewing and refining the campus-based assessment process
        using the resource report, campus experience, service area
        schools' input,
    b. identifying and implementing pilot assessment models,
    c. implementing campus assessment processes, and
    d. assessing the effectiveness and institutionalization of
        campus-based assessment models.

PRINCIPLES OF SUBJECT MATTER ASSESSMENT

I.   **Diversity and Unity**

The principles which follow derive from the wish to honor competing demands for <u>diversity</u> <u>and</u> <u>unity</u> in subject matter assessment across the CSU campuses.

A.   Diverse assessment techniques are needed to preserve heterogeneity and pluralism in both English and education curricula, and in the ways these two academic areas cooperate with one another and with their constituent communities on the various campuses.

   1.   The commitment to diversity is based on a recognition that, within the CSU, our goal is not to transmit a single "canon" of information as the sole content of a liberal education.

   2.   The commitment to diversity further preserves the ability of campuses to experiment with diverse approaches to the preparation of teacher candidates within a discipline.

   3.   Diversified assessment also enables campuses to develop curricula in response to the needs of their constituent communities, from which many of their teacher candidates are drawn and where many of their newly credentialed teachers will work.

   4.   To preserve and reflect this diversity of curricula, we recommend that assessment procedures sample relevant areas of knowledge and competency rather than undertake a comprehensive appraisal of all relevant subject areas. The question cannot feasibly be asked: "Does a student know all that s/he may need to know, or all that s/he has been taught?", but we can ask, "Are there areas in which the student appears to be deficient?"

   5.   The assessment of subject area competency should reflect the beliefs that the best education teaches one how to learn and that one can never learn all that is worth knowing. We seek to design an assessment program that will encourage and reinforce lifelong learning rather than a static education based on a prescribed body of content.

B.   Since students from all campuses seek the same certification, a State of California Single Subject Credential in English, some common ground for assessment across campuses is needed. The credential should certify those competencies which educators and policymakers agree qualify a person to teach English in the public schools. This concern for unity leads us to search for common approaches in two areas: subject matter core areas of competency and assessment design.

   1.   Core areas of competency include performance abilities and knowledge found to be common to all programs and generally

thought to be essential to the teaching of English. Additional competencies may be required at individual campuses. A suggested set of such core competency areas identified by this workgroup is presented elsewhere in this report.

2. The assessment of performance in English i, a field in flux. English educators are currently seeking assessment models which reflect new understandings of what constitutes competency in reading, writing, speaking, listening, critical thinking and literary appreciation. Thoughtful educators are aware that assessment methods reflect and often determine what is taught and learned in a program. This report reflects that concern in setting forth suggestions for assessment design.

II. Assessment Design

The following principles are suggested to guide the development of CSU assessment programs:

A. Within agreed-upon guidelines, authority and responsibility for assessment design and implementation should be reserved to the individual CSU campuses. It is appropriate that subject matter competency be assessed by the faculty rather than the legislature or other government agencies.

B. Subject matter departments such as English should work closely with schools or departments of education to design and implement subject area competency assessment.

C. Additional resources for the design and implementation of assessment programs include: measurement experts (on or off campus), external evaluators and cross-campus consultants, community college faculty and administrators, high school faculty and administrators, and credential candidates and newly credentialed teachers who may reflect upon their own subject matter preparation.

D. Quality assessment programs for subject matter competency in English should include the following features:

1. Multiple measures should be used. A single test, observation, or interview does not provide a sufficiently reliable or valid basis for diagnosis or selection.

2. For the same reason, direct performance appraisals are needed to supplement indirect measures such as paper and pencil tests.

3. Qualitative as well as quantitative methods of evaluation should be used, although qualitative observations may be recorded using quantitative rating scales or numerical coding. Qualitative appraisals should be based on the systematic application of explicit criteria. Great care should be exercised in the statistical treatment and interpretation of these qualitative judgments.

4. Evaluations should be criterion rather than norm referenced. The goal of assessment is to certify an adequate level of subject matter preparation in terms of specific criteria, not to rank-order individuals or determine their place in a distribution. Criterion-based assessment does not involve predetermined or expected pass rates.

5. Assessment procedures should meet accepted standards of professional evaluation with respect to content or construct validity and reliability. Whenever possible, independent ratings should be used to enhance the reliability of criterion based judgments. This search for consistency should not obscure the fact that these independent judgments may provide useful diagnostic information to candidates. Ideally, all qualitative judgments based on direct observations or interviews should involve at least two independent ratings.

6. Some performance observation should be "contextualized," with the student demonstrating ability to apply principles of language in real-life or simulated communicative settings. Contextual assessment is contrasted to other forms of assessment based on test scores or interview data. Contextual performance assessment provides an opportunity for the candidate to demonstrate complex, integrated problem-solving behaviors rather than the discrete, unrelated subcompetencies measured by traditional objective tests.

7. Assessment instruments should be directed toward the dual goals of encouraging candidates from diverse cultures to enter teaching and at the same time preparing future teachers to teach students from a variety of cultures. To achieve these goals, performance assessment procedures should encourage students to demonstrate competence in many multi-cultural materials and should foster constructive attitudes toward a variety of oral and written dialects and ESL or bilingual influences on usage.

E. The scheduling of subject matter assessment is an important consideration since the assessment serves both formative and summative functions. Because of the need to make summative judgments, assessment programs may tend to focus on the period immediately prior to student teaching. However, formative assessment will prove more effective and useful in guiding student development if it is undertaken earlier in the student's undergraduate program and continued during credential training. Furthermore, subject matter specialists should participate in the summative assessment which results in a recommendation for or against teacher certification.

1. Formative evaluation provides information regarding areas of strength and weakness in the candidate's subject matter preparation. It may also help the student re-evaluate the appropriateness of his or her decision to enter teaching.

Campuses should not require candidates to complete additional coursework in the academic field prior to diagnostic evaluation except for those courses which represent actual deficiencies, based on transcript evaluation, in formal requirements. However, campuses may use formative assessment results as a means of demonstrating previously acquired competencies which are equivalent to waiver course requirements.

Formative assessment should be followed by student advisement which includes clear and reasonable alternatives for making up deficiencies and satisfying subject area competency requirements.

2. Summative evaluation is the final decision made in each case to determine whether a student is adequately prepared in the subject matter competency areas and ready to begin student teaching. Opportunities for formative evaluation should precede this decision. Criteria for summative evaluation should be clear. Procedures should be established for students who may wish to appeal negative decisions.

