

Single Subject Credential Program: History, Assessment, and Changes
Spring 2004 – Spring 2006

Jeanne M. Grier, Ph.D
Associate Professor of Secondary Education
California State University Channel Islands

August 21, 2006

Table of Contents

History of the Single Subject Program	1
About the Program	1
Spring 2004	1
Program Overview	1
Program Assessment	1
Program Changes	2
Academic Year 2004-2005	3
Program Overview	3
Program Assessment	3
Program Changes	5
Academic Year 2005-2006	6
Program Overview	6
Program Assessment	6
Program Changes	9
Summary	10
Appendix 1: Portfolio Description and Guidelines—Spring 2004	11
Appendix 2: CSUCI Single Subject Portfolio Assessment Rubric	13
Appendix 3: Program Planning Options	16
Appendix 4: Single Subject Portfolio Guidelines—2004-2005	17
Appendix 5: Single Subject Portfolio Matrix	19
Appendix 6: Single Subject Program Assessment Survey Spring 2006	21

History of Single Subject Credential Program

About the Program

The Single Subject (secondary) program enrolled the first cohort of seven students in Spring 2004 and has continued to admit a cohort of students each semester thereafter. The credential program is typical of many California teacher preparation programs in that candidates enter with an undergraduate degree and verified subject matter competency. The program is designed to prepare teachers for diverse classrooms in middle and high school settings in California and currently prepares teachers in the subject areas of mathematics, science, and English and consists of six courses: one general methods class, two subject-specific methods classes, one secondary literacy class, and two classes called “Access to Learning”—one focusing on special needs learners and one focusing on English Language Learners. Each semester the students are enrolled in classes they are required to have a university supervised field placement. The students are required to complete two eight-week supervised student teaching assignments: one in a middle school and one in a high school. Classes are taught in the first eight weeks of the semester while full time students are participant/observers one day a week in a middle or high school class in their content area. During the last eight weeks of the semester full-time students transition into student teaching. Part-time students spend the entire semester as participant/observers attending their field placement one half-day a week.

The program uses a cohort model for full-time students. English, science, and mathematics post-baccalaureate students enter the program each semester and take all courses together with the exception of the two subject specific methods classes, which are separated by discipline. Part-time students begin two courses with one cohort but overlap courses with other cohorts to complete the program. Students can complete the program full-time in two semesters or part-time in three to six semesters.

Credential students who are hired to teach in local schools without a credential are called teaching Interns and can complete the program in as few as three semesters. Students may begin the program as full-time or part-time students and then be hired as an Intern while completing the credential program or come into the program with a teaching position already secured. For the first semester as an Intern in the credential program, the student is required to be part-time and take a maximum of two classes and a supervised field placement.

Spring 2004

Program Overview

The single subject credential program enrolled seven students in its first semester (2 English, 3 math, and 3 science). The sequence of course offerings each semester was determined based upon what the faculty determined the students “needed first” to begin the program and be prepared for their first student teaching experience. In order to maximize course offerings for the five full-time and two part-time students (one was an Intern) three courses were offered: EDSS 530: General Secondary Methods, EDSS 540: Secondary Literacy, and EDSS 550: Access to Learning—English Language Learners. EDSS 540 and EDSS 550 were offered back-to back because of the similarity of content and use of overlapping assignments.

Program Assessment

The Single Subject Portfolio was adapted from the work of the Education Portfolio Pilot Assessment Group. Education faculty—consisting of five full-time tenure track and two full time lecturers met four times during fall 2003 and five times in spring 2004 with the goal of creating

the framework of a Program Portfolio as a tool for program assessment and a measure of student learning in the Credential Program. The task was a much more complex process the further we explored our options and developed our communal philosophies.

Initially, the program portfolio was envisioned to be designed around the existing Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) outlined by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). It was evident early on in our discussions that the faculty desired a structure for the portfolio that encompassed the TPEs but was not driven by them. Our first several meetings focused on identifying the major “Core Competency” pieces that our teacher candidates should possess and be able to demonstrate upon completion of the program. Four core competencies were identified and the 13 TPEs were backward-engineered and aligned with one of the four competencies. In keeping with the mission of our pilot project we fully developed one of the core competencies for the portfolio that was to be assigned to all (n=7) single subject candidates in Spring 2004. Additionally, we designed the initial organizational structure of the portfolio including reflective narratives and explicit connective elements to the TPEs. Please refer to Appendix 1: “Education Program Portfolio Description and Guidelines—Spring 2004.”

The assessment team met regularly during spring semester to develop the Portfolio Rubric. Please see Appendix 2: “CSUCI Single Subject Portfolio Assessment Rubric”. This portfolio rubric follows the basic structure of the portfolio organizational outline. Students were not required to submit a formal portfolio during spring 2004 but were given the guidelines to begin building their summative portfolio due at program completion.

Program Changes

It was soon discovered that the first course sequence could not be sustained long-term due to unit constraints for part-time students and addressing course offering needs for future cohorts. Ideally, part-time students would enroll in EDSS 530, EDSS 550 and a one-unit field observation for a total of six units. Part-time students could not be enrolled in more than six units to maintain their status and tuition rate and were therefore allowed to take the EDSS 540/550 combination (and only come to campus two nights a week rather than four nights a week) and delay the general methods course until the following semester. This decision put the part-time students at a distinct disadvantage in their lesson planning abilities for course assignments and fieldwork. Additionally, we needed to be mindful of the course availability needs of the fall 2004 cohort to finish the program in two semesters.

As a result of these unintended obstacles the course sequence in the single subject credential program was amended. Course offerings were sequenced to accommodate full-time, part-time, first-semester, second-semester, through sixth semester, and Intern students. Students are not given a choice of courses to take but are rather given a set course sequence based upon their selected program status. (See Appendix 3-“Program Planning Options”).

The piloting of the portfolio process and rubric brought to light two areas for improving the portfolio process. First, the portfolio elements developed in the planning process for the multiple subjects program did not fully translate for the single subject program. A revised and tailored single subject program portfolio was created that better aligned to the single subject curriculum and differentiated portfolio requirements for first semester students and second semester students. First semester students were now asked to submit one artifact for each Core Competency element for formative feedback while second semester students submitted two artifacts and wrote a longer and more comprehensive reflective narrative. (See Appendix 4: Single Subject Portfolio Guidelines—2004-2005).

