

**CSUS Reading Certificate and Credential Program Assessment  
System Manual (CSUS-RCCPAS Manual)**



Language and Literacy Area Group  
Department of Teacher Education  
College of Education  
California State University, Sacramento  
6000 J Street  
Sacramento, California

Spring, 2006

## Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Orientation	3
Competencies	11
Clinical Experiences (CE)	
Instructional Competencies (IC)	
Professional Perspectives (PP)	
Appendix A CSUS-RCCPAS Evaluation Form	16
Appendix B Entry Slips	17
Entry Slip Form 1	
Entry Slip Form 2	
Entry Slip Form 3	
Entry Slip Form 4	

## Orientation

*Purpose:* This manual explains requirements of the *CSUS Reading Certificate and Credential Program Assessment System* (hereafter, RCCPAS) designed to fulfill criteria mandated by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). RCCPAS uses a portfolio system either in hard copy or electronic format. Successful completion of RCCPAS and acceptable academic performance in course work leads to a recommendation for a certificate or credential to CCTC.

Your responsibilities are—

- Familiarity with RCCPAS,
- Collection of evidence of accomplishments,
- Analysis of this evidence in writing,
- Presentation of this evidence for evaluation.

Students with the sole aim of earning a master's degree are exempt from RCCPAS.

*Process:* Attend a portfolio orientation session early in the program, and make sure you understand the competencies. Begin collecting and cataloguing coursework (clinical planning and assessment documents, written responses and/or analyses of class readings, etc.) and artifacts from your own teaching (e.g., lesson plans, journal entries, class notes, assessments, etc.). Note that artifacts must entail some processing of information on your part. Class handouts and articles do not provide evidence that you learned something. Learning log notes, class discussion notes, purposeful summaries, excerpts from class papers that show how you synthesized a variety of studies, informal anecdotal notes that capture your observations of experiences (date them), and the like do provide evidence.

If your goal is to earn a Reading Certificate and you plan not to take the Specialist courses, upon completion of the certificate courses, put your artifacts in folders, number them, and create an index that includes the number of each folder and a name for the artifact. Put these folders in an accordion file box or some other container designed to hold folders (e.g., a CD). From then on refer to the container as your “artifact appendix”—a collection to add on to your portfolio reflective writings. In preparing for your portfolio review, you will need to complete two steps. The first step is to *organize the artifacts* that make up the evidence you are submitting. The second is to do some *reflective writing* on two levels (see reflective writing forms in Appendix B). Here we will discuss the organization of the artifacts and then address the reflective writing.

*Step One: Organizing the artifacts.* The goal of this step is to create thematic or topical folders that hold your artifacts. You will then put the folders in order and

arrange them in your portfolio. How do you create a thematic or topical folder? Think about projects or extended learning activities or papers you wrote. For example, you may have a number of artifacts that have to do with tutoring a beginning reader: 1) an initial diagnostic write-up, 2) lesson plans, 3) anecdotal records you kept during the tutoring, and 4) final case study on the student. Put all of these artifacts in a folder labeled “tutoring a beginning reader” (for now, we’ll call this ‘Folder A’), and number each artifact within the folder (e.g., the initial diagnostic write-up is artifact #1). On the label for that folder include the range of numbers for the artifacts (e.g., 1-15).

For a second example, you may have 1) reading notes from a collection of empirical studies you read on revision as a part of the writing process, 2) drafts of a paper you wrote on this topic, and 3) a final copy of a paper you wrote examining research findings related to teaching children to revise during the writing process. Put all of these artifacts in a folder labeled “paper on research findings related to revision” (for now, we’ll call this ‘Folder B’); number each artifact within the folder and record the range of artifacts on the label.

