

**APPENDIX A. Overview of Teaching Event Tasks & Sample Rubrics
for Elementary Literacy (2003-04 Pilot Year)**

Overview of Elementary Literacy Teaching Event

Focus of Teaching Event	What to do	What to submit
A. Planning Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction (TPEs 1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9)	Select a series of lessons that strengthen students' ability to comprehend and/or compose text. This series is part of a larger instructional unit. Provide relevant information about your instructional context and your students as learners of literacy. Create an instruction and assessment plan. Record daily reflections on what happened, to submit for Task D.	Task A.1 Instructional Context Task A.2 Overview of Instruction and Assessment Plan and Daily Lesson Instruction and Assessment Plans Task A.3 Planning Commentary
B. Implementing Instruction (TPEs 1,2,4,5,6,7, 11)	Review your plans and prepare to videotape your class. Identify opportunities for students to use relevant skills and strategies to comprehend and/or compose text. Videotape the lesson(s) you have identified. Review the videotape to identify one video clip portraying the required features of your teaching. The total running time of this clip should not exceed 15 minutes. Copy or upload this clip into a new videotape or file. Write a commentary that analyzes your teaching and your students' learning in the video clips.	Task B.1 Videotape Task B.2 Teaching Commentary
C. Assessing Student Learning (TPE 3)	Write a commentary that uses assessment data to provide an achievement profile of the whole class and analyzes the extent to which the class met the learning goals. Identify two focus students and collect at least three samples of their work to analyze learning over time. Write a commentary on the two focus students' learning progress during the instructional unit.	Task C.1 Whole Class Learning Commentary Task C.2 Individual Student Learning Commentary
D. Analyzing Teaching and Learning (TPE 13)	Provide your daily reflections. Write a commentary about what you would do if you could teach this learning segment again.	Daily Reflections from Task A Task D.1 Reflective Commentary

**ELEMENTARY LITERACY RUBRIC
2003-04 Pilot**

PLANNING				
GQ:	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<p>1. How does the instructional design make the curriculum accessible to the students in the class? (TPEs 1B, 4, 6B/C,9)</p>	<p>Plans for making the literacy curriculum accessible to students are general or formulaic, with few specific connections to either the learners or to the literacy curriculum content.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>The plans include significant inaccuracies that would lead to student misunderstandings.</p>	<p>The candidate plans strategies to make the literacy curriculum accessible.¹</p> <p>These strategies have connections to the learners and/or the literacy curriculum content.</p>	<p>The candidate plans strategies to make the literacy curriculum accessible that include active involvement by students and that accurately depict content in more than one way.²</p> <p>These strategies have connections to the learners and/or the literacy curriculum content.</p>	<p>The candidate plans strategies to make the literacy curriculum accessible that include active involvement by students and that accurately depict content in more than one way.</p> <p>These strategies have connections to the learners and/or the literacy curriculum content.</p> <p>There are explicit plans to have the students summarize, analyze, or reflect on what they learned.</p>
<p>2. How does the instructional design reflect a coherent approach to the literacy curriculum? (TPEs 4, 9)</p>	<p>Some elements of the instructional design focus on building understanding of the central concept(s), essential questions, or key skills that were identified as the literacy focus of the learning segment.</p>	<p>The instructional design is focused on building understanding of the central concept(s), essential questions, or key skills that were identified as the literacy focus of the learning segment.</p>	<p>The instructional design includes a progression of activities and assessments that build understanding of the central concept(s), essential questions, or key skills that were identified as the literacy focus of the learning segment.</p>	<p>The instructional design includes a progression of activities and assessments that build understanding of the central concept(s), essential questions, or key skills that were identified as the literacy focus of the learning segment.</p> <p>The instructional design scaffolds and extends the learning of students with diverse needs.</p>
<p>3. How does the instructional design reflect a balanced approach to the literacy curriculum? (TPEs 4, 9)</p>	<p>The collection of instructional tasks and assessments are one-dimensional (e.g., a focus solely on conventions and skills with no attention to interpretation or meaning or vice versa).</p>	<p>The collection of instructional tasks and assessments include connections between facts, conventions, skills, and strategies in literacy, although the overall focus is primarily one-dimensional.</p>	<p>The collection of instructional tasks or the set of assessment tasks make solid connections among facts, conventions, skills, and strategies in literacy.</p>	<p>The collection of instructional tasks and assessments make solid and consistent connections among facts, conventions, skills, and strategies in literacy.</p>

¹ Such as establishing a purpose for reading; modeling decoding strategies

² Such as acting out a story, reading your writing aloud

**ELEMENTARY LITERACY RUBRIC
2003-04 Pilot**

PLANNING				
GQ:	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<p>4. How does the instructional design reflect and address student interests and needs? (TPE 6, 8, 9)</p>	<p>The instructional design reflects aspects of students' backgrounds, interests, prior learning, or experiences that have little relationship to the literacy learning goals.</p>	<p>The instructional design includes activities that draw upon aspects of students' backgrounds, interests, prior learning, or experiences to help students reach the literacy learning goals.</p>	<p>The instructional design includes activities that draw upon aspects of students' backgrounds, interests, prior learning, or experiences to help students reach the literacy learning goals. Explicit consideration has been made for particular student needs that require differentiation or strategic teaching decisions.</p>	<p>The instructional design includes activities that draw upon aspects of students' backgrounds, interests, prior learning, or experiences to help students reach the literacy learning goals. Explicit consideration has been made for particular student needs that require differentiation or strategic teaching decisions. These considerations exhibit a strong understanding of how to design instruction for a diverse class of students.</p>
<p>5. How well are the learning goals, instruction and assessments aligned? (TPEs 3, 9)</p>	<p>There is a mismatch between one or more of the assessment instruments or methods selected and the literacy learning goals being assessed.</p>	<p>The informal and formal assessments planned provide opportunities for students to demonstrate progress toward the literacy learning goals, although it is not clear that the assessment of one or more goals go beyond surface-level understandings. The instruction planned provides students opportunities to learn what is assessed.</p>	<p>The informal and formal assessments planned provide multiple opportunities for students to demonstrate progress toward the literacy learning goals. The assessments allow students to show some depth of understanding or skill with respect to the learning goals. The instruction planned provides students opportunities to learn what is assessed.</p>	<p>The informal and formal assessments planned provide multiple opportunities for students to demonstrate progress toward all of the literacy learning goals. The assessments allow students to show both basic and complex understandings and skills, relative to the learning goals. The instruction planned provides students opportunities to learn what is assessed.</p>

**ELEMENTARY LITERACY RUBRIC
2003-04 Pilot**

INSTRUCTION				
GQ:	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<p>1. How does the candidate actively engage students in their own understanding of relevant skills and strategies to comprehend and/or compose text? (TPEs 5, 10, 11)</p>	<p>Students participate in learning activities but are provided limited opportunities to engage with the content in ways that are likely to help them improve their abilities to use relevant skills and strategies to comprehend and/or compose text. OR Classroom management is problematic and student behavior interferes with learning.</p>	<p>The candidate structures classroom norms and activities to provide opportunities for students to use relevant skills and strategies to comprehend and/or compose text.</p>	<p>The candidate structures classroom norms and activities to provide opportunities for all students to actively engage in the activities to use relevant skills and strategies to comprehend and/or compose text in meaningful and thoughtful ways. If students were not engaged, the candidate makes thoughtful suggestions for improvement.</p>	<p>The candidate structures classroom norms and activities to provide opportunities for all students to use relevant skills and strategies to comprehend and/or compose text in meaningful and thoughtful ways. If students were not engaged, the candidate makes thoughtful suggestions for improvement. The candidate thoughtfully probes and connects elements of the discussion in ways that extend student thinking and raise stimulating questions for future thought and discussion.</p>
<p>2. How does the candidate monitor student learning and respond to student comments, questions, and needs? (TPEs 2, 5)</p>	<p>The candidate monitors student learning and acknowledges student comments and questions. However, candidate responses are general and not directed at improving student abilities to use relevant skills and strategies to comprehend and/or compose text. OR The candidate's responses include one or more significant inaccuracies.</p>	<p>The candidate's responses to student comments and questions represent reasonable attempts to improve student abilities to use relevant skills and strategies to comprehend and/or compose text.</p>	<p>The candidate's responses build on student responses, using student input and evidence of student learning to guide instruction and improve student abilities to use relevant skills and strategies to comprehend and/or compose text.</p>	<p>Candidate's monitoring strategies provide rich information about student thinking and needs. The candidate's responses build on student responses, using student input and evidence of student learning to guide instruction, as well as to foster student engagement and improve student abilities to use relevant skills and strategies to comprehend and/or compose text.</p>

**ELEMENTARY LITERACY RUBRIC
2003-04 Pilot**

ASSESSMENT				
GQ:	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
1. How does the candidate's analysis of whole class learning reveal students' understanding of literacy? (TPEs 1B, 2,3)	The analysis identifies what some students understood or learned and what some did not. The student work samples are rarely or are inappropriately used to support the analysis.	The analysis identifies what most students understood or learned and what some or most did not. The analysis is supported through appropriate references to student work samples.	The analysis identifies what most students understood or learned and what some or most did not. The analysis is supported through appropriate references to the student work samples. The analysis clearly discusses the relationship between the learning goals and what students learned and did not learn.	The analysis distinguishes between levels of students' use of strategies and skills to comprehend and/or compose text. Student work samples are consistently used to support the analysis. Both general patterns and special needs of individuals or subgroups of students are noted, in relation to the learning goals.
2. How does the candidate analyze the two students' progress over time? (TPEs 1B, 2, 3)	The assessment and analysis of the two students' work focus on learning that has little relationship to the central concept(s), essential question, or key skills in literacy. OR The candidate does not support conclusions with relevant evidence.	The analysis describes surface characteristics of the student work as it relates to the central concept(s), essential question, or key skills in literacy and notes changes over time.	The analysis describes what students have done well, what they have done to some extent, and/or what they need to know with respect to the central concept(s), essential question, or key skills in literacy. It notes several changes over time.	The analysis provides specific details about what students have done well, what they have done to some extent, and what they need to know with respect to the central concept(s), essential question, or key skills in literacy. The analysis discusses the influences of teaching decisions on changes in student learning over time.
3. What is the quality of oral and written feedback to the two students about literacy? (TPE 3)	Literacy feedback is general, and provides little guidance for improvement. OR The feedback contains significant inaccuracies.	The literacy feedback identifies what was done well and areas for improvement.	Specific literacy feedback helps the student understand what s/he did that made a work sample strong, and gives suggestions to guide improvement.	Specific comments are supportive and prompt analysis of the work by the student. The literacy feedback shows strong understanding of students as individuals as well as of the content and language goals they are trying to meet.