Academic Year 2004 - 2005

Program Overview

The fall 2004 cohort consisted of 15 students (5 English, 8 math, and 2 science) and six of the seven Spring 2004 starters returned to the program—all as Interns with teaching positions in local high schools (one math student dropped out). As Interns, these students were required to be part-time students in the program for their first semester as an Intern. This already established policy allowed the program to transition to the new course sequence without having to offer independent study courses for the first cohort students to complete the program in two semesters.

The Spring 2005 cohort had 13 students (3 English, 5 math, and 5 science) enrolled. Four of the 15 fall 2004 students (1 English, 2 math, and 1 science) had dropped out of the program by the end of spring 2005. During exit interviews, all reported that they decided not to be teachers mainly due to their experiences in the schools during field observation and student teaching.

Program Assessment

Seizing an opportunity to enhance the use of technology in the single subject program, electronic portfolios were investigated as a means of not only reducing paper consumption but as a way to increase the timeliness of feedback and interaction between the students and the evaluators. At the beginning of fall 2004 “Taskstream,” an e-portfolio and course management on-line software, was used to implement an electronic portfolio pilot assessment project in the Single Subject Credential Program. Therefore, the new portfolio organization and guidelines were transferred to the Taskstream environment. The CSUCI Library and the Education Program provided the initial funds for student subscriptions. The new cohort of students were required make electronic portfolio submissions while students from the first cohort had the option of submitting a portfolio in paper or electronically.

Five students in the Single Subject Program completed the portfolio and evaluation rubrics were completed for four of the students—three of which were completing the program at the end of fall 2004. Table 1 illustrates the distribution of individual and average portfolio scores.

Table 1. Fall 2004 Single Subject Credential Program Portfolio Results

n=4	Portfolio Element	Distribution				Average
		3	2	1	0	
	Resume		1	2	1	1
	Philosophy		3		1	1.5
Core Competency: Learning Environment	Reflective Narrative	1		1	2	1
	Connection to TPEs		2	2		1.5
Core Competency: Instructional Process	Reflective Narrative		2	1	1	1.25
	Connection to TPEs		1	3		1.25
Core Competency: Learning About Students	Reflective Narrative		1	1	2	.75
	Element 1 Connection to TPEs			3	1	.75
	Element 2 Connection to TPEs		1	2	1	1
	Element 3 Connection to TPEs			3	1	.75
Core Competency: Professionalism	Reflective Narrative		1	3		1.25
	Connection to TPEs			2	2	.5

These students were expected to score in the “proficient” category corresponding to a score of “2”. The overall average scores suggest that the students did not achieve at expected levels. However, certain individual did meet expectations on various portfolio elements. Disturbingly, students overall scored the lowest in Core Competency: Learning About Students, where they were asked to provide further detail and more artifacts. These results show that it is difficult to make reliable predictions based upon average scores for n = 4.

First semester students turned in a formative electronic portfolio at the end of Fall 2004. Evaluators were asked to give feedback to the candidates on progress made. Six evaluators each spent two days reviewing the student portfolios—an equivalent of 12 days. Evaluators made comments on artifact selection and used a newly developed rubric (Denney & Grier, 2004) to evaluate the reflective narratives for each core competency. Evaluators commented on the difficult of using the new electronic portfolio system but favored the system over paper portfolios.

Eight of the 11 students completing the program in Spring 2005 completed summative electronic portfolios for evaluation. Table 2 summarizes the results.

Table 2. Spring 2005 Completers—Portfolio Results

Rubric Criteria	Authors evaluated	Avg. for Group (raw score)	Std. Dev. for Group	Median for Group	Avg. for Core Competency
Knowledge, Skills,& Dispositions Used to score: Learning Environment	8	2.13/3	0.52	2	2.06/3
Connected to TPEs Used to score: Learning Environment	8	2.19/3	0.59	2.25	
Writing: Grammar & Mechanics Used to score: Learning Environment	8	1.88/3	0.52	1.5	
Knowledge, Skills,& Dispositions Used to score: Instruction Process	8	2.50/3	0.53	2.5	2.6/3
Connected to TPEs Used to score: Instruction Process	8	2.94/3	0.18	3	
Writing: Grammar & Mechanics Used to score: Instruction Process	8	2.38/3	0.44	2.25	
Knowledge, Skills,& Dispositions Used to score: Learning About Students	8	2.13/3	0.74	2.25	2.17/3
Connected to TPEs Used to score: Learning About Students	8	2.19/3	0.7	2.25	
Writing: Grammar & Mechanics Used to score: Learning About Students	8	2.19/3	0.46	2	
Knowledge,Skills,& Dispositions Used to score: Professionalism	8	1.63/3	0.69	2	1.79/3
Connected to TPEs Used to score: Professionalism	8	1.94/3	0.82	1.75	
Writing: Grammar & Mechanics Used to score: Professionalism	8	1.81/3	0.26	2	

Again, students were expected to score in the “proficient” category that corresponded to a “2” on a 4 point scale (range: 0 to 3). In all core competency areas, with the exception of

“Professionalism” the overall average indicates students are meeting program expectations. Of particular note is the strong average score reported for “Instructional Processes.” This result is not surprising as the students take several methods courses throughout the program and develop the skills to write engaging lessons and unit plans.

Program Changes

The transition between the initial semester and the full program cycle was very enlightening. The program was initially designed to have students complete a middle school experience/student teaching before the high school placement. The fall 2004 students were placed in middle schools. However, since all of the spring 2004 students had been placed in middle schools they were ready for high school placements in the fall and four had become interns in high schools for the fall semester. Because the cohorts overlapped in several courses it was problematic for several of the instructors to tailor assignments at a specific grade level—especially the subject methods courses that were designed to target either middle school or high school methods for the discipline. Instructors and students had to negotiate collectively and individually this semester regarding course assignment requirements. However, it was recognized that this would be a continuing pattern each semester for full-time students who enter the program in the spring. The spring semester content methods courses focus on the high school curriculum but first semester students are placed at middle schools. This information is now well advertised at orientation meetings and during interviews and advising for students entering the program in the spring semester.