F. Throughout credential training, and in the final recommendation for certification or non-certification of teacher candidates, the academic departments should remain cooperatively involved with schools or departments of education in the process of assessing the candidate's readiness for teaching. To receive a credential, a teacher must be able to integrate pedagogy and content in applications that reflect an appropriate level of understanding of how students acquire language arts competencies and how the teacher fosters development of these competencies in the context of larger educational goals. Both English and education faculty are needed to assess this level of preparation.

III. Subject Matter Assessment and Educational Reform

Subject matter assessment is part of a larger continuing effort to improve education. Specifically, a sound subject matter assessment program will improve the preparation of future teachers and consequently the quality of instruction in the public schools. Careful formulation and implementation of a program of subject matter assessment will also help inform concerned citizens and their elected representatives about the competencies needed for effective performance in the classroom. Such a program will also reassure them that the academic community is meeting its professional responsibility for quality assurance in the preparation of teachers.

A. Improvement of Teacher Preparation

1. An individual assessment program based on multiple measures at various points in the student's academic career increases the likelihood that subject matter deficiencies will be identified and corrected in a timely manner. Such a program will help students better understand the level of competency needed for

8

successful teaching and thus re-evaluate their commitment to
the profession. Although the assessment process will exclude
some unqualified candidates from teaching careers, it will,
more importantly, assure that successful teacher candidates
possess the subject matter competencies they will need in the
classroom.

2. Systematic review of assessment data will facilitate
   evaluation of the subject matter instructional program.
   Working together, faculty members can use these data to
   improve both curriculum content and instructional methods.
   The success of these efforts is expected to improve the
   subject matter preparation of future teacher candidates.

3. Some credentialed teachers have not completed waiver programs
   or taken the National Teacher Examination -- for example,
   teachers with emergency or interstate reciprocity credentials
   and applicants for supplemental authorization. At present,
   many of these teachers are not adequately assessed for subject
   matter competency. This workgroup recommends that subject
   matter assessment be extended to include all those who apply
   for teaching credentials in California.

B. Lack of public confidence in the schools has stimulated external
   demands for improved teacher preparation. Careful assessment of
   subject matter preparation will reassure legislators and the public
   that future teachers are indeed well qualified to assume their
   teaching responsibilities. It is important that faculty members
   make assessment procedures known and understood outside the
   university. As part of this effort, it may be useful to open some
   of these assessment procedures to outside observers. Also,
   external evaluators may be invited to participate in candidate
   interviews or portfolio reviews.

C. Finally, it is important that adequate funding be provided to
   support the assessment program. An effective and comprehensive
   subject matter assessment program will require a substantial
   commitment of funds. Failure to provide this support will
   seriously jeopardize results.

AREAS OF COMPETENCE

We do not limit our use of the words "competence," "competency," and "competencies" to the narrow sense intended by behaviorists who define competencies as discrete behaviors or sets of behaviors that can be observed and quantified (counted or measured, as in: how big, how many, how much, how frequently, etc.).

Instead, we borrow the connotations of "competence" from the literature of cognitive development, especially language acquisition. This literature distinguishes, for instance, between performance without competence (when a learner mimics performance, executing basic behaviors without understanding their meanings or appropriate applications) and performance with competence (when a language user understands and can make conscious the meanings and implications of what s/he does, and apply this understanding in a wide range of settings, engaging in meta-analysis of her or his own and others' language behaviors).

We further broaden the idea of "subject matter competence" in English to include highly complex patterns of literate behavior, which cannot be described or assessed merely as aggregates of literacy skills, as discrete behaviors. To assess "literacy skills," e.g., those skills needed for decoding or encoding tests, one asks, "Can the reader re-tell what it says?" or "Can the writer write it down?" To evaluate "literate behavior," on the other hand, we ask, "What does the reader do with what it says?" or "What does the writer use writing for?"

Literate behavior, an expected characteristic of graduates of English departments, includes ways of using knowledge and language, and ways of expressing understandings that, so far, defy quantification, or reduction to behaviors that can be assessed by questions with right or wrong answers, or well-defined tasks with clearly correct or incorrect executions. This does not mean, however, that literate behavior and other higher order competencies cannot be observed as they are revealed in performance that is evaluated by time-honored methods like consensus among a panel of experts.

The sample "competencies" which follow include several kinds of "subject matter competencies," each subject to evaluation by different methods:

● Knowledge (tested by questions asking for recall or recognition behavior).

● Basic skills (how to correctly perform discrete behaviors).

● Understandings and abilities requiring higher order cognitive activities that belong to the fields of literature, composition, language studies and speech, and that English teachers will need as they help others to acquire not only literacy skills but literate behavior.

Psychometric expertise has allowed us to develop adequate measures of most competencies belonging to the first and second categories, but only some in the third. The former are generally well-assessed by standardized tests and other quantified measures; the latter usually require direct observation of complex performance.

The major difficulties we anticipate in developing appropriate ways to assess the subject area competencies in the third category will arise in providing creative ways for candidates to display deeper understandings in performance; in defining the levels of competency considered adequate, according to specific criteria; and establishing the fairness and consistency of qualitative judgments.

The Workgroup has identified five subject matter competency areas and developed examples of competencies for each. These are found below.

I. General Competencies

    A. Understanding ways in which speaking, listening, writing, reading and thinking are interrelated.

    B. Ability to formulate questions which stimulate thoughtful discussion of literature, clarify language concepts, and foster thinking during the composing process.

    C. Understanding how speaking and writing serve as ways of learning.

    D. Understanding ways in which the study of language arts fosters critical thinking.

II. Literature Competencies (All Media)

    A. Familiarity with American, British, world, ethnic, and adolescent literature.

    B. General knowledge of literary history.

    C. Familiarity with examples of literary genres (including the novel, short story, poetry, drama, biography, essay and public address), and ability to demonstrate critical approaches and aesthetic responses appropriate to each genre.

    D. Knowledge of basic approaches to literary criticism.

    E. Understanding of how readers elicit and create meaning from literature, and ability to articulate one's own reading process.

    F. Understanding of the interrelationship between literature and ethical, aesthetic, cultural, political and social values.

    G. Ability to read literature as a source for exploring and interpreting human experience - its achievements, frustrations, foibles, values, conflicts.