**ELEMENTARY LITERACY RUBRIC
2003-04 Pilot**

REFLECTION				
GQ:	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<p>1 To what extent did the candidate's reflections focus on student learning? (TPEs 12, 13)</p>	<p>Reflections focus on classroom management, instructional design issues, or the extent of student participation in activities, with no ties to student learning. OR Reflections make generalizations that are not consistent with other evidence in the Teaching Event.</p>	<p>Reflections focus in a general way on what students did or did not understand about literacy, and are consistent with the assessment results described in the previous task.</p>	<p>Reflections focus on consideration of specific details of what students did or did not understand about literacy and the extent to which teaching practices were or were not able to facilitate student understanding of literacy content and skills. Reflections are consistent with the assessment results described in the previous task.</p>	<p>Reflections focus on consideration of specific details of what students did and did not understand about literacy, as well as the extent to which teaching practices were or were not able to facilitate student understanding of literacy content and skills. Reflections are consistent with the assessment results described in the previous task and reflect a focus on significant content understandings and skills.</p>
<p>2. What is the relationship between the candidate's reflections on teaching and on learning? (TPEs 12, 13)</p>	<p>There is little or no evidence that the candidate can make plausible links between planning, instruction, or assessment decisions and student learning of literacy.</p>	<p>The candidate proposes and/or identifies changes in teaching practice based on reasonable assumptions about how student learning of literacy was tied to planning, instruction, or assessment decisions.</p>	<p>The candidate identifies changes in teaching practice based on reasonable assumptions about how student learning of literacy was tied to planning, instruction, or assessment decisions. The candidate is able to link their knowledge of research and theory with what they know about their students.</p>	<p>The candidate identifies specific strategic changes in teaching practice based on meaningful links between student literacy performance and different planning, instruction, or assessment decisions. These changes reflect knowledge from research and theory about effective teaching practice as well as what they know about their students.</p>

**ELEMENTARY LITERACY RUBRIC
2003-04 Pilot**

ACADEMIC LANGUAGE				
GQ:	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<p>1. How does the candidate’s planning, instruction, and assessment support academic language development?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic language appears inconsistently throughout the learning goals, instructional activities, and assessments. • Instructional activities ask students to use or understand academic language with little or no supports or scaffolds. • In identifying student strengths and needs from oral and written performances, the candidate does not specifically address academic language. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning goals, instructional activities, and assessments focus in a general way on at least one component of academic language. • The candidate is aware of student needs with respect to academic language and uses scaffolds or supports to address these needs, but the implementation of these scaffolds or supports or the materials used are not well-suited to help students develop proficiency in academic language. • The candidate’s analysis of oral and written performance for academic language development identifies specific student strengths and needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning goals, instructional activities, and assessments focus meaningfully on specific structures or features of at least one component of academic language. • The learning tasks include scaffolds or supports (e.g., use of context, categorization, or analysis of meaningful word parts to develop vocabulary; modeling of strategies for comprehending or constructing texts; explicit communication of features of oral or written language genres; providing linguistic frames to help students understand and produce academic language for specific purposes) to help students develop proficiency in the targeted component(s), while preserving the complexity of the content. • The candidate’s analysis of oral and written performance for language development identifies the degree of progress as well as student needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning goals, instructional activities, and assessments focus meaningfully on specific structures or features of one or more components of academic language³. This may include subject-specific vocabulary, but includes at least one other component. • The learning tasks include scaffolds or supports (e.g., use of context, categorization, or analysis of meaningful word parts to develop vocabulary; modeling of strategies for comprehending or constructing texts; explicit communication of features of oral or written language genres; providing linguistic frames to help students understand and produce academic language for specific purposes) to help students develop proficiency in the targeted component(s), while preserving the complexity of the content. • The candidate’s analysis of oral and written performance for language development identifies the degree of progress as well as student needs. If appropriate to the learning goals, the candidate can look beyond spelling and grammatical errors to identify student strengths in using components of academic language that go beyond the sentence level to connected discourse, such as text organization.

³ Components of academic language, from more general to more specific, include such things as formal oral presentations, writing genres, comprehension or construction of texts, subject-specific vocabulary, language functions associated with texts for specific purposes within the particular academic subject, organizational signals of different text structures.

APPENDIX B.
Relationship of TPEs to Guiding Question Rubrics (2003-04 Pilot)

Scoring Rubric	Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) Measured by Guiding Question Rubrics												
	Domain A	Domain B		Domain C			Domain D	Domain E		Domain F			
	TPE 1. Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction	TPE 2. Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction	TPE 3. Interpretation and Use of Assessments	TPE 4. Making Content Accessible	TPE 5. Student Engagement	TPE 6. Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices	TPE 7. Teaching English Learners	TPE 8. Learning about Students	TPE 9. Instructional Planning	TPE 10. Instructional Time	TPE 11. Social Environment	TPE 12. Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations	TPE 13. Professional Growth
Task A: PLANNING CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION, AND ASSESSMENT													
EL1: Access to Curriculum	X			X		X	X	X					
EL2: Coherent Instructional Design				X				X					
EL3: Balanced Instructional Design				X				X					
EL4: Student Needs & Characteristics						X	X	X	X				
EL5: Assessment Alignment			X						X				
Task B: IMPLEMENTING INSTRUCTION													
EL6: Engagement with Literacy	X				X					X	X		
EL7: Monitoring Learning		X			X								
Task C: ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING													
EL8: Whole Class Learning	X	X	X										
EL9: Individual Student Progress	X	X	X				X						
EL10: Feedback			X										
Task D: ANALYZING AND REFLECTING ON TEACHING AND LEARNING													
EL11: Focus of Reflection												X	X
EL12: Teaching and Learning												X	X
ACADEMIC LANGUAGE													
EL 13 Academic Language							X						

APPENDIX C

PACT Bias and Sensitivity Review – Fall 2003

In October 2003, teacher educators from several institutions in California met to participate in the PACT Bias and Sensitivity Review. During the meeting, they reviewed the prompts that were common across all of the 2002-03 PACT Teaching Event portfolios for instances of bias. The purpose of the meeting was to identify ways in which the prompts might 1) pose challenges to candidates based on language, race/ethnicity, gender, special needs, and teaching context and 2) privilege certain curricula, instructional or assessment activities, or pedagogical approaches. As part of the review, teacher educators with expertise in particular content areas also reviewed the subject-specific prompts in each credential area.

The following issues were addressed as part of the bias review:

1. Is the content and language represented in the Teaching Event prompts equally familiar or unfamiliar to all diverse segments (i.e., diverse with regard to race, ethnicity, gender, special needs, language) of the candidate population?

2. Are the Teaching Event prompts free of language and/or content that might be offensive to any diverse segment of the candidate population?

3. Are the Teaching Event prompts free of language and/or content reinforcing stereotypes concerning any diverse segment of the candidate population?

4. Are the Teaching Event prompts equally appropriate for candidates in all classrooms within particular certification codes (e.g., multiple subjects, mathematics, etc.)?

5. Do the Teaching Event prompts accommodate different teaching contexts and diverse K-12 student populations (i.e., diverse with regard to race, ethnicity, social class, special needs, language, gender, sexual orientation)?

6. Does the Teaching Event allow candidates to explain the limitations of their teaching context? Does it allow them to explain the decisions they made in this context? Given the teaching context, does the Teaching Event allow candidates to explain what they know about teaching, learning, and assessment?

The feedback and concerns raised during the review were used by the PACT Research Staff in revising the Teaching Events for 2003-04.

APPENDIX C
PACT Bias and Sensitivity Review – Fall 2003

The bias review participants included 18 individuals from 10 PACT institutions. The participants were selected based on their experience working with pre-service teaching candidates; their knowledge of issues related to language, race/ethnicity, gender, and/or special needs and schooling; and their expertise in a particular credential area. The participants included the following:

Julie McNamara, UC-Berkeley
Dan Zimmerlin, UC-Berkeley
Barbara Merino, UC-Davis
Rick Pomeroy, UC-Davis
Pauline Holmes, UC-Davis
Gordon Suzuki, UCLA
Christina Hale-Nardi, UC-Riverside
Campbell Naismith, UC-San Diego
Teri Marchese, UC-Santa Cruz

Cindy Pease-Alvarez, UC-Santa Cruz
Kate Masarik, SDSU
Alberto Rodriguez, SDSU
Rosalinda Quintanar, SJSU
Etta Hollins, USC
Dave Donahue, Mills
Linda Darling-Hammond, Stanford
Nadine Ruiz, Stanford
Ursula Sexton, West Ed

APPENDIX C
PACT Bias and Sensitivity Review – Fall 2003

Table 1
Results of Fairness Review for Common Teaching Event Prompts
Task A – Instructional Context

Fairness Question	Initial Rating			Final Rating	
	Yes	No	Not Sure	Yes	No
1. Is the content and language represented in the Teaching Event prompts equally familiar or unfamiliar to all diverse segments (i.e., diverse with regard to race, ethnicity, gender, special needs, language) of the candidate population?	20%	30%	50%	70%	30%
2. Are the Teaching Event prompts free of language and/or content that might be offensive to any diverse segment of the candidate population?	50%	20%	30%	90%	10%
3. Are the Teaching Event prompts free of language and/or content reinforcing stereotypes concerning any diverse segment of the candidate population?	50%	20%	30%	80%	20%
4. Are the Teaching Event prompts equally appropriate for candidates in all classrooms within particular certification codes (e.g., multiple subjects, mathematics, etc.)?	60%	20%	20%	80%	20%
5. Do the Teaching Event prompts accommodate different teaching contexts and diverse K-12 student populations (i.e., diverse with regard to race, ethnicity, social class, special needs, language, gender, sexual orientation)?	20%	20%	60%	70%	30%
6. Does the Teaching Event allow candidates to explain the limitations of their teaching context? Does it allow them to explain the decisions they made in this context? Given the teaching context, does the Teaching Event allow candidates to explain what they know about teaching, learning, and assessment?	70%	20%	10%	80%	20%

Note: N=10 for all questions

APPENDIX C
PACT Bias and Sensitivity Review – Fall 2003

Table 2
Results of Fairness Review for Common Teaching Event Prompts
Task B – Planning

Fairness Question	Initial Rating			Final Rating	
	Yes	No	Not Sure	Yes	No
1. Is the content and language represented in the Teaching Event prompts equally familiar or unfamiliar to all diverse segments (i.e., diverse with regard to race, ethnicity, gender, special needs, language) of the candidate population?	40%	30%	30%	70%	30%
2. Are the Teaching Event prompts free of language and/or content that might be offensive to any diverse segment of the candidate population?	40%	20%	40%	80%	20%
3. Are the Teaching Event prompts free of language and/or content reinforcing stereotypes concerning any diverse segment of the candidate population?	50%	0%	50%	80%	20%
4. Are the Teaching Event prompts equally appropriate for candidates in all classrooms within particular certification codes (e.g., multiple subjects, mathematics, etc.)?	40%	10%	50%	70%	30%
5. Do the Teaching Event prompts accommodate different teaching contexts and diverse K-12 student populations (i.e., diverse with regard to race, ethnicity, social class, special needs, language, gender, sexual orientation)?	0%	40%	60%	70%	30%
6. Does the Teaching Event allow candidates to explain the limitations of their teaching context? Does it allow them to explain the decisions they made in this context? Given the teaching context, does the Teaching Event allow candidates to explain what they know about teaching, learning, and assessment?	20%	50%	30%	70%	30%

