1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)

A. Five-year Review Planning Goals

The MS in Education, Option in Reading Instruction includes the State-issued Reading Certificate. CAEP accredits the MS and the Reading Certificate Program is accredited by CTC. Like all programs in our PreK-12 Professional Education Unit, we define goals/objectives biennially. Data is gathered every year. Every other year is an “Analytic Year,” in which two years of data are analyzed to determine Unit and Program improvement goals/objectives. The alternate year is an “Implementation Year,” in which program modifications are completed to meet the goals/objectives. 2013-2014 was an Implementation Year. Programmatic modifications were implemented, the most important of which were the re-design of the Reading Program to meet new CTC Reading standards. New goals/objectives will be defined this fall for the 2014-
2015 year.

B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress

- The following goals from 2012-2013 were implemented in 2013-2014:

  1) Program Standard Goal 1:
  The Reading Program was redesigned to meet the new CTC standards for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization
  • Objective RC/PSG 1.2
  This goal was met. Courses were revised to align to the new standards and a new Program Assessment Document was submitted to CTC in November, 2013.

  2) Program Standard Goal 2:
  Improve candidates’ ability to design and implement instruction for English learners that is drive by the results of assessment (1998 CTC Standards for the Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential, Standard 4: Planning and Delivery of Reading Instruction Based on Assessment; Standard 10: Cross-cultural Practice; and Standard 15: Preparation for Meeting the Reading and Writing Needs of All Students.
  • Objective RC/PSG 2.1 Consider changes to the course content of TED 6220 that will improve the ability of candidates to link assessment to instruction for English learners in their field experience assignments.
  This goal was partially met. Although the course content was revised to strengthen EL instruction, an insufficient number of English learners were available for the Reading Clinic.

  3) Program Standard Goal 3:
  Improve candidates’ ability to provide a coherent rationale for the lessons to be implemented during field experiences (1998 CTC Standards for the Reading Certificate and Reading and
• Objective RC/PSG 3.1 Consider alternative for improving candidates’ ability to provide sound rationales for the five-lesson sequence implemented in TED 6253. This goal was met. Candidates continued to earn high scores in providing a coherent rationale (mean 3.73).

Goals for 2014-2015
1) Improve candidates ability to promote a “culture of literacy”. The new CTC Reading and Literacy Added Authorization Standard 2 requires programs to instruct candidates on promoting a “culture of literacy”. A substantial effort has been made to include this new standard in course content. In 2014-2015 candidates will be assessed to determine whether progress has been made in meeting this CTC standard.

2) Demonstrate reliability of scoring of signature assessments in the Reading Program. The new CTC Reading and Literacy Added Authorization Standards require programs to demonstrate that instructors who score signature assessments are calibrated to ensure reliability. The Reading faculty has begun to grapple with this new requirement, meeting regularly to discuss signature assessments and to refine scoring rubrics. In 2014-2015 faculty will meet to jointly score signature assessments and to discuss scoring decisions for one or more courses in the program.

C. Program Changes and Needs
1) Improve Communication with the Chancellor’s Office
Sequoia Union High School District in Redwood City requested that we establish a Reading Program in that district in 2014-2015. Despite attracting 25 qualified applicants, we were not able to obtain permission from the Chancellor’s Office to expand our program into Redwood
City. We must learn how to work more effectively with the Chancellor’s Office in order to respond to the needs of school districts.

2) Explore the Possibility of Rotating the Reading Program between Districts
Because reading instruction is a highly specialized discipline, it is difficult to attract a full cohort of candidates from the same district/geographical area each year. It may be necessary to begin rotating the Reading Program between different districts each year. Next year, the program could be held in Redwood City and the following year in the East County (Pittsburg/Antioch). In three years the Reading Program could return to Pleasanton, where a demand for reading instruction would presumably have grown. Once again, this model will only be feasible if the we are able to work more effectively with the Chancellor’s Office.

3) Continue Alignment of the Reading Program with the Common Core State Standards, the new English Language Development Standards, and the new Smarter Balanced Assessment Program (currently being piloted in local schools).
Reading instruction has changed substantially since the introduction of the new Common Core State Standards (CCSS) currently being implemented in California’s K-12 public schools. The pilot testing of the new Smarter Balanced assessments, release of the new English Language Development (ELD) Standards, and the release of the draft Reading/Language Arts Framework have compounded the challenge. Reading Program professors have revised course content and have developed lectures and assignments aligned with the CCSS. Additional changes will be made to courses, particularly TED 6220 (Diversity), to align with the new ELD standards. The Reading Program faculty will need to carefully monitor changes made by the Commission in Teacher Credentialing, the California Department of Education, Smarter Balanced Assessments and in public school instruction to ensure relevance in a rapidly changing educational setting.