III. Composition Competencies

    A. Ability to write clear, effective expository prose, demonstrating mastery of the conventions of standard written English.

16

B. Ability to articulate one's own writing process.

C. Ability to discuss components of the writing process, and how processes may differ for different writers in different contexts.

D. Ability to describe and model a wide range of discourse types and functions, using a variety of writing strategies.

E. Ability to evaluate and critique a piece of writing by an apprentice or novice writer.

IV. Language Competencies

A. Understanding of the principles of first and second oral and written language acquisition and development.

B. Knowledge of how social, cultural and economic environments influence language acquisition and use.

C. Knowledge of major developments in English language history.

D. Understanding of the major grammatical theories of English and their applications to language acquisition and use.

E. Ability to discuss relations between linguistic diversity and culture.

V. Oral Communication Competencies

A. Ability to express oneself aloud, clearly and effectively.

B. Ability to identify, the components and varieties of oral communication.

C. Ability to model effective speaking and listening skills.

D. Skill in the oral interpretation of literature.

SOURCES OF ASSESSMENT INFORMATION

Many sources of assessment info mation may be used to evaluate the subject
matter competency of future teachers. The utilization of particular
assessment procedures will vary from campus to campus depending upon the
overall design of the assessment process and the range of skills to be
evaluated. Other factors which will influence assessment design are the
proportion of transfer and non-waiver candidates to be evaluated, the validity
and efficiency of existing assessment procedures, available staff resources
and other internal and external influences, responsibilities and constraints.
However, regardless of the particular configuration of assessment procedures
adopted by any given campus, the following general guidelines should be
considered:

GENERAL GUIDELINES

I.   Assessment Criteria and Evaluation Procedures

     Assessment criteria and summative evaluation procedures should be
     equitably applied to transfer and waiver-program teacher candidates.
     Waiver program candidates may participate in more extensive formative or
     diagnostic assessment, but summative criteria and assessment procedures
     which lead to approval or disapproval for entry into student teaching
     must be comparable for both groups.

II. Formative and Diagnostic Assessment Recommendations

     When formative or diagnostic assessment indicates that remedial work is .
     needed, deficiencies should be clearly identified and a specific
     schedule for reassessment of these competencies should be established.

III. Assessment Procedure Evaluation

     The assessment procedure itself should be systematically re-evaluated on
     a continuing basis. Early in its history these re-evaluations should
     occur frequently. Responsibility for monitoring the assessment program
     should be specifically assigned and conscientiously performed. As
     conditions change, this monitoring process will undoubtedly lead to
     adjustments and improvements in the assessment program and, therefore,
     is crucial to its success.

IV. Assessment Process and Procedures for Evaluators

     The assessment process should provide for multiple evaluators, as well
     as an array of procedures and sources of information. Variation among
     evaluator judgments may indicate that criteria are unclear and in need
     of redefinition, or that the evaluators themselves need training to
     prove the accuracy and reliability of their judgments, or both. Even if
     significant discrepancies do not appear, evaluators should check a
     sample of assessments to be sure that a consistent standard of
     evaluation is maintained.

V.   Assessment Validation Process

To validate the assessment process, a sample of credentialed candidates should be visited on-site to determine their "continued subject matter competency" and relevant information should be gathered from suitable sources. Results from this "long-range" validation will help assure that campus assessment procedures are sufficiently sensitive and properly calibrated.

METHODS OF ASSESSMENT INFORMATION GATHERING

A comprehensive assessment program may utilize many sources of information. Included among these sources are traditional classroom activities, interviews, portfolios, test data, capstone courses and other documentation and activities.

I.   Classroom Activities

Traditional activities within existing classes are an important source of assessment information, but one that is primarily applicable to waiver students. Although teacher candidates may be given some special assignments, many regular classroom activities in English courses can provide information that is useful in assessing subject matter competency. In making assessments based on regular classroom activities, it is important that specific competencies be defined and criteria clearly stated. Normally, these assessment procedures will be separate from and more specific than those used to determine the overall course grade. Furthermore, it is important to determine that instruction in the course actually covers the competency to be assessed. Finally, the assessment should be multidimensional, covering, for example, both impromptu and prepared performances, or related to more than one genre, such as poetry and prose. Suggested classroom activities include:

A.   Leading group discussions.

B.   Participating in group discussions.

C.   Writing or speaking on selected topics or in response to a specific piece of work. The product of such an assignment might be expository or narrative prose or a critique.

D.   Rewriting activities which proceed from initial outline to draft to revision to final editing.

E.   Producing a synopsis or critique in response to an audio tape presentation.

F.   Responding to regular classroom assignments and tests which focus, at least in part, on competency areas of concern. Especially useful would be assignments which require multiple or integrated levels of interpretation and analysis.

G.   Group writing exercises.

H. Interpretive reading of pieces of literature or of the student's own work.

II. Interviews

Interviews are best suited for assessing higher level skills, such as the ability to integrate, synthesize, and interpret areas of knowledge. For example, a student might be asked to discuss ways in which the study of language can foster critical thinking. Other modes of assessment, such as objective tests, are more effective for measuring recall or recognition. In an interview evaluators can probe student responses. The give and take of the interview provides students an opportunity to demonstrate a variety of skills. Finally, each evaluator should render an independent rating of each competency area to be assessed.

A. Interview questions should be carefully structured to address pre-determined, specific competencies. Interviewers may even be provided with written questions to ensure some degree of uniformity in the interview process. Members of the interview panel may prepare in advance by reading portfolios and reviewing transcripts, biographical statements or other documentation.

B. Candidates may be interviewed individually or in groups. They may be advised of interview topics well in advance, just prior to the interview or not at all. Interview topics may be described in general terms or candidates may actually receive copies of the interview questions.

C. The purpose and scope of the interview will depend upon assessment program goals, characteristics and resources, as well as the amount of information available from other sources. Interviews may provide summative assessment in the form of comprehensive competency verification or selected reassessment, or may be primarily formative and diagnostic.

D. In addition to faculty participants, interviews may include advisors, master teachers, cooperating high school teachers, student teachers currently in the program, district curriculum specialists, external evaluators or other consultants.

E. Interviews may focus on a variety of topics. Possible questions include: a) describe your philosophy of education, b) describe how some teachers have significantly influenced you or guided your intellectual development, c) explain why you want to become an English teacher, d) explain how literature can contribute to one's understanding of life, e) evaluate a piece of writing, f) demonstrate your understanding of grammatical theories or, g) discuss your favorite type of literature. Interviews also provide an opportunity for discussion and evaluation of student portfolios.