During this academic year, having completed a full program cycle, the teaching faculty recognized the need to coordinate assignment due dates in courses offered each semester. This task proved difficult to implement each semester without permanent faculty teaching the courses. However, because of this task, beginning of the semester faculty meetings have been implemented for new and continuing instructors to become familiar with each other, the program, and program policies.

The portfolio results had implications for program improvement as well. First, students had difficulty in selecting appropriate artifacts for their portfolio. More than likely, this was due to the lack of emphasis of the portfolio and the TPEs in the individual courses. The students commented in course evaluations that the portfolio seemed like an “add on” piece to the program. Therefore, portfolio was given a “home” in the curriculum and was assigned to the two student teaching seminars (EDSS 571 and EDSS 581). The student teaching seminars each devote one class period to discussing the portfolio requirements and TPEs. Students are introduced to the reflective narrative rubrics, given sample reflective narratives to score, and information on reflective writing. Also, to assist students with artifact selection, a course matrix was developed by all program instructors. This document offered suggestions for portfolio artifacts—or “signature assignments” from each course (see Appendix 5: Single Subject Portfolio Matrix).

Evaluating portfolios over the first two semesters of the program became very expensive. Evaluators, usually part-time faculty and supervisors, were paid \$100 day and averaged 2 days per evaluation cohort. Familiarity with the evaluation tools over time could potentially reduce the time spent on portfolio evaluation but there was an additional issue of students feeling overloaded and overwhelmed with the portfolios due at the end of the semester. Therefore, during Spring 2005 the requirements for first semester student teachers were changed. Rather than submitting artifacts for every portfolio element—whether or not they had taken the

associated courses—students were asked to submit a complete set of artifacts and the reflective narrative for “Core Competency: Learning Environment” for formative assessment. This provided students relief while providing them the opportunity to learn from the feedback they received before turning in their summative portfolio. Additionally, the portfolio evaluators were asked to only “look at” the artifacts but evaluate the reflective narrative only—giving one summative score for a Core Competency. These events greatly reduced the amount of time spent during Spring 2005 on portfolio evaluation by almost half.

The low average score in the Core Competency “Professionalism” was not surprising as many of the sub-elements of the area were not specifically addressed in the program, but rather prerequisite courses. Additional efforts will be made across program coursework to address this important area.

Additional portfolio changes can be found in: Denney, M. & Grier, J.M. (2006). *A tale of two programs: A comparative study of electronic portfolio assessment in teacher education*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association 2006 Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA, April, 2006.

Academic Year 2005 – 2006

Program Overview

The fall 2005 cohort had 12 students (5 English, 6 math, and 1 science) and 11 students from the spring 2005 cohort returned to the program. Nine students in the program held Internships in local schools. Several of the Interns were full-time students the previous semester and secured teaching jobs over the summer. In spring 2006 the new cohort consisted of 10 students (3 English, 3 math, and 4 science) and there was a total of ten students with Internships.

Interns were becoming a significant population in the program with unique needs that required addressing. During this year an Intern Handbook was drafted with various policies and advising options for students wishing to become Interns either before entering or during enrollment in the program. Formalizing this information helped to increase the communication between students, advisors, faculty, and the credential office staff.

The Internship program presented another obstacle—albeit a small one. The program was initially designed to require experiences at both a middle school and a high school, and the student teaching related courses were titled “Middle School Student teaching” and “High School Student teaching” respectively. Procedures and policies had been developed to allow the Intern to complete the second student teaching in his or her own classroom, however, the student Intern must still take both student teaching courses.

Program Assessment

The electronic portfolio remained the primary means of assessing student learning and competency achievement in the Single Subject Credential Program. Four students completed the program in Fall 2005 and 17 completed in Spring 2006. Table 3 summarizes the combined results.

Table 3. Fall 2005 and Spring 2006 Completers—Portfolio Results

Rubric Criteria	Authors evaluated	Avg. for Group (raw score)	Std. Dev. for Group	Median for Group	Avg. for Core Competency
Knowledge, Skills,& Dispositions Used to score: Learning Environment	21	2.19/3	0.68	2	2.25
Connected to TPEs Used to score: Learning Environment	21	2.45/3	0.47	2.5	
Writing: Grammar & Mechanics Used to score: Learning Environment	21	2.10/3	0.49	2	
Knowledge, Skills,& Dispositions Used to score: Instruction Process	21	2.12/3	0.59	2	2.21
Connected to TPEs Used to score: Instruction Process	21	2.48/3	0.43	2.5	
Writing: Grammar & Mechanics Used to score: Instruction Process	21	2.02/3	0.4	2	
Knowledge, Skills,& Dispositions Used to score: Learning About Students	21	2.38/3	0.5	2	2.35
Connected to TPEs Used to score: Learning About Students	21	2.43/3	0.68	3	
Writing: Grammar & Mechanics Used to score: Learning About Students	21	2.24/3	0.44	2	
Knowledge, Skills,& Dispositions Used to score: Professionalism	21	2.21/3	0.44	2.5	2.14
Connected to TPEs Used to score: Professionalism	21	2.10/3	0.74	2.5	
Writing: Grammar & Mechanics Used to score: Professionalism	21	2.12/3	0.44	2	

Graduating students are expected to score “proficient” or “2” in each Core Competency. The combined scores for Fall 2005 and Spring 2006 students indicate that students are meeting the overall expectations for the program. Of special note is the passing average score for Core Competency: Professionalism that was an area that needed improvement identified by the portfolio results from Spring 2005.

During Spring 2006 additional data was gathered from program constituents. A program survey was administered to all student teachers during the final seminar and an open-ended questionnaire was sent to all program instructors and supervisors.

The student program assessment survey was given to twenty-four, CSUCI Single Subject Credential students ranging in age from 22 to 49 years old. Of the participants, fifteen were female, eight were male, and one student responded N/A. Students were in their first to fifth semester in the Single Subject Program. The majority of participants had obtained a B.A. degree, two had an M.A. degree, and one student held a PhD.

The first half of the survey consisted of 18 program components in which the students rated how prepared they felt on a scale of 1-4 with an optional answer of N/A. An area for comments was provided for each component. The second half included seven questions in regards to areas of strengths and weaknesses within students themselves and the Single Subject Program. This section also allowed for suggestions and commentary on faculty members.