Note: N=10 for all questions

APPENDIX C
PACT Bias and Sensitivity Review – Fall 2003

Table 3
Results of Fairness Review for Common Teaching Event Prompts
Task C – Instruction

Fairness Question	Initial Rating			Final Rating	
	Yes	No	Not Sure	Yes	No
1. Is the content and language represented in the Teaching Event prompts equally familiar or unfamiliar to all diverse segments (i.e., diverse with regard to race, ethnicity, gender, special needs, language) of the candidate population?	30%	40%	30%	70%	30%
2. Are the Teaching Event prompts free of language and/or content that might be offensive to any diverse segment of the candidate population?	50%	20%	30%	90%	10%
3. Are the Teaching Event prompts free of language and/or content reinforcing stereotypes concerning any diverse segment of the candidate population?	40%	20%	40%	90%	10%
4. Are the Teaching Event prompts equally appropriate for candidates in all classrooms within particular certification codes (e.g., multiple subjects, mathematics, etc.)?	50%	30%	20%	70%	30%
5. Do the Teaching Event prompts accommodate different teaching contexts and diverse K-12 student populations (i.e., diverse with regard to race, ethnicity, social class, special needs, language, gender, sexual orientation)?	50%	40%	10%	70%	30%
6. Does the Teaching Event allow candidates to explain the limitations of their teaching context? Does it allow them to explain the decisions they made in this context? Given the teaching context, does the Teaching Event allow candidates to explain what they know about teaching, learning, and assessment?	40%	50%	10%	70%	30%

Note: N=10 for all questions

APPENDIX C
PACT Bias and Sensitivity Review – Fall 2003

Table 4
Results of Fairness Review for Common Teaching Event Prompts
Task D – Assessment

Fairness Question	Initial Rating			Final Rating	
	Yes	No	Not Sure	Yes	No
1. Is the content and language represented in the Teaching Event prompts equally familiar or unfamiliar to all diverse segments (i.e., diverse with regard to race, ethnicity, gender, special needs, language) of the candidate population?	10%	70%	20%	90%	10%
2. Are the Teaching Event prompts free of language and/or content that might be offensive to any diverse segment of the candidate population?	10%	70%	20%	90%	10%
3. Are the Teaching Event prompts free of language and/or content reinforcing stereotypes concerning any diverse segment of the candidate population?	10%	70%	20%	100%	0%
4. Are the Teaching Event prompts equally appropriate for candidates in all classrooms within particular certification codes (e.g., multiple subjects, mathematics, etc.)?	50%	20%	30%	100%	0%
5. Do the Teaching Event prompts accommodate different teaching contexts and diverse K-12 student populations (i.e., diverse with regard to race, ethnicity, social class, special needs, language, gender, sexual orientation)?	50%	20%	30%	90%	10%
6. Does the Teaching Event allow candidates to explain the limitations of their teaching context? Does it allow them to explain the decisions they made in this context? Given the teaching context, does the Teaching Event allow candidates to explain what they know about teaching, learning, and assessment?	50%	20%	30%	90%	10%

Note: N=10 for all questions

APPENDIX C
PACT Bias and Sensitivity Review – Fall 2003

Table 5
Results of Fairness Review for Common Teaching Event Prompts
Task E – Reflection

Fairness Question	Initial Rating			Final Rating	
	Yes	No	Not Sure	Yes	No
1. Is the content and language represented in the Teaching Event prompts equally familiar or unfamiliar to all diverse segments (i.e., diverse with regard to race, ethnicity, gender, special needs, language) of the candidate population?	30%	30%	40%	90%	10%
2. Are the Teaching Event prompts free of language and/or content that might be offensive to any diverse segment of the candidate population?	20%	40%	40%	80%	20%
3. Are the Teaching Event prompts free of language and/or content reinforcing stereotypes concerning any diverse segment of the candidate population?	30%	30%	40%	90%	10%
4. Are the Teaching Event prompts equally appropriate for candidates in all classrooms within particular certification codes (e.g., multiple subjects, mathematics, etc.)?	50%	10%	40%	90%	10%
5. Do the Teaching Event prompts accommodate different teaching contexts and diverse K-12 student populations (i.e., diverse with regard to race, ethnicity, social class, special needs, language, gender, sexual orientation)?	50%	10%	40%	80%	20%
6. Does the Teaching Event allow candidates to explain the limitations of their teaching context? Does it allow them to explain the decisions they made in this context? Given the teaching context, does the Teaching Event allow candidates to explain what they know about teaching, learning, and assessment?	50%	10%	40%	90%	10%

Note: N=10 for all questions

APPENDIX D
Timeline of PACT Activities & Participants

2002-2003 PILOT YEAR

❖ **July 24-25, 2002** (Stanford University) – Initial Development Meeting

DAY ONE Participants

- Cindy Pease-Alvarez, UC-Santa Cruz
- Randy Souviney, UC-San Diego
- David Donohue, Mills College
- Linda Darling-Hammond, Stanford University
- Robert Calfee, UC-Riverside
- Judi Conroy, UC-Irvine
- Carolyn Nelson, San Jose State University
- Gordon Suzuki, UC-Los Angeles
- Andrea Whittaker, San Jose State University
- Susan Schultz, Stanford University
- Maryann Nielsen, UC-Los Angeles
- Lee Shulman, Carnegie Center for the Advancement of Teaching
- Rose Asera, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
- Nina Moore, UC Office of the President
- PJ Hallam, UC-Berkeley
- Terry Underwood, UC Berkeley
- Raymond Pecheone, PACT Director
- Kendyll Stansbury, PACT Project Manager
- Ruth Chung, Stanford University
- Ann Ford-Johnson, UC-Irvine
- Peter Jones, UC-Irvine

DAY TWO (Participants from Day One and the following)

- Rachel Lotan, Stanford University
- Charles “Cap” Peck, UC-Santa Barbara
- Pamela Grossman, Stanford University
- Pauline Holmes, UC Davis

Meeting Agenda:

This was one of the first meetings of program directors and representatives from across the PACT Consortium campuses. At this meeting, the principal components and format of the Teaching Event were conceptualized and the decision to hire a Project Manager (Kendyll Stansbury) was made.

Basic Agreements

1. The teaching event will be designed to be subject-specific and not generic. That is, each subject area will reflect the content/pedagogy of their discipline in the design of the portfolio tasks including video segments and student work samples.
2. Areas in which initial development will proceed are: (1) elementary (literacy and mathematics) (2) mathematics; (3) science; (4) English/language arts; and (5) social studies. The teaching event will focus on a week of instruction or no more than 10 hours of instructional time.
3. All teaching event portfolios will share common dimensions/categories (formerly referred to as shells). The dimensions that have been put forth are: (1) Planning (for learning) (2) Teaching (for learning) (3) Assessment (for learning) (4) Reflection (for learning).
4. Video Tape – Several video segments (5-10 minutes long) will be required in response to specific prompts regarding aspects of teaching (e.g. leading a literary discussion, supporting writing, scaffolding group work), rather than one long continuous video segment.
5. Student Work
 - a) The student learning commentary (examining two or three students' work over time to examine evidence of learning in relation to teaching) –we might consider requiring that one of the students be an English language learner (and/or that one be an exceptional needs student).
 - b) The assessment of collected work on an assignment for an entire class and its analysis in relation to teaching
6. Other Considerations - Definition of student work samples-any work product of the students such as notes, drafts, tests, quizzes, and final projects. Student work may also include performances such as exhibitions, oral presentations, audiotaped or transcribed interviews, and applied uses of technology (videos, CD-Rom, web applications).

❖ **October 21,2002** (Stanford University) – PACT Leadership Team Meeting

Participants:

- Bob Calfee, UC-Riverside;
- Linda Darling-Hammond, Stanford University;
- David Pearson, UC Berkeley;
- Ray Pecheone, PACT Director
- Kendyll Stansbury, PACT Project Manager
- Peter Youngs, Stanford University

Meeting Agenda:

- I. Status report for Teaching Event Handbook Development teams. Each team has five to seven members except the ELL/Special Needs team. Group discussed the need to add members to this team and increase overall racial/ethnic diversity of the TE Teams.
- II. Teaching Event Scoring: Discussion of three possible models: 1) Consensus scoring model; 2) Task-based progressive scoring, with opportunities to modify scores; 3) Read through entire portfolio then score. Combination of #2 with modification of #3 were recommended.

- III. Discussion of Timeline for PACT activities. Development teams to meet for second time in December and third time in January. Starting in February, candidates to pilot the TEs, will be sent to teacher educators and others for another round of review.
- IV. Discussion of technology. No electronic portfolios in 2002-03, but if individual campuses have capacity, can choose to go electronic.
- V. Membership: other CSUs have expressed interest in joining.
- VI. Funding. Funds from UCOP and Hewlett foundation. In-kind donations from members, including payment for travel.

“Guidance for Developing the Portfolio Handbook” document was produced for use by Development Teams

Teaching Event Development Team Meetings

The elementary team began meeting in August after the initial development meeting in July. They produced two drafts of prompts. The other teams began their meetings with identifying the focus of the Teaching Event (e.g., for English-language arts, was it to focus on reading? Writing? Both?), the video clips, and the type of student work that might be submitted. In December, the PACT technical team at Stanford developed a generic template for teams to review, with designated places to insert subject-specific foci. Each team reviewed the template and considered additional questions that addressed essential parts of their discipline (e.g., science inserted a question about anticipated misconceptions and how the candidate planned to surface them). At the next meeting, the additional questions were circulated to all teams for their consideration. Some questions were adopted or adapted by other teams. For some questions, e.g., misconceptions for the English-language arts team, the team decided that there was no parallel in their discipline. After the Teaching Event was circulated for feedback in January, the teams finalized the Handbooks for distribution.

Beginning in January, the team’s attention turned to rubrics. The PACT management team at Stanford identified topics for Guiding Questions and invited teams to review the topics and begin to identify four levels of development with respect to each Guiding Question. Again, ideas and language from all teams were shared with all teams in a meeting on February 25 attended by representatives from each team. The teams shared ideas, and the representatives developed draft rubrics which were circulated to team members for feedback, then finalized.