2ɔ

III. Portfolios

A portfolio is a collection of student work samples, documents and reports. Portfolios are especially useful for assessing transfer candidates who may have spent little time on campus and are not well known to the faculty. If portfolios are required, students must be given explicit information regarding the materials to be included and adequate time to collect and prepare the documentation. Portfolio content may differ for transfer and waiver-program candidates. However, portfolio requirements should be uniform within a given category of students. To assure uniformity and fairness, additional requirements in individual cases should be minimal and carefully justified. Portfolios should be assessed by more than one trained evaluator and candidates should be told who will have access to their portfolios. Portfolios may contain a wide variety of materials including those suggested below. Although the first four items do not relate directly to subject matter competency, they may provide some insight into the candidate's suitability for teaching and provide topics for further discussion in an interview.

A. A personal statement of professional goals.

B. An autobiographical statement including events and influences which led to the candidate's decision to enter teaching.

C. A self-evaluation which may include an essay or a standard rating form, or both.

D. Results from attitude and/or personality inventories. If inventory scores are included, they must be used very cautiously and should be interpreted by a qualified psychologist.

E. Personal writing samples which are self-selected, drawn from assigned categories, or specifically prepared for the portfolio.

F. Observation logs or reports from early field experience or other school visits.

G. Audio or video tapes in which the candidate demonstrates performance in selected competency areas.

H. Materials relating to previous teaching experiences such as syllabi, lesson plans, tests, reports of special projects or activities and evaluations by students, colleagues or supervisors.

I. Statements prepared for admission to the school of education.

IV. Testing

Tests can provide relatively objective assessment of selected subject matter competencies. Before using a test for subject matter assessment, its psychometric characteristics should be evaluated by a person who is knowledgeable about measurement. When using tests, the following principles should be kept in mind.

A. Whether using a locally constructed test or a published standardized test, the instrument should be subjected to item-by-item scrutiny to be sure that its content is appropriate to the competency being assessed.

B. A norm-referenced test may not be suitable for assessing mastery of a given competency since such tests are usually designed·to measure a broad range of ability. If a norm-referenced test is used, norm data must be based on an appropriate comparison group.

C. Essay examinations and writing samples should be evaluated by multiple readers who have been trained to assess papers against stated scoring criteria. Essay topics should be pretested and rater reliability should be checked periodically.

D. Performance examinations, such as poetry reading, discussion of audio tapes, or group discussion leadership, should also be assessed in terms of established scoring criteria by more than one trained evaluator.

E. Local tests of any kind must be carefully constructed and thoroughly pre-tested prior to use. Test development is a demanding and time-consuming activity which requires expertise in measurement theory and practice. Faculty members who develop local assessment instruments may need the assistance of measurement and evaluation consultants.

F. State and national standardized testing programs that may be useful for subject matter assessment include: the National Teacher Examination, the California Basic Educational Skills Test, the English Equivalency Examination, the College Level Examination Program, the Graduate Record Examination, the Scholastic Aptitude Test, and published standardized tests in speech and English.

G. Locally developed tests may be used to measure writing proficiency, grammar and usage, knowledge of writing conventions, knowledge of literature, and other specific competencies.

V.   A Capstone Course

A capstone course in English might include activities specifically designed to generate a wide range of assessment information. Such a course would probably carry one unit of credit, might be team taught and would most appropriately come at the end of the candidate's subject matter course sequence.

A. In addition to summative evaluation, the course would provide an opportunity to reassess previously identified deficiencies.

B. Assessment activities in the course should cover the entire range of subject matter competencies. Although no single candidate is likely to require assessment for every competency, a non-waiver program student may need to be evaluated for most of them.

C. Assessment techniques used in the capstone course would likely include abbreviated variants of those embodied in regular courses, and other assessment approaches described elsewhere in this report.

D. In the capstone course, the assessment emphasis would be on verification of competency rather than diagnosis of deficiencies. Nevertheless, some opportunity should be provided for the reassessment of previously identified deficiencies.

E. Finally, the capstone course could provide a focus for subject matter competency assessment. Evaluation procedures themselves could be analyzed and discussed and new approaches tested. These activities would communicate to students that continuing re-evaluation is an important tenet of the teaching profession.

VI. Additional Assessment Information Sources

Other important sources of assessment information are found below; however, assessment should not rely exclusively on these sources.

A. Academic transcripts of coursework completed.

B. Letters of recommendation and other performance ratings from faculty, supervisors or others familiar with the candidate's work or academic performance. A standardized form may be developed for this purpose to focus evaluation responses on specific subject matter competencies. Another approach might involve circulating a list of candidates together with a request for faculty comments or ratings.

C. If properly designed, some activities within regular courses may be evaluated or contribute to competency assessment. Possibilities include: structured peer ratings which are part of a regular class assignment; model lesson plans which are evaluated against such criteria as organization, clarity, and opportunity for student involvement; evaluation of student audio or video tapes or personal performances; evaluation of early preliminary field experiences which occur in the junior year for waiver candidates and soon after entry for transfers; and individual assignments such as senior projects, training as holistic essay readers, test item development, group writing tasks, oral or written cross-disciplinary assignments, in-depth writing revision exercises, multilevel literary interpretation, and the critique of actual high school student writing samples, preferably selected to exemplify particular errors.

23

MODELS FOR COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT

The assessment models which follow have been developed to provide a resource for all campuses as they implement their own assessment process to determine subject matter competence for prospective English teachers. Some models are in place and describe current procedures; others are proposed models for particular campuses. Some models refer specifically to the competencies identified earlier in this report; others refer to more general areas of competence.

These models do have a number of features in common. In each model, desired and required competencies are identified. Each model also provides for multiple measures to ensure competency, and each incorporates assessment at various stages of a student's preparation. Finally, each model provides ways of addressing deficiencies or improving skills which have been identified as weak.

These models illustrate integrated programs of assessment. Features from each model may be incorporated or adapted by campuses, or other methods of assessment may be preferred. While the following models are not constructed in parallel fashion, they do represent the approaches designed by faculty on various individual campuses to fulfill our responsibility to measure and certify competencies required for beginning teachers of English.