(See Appendix 6: Single Subject Program Assessment Survey Spring 2006). Table 4 summarizes the average scores for the 18 Likert-scale program components.

Table 4: Perceived Preparation on Program Components

Lesson/daily planning	3.5
Long-term/unit planning	3.21
Incorporating Content Standards into your lesson plans	3.5
Teaching literacy	2.76
Teaching mathematics	3.25
Teaching science	2.75
Teaching English	3.33
Teaching a diverse student population, including students with disabilities or special needs	3.13
Teaching English Language Learners	3.35
Teaching students with different learning styles	3.46
Learning about the background and culture of students	3.17
Assessment of student learning	3.33
Using a variety of teaching methods	3.46
Classroom Management	2.92
Behavior management	2.83
Use of technology for teaching and learning	3.17
Communicating with families	2.96
Reflecting on teaching	3.17

The areas that students felt most strongly prepared in were clearly teaching methods, incorporating standards into lessons and overall lesson planning due to the emphasis and variety of practice required while in the program. Areas of concern for more than half of the participants related to teaching were classroom management, motivating students to learn, and grading. Students identified the strengths of the credential program being small class sizes, and faculty support and expertise. Suggestions for improving the coursework seemed to be subject specific depending on the participant's area of study. Participants commented on improving communication with cooperating schools and teachers so that all involved knew what was

expected of them. More than several students felt inadequately prepared to teach literacy and several comments expanded on the students' dissatisfaction with the course instructor and curriculum. Lastly, changes and improvements were mentioned in class time/day scheduling, course redundancy and the difficulties of large projects and portfolios due at the end of the semester. Students definitely felt the 8/8 schedule was too overwhelming and intense especially when course projects were due during their student teaching experience.

Information gathered from program faculty was also informative. The email-based voluntary survey assessed the single subject faculty views of the Single Subject Credential Program. The survey consisted of five questions for a short commentary response. Five Instructors and two Supervisors returned surveys out of nine invitations to participate. In response to what went well in the program, faculty reflected that coordination and collaboration among instructors, supervisors, and cooperating teachers was strong. The area of improvements included increasing the number of tenure track faculty teaching in the program, critical candidate selection, to increasing instructor/supervisor communication about particular students and course assignments. SPED integration and support and specifics in reworking the English methods sequence were also mentioned. Suggestions for increasing the effectiveness of the program were to more closely align the portfolio with individual courses, offer SPED support to students during seminar, and to review the purposes of EDSS 540: Secondary Literacy. Overall, the program is highly rated by its faculty with excellent comments about interaction, leadership, and collegiality amongst faculty and students.

Program Changes

The portfolio process was becoming more and more routine for course instructors and especially portfolio evaluators. Therefore, for the incoming fall 2005 cohort, it was time to stop using the term "pilot project." Completion and passing of the portfolio became a requirement for passing the seminar and the program for Spring 2005 graduates. Passing required students receive a "2" or better in at least two Core Competencies and no scores of "0." The resume, philosophy, and summative questions must be completed with a rating of "met criteria." Students would be required to redo and resubmit those portfolio elements not meeting minimum standards. Four students had to redo sections of their portfolio to be considered "passing." Therefore, Table 3 reflects the final or adjusted scores and average of completing students.

EDSS 540: Secondary Literacy was identified as an area of concern by several assessments tools. The course was designed for secondary single subject students but also enrolls Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities credential students as well. For the past several semesters, the instructors of this course (only one instructor has taught the course twice) have expressed frustration at not only the mixed student population but also the range of student field placements (pre K & elementary for SPED students to middle school and high school for Single Subject students) while taking the course. Additionally, in Spring 2006 a new instructor for the course was hired three days before the beginning of the semester and did not have much time to prepare for the course. This lack of planning manifested in many problems and issues throughout the entire semester. It is not surprising that "teaching literacy" scored so low in students' perceptions of their preparation. First semester students would rate the area as low because they had not taken the course and second semester students were not satisfied with the course instructor and course management. Although no dramatic changes are planned for this course at this time, additional data will be collected this year on how to improve the course and meet the needs of all involved.

It will be recommended that the two student teaching experiences and the two student teaching seminars be renamed. Currently, the names reflect either middle school or high school depending upon the student's placement. EDSS 575 will become First Student Teaching and EDSS 585 will become Second Student Teaching. The student teaching seminars will have similar naming respectively. These changes will address the issues of Interns completing their two student teachings at only one level and part-time students who may student teach at a high school before middle school due to their program plan.

Several different program models will be explored to reduce the tension and anxiety of the students in the 8/8-program format. Anecdotal information suggests that instructors would like to see the students during their student teaching experience to extend and expand on course concepts and provide additional student support.

Summary

This report details the history, assessment efforts, and changes over the first five semesters of the Single Subject Credential Program at California State University Channel Islands. The program continues to evolve based upon data accumulated both formally and informally. The beginnings of an assessment framework are underway to guide the formal program assessment process.

Initial findings indicate the program is quite successful both in the eyes of the students and faculty as well as indicated by results from students' portfolio evaluation. Areas of improvement continue to include clarity and communication between program constituents—although many report this area to be a strength—and incorporating the portfolio assessment more seamlessly into the program coursework.

Each semester and each year part-time temporary faculty make huge contributions to the effectiveness of this program. However, there is some turnover of instructors individually and for specific courses. If the program is to remain effective with projected growth (increasing math and science credentials and eventually adding a social studies credential), additional tenure track faculty must be hired. Currently, there is only one tenure-track faculty in the single subject program and most program decisions and the entire history rests with this one person. Redundancy must be built into program coordination elements (recruitment, advising, curriculum oversight, instructor oversight, policy, community outreach) and assessment coordination to maintain the quality and effectiveness already established in the Single Subject Credential Program.

Appendix 1

Education Program Portfolio Description and Guidelines-Spring 2004

Portfolio Description

In order to assist and support you in your professional development as a reflective educator, you will be required to develop a portfolio of your work that demonstrates the qualities and competencies identified by the Education Program Faculty and aligned to the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs). During Fall 2003, the Education Program Faculty identified four Core Competencies for beginning teachers. They are: Learning Environment; Instructional Process; Learning About Students; and Professionalism. Your developmental portfolio is a collection of evidence of your work and progress in the Credential Program toward meeting these competencies. Your portfolio is a formal document and is a reflection of you as a professional.