❖ August 31, November 26, December 10, 2002, January 31, 2003. Elementary Development Team

Participants:

- Andrea Whittaker, San Jose State University
- Bobbie Allen, UC-San Diego
- Anne Ford-Johnson, UC-Irvine
- Annamarie Francois, UC-Los Angeles
- Carolyn Nelson, San Jose State University
- Cindy Pease-Alvarez, UC-Santa Cruz
- Della Peretti, UC-Berkeley
- Alberto Rodriguez, San Diego State University
- Gordon Suzuki, UC-Los Angeles

- Kip Tellez, UC-Santa Cruz

❖ **October 14, December 18, February 7. English Language Arts Team Participants:**

- Terry Underwood, UC-Berkeley
- Steven Athanases, UC-Davis
- Judi Conroy, UC-Irvine
- Pauline Holmes, UC-Davis
- Jill Kerper Mora, San Diego State University
- Melanie Sperling, UC-Riverside

❖ **November 6, December 13, February 7. Mathematics Team: Participants:**

Patrick Callahan, UC Office of the President
 Valerie Henry, UC-Irvine
 Campbell Naismith, UC-San Diego
 Rafaela Santa Cruz, San Diego State University
 Dan Zimmerlin, UC-Berkeley

❖ **November 1, December 2, January 31. Science Team: Participants**

- Chris Halter, UC-San Diego
- Maria Lopez Freeman, UC-Los Angeles
- Donna Ross, San Diego State University
- Susan Schultz, Stanford University
- Irene Swanson, UC-Los Angeles
- Randy Yerrick, San Diego State University

❖ **November 8, December 13, February 1. History/Social-Science Team: Participants**

- Judi Conroy, UC-Irvine
- Dave Donahue, Mills College
- Vicki LaBoskey, Mills College
- Rachel Lotan, Stanford University
- Margaret Nash, UC-Riverside
- Maryann Nielson, UC-Los Angeles
- Daniel Perlstein, UC-Berkeley
- Cathy Zozakiewicz, San Diego State University

❖ **November 13. English Learners Team:**

- Rachel Lotan, Stanford University;
- Cindy Pease-Alvarez, UC-Santa Cruz;
- Athena Waite, UC-Riverside;
- Barbara Merino, UC-Davis

- ❖ **November 12, 2002** (Stanford University) – PACT Leadership Team Meeting
Participants: Robert Calfee, Randy Souviney, Linda Darling-Hammond, Ray Pecheone

Meeting Agenda:

- I. Embedded Tasks: Should they be part of the summative PACT assessments?; Number of Embedded Assessments, Standard across institutions or not?; Plans to establish validity and reliability; Compensatory (aggregated scores) or conjunctive (must reach passing score on each EA); Embedded tasks committee; Working policy group consisting of 6-8 members of Embedded tasks committee; Letter to deans, program directors about Embedded Tasks Committee
- II. Teaching Events: Vision statement (critical stance or position); English Language Learners; Student work; Cognitive Demand; Composition of Development Teams; Should handbook writers be paid?; Communication to supervisors, CTs, principals
- III. Technical Advisory Group: To meet during winter, will focus on EAs and TEs, scoring, Bias Review, Standard setting.
- IV. Research: Baseline data, Surveys, Case studies; Comparison between PACT and ETS TPA; Ruth Chung's dissertation research
- V. Funding
- VI. Other credential areas: Foreign language, Art, Music, PE
- VII. Membership: Policy for opening membership to additional institutions

- ❖ **November 13, 2002** (Stanford University) – PACT Advisory Committee Meeting

Participants:

Linda Darling-Hammond, Stanford University;
Robert Calfee, UC-Riverside;
David Pearson, UC-Berkeley;
Randy Souviney, UC-San Diego;
Andrea Whittaker, San Jose State University;
Della Peretti, UC-Berkeley;
Gordon Suzuki, UC-Los Angeles;
Terry Underwood, UC-Berkeley;
Randy Yerrick, SDSU;
Sally Hewlett, Flora Foundation;
Melanie Sperling, UC-Riverside;
Patrick Callahan, UC-San Diego;
Judi Conroy, UC-Irvine;
Rose Asera, Carnegie Center for the Advancement of Teaching;
Rick Pomeroy, UC-Davis;
Ray Pecheone, PACT Director
Kendyll Stansbury, PACT Project Manager
Peter Youngs, Stanford University
Ruth Chung, Stanford University

Meeting Agenda:

- I. Update representatives of institutions on PACT's progress in developing Embedded Assessments and Teaching Events
- II. Provide feedback to representatives of the Teaching Event teams on their work
- III. Discuss piloting of the Teaching Events in Spring of 2003

❖ December, 12, 2002 (UC-San Diego) - PACT Advisory Committee Meeting**Participants:**

- Randy Souviney, UC-San Diego;
- Bobbie Allen, UC-San Diego;
- Marcia Sewall, UC-San Diego;
- Jerry Balzano, UC-San Diego;
- Bob Calfee, UC-Riverside;
- Lynn Larsen, UC-Riverside;
- Carolyn Nelson, San Jose State University;
- Lionel Meno, SDSU;
- Cathy Zozakiewicz, SDSU;
- Eloise Metcalfe, UC-Los Angeles;
- Yasmin Kafai; UC-Los Angeles;
- Barbara Merino, UC-Davis;
- Cynthia Passmore, UC-Davis;
- Cindy Pease-Alvarez, UC-Santa Cruz;
- Charles "Cap" Peck, UC-Santa Barbara;
- Willis Copeland, UC-Santa Barbara;
- Dan Zimmerlin, UC-Berkeley.
- Ray Pecheone, PACT Director
- Peter Youngs, Stanford University

Meeting Agenda:

- I. Discussion of Teaching Events and how it differs from TPA developed by ERS. Five TEs to be piloted in spring 2003. Teacher educators from all 12 PACT institutions participated in developing subject-specific TEs. Data and feedback to be used to revise TEs for next pilot year.
- II. PACT Management Team would coordinate scorer training and scoring in first year. 2 options: 1) Train scorers and do calibrations every year at central location; 2) Train scorers and re-certify them every year at own institutions (electronically)
- III. Number of candidates piloting this spring estimated at 550. Need for 130-140 individuals to score 550 TEs in two days. Need to recruit National Board assessors.
- IV. Embedded tasks
- V. Report from UC-San Diego faculty work on Embedded Tasks. Discussion about Embedded Tasks. Will need validity evidence for Embedded Tasks.

❖ **December 15, 2002-January 15, 2003** – Drafts of Teaching Event Handbook were distributed by email for teacher educator review throughout consortium. Feedback was due by January 10. Began developing rubrics and guiding questions in January.

❖ **January-February 2003 Activities**

TE Handbooks were formatted, reproduced, and distributed to teacher education program directors, instructional supervisors, credential candidates
TE Development Teams met together to discuss guiding questions and begin working on rubrics.

❖ **January 9, 2003 (Stanford University) – Technical Advisory Group**
Participants:

- Edward Haertel, Stanford University;
- Mark Wilson, UC-Berkeley;
- Lloyd Bond, Carnegie Foundation;
- Robert Calfee, UC-Riverside;
- Linda Darling-Hammond, Stanford University;
- David Pearson, UC-Berkeley;
- Randy Souviney, UC-San Diego;
- Pamela Moss; University of Wisconsin
- Judith Warren-Little, UC Berkeley
- Joan Herman, Stanford University
- Bob Polkinghorn, UC Office of the President
- Lee Shulman, Carnegie Center for the Advance of Teaching
- Maryl Gearhart, UC Berkeley
- PJ Hallam, UC Berkeley
- Rose Asera, Carnegie Center for the Advance of Teaching
- Raymond Pecheone, PACT Director
- Kendyll Stansbury, PACT Project Manager
- Peter Youngs, Stanford University
- Ruth Chung, Stanford University

Meeting Agenda:

- I. Overview of Project:
- II. SB 2042
- III. PACT – accomplishments, next steps
- IV. Scoring simulation
- V. Overview of Scoring Models
- VI. CT Model
- VII. Haertel approach
- VIII. Creating a score scale for the Teaching Event
- IX. Bias and sensitivity review, Standard setting
- X. Design for combining data from the Embedded Assessments and Teaching Event
- XI. Rubrics-generic? Task-based? Analytic? Dimensional?

- XII. Documenting validity and reliability
- XIII. Implementation
- XIV. Delta Project (Carnegie)
- XV. Timeline for PACT
- XVI. Implementation questions

❖ **January 29, 2003** (San Jose State University) PACT Advisory Committee Meeting

Participants:

- Randy Souviney, UC-San Diego
- Carolyn Nelson, San Jose State University
- Andrea Whittaker, San Jose State University
- Stephanie Steffey, San Jose State University
- Brenda Fikes, San Jose State University
- Barbara Merino, UC-Davis
- Cindy Pease-Alvarez, UC-Santa Cruz
- Kip Tellez, UC-Santa Cruz
- Charles “Cap” Peck, UC-Santa Barbara
- Willis Copeland, UC-Santa Barbara
- Cathy Zozakiewicz, SDSU
- Yasmin Kafai, UC-Los Angeles
- Dan Zimmerlin, UC-Berkeley
- Judi Conroy, UC-Irvine
- Peter Jones, UC-Irvine
- Vicki LaBoskey, Mills College
- Rachel Lotan, Stanford University
- Ray Pecheone, PACT Director
- Peter Youngs, Stanford University
- Kendyll Stansbury, PACT Project Manager
- Ruth Chung, Stanford University

Meeting Agenda:

- I. PACT Teaching Events
 - A. Implementation issues for campuses
 - B. Number of MS and SS participants from pilot institutions
 - C. IRB issues
 - D. Individual IHE submissions to CTC
 - E. Scoring of Teaching Events
 - F. Identification Numbers for Candidates
 - G. Surveys

- II. Embedded Assessments (EAs)
 - A. Identification of EAs and uploading of EAs to PACT EA website
 - B. Roles of EAs in spring, 2003 PACT pilot
 - C. Future plans to integrate EAs and Teaching Event in making credential decisions

❖ **February 25, 2003** (Stanford University). Rubric Development Meeting

Participants:

- Rose Asera, Carnegie Center for the Advance of Teaching
- Susan Schultz, Stanford University
- Maryann Nielsen, UC-Los Angeles
- Andrea Whittaker, San Jose State University
- Dan Zimmerman, UC Berkeley
- Judi Conroy, UC-Irvine
- Anne Johnson, UC-Irvine
- Cathy Zozakiewicz, SDSU
- Chris Halter, UC-San Diego
- Lynn Larsen, UC-Riverside
- Ray Pecheone, PACT Director
- Peter Youngs, Stanford University
- Kendyll Stansbury, PACT Project Manager
- Ruth Chung, Stanford University

Meeting Agenda:

- I. Overview of Agenda and Reference Materials
- II. Overview of Scoring Process
- III. Anatomy of the Planning Rubric
- IV. Teams review & edit generic pieces and write subject-specific pieces of Planning Rubric
- V. Team reports on edits & writing
- VI. Team assignments for rubric development
- VII. Development work on assigned rubric
- VIII. Printing & copying of rubric work
- IX. Team reports on rubric work and discussion
- X. Teams work on subject-specific pieces of other two rubrics

❖ **March 1-May 15, 2003:** Student teachers pilot Teaching Events

❖ **March 7, 2003** (UC-San Diego) –PACT Advisory Committee meeting

Participants:

- Randy Souviney, UC-San Diego
- Chris Halter, UC-San Diego
- Bobbie Allen, UC-San Diego
- Andrea Whittaker, San Jose State University
- Cindy Pease-Alvarez, UC-Santa Cruz
- Rafaela Santa Cruz, San Diego State University
- Eloise Lopez Metcalfe, UCLA
- Yasmin Kafai, UCLA
- Della Peretti, UC-Berkeley
- Judi Conroy, UC-Irvine

- Susan Meyers, UC-Irvine
- Lynn Larsen, UC-Riverside
- Kris Nichols, UC-Riverside
- Ray Pecheone, PACT Director
- Peter Youngs, Stanford University
- Kendyll Stansbury, PACT Project Manager

Meeting Agenda:

The group talked about Embedded Assessments and the process for identifying existing assessments. Implementations issues were also addressed. These included logistics of videotaping and the process of obtaining permission from parents for students to appear on the videotape.

- ❖ **March 19, 2003** (UC-San Diego). Electronic Interface Exploration Group **Participants:** Representatives from UCB, UC-Irvine, UCOP, UC-Riverside, UC-Santa Barbara, UC-Santa Cruz, UC-San Diego (host)

Meeting Summary:

Resulting Plans: In the coming months three products will be developed:

I. A UC Portfolio-Building Tool

This is to take advantage of the considerable experience acquired by UC-Irvine, UC-Riverside and UC-Santa Cruz during their portfolio tool building.

This tool will be adoptable by any UC campuses interested.

Features of this tool will be specified at a meeting at UCOP on April 30.

Souviney (UC-San Diego) will convene this meeting.

II. A PACT-Specific Scoring Tool

This to give evaluators capability, via the WW, of: a) accessing and displaying components of PACT e-portfolios developed by credential candidates, b) entering judgments into specified rubrics, c) entering textual comments where appropriate, d) transmitting summary of judgments to appropriate agency.

Work will begin on this tool in the summer. Workers will include representatives from campuses that have already developed versions of an e-portfolio and other interested parties.

III. A Proposal Seeking Funding for the Development of a PACT-DIVER Tool

This tool will: a) Allow credential candidates to add comments/descriptions/ reflections to identified segments of a video, a scanned artifact or a word/processed document, b) Allow faculty to append formative comments to what credential candidates have created via a, c) Interface with the PACT-Specific Scoring Tool (see #2 above) so that evaluators may view and evaluate what credential candidates have created via a.

A preliminary proposal seeking funding for this development will be submitted to NSF's Teacher Professional Continuum Program on May 19, 2003. The Lead Agency will be the Stanford Center for Innovations in Learning. UC contact campus will be UC-San Diego. Any PACT campuses may participate.

❖ **March-April, 2003:** Identification of benchmark Teaching Events. Program directors were requested to submit Teaching Events of early completers for use as possible benchmarks. Teaching Events were reviewed by lead scoring trainers and other development team members to select appropriate benchmarks for scoring.

❖ **April 30, 2003** (or earlier): Teacher educators provide feedback on Teaching Events

❖ **May 8, 2003** (Stanford University) – Lead Trainers Training
Facilitated by Steven Athanases, UC Davis

Participants:

- Andrea Whittaker, San Jose State
- Anne Ford-Johnson, UC-Irvine
- Gordon Suzuki, UCLA
- Nathaniel Shultice, UCLA
- Julie McNamara, UC-Berkeley
- Kate Masarik, San Diego State University
- Steve Athanases, UC-Davis
- Terry Underwood, UC-Berkeley
- Susan Schultz, Stanford University
- Rachel Millstone, UC-San Diego
- Maryann Nielsen, UCLA
- Cathy Zozakiewicz, San Diego State
- Dan Zimmerlin, UC-Berkeley
- Valerie Henry, UC-Irvine

Meeting Agenda:

- I. Overview of Teaching Event, scoring, and training
- II. Highlights of emerging issues in scoring
- III. Candidate A: A guided review of a full Teaching Event
- IV. Discussion: Emerging issues, questions
- V. Candidate B: Team review
- VI. Candidate C: Some solo scoring practice
- VII. Discussion: Emerging issues, questions
- VIII. Planning for June

❖ **May-June, 2003:** Scoring of Teaching Events

San Jose State University, June 9-12

UC-Irvine, June 25-28

UC-Los Angeles, June 11-15

UC San Diego, June 17-20

Stanford University, June 17-20

Participants in training and/or scoring (2002-03): 124

Name	Affiliation	Content Area
Cindy Acerno	National Board Certified Teacher	EM
Rae Adams	NBPTS Resource Ctr Coord	HSS
Kim Alvis		HSS
Paul Ammon	Faculty, UC Berkeley	EL
John Anella	San Diego City Schools	MTH
Terri Battenburg		EL
Allan Bellman		MTH
Judy Bilardello	Supervisor, SJSU	EL
Judy Bippert	Supervisor, SDSU	EM
Joan Boyle	San Diego City Schools	EL
Amy Brandt	San Diego City Schools	EL
Alice Bullard	Cluster 2 Cons	EL
Ruth Chung	Supervisor, Stanford University	HSS
Enrique Cordoba	San Diego City Schools	EL
Marney Cox	New Teacher Project	EM
Laura Craig	Faculty, SDSU	EL
Nikki Dana	SJSU	EM
Mai Dao	Supervisor, SJSU	EM
Len Davidman	Faculty, Cal Poly SLO	EM
Leslie Dwyer		EL
Vickie Ebert	Supervisor, UCSC	EL
Barbara Felman		EM
Paty Fernandez	Supervisor	EL
Brenda Fikes	Faculty, SJSU	EL
Anne Ford-Johnson	MS Program Coordinator, UC-Irvine	EM
Fred Freking	Faculty, UCLA	EM
Maryl Gearhart	TAG, UC Berkeley	
Frankie Gelbwachs	Supervisor, UCLA	HSS
Carol Gilbert		EM
Barbara Giles		ELA
Susan Giovanni		ELA
Rose Marie Gonzalez		EL
Katerina Govoni	San Diego City Schools	EL
PJ Hallam	Graduate student, UC Berkeley	EL
Chis Halter	Faculty, UC-San Diego	SCI
Valerie Henry	Faculty, UC-Irvine	MTH
Brett Hernandez	Teacher	EM
Emma Hipolito		HSS
Linda Hobbs		MTH
Pauline Holmes	Faculty, UCD	ELA
Deb Holtzman	Graduate student, Stanford	MTH
Maria Hyler	Supervisor, Stanford	ELA
Danielle Igra	Graduate student, Stanford	ELA
Carolyn Jaynes	UC Berkeley	EL

Participants in training and/or scoring (2002-03)

Name	Affiliation	Content Area
Dena Johnson		EM
Evangelina Jones	Supervisor, SDSU	HSS
Jane Marie Jordan	National Board Certified Teacher	HSS
Wendy Jordan		SCI
Lisa Kelly	Faculty, Dominican College, Ukiah	ELA
Margo Kipps	Faculty, UC-Santa Cruz	ELA
Barbie Kitchin	National Board Certified Teacher	EM
Sheila Lane	UC-Los Angeles	EM
Lynn Larsen	UC-Riverside	EL
Kent Lewis		HSS
Michael Lewis	Dean Sacramento State University	
Jennifer Lizar		MTH
Kim Lyons	UC-Los Angeles	HSS
Jill Madden	Supervisor, UC-Santa Cruz	EM
Carol Maloney	Supervisor, SJSU	EL
Kate Masarik	Faculty, SDSU	EM
Julie McNamara	Supervisor, UC Berkeley	EM
Rachel Millstone	Faculty, UC-San Diego	SCI
Jan Montes		ELA
Stephani Moore	San Jose State University	EL
Campbell Naismith	Faculty, UC-San Diego	MTH
Suzanne Nakashima	National Board Certified Teacher	EL/EM
Kris Nicholls	Supervisor, UC-Riverside	EL
Lily Ning		SCI
Nancy Nuesseler		HSS
Genevieve Oakes	Cooperating Teacher, UC-Irvine	HSS
Rose Olivares	Science Subject Matter Project	SCI
Mary O'Shea	San Diego City Schools	ELA
Susan Oswald		EM
Joan Owen		ELA
Cindy Pease-Alvarez	Faculty, UC-Santa Cruz	EL
Faye Peitzman	UC-Los Angeles	ELA
Kris Pemberton	Supervisor, SJSU	EL
Della Peretti	Program Coordinator, UC Berkeley	EL, EM
Mario Perez	UC-Los Angeles	EM
Araceli Placido	Supervisor, SJSU	EM
Rick Pomeroy	Faculty, UCD	SCI
Alice Pounds	Supervisor, SJSU	EL
Cliff Rachlin	Teacher	ELA
Frieda Rector	Supervisor, UCLA	HSS
Terri Reed	San Diego City Schools	ELA
Carol Robledo	Faculty, San Jose State University	EL
Ann Rounds	BTSA, San Mateo HSD	ELA
Patricia Sanders	National Board Certified Teacher	ELA

Participants in training and/or scoring (2002-03)

Name	Affiliation	Content Area
Sam Sandoval	Cooperating Teacher, SDSU	SCI
Kim Scattareggia		EM
Susan Scharton	UC-San Diego	EM
Marcia Sewall	Faculty, UC-San Diego	ELA
Ursula Sexton	WestEd	SCI
Grace Sherr		EL
Maureen Shookman		EL
Nathaniel Shultice	Supervisor, UC-Los Angeles	EM
Harriet Sibley		EL
Stephanie Siddens	Supervisor, UC-Santa Cruz	EM
Tine Sloan	Program Director, UC-Santa Barbara	EL
Eliza Spang	Supervisor, Stanford	SCI
Deanna Staaake	UC-Los Angeles	EL
Megan Staples	Supervisor, Stanford	MTH
Marilyn Steele	UC-Los Angeles	EL
Holly Stipe	CSU-San Marco	EM
Judy Sugishita	Faculty, San Jose State University	EL
Donna Taggert	Faculty, UC-Irvine	MTH
Kip Tellez	Faculty, UC-Santa Cruz	EL, EM
Andrea Torchin	Faculty, UC-Santa Barbara	EL
Rochelle Treger	SDSU	HSS
Terry Underwood	Faculty, Sacramento State Univ.	ELA
Sarah VanVelsor	Cooperating Teacher, Univ of SD	EL
Rose Vilchez		EL
Athena Waite	Director of Teacher Ed, UC Riverside	SCI
Nancy Walsack	Faculty, UC-Riverside	EM
Claudia Ward		EL
Linda Webb	Univ. of San Diego	EL
Adam Wemmer	Cooperating Teacher	HSS
Maureen West	Supervisor, SJSU	EM
Jan White	New Teacher Project	EM
Andrea Whittaker	Faculty, San Jose State University	EL
Rae Jean Williams	Faculty, UC-Los Angeles	ELA
Charles Zartman	Faculty, CSU-Chico	EM
Dan Zimmerlin	Program Coordinator, UC Berkeley	MTH
Cathy Zozakiewicz	Faculty, SDSU	HSS

2003-2004 PILOT YEAR

❖ September 10, 2003 (UC San Diego) – PACT Advisory Committee Meeting

Participants:

- Randy Souviney, UC-San Diego
- Della Peretti, UC-Berkeley
- Barbara Merino, UC-Davis
- Susan Meyers, UC-Irvine
- Eloise Lopez Metcalfe, UC-Los Angeles
- Maryann Nielsen, UC-Los Angeles
- Athena Waite, UC-Riverside
- Donna Henderson, UC-Riverside
- Kathy Evans, UC-Riverside
- Linda Scott-Hendrick, UC-Riverside
- Bob Calfee, UC-Riverside
- Lynn Larsen, UC-Riverside
- Tine Sloan, UC-Santa Barbara
- Willis Copeland, UC-Santa Barbara
- Kip Tellez, UC-Santa Cruz
- Rachel Millstone, UC-San Diego
- Katerina Escardo, San Diego City Schools
- Terri Reed, San Diego City Schools
- Marlowe Berg, San Diego State University
- Kris Pemberton, San Jose State University
- Matt Pigg, University of California Office of the President
- Patrick Callahan, University of California Office of the President
- Ray Pecheone, PACT Director
- Peter Youngs, Stanford University

Meeting Agenda:

- I. Teaching Event Scoring Data 2002-03
- II. There were 5-20 Teaching Events remaining to be scored in the areas of English/language arts, history/social science, mathematics, and science, and 30-35 Teaching Events remaining to be scored in elementary literacy and elementary mathematics. Incomplete Teaching Events were not scored.
- III. Ray Pecheone presented the results of several analyses of the PACT scoring data that had been conducted by Ruth Chung and himself. Of the Teaching Events that were double scored, Ray observed that 90 percent of these overall scores were either exact matches or adjacent scores (e.g., 1 and 2, 2 and 3, or 3 and 4). Our analysis indicated that candidates consistently did better on the planning and instruction tasks as compared to the assessment and reflection tasks.
- IV. Plans for Disseminating Handbooks and Rubrics
- V. Kendyll Stansbury had recently sent draft versions of the 2003-04 Teaching Events to program directors. Feedback on the drafts from all of the pilot institutions expected by

September 30th in order to have the final versions of the 2003-04 Teaching Event handbooks ready by mid-October.

- VI. Possible revisions to the PACT Teaching Events for 2003-04:
 - a. They would incorporate a social justice perspective
 - b. There would be standardized formats for instruction and assessment plans
 - c. The reflection prompts would all appear in the Reflection task
 - d. There would be more connections to theory, asking candidates to provide rationales for their instructional decisions
 - e. Campuses would have the option of separating elementary literacy and elementary mathematics in the Multiple Subjects Teaching Event
- VII. Implementation Issues
- VIII. Plans for Spring, 2004 Scoring
- IX. Tentative plan for PACT training-of-trainers and scoring for spring, 2004. Each campus would be asked to provide two to four candidates for the lead trainer training sessions. In 2003-04, the PACT consortium will conduct some centralized scoring in order establish external validity and reliability of the scoring process.
- X. Electronic Portfolios
- XI. Matt Pigg provided an overview of the UCOP electronic portfolio system. Matt will be available to work with PACT institutions in fall 2003. At future PACT advisory committee meetings, other UC campuses that have developed and piloted electronic portfolios are to present on their systems. These campuses include UC-Riverside, UC-Irvine, and UC-San Diego.
- XII. Update on Embedded Tasks
- XIII. Lynn Larsen provided an update of PACT's efforts to identify and catalogue Embedded Assessment (EA) tasks. Lynn and Bob Calfee hosted a meeting of a working group of PACT program directors on August 18th at UC-Riverside to discuss these efforts. Lynn shared a detailed handout that explicates the relationship between the EA tasks and the Teaching Events and articulates several decisions regarding the EA pilot that will need to be made

❖ **October 9, 2003 (UC Davis) – Embedded Assessments Meeting**

Meeting agenda (in small groups)

- I. Status report on each campus's progress toward identifying Signature Assessments
- II. Discussion of difficulties that have risen or that might arise
- III. Criteria for Signature Assessments:
 - a. Address multiple TPEs and address PIAR
 - b. Produce adequate snapshot of candidate performance
 - c. Occur at least twice in different courses and fieldwork
 - d. Occur early, middle, and late in the credential program
 - e. Scored in a systematic and consistent way
 - f. Address themes of EL, Special Ed, classroom management, technology
- IV. For campuses that have moved forward, discussion of what process has been like. How were SAs identified, who need to meet and how often, what changes had to be made to

assignments to elevate them to SA status, what recommendation to campuses just starting the process?

- ❖ **October 10, 2003** (UC Davis) – UC Deans and Directors Meeting
Score Data presentation from 2002-03 pilot year, Ray Pecheone and Ruth Chung.
- ❖ **October 15, 2003** (UC Riverside) - *The Galileo Program: Building a Technology-Rich Model of Performance-Based New Teacher Assessment* (Electronic Portfolio Project – G*STAR)

Participants: Linda Scott Hendrick, Sharon Duffy, Scott Lowder, Linda Sanada, Jocelyn Edey, Gloria Gibbs, Jacquelyn Schrimpf, Andrea Gonzales, Sumit Imusksri, Robert Calfee, Janis Dwyer, Mark Groen, Irving Hendrick, Elaine Mays, John McNeil, Joe Ryan, Athena Waite, Kris Nicholls, Nancy Walsack, Michelle Ireland, Christopher Kim, Ola Jackson, Elizabeth Ellsworth, Monica Alexander, Vanez Butler, Linda Childress, Kathy Evans, Marilyn McGrath, Danene Soares, Edie Spain, Nancy Walsack, Lynn Larsen, Leigh McNeil

Meeting Agenda

- I. Overview of the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) (Robert C. Calfee, Lynn Larsen)
 - II. Panel Discussion: Implementation of the G*STAR Electronic Portfolio System within the PACT at UC-Riverside, 2002-2003 (Elaine Mays, UC-Riverside Teacher Supervisor; Kris Nicholls, UC-Riverside Teacher Supervisor; Nancy Walsack, UC-Riverside Teacher Supervisor; Leigh McNeill, Teacher)
 - III. Open discussion
 - IV. G*STAR Electronic Portfolio System For Professional Development: Update (Chris Kim, Technical Team)
 - V. Outcomes of Summer, 2003 Portfolio Scoring; Portfolio Sample; Process; Results (Linda Scott Hendrick, Athena Waite, Jocelyn Edey)
 - VI. Group work
 - VII. Next Steps: Translating Portfolio Scores into Teachers' Profiles for Professional Development Transitions
- ❖ **October 29, 2003** (Stanford University)- Bias and Sensitivity Review Meeting
Participants:
 - Julie McNamara, UC-Berkeley
 - Dan Zimmerlin, UC-Berkeley
 - Barbara Merino, UC-Davis
 - Rick Pomeroy, UC-Davis
 - Pauline Holmes, UC-Davis
 - Gordon Suzuki, UC-Los Angeles
 - Christina Hale-Nardi, UC-Riverside
 - Campbell Naismith, UC-San Diego
 - Teri Marchese, UC-Santa Cruz
 - Cindy Pease-Alvarez, UC-Santa Cruz
 - Kate Masarik, SDSU

- Alberto Rodriguez, SDSU
- Rosalinda Quintanar, San Jose State University
- Etta Hollins, USC
- Dave Donahue, Mills
- Linda Darling-Hammond, Stanford
- Nadine Ruiz, Stanford
- Ursula Sexton, West Ed
- Raymond Pecheone, PACT Director
- Kendyll Stansbury, PACT Project Manager
- Peter Youngs, Stanford University
- Ruth Chung, Stanford University

Participants in the bias/sensitivity review examined the prompts that were common across all of the 2002-03 PACT Teaching Event portfolios for instances of bias. The purpose of the meeting was to identify ways in which the prompts might 1) pose challenges to candidates based on language, race/ethnicity, gender, special needs, and teaching context and 2) privilege certain curricula, instructional or assessment activities, or pedagogical approaches.

❖ **January 29-30, 2004 (UC-San Diego).** Training of Trainers

Lead Trainers:

1. Lynn Larsen, Elementary Literacy, UC-Riverside
2. Kate Masarik, Elementary Math, San Diego State
3. Marcia Sewall, English/Language Arts, UC-San Diego
4. Chris Halter, Mathematics, UC-San Diego

Participants (19):

- Lynn Larsen, Instructor/Supervisor, UC-Riverside (EL)
- Kathy Melanese, Instructor/Supervisor UC-San Diego (EM)
- Katerina Govoni, Instructor/Supervisor, San Diego City Schools (EL)
- Enrique Cordoba, Instructor/Supervisor, San Diego City Schools (EL)
- Laura Craig, Instructor/Supervisor, San Diego State University (EL)
- Kate Masarik, Instructor/Supervisor, San Diego State University (EM)
- Margie Glickman, Instructor/Supervisor UC-San Diego (EM)
- Nancy Walsack, Instructor/Supervisor, UC-Riverside (EM)
- Donna Henderson, Instructor/Supervisor, UC-Riverside (EM)
- Marcia Sewall, Instructor/Supervisor UC-San Diego (ELA)
- Mary O' Shea, Instructor/Supervisor, San Diego City Schools (ELA)
- Sylvia Tinling, Instructor/Supervisor, UC-Riverside (ELA)
- Chris Alger, Instructor/Supervisor, San Diego State University (ELA)
- Mike Midkiff, District Administrator, San Diego City Schools (ELA)
- Athena Waite, Program Director, UC-Riverside (ELA)
- Chris Halter, Instructor/Supervisor UC-San Diego (MTH)
- Rachel Millstone, Instructor/Supervisor UC-San Diego (SCI)
- Randy Yerrick, San Diego State Univ. (SCI)
- Kathy Evans, Instructor/Supervisor, UC-Riverside (MTH)