For a third example, you may have several artifacts from work you did on a class project involving think alouds: 1) reflective notes on several articles from practitioner journals like *Reading Teacher*, 2) transcriptions of think alouds done by a seventh grade boy whom you taped as part of an informal reading inventory, 3) a think aloud bookmark you asked this boy to use, 4) drafts of an outline for a class presentation on your think aloud work, and 5) the final outline for the class presentation on your findings from studying the boy’s think aloud data. Put all of these artifacts in a folder labeled “think aloud project” (for now, we’ll call this Folder C’); number each artifact within the folder.

When you have finished creating thematic or topical folders, put them in an order, and make sure that you letter them consecutively. Then write a list of the folders by letter along with their names in the order they appear in your portfolio. The list for the folders we’ve referenced as examples would look like this:

- Folder A — Tutoring a beginning reader, artifacts 1-15
- Folder B — Paper of research findings related to revision, 16-21
- Folder C — Think aloud project, 22-44

Inside each folder, create a folder index that lists the artifact by number within that folder. The index for Folder B in the above example would look like this:

- Artifact 1 — reading notes from a collection of empirical studies on revision
- Artifact 2 — drafts of a paper on empirical studies of revision
- Artifact 3 — final copy of the paper

This organization allows you to point to collections of artifacts all having to do with an experience or an assignment or a paper, each collection in its own folder. It also allows you to refer to individual artifacts within each folder if necessary.

*Step Two: Reflective Writing.* Once you have the artifacts in your portfolio organized and indexed for easy reference, you will do some reflective writing on two levels. The first level is an introduction to the portfolio—think of it as a “letter to the reviewer.” The second is a series of what this portfolio system calls “entry slips”—actually, you’ll write three entry slips, one for Clinical Experiences, one for Instructional Competencies, and one for Professional Perspectives. The entry slip forms themselves are in Appendix B of this handbook. It is perhaps easiest to download an electronic version of these entry slips so that you can type your responses right onto the form. You may photocopy the slips in this handbook as well. The entry slips are used by the reviewer to make judgments about your competence in each of the areas specified; when your portfolio is returned, you may view these judgments and any notes made by the reviewer.

Even though the word “slip” suggests a scrap of paper or a single sheet of paper, “entry slips” actually turn out to be lengthy and serve an important function for the portfolio reviewer (see Appendix B for Entry Slip forms). Entry slips are your place to interpret the evidence in a way that lets the reviewer understand what the folders, and the artifacts they contain, show about you as a reading professional. They provide a road map through the evidence to lead to a full picture of your competence. Without entry slips, the reviewer sees a set of folders with artifacts but knows little about what you think the artifacts in the folders mean. Entry slips help reviewers by referring to the folders and explaining why the artifacts they contain are good pieces of evidence of a competency, how the reviewer might interpret the artifacts, what the artifacts reveal about your experience and expertise, and how the artifacts fit within the other artifacts you chose. You help the reviewer find just the right artifact at just the right time to make a judgment about a particular competency as the reviewer works through your submissions.

Consider the following example of entry-slip writing intended to demonstrate professional competence of the ability to teach comprehension and composition (Instructional Competency Two). Note that the entry slip for Instructional Competency Two has two subheadings: *analysis of the evidence* and *scorer’s judgment*. In the first section, you write about the evidence in a way that helps the reviewer understand it in relation to your accomplishments. Note that the reviewer will look specifically for evidence of each subcomponent of the outcome (the exact words of the subcomponents are used and *italicized* in the example) as well as more generally at the totality of your discussion in regard to writing instruction and comprehension instruction. In the following example, the entry slip uses Folders A, B,

and C discussed earlier, but you are by no means limited to three folders per entry slip. Here is the example written on the same entry slip form available to you in Appendix B:

Instructional Competency 2: Comprehension and Composition.