The Education Program Faculty will guide and advise you in the construction of your portfolio both individually and in the student teaching seminars. You will be required to present your completed portfolio to a panel of the Education Program Faculty and area teachers and administrators before completing your Credential Program at CSUCI.

When you seek employment as a credentialed teacher, you will be able to share portions of your portfolio with perspective employers in addition to your resume and letters of recommendation.

Instructions for Portfolio Development

Include a current copy of your resume and philosophy of teaching. Gather evidence from your coursework and fieldwork for each Core Competency. A listing of TPEs has been loosely associated with each Core Competency to assist you in focusing on the competency and choosing appropriate evidence. First semester student teachers and second semester student teachers will be asked to collect differing numbers of artifacts to include in the portfolio. Because the portfolio is seen as a cumulative and summative process students are encouraged to collect artifacts throughout their credential program for inclusion.

Reflective Narratives: For each Core Competency you will write a Reflective Narrative. After gathering your artifact(s), write a 1-2 page reflective narrative for each Core Competency that answers the guiding questions and describes how the artifacts you have chosen clearly demonstrate your core knowledge, skills, and abilities related to the Core Competency.

Connection to TPE's: For each artifact or set of artifacts per element you will write a one to two paragraph summary of how and why are the artifacts you have chosen to include in your portfolio are representative of the TPE's associated with that Core Competency.

Core Competency: Learning About Students: The current focus of this semester's portfolio is "Core Competency: Learning About Students." This area has been organized into three elements: Developmental Characteristics, Background, and Approaches to Learning. These elements are described in the Education Program Portfolio Component Description and Organization Outline. Students will be expected to provide a summative explanation for each element and how the evidence presented relates to the TPEs.

Please follow the outline when organizing your portfolio.

Education Program Portfolio Component Description and Organization Outline
I. Resume
II. Philosophy of Teaching
III. Core Competency: <u>Learning Environment</u> (TPE's 10, 11) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Reflective Narrative:</u> Why are the artifacts in this Core Competency important to you and how are they representative of your knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to the learning environment? • <u>Connection to TPE's:</u> How and why are these artifacts representative of the TPE's? • <u>Artifact/s:</u> One artifact for 1st semester ST; Two artifacts for 2nd semester ST
IV. Core Competency: <u>Instructional Process</u> (TPE's 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Reflective Narrative:</u> Why are the artifacts in this Core Competency important to you and how are they representative of your knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to the instructional process? • <u>Connection to TPE's:</u> How and why are these artifacts representative of the TPE's? • <u>Artifact/s:</u> One artifact for 1st semester ST; Two artifacts for 2nd semester ST
V. Core Competency: <u>Learning About Students</u> (TPE's 6, 8) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Reflective Narrative:</u> Why are the artifacts in this Core Competency important to you and how are they representative of your knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to learning about students? <p><i>Element 1: Developmental Characteristics (Social, Intellectual, Emotional, Physical)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Connection to TPE's:</u> How and why are these artifacts representative of the TPE's? ○ <u>Artifact/s:</u> One artifact for 1st semester ST; Two artifacts for 2nd semester ST <p><i>Element 2: Background (Family, Behavior, Cultural/Linguistic)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Connection to TPE's:</u> How and why are these artifacts representative of the TPE's? ○ <u>Artifact/s:</u> One artifact for 1st semester ST; Two artifacts for 2nd semester ST <p><i>Element 3: Approaches to Learning (Prior knowledge, abilities, interests, Learning styles, Individual differences)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Connection to TPE's:</u> How and why are these artifacts representative of the TPE's? ○ <u>Artifact/s:</u> One artifact for 1st semester ST; Two artifacts for 2nd semester ST
VI. Core Competency: <u>Professionalism</u> (TPE's 12, 13) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Reflective Narrative:</u> Why are the artifacts in this Core Competency important to you and how are they representative of your knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to professionalism? • <u>Connection to TPE's:</u> How and why are these artifacts representative of the TPE's? • <u>Artifact/s:</u> One artifact for 1st semester ST; Two artifacts for 2nd semester ST
VII. Portfolio Summary <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the special qualities that you bring as an individual and you have developed as a professional? 2. How does this portfolio represent you as a developing professional who can address the diverse needs of all students? 3. How does this portfolio represent your evolving philosophy of teaching and practice?
VIII. Professional Documents Include in this section any certificates, permits, credentials, or documents that show your

professional accomplishments or academic distinctions.

Appendix 2: CSUCI Single Subject Portfolio Assessment Rubric

		Distinguished (3)	Proficient (2)	Emergent (1)	Unsatisfactory (0)
1	Resume	Correct mechanics; Includes all pertinent information clearly; professional format using advanced word processing features	Correct mechanics; Includes all pertinent information; professional format	Correct mechanics with minimal errors; Includes all pertinent information; format needs improvement	Many mechanical errors present; Information is incomplete; Format and professional appearance is lacking
Comments:					
2	Philosophy of Teaching	Mechanical errors absent; Professional style and presentation; At least three elements fully addressed; Several specific examples for each element	Mechanical errors absent; Professional style and good presentation; At least three elements addressed; At least two specific examples for each element	Few mechanical errors; Style is somewhat professional with a good presentation. At least two elements fully addressed; Only one specific example per element	Many mechanical errors; Style is not professional or presentation is not acceptable. Only two elements addressed but developed; Specific examples not present
Comments:					
3	Core Competency: Learning Environment				
	Reflective Narrative	Reflected in-depth on knowledge, skills and dispositions and connections to core competencies Thoroughly addresses guiding questions	Reflected on knowledge, skills and dispositions and connections to core competencies; Addresses guiding questions	Reflected on at least two (knowledge, skills and/or dispositions) and connections to core competencies; Partially addresses guiding questions	Little reflection on knowledge, skills and dispositions related to core competencies or guiding questions
Comments:					
	Connection to TPEs	Appropriate artifact/s; Connection to the TPEs described and fully explained with multiple examples	Appropriate artifact/s; Connection to the TPEs described and explained with several examples	Appropriate artifact/s; Connection to the TPEs described and partially explained with one or two examples	Inappropriate artifact; connection to the TPEs not described; No supporting examples
Comments:					
4	Core Competency: Instructional Process				
	Reflective Narrative	Reflected in-depth on knowledge, skills and dispositions and connections to core competencies Thoroughly addresses guiding questions	Reflected on knowledge, skills and dispositions and connections to core competencies; Addresses guiding questions	Reflected on at least two (knowledge, skills and/or dispositions) and connections to core competencies; Partially addresses guiding questions	Little reflection on knowledge, skills and dispositions related to core competencies or guiding questions
Comments:					
	Connection to	Appropriate artifact/s;	Appropriate artifact/s;	Appropriate artifact/s;	Inappropriate artifact;