- Kendyll Stansbury, PACT Project Manager

❖ **February 6-7, 2004** (Stanford), Training of Trainers

Lead Trainers

1. Andrea Whittaker, Elementary Literacy, San Jose State
2. PJ Hallam, Elementary Math, UC-Berkeley
3. Terry Underwood, English/Language Arts, CSU-Sacramento
4. Dan Zimmerlin, Mathematics, UC-Berkeley
5. Ursula Sexton, Science, West Ed

Participants (21)

- Andrea Whittaker, Professor, San Jose State University (San Jose State University) (EL)
- Pam Spycher, Instructional Supervisor, UC-Davis (EL)
- Michele Fortes, Instructional Supervisor, UC-Davis (EL)
- Karie Mize, Instructional Supervisor, UC-Davis (EM)
- Teri Marchese, Program Coordinator, UC-Santa Cruz (EL)
- Kris Pemberton, Instructional Supervisor, San Jose State University (EL)
- Kath Gray, Instructional Supervisor, San Jose State University (EL)
- Stephanie Steffey, Instructional Supervisor, San Jose State University (EL)
- Brenda Fikes, Instructional Supervisor, San Jose State University (EL)
- PJ Hallam, Researcher, UC-Berkeley (EM)
- Al Mendle, Instructional Supervisor, UC-Davis (EM)
- Kerrin Murphy, Instructional Supervisor, UC-Santa Cruz (EM)
- Terry Underwood, Program Coordinator, CSU-Sacramento (ELA)
- Helen Duffy, Researcher, Stanford (ELA)
- Margo Kipps, Instructional Supervisor, UC-Santa Cruz (ELA)
- Janet Hecsh, Professor, CSU-Sacramento (ELA)
- Dan Zimmerlin, Program Coordinator, UC-Berkeley (MTH)
- Nikki Cleare, Instructional Supervisor, Stanford (MTH)
- Allan Bellman, Instructional Supervisor, UC-Davis (MTH)
- Ursula Sexton, Researcher, West Ed (SCI)
- Rick Pomeroy, Instructional Supervisor, UC-Davis (SCI)
- Kendyll Stansbury, PACT Project Manager

❖ **February 17-18, 2004.** (UC-Los Angeles) Training of Trainers

Lead Trainers

1. Gordon Suzuki, Elementary Literacy, UCLA
2. Marcia Sewall, English/Language Arts, UC-San Diego
3. MaryAnn Nielsen, History-Social Science, UCLA
4. Fred Freking, Science, UCLA

Participants (20)

- Gordon Suzuki, Program Coordinator, UC-Los Angeles (EL)

- Tine Sloan, Program Director, UC-Santa Barbara (EL)
- Christina Hale-Nardi, UC-Riverside (EL)
- Marcia Sewall, UC-San Diego (ELA)
- Rae Jeane Williams, Program Coordinator, UCLA (ELA)
- Catherine Leffler, UC-Santa Barbara (ELA)
- MaryAnn Nielsen, UCLA (HSS)
- Kathy Evans, UC-Riverside (HSS)
- Robert Gray, UC-Santa Barbara (HSS)
- Jean Hawthorne, UC-Santa Barbara (HSS)
- Ron Kok, UC-Santa Barbara (HSS)
- Ann Lippincott, UC-Santa Barbara (HSS)
- Jack Phreaner, UC-Santa Barbara (HSS)
- Tony Rosilez, UCLA (MTH)
- Elissa Ross, UC-Santa Barbara (MTH)
- Jim Short, UC-Santa Barbara (MTH)
- Fred Freking, Instructional Supervisor, UCLA (SCI)
- Lorna Endler, Instructional Supervisor, UC-Santa Barbara (SCI)
- Lynne Cavazos, Program Coordinator, UC-Santa Barbara (SCI)
- Athena Waite, Program Director, UC-Riverside (SCI)
- Kendyll Stansbury, PACT Project Manager

❖ **February 11, 2004** (UC-Los Angeles), Embedded Signature Assessments Meeting

Participants: Randy Souviney, Chris Halter, Rachel Millstone (UC-San Diego); Penny Chiappe, Jacqueline D'warte, Susan Meyers (UC-Irvine); Eloise Metcalfe, Maryann Nielson, Marjorie Orellena (UC-Los Angeles); Donna Henderson, Kathy Evans, Bob Calfee, Lynn Larsen (UC-Riverside); Tine Sloan (UC-Santa Barbara)

Meeting Agenda:

- I. Campus Reports on ESA progress
UC-Santa Barbara, UC-San Diego, UC-Irvine, ULCA, UC-Riverside, SDSU
- II. General comments about ESAs
- III. Rubrics

❖ **June 21- 25, 2004**, Score Audit (Stanford University)

Day 1 – Scorer Training (in content area groups)
 Overview of scoring process, bias issues
 Note-taking and documentation
 Understanding the instructional context
 Understanding Level 2: Planning
 Understanding Level 2: Instruction
 Understanding Level 2: Assessment and Reflection
 Academic Language rubric

Debrief

HW: Review the relevant paragraphs of *Thinking Behind the Rubric* on the differences between Levels 1 and 2, Skim the Instructional Context, Planning, Assessment, and Reflection sections of the Level 1 Benchmark, and take notes.

Day 2 – Scorer Training (in content area groups)

Understanding Level 1: Planning

Understanding Level 1: Instruction

Understanding Level 1: Assessment and Reflection

Understanding Level 1: Academic Language

Previously trained scorers meet for overview of note-taking changes

Scorers in training: Meet in content groups and review Level 3

Previously trained scorers join newly trained scorers in content groups

Review and discuss common Teaching Event

Scoring procedures (checking in and out Teaching Events, location of technology, Scorer feedback forms, etc.)

Day 3 – Scoring (in content area groups)

Day 4 – Scoring (in content area groups)

Participants in Audit Scoring (2003-04): 48

Aida Allen	Cooperating Teacher, SDSU	EL
Judy Bippert	Supervisor, SDSU	EM
Jared Boyce		MTH
Mark Camras	Faculty, UC-Irvine	HSS
Ruth Chung	Supervisor, Stanford	HSS
Enrique Cordoba	San Diego City Schools	EL
Ben Curatolo	San Diego City Schools	SCI
Christine Cziko	Program Director, UC Berkeley	ELA
Virginia Downing	Teacher	EM
DiAnn Ellis	Faculty, SFSU	EL
Lorna Endler	Faculty, UC-Santa Barbara	SCI
Barbara Ford	SFSU	EM
Anne Ford-Johnson	MS Program Coordinator, UC-Irvine	EM
Katerina Govoni	San Diego City Schools	EL
Brett Hamilton	Teacher	SCI
Donna Henderson	Faculty, UC-Riverside	EL
Marianne Hew	Teacher	ELA
Etta Hollins	Faculty, USC	EL
Pauline Holmes	Faculty, UCD	ELA
Catherine Leffler	Faculty, UC-Santa Barbara	ELA
Ann Lippincott	Faculty, UC-Santa Barbara	HSS
Melinda Love	Director, Mt. Diablo BTSA	EL
Teri Marches	Program Director, UC-Santa Cruz	EL
Debbie Maya	UC-Riverside	MTH
Diane Mayer	Program Director, UC Berkeley	EM

Participants in Training/Scoring and/or Audit Scoring (2003-04)

Kelly Montes de Oca	Staff Developer	ELA
Campbell Naismith	Faculty, UC-San Diego	MTH
Suzanne Nakashima	National Board Certified Teacher	EL/EM
Maryann Nielsen	Faculty, UC-Los Angeles	HSS
Cindy Pease-Alvarez	Faculty, UC-Santa Cruz	EL
Anne Powell	Faculty, UC-Los Angeles	EM
Gisele Ragusa	Faculty, USC	EL
Rebecca Rosa-O'Brien	Faculty, UCD	HSS
Anthony Rosilez	Faculty, UC-Los Angeles	MTH
Elissa Ross	Faculty, UC-Santa Barbara	MTH
Patricia Sanders	National Board Certified Teacher	ELA
Misty Sato	Director, NBPTS Resource Ctr	SCI
Linda Scott-Hendrick	Faculty, UC-Riverside	ELA
Marcia Sewall	Faculty, UC-San Diego	ELA
Tine Sloan	Program Director, UCSB	EL
Lisa Stone	Teacher	EM
Gordon Suzuki	Faculty, UC-Los Angeles	EL
Walter Ullrich	Program Director, CalState Teach (Fresno)	EL
Athena Waite	Director of Teacher Ed, UC-Riverside	SCI
Nancy Walsack	Faculty, UC-Riverside	EM
Andrea Whittaker	Faculty, San Jose State University	EL
Robyn Woolfolk	Teacher	WL
Randy Yerrick	Faculty, SDSU	SCI

2004-2005 PILOT YEAR

❖ **September 2, 2004** (San Jose State University), PACT Program Directors Meeting **Participants:**

- Olga Amarel, SDSU
- Bob Calfee, UC-Riverside
- Jessica Eiselman, UCOP
- Nancy Farnan, SDSU
- Barbara Ford, SFSU
- Janet Hecsh, Sac State
- Amy Jackson, CCTC
- Chris Kim, UC-Riverside
- Margie Kitano, SDSU
- Colleen Keirn, Mills
- Vicki Laboskey, Mills
- Jon Lee, UCOP
- Rachel Lotan, Stanford
- Teri Marchese, UC-Santa Cruz
- Diane Mayer, UC-Berkeley
- Barbara Merino, UC-Davis
- Susan Meyers, UCI
- Susan O'Hara, Sac State
- Gisele Ragusa, USC
- Nadeen Ruiz, Stanford
- Mary Sandy, CSU Chancellor's Office
- Linda Scott Hendrick, UCR
- Tine Sloan, UCSB
- Randy Souviney, UCSD
- Kip Tellez, UC-Santa Cruz
- Zeno Franco, PACT
- Ray Pecheone, PACT Director
- Kendyll Stansbury, PACT Project Manager
- Ruth Chung, PACT Research Associate

Meeting Agenda

- I. Conversation with Mary Sandy, CSU Chancellors Office
- II. Discussion of candidate and Faculty support – research findings, promising practices, continuing barriers
- III. Development of support materials for candidates and Faculty/supervisors
- IV. Conversation with Amy Jackson, CCTC (conference call)
- V. Overview of streamlined Teaching Event and adaptation for other credential areas
- VI. Timeline for 2004-05 and calendar setting
- VII. Overall analysis of Score Audit

❖ **September Activities**

- Developed Candidate Support Handbook (Making Good Choices, Videotaping Tips) and distributed
- Adapted Teaching Events for Art, Business???, Modern Languages, Music, and Physical Education, and distributed them to programs piloting them.

❖ **November Activities**

- Benchmarking for scoring with new rubrics
- “Writing rubrics” workshop

❖ **January Activities**

- Recruit scorers

❖ **January 24, 2005** (Stanford University). Standard Setting Panel Meeting.

Panelists from 12 of the consortium campuses participated in the process for at least part of the day. Nine of the panelists participated in the full day of proceedings.

Participants:

- Bobbie Allen, UC-San Diego
- Laura Craig, San Diego State University
- DiAnn Ellis, San Francisco State University
- Anne Ford-Johnson, UC-Irvine
- Donna Henderson, UC-Riverside
- David Jelinek, Sacramento State University
- Vicki Laboskey, Mills College
- Rachel Lotan, Stanford University
- Julie McNamara, UC Berkeley
- Tine Sloan, UC Santa Barbara
- Gordon Suzuki, UC-Los Angeles
- Kip Tellez UC Santa Cruz

Meeting Agenda

- I. Welcome and orientation to the day’s work
- II. Brainstorming (individual and pair-share)
What constitutes a passing performance on the Teaching Event?
(PIAR-L, and Overall Performance)
- III. Rating candidate performance profiles (Elementary Literacy, 2004 scores)
- IV. Break for lunch. Profiles ratings will be collected and compiled.
- V. Presentation of compiled Profile ratings & Discussion of specific profiles
- VI. Come to consensus on some decision rules about passing/failing performances
- VII. Present and discuss one cut-score model, ways to operationalize the decision rules, cut scores and confidence band around cut score for TEs to be re-read

❖ **March 2, 2005 (Stanford University), Training of Trainers**

Participants:

- Susan O'Hara, Sacramento State
- Diane Ellis, San Francisco State University
- Barbara Ford, San Francisco State
- Sarah Jacobs, UC-Santa Barbara
- Ann Carlyle, UC-Santa Barbara
- Elisa Ross, UC-Santa Barbara
- Lorna Endler, UC-Santa Barbara
- Catherine Leffler UC-Santa Barbara
- Ben Curatolo, San Diego City Schools Intern Program
- Katerina Govoni, San Diego City Schools Intern Program
- Michael Wnek, San Diego City Schools Intern Program
- Colleen Keirn, Mills College
- Ruth Cossey, Mills College
- Judy Bippert, San Diego State University (trainer)
- Anne Ford-Johnson, UC-Irvine (trainer)
- Rachel Millstone, UC-San Diego
- Kathy Evans, UC-Riverside
- Patricia Parr, UC-Riverside
- Athena Waite, UC-Riverside
- Nancy Walsack, UC-Riverside
- Gordon Suzuki, UCLA
- Colin Haysman, Stanford University
- Pam Spycher, UC-Davis

Meeting Agenda

- I. Recommended Training Process for New Programs
- II. Recommended Cut Score for Passing the Teaching Event
- III. Changes in Teaching Event and Rubrics
- IV. "Thinking Behind the Rubrics" document
- V. Materials available on website
- VI. Recording Evidence (summary or salient points)
- VII. Review of benchmark performance

❖ **February 23, 2005 (San Jose State University).** Standard Setting-Confirmatory Group meeting. 14 representatives from 12 institutions participated in the Standard Setting Confirmatory Group meeting. They reviewed the recommendations from the Standard Setting Panel and confirmed the passing standard proposed by the Panel.

Participants:

- Judi Conroy, UC Irvine
- Laura Craig, San Diego State University

- Barbara Ford, San Francisco State University
- Colleen Keirn, Mills College
- Ron Kok, UC Santa Barbara
- Diane Mayer, UC Berkeley
- Barbara Merino, UC Davis
- Rachel Millstone, UC San Diego
- Carolyn Nelson, San Jose State University
- Della Peretti, UC Berkeley
- Linda Scott-Hendricks, UC Riverside
- Vanessa Sheared, San Francisco State University
- Gordon Suzuki, UC-Los Angeles
- Kip Tellez, UC Santa Cruz

Meeting Agenda: The second stage of standard setting called for a group of program leaders from the PACT programs to review those initial recommendations made by the Standard Setting Panel and to decide on a set of passing standards (along with a cut-score model) that would be submitted to all participating programs for review and approval. Issues also tackled by the Standard Setting Policy Group were how to include the Academic Language rubric in the overall passing standard and whether a candidate can pass overall when failing an entire task that covers certain TPEs exclusively.

❖ **March-April** Local Scorer Training

❖ **May-June** Local Scoring

❖ **August 18, 2005 (Stanford University).** PACT Leadership Team Meeting.

Participants:

- Bob Calfee
- Linda Darling-Hammond
- David Pearson
- Ray Pecheone
- Randy Souviney
- Kendyll Stansbury

Meeting Agenda:

- I. Teacher Assessment Office at UCOP
- II. Report on conversations with Alan Bersin
- III. CCTC submission
- IV. Recommended passing standard
- V. Embedded Signature Assessments
- VI. Carnegie-Spencer grant application update

❖ **October 25, 2005 (UC-Irvine).** Regional Program Directors Meeting – Southern California.

Participants:

Gwen Brockman, CSUDH
Judi Conroy, UCI
Jacqueline Dwart, UCI
Kathy Evans, UCR
Katerina Govoni, SDCS
Anne Johnson, UCI
Leslie Kapner, UCLA
Shirley Lal, CSUDH
Pat McCabe, UCI
Susan Meyers, UCI
Jenny Monnheimer, UCI
Eloise Metcalfe, UCLA
Jan Parkinson, Program Manager, SDCS
Faye Peitzman, UCLA
Tine Sloan, UCSB
Randy Souviney, UCSD
Donna Taggert, UCI
Mike Wnek, SDCS
Ray Pecheone, PACT Director
Kendyll Stansbury, PACT Project Manager
Ruth Chung, PACT Research Associate

Meeting Agenda

- I. Updates
 - CCTC Submission
 - Changes for 2006 pilot
 - ESA progress
- II. Implementation Issues
 - Regional Scoring vs. Local Scoring with Audit
 - Completion of Standards Setting
 - Carnegie/Spencer research
- III. Scaling up
 - Piloting and Scoring plans
 - Benchmarking & Trainer of Trainers
- IV. Reports on Best Practices and Remaining Challenges (including 2005 scores and survey results)
- V. Potential Support for Addressing Implementation Problems
 - Implementation Handbook
 - Exemplary Instructional Materials for Challenging Topics on Website
 - Other Forms of Support

- ❖ **November 11, 2005. (San Jose State University).** Regional Program Directors Meeting – Northern California.

Participants:

Ruth Chung, PACT Research Associate
Barbara Ford, SFSU
Kristin Geiser, Stanford University
Andrew Hudson, UCOP
Colleen Keirn, Mills College
Diane Mayer, UC-Berkeley
Barbara Merino, UC-Davis
Carolyn Nelson, SJSU
Cindy Pease-Alvarez, UC-Santa Cruz
Ray Pecheone, PACT Director
Bob Pritchard, CSU-Sacramento
Kendyll Stansbury, PACT Project Manager
Kip Tellez, UC-Santa Cruz
Andrea Whittaker, SJSU

Meeting Agenda

- I. Updates
 - CCTC Submission
 - Changes for 2006 pilot
 - ESA progress
- II. Implementation Issues
 - Regional Scoring vs. Local Scoring with Audit
 - Completion of Standards Setting
 - Carnegie/Spencer research
- III. Scaling up
 - Piloting and Scoring plans
 - Benchmarking & Trainer of Trainers
- IV. Reports on Best Practices and Remaining Challenges
(including 2005 scores and survey results)
- V. Potential Support for Addressing Implementation Problems
 - Implementation Handbook
 - Exemplary Instructional Materials for Challenging Topics on Website
 - Other Forms of Support

- ❖ **December 8, 2005 (UC-Davis).** Stanford Setting Policy Group Meeting. 18 program directors/faculty from 13 of the PACT programs participated in this meeting. They reviewed the recommendations of the Standard Setting Panel and Confirmatory Group and made a final decision on a passing standard.

Participants:

- Bobbie Allen, UC-San Diego
- Bob Calfee, PACT Leadership team
- Ruth Chung, PACT Research Associate

- Judi Conroy, UC-Irvine
- Virginia Dixon, CSU-Sacramento
- Nancy Farnan, San Diego State
- Barbara Goldman, UC-Davis
- Shirley Lal, CSU-Dominguez Hills
- Diane Mayer, UC-Berkeley
- Barbara Merino, UC-Davis
- Eloise Metcalfe, UCLA
- Susan Meyers, UC-Irvine
- Nina Moore, UCOP
- Carolyn Nelson, San Jose State
- Cindy Pease-Alvarez, UC-Santa Cruz
- Raymond Pecheone, PACT Director
- Jody Prisilec, UCLA
- Nadeen Ruiz, CSU-Sacramento and UC-Davis
- Pauline Sahakian, UC-Merced (Guest)
- Vanessa Sheared, San Francisco State
- Tine Sloan, UC-Santa Barbara
- Kendyll Stansbury, PACT Project Manager
- Athena Waite, UC-Riverside

Meeting Agenda

- I. Overview of work to date
 - Charge of the committee
 - Law, Assessment Quality Standards, and California TPA passing standard
 - Standards Setting I and II process and results
 - Profiles of passing candidates

- II. Consideration of Task-Based Models
 - Overview of alternative approaches
 - Discussion of approaches

- III. Discussion of models
 - Discussion leading to selection of one model
 - Overview of variations

- IV. Selection of a passing standard
 - Discussion of variations
 - Determination of a final passing standard

- ❖ **October 20, 2006 (UC-Berkeley).** UC Deans and Directors meeting. Deans and Directors from every UC were present. They were asked to consider a revision to the passing standard. The group expressed unanimous agreement that a revision to the passing standard should be made and that the revised passing standard should require that candidates pass all five

categories of the Teaching Event scoring rubrics and have a maximum number of “1”s across rubrics.

- ❖ **December 1, 2006 (San Francisco State University).** Program Directors from four of the CSUs were present (representing San Francisco State University, San Jose State University, Sacramento State University, and CSU-Dominguez Hills), as well as representatives from the University of San Diego and University of the Pacific. They were asked to consider a revision to the passing standard. The group expressed unanimous agreement that a revision to the passing standard should be made and that the revised passing standard should require that candidates pass all five categories of the Teaching Event scoring rubrics and have a maximum number of “1”s across rubrics.
- ❖ **January, 2007 (via email correspondence).** Program Directors of the 16 PACT programs that had participated in the Standard Setting process from the beginning (8 UCs, 5 CSUs, Stanford, Mills College, San Diego City Schools) were emailed a description of a revised passing standard that would require candidates to pass all five categories of the Teaching Event scoring rubrics and have no more than 3 “1s” across rubrics. The revised passing standard was overwhelmingly approved by participants. 11 out of 12 respondents approved of the revised passing standard. The other program voted for a passing standard that was slightly more stringent (requiring that candidates have no more than 2 “1”s across rubrics).