Analysis of the Evidence

Folders A, B, and C provide much evidence of my competence in teaching comprehension and composition. Although Folder A includes my work with a beginning reader and is focused mainly on teaching fluency (see entry slip for IC1 for in-depth discussion of this aspect of the folder), please note that in the initial diagnostic workup, in the lesson plans, and in the final write-up, I paid careful attention to *vocabulary* not just as words to decode, but as words that have meanings attached to schemas and *background knowledge*. I checked early to find out my student's understanding of key *academic language* like 'predict' and 'classify' and other words we would be using. We needed to do work to help him make a *concept formation* for 'classify,' but he succeeded as we talked about 'classifying words' rather than 'sorting words.' Note also that my lesson plans include activities where I read aloud to this student from books that would have challenged his decoding skills. I deliberately chose both *expository* and *narrative text structures* in order to focus part of the instruction on learning about texts at levels larger than the individual word. I wanted my beginning reader to improve in decoding primarily, but I also wanted to see improvement in comprehension. Throughout my work with him, I found *high quality books* that he could check out for *independent reading*, and we shared our thoughts about those books regularly. As a professional literacy teacher, this shows that I am fully aware of the need to address comprehension at all levels of development, for all types of readers. I also understand the importance of listening as a source of vocabulary growth as well as development of knowledge about text structures.

All of the artifacts from the think aloud project (Folder C) show that I have a firm grasp of the research on think aloud as a *portfolio-type* tool for *assessing comprehension and composition*; a real strength seen in Folder C is the analysis of the think aloud data that I did for the class presentation (e.g., artifact 4 in Folder C, drafts of an outline for a class presentation on my think aloud work). At first, I had a hard time making fine distinctions, but as I worked with the outline, I was able to see that not all predictions are of the same kind or quality, something that is clear in the changes in the draft outline. In the analysis of the transcripts, I found instances of prediction, self-monitoring, and making personal connections that surprised me given the conversations I had had with this boy previously. As a professional I now know that before making judgments about a reader's capacity to comprehend, teachers must not rely on casual conversations and first impressions; it is important to collect data in

a systematic way and analyze it carefully. (Please note also in Folder M the review of the literature I did on metacognition. This lit review helped me extend my understanding of think aloud from an assessment tool to a teaching tool for both teacher and student.)

Folder B includes work that I did to write a paper for the writing course examining studies on revision as part of writing, and the work itself is evidence that I am fully aware of *writing process strategies* not just as a teacher, but also as a writer. In fact, one of the hardest things about writing this paper was that I had no real *sense of audience* to guide me. I knew that I was writing in an APA style for a ‘scholarly audience’ (whatever that is), but it wasn’t a real audience for me—I didn’t know it well enough to use this knowledge as a resource for writing. (Compare the piece of writing submitted in Folder G—a poem I wrote during our writer’s workshop in the same course—with this paper on revision. My poem works because I knew I wanted my mother to read it.) Nonetheless, please look at the drafts included in this folder and note that its early formlessness gradually becomes the final paper with coherent headings and subheadings—organization and clarity are major concerns of the writer throughout the process, including *planning, drafting, revising, and editing*. I was able to overcome my vague sense of audience by keeping a constant focus on getting the thing organized and saying what I had to say.

In my final paper, I discuss the connection between a writer’s knowledge of how readers are apt to comprehend a text *and* how he or she might revise a text. For example, when a young writer is revising a story, if he is a reader he would know to check to see whether he has put adequate clues into his story to allow a reader to make predictions about what is coming next. Again, he could do this *only if* he knows something about how a reader might comprehend the text. In many ways, teaching revision is a real opportunity to reinforce comprehension. I have a lot of work to do in the future to explore this idea, but this evidence shows that I am headed in the right direction in terms of understanding the reading-writing connection.

The work in Folder B (paper on revision) is very important to me. Before writing this paper, my understanding of how writers revise was superficial at best. Reading the research, drafting the paper and getting peer responses, and creating the final copy (publishable quality, I can only hope), gave me the opportunity to think through the nature of the entire writing process—I was stunned by the insight that a writer’s sense of audience has so much to do with how deeply he or she revises work. I did not understand this before. I think if I had done the paper on revision before I wrote the final case study of the beginning reader (Folder A), I would have made changes to the case study based on a deeper understanding of the fact that my student’s parents were the primary audience. Do they really know what a phoneme is? As it is, the case study is not very friendly to his parents. But we live and learn—I now know

that as a professional I have to be careful when I write about student performance to make sure that I take into account the needs of the reader of the report.

SCORER’S JUDGMENT

1 = Not Pass

2 = Pass

3 = Exceeds the standard

<i>Reading comprehension</i>	1	2	3	
academic language, background knowledge, concept formation, vocabulary development	1	2	3	
narrative text structure, expository text structure, thinking and study strategies	1	2	3	[Needs more
evidence: No mention of study strategies]				
independent reading of high quality books	1	2	3	
<i>Written composition</i>	1	2	3	
writing process strategies including sense of audience, planning, drafting, revising, and editing	1	2	3	
writing assessment, including direct writing assessment models and portfolio models	1	2	3	[Needs more
evidence: No mention of direct writing assessment.]				

In this case, the portfolio reviewer might return the portfolio and ask for additional evidence in those areas noted. Alternatively, because the bulk of the evidence suggests passing and even exceeding the standards in most areas, the reviewer might simply email you or ask you to explain in more detail where evidence for these areas might be found in what you already submitted. Of course, more might be said about these artifacts as the reflective process unfolds, and you continue to write additional entry slips. The point is that without the entry slip, the reviewer would have no way to understand what the artifacts represent about you—your perception of the strengths and weaknesses in the artifacts, for example (How would the reviewer know that you

were later dissatisfied with the case study even though when you wrote it you were perfectly satisfied and you got an ‘A’ on it at the time and learned a lot from doing it? We *do* expect growth in the program, and we hope you experience lots of it.) Your discussion helps the reviewer connect the dots of your artifacts.

Remember, too, the course instructors have already graded the pieces of work you submit in your portfolio. The quality of the work is not in question during the review. In fact, we know that work that you did early in the program may not show the depth of understanding that work you did later in the program shows—nobody expected you to do the same quality work at the beginning that you did at the end. The purpose in the portfolio is not to determine the worth of each individual folder and then add them up. Instead, the portfolio is a way for you and for the reviewer to see how these pieces of the puzzle fit together to make up evidence of your unique competencies as a teacher with a certificate or an advanced specialist credential—and to see how your competencies matured.

Finally, write a letter to the reviewer and comment holistically on your development as a literacy teacher. What are your strengths? What are your goals for improvement? Why does this portfolio matter? What do all of the artifacts in all of the folders say about you as a professional literacy educator? What are the themes and patterns in the evidence that you want a reviewer to notice?

Organize your portfolio container by placing the letter to the reviewer in the first folder, your three entry slips in the second folder, and the index to your artifacts in a third folder. If your immediate goal is just the reading certificate, you need to submit your portfolio to the program coordinator. If your ultimate goal is the reading specialist credential, you could view this midpoint preparation as a rehearsal for the final portfolio. It is not necessary for you to submit the portfolio *if you intend to complete the second tier of courses*. We encourage you to share your portfolio with one of the faculty informally for midcourse feedback.

Submit your work to the program coordinator when you are ready. After faculty review of your portfolio, you will be contacted. If faculty would like to see additional work from you—more artifacts, more explanation on the entry slips, more depth in the letter—specific concerns will be explained. In this event you can resubmit your portfolio.

*Certificate Portfolio:* Competencies specified within the 'Clinical Experience' and 'Instructional Competencies' subsections of the program outcomes must be accomplished. Certificate level professional Competencies must be accomplished.

*Credential Portfolio.* All of the competencies specified within the 'Professional Perspectives' subsection of the credential portfolio *and* those competencies specified in the certificate portfolio must be accomplished.

The form you'll need to submit to the Department Office (Eureka 215) in support of the recommendation to CCTC is included in this manual. Upon the successful completion of a portfolio, the faculty will file this form with the Department Office; you will receive a copy as well. All materials included in the portfolio itself remain your property.

## Competencies

Competencies fall into three broad categories:

- Clinical Experiences (CE),
- Instructional Competencies (IC), and
- Professional Perspectives (PP).

*Clinical Experiences:* Evidence of experiential understanding of diversity must come from your clinic courses (200, 201), your own classroom, the classrooms of colleagues, and other settings as appropriate. Submit documentation included in this manual with additional artifacts as needed along with reflective commentary on insights you had from your experiences in your entry slip.

*Instructional Competencies* Evidence of these competencies must come from the certificate courses. For credential students, evidence must also come from the specialist courses. Additional evidence may come from your own teaching.

*Professional Perspectives.* These competencies are divided into certificate and credential levels. Evidence of the certificate competencies should come from the certificate courses. Evidence of the specialist level should come from the specialist courses. These competencies are often demonstrated through artifacts from professional work history as well.

## Clinical Experiences

This matrix specifies the range of students with whom both RC and RSC candidates are expected to have experiences. Evidence for these experiences may be presented in the form of faculty initials.

	<u>EDTE 200 (RC)</u>	<u>EDTE 201 (RC)</u>	<u>EDTE 207 (RSC)</u>
Beginning Reader	_____	_____	_____
Struggling Reader	_____	_____	_____
English Learner	_____	_____	_____
Male	_____	_____	_____
Female	_____	_____	_____
Different Ethnicity	_____	_____	_____
Older Reader	_____	_____	_____

## **Instructional Competencies**

Instructional Competency 1: Fluency. You have current research-based skills and knowledge allowing you to assess and teach students to become fluent readers at all grade levels including English Language Learners.

Your work demonstrates your capacity to support growth in the following areas:

- (a) phonemic awareness, decoding and word recognition [200, (207)],
- (b) spelling [200, 203, (207)], and
- (c) extensive practice with appropriate materials [200, 201, (207)], and
- (d) the capacity to promote wide, independent reading among children [200, 201, (207), (209)].

Instructional Competency 2: Comprehension and Composition. You have research-based skills and knowledge allowing you to assess and teach reading comprehension.

Your work demonstrates your capacity to support growth in each of the following areas:

- (a) academic language, background knowledge, concept formation, vocabulary development [201, 203, (207), (209)];
- (b) narrative text structure, expository text structure, thinking and study strategies, and
- (c) independent reading of high quality books [201, (209)].

You have research-based skill and knowledge allowing you to teach written composition.

Your work demonstrates your capacity to support growth in each of the following areas:

- (a) writing process strategies including sense of audience, planning, drafting, revising, and editing [203], and
- (b) writing assessment, including direct writing assessment models and portfolio models [203].

Instructional Competency 3: Planning and Delivering Instruction based on Assessment. You have research-based skill and knowledge allowing you to participate in ongoing assessment and evaluation of students' reading and writing, including ongoing assessment and evaluation of ELL students' reading and writing [200, 201, 203, (207)].

Your work demonstrates your capacity to support growth in the planning and delivery of appropriate reading and writing instruction based on formal and informal assessment and evaluation results to meet the reading and writing needs of all students [200, 201, 203, (207)]

## Professional Perspectives

RC candidates should provide evidence for the RC level; RSC candidates should provide evidence for both the RC and the RSC levels. Additional evidence for these competencies may be presented from other program courses as well for those candidates who are also seeking a master's degree

### Certificate Level

Professional Perspective/Certificate Level/ Item 1: You have a thorough knowledge base in each of the following areas:

- (a) how children learn to read and write;
- (b) the structure of the English language including phonology, morphology, orthography [200, 201, 203, 205, (202), (207), (209)];
- (c) second language acquisition [200, 201, 203, 205, (202)],
- (d) the relationships among language, spelling, reading, and writing [200, 201, 203, 205, (202), (207), (209)], and
- (e) psychological and sociolinguistic aspects of reading and writing [205, (202)].

Professional Perspective/Certificate Level/ Item 2: You can articulate and apply an understanding of the research on instruction in reading and the language arts [205, (206), and other courses].

Professional Perspective/Certificate Level/ Item 3: You have the ability to respect, understand and teach students who are different from you, including ethnic, cultural, gender, linguistic, and socio-economic differences [200, 201, 203, (202), (207), and experience outside CSUS coursework].

### Credential Level

Professional Perspective/Credential Level/ Item 1: You have knowledge and skills that enable you to provide leadership at the level of the whole school, the district, and the state in the following areas:

- (a) making program, curriculum, instructional and intervention decisions [206], and
- (b) providing successful staff development to assure the effective implementation of those decisions [206, and other experiences outside CSUS coursework].

Professional Perspective/Credential Level/ Item 2: You can apply research-based knowledge in the analysis of program strengths, weaknesses, and success in both reading and writing instruction. You can evaluate published instructional materials. [200, 202, 205, 206, 207]

Professional Perspective/Credential Level/ Item 3: You understand and can use knowledge of effective reading and language arts instruction, intervention, and curriculum in program planning. [203, 206, 207]

Professional Perspective/Credential Level/ Item 4: You have acquired an in-depth knowledge and understanding of specialized areas of study that influence and affect teaching and learning in the field of reading and language arts. [203, 205, and others]

Professional Perspective/Credential Level/ Item 5: You have research-based knowledge and in-depth understanding of how students from a variety of sociocultural and linguistic backgrounds learn to read and write. [202, 205, 207]

Appendix A  
**CSUS-RCCPAS EVALUATION FORM**

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date submitted:** \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_ **Program(s):** Reading Certificate  
 Reading Specialist Credential

Upon successful completion of all program coursework and the requirements of the RCCPAS, the language and literacy graduate program coordinator will provide copies of this completed form to Department Office (for the student's file), the Credentials Office, and to the candidate. In the event of a decision against the candidate, the faculty advisor and/or committee must include written recommendations for additional coursework and/or experiences that hold promise of supporting the candidate's growth toward the competency in question.

**SCORER'S JUDGMENT**

- 1 = Not Pass
- 2 = Pass
- 3 = Exceeds the standard

1. Clinical Experience.	1	2	3
2. Instructional Competencies:			
a. Instructional Competency: Fluency.	1	2	3
b. Instructional Competency: Comprehension and Composition.	1	2	3
c. Instructional Competency: Planning and Delivering Instruction based on Assessment.	1	2	3

3. Professional Perspectives:

Certificate Level

a. Professional Perspective/Certificate Level/Item 1.	1	2	3
b. Professional Perspective/Certificate Level/Item 2.	1	2	3
c. Professional Perspective/Certificate Level/Item 3.	1	2	3

Credential Level

a. Professional Perspective/Credential Level/Item 1:	1	2	3
b. Professional Perspective/Credential Level/Item 2:	1	2	3
c. Professional Perspective/Credential Level/Item 3:	1	2	3
d. Professional Perspective/Credential Level/Item 4:	1	2	3
e. Professional Perspective/Credential Level/Item 5:	1	2	3

**COMMENTS:**

**Faculty Signature and date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Candidate Signature and date:** \_\_\_\_\_

Appendix B  
**CSUS-RCCPAS ENTRY SLIP FORM 1 (Attached pages as needed)**  
**CLINICAL EXPERIENCES**

Analysis of the Evidence

**SCORER'S JUDGMENT**

1 = Not Pass

2 = Pass

3 = Exceeds the standard

<i>Clinical Experiences</i>	1	2	3
Beginning Reader	1	2	3
Struggling Reader	1	2	3
English Learner	1	2	3
Male	1	2	3
Female	1	2	3
Different Ethnicity	1	2	3
Older Reader	1	2	3

**CSUS-RCCPAS ENTRY SLIP FORM 2 (Attached pages as needed)**

Instructional Competency 1: Fluency

Analysis of the Evidence

SCORER'S JUDGMENT

1 = Not Pass

2 = Pass

3 = Exceeds the standard

<i>Fluency</i>	1	2	3
phonemic awareness, decoding			
word recognition	1	2	3
spelling	1	2	3
extensive practice with appropriate materials	1	2	3
capacity to promote wide, independent reading among children	1	2	3

Instructional Competency 2: Comprehension and Composition.