		Distinguished (3)	Proficient (2)	Emergent (1)	Unsatisfactory (0)
	TPEs	Connection to the TPEs described and fully explained with multiple examples	Connection to the TPEs described and explained with several examples	Connection to the TPEs described and partially explained with one or two examples	connection to the TPEs not described; No supporting examples
Comments:					
5 Core Competency: Learning About Students					
	Reflective Narrative	Reflected in-depth on knowledge, skills and dispositions and connections to core competencies Thoroughly addresses guiding questions	Reflected on knowledge, skills and dispositions and connections to core competencies; Addresses guiding questions	Reflected on at least two (knowledge, skills and/or dispositions) and connections to core competencies; Partially addresses guiding questions	Little reflection on knowledge, skills and dispositions related to core competencies or guiding questions
Comments:					
	Element 1 Connection to TPE Developmental Characteristics	Appropriate artifact; Connection to the TPEs described; Connection fully explained; Accurate knowledge of typical developmental group characteristics as well as individual variation	Appropriate artifact; connection to the TPEs described; Connection fully explained; Accurate knowledge of typical developmental group characteristics	Appropriate artifact; Connection to the TPEs described; Connection partially explained; Accurate knowledge of development in age group and developmental areas	Inappropriate artifact; Connection to the TPEs not described; connection not explained; Little evidence of knowledge of children's development
Comments:					
	Element 2 Connection to TPE Background Family, Behavior, Culture, Language,	Appropriate artifact; Connection to the TPEs described; Connection fully explained; Displays knowledge of individual variation cultural/linguistic and familial background	Appropriate artifact; Connection to the TPEs described; Connection fully explained; Displays knowledge of group characteristics in culture and linguistic heritage	Appropriate artifact; Connection to the TPEs described; Connection partially explained; Recognizes value of culture and heritage but displays this knowledge for class as a whole	Inappropriate artifact; Connection to the TPEs not described; Connection not explained; Little evidence of knowledge of children's cultural or linguistic heritage and its value.
Comments:					
	Element 3 Connection to TPE Approaches to Learning, Prior knowledge, abilities interests, styles Individual differences	Appropriate artifact; Connection to the TPEs described; Connection fully explained; Displays knowledge of individual variation and how to gain such information	Appropriate artifact; Connection to the TPEs described; Connection fully explained; Displays knowledge of learning styles as applied to group of students	Appropriate artifact; Connection to the TPEs described; Connection partially explained; Displays general knowledge of approaches to learning that students exhibit	Inappropriate artifact; connection to the TPEs not described; Connection not explained; Little evidence of knowledge of children's learning styles and how to gain information about them
Comments:					

		Distinguished (3)	Proficient (2)	Emergent (1)	Unsatisfactory (0)
6 Core Competency: Professionalism					
	Reflective Narrative	Reflected in-depth on knowledge, skills and dispositions and connections to core competencies Thoroughly addresses guiding questions	Reflected on knowledge, skills and dispositions and connections to core competencies; Addresses guiding questions	Reflected on at least two (knowledge, skills and/or dispositions) and connections to core competencies; Partially addresses guiding questions	Little reflection on knowledge, skills and dispositions related to core competencies or guiding questions
Comments:					
	Connection to TPEs	Appropriate artifact/s; Connection to the TPEs described and fully explained with multiple examples	Appropriate artifact/s; Connection to the TPEs described and explained with several examples	Appropriate artifact/s; Connection to the TPEs described and partially explained with one or two examples	Inappropriate artifact; connection to the TPEs not described; No supporting examples
Comments:					
7 Portfolio Summary					
	Questions	All three questions are fully addressed with multiple examples directly related to elements within the portfolio	All three questions are fully addressed with several examples directly related to elements within the portfolio	All three questions are addressed with a few connections made to elements within the portfolio	Fewer than three questions are addressed or three questions are addressed but responses are superficial
Comments:					

Appendix 3

SINGLE SUBJECT PROGRAM PLANNING OPTIONS—FALL START

COURSE OF STUDY FOR THE FULLTIME SINGLE SUBJECT PROGRAM (30 units)

First Semester (Fall): 15units

EDSS 530	General Secondary School Methods (3)
EDSS 53--	531 = Math; 532 = Science; 533 = English, Content Methods I (3)
EDSS 560	Access to Learning: Special Needs Learners (2)
EDSS 575	Student Teaching Middle School (6)
EDSS 571	Student Teaching Seminar (1)

Second Semester (Spring): 15 units

EDSS 540	Literacy in Secondary Schools (3)
EDSS 54--	541 = Math; 542 = Science; 543 = English, Content Methods II (3)
EDSS 550	Access to Learning: English Language Learners (2)
EDSS 585	Student Teaching High School (6)
EDSS 581	Student Teaching Seminar (1)

COURSE OF STUDY FOR THE INTERN & PART-TIME SINGLE SUBJECT PROGRAM (31-34 units)

SEMESTER	OPTION A	OPTION B	OPTION C
1 ST	EDSS 530 (3) EDSS 560 (2) EDSS 570 (1)	EDSS 530 (3) EDSS 560 (2) EDSS 570 (1)	EDSS 530 (3) EDSS 560 (2) EDSS 570 (1)
2 ND	EDSS 540 (3) EDSS 550 (2) EDSS 580 (1)	EDSS 540 (3) EDSS 550 (2) EDSS 580 (1)	EDSS 540 (3) EDSS 54— (3) EDSS 550 (2) EDSS 571 (1) EDSS 575 (6)
3 RD	EDSS 53— (3) EDSS 570 (1)	EDSS 53— (3) EDSS 571 (1) EDSS 575 (6)	EDSS 53— (3) EDSS 581 (1) EDSS 585 (6)
4 TH	EDSS 54— (3) EDSS 580 (1)	EDSS 54— (3) EDSS 581 (1) EDSS 585 (6)	
5 TH	EDSS 571 (1) EDSS 575 (6)		
6 TH	EDSS 581 (1) EDSS 585 (6)		

EDSS 570. Field Experience Middle School (Part-Time Program) (1)

EDSS 580. Field Experience High School (Part-Time Program) (1)

SINGLE SUBJECT CREDENTIAL STUDENTS MUST BE ENROLLED IN EITHER FIELD EXPERIENCE OR STUDENT TEACHING EACH SEMESTER.