I. **Model A**

A. Context

Campus A has an FTES of 17,000 and an English Education Program which admits 24 students per semester into a two-semester secondary credential program. Students are evaluated prior to admission to the program by an English Education Screening Committee made up of two secondary school English teachers, a student teacher currently in the credential program and the English Education Coordinator. On Campus A, certification of subject matter competency and admission to the credential program are carried out within the major departments.

B. Model A Description

For students in the waiver program, assessment begins at about the junior year. The English Education Coordinator meets regularly in advisement sessions and reviews coursework and scholarship each semester, working for a breadth of preparation in language, composition, and literature. In addition, students must pass the upper-division writing requirement, demonstrating competency in composition. Evaluation forms from instructors in the upper-division language and composition courses will also be placed in the credential application files.

For all students, campus waiver graduates, transfer graduates, and students who have passed the NTE, there is a common assessment procedure prior to admission to the credential program. First, a

transcript review is done to ensure scholarship and breadth of coursework in language, composition and literature. Those who are lacking in some area may take coursework to eliminate deficiencies.

All students must pass the CBEST, ensuring basic skills in reading and composition. In addition, all students also take the NTE in English Language and Literature. This standardized test provides comparative information on candidates no matter what their preparation or where they went to school. While there is no set specific pass/fail score, the test is considered to be valuable as an indication of the student's breadth of knowledge in literature and language.

Two other measures are used to assess competency in writing. First, applicants write an autobiography and statement of interest in the teaching profession. Students have an opportunity to revise and polish this document before placing it in their file. The second instrument is a timed departmental essay topic which is scored holistically by the screening committee. This too, helps assess writing competencies.

Applicants are also asked to take a timed departmental grammar and usage test as another common measure of language skills.

During the interview with each of the candidates, questions may be asked, suggested by the file review to help obtain as complete a picture of the candidate as possible. Some of the questions will be based on subject matter; others will relate to experiences and interests. During the interview, an attempt is made to try to complete the assessment of subject matter competency.

Even though candidates are carefully screened to ensure subject matter competency before admission to the program, the first semester of the program provides one more opportunity to evaluate skills and competencies. All of those accepted into the program take a course in methods of teaching English. In this course, which is prior to student teaching, discussions, writing assignments and presentations all provide the opportunity to review competencies again. Any deficiencies noted during this semester must be corrected before admission to student teaching.

At the end of this first semester of professional preparation, evaluations are received from master teachers, university supervisors, the methods instructor, and the candidate. With positive evaluations from all concerned, the candidate may continue into student teaching.

Overall, this campus believes in multiple assessment measures including a standardized test (the NTE). All of the competencies suggested in the report are thus evaluated in various ways during the screening process and during the first semester of the credential program and certified before a student is admitted into student teaching.

22

25

ASSESSMENT MODEL A

POINTS OF ASSESSMENT	ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES	COMPETENCY ASSESSED	PURPOSE (Formative, Summative Cumulative)	STEPS TO REMEDY DEFICIENCIES	COMMENTS
JUNIOR YEAR	Transcript review & advisement evaluation forms from upper division language and composition instructors upper division writing test (Examination in Writing Proficiency)	A - breadth of coursework & scholarship B - writing skills	Formative	advisement to appropriate courses additional coursework or directed work English Department Tutorial Program	Students may re-take exam
SENIOR YEAR POST BAACALAUREATE TRANSFERS AND CSUF GRADUATES	Same possibilities as junior year A - Transcript review B - CBEST C - RTE (English Language and Literature) D - Autobiography & statement of interest E - Timed departmental essay F - Department grammar & usuage test G - Interview	A - appropriate academic preparation & scholarship B - Basic skills reading and writing C - Prep. in lit. language D - writing skills incl. revision E - Writing skills F - Skills in lang. & usage G - Variety of academic competencies tailored for each	Formative	however, student must demonstrate competencies before being accepted to the program	Additional course-work or review may be asked for if deficiencies are

23

26

ASSESSMENT MODEL A

POINTS OF ASSESSMENT	ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES	COMPETENCY ASSESSED	PURPOSE (Formative, Summative Cumulative)	STEPS TO REMEDY DEFICIENCIES	COMMENTS
1ST SEMESTER PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION	A variety of assignment strategies in the English Methods class - discussion - group work - written work - video-taped presentations Evaluations are submitted by - Master teachers - University supervisors - Methods instructor - Candidate	Virtually all of our sample competencies are assessed during this class A combination of subject matter and pedagogical competencies	Formative and Summative Summative	Additional study of coursework	All deficiencies must be remedied before admission to student teaching
EMERGENCY CREDENTIAL TEACHERS					

24

II. Model B

  A. Context

      Campus B is an urban campus with an FTES of 19,000. The English
      Secondary Credential Waiver Program is 45 units, with variants
      possible which emphasize Speech, Journalism/Creative Writing,
      Humanities, American Studies, Comparative Literature, or Ethnic
      Studies. The English Department presently interviews 90-100
      applicants per semester for entrance into the secondary credential
      program (English), of which only 10% have been through their waiver
      program. It does not seem feasible, therefore, for Campus B to use
      their own waiver courses as loci for evaluating any of the core
      competencies. Following is a possible plan which would assess the
      subject matter competency of Campus B candidates. This assessment
      would be administered to all candidates, both natives and B.A.
      transfers, and would thus ensure the greatest equity in their
      certification.

  B. Model B Description

      1. Sources of Assessment Information

          a. Test Scores – e.g., CLEP with essay, NTE, Campus B upper
              division written English test

          b. Transcripts/Grades

          c. Portfolio – Self expression in writing (fluency, text
              awareness, audience awareness, general presentation,
              appropriateness

          d. Response to Literature – Written

          e. Response to Student Written Work – Interview

          f. Literature – Interview

          g. Language and Rhetoric – Interview

          h. Oral Competency – Interview

      2. Levels of Performance

          a. 1 = Extensive inadequacies
          b. 2 = Minor flaws and inadequacies
          c. 3 = Adequate to good
          d. 4 = Outstanding

      3. Prior to the Interview

          a. Candidate will submit coursework taken (with grades) and
              projected course work plan.

b. Candidate will have taken appropriate writing tests.

c. Candidate will submit a portfolio of personal writing. (All submissions must be typed.)

    (1) Letter/Essay: Position Statement or Autobiographical Statement on reasons for wanting to teach English in high school.