4) During the past decade of budget cuts in the public schools most Reading specialist positions were eliminated and few graduates of the Reading Program were hired for the jobs they were trained to do. However, budgets are expanding and Reading specialist positions appear to be
returning, albeit in altered form. For example, positions are opening in high schools, working with struggling secondary readers, particularly English learners. Reading specialists are also being hired as literacy coaches for schools and districts. Although all Reading positions require a deep understanding of literacy development, coaching teachers requires a different set of skills than working directly with students. Our candidates must be skilled in Reading development, literacy instructional methods, and adult learning theory. The Reading Program must carefully examine the needs of our local school districts, and design appropriate course content, to ensure that our program prepares candidates to be the literacy leaders of the future.
2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (about 1 page)

A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

*** MS in Education, Option in Reading Instruction ***

Program Specific Student Learning Outcomes

Candidates who graduate with the MS in Education, Option in Reading Instruction, will be able to:
(1) Demonstrate a thorough understanding of theory and research on an effective culture of literacy for diverse prekindergarten through high school students, their families, and communities;
(2) Demonstrate knowledge of research-based instructional practices in each component of literacy and the ability to assess, instruct, and provide intervention for each component of literacy instruction, including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language development, reading and listening comprehension, and vocabulary development, and writing;
(3) Successfully plan and implement a balanced literacy environment, including the selection and use of instructional materials, technology, routines, and strategies that are appropriately aligned with students’ assessed language and literacy needs; and
(4) Complete an action research project in the field of literacy, including a review of the research literature, planning and implementing an instructional unit, and an analysis of student learning and research results

Our candidates will:

UAO1: Demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions aligned with professional standards to implement universal design and research-based programs to achieve equitable learning outcomes.

UAO2: Demonstrate the ability to create environments, systems, and practices in which all
individuals are treated with respect, dignity, trust, and fairness.

UAO3: Work collaboratively with students, parents, and professional colleagues to achieve equitable learning outcomes and equitable environments.

UAO4: Know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

*** Attached as Appendix A: Correlation (Curriculum) Map: ILOs, UAOs, CTC Standards, National Accreditation Standards

*** Attached as Appendix B: Correlation (Curriculum) Map: ILOs and SLOs
Please list all outcomes in the box below, and append a curriculum map showing alignment of the Program Student Learning Outcomes and CSUEB Institutional Learning Outcomes.

B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

Unit Assessment Outcome (4) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Program Student Learning Outcome (2) Demonstrate knowledge of research-based instructional practices in each component of literacy and the ability to assess, instruct, and provide intervention for each component of literacy instruction, including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language development, reading and listening comprehension, and vocabulary development, and writing;
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C. Summary of Assessment Process

Signature assignments are administered in each of the Graduate Reading courses. Two of the assessments are discussed in this report. Candidates are assessed on their ability to design instruction for struggling readers in TED 6253 and their ability to identify student learning needs, administer assessments, and interpret assessments in TED 6231. Disaggregated data are used to evaluate program effectiveness and to inform program improvement.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

TED 6253 scores on the signature assignment, the Field Experience Report, declined overall (3.77 – 2012/2013 and 3.63 – 2013/2014) and in most rubric categories. This is most likely due to the fact that the field experience curriculum was changed during the summer of 2013 in response to student requests. Because the data indicate that the changes resulted in lower student achievement, the TED 6253 curriculum will return to the previous model in summer 2014.

The TED 6231 scores on the signature assignment, the Assessment Report were approximately the same in both years. All Graduate Reading Program professors focused on improving student reflections during the past year. This skill was considered an important professional disposition and a necessary precursor to the development of professional competence. Improvements in this skill were noted in both the signature assignments for both TED 6253 and TED 623.
3. STATISTICAL DATA

TED 6253 Reading Comprehension Field Experience Report
Rubric Component        Mean 2012-2013  Mean 2013-2014
Rationale for the Strategy 3.73          3.73
Description of the Students 3.87          3.80
Overview of the Unit               3.73          3.65
Assessment                           3.47          3.30
Content of Lessons               4.00          3.70
Instructional Effectiveness 3.73          3.48
Reflections                           3.67          3.75
Caliber of the Paper               3.93          3.60
Average Score Overall              3.77          3.63

TED 6231 Assessment Report
Rubric Component        Mean 2012-2013  Mean 2013-2014
Identification              4.00          3.53
Reason                           3.86          3.76
Observations              4.00          3.82
Assessment               4.00          3.71
Analysis               4.00          4.00
Interpretation             3.57          4.00
Summary                3.36          3.82
Reflections              3.71          4.00
Caliber                  3.82
Average Score Overall      3.82          3.83

The following table provides demographic data on Education candidates (not limited to those enrolled in the Graduate Reading Program).
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## Education Candidates 2009-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree Level</td>
<td>Degree Level</td>
<td>Degree Level</td>
<td>Degree Level</td>
<td>Degree Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity unknown</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident aliens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident aliens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The following table provides demographic information on the candidates enrolled in TED 6253 in the summer of 2013.

### Ethnicity of Graduate Reading Candidates, Summer 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree Level</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Degree Level</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Degree Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple ethnicity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity unknown</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident aliens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Appendix includes Curriculum Maps for the Graduate Reading Program
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## Appendix
### Graduate Reading Program Curriculum Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TED 6230</td>
<td>Reading Certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED 6220</td>
<td>Reading Certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED 6253</td>
<td>Reading Certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED 6231</td>
<td>Reading Certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED 6232</td>
<td>Reading Certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED 6250</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED 6020</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED 6901</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ILO TR

**Thinking and Reasoning:**

**SLO 1**

**Theory & Practice**

**Fluency Issues Project**
- Review an area of fluency research where there remains concern and/or controversy.
- Sign up for a topic from the list attached and find three scholarly articles about your topic.
- Provide a 2-3-page summary with a bullet point list and bibliography.

**SUMMARY ON THE LITERACY EDUCATION OF AFRICAN AMERICAN CHILDREN**
- Read the assigned research articles and lecture notes on the education of African American children.
- Write a two-three-page paper summarizing key points regarding the literacy education of African American children.

**Sequence of the Standards**
- Examine the Preschool Foundations (including ELD), California’s Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts, and ELD Standards.
- Write a paper, discussing the progression of skills in Reading Comprehension that students, including English learners, are expected to

**Site Based Data Analysis and Presentation**
- Analyze the data concerning literacy assessments for the students in a classroom and across grade levels.

**Intervention Program**
- Select a research-based program designed to address reading difficulties. Provide a description of the program, including its research base, key instructional methods, placement within the RTI\(^2\) process, sample materials, documented outcomes, feasibility (cost per student, class school, district, training, etc.), your own evaluation of program effectiveness.

**Research Project**
- Implement a research project based on the 5-minute vocabulary test with your class and analyze the results with the class, using SPSS. Write a paper describing the study, results, and implication of the research.

**Research Paper**
- Write a statement of the research question or project effort; a draft review of the literature; draft method section; draft data analysis section

**Action Research Final Paper**
- Write Data Analysis, Findings Section, Conclusions Professional Development Plan
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attain.

Download the article, “Reparable Harm Response” and write a summary and a reflection on the challenges of teaching English Learners. Post to the Discussion Board. Then read and respond substantively to five (5) other posts.

Native Language Report
Give an Oral Presentation of your report, emphasizing problems that NL students have learning to read in English and ways that teachers can help NL students acquire English language literacy.

Field Experience Report
Write a detailed report describing the instructional unit and analyzing how the student responded to instruction based on an analysis of pretest/posttest data.

Write field experience reports for parents and teachers of your clinic student.

Two Assessment Reports
Complete two in depth analysis of students’ literacy skills. Analyze the data and prepare a letter to the student’s parents and one to the teacher or literacy specialist.

Intervention Program Review & Presentation
Present a 15-minute overview of your program, using visual aids. Post copies of your paper in advance of the presentation.

Research Study Report (Oral presentation)
Select a literacy study from the What Works Clearinghouse (http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/). Present the following key points to the class: What was the study about? What was the setting (grade, location, type of students, duration) What was the intervention? What did the researchers find out?

