Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Preliminary Report of Findings and Addendum

Institution	USC		Program	**PRELIMINARY SINGLE SUBJECT-WL**
Date of Review	July 8, 2021			

Please complete the table below for all programs that were deemed to require "more information needed" by reviewers during Program Review (PR). Brief narrative (150 words or less) is allowable, but response <u>must</u> include links to evidence that address the issue identified by the reviewers.

Posting the Addendum
Information from the addendum must be posted on the institution's accreditation website at least 60 days before the site visit, along with the original program review document and feedback from the program reviewers. Please do not resubmit your response the items below; responses need only be added to your institution's accreditation website.

Standards Found to be Preliminarily Aligned	Standard 1.

Standards Requiring More Information	Comment from Program Reviewers	Response from Program
Standard 2: Preparing Candidates toward Mastery of the *Teaching Performance Expectations* (TPEs)	It is unclear how the course assignments align to the TPEs and how the assessment outlines in the syllabi link to data that could be	Thank you for this feedback. Our responses are as follows: 1. To address the first part of this comment requesting clarity about how our course assignments align to the TPEs, we would like to offer again our Course Matrices, linked below. Given the time invested in building these matrices, we wanted to draw attention to them once more, in hopes that they might sufficiently illustrate how the specific assignments and activities in courses link to the General TPEs and the subject-specific competencies for the ELD and WL credentials. For each matrix, course names are listed across the top and candidate

	actionable. Please explain how course activities align with rubric indicators and with course objectives that demonstrate TPE fulfillment. On page 2, it is unclear how candidates are receiving feedback in "introduce, practice and assess model." *At the site interview, please have the university supervisors ready to respond to how candidates receive feedback.*	competencies down the left side: *5.1.1. Course Matrix: ELD and WL General TPEs* *5.1.2 Course Matrix: Single Subject: English Language Development* *5.1.3 Course Matrix: Single Subject: World Languages* 2. The second part of this comment, requesting explanation of how our learning objectives align to course activities and to TPEs, is very helpful and illuminates for us an omission in our syllabi. To address this adequately, we will add this task to our program improvement plan. In advance of the site interview, we will identify the best way to satisfy this gap, whether through creating tables for each syllabus, such using the template below, or through another way to map these alignments effectively. <table><tr><td>Course learning objective</td><td>Course activities, assignments, or assessments</td><td>TPEs (General, ELD, WL)</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> 3. We will be prepared at the site interview to describe how candidates receive feedback.
Standard 3: Clinical Practice	*MAT-TESOL Fieldwork Summary* indicates the organization of clinical practice.	1. We will be prepared to provide at the on-site interview evidence of how our candidates are placed into diverse classroom settings. ● schools that meet specific criteria ● Mentor Teachers also meet specific criteria

A. Organization of Clinical Practice B. Criteria for School Placements C. Criteria for the Selection of Program Supervisors D. Criteria for the Selection of District-Employed Supervisors	A. Organization of Clinical Practice is met. B. There is a statement supporting the criteria for school placements as meeting CTC requirements. Evidence of tracking placements and how candidates are placed into diverse classroom settings will be needed at the onsite visit. C. Selection of Program Supervisors – evidence of criteria for selecting program supervisors and district employed supervisors should be submitted, and D. please offer a paragraph on how supervisors and district employed supervisors are trained. Support providers should be able to articulate	

	how they are trained by the university.	
Standard 4: Monitoring, Supporting, and Assessing Candidate Progress towards Meeting Credential Requirements	Please provide evidence of candidate support: feedback, coaching, remediation. 6.1 The Clinical Practice Assessment Instruments link will not open. Please offer access.	1. The following slidedeck of feedback examples illustrates ways we provide candidate support, which include: Slide 1: Example of feedback on a candidate's Reflective Focus Video (RFV) using assignment rubric; feedback is provided both by highlighting relevant parts of rubric language and by additional comments to candidates indicating areas to work on. Slide 2: An example of how candidates are encouraged to resubmit components of RFVs and Reflective Teaching Events (RTEs) in order to allow them to incorporate feedback and demonstrate mastery. Slide 3: This excerpt from our 660A syllabus illustrates how guiding questions are structured to support in-class discussion and feedback from instructor and peers on aspects of teaching and learning that are linked to edTPA components. Slide 4: This email illustrates how our placement office is actively and intensively involved both in coaching and remediation efforts, including working to intervene when issues arise at a placement site. In addition to timely problem solving, our team takes collective effort in coaching in areas such as soft skills, communication, and help-seeking. Slides 5-6: These slides illustrate how assignments are structured to facilitate coaching and support by both the University Instructor and Guiding Teacher. This includes a continuum from: Entry Interview, which provides a structured opportunity for the candidate, Guiding Teacher, and Instructor to meet together to discuss his/her understanding of the expectations of this course; to Mid-semester Check in meetings; through the individual induction plan, where the Guiding Teacher & Instructor work with the candidate to develop an individualized plan for ongoing development, based on his/her demonstrated strength and weakness.

		2. Here is a repaired link to 6.6.1 *Clinical Practice Assessment Instruments* [this is on page 8 in the original program review document]
Standard 5: Implementation of **a** Teaching Performance Assessment A. Administration of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) B. Candidate Preparation and Support C. Assessor Qualifications, Training, and Scoring	The table presented provides an overall scope and sequence of the standard, but limited information is offered in support of how Standard 5 is achieved. The USC Weekly Observation Form offers TPE distribution but there is no clear pathway/crosswalk delineated to align the activity with the TPE. Please demonstrate how TPE's are met in each course and prepares candidates for CalTPA/edTPA. Please make sure the "Snapshot of	1. Steps that occur in our courses to support the achievement of Standard 5 include the following: ● EdTPA Coordinator provides a comprehensive video introduction to the EdTPA, which is made available to all candidates; ● EdTPA Coordinator is regularly invited to class meetings (on average 3 times a semester) during student teaching courses to introduce edTPA process, support steps toward achievement, and respond to ongoing questions; ● Syllabi for our courses 660 A/B, which parallel the student teaching placement, have integrated into them suggested edTPA timeline, key activities, and critical benchmarks - these facets of the process are an integral part of class discussions; ● 660A and 660B instructors explain the edTPA rubrics (WL and ELD) at outset of course sequence and then refer to the document in commenting on candidates' teaching, highlighting the items which are coming up in the EdTPA timeline. 2. The request for demonstration of how our TPEs are met and how they are aligned to the preparation of candidates for the edTPA highlights an omission in our syllabi. To address this adequately, we will add this task to our program improvement plan. In advance of the site interview, we will identify the best way to satisfy this gap, whether through creating tables for each syllabus or a program-wide crosswalk. 3. Here is repaired link to our snapshot of Spring 2020 [this link is from page 8 in the program review document] 4. Regarding a description of edTPA assessors, we do not do local scoring. Everything is scored by Pearson. Therefore, we did not include a description of their assessor qualifications.

	spring 2020" link can open. Please offer a detailed description of edTPA assessor qualifications or detail whether the assessments are sent to Pearson for assessment.	

Standard 6: Induction Development Plan	The IDP (Induction Development Plan) should be submitted. Please note, "Key Assessment refinement: As a result of data gathered during our 2018 review of Key Assessments, it was concluded that rubrics for these assessments needed to be refined to produce greater score variation and more meaningful and nuanced analysis of results. and better ability to compare and	1. Our IDP is contained within our 660B course, the second course in the student teaching course sequence. Here are the artifacts associated with this plan:
		    1. Our IDP template
		    2. An example of a candidate's revised and completed IDP
		    3. Summary of the IDP process:
		        a. Before Exit Interview between instructor and candidate, candidate engages in personal reflection and consults with guiding teacher to complete draft of Induction Development Plan, including proposing at least one area of strength, one area of improvement, and a professional development goal.
		        b. During Exit Interview, instructor and candidate discuss candidate's strengths, instructor asks clarifying questions, offers suggestions on making learning goals specific and measurable.
		        c. After Exit Interview, candidate reviews feedback and submits final version
		
		2. Due to the onset of the pandemic, our work on the refinement of our Key Assessments got set aside. We will add this work to our program improvement plan.

	analyze student performance. This process will be completed by Spring 2020" – please offer this artifact that demonstrates completion.	