Appendix 4: Single Subject Teaching Credential Program Electronic Portfolio Description and Guidelines 2004-2005

Portfolio Description

In order to assist and support you in your professional development as a reflective educator, you will be required to develop an electronic portfolio of your work that demonstrates the qualities and competencies identified by the Education Program Faculty and aligned to the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE's). During Fall 2003, the Education Program Faculty identified four Core Competencies for beginning teachers: Learning Environment; Instructional Process; Learning About Students; and Professionalism. This Portfolio is a collection of evidence of your work and progress in the Credential Program toward meeting the Core Competencies. Your Portfolio is a formal document and is a reflection of you as a professional.

The Program Faculty will guide and advise you in the construction of your electronic portfolio both individually and in the student teaching seminars. When you seek employment as a credentialed teacher, you will be able to share portions of your portfolio with perspective employers in addition to your resume and letters of recommendation. Additionally, CSUCI is working with the Ventura County Superintendent's Office of Schools to ensure that your portfolio will be of use during your BTSA training.

Instructions for Portfolio Development

Include a current copy of your resume and philosophy of teaching. Gather evidence from your coursework and fieldwork for each Core Competency and associated elements. Each Core Competency is associated with a listing of TPEs to assist you in focusing on the competency and choosing appropriate evidence. Because the portfolio is seen as a cumulative and summative process, students are encouraged to collect artifacts throughout their credential program for inclusion.

First semester student teachers: Provide a minimum of one artifact for each element of the Core Competencies; however, more artifacts are encouraged. **At least 50% (n = 11) of the artifacts you choose must be your original work. After gathering your artifacts, write a 1-2 page Reflective Narrative for each Core Competency that describes how the artifacts you have chosen clearly demonstrate your core knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to the Core Competency and how these artifacts are representative of the TPEs. (See Portfolio Organizational Outline for details).

Second semester student teachers: Provide a minimum of two different types of artifacts for each element of the Core Competencies; however, more artifacts are encouraged. **At least 75% (n = 33) of the artifacts you choose must be your original work. After gathering your artifacts, write a 3-4 page Reflective Narrative for each Core Competency that describes how the artifacts you have chosen clearly demonstrate your core knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to the Core Competency and how these artifacts are representative of the TPEs. (See Portfolio Organizational Outline for details).

Please follow the organizational outline when developing your portfolio.

Single Subject Teaching Credential Program Portfolio Organizational Outline
I. Resume
II. Philosophy of Teaching
III. Core Competency: <u>Learning Environment</u> (TPEs 9, 10, 11) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Establishing and Maintaining a Culture for Learning B. Classroom Procedures C. Student Behavior D. Long-term Planning and Instructional Goals E. Daily Planning and Lesson Objectives F. Resource Selection, Adaptation, and/or Enrichment Reflective Narrative
IV. Core Competency: <u>Instructional Process</u> (TPEs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Content Knowledge in the Content Area —Grade/Developmentally Appropriate B. Instructional Methods in the Content Area —Grade/Developmentally Appropriate C. Literacy in the Content Area D. Teaching English Learners E. Teaching Special Needs Learners F. Student Engagement in Learning G. Assessment of Student Learning Reflective Narrative
V. Core Competency: <u>Learning About Students</u> (TPEs 6, 8) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Approaches to Learning B. Background and Culture C. Behavioral Assessments D. Assessing Literacy Skills E. Assessing Special Needs Reflective Narrative
VI. Core Competency: <u>Professionalism</u> (TPEs 12, 13) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Professional, Legal, Ethical Obligations B. Reflecting on Teaching C. Communication with Families D. Maintaining Accurate Records Reflective Narrative
VII. Portfolio Summary (Second semester student teachers only) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. What are the special qualities that you bring as an individual and you have developed as a professional? 5. How does this portfolio represent you as a developing professional who can address the diverse needs of all students? 6. How does this portfolio represent your evolving philosophy of teaching and practice?
VIII. Professional Documents Include in this section any certificates, permits, credentials, or documents that show your professional accomplishments or academic distinctions.

Appendix 5: Single Subject Portfolio Matrix of Signature Assignments

The following is a list of possible artifacts that you may use in your portfolio.

You will need two (2) artifacts for each sub-element of each Core Competency.

Portfolio Element	Embedded In:	Possible Evidences/Artifacts
I. Resume	Seminar-2	Resume
II. Philosophy of Teaching	Seminar-2	Teaching Philosophy Summary
III. Core Competency: Learning Environment: TPEs 9, 10, 11		
G. Establishing and Maintaining a Culture for Learning	EDUC 512 EDUC 520 Seminar-1	Bilingual Teacher Interview Management Philosophy Classroom Documentary
H. Classroom Procedures	EDUC 520 530 532	From Management Plan Classroom Syllabus Lab Safety Plan
I. Student Behavior	EDUC 520 575/585	From Management Plan Expectations for Student Behavior
J. Long-term Planning and Instructional Goals	530 53— or 541—	Calendar and Goals from Unit Plan Calendar and Goals from Unit Plan
K. Daily Planning and Lesson Objectives	530 53--, 54--	Lesson from class, midterm, or unit Lesson from class, unit, or field placement
L. Resource Selection, Adaptation, and/or Enrichment	550 540	ELD Materials Review Activity Textbook Analysis
IV. Core Competency: Instructional Process: TPEs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7		
A. Content Knowledge in the Content Area —Grade/ Developmentally Appropriate	53— 54— 532	Assignment, Lesson, or other original artifact Assignment, Lesson, or other original artifact Field Trip Report
B. Instructional Methods in the Content Area —Grade/ Developmentally Appropriate	53— 54— 532	Assignment, Lesson, or other original artifact Assignment, Lesson, or other original artifact Microteaching Lesson Plans
C. Literacy in the Content Area	550 540	ELD or SDAIE Lesson Plan Lesson Plan kernels for integrating literacy
D. Teaching English Learners	550 ENGL 475	ELD or SDAIE Lesson Plan Outcome Assessment: Final Paper
E. Teaching Special Needs Learners	560 560	Special Education Services Summary Curriculum & Collaboration Project
F. Student Engagement in Learning	530 53— or 54—	Collection of Anticipatory Sets from unit plan Lesson Plan from class or unit
G. Assessment of Student Learning	530 53— or 54— Seminar-2	Assessment Section from Unit Plan Assessment tools from lessons or unit Sample Assessment Tool
V. Core Competency: Learning About Students: TPEs 6, 8		
F. Approaches to Learning	EDUC 512 530 532	Cultural Simulations Learning Theorist Power Point Student Interviews
G. Background and Culture	550 560 EDUC 512	Case Study Film Analysis Personal History/Family History

