

STANDARD 1: CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND PROFESSIONAL DISPOSTIONS

1. What do candidate assessment data tell the unit about candidates' meeting professional, state, and institutional standards?

1a. Content Knowledge for Teachers

Candidates who complete both the initial and the advanced programs in education possess the knowledge to be effective educators. The unit relies on data from myriad sources to ascertain the effectiveness of its programs including course grades and core assessments, cumulative grade point averages (GPA), portfolio assessments, national certification or licensure tests, and field experience and clinical practice assessments. Exhibits 1.3.d, 1.3.f, 1.3.i and 1.3.j include data on grades, core assessments, national or state tests/assessments, samples of assessment rubrics and assignments for different programs at the initial and advanced levels, and candidate and graduate survey data.

Prior to admission to Professional Education, candidates for initial programs show competency in content subjects during General Education to gain admittance to each program and must maintain a particular cumulative GPA throughout their program. The average ACT score for initial applicants is 21.85 (Exhibit 1.3.d Institutional Research Data). The average GPA at admission to Professional Education during 2010-2011 was 3.23 for undergraduate and 3.79 for graduate (Exhibit 2.3.b).

The *Teacher Credential* unit assessment (TCC) for initial programs examines performance on four domains; planning, classroom environment, instruction, and professionalism using 22 criteria. Criteria that specifically assess content proficiency are 1 a, *Demonstrating Knowledge of Content* and 1d, *Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources*. During 2009-2010 100% of candidates met or exceeded expectations on both criteria. During 2010-2011 100% of K-12/Secondary (KSP) and Special Ed (SPED) and 98% of Elementary (EEC) candidates met or exceeded both criteria. Performance in prior field experiences shows developmental progression toward the high level of competence expected in student teaching (Exhibit 1.3.d EEC, KSP, SPED TCC Levels 2, 3, 4).

Content knowledge is confirmed with Praxis examinations (prior to 9/1/2010) and now the MTLE content examinations. Pass rates for content tests were above 82% except for Middle School Social Studies, which was closed (Exhibit 1.3.b Title II reports for 2009, 2010, 2011d). Pass rates for 2010-11 will be reported after submission of this year's Title II report. The Transition to Teaching Survey (TTS) is used to obtain outcome data from recent graduates of initial programs one year post graduation. Results indicate that graduates feel well-prepared to teach in their content areas (2011 =100%; 2010 = 98.9%). Responses also indicate that they feel well-prepared to identify clear subject matter learning goals (2011=100%; 2010= 96.9%) and to access the professional literature to expand knowledge about teaching and learning (2011= 91.3%; 2010= 100%) (Exhibit 1.3.i TTS).

Advanced graduate survey data in 2009 indicated that programs met expectations for all elements. Content knowledge was rated at 3.5 (on a 4-point scale) or above with (Exhibit 1.3.i – 2009 Results Advanced Graduate Programs). Advanced teacher programs use core assessments aligned to professional standards to assess candidates in their program (Exhibit 1.3.c Key Rubrics – Alignment Tables). Core assessments for content and results are shown in Exhibit 1.3.d Advanced Teacher Assessment of Standard 1 – Results. Each program has an assessment alignment chart describing results for core assessments that address content. The data results are reported in the fourth column of each alignment chart titled, *Program Assessment Results Summary* (Exhibit 1.3.d Phase II).

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teachers

Candidates demonstrate competency on the TCC and through observations and artifacts as part of core assessments from content methods for KSP or content pedagogy core assessments in EEC and SPED. TCC criteria that assess pedagogical content knowledge and skills are 3 a, *Communicating with Students* and 3b, *Using Questioning and Discussion*. During 2009-2010, 100% of

candidates met or exceeded expectations on both criteria. During 2010-2011 100% SPED, 99% of KSP and 98% of EEC candidates met or exceeded both criteria. Performance in prior experiences shows progression (Exhibit 1.3.d EEC, KSP, SPED TCC Levels 2, 3, 4). TTS results indicate that initial graduates feel well-prepared to teach in their content areas (2011 =100%; 2010 = 98.9%). Responses also indicate that they feel well-prepared to identify clear subject matter learning goals for students (2011=100%; 2010= 96.9%); reflect on data to inform instruction (2011 = 88.2%; 2010 = 88.5%).

Advanced graduate survey data in 2009 indicated that programs were meeting expectations for all elements. Element 1b- Content and Pedagogical Knowledge were rated at 3.5 or above (on a 4 point scale) (Exhibit 1.3.i – 2009 Results Advanced Graduate Programs). Core assessments for advanced programs and results are documented in Exhibit 1.3.d – Advanced Teacher Assessment of Standard 1 – Results. Each program has an assessment alignment chart that shows assessment results for pedagogical content knowledge and skills. The data results are reported in the fourth column of each alignment chart, *Program Assessment Results Summary* (Exhibit 1.3.d – Phase II).

1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teachers

Competency is shown through core assessments and nine criteria on the TCC including 1b – *Knowledge of Students*, 1c – *Instructional Outcomes*, 1d – *Knowledge of Resources*, 2c – *Classroom Procedures*, 2d – *Student Behavior*, 2e – *Physical Space*, 4a – *Reflecting on Teaching*, 4b – *Accurate Records*, and 4e – *Growing Professionally*. The percentage meeting or exceeding expectations is shown below. During both years 100% of SPED met or exceeded expectations on all criteria.

		1b	1c	1d	2c	2d	2e	4a	4b	4e
2009-10	KSP	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%
	EEC	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2010-11	KSP	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	100%	99%	100%	99%
	EEC	98%	99%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	97%	98%

Performance in prior experiences shows development (Exhibit 1.3.d EEC, KSP, SPED TCC Levels 2, 3, 4). Field experience charts in Exhibit 3.3.b show assessments that examine use of technology.

Advanced survey data in 2009 indicated that programs were meeting expectations for all elements. Items related to Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills were rated at 3.5 (out of 4) or above (Exhibit 1.3.i – 2009 Results Advanced Programs). Core assessments for advanced programs and results for each program are documented in Exhibit 1.3.d – Advanced Teacher Assessment of Standard 1 – Results. Specific core assessments that address professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are reported in the fourth column of each alignment chart, *Program Assessment Results Summary* (Exhibit 1.3.d – Phase II).

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

Data indicates that teacher candidates can assess and monitor student learning. TCC criteria that assess proficiency are: 1e – *Designing Instruction*, 1f – *Designing Assessments*, 3c – *Engaging Students*, 3d – *Using Assessments*. During all three years of data collection, 100% of SPED candidates met or exceeding expectations on all four criteria. During 2009-10 and 2011, 100% of KSP candidates met or exceeded expectations on all four criteria, while in 2010-11 99% met or exceeded criteria 1e, 1f, c and 100% met criteria 3d. During 2009, 100% of EEC candidates met or exceeded all criteria. During 2010 and 2011 100% of EEC candidates met or exceeded expectations on criterion 1f, 99% and 98 % met expectations on criteria 1c, 100% and 98% of candidates met criteria 1d, and 99% of EEC candidates

2010-11	KSP	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%
	EEC	98%	100%	98%	97%	98%	97%

using the *Showing Professionalism* assessment at all levels/blocks. Assessments on 15 criteria progress toward expected end of program proficiencies (Exhibit 1.3.d Showing Professionalism).

Core assessments for advanced programs are documented in Exhibit 1.3.d – Advanced Other School Professionals Assessment of Standard 1 – Results. Data that addresses dispositions are reported in the fourth column of each alignment chart, *Program Assessment Results Summary* (Exhibit 1.3.d – Phase II). KSP advanced teacher programs have also documented dispositions with the Advanced Showing Professionalism assessment (Exhibit 1.3.e Core Assessments).

2. Briefly summarize the most significant changes related to Standard One that have led to continuous improvement.

Rapid changes in expectations, assessments instruments, and assessment systems have occurred at multiple levels: institution, Bush partnership, state, and nation. These changes have challenged the unit and programs to collect and analyze across programs and time for continuous improvement decision making. This changing context heightens the need for aligned systems, accurate data, and effective processes that involve faculty in data-informed decision making for continuous improvement. This is an area for continued planning and growth.

The change from Praxis to MTLE data is requiring increased analysis and alignment of courses and assessments to the specifications for this test. The increased rigor of the MTLE tests has prompted faculty to join together to develop change in support systems to help our candidates pass. Additional support courses, digital modules, practice assessments, and one on one coaching have been implemented to improve student performance on this assessment. Faculty are developing alignment charts to analyze courses for changes to support increased candidate success.

The amount of data collected by all programs has increased dramatically, placing pressures on the data management system to adapt and change. Sometimes the request for data collection and analysis by programs was not possible due to constraints in the data management systems and their interface with university systems. Continuous improvement of SIMS was a key effort to address our data needs. When it became apparent that additional data analytical power was needed, we sought a new data management system. Following training in the new system, faculty will need to analyze, align, and load new core assessments in the system that will help them assess candidate’s knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Alignment of core assessments across the unit will be carefully reviewed.

In spite of constraints from the data system there are good examples of data analysis used for continuous improvement over the last three years by programs. The following data-driven changes were executed.

- Additional emphasis on writing in undergraduate and graduate programs
- Increased expectations for appropriate dress, grammar, and punctuality in licensure programs.
- Focus on improving faculty inter-rater reliability on assessments. We are not yet there but are clearly conscious of this need as well as the need to involve cooperating teachers in this process for reliability of field experience assessments. Studies of the inter-rater reliability of the Danielson Framework and newly adopted TPA have begun.
- Adopting the revised Danielson Framework and aligning the TPA rubrics with the Framework.
- Deepening alignment of the TPA with course work and field experiences and design of signature assessments in earlier experiences.

- Analysis of TPA tasks, rubrics, and student work samples shared by supervisors and faculty to improve assessment practices and changes in candidate support.
- Development of digital modules to support candidate learning and consistency of instructional support.
- Revised assessments as programs were redesigned to better match the competencies needed
- Focus on improving student competency in diversity in both undergraduate and graduate programs through increased opportunities to learn and be assessed. Increasing opportunities to assess integration of technology.
- Imbedding more opportunities to apply and assess diversity, research, and scholarly writing in graduate programs.
- Revisions in undergraduate course and field experience assignments to more closely align with the competencies we are measuring in our Danielson and TPA rubrics.
- Annual application to the Graduate School for a Research Assistants to execute changes in the data system, retrieve and analyzed reports, and work with faculty to produce reports analyzed by departments.
- Advocacy, investigation, and selection of a new data management system to improve data driven decision- making.

(Exhibits 1.3.d Core Assessments - KSP, Student teaching)

The TTS identified several areas for program strengthening, primarily in depth understanding the needs of diverse students and the wide range of student learning needs. Graduates felt less well-prepared to: design instruction for English Language Learners (2011 = 76.5%; 2010 = 56.9%); design instruction for students with emotional-behavioral needs (2011 = 64.7%; 2010 = 69.8%); identify clear subject matter learning goals for students (2011=100%; 2010= 96.9%); reflect on student data to inform instruction (2011 = 88.2%; 2010 = 88.5%. These areas are all addressed through the work of TPA and faculty have made changes to curriculum, field experiences, and expectations as a result. Anecdotal reports from TOSAs who work with student teachers show that they see a difference in the preparation of student teacher candidates. We expect to see those changes reflected in our future TTS results as well.

We have actively piloted the Teacher Performance Assessment for three semesters in student teaching and also in earlier preparation courses. As we increase our use of this content-based assessment, we are learning more about our candidates' content knowledge, content pedagogical knowledge, and pedagogical skills. TPA requirements provide rich, observable, reliable data on candidates' knowledge and skills. Candidates complete four tasks using 11 rubrics to assess planning, engagement of students, assessment, and reflection to improve learning for all students. The planning task was piloted in Fall 2010 with 89% passing. Spring 2011 included all four tasks and pass rates were 85%, 82%, 81%, and 81%, respectively. Fall 2011 pass rates on the four tasks were 93%, 90%, 91%, and 93% (Exhibit 1.3.d Student Teaching Grades).

To assure consistent student performance across programs, a common lesson plan was developed and adopted and will be revised again in May. To assure consistent, reliable application of this new assessment, digital modules were developed during Summer 2011 and used by student teachers and some earlier preparation candidates in Fall 2011 and Spring 2012. (Exhibit 1.3.d – Core Assessments – Student Teaching and KSP) (Exhibit 1.3.d Core Assessments – KSP and Exhibit 1.3.d Core Assessment – Student Teaching) The 11 rubrics contain elements that apply across content, pedagogical knowledge and skills, and dispositions. Alignment mapping to NCATE, SEPs, and Danielson Framework will occur in May 2012.

Plans

Two criteria in the Showing Professionalism assessment that have not reached the 90% benchmark are Professional Growth and Using Technology where proficiency was “not observed” in many cases. These are areas where the unit could provide closer scrutiny of candidates and develop new assessments. Clearer assessments and connections to instruction for diversity and technology are areas for continued growth. Plans to use the IDI and to analyze pre and post pilot data of candidate use of technology are underway.

The unit plans to adopt the revised Danielson Framework and align it with the TPA rubrics. Based on this work we will develop aligned signature assessments in earlier preparation experiences. Revision of the common lesson plan for the unit will happen in May 2012. To assure consistent understanding of pedagogical terminology, concepts, theories, and research-based strategies that need to be used appropriately in teaching and assessments, several Wikis are being developed for use by faculty and candidates.

Plans are in progress to add additional digital modules to assure consistency in instruction aligned with assessments in the areas of differentiation, assessment, co-teaching, mental health, and technology.