Research Paper: Write a statement of the research question or project effort; a draft Review of the literature; draft method section; draft data analysis section

Write a Proposal or Grant
Class Presentation
Action Research Paper
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Download the article, *Reparable Harm* and write a summary and a reflection on the challenges of teaching English Learners. Post to the Discussion Board. Then read and respond substantively to five (5) other posts.

**Native Language Report**
Work with 3-4 classmates and select one of the native languages other than English (NL) spoken by children in California schools. Investigate the characteristics of the NL and compare the language to English. Identify problems that native speakers of the language may experience as they learn English and suggest methods that teachers can use to help students acquire English language literacy.

**Culture of Literacy Paper**
Write a paper describing the culture of literacy you have created in your classroom and school. Describe how you honor students’ diverse knowledge, skills, abilities, and backgrounds. Discuss your high expectations for student literacy achievement and how you increase student motivation to read.

**Informal Interview**
Conduct an interview to learn about how your student perceives himself as a person and as a reader. What does the student like about school, dislike? What are the student’s interests and abilities? Where does the student see him/herself in 2-3 years?

**Instructional Strategy Presentation**
Choose an instructional strategy that you will be incorporating into your intervention plan.
Locate a theoretical reference or foundations of the strategy and the target area/skills for use.
Identify the component steps of the strategy and the target area/skills for use.
Learn the strategy so that you can teach it to others.
Bring materials to demonstrate the strategy and if possible student work.

**Text Analysis and Strategy Selection:**
Work in a group of 3-4. Analyze professional practices discussion circle

**Standardized Reading Assessment Instrument Evaluation and Implementation**
Work in teams of 4. Locate a professional article or chapter in a research project

**Peer Review and Feedback of Research Paper**

*Created 5/2013*
Collaboratively

*Harm and write a summary and a reflection on the challenges of teaching English Learners. Post to the Discussion Board. Then read and respond substantively to five (5) other posts.*

Native languages other than English (NL) spoken by children in California schools.

Several passages from each of three texts. Identify text features that might impede students’ comprehension, and select strategies to support comprehension.

In groups of four review and use a standardized test that is distributed in class. These assessments will be available to you during your enrollment in the RLAA program. The evaluation will begin in class and will be concluded in the field. Prepare one report per group for presentation to the class.

Preparation

ILO SED Demonstrate expertise

Fluency Assessment
Plan Project
Design, Project

Field Experience Plan and implement lessons for one or more English learners (ELs) in

Field Experience Plan and implement a five-lesson unit for a struggling reader, focusing

Two Assessment Reports Complete two in depth analysis of

Intervention Project Implement a Reading/Language Arts intervention plan

Mini Literature Review Develop a research question about a literacy topic

Research Paper: Write a statement of the research question or project effort;

Action Research Final Paper: Write Data Analysis, Findings Section,
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SLO 2
Research-based practices

SLO 3
Balanced Literacy Environment

SLO 4
Action Research

Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Implementation, and assess research-based fluency lesson plans for primary level students.

The assignment can be completed with students at any grade level, Prek-12. The students must be designated English language learners (ELs) by their school district at a level less than proficient on reading comprehension.

Professional Development Workshop: Review school-wide assessment data on reading at your school site. Evaluate school literacy achievement and identify an area of need for the school. Design a professional development workshop for teachers at the school site.

Analyze the data collected. Provide a detailed analysis to the reader. Then discuss student’s reading strengths and difficulties based on specific information derived from the assessment battery and provide recommendations for reading instruction designed to improve achievement.

with one student based on the results of an IRI (expository) and phonics survey or case study from last quarter. Intervention will take place for a minimum of 10 hours over the course of the quarter.

You might want to investigate in your own classroom. Read six or more peer-reviewed research studies about the topic. Identify themes and write a synthesis of the research.

Point out the need for your proposed study.

Research Paper: Write a statement of the research

Action Research Final Paper: Write a draft review of the literature; draft method section; draft data analysis section

Conclusions Professional Development Plan
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question or project effort; a draft review of the literature; draft method section; draft data analysis section
Graduate Reading Program Curriculum and Assessment Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSES</th>
<th>ILO</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>3.4</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>3.6</th>
<th>3.7</th>
<th>3.8</th>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>4.2</th>
<th>4.3</th>
<th>4.4</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5.A1</th>
<th>5.A2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6230</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6220</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6231</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6232</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6020</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6901</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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