    (2) Postscript to Letter/Essay: An informal look at "My Writing Process." Please ruminate on such questions as "What makes writing hard, easy, fun for me...? When is it hardest? What do I do to get started? How do I go about finishing? What gets in the way? What helps?" The purpose is not to know whether you have a "good" or "bad" process, but to know how you talk about that process. (2 - 5 typewritten pages)

<div align="center">OR</div>

    An informal piece about an English teacher from the past or in the present; what sorts of enthusiasms, behaviors, methodologies, did (does) this person possess or use? How did you or other students respond to this teacher?

    (3) In addition, you may - if you wish - add to the portfolio not more than two additional short pieces of writing, either "creative" (narrative or descriptive pieces, poems) or journalistic, or business reports. Include no more than one poem. Neither of these "extra" pieces should be an essay on literary criticism for a course.

4. Interview

a. Written: Response to Literature   45 Minutes

Here are three short poems. Read them all and then choose ONE to write about. Your assignment is to say as succinctly as you can what the subject of the poem you have chosen to consider is. There are several things to keep in mind as you do this:

    (1) The subject of the poem is not the same thing as a summary of what happens in the poem.

    (2) Your reader must be given some sense of how you arrived at your sense of what the poem is about. Show how language was handled to make you see what it is you have decided the poem is saying. (It is appropriate -- necessary! --to talk about tone, imagery, metaphor and the other tools of poetic language.) Pay particular attention to unusual

31

phrasing, repetitions, and sounds. Account for what they are doing in the poem. Proofread your paper.

See next few pages for sample poems:

[Poems are all short and represent a variety of authorship in terms of era, ethnicity, gender, style.]

b. Oral: Literature   30 Minutes

A faculty member from Speech and Communication Studies will be present as a listener during this 30 minute segment to evaluate the candidate's competence both in interpretive reading and in oral communication.

The interview will begin with an oral reading by the candidate of the poem chosen for the essay in Part I. The interviewer will then ask questions pertaining to the candidate's background in literature.

The candidate should have some acquaintance with English, American, world, ethnic, and adolescent literature; should know one of the first four areas well; and should be familiar with all major genres of literature. Questions will be designed to discover what candidates know and how they are able to articulate their ideas and feelings about literature.

The candidate will be asked to think in advance about the following three questions:

(1) When you read for yourself, not for courses, what do you choose?

(2) Candidates who are going to teach English in secondary schools are expected to be familiar with English, American, world, and ethnic literature. Which of those do you feel you know best? Who are your favorite authors? Which of their works do you like especially? Why? What further study would you like to do?

(3) Which of these do you feel you know least? What would you like to know more about?

The remainder of the interview could be structured around such questions as:

(4) Candidates should also be familiar with poems, plays, novels, biographies and short stories. You've mentioned several (novels, plays, poems, biographies, short stories), but not many or no (poems, plays, novels, biographies, short stories).

What (poems, plays, novels, biographies, short
stories) are you especially well acquainted with?

(5) What in your experiences of literature do you
especially want to share with young people?

(6) What in your experiences of Shakespeare do you
especially want to share with young people?

c. Oral: Language & Rhetoric   30 Minutes

The candidate should have some acquaintance with the
history and structure of the English language, and with
the composition process. Questions will be designed to
discover what the candidates know and how they are able
to articulate their ideas about those subjects.

The candidate will arrive 30 minutes before the interview
and be given a short piece of student writing to look
over. At the beginning of the interview the candidate
will be asked to comment briefly on the strengths and
weaknesses of the piece and to suggest several points of
revision.

The candidate will be asked to think in advance about the
following three questions:

(1) Do students need to be able to describe English
grammar or recite the rules of standard usage in
order to write well? What kinds of grammar
instruction do you imagine might be helpful to a
developing writer?

(2) What are some ways writers combine ideas (expressed
in phrases or clauses) in sentences? What are the
effects of such combining? Do you think good
writers prefer long or short sentences? Explain
which you prefer and why. Should young writers be
taught to stick to short sentences in order to avoid
errors?

(3) How do you feel about dialect differences among
speakers of English? Do you feel you will need to
teach a correct method of speaking? A correct form
of usage in writing? How did other dialects come to
be and what are the implications of this for
correcting the speech or writing of young people in
school?

The remainder of the interview could be structured around
such questions as:

(4) What information does a typical dictionary entry
give? What is the source of that information?

(5) Please distinguish between the deep structure and
the surface structure of sentences. How/why is it
useful to make this distinction?

5. Summary of Evaluation Results and Recommendations to Candidate

Considering the combined record of courses, the writing from
both the portfolio and the response to literature, and the
interview responses, interviewers will either (1) certify that
the candidate is fully prepared, (2) recommend that he/she
fill gaps, or (3) require that he/she, before student
teaching, become competent in certain areas in which he/she is
deficient.

If students are required to make up deficiencies, they can do
so either by taking courses recommended by the interviewers
with a grade of B or better or by studying on their own. If
the courses are taken at another school, they must be
pre-approved. A candidate may choose to make up an oral
deficiency on her/his own by practicing with a tape recorder.
If a student elects to study or practice, he/she will then be
re-interviewed only in the deficient area.

Courses have been identified which will enable a student to
make up deficiencies. Additional courses may be identified as
the program develops.

Any student who wishes to appeal the judgment of the
interviewers should request in writing a hearing with an
English Department standing committee consisting of three
faculty members with advising specialties in literature,
language and composition, respectively.

6. Postscript

The one competency not adequately addressed by the above plan
is "ability to model effective speaking and listening
skills." It is possible that the curriculum and instruction
course, required of all candidates as part of their
professional sequence, could be the locus for assessing this -
and perhaps several other of the core competencies.

Furthermore, the workgroup discussions held August 17 - 20,
1987 led to the consideration of seriously revising the
present waiver program to better meet the realities of
California high school English classrooms, as reflected in the
core competencies. For example, this campus does not
presently require coursework in second language acquisition or
in specific problems of teaching English as a second language;
nor does it sufficiently assure students' familiarity with
ethnic or world literature.

ASSESSMENT MODEL B

POINTS OF ASSESSMENT	ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES	COMPETENCY ASSESSED	PURPOSE (Formative, Summative Cumulative)	STEPS TO REMEDY DEFICIENCIES	COMMENTS
JUNIOR YEAR					
SENIOR YEAR	Test Scores	B. 1,2,3; D. 3,4	Formative	Coursework	
	Grades	variety	Formative	Coursework	
	Portfolio	A. 2; C. 1, 2	Formative	Coursework	
	Response to Lit - written	B. 3, 5; C. 1	Formative	Coursework	
	Response to student work	C. 3, 5	Formative	Coursework	
	Interview	A. 1-4; B. 1-5; C. 2-4; D. 1-5; E. 1, 4	Formative	Coursework	
POST BAACALAUREATE TRANSFERS	Test Scores	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	
	Transcript/Grades	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	
	Portfolio	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	
	Response to Lit - written	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	
	Response to student work	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	
	Interview	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	

30

36

ASSESSMENT MODEL B

POINTS OF ASSESSMENT	ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES	COMPETENCY ASSESSED	PURPOSE (Formative, Summative Cumulative)	STEPS TO REMEDY DEFICIENCIES	COMMENTS
1ST SEMESTER PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION	Methods Class	Possibly all	Formative	Coursework	
	Re-testing of areas diagnosed earlier as deficient		Summative		
EMERGENCY CREDENTIAL TEACHERS					

31

III. **Model C**

    A. Context

        Campus C is a medium/large campus with 18,000 FTE. Two hundred to 300 of these students are credential candidates in the English Single Subject Major, with 80-100 currently in the School of Education Teacher Education Program. There are relatively few transfer students with completed waiver programs.

    B. Model C Description

        This assessment model depends upon three components:

        1. A sequence of coursework, in which two "junior-level" courses are prerequisites for two "senior level" courses. (In practice, it would be possible for all four courses to be taken in the junior year.)

        2. Three examinations, two as entry-level assessments of basic competency (one in traditional grammar and standard usage, and one in writing), and one at the end of the major program to assess quantitatively a candidate's general knowledge of literature and literary history.

        3. A "summative" assessment employing the related components:

            a. The evaluation of a portfolio containing the records of assessment from the four required courses and the three examinations, sample papers and examinations written for the required courses and at least two or three other courses.

            b. A transcript, a summary of evaluative comments from all Department faculty recorded on a form distributed for the purpose, and other information as deemed relevant.

            c. A "capstone course" or "assessment course," which would be a one-unit S-25 supervisory registration, in which the student would prepare for the final assessment, and the record of which would also be entered into the portfolio;

            d. A final interview, or oral examination of some 30 minutes duration in which two or more faculty would assess the candidate's competencies, using the portfolio as a guide to questioning.

        At each stage of the evaluation, the student would be apprised of whatever deficiencies he/she needed to remedy and the prescribed course remediation or other means. If the student failed the traditional grammar and standard usage examination, he/she would be required to take a course in traditional grammar and standard usage and pass with a B- or better. If the student failed the upper division writing proficiency examination, he/she would be advised

into appropriate coursework or tutoring, and required to repeat the examination. Should the student receive a grade lower than B- on any of the required courses, he/she would be required to repeat the course.

If at any stage it becomes apparent that the student's chances for success in the credential program were poor, he/she would be so apprised. If the student failed the standardized literature examination he/she would be counseled as to needed remediation and required to follow up on the advisor's recommendation before retaking the exam.

If in the judgment of the interview committee (or oral exam committee) the candidate did not adequately demonstrate the requisite competencies, he/she would be apprised of the steps necessary to remedy deficiencies or, if the deficiencies were judged to be too great to remedy, advised that he/she would not be admitted to the professional education program. This last judgment should rarely occur at this stage, as at some point in the incremental assessment which goes on throughout the program, students unlikely to succeed should have been counseled out of the program.

Transfer students who have completed credential majors at other institutions should undergo an assessment which requires at least the same culminating or summative assessment. The Credential Advisor/Committee will evaluate the candidate's transcript for evidence of coursework in the relevant areas (literature, language, composition and speech).

The candidate will be required to enroll in the "capstone course" (possibly in summer session or through extended learning) as well as compile a portfolio of work from the institution at which the undergraduate English program was completed. Other items which could be included are: specific written assignments and examinations required at the local campus, including the Writing Proficiency requirement (unless already met), the standardized literature test, and other possible essay type examinations. The candidate will be expected to demonstrate general competency in the interview or oral exam.

Persons holding emergency credentials should be required to complete the waiver program demonstrations of competency to which other students are held. It should be possible however, for evidence of mastery of various competencies acquired while teaching to be presented, and the Credential Advisor/Committee would be empowered to waiver some requirements. The candidate would however, in all instances be held to the final assessment of portfolio, capstone course and interview/oral exam.

ASSESSMENT MODEL C

POINTS OF ASSESSMENT	ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES	COMPETENCY ASSESSED	PURPOSE (Formative, Summative Cumulative)	STEPS TO REMEDY DEFICIENCIES	COMMENTS
JUNIOR YEAR	1. Junior-level writing proficiency examination	C1	Formative: diagnose need remediation to qualify for required courses in credential program.	Coursework, tutoring, workshops, counselling available.	
	2. Examination in traditional grammar and standard usage	to some extent, D4, C1	Formative: determine minimal foundation for study of comparative grammars, etc.	Students who fail must take course in traditional grammar and standard usage.	
	3. Advanced expository writing course	A2, 3, 4; C1, 2, 3, 4	Formative: a requirement for other credential courses.	Student must receive a B- or repeat the course.	
	4. Introductory (upper division) linguistics course.	A1, 2, to some extent 3; D 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	Formative: provide basis for understanding of language study; required for subsequent courses in program.	Student must repeat course unless he/she receives grade of B-.	

34

ASSESSMENT MODEL C

POINTS OF ASSESSMENT	ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES	COMPETENCY ASSESSED	PURPOSE (Formative, Summative Cumulative)	STEPS TO REMEDY DEFICIENCIES	COMMENTS
SENIOR YEAR	5. Adolescent literature and film course	A1, 2, 4; B3, 4, 5, 6, 7; E 1. 4.	Formative: basic literature for teachers course.	Student must repeat course unless he/she receives grade of B-.	
	6. Composition theory and application course	A1, 2, 3, 4; C2, 3, 4, 5.	Formative: knowledge of and ability to apply composition theory.	Student must repeat course unless he/she passes with grade of B-.	
	7. Standardized literature examination (possibly a CLEP or NTE test)	B 1. 2	Formative: to assess quantitative knowledge of literature.	Coursework, reading in periods, literary history, where knowledge is deficient.	
	8. Combination of the following: a) "capstone" or "assessment" course (1-unit S-25 to five workload credit to one or two faculty members; b) examination of "portfolio" of work from required courses and one or two other (literature) courses; c) "interview" (or "oral exam"), testing candidate's mastery of competencies in all areas, using "capstone" course and "portfolio" as guides to questioning.	All	Formative and Summative: To be admitted to the Professional Education Program student must receive a positive recommendation from this final assessment. Students who do not should either be advised as to what remedial work must be undertaken, or counselled as to the advisability of continuing in the program. This latter counselling however, should not be delayed until this point if, at any time, it becomes apparent that the student's prospects for success in program are poor.	Student may be advised into or required to take courseowrk, including repeating courses; may be required to retake exams; may be advised to re-interview at a later time, etc.	

35

ASSESSMENT MODEL C

POINTS OF ASSESSMENT	ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES	COMPETENCY ASSESSED	PURPOSE (Formative, Summative Cumulative)	STEPS TO REMEDY DEFICIENCIES	COMMENTS
POST BACCALAUREATE TRANSFERS	1. Portfolio: to be compiled by student, to include papers written at school of origin, and written assignments from campus of assessment.	All	Formative/Summative: If candidate performs at acceptable level, he/she should be ranked along with "native" students recommended for Pro- fessional Education Program	If candidate is de- ficient he/she should be required to take appropriate remedial program.	

36

ASSESSMENT MODEL C

POINTS OF ASSESSMENT	ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES	COMPETENCY ASSESSED	PURPOSE (Formative, Summative Cumulative)	STEPS TO REMEDY DEFICIENCIES	COMMENTS
1ST SEMESTER PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION					
EMERGENCY CREDENTIAL TEACHERS	To receive clear credential, Emergency Credential teachers should be requied to compelte the same basic requirements for the Single Subject Credential as other credential candidates. Based upon evidence presented, the Credential/Advisor/Committee may waive certain requirements or coursework if convinced that the candidate has acquired the necessary competencies. The actual competencies will be determined ultimately by the same final Formative/Summative assessment as given all candidates, with the same consequences.				

37

48

4 7

RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO RESOURCE AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

State resources are necessary for the development and implementation of a formal process to assess prospective teachers' subject matter competency prior to entry into the professional education program's supervised teaching experience. Such support is necessary whether this assessment is campus-based or limited to a standardized, statewide examination of subject matter knowledge.

Policy makers advocating a State standardized test of subject matter knowledge for prospective teachers acknowledge the need for State support for test development. However, it is likely that credential candidates will have to bear the costs of test administration through fees, such as those charged for the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST).

The Workgroup on Assessment of Prospective English Teachers strongly recommends that State support be sought for development and implementation of campus-based assessment of the subject matter competence of prospective teachers. A successful effort to persuade the legislature to fund such a program, however, will very probably require demonstration that campuses have already developed, or have made considerable progress in developing, assessment processes which are well conceived, specific, and creditable.

As campuses develop and implement assessment processes without additional support, questions relating to resources and administration are likely to be an integral part of their considerations. The recommendations found below recognize that State funding is not at present specifically provided for development or implementation of subject matter competency assessment by academic departments. The following recommendations pertain to the costs of both development and implementation of assessment procedures.

I.   Development

A.   Lottery funds may be an excellent source of support for one-time assessment development and piloting of assessment processes. (Lottery funds are inappropriate for long-term implementation support.) Lottery funds allocated to the campuses as Discretionary Funds could be sought for this purpose. As well, existing lottery funds set aside for Instructional Program Improvement/Enhancement could be a resource.

For 1988-89, system lottery funds should be allocated to campuses specifically for further development of assessment models. A primary basis for allocation should be the number of waiver programs on the campus. Funding might range from $50,000 to $100,000 per campus.

B.   Assigned time could support development of the assessment process. For instance, a faculty member could be assigned 3 WTU's for a semester to chair the development effort and a development committee.

C.   Faculty members of an assessment development committee could serve as a part of their regular committee assignments.

D. Campuses could develop proposals for private funding that may
    support assessment development processes and, possibly, related
    research.

II. **Implementation**

A. Assigned time and committee work could be devoted to assessment
    implementation. For instance, a campus department might provide 3
    WTU's for the chair of a standing teacher assessment committee
    whose members are serving as a part of their regular committee
    assignments.

B. A course could be established for integrated experiences and
    assessment purposes. Dependent upon the depth and breadth of
    procedures, this course could be taught as supervision, activity,
    or activity laboratory. For example, one faculty position could
    accommodate 90 to 100 students per term (6 FTES assuming one
    credit unit per student).

C. On some campuses and for some students, integrating specifically
    designed assessment activities within one or more required waiver
    program courses could reduce costs to the campuses. Perhaps these
    activities or common assessment assignments could be conducted in
    several courses each year or a student in the waiver program could
    be assessed over a period of time by several faculty members
    teaching waiver progam courses.

D. Many students could undergo assessment through a specially designed
    course offered by extended or continuing education, such as summer
    session for students wanting to enter student teaching or the
    credential program in the fall term. It should be kept in mind,
    however, that an extension course cannot be "required" of any
    student.

E. Students may be required to pay an assessment fee of up to $25,
    which would be deposited in a revolving trust fund operated
    similarly to the account extablished for the upper-division written
    English tests on many campuses.

F. For the purposes of specific assessment activities carried out
    within a course, a second assessor beyond the regular instructor
    might be paid a stipend through the funds raised by an assessment
    fee (see E above).

E. Assessment processes could be developed that rely in part on
    utilization of extra-campus assessors who possess the appropriate
    expertise, such as exemplary public school teachers, school
    district curriculum specialists, and professional association
    members, who may be willing to serve at no cost to the campus or
    with minimal stipends which could be supported by assessment fees.

III. **Administration**

A. Each department should designate a member of the faculty to be primarily responsible for managing the department's assessment process. Campuses may wish to establish some general guidelines and reviews for department processes. Each campus should provide for an appeals process should a student wish to challenge the results of the assessment.

B. Campuses that will be assessing large numbers of students may wish to establish an Assessment Center which could provide common clerical and recordkeeping assistance facilities, proctoring services, video taping and other services to all participating departments, thus reducing costs. Fees could support the overhead costs of such a center.

C. A resource center to provide collection and dissemination of information regarding assessment methods, instruments, and experiences would be helpful, especially in the current stage of development.

51