Analysis of the Evidence

SCORER’S JUDGMENT

1 = Not Pass

2 = Pass

3 = Exceeds the standard

<i>Reading comprehension</i>	1	2	3
academic language, background knowledge, concept formation, vocabulary development	1	2	3
narrative text structure, expository text structure, thinking and study strategies	1	2	3
independent reading of high quality books	1	2	3
<i>Written composition</i>	1	2	3
writing process strategies including sense of audience, planning, drafting, revising, and editing	1	2	3
writing assessment, including direct writing assessment models and portfolio models	1	2	3

Instructional Competency 3: Planning and Delivering Instruction based on Assessment.

Analysis of the Evidence

SCORER’S JUDGMENT

1 = Not Pass

2 = Pass

3 = Exceeds the standard

Overall Performance	1	2	3
Ongoing assessment and evaluation	1	2	3
Planning and delivery of appropriate reading and writing instruction	1	2	3

**CSUS-RCCPAS ENTRY SLIP FORM 3 (Attached pages as needed)**

**Certificate Level**

Professional Perspective/Certificate Level/ Item 1:

Analysis of the Evidence

SCORER'S JUDGMENT

1 = Not Pass

2 = Pass

3 = Exceeds the standard

Overall Performance	1	2	3
how children learn to read and write	1	2	3
the structure of the English language including phonology, morphology, orthography	1	2	3
second language acquisition	1	2	3
the relationships among language, spelling, reading, and writing	1	2	3
psychological and sociolinguistic aspects of reading and writing	1	2	3

Professional Perspective/Certificate Level/ Item 2: Research

Analysis of the Evidence

SCORER'S JUDGMENT

- 1 = Not Pass
- 2 = Pass
- 3 = Exceeds the standard

Overall Performance	1	2	3
---------------------	---	---	---

Professional Perspective/Certificate Level/ Item 3: Diversity

Analysis of the Evidence

SCORER'S JUDGMENT

- 1 = Not Pass
- 2 = Pass
- 3 = Exceeds the standard

Overall Performance	1	2	3
---------------------	---	---	---

**CSUS-RCCPAS ENTRY SLIP FORM 4 (Attached pages as needed)**

**Credential Level**

Professional Perspective/Credential Level/ Item 1: Leadership

Analysis of the Evidence

**SCORER'S JUDGMENT**

1 = Not Pass

2 = Pass

3 = Exceeds the standard

Overall Performance	1	2	3
making program, curriculum, instructional and intervention decisions	1	2	3
providing successful staff development to assure the effective implementation of those decisions	1	2	3

Professional Perspective/Credential Level/ Item 2: Curriculum and Instruction

Analysis of the Evidence

**SCORER'S JUDGMENT**

1 = Not Pass

2 = Pass

3 = Exceeds the standard

Overall Performance	1	2	3
---------------------	---	---	---

Professional Perspective/Credential Level/ Item 3: Program Planning

Analysis of the Evidence

SCORER'S JUDGMENT

- 1 = Not Pass
- 2 = Pass
- 3 = Exceeds the standard

Overall Performance	1	2	3
---------------------	---	---	---

Professional Perspective/Credential Level/ Item 4: Specialization

Analysis of the Evidence

SCORER'S JUDGMENT

- 1 = Not Pass
- 2 = Pass
- 3 = Exceeds the standard

Overall Performance	1	2	3
---------------------	---	---	---

Professional Perspective/Credential Level/ Item 5: Diversity

Analysis of the Evidence

SCORER'S JUDGMENT

- 1 = Not Pass
- 2 = Pass
- 3 = Exceeds the standard

Overall Performance

1

2

3

**CSUS-RCCPAS LETTER TO THE REVIEWER (Attached pages as needed)**