	Seminar-2	Community Documentary
H. Behavioral Assessments	EDUC 520 560	Student Observations/Data Tools Curriculum & Collaboration Project
I. Assessing Literacy Skills	ENGL 475 540	CELDT Language Assessment Assignment Learner, Text, and Context Paper
J. Assessing Special Needs	560	Curriculum & Collaboration Project
VI. Core Competency: Professionalism: TPEs 12, 13)		
E. Professional, Legal, Ethical Obligations	EDUC 512 560 Seminar-1	Class readings/discussion summary School Services Project Safe & Healthy Learning Environment
F. Reflecting on Teaching	560 540/550 530	Electronic Discussions Dialogue Journal Blackboard Discussions
G. Communication with Families	EDUC 512 EDUC 520	Community Study Assignment Parent Contacts (management plan)
H. Maintaining Accurate Records	EDUC 520 575/585	Data Tools Grade book

If no prefix is listed above, please assume EDSS.

For each artifact provide a brief description of the artifact along with a brief statement of how this represents the sub-element. (Example for VI. C: Parent Contacts section of Management Plan: This is a section from my management plan from EDUC 520 in which I present three ways that I plan on communicating with parents and families. Each strategy has a brief description on how I plan to use it.)

There is some leeway with lesson plans used in the portfolio. The lesson plans may have been assigned in a particular course as a stand-alone assignment, part of a unit plan, or created for your field placement. Please be sure to include the program context in which the lesson plan was created in your brief description (as noted above).

For first semester student teachers

You will have the opportunity to complete “Core Competency: Learning Environment” as a formative assessment. Provide artifacts (2 for each sub-element) for the courses you have completed or are currently enrolled and write a Reflective Narrative on how the artifacts demonstrate your knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to the Core Competency and how you feel you have addressed the associated TPE’s.

For second semester student teachers

Provide artifacts for the courses you have completed or are currently enrolled to complete all sections of the portfolio. Write a Reflective Narrative for each Core Competency on how the artifacts demonstrate your knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to that Core Competency and how you feel you have addressed the associated TPE’s.

**Please copy and paste all textual artifacts into the TaskStream text box. Only include attachments of .pdf files or pictures (.jpeg) that cannot be added as text.

**Appendix 6: California State University Channel Islands
Single Subject Credential Program Assessment Spring 2006**

Please provide us information about your preparation to become a teacher. We will use this information to assist us in reviewing and revising the Credential Programs at California State University Channel Islands. By completing this questionnaire, you are consenting to the use of your responses for our program evaluation. Individual responses will not be revealed in our use of this data. Your responses will be collated with all other students in the program.

This survey is designed to gather student perceptions on various program components in order to strengthen the Single Subject Program. This survey is voluntary and is not meant to replace comments made by students on the SETE forms for individual courses or instructors. SETE data and comments are not compiled for program improvement and are only made available to individual instructors several weeks after the grades have been posted. Your comments here provide valuable and immediate feedback.

1. Age _____
2. Gender Female ____ Male _____
3. Credential Program
 - a. Single Subject Mathematics _____
 - b. Single Subject Science _____
 - c. Single Subject English _____
4. What is your highest degree earned? Bachelor's _____ Masters ____ Other, specify _____
5. What was your undergraduate major? _____
6. How many semesters have you been in the Single Subject Program? (circle one)

1 2 3 4 5 6
7. What is your level of preparation in each of the following areas? **NA= not applicable**
1= poorly prepared 2=fairly prepared 3=well prepared 4 exceptionally well prepared

Program Component	Circle one	Comments
Lesson/daily planning	NA 1 2 3 4	
Long-term/unit planning	NA 1 2 3 4	
Incorporating Content Standards into your lesson plans	NA 1 2 3 4	
Teaching literacy	NA 1 2 3 4	
Teaching mathematics	NA 1 2 3 4	

Teaching science	NA 1 2 3 4	
Teaching English	NA 1 2 3 4	
Teaching a diverse student population, including students with disabilities or special needs	NA 1 2 3 4	
Teaching English Language Learners	NA 1 2 3 4	
Teaching students with different learning styles	NA 1 2 3 4	
Learning about the background and culture of students	NA 1 2 3 4	
Assessment of student learning	NA 1 2 3 4	
Using a variety of teaching methods	NA 1 2 3 4	
Classroom Management	NA 1 2 3 4	
Behavior management	NA 1 2 3 4	
Use of technology for teaching and learning	NA 1 2 3 4	
Communicating with families	NA 1 2 3 4	
Reflecting on teaching	NA 1 2 3 4	

Additional Comments: (If more space is needed please use last page.)

8. In what areas do you feel most strongly prepared to be a teacher and why?

9. What are your greatest concerns related to teaching?

10. What are the strengths of the Credential Program?

11. What suggestions do you have for improving the coursework in the Credential Program?

12. What suggestions do you have for improving the field experiences and student teaching in the Credential Program?

13. In what other ways would you like to see the program changed or improved for other students?

14. If you have had one or more teachers at CSUCI who have significantly influenced your life, please describe your experience in as full a manner as possible, providing details about the teacher, the setting, the kind of changes that you experienced and how you felt about the experience.

Additional Comments: