

## **IU School of Education – IUPUI**

### **2016-2017 PRAC Report**

The School of Education (SOE) has made major changes to its assessment system during the past year in preparation for a Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) accreditation visit during fall 2017. In the past, each program developed assessments aligned with their own national SPA standards. These assessments addressed many of the same topics but differed from program to program. With the adoption of the new CAEP standards, Educator Preparation Providers (EPP) were required to use assessments which were common across all programs as their key assessments. This required a major adjustment to the SOE's assessments. Therefore, many of our assessments were in the pilot stages during 2016-2017 and we were working on establishing validity and reliability for non-proprietary assessments. The SOE has adopted four key assessments for its teacher preparation programs in addition to state required licensure testing and surveys. The key assessments are Benchmark I, Lesson Planning, Benchmark IV and Student Teaching Final Evaluation-Part A. A description of each of these assessments, rubrics, data, reliability and validity information, and use of data follow. In addition, results from graduate and employer surveys are provided along with data on graduates' evaluations by their school corporations.

#### **Benchmark I - CAEP Standards 1.1, 1.3, 3.3, 5.1**

##### **InTASC Categories: Learner Development, Learning Differences, Content Knowledge, Professional Learning and Ethnical Practice, and Leadership and Collaboration Cross Cutting Theme Diversity**

The Benchmark I Rubric was used twice during each initial teacher education program to assess and provide continuing feedback to the candidates and EPP as the candidates progressed through the early stages of the program. At the end of Block I, all candidates were assessed by the team of faculty teaching a particular cohort of candidates during that block. Faculty meet together to discuss and evaluate each candidate using the Benchmark I rubric. The data were entered in a database and e-mails were sent to candidates summarizing their personal feedback. Candidates were encouraged to address areas of concern as they move into Block II. Reports were generated by program and shared with faculty at program meetings.

At the end of Block II, the Block II team of faculty revisited the Benchmark Rubric for each candidate. Feedback was given on candidates' progress on negative indicators from Block I and any new negative indicators that were noted by the Block II team. Improvements on negative indicators from Block I were also noted. Candidates were sent their feedback from Block I along with the new feedback from the Block II instructors noting continuing challenges and areas of professional growth. If candidates encounter problems in the program, their Benchmark I assessment data were used as a source of evidence when making decision about retention and/or reinstatement in the program. Aggregated data from this benchmark were used to evaluate programs and admission standards.

Since 2004, minor changes were made to the original rubric used for this Benchmark. A copy of the last version of the old rubric can be found later in this document. This old rubric was used through fall 2015 for all candidates in initial programs and for one option of elementary candidates during spring 2016. Because of changing accreditation requirements, the EPP designed a new rubric, for the benchmark, mapped to CAEP and InTASC standards. The rubric was created using the CAEP Evidence Guide. Target levels were established for each indicator on the rubric. The target levels will be elevated for some indicators when the EPP starts to use the new rubric at the end of Block II since there is anticipated professional growth in most of these areas from Block I through Block II. The new rubric was piloted during spring 2016 with one elementary and one secondary option. It was fully implemented during fall 2016. Because of the need to refine the rubrics, it has not been used at the end of Block II as with the old rubric. Use at the end of Block II will be phased in starting spring 2017.

### **Reliability and Validity:**

#### **Content Validity Study:**

Since a Benchmark I assessment had been used by the EPP faculty for many years, the format of the assessment was in place. At the end of each semester, the team of instructor for each Block I cohort meets to complete the Benchmark I rubric for each candidate. The candidate then receives feedback on this assessment as they enter Block II. In the past, the feedback was in the form of an email. With the EPP moving to house all assessments in Taskstream, the EPP wanted to have the feedback sent to the candidates directly from Taskstream. This necessitated the development of a new rubric to be used for Benchmark I.

The first step the EPP took was to design a new valid Benchmark I assessment grounded in the InTASC, CAEP, and new SPA standards. The InTASC and CAEP standards were indicated on the appropriate indicators of the rubric and the SPA standards were addressed in a mapping document. The EPP also relied upon experiences with the former Benchmark I assessment rubric to determine the appropriate indicators and the levels of proficiency. The initial draft of the rubric was developed by the Office of Program Evaluation and Assessment (OPEA), which had coordinated the Benchmark I assessment in the past.

The initial draft of the new rubric was reviewed with the Assessment Committee for feedback for revisions. General comments were also solicited from members of the Stakeholders group. A pilot of the new rubric was conducted and feedback from the instructional teams that piloted the new rubric was used to make modifications to the rubric.

#### **Predictive Validity Study:**

The EPP conducted a study to determine the predictive validity of the Benchmark I rubric. The study addressed the question of whether the Benchmark I Rubric was a good predictor of candidates' future success in the program. Average scores overall and on each indicator were used for the Benchmark I data. These data were obtained from Taskstream for the 73 elementary majors and 44 secondary/all-grade majors for which the Benchmark I was completed during the fall 2016 semester. This was the earliest semester the EPP had Benchmark I data using the new rubrics. Candidates' future success was then determined by the semester GPA for Block II completed during spring 2017. A Pearson R statistic was completed to compare the correlation of candidates' overall score on the Benchmark I and the Block II semester grades. A Pearson R test was performed also on candidates' scores for individual indicators of Benchmark I and their overall scores on the Benchmark I with the last nine

indicators under Professionalism omitted. These indicators were omitted as they address expected behaviors and were placed on the Benchmark I Rubric in order to emphasize their importance but were not tied to any state or national standards.

### Analysis of Data

“As a general rule, the higher the validity coefficient the more beneficial it is to use the test. Validity coefficients of  $r = .21$  to  $r = .35$  are typical for a single test. Validities for selection systems that use multiple tests will probably be higher because you are using different tools to measure/predict different aspects of performance, where a single test is more likely to measure or predict fewer aspects of total performance. The table below serves as a general guideline for interpreting test validity for a single test.” (<http://www.hr-guide.com/data/G362.htm>)

<b>Validity coefficient value</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
above .35	very beneficial
.21 - .35	likely to be useful
.11 - .20	depends on circumstances
below .11	unlikely to be useful

### Elementary

### Data

Elementary candidates take four teacher education courses along with two accompanying field experiences during Block II for 14 credit hours. Occasionally candidates may also take one special education course if they are enrolled in a dual program in special education.

Analysis of the relationship between the Benchmark I indicators and the Block II GPA indicated the use of the Benchmark I is “very beneficial” for the majority of individual indicators and the Benchmark I overall. The statistics for (1) Understanding of Block Content, (2) Content Knowledge, and (3) Cultural Awareness indicated the correlation was approaching a strong relationship. The relationship for (1) Critical Thinking Skills and (2) Professional Growth exceeded the criteria for a strong positive linear relationship. Understanding Learning and Learners, Dispositions Toward Content. Thoughtful & Responsive Listener, Reflective and Ability to Self-Assess had Pearson R values, which indicated a moderate positive relationship.

The relationship between the holistic average for all indicators and the Block II semester GPA was 0.358168, which supports that the use of the Benchmark I is “very beneficial.” However, when omitting the indicators at the end of the instrument which were not grounded in the InTASC Standards, the Pearson R value was 0.8967 which indicates a strong correlation between the Benchmark I Rubric and candidates’ future success in

the program. **These results support that the Benchmark I Rubric has a strong predicative correlations with candidates' future success in the program and is very beneficial to use.** .

### *Secondary/All-Grade*

Secondary/all-grade majors take three education courses along with one accompanying field experience courses for 10 credit hours. Additional courses may be taken in the content area during this semester. The data was not aggregated by program as this would results in a very small N. When additional benchmark data is available, an analysis will be done for each secondary and all-grade program.

Many of the indicators for the secondary/all-grade candidates had no deviation so a Pearson R could not be calculated on these indicators. The only indicator, which showed a moderate correlation, was the one addressing attendance with an R-value of 0.53287. The statistics supports the indicators for (1) Understanding of Block Content, (2) Understanding Learning and Learners, (3) Writing Skills, and (4) Professional Growth are "likely to be useful" even though the correlations of these individual indicators were very weak. However, the correlation between the overall Benchmark I average scores of individual candidates with their GPA in Block II was 0.480438 which is deemed "very beneficial" and is approaching a moderate positive relationship. The correlation was not as strong if the last nine indicators were removed from the calculations but was still deemed "very beneficial" to use.

Further investigation into the differences in the correlation between the Benchmark I and Block II GPAs to provide more insight into the causes for these differences is warranted. Some possible causes for the difference resulting from Initial discussions at a Teacher Education meeting in September were the expectations of elementary and secondary/all-grade faculty completing the Benchmark I, how the impact of taking non-education courses during Block II for secondary/all-grade candidates might impact the GPA, and how the Professional indicator are emphasized.

### Plans:

Once these candidates complete Block III in fall 2017, a similar study will be conducted to investigate further the correlation between scores on the Benchmark I Rubric and candidates' future success in the program. A similar study will be conducted with the Benchmark I Rubric and the Student Teaching Part A during spring 2018 when these candidates are completing their student teaching.

Additional studies using other cohorts will also be conducted to determine if the results from the first study are characteristic for other cohorts. The first of these studies will be done after the fall 2017 semester with the group of candidates who completed Block I during spring 2017.

When additional benchmark data is available so that data can be collapsed over multiple semesters to obtain larger Ns., an analysis will be done for each secondary and all-grade program.

See Data Below

<b>Elementary Proficiencies</b>	<b>Target Level</b>	<b>Indicator Average</b>	<b>Indicator Range</b>	<b>Pearson R value for Indicator</b>
<b>Understanding of Block Content</b> CAEP #1.1 & #1.3 InTASC #1	3.00	2.91	1.00-3.00	0.690169
<b>Understanding Learning and Learners</b> CAEP #1.1 InTASC #1	3.00	2.96	1.00-3.00	0.647844
<b>Believes all Learners Can Achieve</b> CAEP #1.1 InTASC #2	3.00	2.99	2.00-3.00	0.480184
<b>Designing Learning Experiences</b> CAEP #1.1 InTASC 2	3.00	3.00	3.00-3.00	*
<b>Fostering Communication</b> CAEP #1.1 InTASC 10,	3.00	3.03	3.00-4.00	0.124637
<b>Content Knowledge</b> CAEP #1.1 InTASC #4	3.00	2.97	2.00-3.00	0.683849
<b>Dispositions Toward Content Knowledge</b> CAEP #1.1 InTASC #4	3.00	2.94	1.00-3.00	0.63492
<b>Writing Skills</b>	3.00	2.97	1.00-4.00	0.454798
<b>Oral Skills</b>	3.00	3.00	3.00-3.00	*

<b>Thoughtful &amp; Responsive listener</b> CAEP #1.1, #3.3 InTASC #10	3.00	2.99	1.00-4.00	0.559277
<b>Critical Thinking Skills</b> CAEP #1.1, #3.3 InTASC #9	3.00	3.03	2.00-4.00	0.740888
<b>Reflective</b> CAEP #1.1, #3.3 InTASC #9	3.00	3.01	1.00-4.00	0.651552
<b>Cultural Awareness</b> CAEP #1.1, #3.3 InTASC #9	3.00	2.97	2.00-4.00	0.692013
<b>Professional Growth</b> CAEP #1.1, #3.3 InTASC #9 & #10	3.00	2.94	1.00-4.00	0.771632
<b>Respectfulness</b> CAEP #1.1, #3.3 InTASC #10	3.00	3.00	2.00-4.00	0.353872
<b>Attitude</b> CAEP #1.1, #3.3 InTASC #10	3.00	3.01	2.00-4.00	0.434368
<b>Ability to Self Assess</b> CAEP #1.1, #3.3 InTASC #9	3.00	2.99	2.00-4.00	0.614289
<b>Response to Feedback</b>	3.00	2.99	2.00-4.00	0.480184

<b>CAEP #3.3</b>				
<b>Attentiveness CAEP #3.3</b>	3.00	2.99	2.00-3.00	0.480184
<b>Participation CAEP #3.3</b>	3.00	2.81	2.00-4.00	0.360844
<b>Preparedness for class/Field CAEP #3.3</b>	4.00	3.94	1.00-4.00	0.471526
<b>Attendance CAEP #3.3</b>	4.00	3.91	1.00-4.00	0.178272
<b>Being on Time CAEP #3.3</b>	4.00	3.92	2.00-4.00	0.368514
<b>Work Habits CAEP #3.3</b>	4.00	3.78	1.00-4.00	0.592506
<b>Management Skills CAEP #3.3</b>	4.00	4.86	1.00-4.00	0.345917
<b>Professional Dress CAEP #3.3</b>	4.00	4.00	4.00-4.00	*
<b>All Indicators</b>				0.358168
<b>Indicators Above the Black Line</b>				0.8967

Secondary/All-Grade Proficiencies	Target Level	Indicator Average	Indicator Range	Pearson R value for Indicator
Understanding of Block Content CAEP #1.1 & #1.3 InTASC #1	3.00	2.98	2.00-3.00	0.279944
Understanding Learning and Learners CAEP #1.1 InTASC #1	3.00	2.98	2.00-3.00	0.279944
Believes all Learners Can Achieve CAEP #1.1 InTASC #2	3.00	3.00	3.00-3.00	*
Designing Learning Experiences CAEP #1.1 InTASC 2	3.00	3.00	3.00-3.00	*
Fostering Communication CAEP #1.1 InTASC 10,	3.00	3.00	3.00-3.00	*
Content Knowledge CAEP #1.1 InTASC #4	3.00	2.97	2.00-3.00	0.
Dispositions Toward Content Knowledge CAEP #1.1 InTASC #4	3.00	3.00	3.00-3.00	*
Writing Skills	3.00	2.80	1.00-3.00	0.279944
Oral Skills	3.00	3.00	3.00-3.00	*
Thoughtful & Responsive listener CAPE #1.1, #3.3 InTASC #10	3.00	3.00	3.00-3.00	*



<b>Critical Thinking Skills</b> CAEP #1.1. #3.3 InTASC #9	3.00	3.00	3.00-3.00	*
<b>3.00Reflective</b> CAEP #1.1, #3.3 InTASC #9	3.00	3.00	3.00-3.00	*
<b>Cultural Awareness</b> CAEP #1.1. #3.3 InTASC #9	3.00	3.00	3.00-3.00	*
<b>Professional Growth</b> CAEP #1.1, #3.3 InTASC #9 & #10	3.00	3.21	3.00-4.00	0.228238
<b>Respectfulness</b> CAEP #1.1, #3.3 InTASC #10	3.00	3.00	3.00-3.00	*
<b>Attitude</b> CAEP #1.1. #3.3 InTASC #10	3.00	3.00	3.00-3.00	*
<b>Ability to Self Assess</b> CAEP #1.1. #3.3 InTASC #9	3.00	3.00	3.00-3.00	*
<b>Response to Feedback</b> CAEP #3.3	3.00	3.00	3.00-3.00	*
<b>Attentiveness</b> CAEP #3.3	3.00	2.98	2.00-3.00	0.009073
<b>Participation</b>	3.00	2.98	2.00-3.00	0.009762

<b>CAEP #3.3</b>				
<b>Preparedness for class/Field CAEP #3.3</b>	4.00	3.89	2.00-4.00	-0.05994
<b>Attendance CAEP #3.3</b>	4.00	3.54	2.00-4.00	0.53287
<b>Being on Time CAEP #3.3</b>	4.00	3.91	1.00-4.00	-0.11831
<b>Work Habits CAEP #3.3</b>	4.00	3.98	2.00-4.00	*
<b>Management Skills CAEP #3.3</b>	4.00	3.72	2.00-4.00	-0.02537
<b>Professional Dress CAEP #3.3</b>	4.00	4.00	4.00-4.00	*
<b>All Indicators</b>				0.480438
<b>Indicators Above the Black Line</b>				0.385107









### Highlighted areas indicate correlations “very beneficial”

The EPP then investigated the validity of Benchmark I by having a panel of experts “map” the indicators to the InTASC standards. Two members of the Stakeholders group (a principal and a teacher) as well as a former block EPP faculty member and a faculty member/chair from another university were given a document with the indicators from the rubric that had been mapped to the InTASC standards. The level of proficiencies for each indicator were provided also but the document did not contain any references to the InTASC standards. The panel was also given a copy of the InTASC standards. The panelists were asked to read each indicator and determine which InTASC Standard the indicator was addressing. They were also given the opportunity to make comments for each indicator. Completed forms were collected and compiled by the OPEA and the results were shared with the Assessment Committee.

### Results of Panel Review:

The panelists’ standard selections were compiled for each indicator to determine the level of agreement with the InTASC standard for which the indicator was designed to evaluate. Of the 14 indicators of the Benchmark I rubric mapped to the InTASC standards, six had 100% agree with the alignment of the indicator to the standards for which they were designed. These indicators were: (1) Understanding Learning and Learners, (2) Believes all Learners Can Achieve, (3) Content Knowledge, (4) Reflective, (5) Professional Growth and (6) Ability to Self Assess.

Four additional indicator had three of the four reviewers agreeing on the standard being assessed. These indicators were: (1) Designing Learning Experiences, (2) Thoughtful & Responsive Listener, (3) Respectfulness, and (4) Attitude.

Four of the indicators had 50% agreement. For the indicator Fostering Communication, the phrase “members of the learning community” seemed to be interpreted in different ways. The intent of the indicator was to assess the communications with teachers, colleagues and peers, which is InTASC Standard 10. Two of the reviewers interpreted that to mean communications within the classroom. Although the intent of the indicators is discussed during Benchmark I deliberations, modification of the wording was warranted.

Two other indicators where there was 50% agreement were those addressing critical thinking skills and cultural awareness. Again the intention was to address the candidates’ critical thinking skills and their own personal cultural awareness. Both of these indicators were mapped to InTASC Standard 9. Feedback supported that some of the reviewers interpreted these indicators to be addressing the candidates’ ability to support and develop Critical Thinking Skills and Cultural Awareness in their students. Clarification was warranted for both indicators.

The last indicator with a 50% agreement was the indicator addressing Dispositions toward Content Knowledge, which addresses InTASC Standard 4. The confusion seemed to be the meaning of the term “content knowledge.” Two reviewers seemed to interpret that to mean the candidates’ pedagogical knowledge. The phrase “culturally situated aspect of the content areas” seemed to confuse two of the reviewers. This result was not surprising, as this indicator often needs further explanation during the Benchmark I meetings each semester. Modification of the wording was warranted.

### Recommendations based on Panel Review:

The results of this validity study support that minor changes in the wording of the four indicators with 50% agreement are warranted. These changes need to be addressed by the Assessment Committee prior to using the rubric in spring 2018.

### Data Findings

During fall 2016, all candidates were assessed using the new rubric. The report can be found at Benchmark I Fall2016 Data-InTASC Standards in the Benchmark I file. For InTASC Standard 1: Learner Development, average scores ranged from 2.86 to 3.00 across all programs with an overall average of 2.97/4. For InTASC Standard 2: Learning Differences, all candidates averaged a 3.00/4, which is target for Block I. The average scores for InTASC Standard 4 ranged from 2.86 – 3.00 across all program with an overall average of 2.98/4. InTASC Standard 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice: ranged from 2.94 to 3.50 with the majority of program averages being at or above the 3.00 target level. For InTASC Standard 10: Leadership and Collaboration, average scores for the programs ranged from 2.94 – 3.00 with the majority being 3.00, which is target.

### Using Data

The purpose of the Benchmark I Assessment has always been to identify and support our candidates at the end of the first semester of the program so they might complete their program of study and ultimately be effective educators. The Benchmark I Assessment has been a reliable tool that has indeed helped us to identify early struggles in the areas of Knowledge and Habits of Mind, Written and Oral Communication, Interactions with Teachers and Students, and Dispositions and Professional Behavior and now in the areas addressed by InTASC Standards 1, 2, 4, 9, and 10. However, we came to realize that we needed to more consistent in the use the results of this assessment to support our candidates. Longitudinal data have shown that interns with five or more negative indicators normally do not complete the program. In order to make better use of the Benchmark I data, we recently added a policy to follow up more rigorously with candidates when they receive a number of negative indicators or score below target in many areas. Our new policy requires that a candidates with three or more indicators below target will be assigned a mentor faculty member. The mentor then works with the candidate to help the candidate to address the areas of concern during the next one or two semesters. By providing this early intervention support, we hope to insure that candidates are better prepared to enter and be successful in their student teaching experience and then go on to be successful in the teaching profession.

### New Rubric for Benchmark I



The new rubric was piloted during spring 2016 and fully implemented during fall 2016. The target level for each proficiency is highlighted in blue. Starting spring 2017, candidates will receive individualized rubrics through TaskStream that are completed by their Block I instructors. Starting fall 2017, a follow-up to Benchmark I will be completed by the Block II teams and shared with the candidates as the old version of the rubric is phased out. The some target levels will be elevated for the Block II assessment. The new rubric is in TaskStream and program reports are generated for Benchmark I for each programs at the end of the semester.

<b>The Learner and Learning</b>				
Proficiencies	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Understanding of Block Content  CAEP #1.1 & #1.3	Demonstrates serious misconceptions about main ideas taught in the block.	Demonstrates some understanding of the main ideas taught in the blocks but lacks understanding in some key areas	Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the main ideas taught in the block.	Demonstrates a deep understanding of the main ideas taught in the block.
Understanding Learning and Learners  CAEP #1.1 InTASC #1	Does not demonstrate an understanding of learners' differences and the use of this information to support learners' growth	Is aware of learners' differing strengths and areas for growth but struggles using the information to support learners' growth	Is aware of learners' differing strengths and areas for growth and how to use the information to support learners' growth but struggles to take responsibility for that growth	Respects learners' differences and uses this information to support learners' growth and development. Takes responsibility for understanding learners' experiences to support their development.
Believes all Learners Can Achieve  CAEP #1.1 InTASC #2	Does not demonstrate a belief that all learners can achieve at a high level and always views learners from a deficit model	Demonstrate a belief that most learners can achieve but sometimes views learners from a deficit model	Demonstrate a belief that all learners can achieve and does not view learners from a deficit model but does not always persist in helping each learner reach his/her full potential	Believes that all learners can achieve at high levels and persists in helping each learner reach his/her full potential.

<p>Designing Learning Experiences</p> <p>CAEP #1.1</p> <p>InTASC 2</p>	<p>Does not demonstrate an ability to design developmentally appropriate learning experiences</p>	<p>Designs developmentally appropriate learning experiences but does not document the learning with artifact of learning or assessment tools.</p>	<p>Designs developmentally appropriate learning experiences and attempts to document student growth</p>	<p>Designs developmentally appropriate learning experiences and attempts to document student growth</p>
<p>Fostering Communication</p> <p>InTASC 10,</p>	<p>Does not participate in respectful communications with members of the learning community that includes peers and instructors or may interact in a disrespectful manner.</p>	<p>Is a thoughtful and responsive listener and observe but only participates in communications when initiated by others</p>	<p>Seeks to foster some respectful communication with some members of the learning community but does not reach out to all members</p>	<p>Seeks to foster respectful communication among all members of the learning community and is a thoughtful and responsive listener</p>
<p>Content Knowledge</p>				
<p>Content Knowledge</p> <p>CAEP #1.1</p> <p>InTASC #4</p>	<p>Lacks essential content area knowledge. Makes content errors; does not recognize errors made by students.</p>	<p>Displays basic content knowledge; sometimes fails to make connections between and among concepts</p>	<p>Displays solid content knowledge and makes connections among central concepts within the discipline with other disciplines</p>	<p>Displays extensive content knowledge and makes clear and meaningful connections to other concepts and disciplines</p>
<p>Dispositions Toward Content Knowledge</p> <p>CAEP #1.1</p> <p>InTASC #4</p>	<p>Does not demonstrate knowledge of the complexity and culturally situated aspects of the content areas he/she is preparing to teach. Is unaware of possible bias in the educators representations of the discipline</p>	<p>Demonstrates some knowledge of the complexity and culturally situated aspects of the content areas the educator is preparing to teach but does not seem to recognize potential for bias.</p>	<p>Demonstrates adequate knowledge of the complexity and culturally situated aspects of the content areas the intern is preparing to teach and recognizes potential for bias. No evidence that the intern keeps abreast of new ideas and understandings in the field.</p>	<p>Realizes that content is not a fixed body of facts but is culturally situated. The intern keeps abreast of new ideas and understandings in the field. Recognizes the potential for bias in his/her representations and seeks to approach problems of bias.</p>

<b>Written and Oral Skills</b>				
Writing Skills	<p>Writing may show improvement, but the quality is still an area of serious concern.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Underdeveloped content.</li> <li>➤ Language problems.</li> <li>➤ Underdeveloped organization.</li> <li>➤ Requires rereading and filling in gaps.</li> <li>➤ Many mechanical errors.</li> </ul>	<p>No major mechanical errors but struggles to express ideas</p> <p>Needs to work on making writing more fluent, concise, and well organized</p>	<p>No major mechanical errors or structural concerns but needs to continue to work on depth of writing</p>	<p>Competent writing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Insightful, solid</li> <li>➤ Appropriate language</li> <li>➤ Good organization</li> <li>➤ Fluent.</li> <li>➤ Concise.</li> <li>➤ Few mechanical errors</li> </ul>
Oral Skills	<p>Normally speaks in an unclear and difficult to hear voice. Has trouble expressing ideas clearly when speaking.</p>	<p>Sometimes struggles to express ideas clearly when speaking - Does not always speak in a clear and easily heard voice</p>	<p>Usually expresses ideas clearly, when speaking Does speak in a clear and easily heard voice.</p>	<p>Strong verbal communication</p> <p>Expresses ideas clearly and speaks in a clear voice.</p>
<b>Professional Responsibility</b>				
<p>Thoughtful &amp; Responsive listener</p> <p>CAPE #1.1, #3.3</p> <p>InTASC #10</p>	<p>Does not demonstrate the ability to thoughtfully listen &amp; respond to other's insights, needs, &amp; concerns, e.g. asks questions, summarizes points, etc.</p>	<p>Struggles to demonstrate the ability to thoughtfully listen &amp; respond to other's insights, needs, &amp; concerns, e.g. asks questions, summarizes points, etc.</p>	<p>Usually demonstrates the ability to thoughtfully listen &amp; respond to other's insights, needs, &amp; concerns, e.g. asks questions, summarizes points, etc.</p>	<p>Consistently demonstrates the ability to thoughtfully listen &amp; respond to other's insights, needs, &amp; concerns, e.g. asks questions, summarizes points, etc.</p>

<p>Critical Thinking Skills</p> <p>CAEP #1.1. #3.3</p> <p>InTASC #9</p>	<p>Consistently does all or almost all of the following:</p> <p>Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information, or the points of view of others. Fails to identify or hastily dismisses salient arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con. Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view. Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons, and unwarranted claims. Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions. Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason.</p>	<p>Does most or many of the following:</p> <p>Misinterprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.  Fails to identify salient arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.  Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view.  Justifies few results or procedures, seldom explains reasons.  Regardless of the evidence or reasons maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.</p>	<p>Does most or many of the following:</p> <p>Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.  Identifies relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.  Offers analyses and evaluations of obvious alternative points of view.  Justifies some results or procedures, explains reasons.  Fairmindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead.</p>	<p>Consistently does the following:</p> <p>Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.  Identifies the salient arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.  Thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates major alternative points of view.  Draws warranted judgments and avoids fallacious conclusions.  Justifies key results and conclusions, explains assumptions.  Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>Reflective CAEP #1.1, #3.3 InTASC #9</p>	<p>Does not demonstrate a willingness to suspend initial judgments, be receptive of a critical examination of multiple perspectives, generate effective/productive options, make reasoned decisions with supporting evidence, makes connections to previous reading/courses/experience, etc.</p>	<p>Struggles to demonstrate a willingness to suspend initial judgments, be receptive of a critical examination of multiple perspectives, generate effective/productive options, make reasoned decisions with supporting evidence, makes connections to previous reading/courses/experience, etc.</p>	<p>Usually willing to suspend initial judgments, receptive of a critical examination of multiple perspectives, generate effective/productive options, make reasoned decisions with supporting evidence, makes connections to previous reading/courses/experience, etc.</p>	<p>Consistently willing to suspend initial judgments, receptive of a critical examination of multiple perspectives, generate effective/productive options, make reasoned decisions with supporting evidence, makes connections to previous reading/courses/experience, etc.</p>
<p>Cultural Awareness CAEP #1.1. #3.3 InTASC #9</p>	<p>Fails to incorporate a broad perception of cultural &amp; social diversity. Fails to communicate the owner's insight and ownership of a personal meaning of diversity (avoiding clichés). Fails to demonstrate personal growth and/or a commitment to the positive practice of diversity in everyday life.</p>	<p>Incorporates a perception of cultural &amp; social diversity and occasionally communicates the owner's insight and ownership of a personal meaning of diversity (avoiding clichés). Does not demonstrate demonstrates both personal growth and a commitment to the positive practice of diversity in everyday life. Shows some acceptance of differing attitudes related to diversity in everyday life</p>	<p>Adequately incorporates a broad perception of cultural &amp; social diversity and communicates the owner's insight and ownership of a personal meaning of diversity (avoiding clichés). Demonstrates both personal growth and a commitment to the positive practice of diversity in everyday life. Shows some acceptance of differing attitudes related to diversity in everyday life</p>	<p>Is committed to developing a broad perception of his/her own frames of reference (culture, gender, language, etc.) and their relationship to the frames of knowing), the positive practice of diversity in everyday life, and their relationship to the positive practice of diversity in everyday life. Sees him/herself as a learner who continuously seeks to learn and draw upon current research as source of reflection to improve practice.</p>
<p>Professional Growth</p>	<p>Does not demonstrate a commitment to continuous learning including curiosity, creativity and flexibility</p>	<p>Attempts to demonstrate a commitment to continuous learning but does not include curiosity, creativity and/or flexibility</p>	<p>Demonstrates a commitment to continuous learning including curiosity, creativity and flexibility</p>	<p>Takes initiative to work with colleagues to enhance practice and learning. Embraces the challenge of improvement and</p>

CAEP #1.1, #3.3 InTASC #9 & #10				
Respectfulness CAEP #1.1, #3.3 InTASC #10	Does not show due courtesy & consideration for people & ideas nor demonstrates sensitivity with respect to language use with peers and instructors	Occasionally does not show due courtesy & consideration for people & ideas or does not demonstrate sensitivity with respect to language use with peers and/or instructors	Usually shows due courtesy & consideration for people & ideas; demonstrates sensitivity with respect to language use	Is aware and always shows due courtesy & consideration for people & ideas; demonstrates sensitivity with respect to language used with peers and instructors
Attitude CAEP #1.1. #3.3 InTASC #10	Has the tendency to be negative and/or blames problems on others.	Sometimes demonstrates a caring, cooperative, and respectful attitude toward others Sometimes demonstrates safe behavior but occasionally demonstrates a negative attitude and/or blames others	Demonstrates a caring, cooperative, and respectful attitude toward others Demonstrates safe behavior Does not blame others for problems but struggles to be positive under challenging circumstances	Demonstrates a caring, cooperative, and respectful attitude toward others Demonstrates safe behavior on the positive under challenging circumstances.
Ability to Self Assess CAEP #1.1. #3.3 InTASC #9	Misjudges personal strengths or weaknesses when self-assessing. Little self-disclosure, minimal risk in connecting concepts from class to personal experiences Self-disclosure tends to be superficial and factual, without self reflection	Struggles to understand concepts but examines somewhat cautiously own experiences in the past as they relate to the topic. Sometimes defensive or one-sided in analysis Does not ask probing questions about self	Seeks to understand concepts by examining openly own experiences in the past as they relate to the topic, to illustrate points you are making. Demonstrates an open, non-defensive ability to self-appraise discussing both growth and frustration as they related to learning in class Struggles to ask probing questions about self and struggles seeking to answer these	Seeks to understand concepts by examining openly own experiences in the past as they relate to the topic, to illustrate points you are making. Demonstrates an open, non-defensive ability to self-appraise discussing both growth and frustration as they related to learning in class Frequently asks probing questions about self and struggles seeking to answer these, Accurately assesses strengths or weaknesses when self-assessing

Response to Feedback CAEP #3.3	Does not view constructive feedback and situations maturely nor analyze feedback and makes appropriate adjustments Defensive toward feedback and blames others for problems	Struggles to view constructive feedback and situations maturely Does not analyze feedback and makes appropriate adjustments	Usually views constructive feedback and situations maturely; Attempts to analyze feedback and makes appropriate adjustments	Consistently views and situations maturely and makes appropriate adjustments
Attentiveness CAEP #3.3	Frequently inattentive in class and is involved in activities that affect the attention of others. (sidebar, etc.)	Frequently inattentive in class but does not affect the attention of others	Attentive during most class activities and discussion	Attentive during class discussions.
Participation CAEP #3.3	Rarely take an active role in own learning. Intern often does not participate and rarely share ideas or ask questions. Displays poor listening skills, and may be intolerant of the opinions of others. As a result of being unprepared for or disengaged from class, intern often refuses to offer ideas even when called upon.	Sometimes takes an active role in own learning, sharing relevant ideas and asking appropriate questions. Although reluctant to take risks, the intern contributes occasionally to class discussions, listens to classmates, and respect their opinions. The intern's contributions are usually informed by preparation, although occasionally the intern is caught unprepared	Consistently take an active role in own learning. The intern participates regularly in class discussions and frequently volunteer ideas, asks thoughtful questions, and defends opinions. The intern listens respectfully to classmates and is willing to share ideas because of having completed assignments.	Takes a voluntary, active role in own learning in class discussions and asks thoughtful questions and the intern demonstrates careful, thoughtful listening and makes insightful and meaningful contributions.
Preparedness for class/Field CAEP #3.3	Rarely, if ever, well prepared for class; e.g., evidence of completed reading/assignments and engagement of reading materials - written notes, questions, other responsibilities Does not come to field prepared	Occasionally well prepared for class/; e.g., evidence of completed reading/assignments and engagement of reading materials - written notes, questions, other responsibilities Does not come to field prepared	Usually well prepared for class/; e.g., evidence of completed reading/assignments and engagement of reading materials - written notes, questions, other responsibilities Comes to field prepared	Consistently well prepared for class/; e.g., evidence of completed reading/assignments and engagement of reading materials - written notes, questions, other responsibilities Comes to field well prepared
Attendance CAEP #3.3	Misses 3 or more days worth of classes.			Attends class regularly
Being on Time	Numerous tardies/early	Several tardies/early	Few tardies/early	Timely and consistent

CAEP #3.3	departures	departures	departures	presence in class/
Work Habits CAEP #3.3	Regularly turns in late assignments. Does not correspond with instructor about lateness Makes little effort to make up work.	Turns in some late assignments Does correspond with instructor about lateness Turn in assignments more than a week late	Turns in some late assignments Does correspond with instructor about lateness Takes responsibility for making up work.	Meets deadlines.
Management Skills CAEP #3.3	Lacks time management skills resulting in a negative impact on learning, academic performance, and/or professionalism	Struggles with time management skills at times resulting in a negative impacts on learning, academic performance, and/or professionalism	Struggles with time management skills at times but it does not have a negative impact on learning, academic performance, and/or professionalism	Has good time ma
Professional Dress CAEP #3.3	Grooming or dress is often inappropriate.	Dress acceptable but not always professional	Dress appropriate but not always professional	Neatly, appropriat professional mann

### **Lesson Planning - CAEP Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 5.1**

**InTASC Categories: Learning Differences, Content Knowledge, Application of Content, Assessment, Planning for Instruction, Professional Learning and Ethnical Practice**

#### **Cross Cutting Theme: Diversity and Technology**

Prior to fall 2016, candidates' skills and knowledge relating to lesson planning were assessed as part of a class activity. Individual rubric were developed for each program that addressed the appropriate SPA standards. During spring 2016, the Evaluation Committee undertook the task of developing a new lesson plan rubric to be used across all programs. One faculty member from the secondary and one from the elementary programs developed the first draft of the rubric to address the skills, knowledge, and disposition that pertained to lesson planning that would be common across all programs. Once this rubric (Part A) is ready for implementation, the faculty in each program will be asked to design a Part B to the assessment to address the skills, knowledge, and dispositions specific to the content area.



It was decided that the rubric would be used at the end of Block II. Much like the Benchmark I, the team of instructors from Block II would meet and jointly complete a rubric for each candidate in their option. The rubric was piloted during fall 2016 with one secondary and one elementary option. The completed rubric was not shared with the individual candidates during fall 2016 as the faculty felt it needed to be refined more before it became high stakes.

### **Reliability and Validity:**

#### Study on Content Validity – Panel of Experts

Three experienced teacher educators were part of a panel asked to review the Lesson Planning Rubric for validity. Two members were faculty member at another IU School of Education and one was an education faculty from IUPUI who had not reviewed the rubric previously. Each member of the panel was given a document with the indicators from the rubric. The levels of proficiencies for each indicator were provided but the document did not contain any references to the InTASC standards. The panel was also given a copy of the InTASC standards. The panelists were asked to read each indicator and determine which InTASC standard the indicator was addressing. They were also given the opportunity to make comments for each indicator. Completed forms were collected and compiled by the OPEA and the results were shared with the Assessment Committee.

#### Results of Panel Review:

All members of the panel felt that the rubric addressed InTASC standard 2 with the indicators “Leverages learners differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, abilities, perspectives, talents and interests as tools for learning” and “Incorporates race, language and dialects into lesson and integrates them into his/her instructional plan as a way to engage students in learning. InTASC Standard 6 was mapped to “Uses *evidence gathered* on learners’ diverse strengths and needs and is committed to using this information to plan effective instruction” and “Uses assessments that match learning objectives with assessment methods and minimizes sources of bias that can distort assessment results” by all three panelists as well. There was 100% agreement that the indicator “Plans opportunities for learners to question and challenge assumptions and approaches in order to foster innovation and problem solving in local and global contexts” was addressing InTASC Standard 5. InTASC Standard 8 was selected for “Uses a range of evidence-based instructional strategies, resources to plan complex instruction that meets diverse learning needs” by all three panelists. InTASC Standard 9 was a unanimous choice for “Challenges and deepens his/her own frame of reference (e.g. culture, gender, language, abilities, ways of knowing) the potential biases in these frames, and their impact on expectations for and relationships with learners and their families.” Two of the panelists selected InTASC Standard 4 for “Creates opportunities for learners to apply methods of inquiry to learn disciplinary content” while the other panelist selected InTASC Standard 5 for this indicator.

The only indicator resulting in differing opinions was “Connections to prior and subsequent learning/experiences to inform instruction and support student centered culturally relevant learning and are grounded in the theoretical framework of the program are included.” Two of the panelist selected InTASC Standard 4 or 7 but one panelist selected InTASC Standard 1. Standard 1 was selected because of the phrase “includes prior knowledge of learners” while Standard 4 was selected because of the indicator stating the instruction should be grounded in the theoretical framework of the program.

### Recommendations based on Panel Review:

The results of the Panel Review strongly supports that the Lesson Planning Rubric addressed the InTASC standards for which it was developed. All but one indicator clearly addresses the appropriate InTASC Standard indicated on the rubric. Minor changes to the wording of this indicator may be warranted and will be addressed by the Assessment Committee prior to spring 2018.

### **Findings**

Thirty-seven elementary candidates, two secondary English, one secondary math candidate, and 10 secondary social studies candidates participated in the pilot during fall 2016. Program averages ranged from 2.80 – 4.00 with a Level 3 being the target level for candidates at the end of the second block of a four-block program. Candidates in the all-grade physical education program scored above average for all criteria except “creating opportunities for learner to apply methods of inquiry to learn disciplinary content” (InTASC 4, 7) (avg.=2.83) and “incorporating race, language and dialects into lesson and integrating them into the instructional plan as a way to engage student in learning” (InTASC 2) (avg. = 2.83). Further investigation into how the nature of the discipline might impact these criteria is warranted.

The two visual art candidates scored above target on all criteria with averages that ranged from 3.00 to 4.00 on a 4-point scale.

Overall, the elementary candidates had averages slightly below the target for most criteria. The averages ranged from 2.57 to 3.11 with only one criteria having an average above the target. This bring into question the reliability of the rubric across programs and how the need to complete lesson plans for a variety of content areas might impact how the candidates are scored on this rubric.

The secondary English and secondary math candidates scored very well on this assessment. The averages for the two secondary English candidates ranged from 3.50 to 4.00, which is well above the target of 3.00. The one math candidates also scored at or above the target on all criteria with a range of 3.00 – 4.00. The 10 secondary social studies candidates had aggregated averages that ranged from 2.80 to 3.50. The only criteria where they scored below target was a 2.80 on “incorporating race, language and dialects into lesson and integrating them into their instructional plan as a way to engage students in learning” (InTASC 2)

### **DATA**

<b>Rubric Criteria</b>	<b>Folio Area</b>	<b>Authors evaluated</b>	<b>Average for Group (Raw)</b>	<b>Average for Group (%)</b>
Lesson Plan – Rationale: Creates opportunities for learners to apply methods of inquiry to learn disciplinary content. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 4, 7)	All Grade Physical Education: Lesson Plan Assessment	6	2.83/4	70.83

Lesson Plan – Rationale: Uses evidence gathered on learners’ diverse strengths and needs and is committed to using this information to plan effective instruction. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7)	All Grade Physical Education: Lesson Plan Assessment	6	3.33/4	83.33
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Uses a range of evidence-based instructional strategies, resources to plan complex instruction that meets diverse learning needs CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7)	All Grade Physical Education: Lesson Plan Assessment	6	3.50/4	87.5
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Uses assessments that match learning objectives with assessment methods and minimizes sources of bias that can distort assessment results. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 6)	All Grade Physical Education: Lesson Plan Assessment	6	3.33/4	83.33
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Plans opportunities for learners to question and challenge assumptions and approaches in order to foster innovation and problem solving in local and global contexts CAEP 1.1; InTASC 5)	All Grade Physical Education: Lesson Plan Assessment	6	3.50/4	87.5
Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Leverages learners differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, abilities, perspectives, talents and interests as tools for learning. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 2)	All Grade Physical Education: Lesson Plan Assessment	6	3.50/4	87.5
Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Incorporates race, language and dialects into lesson and integrates them into his/her instructional plan as a way to engage students in learning. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 2)	All Grade Physical Education: Lesson Plan Assessment	6	2.83/4	70.83

Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Challenges and deepens his/her own frame of reference (e.g. culture, gender, language, abilities, ways of knowing) the potential biases in these frames, and their impact on expectations for and relationships with learners and their families. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 9 )	All Grade Physical Education: Lesson Plan Assessment	6	3.17/4	79.17
Lesson Plan – Rationale: Creates opportunities for learners to apply methods of inquiry to learn disciplinary content. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 4, 7)	All Grade Visual Arts: Lesson Plan Assessment	2	3.50/4	87.5
Lesson Plan – Rationale: Uses evidence gathered on learners' diverse strengths and needs and is committed to using this information to plan effective instruction. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7)	All Grade Visual Arts: Lesson Plan Assessment	2	3.50/4	87.5
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Uses a range of evidence-based instructional strategies, resources to plan complex instruction that meets diverse learning needs CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7)	All Grade Visual Arts: Lesson Plan Assessment	2	4.00/4	100
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Uses assessments that match learning objectives with assessment methods and minimizes sources of bias that can distort assessment results. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 6)	All Grade Visual Arts: Lesson Plan Assessment	2	4.00/4	100
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Plans opportunities for learners to question and challenge assumptions and approaches in order to foster innovation and problem solving in local and global contexts CAEP 1.1; InTASC 5)	All Grade Visual Arts: Lesson Plan Assessment	2	3.00/4	75

Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Leverages learners differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, abilities, perspectives, talents and interests as tools for learning. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 2)	All Grade Visual Arts: Lesson Plan Assessment	2	4.00/4	100
Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Incorporates race, language and dialects into lesson and integrates them into his/her instructional plan as a way to engage students in learning. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 2)	All Grade Visual Arts: Lesson Plan Assessment	2	3.00/4	75
Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Challenges and deepens his/her own frame of reference (e.g. culture, gender, language, abilities, ways of knowing) the potential biases in these frames, and their impact on expectations for and relationships with learners and their families. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 9 )	All Grade Visual Arts: Lesson Plan Assessment	2	3.50/4	87.5
Lesson Plan – Rationale: Creates opportunities for learners to apply methods of inquiry to learn disciplinary content. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 4, 7)	Elementary: Lesson Plan Assessment	37	2.97/4	74.32
Lesson Plan – Rationale: Uses evidence gathered on learners' diverse strengths and needs and is committed to using this information to plan effective instruction. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7)	Elementary: Lesson Plan Assessment	37	3.11/4	77.7
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Uses a range of evidence-based instructional strategies, resources to plan complex instruction that meets diverse learning needs CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7)	Elementary: Lesson Plan Assessment	37	2.73/4	68.24

Lesson Plan – Procedures: Uses assessments that match learning objectives with assessment methods and minimizes sources of bias that can distort assessment results. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 6)	Elementary: Lesson Plan Assessment	37	2.84/4	70.95
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Plans opportunities for learners to question and challenge assumptions and approaches in order to foster innovation and problem solving in local and global contexts CAEP 1.1; InTASC 5)	Elementary: Lesson Plan Assessment	37	2.57/4	64.19
Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Leverages learners differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, abilities, perspectives, talents and interests as tools for learning. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 2)	Elementary: Lesson Plan Assessment	37	2.65/4	66.22
Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Incorporates race, language and dialects into lesson and integrates them into his/her instructional plan as a way to engage students in learning. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 2)	Elementary: Lesson Plan Assessment	37	2.22/4	55.41
Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Challenges and deepens his/her own frame of reference (e.g. culture, gender, language, abilities, ways of knowing) the potential biases in these frames, and their impact on expectations for and relationships with learners and their families. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 9 )	Elementary: Lesson Plan Assessment	37	2.19/4	54.73

Lesson Plan – Rationale: Uses evidence gathered on learners’ diverse strengths and needs and is committed to using this information to plan effective instruction. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7)	Secondary English: Lesson Plan Assessment	2	3.50/4	87.5
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Uses a range of evidence-based instructional strategies, resources to plan complex instruction that meets diverse learning needs CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7)	Secondary English: Lesson Plan Assessment	2	4.00/4	100
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Uses assessments that match learning objectives with assessment methods and minimizes sources of bias that can distort assessment results. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 6)	Secondary English: Lesson Plan Assessment	2	3.50/4	87.5
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Plans opportunities for learners to question and challenge assumptions and approaches in order to foster innovation and problem solving in local and global contexts CAEP 1.1; InTASC 5)	Secondary English: Lesson Plan Assessment	2	3.50/4	87.5
Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Leverages learners differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, abilities, perspectives, talents and interests as tools for learning. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 2)	Secondary English: Lesson Plan Assessment	2	4.00/4	100
Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Incorporates race, language and dialects into lesson and integrates them into his/her instructional plan as a way to engage students in learning. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 2)	Secondary English: Lesson Plan Assessment	2	3.00/4	75

Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Challenges and deepens his/her own frame of reference (e.g. culture, gender, language, abilities, ways of knowing) the potential biases in these frames, and their impact on expectations for and relationships with learners and their families. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 9 )	Secondary English: Lesson Plan Assessment	2	3.50/4	87.5
Lesson Plan – Rationale: Uses evidence gathered on learners' diverse strengths and needs and is committed to using this information to plan effective instruction. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7)	Secondary Mathematics: Lesson Plan Assessment	1	3.00/4	75
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Uses a range of evidence-based instructional strategies, resources to plan complex instruction that meets diverse learning needs CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7)	Secondary Mathematics: Lesson Plan Assessment	1	4.00/4	100
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Uses assessments that match learning objectives with assessment methods and minimizes sources of bias that can distort assessment results. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 6)	Secondary Mathematics: Lesson Plan Assessment	1	3.00/4	75
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Plans opportunities for learners to question and challenge assumptions and approaches in order to foster innovation and problem solving in local and global contexts CAEP 1.1; InTASC 5)	Secondary Mathematics: Lesson Plan Assessment	1	4.00/4	100
Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Leverages learners differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, abilities, perspectives, talents and interests as tools for learning. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 2)	Secondary Mathematics: Lesson Plan Assessment	1	4.00/4	100



Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Incorporates race, language and dialects into lesson and integrates them into his/her instructional plan as a way to engage students in learning. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 2)	Secondary Mathematics: Lesson Plan Assessment	1	3.00/4	75
Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Challenges and deepens his/her own frame of reference (e.g. culture, gender, language, abilities, ways of knowing) the potential biases in these frames, and their impact on expectations for and relationships with learners and their families. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 9 )	Secondary Mathematics: Lesson Plan Assessment	1	4.00/4	100
Lesson Plan – Rationale: Uses evidence gathered on learners’ diverse strengths and needs and is committed to using this information to plan effective instruction. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7)	Secondary Social Studies: Lesson Plan Assessment	10	3.40/4	85
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Uses a range of evidence-based instructional strategies, resources to plan complex instruction that meets diverse learning needs CAEP 1.1; InTASC 7)	Secondary Social Studies: Lesson Plan Assessment	10	3.30/4	82.5
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Uses assessments that match learning objectives with assessment methods and minimizes sources of bias that can distort assessment results. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 6)	Secondary Social Studies: Lesson Plan Assessment	10	3.20/4	80
Lesson Plan – Procedures: Plans opportunities for learners to question and challenge assumptions and approaches in order to foster innovation and problem solving in local and global contexts CAEP 1.1; InTASC 5)	Secondary Social Studies: Lesson Plan Assessment	10	3.40/4	85

Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Leverages learners differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, abilities, perspectives, talents and interests as tools for learning. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 2)	Secondary Social Studies: Lesson Plan Assessment	10	3.30/4	82.5
Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Incorporates race, language and dialects into lesson and integrates them into his/her instructional plan as a way to engage students in learning. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 2)	Secondary Social Studies: Lesson Plan Assessment	10	2.80/4	70
Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions: Challenges and deepens his/her own frame of reference (e.g. culture, gender, language, abilities, ways of knowing) the potential biases in these frames, and their impact on expectations for and relationships with learners and their families. CAEP 1.1; InTASC 9 )	Secondary Social Studies: Lesson Plan Assessment	10	3.50/4	87.5

### Using Data

Feedback from the instructors piloting the rubric included:

- Instructors need to use this rubric throughout the semester in order to capture students’ abilities more accurately than I was able to do here. I am grateful this is a pilot and not a high-stakes assessment for these students. I know my “scores” are not as accurate as they would be if we had given students this rubric as they planned and used it multiple times throughout the semester to assess their progress. For instance, our lesson plan template in secondary did not really capture the elements in the Rationale section on the rubric. We could have prompted students more clearly.
- I know that I was a bit too generous with my scores --- probably more “emerging” indicators should be used. The word “developing” (#3) drew me in. You might want to review the rubric differences for “emerging” and “developing” to make sure they represent what we want.
- I noticed that our students were not as strong in “inquiry” (Rationale #2) as I’d hoped. I attribute some of this to the lack of inquiry methods in many classrooms, especially in middle school. Though we read, discussed, and modeled inquiry in our class, this might be an

important area for more emphasis in the future since students may not be seeing how it works in their content areas it in their field experiences.

### **Plans**

The Evaluation Committee will collect feedback from faculty during spring 2017 and make needed modification to the rubric before fall 2017.

The addition of a Part B to address discipline specific criteria is to be piloted during spring 2018.

### **New Rubric for Lesson Planning Assessment fall 2016**

<i>Indicator</i>	Not documented/ observed	Emerging	Developing	Enacting
<b>Lesson Plan – Rationale</b>				
Connections to prior and subsequent learning/experiences to inform instruction and support student centered culturally relevant learning and are grounded in the theoretical framework of the program are included.  CAEP 1.1; 1.2,InTASC 4, 7	Plan does not include information about prior knowledge and/or how it informed instruction. No or minimal evidence of connections to program framework.	Plan includes prior knowledge of learners and how this informed instructional choices. Plan demonstrates minimal connections to program framework.	Plan includes prior knowledge of learners & how this informed instructional choices. Plan demonstrates some connections to program framework with attention to culturally relevant teaching.	Plan includes prior knowledge of learners & how this informed instructional choices. Plan demonstrates multiple connections to program framework – CRT, UDL, DI, etc.
Creates opportunities for learners to apply methods of inquiry to learn disciplinary content.  CAEP 1.1; 1.3,InTASC 4, 7)	No inclusion of inquiry methods are present in the lesson	Inquiry methods are included but they are largely teacher driven and are not/or are minimally connected to content.	Student-driven inquiry methods are used but the connection to learning content could be more developed	Uses content standards to promote deep conceptual learning using student-driven inquiry methods. Clear connections to course readings.
Uses <i>evidence gathered</i> on learners’ diverse strengths and needs and is committed to	No attention to diverse strengths is included	Includes minimal attention to students' diverse	Clear evidence for using students' strengths is included but connection to	Clear evidence of drawing on students' diverse strengths is

using this information to plan effective instruction.  CAEP 1.1; 1.2 InTASC 7)		strengths but not connected to instruction	instruction could be stronger	included and embedded into the instructional activities
<b>Lesson Plan – Procedures</b>				
Uses a range of evidence-based instructional strategies, resources to plan complex instruction that meets diverse learning needs  CAEP 1.1; 1.2, 1.5 InTASC 7)	Limited scope of instructional activities are included. All are low-level and not connected to course readings	Several different instructional methods are used. While they are diverse there is no connection to course theory or attention to meetings the diverse needs of learners.	Multiple instructional strategies are used in theoretically grounded ways. Beginning attention to meeting the needs of diverse learners is included.	Wide range of theoretically grounded instructional activities are used. These include embedded technological resources and integrated attention to social justice and equity.
Uses assessments that match learning objectives with assessment methods and minimizes sources of bias that can distort assessment results.  CAEP 1.1; InTASC 6)	Assessment does not match objective nor attempts to address bias	Assessment do attempt to match objectives but they do not address bias	Assessments match objectives and they attempt to address bias	Assessments match objectives and do address and minimize sources of bias.
Plans opportunities for learners to question and challenge assumptions and approaches in order to foster innovation and problem solving in local and global contexts  CAEP 1.1; InTASC 5)	Plan does not include opportunities for students to question, challenge, innovate, or problem solve.	Plan includes some opportunities for students to question, challenge, innovate and problem solve, but these are generally teacher-driven and superficial.	Plan includes multiple opportunities for students to question, challenge, innovate and problem solve in local and global contexts.	Plan includes multiple and varied opportunities for students to question, challenge, innovate, and problem solve in local and global contexts. These opportunities are generally student driven.
<b>Lesson Plan – Critical Dispositions</b>				

<p>Leverages learners differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, abilities, perspectives, talents and interests as tools for learning.</p> <p>CAEP 1.1; InTASC 2)</p>	<p>No attention is made to connect to students' outside of school life or world as teaching tools</p>	<p>Attempts are made to pay attention to students' cultural and life world but the connection to instruction is not clear.</p>	<p>Students' varied background and family experiences are included in ways that begin to support learning.</p>	<p>Students' experiences are embedded and integrated into the activities with finesse and complexity. The connections are authentic and not superficial and maximize learning.</p>
<p>Incorporates race, language and dialects into lesson and integrates them into his/her instructional plan as a way to engage students in learning.</p> <p>CAEP 1.1; InTASC 2)</p>	<p>No evidence of integration of race, lang., or dialects into plan.</p>	<p>Plan incorporates race, language and/or dialects, but the connection to the lesson content and/or the students is minimal or confusing.</p>	<p>Plan incorporates race, language and/or dialects into lesson and integrates them into his/her instructional plan as a way to engage some students in learning.</p>	<p>Plan incorporates race, language and/or dialects into lesson and integrates them into his/her instructional plan as a way to engage ALL students in learning.</p>
<p>Challenges and deepens his/her own frame of reference (e.g. culture, gender, language, abilities, ways of knowing) the potential biases in these frames, and their impact on expectations for and relationships with learners and their families.</p> <p>CAEP 1.1; InTASC 9 )</p>	<p>Little or no evidence of this within the plan</p> <p>(Look at ---reflection, rationale, understanding of students' needs, etc.)</p>	<p>Some evidence in the plan that the student reflects on own biases in designing instruction for learners. Minimal evidence in how this impacted expectations and instruction.</p>	<p>Clear evidence in the plan that the student reflects on own biases in designing instruction for learner and uses this to impact expectations and instruction.</p>	<p>Clear and significant evidence in the plan that the student reflects on own biases in designing instruction for learner and uses this to impact expectations and instruction, AND supports students in challenging &amp; deepening their own views.</p>

## **Benchmark IV -CAEP Standards 1.1, 3.4, 3.5, 5.1**

**INTASC Categories: Learner Development, Learning Differences, Content Knowledge, Assessment**

### **Benchmark IV - Student Teacher Impact on Students' Learning**

Student teachers will be supported with multiple, informal opportunities during Blocks II and III to study and analyze student work in order to draw conclusions about students' learning and use that data to inform next teaching steps. This Benchmark IV assignment and rubric is designed as a *formal assessment* opportunity at the end of the Block IV student teaching experience, for student teachers to provide evidence of their impact on students' learning during their student teaching experiences. During Blocks II and III, pre-service teachers and faculty will *frequently use this rubric to informally* assess the pre-service teachers' analyses of their students' learning.

This benchmark's format was a result of feedback from candidates who had expressed a concern that most of the EPP's assessments had a written format. They asked that the EPP consider a format that allowed the candidates to talk about what they knew and had learned in addition to providing written feedback. Thus, Benchmark IV is grounded in an interview conducted with each student teacher at the end of the student teaching experience. The student teachers are expected to score at levels 2 and 3 on this rubric with level 3 being target.

During the first weeks of Block IV student teaching, student teachers are asked to collect evidence of student learning resulting from their teaching. Student teachers are able to select any evidence they feel documents that students have learned because of their teaching. The student teachers are encouraged to select evidence that supports that students have learned at the conceptual/higher order level rather than just learned information. This evidence includes:

1. Cover page with your name, content area, the school, grade-level and course in which the unit was taught.
2. A brief statement of the unit's teaching goals and an outline of the lessons for the unit.
3. An example of an assessment of students' prior learning, (knowledge), such as a KWL Chart, Anticipation Guide, etc.
4. **A written analysis of how the data** gained from your prior learning assessment informed the instructional plan (#1 above). Please limit your analysis to one page.
5. Examples of formative and summative assessments (e.g., handouts, products, or rubrics) used during the unit.
6. Artifacts of student work from assessments representing the spectrum of student learning (samples of low, on target, and exemplary work) resulting during your unit of instruction.
7. **Analysis of videotape.** One to two pages that set the context for this lesson and summarizes the peer review analysis conducted

At the end of Block IV student teaching, the student teachers bring the evidence to an exit conference with the university coach and an EPP or content faculty. During the exit conference, the student teachers will present their self-assessment, using the Benchmark IV rubric, and a written summary of the following: a rationale for selecting the evidence from particular learning activities; an analysis of the students' learning which is supported by the evidence; and how they believe their instruction impacted the students' learning.

After the exit conference, the university coach/faculty will consider the evidence presented and will complete the Benchmark IV rubric and send the completed rubric and feedback to the student teacher. The assessment completed by the university coach/faculty will stand as the final assessment.

### **Reliability and Validity:**

Feedback from faculty using the rubric as well as other faculty from the EPP, faculty from other schools within the university, and P-12 stakeholders were solicited to address content validity. The IUPUI Assessment Committee developed the rubric and mapped it to the CAEP and InTASC standards. The members of the Committee on Teacher Education (COTE) also reviewed the rubric and its mapping to the standards and provided feedback. This committee has members from other IUPUI schools as well as K-12 members.

Reliability is still something the EPP needs to address in more detail. The fact that two faculty member complete the rubric together and must come to consciences for each indicator is the starting point. The EPP plans to conduct interrater reliability studies on the new rubric during fall 2017.

### **Findings from Pilot Study –fall 2016**

When the student teachers addressed how their knowledge of their students, subject matter, and pedagogy came together in their learning of what it means to teach (InTASC 1 & 2), the mean scores ranged from 2.00 – 2.94 with elementary candidates being assessed above those in the secondary programs. A little over 62% of the elementary candidates scored at or above target level 3, while 60% of the secondary English student teachers scored at target and 50% of the secondary social studies student teachers scored at or above target.

When asked to display their depth of content knowledge of concepts evident in their learning experiences (InTASC 4) by describing the nature and quality of the learning activates they chose, the means ranged from 2.75 – 3.00. Approximately 62% of the elementary student teachers were at or above target level 3 while 80% of the secondary English, 10% of the secondary math, and 75% of the secondary social studies student teachers were at or above level 3.

Students teacher were asked to display their knowledge and understanding of assessments (InTASC 6) when they were asked how they used an assessment process, using both formative and summative assessments, to inform their instruction and decision-making. For this criterion, over 62% of the elementary student teachers, 60% of the secondary English student teachers, and 25% of the secondary social studies student teachers were at or above level 3. This seemed to be the most challenging portion of the interview for the student teachers. When asked to address the evidence that they impacted student learning through their efforts to teach, 100% of the elementary student teachers, and 60% of the secondary English student teachers were at or above target level. When asked what the students learned from those learning activities and how that affected the student teacher's next steps, 100% of the elementary, secondary English, and secondary math student teachers were at or above level 3, Twenty-five of the social studies student teachers were at level 3 with the remainder at level 2.

When asked to speak to how their instruction impacted the students' learning (InTASC 8), approximately 62% of the elementary student teachers, 100% of the secondary English, and 75% of the secondary social studies student teachers were at or above target level.

### Spring 2017 Data

For the 42 elementary candidates completing Benchmark IV, the aggregated means for the six individual indicators ranged from 3.21 – 3.36. For the five secondary English candidates, the means for the indicators ranged from 2.4 – 3.6 while the means ranged from 1.5 – 2.75 for the four secondary social studies majors. Only one mathematics candidate completed Benchmark IV during the spring 2017 semester. That candidate's scores range from 1.00- 3.00 on the six indicators.

Overall, the elementary candidates performed better on the assessment than the secondary candidates. Candidates had higher scores on the indicators address analyzing what the students learned from the learning activities and how that affected the candidates' next steps and articulating the instructional impact on students' learning. The candidates struggled the most with providing concrete evidence of student learning and articulating how they used both formative and summative assessments to inform their decision-making.

### Using Data

The EPP is still discussing how to refine this assessment. The faculty find it rewarding to have a conference with the student teachers at the end of the program where the student teachers reflect on their professional growth during the program. The faculty feel that giving guidelines for the expectation of the interview is important but want to continue to allow the student teachers freedom to select and bring the type of evidence they feel represents the learning that has occurred in their classrooms. Sometimes the type of evidence the student teachers select can be very significant in analyzing the student teachers' understanding of the assessment and learning processes.

### New Rubric for Benchmark - fall 2016

Although this benchmark was first used by the EPP during spring 2007, the elementary and secondary programs had been using different rubrics. The EPP has recently resigned the rubric to be used across all initial teacher education programs. It was piloted during fall 2016.

### **Benchmark IV Rubric**

Level 3 is considered Target but a student teacher may one or two categories at level 2 and still pass.

Indicator/	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<b>Learning from Assessment Processes: How have you used an assessment process, using both formative and summative</b>	<i>The teacher candidate demonstrates how s/he sets/presents a standard for quality student performance; provides students feedback on their performance; or uses a single, summative assessment of</i>	<i>In addition, the teacher candidate demonstrates how s/he sets/presents standards for quality student performance, provides students with feedback on their performance, demonstrates the quality of student learning by analyzing an assessment</i>	<i>In addition, the teacher candidate demonstrates how s/he uses an assessment plan to inform instruction where the methods of assessment are coherent with methods of teaching, varied (traditional and authentic), formative and summative, and used</i>	<i>In addition, the teacher designs or implements instruction that demonstrates skillful integration of multiple quality standards simultaneously.</i>



<p><b>assessments, to inform your instruction and decision-making?</b></p> <p>CAEP 1.1 InTASC 6</p>	<p><i>student learning which audits learning.</i></p>	<p><i>process, varied measures of learning from (traditional and authentic) assessment tasks; multiple measures (formative and summative) of student learning.</i></p>	<p>to support individual student development.</p>	
<p><b>Impact on Student Learning: What evidence do you have that you have impacted student learning through your efforts to teach?</b></p> <p>CAEP 1.1 InTASC 6</p>	<p><i>The teacher candidate provides evidence/artifacts of student learning, and describes quality student performance, how students received feedback on their performance, or how data from assessments show evidence of learning outcomes.</i></p>	<p><i>In addition, while using evidence, the teacher candidate demonstrates impact on student learning by describing, reflecting, (using both feelings and thoughts), and deconstructing the impact on student learning using concepts of learning, teaching, assessment, and student diversity.</i></p>	<p>In addition, while using description, reflection, and deconstruction to frame evidence of student learning, the teacher candidate demonstrates an ability to reframe and takes action for the benefit of future teaching or improved student learning.</p>	<p>In addition the teacher designs and implements instruction, that demonstrates skillful integration of multiple quality standards simultaneously.</p>
<p><b>Learner Development and Learning Differences: How has your knowledge of your students, subject matter, and pedagogy come together in your learning what it means to teach?</b></p> <p>CAEP 1.1 InTASC 1 &amp; 2</p>	<p><i>The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of purposes for learning; how to check for or anticipates students' understanding and/or misunderstandings prior to or during instruction; or how to pedagogically adapt materials or activities to the characteristics of specific students.</i></p>	<p><i>In addition, while using differentiated purposes based on student characteristics, the teacher demonstrates an ability design instruction that flexibly creates a feedback or assistance loop for students and results in students demonstrating comprehension of academic content.</i></p>	<p>In addition, the teacher demonstrates ability to design instruction that focuses on significant learning goals, identifies and builds on student strengths and needs; and flexibly uses instructional strategies and classroom organizations that are most likely to hook students into new ideas across a lesson or unit; while producing quality evidence of student learning.</p>	<p>In addition the teacher designs and implements instruction, that demonstrates skillful integration of multiple quality standards simultaneously.</p>
<p><b>Depth of Content Knowledge of Concepts Evident in Learning Experiences</b></p>	<p><i>Learning experiences are not grounded in key aspects of the discipline. Teacher does not demonstrate understanding of</i></p>	<p><i>Some of the learning experiences created are not well grounded in key aspects of the discipline. Teacher demonstrates a partial understanding</i></p>	<p>Teacher demonstrates <i>a solid understanding of</i> central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he/she teaches and</p>	<p>Teacher demonstrates <i>a depth of</i> understanding of central concepts of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he/she teaches and c</p>

<p><b>(What is the nature/quality of the learning activities you chose?)</b></p> <p>CAEP 1.1 InTASC 4</p>	<p>central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he/she teaches.</p>	<p><i>of</i> central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he/she teaches;</p>	<p><i>creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible</i> for learners to assure mastery of content.</p>	<p><i>learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful</i> for learners to assure mastery of content.</p>
<p><b>Evidence/Analysis of Learner Progress</b></p> <p><b>(What did the students learn from those learning activities and how did that affect your next steps?)</b></p> <p>CAEP 1.1 InTASC 6</p>	<p>Teacher <i>does not use methods</i> of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, <i>or</i> to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.</p>	<p>Teacher understands and uses <i>1 method</i> of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, <i>or</i> to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.</p>	<p>Teacher understands and uses <i>2 different methods</i> of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, <i>and/or</i> to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.</p>	<p>Teacher understands and uses <i>multiple and varied</i> methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, <i>and</i> to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.</p>
<p><b>Articulation of Instructional Impact</b></p> <p><b>(How did your instruction impact the students' learning?)</b></p> <p>CAEP 1.1 InTASC 8</p>	<p>Teacher <i>does not demonstrate</i> the use of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop an understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.</p>	<p>Teacher understands and uses <i>an instructional strategy</i> to encourage learners to <i>develop an understanding</i> of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.</p>	<p>Teacher understands and uses <i>a few of the same instructional strategies</i> to encourage learners to <i>develop deep understanding</i> of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.</p>	<p>Teacher understands and uses <i>a variety of instructional strategies</i> to encourage learners to <i>develop deep understanding</i> of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.</p>

**Student Teaching Final Evaluation – Part A - CAEP Standards 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 5.1**

**InTASC Categories: Learner Development, Learning Differences, Learning Environments, Content Knowledge, Application of Content, Assessment, Planning for Instruction, Professional Learning and Ethical Practice, and Leadership and Collaboration**

## **Cross Cutting Theme: Diversity & Technology**

### **Student Teaching Final Evaluation Part A**

During the last semester of a secondary or all-grade IUPUI initial teacher education program, candidates complete 16 weeks of student teaching which historically has been 8 weeks in a high school and 8 week in a middle school. The elementary program has an 8-week student teaching experience at the end of Block III and a second 8-week experience at the end of Block IV. The first student teaching experience is normally in a general education classroom while the second experience is at a different developmental level from the first experience or in a classroom associated with a second licensure area such as special education or ENL.

At the end of the first student teaching experience, mentor teachers (supervising teachers) complete the Student Teaching Final Evaluation for the student teachers assigned to their classrooms. The mentor teachers share the evaluation with the student teachers during a three-way conference that includes the student teacher, mentor teacher, and the university supervisor.

For the last several years, the EPP has used a two-part rubric as its student teaching final evaluation, Part A & B. Part A addressed the general skills, knowledge and dispositions while Part B was design to address the content discipline standards. There was one Part A used for elementary and a different Part A used for the secondary and all-grade programs. These old rubrics can be found later in this document with data from four semesters of evaluations

During the 2015-2016 academic year, the EPP faculty decided to develop a new Part A to be used across all initial licensure programs. The Evaluation Committee created a rough draft of a new student teaching rubric ground in the InTASC standards. After several round of modifications, it was piloted with candidates from one option of the secondary program and one option of the elementary program during the fall 2016 semester. Data from this pilot can be found in the Student Teaching –Part A folder as Pilot Student Teaching Data. The new rubric is being used exclusively for Part A during the spring 2017 semester. During the second 8-week student teaching experience, the mentor teachers will continue to use the current Part B rubrics, which differs across program and are designed to address the content specific standards associated with the SPA.

### **Reliability and Validity:**

The Evaluation Committee designed the Student Teaching Evaluation Part A to reflect the new InTASC standards. The rubric was created using the CAEP Evidence Guide. Other EPP faculty reviewed the rubric and provided feedback in terms of content validity. The mentor teachers who piloted the new rubric during fall 2016 were also asked for feedback on the rubric. A summary of that feedback can be found in the Student Teaching Part A folder as “Feedback from Mentor Teachers”. The members of the Committee on Teacher Education (COTE) also reviewed the rubric and its mapping to the standards and provided feedback. This committee has members from other IUPUI schools as well as K-12 members.

Reliability is addressed by the detailed wording of the levels of proficiencies. During fall 2017, a sampling of faculty and mentor teachers will be asked to participate in an exercise to further address the reliability of the rubric. Participants will view a video of a teaching episode and then complete appropriate sections of the rubric on their own. The group will then get together and compare their evaluations. Discussions will follow concerning the use and wording of the rubric. The CAEP coordinator, in conjunction with faculty, staff, mentors, and university supervisors will then design either a video or written tutorial to be used for orientation purposes with future mentor teachers. This tutorial will provide clarification and explanations about the use of the rubric.

## **Findings**

### *Data from New Rubric*

Only pilot data from elementary, secondary English and secondary social studies programs could be analyzed. The all-grade programs were not part of the pilot and there was only one candidate from the secondary mathematics program. Data from the pilot study supports that candidates perform at target (level 3) for most criteria addressed in the rubric. For Learner Development (InTASC #1), the averages for elementary candidates ranged from 2.50 – 3.21 with candidates being at or above target for all criteria except “knowledge of characteristics of age group” (2.93), “knowledge of class history as a learning community” (2.86), and “communicating with families (2.50).” Secondary English candidates’ averages had a range of 2.60 – 4.00 with only “communicating with families”(2.60) below target. Secondary social studies candidates performed in an identical pattern with only the communication with families criteria (2.60) being below target. Communication with families was the only criteria where the program average for all three programs was below target.

InTASC Standard 2 addresses how candidates use their knowledge of learners’ difference to enhance learning for all children. Elementary candidates performed above target (2.86 -3.54) for all criteria for this standard except for the “use of multiple teaching strategies” (2.93) and “designing instruction appropriate to students’ stages of development, strengths, and interests” (2.86). The secondary English program (3.00-3.80) and secondary social studies program (3.40-3.60) had all averages above target for this standard.

When evaluating how well candidates work with others to create effective learning environments (InTASC #3), the program averages for all criteria were above the target with elementary program averages ranging from 3.14-3.21, secondary English program averages ranging from 3.20-3.60, and secondary social studies program averages ranging from 3.40-3.60.

InTASC Standards #4 addresses the content knowledge of the candidates. The program averages for both secondary programs had averages above the target level with secondary English program averages ranging from 3.20-3.40 and secondary social studies program averages ranged from 3.60-3.80. The average for the elementary program was at target level for “knowledge of content” (3.00) but below target for “ability to make content comprehensible” (2.93).

The averages for all candidates in all programs met or exceeded the target level for both criteria addressing Application of Content (InTASC #5). Across all programs the averages ranged from 3.00 – 3.60. For Assessment (InTASC #6), the program averages for both secondary programs met or exceeded the target level for every criteria with a range of 3.00-3.60. The elementary program averages for four of the five criteria were above 3.00 with the “ability to evaluate the progress and performance of the student” being evaluated at 2.934.

All program averages for Planning for Instruction (InTASC #7) and Using Instructional Strategies (InTASC #8) were at or above target for all criteria with a range across all programs being 3.00-3.80. Likewise, all criteria for Professional Learning and Ethical Practice (InTASC #9) and Leadership and Collaboration (InTASC #10) exceed the target level except the elementary program average (2.79) for self-assessment.

### Data from Old Rubric-Elementary

When examining the data from the old elementary rubric for spring 2015 – fall 2016 the majority of program averages for the criteria met or exceeded the 3.00 target level of “Satisfactory.” Program averages were below target for the following criteria for at least one semester:

- Spring 2016 - 2.79 – manages classroom procedures
- Spring 2016 – 2.79 – maximizes instructional time
- Spring 2015 – 2.90 –manages classroom procedure
- Spring 2015 – 2.97 – develops clear and accurate examples and explanations
- Spring 2015 – 2.87 -builds bridges between students’ home culture and the classroom community
- Spring 2015 – 2.85 – differentiates to meet the special needs of children

Several candidates scored below the target area across all semesters and all criteria. Since this evaluation was done after the first 8-week experience at the end of Block III, this gave the candidates and EPP valuable information about the areas that needed special attention before the student teaching experience in Block IV.

### Data from Old Rubric-Secondary and All-Grade Programs

Program averages for all criteria met or exceed the target level (2). Only occasionally, would one candidate receive a rating below target but no pattern of underperformance could be detected. These strong data bring into question the validity of this instrument and its ability to discern different level of proficiencies for the various criteria. The EPP is hopeful that the new rubric will provide data that are more valuable in assisting with the analysis of our candidates’ skills, knowledge and dispositions displayed during student teaching.

### Using Data

Data from the new rubric supports that candidates need more opportunities to learn about the class history prior to student teaching and need to be allowed to communicate more with the families of their students during the student teaching experience. This conclusion is support by the data from the old elementary rubric too. Candidates are now required to visit the classrooms where they will student teach at the beginning of the school year no matter if they are student teaching in the fall or spring. This allows the candidates to observe how a classroom environment is established. The data suggest that having an activity associated with the class history might be appropriate during that time. Mentor teachers also need to be encouraged to find opportunities for the student teacher to meet and interact with the families of the students in the class.

### New Student Teaching Evaluation – Part A

The mentor teacher should complete this assessment during the final week of student teaching. The completed assessment must be shared with the student teacher during a conference. Both the mentor and student teacher should sign the completed form, which should be submitted to the university coach. Target levels are highlighted in blue

InTASC Standard #1: Learner Development: The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary in and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences				
Uses knowledge of prerequisite relationships CAEP 1.1	Plans reflect little understanding of how students build on prior knowledge or develop complex concepts.	Plans to access students' prior knowledge and provide shared experiences.	Demonstrates an understanding of how students' conceptual frameworks develop and how their misconceptions for an area of knowledge can influence their learning.	Knows from experience conceptual frameworks for an area of knowledge and how misconceptions can be dispelled.
Knowledge of characteristics of age group CAEP 1.1	Shows beginning awareness of typical development or individual variation.	Shows awareness of typical development and individual variation.	Shows understanding of developmental stages progressions and ranges of individual variation within each domain--physical, social, emotional, moral and cognitive.	Articulates the developmental stages of the children and plans for individual variation.
Knowledge of class' history as a learning community CAEP 1.1	Building a profile of the class and their background knowledge. Starting to have ideas about how to stretch their learning and performances.	Makes explicit connections to previous experiences or lessons. Demonstrates expanded learning and performance modes.	Plans for students to make connections to previous experiences or lessons. Plans to scaffold expanded learning and performance modes for the class.	Predicts where connections will occur based on experiences of children. Predicts which or performance modes for learners' zone of proximal development.
Knowledge of students' skills and knowledge CAEP 1.1	Knows that students have different skills and knowledge and knows ways to assessing these.	Demonstrates skills and knowledge that are developmentally appropriate for the class.	Identifies individual students' zones of proximal development. Values and builds on the strengths, interests, or knowledge of individual students.	Plans engagements that challenge students in their zone of proximal development and stretch their learning.

Continuity CAEP 1.1	Lessons are related, but the planned learning engagements may not form a progression or build on prior knowledge.	Lessons reflect the larger goals of the unit. Progression of activities in the unit is potentially meaningful.	Lessons move students toward goals of unit. Progression of activities in the unit is clearly meaningful. Effectively sequences topics and concepts so that the students build on prior knowledge.	Lessons designed to s as they work their wa of social knowledge o
Communicating with families CAEP 1.1	Reluctant to make contact with family except with concern for failure or misbehavior.	Provides feedback to families about students' progress according to school policy.	Communicates with parents about students' progress on a regular basis and seeks to develop cooperative partnerships in support of student learning and well-being.	Partnerships with fan parallel practice whe benefit from a consis approach both at hor
InTASC Standard #2: Learning Differences: The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.				
Knowledge of students' interests and cultural heritage CAEP 1.1	Gathers information about students' interests and cultural backgrounds.	Plans engagements that are culturally relevant and interesting to the students.	Connects to students' worlds. Shows understanding of students' families, cultures, and communities.	Bridges students' wo understanding among about their families, c community.
Suitability for diverse students CAEP 1.1	Goals defined primarily for class as a whole.	Begins to differentiate instruction according to learners' stages of development, strengths, and interests.	Designs instruction appropriate to students' stages of development, strengths, and interests.	Goals effectively add of learning needs so t progress along differ
Sensitivity to diversity CAEP 1.1	Relies on stereotypes to understand cultural and gender differences.	Can demonstrate sensitivity to cultural and gender difference, but may be inconsistent.	Communicates in ways that demonstrate a sensitivity to cultural and gender differences (e.g. appropriate eye contact, reading body language, responsiveness to different modes of communication).	Creates a classroom e where students show sensitivity to each oth
Strategies CAEP 1.1	Relies primarily on single teaching strategy and takes full	Experiments with teaching and learning strategies and makes observations about how the strategies help the	Uses multiple teaching and learning strategies to engage students in active learning that promotes critical thinking, problem solving, and performance	Students effectively c array of strategies to own intellectual grow

	responsibility for identifying resources for learning.	students to learn. Solicits students for input about what they can bring to the learning of the class (e.g. resources, knowledge).	capabilities and that helps students assume responsibility for identifying and using learning resources.	
InTASC Standard #3: Learning Environments: The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.				
Collaboration, cooperation, and communication CAEP 1.1	Not attempting to develop students' abilities to work in small groups. May be teaching the interested students and losing the remaining students.	Desires collaborative working arrangements, but is only partially successful in orchestrating groups.	Organizes, prepares students for, and monitors independent and group work that allows for full and varied participation of all individuals.	Establishes a culture where students are engaged and on-task. Considers the needs of group and individuals. Students are aware of their own needs and know when to ask for help or appropriate to help others.
Setting up an interactive learning environment CAEP 1.1	The learning environment is not designed to be interactive.	Occasionally organizes interactive learning activities.	Organizes the classroom so that learning resources invite student inquiry and creative thinking. Uses such strategies as learning centers, experiments, manipulatives, games, invitations, bulletin boards, or computer stations to promote active learning supported by peer interaction.	Promotes student responsibility for creating the learning environment by encouraging students to take ownership of the quality of the learning environment and to share their products, questions, to create challenges, and to share resources for needed resources.
Media and technology CAEP 1.5	Not accustomed to using audio-visual tools or technology to enhance communication and learning.	Effectively uses some media communication tools and technology to enrich learning.	Efficiently and effectively uses a variety of media communication tools, including audio-visual aids and computers, to enrich learning opportunities.	Orchestrates opportunities for students to use a variety of their own learning and active technology communication curriculum.
InTASC Standard #4: Content Knowledge: The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.				





CAEP 1.1			standardized tests) to enhance his or her knowledge of learners.	
Monitoring for understanding CAEP 1.1	Makes few attempts at determining whether students are understanding.	Sometimes monitors for understanding, but may not provide enough opportunities for students to share their perceptions and make connections.	Probes for learner understanding. Helps students articulate their ideas and thinking processes.	Teaches students to monitor their own comprehension and asks questions when their understanding breaks down.
Evaluation of progress and performance CAEP 1.1	Records minimally support student evaluation. Feedback focused on end of grading period.	Ample documentation of student work. Conferences are intermittent and teacher directed.	Maintains useful records of student work and performance and can communicate student progress knowledgeably and responsibly on an ongoing basis.	Students readily give and receive feedback to/from teachers to evaluate progress.
Use of research and evidence to measure P-12 students' progress CAEP 1.2	No evidence that the measurement and/or analysis of P-12 students' progress is grounded in either research or evidence	Measurement and /or analysis of P-12 students' progress is often grounded in evidence but little evidence of the use of research	Measurement and analysis of P-12 students' progress is consistently grounded in evidence and sometimes in research	Measurement and analysis of students' progress is grounded in research and evidence
Applies content and pedagogical knowledge in outcome assessments in response to state and national standards CAPE 1.3	Ability to apply content and pedagogical knowledge in development of outcomes assessments is not apparent.	Applies content and pedagogical knowledge in the development and implementation of outcome assessment but connection to state and national standards is not apparent.	Applies content and pedagogical knowledge to develop and implement outcome assessment that address state and national standards	Consistently applies content and pedagogical knowledge to develop and implement outcome assessment that address state and national standards

InTASC Standard #7: Planning for Instruction: The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.

Lesson or unit structure CAEP 1.1	Lesson or unit lacks clearly defined structure, or the structure is chaotic. Time allocations are unrealistic.	Lesson or unit has a recognizable structure that consistently makes the teacher the central to the learning activities. Most time allocations are reasonable.	Lesson or unit has a clearly defined structure (i.e. workshop or inquiry cycle) that turns learning over to students at least part of the time through activities and reflective work. Time allocations are reasonable.	Lesson or unit structure is clear, and allows for multiple pathways according to learner needs.
Quality learning engagements CAEP 1.1	Learning engagements encourage conformity. All students are expected to produce the same performance.	Learning engagements demonstrate how students can work in a variety of modes to accomplish the same learning.	Learning engagements are open-ended, providing students choices about their modes of performance and encouraging different, but equivalent performances.	Learning engagements encourage variation in students' performance and performance models on multiple levels to meet the developmental and individual needs of diverse learners.
Meaningfulness CAEP 1.1	Lessons are planned without specifying expectations or goals for the students.	Goals are based on general sense of what will interest learners and meet their needs.	Goals are based on assessment of learners and designed to meet learners' developmental needs and interests.	Goals are articulated and related to what students know about the subject and their developmental needs.
Address rigorous college and career-ready standards. CAEP 1.4	Does not demonstrate an awareness of the need to address college and career-ready standards	Is aware of the need to address college and career-ready standards and sometimes incorporates these standards in lessons	Address college and career-ready standards in most lessons.	Lessons consistently address college and career-ready standards.

InTASC Standard #8: Instructional Strategies: The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of subject matter and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

Depth CAEP 1.1	Presents a single viewpoint or theory in depth. Textbook dependent.	Supplements textbook instruction. Finds different ways to explore subject matter concepts.	Represents and uses differing viewpoints, theories, "ways of knowing" and methods of inquiry to teach subject matter concepts.	Expects students, in their learning, to present multiple viewpoints and multiple ways of knowing.
-------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Teacher as researcher CAEP 1.1 CAEP 1.2	Systematically gathers and analyses data from students and classrooms.	Based on analysis of data, formulates a hypothesis about student learning and designs instruction to check.	Practices inquiry by systematically gathering and analyzing data from the classroom and students, and experimenting with, reflecting on, and revising practice.	Articulate about how leads to better instruction inquiry about teaching the classroom.
InTASC Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice: The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/herself, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of all learners.				
Enhancement of content knowledge and pedagogical skills CAEP 1.1	Professional development activities to enhance knowledge or skill not a priority.	Participates in professional activities to a limited extent when they are convenient. Extends personal knowledge of content through resource materials.	Seeks opportunities for professional development to enhance content knowledge and skills. Reads professional literature and talks with other teachers to support his/her own development as a learner and teacher. Extends personal understanding of content through planning and interaction with children.	Seeks out opportunities for professional development and contributes by presenting at professional meetings and conferences.
Self-assessment CAEP 1.1	Provides occasional opportunities for reflection or self-assessment. Teacher evaluates and defines goals.	Helps students understand purpose and value of self-assessment. Teacher and students are partners in identifying strengths and needs.	Uses assessment strategies to involve learners in self-assessment activities, to help them become aware of their strengths and needs, and to encourage them to set personal goals for learning.	Students have a repeated use of assessment strategies routinely to define their own learning goals.
Uses research and evidence to develop an understanding of their own professional practice CAEP 1.2	No evidence that research or evidence is used to develop an understanding of professional practice	Development of an understanding of own professional practice is often grounded in evidence but little evidence of the use of research	Development of an understanding of own professional practice is consistently grounded in evidence and sometimes in research	Development of an understanding of own professional practice is consistently grounded in research
InTASC Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration: The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to lead and collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.				

Collaborating with colleagues to improve learning and conditions  CAEP 1.1	Prefers to keep to self. Reluctant to share ideas or discuss problems with peers or mentor teacher.	Realizes advantages of another point of view. Begins to confide in a few others.	Openly shares ideas, cooperates with mentor teacher and peers in solving problems in the classroom and school.	Takes a proactive stance in conversations and all situations that may b
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------

### **Indiana Content Licensure Tests- ETS PRAXIS II & Pearson Core Tests- CAEP Standards 1.1, 3.4 , 5.1**

#### **InTASC Categories: Content Knowledge**

Prior to September 1, 2013, the state of Indiana required that all candidates applying for an education-teaching license must take and pass an appropriate content test in the PRAXIS II series. These tests contain multiple choice and constructed response items. The tests are designed and administered by Educational Testing Services (ETS) and are deemed valid and reliable. The Division of Professional Standards of the Indiana Department of Education establishes the cut-off scores for these tests. *Praxis II*® Subject Assessments measure knowledge of specific subjects that K-12 educators will teach, as well as general and subject-specific teaching skills and knowledge. ETS uses a validation process consistent with the technical guidelines in the 1999 [AERA Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing](#). View the [ETS Standards for Quality and Fairness \(PDF\)](#).

After September 1, 2013, candidates were required to take the appropriate Indiana CORE Assessments for Educator Licensure test from Pearson. The Indiana CORE Assessments for Educator Licensure are criterion referenced and standards based tests that are designed to ensure that candidates have the developmental (pedagogy) area and content area knowledge and skills needed to teach effectively in Indiana public schools. These tests are based on the REPA Educator Standards, and are aligned with state and national standards for educator preparation and with state standards for the P-12 student curriculum (Indiana Common Core State Standards and Indiana Academic Standards). (<http://www.pearsonvue.com/ielp/>). The Indiana Department of Education established the cut-off scores for these tests. As of June 2015, the cutoff score for Pearson recalibrated some tests based on low statewide pass rates. Data in the following table reflect the two periods during 2014-2015.

#### **Assessment of Content Knowledge**

Another area of assessment for the School of Education is students' content knowledge in their teaching areas. All teacher candidates in the state of Indiana must successfully pass a licensure test in their content area(s). These tests are aligned with national standards for each of the content areas. The School of Education continues to look at pass rates for these tests but this year also examined average number of attempts before passing and percentage passing on the first attempt for the last three years. During the last three years, the state has transitioned from tests from Educational Testing Services (ETS) to Pearson (PS). Therefore, there are years when no students from IUPUI took some of the tests.

## **Findings**

Caution was taken when analyzing these data. With a “random” sample selected by paying self-selected volunteers \$50 to take a test, Pearson obtained a mean and standard deviation to determine the state cut-off score. After almost two years of using this cutoff score, it was determined by Pearson that only 35% of those taking many of the tests statewide were passing. Pearson then recalibrated the scoring and a significant increase was seen statewide for passing scores, number of attempts to pass, and number passing on the first attempt. This resulted in two sets of data for 2014-2015 with the data up to June 2015 being data obtain with a flawed cut-off score.

During the beginning of 2012-2013, elementary candidates were required to take the ETS multiple-subject single test for licensure. The EPP pass-rate for the elementary was 95%. Later that year, the state changed the elementary licensure test to the four individual subject tests from ETS. During the time, the EPP had a 97% pass-rate on the reading/language arts test, 68% on the mathematics test, 97% on the science test, and 90% on the social studies test. The state continue with these tests into the first part of 2013. During that time, the EPP pass rate was 99% for reading/language, 87% for math, 92% for science, and 90% for social studies.

During 2013-2014, the state changed test providers and moved to Pearson. The elementary candidates were required to take the four subject tests created by Pearson especially for Indiana. The EPP pass rates for that period, was language arts 73%, mathematics 44%, science 67%, and social studies 59%. This pattern improved a little at the beginning of 2014, with the EPP pass rate 83% for reading/language arts, 73% for math, 85% for science, and 78% for social studies. The EPP was concerned about the number of candidates passing the licensure tests but it soon became apparent that the pattern was statewide and not just the EPP. As stated earlier, Pearson realized they had not established a fair cutoff score so in the June 2015 they recalibrate how the tests were scored.

AS a result, the EPP pass rates for reading/language arts was 87%, for math 87%, for science 90% and for social studies 84%. This pattern had continued into 2015-2016 with the EPP pass rate for reading/language arts being 88%, mathematics 91%, science 91% and social studies 88%. The IUPUI Average percent of correct answers for the reading/language arts, science, and social studies domains are comparable to the state averages. However, the EPP averages for the math domains far exceed the state averages.

Secondary English candidates have an average pass rate on their licensure tests that average 89% over the last 4 years. Their average percent correct for all domains are comparable to the state averages with some need for more emphasis on modes of writing. There was a .88 positive correlation between the EPP average percent correct and the state averages. The secondary mathematics candidates have a three-year average pass rate of 86% with 32 of the 37 candidates passing over the last four years. EPP candidates’ average percent correct in the eight domains were comparable to those of the state. The pass rates for the secondary social studies candidates ranged from 80% - 96% except for the short time period that Pearson had problems with how they were scoring the test. The average EPP pass rate for 2012-2016 was 87% for the 75 secondary social studies program completers from 2012-2016. There was a 75% positive correlation between the EPP average percent correct and the state average percent correct.

The all- grade physical education test was the only content area test that did not move to Pearson. In 2013-2014. It remained with ETS until 2015. The EPP average pass rate for all-grade physical education candidates ranged from 94-100% for the four-year period. Domain data was not available from ETS. The candidates in the all-grade visual arts program had a 100% pass rate on the content tests from 2012-2016 with average percent correct across the domains that were comparable to the state average.

### Using Data

The EPP realized early on that the elementary candidates were struggling overall with the new Pearson content tests in math, science, and social studies. The School of Education faculty investigated ways to provide more support for these tests to the candidates. This included addressing more content within the education classes and providing free tutoring through the EPP’s Curriculum Resource Center. The most dramatic results have been in mathematics where the elementary candidates have moved their pass rate on the math test from a low of 68% in 2012 on the ETS test and a 44% on the Pearson Test (during the time the scoring of the test was in question) to 91% in 2015-2016.

Test	Number of Program Completers/ Percent Passing on First Attempt			Average Number of Attempts before Passing		
	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
<b>Elementary Education Program</b>						
ETS-Curr	20/85%	3/67%	1/100%	1.2	1.5	1
ETS – Curr	44/82%	*	*	1.2	*	*
ETS- Lang Arts	71/88%	100/83%	1/100%	1.2	1.2	1
ETS-Math	71/41%	100/58%	1/100%	2.6	2	1
ETS- Soc St	71/69%	100/61%	1/100%	1.5	1.8	1
ETS- Science	71/62%	100/62%	1/100%	1.9	1.8	1
PS – Lang Arts	*	14/36%	83/52%	*	1	1.6
PS- Math	*	14/7%	82/41%	*	2.4	1.7
PS-Science, Health, PE	*	14/43%	82/62%	*	1	1.4

PS-Social St., Fine Arts	*	14/29%	81/44%	*	1.2	1.7
Secondary English Program						
ETS-English	10/90%	7/86%	*	1.2	1.3	*
ETS-Eng Lang	11/100%	19/84%	8/100%	1	1.2	1
PS-English	*	*	18/78%	*	*	1.2
Secondary Technology Education Program						
ETS-Technology	5/80%	5/100%	*	1.3	1	*
PS- Engineering, Technology	*	*	1/100%	*	*	1
Secondary Mathematics Program						
ETS-Math	12/75%	1/100%	*	1.4	1	*
ETS-Math	9/100%	7/100%	2/50%	1	1	1.5
PS- Math	*	*	6/67%	*	*	1.4
Secondary Social Studies Program						
ETS-Soc Studies	18/89%	9/100%	*	1.1	1	*
ETS- Soc studies	8/100%	5/60%	1/100%	1	2	1
PS-Historical Persp	*	1/100%	22/41%	*	1	1.9
All-Grade Physical Education Program						
ETS-Phy. Ed	14/86%	4/100%	1/100%	1.2	1	1
ETS-Phy Ed.	3/67%	11/82%	7/57%	1.3	1.2	2.7
All-Grade Visual Arts Program						
ETS-Art	15/100%	7/100%	1/100%	1	1	1



PS-Visual Arts	*	*	14/93%	*	*	1
	Secondary Science Program					
ETS-Biology	4/100%	*	1/100%	1	*	1
ETS – Life Sci		3/67%	3/100%	*	1.3	1
ETS-Chemistry	5/60%	*	*	1.8	*	*
ETS-Physics	5/40%	*	*	6.5	*	*
ETS-Earth Space	3/67%	1/100%	*	1.5	1	*
ETS-Earth Space	1/100%	1/100%	*	1	1	*
	English As A New Language Dual Program					
ETS-ENL	6/67%	3/100%	*	1.3	1	*
PS-English Learners	*	*	10/50%	*	*	1.2
	Special Education Dual Program					
ETS-Spec Ed	5/100%	4/100%	*	1	1	*
ETS-Spec Ed	16/100%	31/90%	*	1	1.1	*
PS-Except Needs	*	3/67%	16/88%	*	1.3	1.1

Academic Years	Number of Candidates	Qualifying Score	EPP Mean	State Mean	Range EPP	% of Candidates Passing
Elementary –Multiple Subject - Single Test						
2012-2013 ETS	62	165	178	179	157-194	95%
Elementary – Four Multiple Subject Tests						
Elementary –Reading/ Language Arts						
2012-2013 ETS	78	165	180	181	115-200	97%
2013-2014 ETS	84	165	181	*	156-200	99%
Pearson	22	220	221.0	220.2	*	73%
2014-2015 Pearson	52	220	227	226	132-276	83%
12/13-06/15	67		231	234		87%
06/15-12/15						
2015-2016 Pearson	134	220	230.7	236.0	152-277	88%
Elementary –Mathematics						
2012-2013 ETS	78	164	170	175	160-179	68%
2013-2014 ETS	84	164	175	176	139-200	87%
Pearson	18	220	190	203	*	44%
2014-2015 Pearson	40	220	210	215	100-285	73%
12/13-06/15	84		235	239		87%
06/15-12/15						
2015-2016	140	220	238.0	236.9	159-290	91%

Elementary – Science						
2012-2013 ETS	78	159	168	170	*	87%
2013-2014 ETS Pearson	84 24	159 220	170 213	171 219	* 130-200	92% 67%
2014-2015 Pearson 12/13-06/15 06/15-12/15	46 71	220	233 242	230 240	120-293	85% 90%
2015-2016 Pearson	138	220	239.7	240.2	155-285	91%
Elementary – Social Studies						
2012-2013 ETS	78	155	168	167	127-197	90%
2013-2014 ETS Pearson	84 22	155 220	167 210	167 216	145—200 *	90% 59%
2014-2015 Pearson 12/13-06/15 06/15-12/15	49 67	220	226 230	224 230	104-278	78% 84%
2015-2016 Pearson	139	220	231.8	232.3	162-285	88%
Domains – Reading/ELA				Year	IUPUI Average Percent Correct	State Average Percent Correct
Foundations of Reading Instruction Foundations of SBRR Instruction CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 1				2013-2014	79.5	81.0
				2014-2015	81.6/76.8	83.7/79.9
				2015-2016	76.9	78.9

Components of Reading Instruction Components of SBRR Instructions CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 7 & 8-IN Standard 2	2013-2014	73.4	72.5
	2014-2015	71.6/76.3	72.5/75.8
	2015-2016	69.1	71.6
English Language Arts Comp/Test Analysis CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 6-IN Standards 3.1-3.2, 3.9-3.11	2013-2014	68.2	70.7
	2014-2015	74.8/71.1	71.7/69.4
	2015-2016	69.5	70.6
English Language Arts Communication Arts CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standards 3.3-3.11	2013-2014	66.7	66.4
	2014-2015	71.6/72.7	73.6/74.2
	2015-2016	69.7	72.9
Domains – Mathematics	Year	IUPUI Average Percent Correct	State Average Percent Correct
Math: Computation/Concept Skills CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standards 4.1-4.8	2013-2014	85.7	75.7
	2014-2015	82.1	78.0
	2015-2016	76.2	73.3
Math Literacy/Instruction CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 8-IN Standards 4.9-4.11	2013-2014	91.7	66.8
	2014-2015	70.8	67.3
	2015-2016	75.0	68.5
Domains – Science/Health/ PE	Year	IUPUI Average Percent Correct	State Average Percent Correct
Science CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 5	2013-2014	71.1	72.4
	2014-2015	77.2/73.5	76.0/71.7
	2015-2016	71.7	71.6
Health, Wellness, Phys. Ed. CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 8	2013-2014	79.6	81.1
	2014-2015	84/81.3	83.8/81.1
	2015-2016	79.6	80.4
Domains – Social Studies/Fine Arts	Year	IUPUI Average Percent Correct	State Average Percent Correct
Social Studies Content and Concept CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 6	2013-2014	63.4	66.3
	2014-2015	72.2/67.8	70.8/68.3
	2015-2016	68.1	68.4
Fine Arts CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 7	2013-2014	74.0	70.6
	2014-2015	75.9/75.9	76.3/75.8

				2015-2016	76.3	76.5
<b>Secondary English</b>						
<b>Academic Years</b>	<b>Number of Candidates</b>	<b>Qualifying Score</b>	<b>EPP Mean</b>	<b>State Mean</b>	<b>Range EPP</b>	<b>% of Candidates Passing</b>
2012-2013 ETS	20	160	174	178	159-189	100%
2013-2014 ETS	24	160	178	178	160-195	100%
2014-2015 Pearson	26	220	230	231	177-251	88%
2015-2016 Pearson	27	220	227.9	230.1	183-263	70%
<b>Domains</b>				<b>Year</b>	<b>IUPUI Average Percent Correct</b>	<b>State Average Percent Correct</b>
Foundations of Reading CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-CAEP 1.1 – InTASC - IN Standard 1				2013-2014	68.3	65.5
				2014-2015	67.3	68.4
				2015-2016	66.4	71.5
Informational/Persuasive Texts CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 2				2013-2014	85.0	80.8
				2014-2015	82.7	79.7
				2015-2016	72.2	76.1
Reading Literary Texts CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 3				2013-2014	65.0	60.1
				2014-2015	61.5	63.9
				2015-2016	70.1	69.7
Components of Writing CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 4				2013-2014	78.3	82.9
				2014-2015	83.0	84.4
				2015-2016	80.6	80.6
Modes of Writing CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 5				2013-2014	65.0	73.5
				2014-2015	74.0	76.6
				2015-2016	75.0	76.4
Listen/Speak/Interpers Communication				2013-2014	56.7	59.8

CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 6				2014-2015	62.8	61.2
				2015-2016	63.0	61.9
Visual Literacy/Media Presentation CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 7				2013-2014	60.0	59.9
				2014-2015	57.7	64.2
				2015-2016	84.0	80.4
Eng. Lang. Arts Instruction/Assessment CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 6, 7 & 8- IN Standard 8				2013-2014	67.5	68.5
				2014-2015	73.6	72.0
				2015-2016	73.1	69.8
<b>Secondary Mathematics</b>						
<b>Academic Years</b>	<b>Number of Candidates</b>	<b>Qualifying Score</b>	<b>EPP Mean</b>	<b>State Mean</b>	<b>Range EPP</b>	<b>% of Candidates Passing</b>
2012-2013 ETS	10	136	157	155	148-190	100%
2013-2014 ETS	8	136	156	158	138-180	100%
2014-2015 Pearson 12/13-06/15 06/15-12/15	4 6	220	223.0 226.7	208.6 225.9	126-272	75% 67%
2015-2016 Pearson	9	220	224.9	225.5	172-252	78%
<b>Domains</b>				<b>Year</b>	<b>IUPUI Average Percent Correct</b>	<b>State Average Percent Correct</b>
Number and Quantity CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4 – IN Standard 1				2013-2014	*	
				2014-2015	61.1/77.8	63.7/69.4
				2015-2016	72.2	71.6
Algebra CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 2				2013-2014	*	
				2014-2015	66.7/75.8	64.2/67.6
				2015-2016	61.6	68.1
Functions				2013-2014	*	

CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 3	2014-2015	60.6/63.6	62.6/67.4
	2015-2016	67.7	67.7
Calculus CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 6	2013-2014	*	
	2014-2015	43.3/56.7	48.2/50.1
	2015-2016	50.0	50.6
Measurement and Geometry CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 4	2013-2014	*	
	2014-2015	41.7/50.0	45.3/50.2
	2015-2016	56.5	51.6
Statistics and Probability CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 5	2013-2014	*	
	2014-2015	50.0/50.0	56.6/59.2
	2015-2016	58.3	62.6
Discrete Mathematics CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 7	2013-2014	*	
	2014-2015	58.3/58.3	55.1/53.4
	2015-2016	54.2	57.1
Math Instruction/Assessment CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 6, 7 & 8-IN Standard 8	2013-2014	*	
	2014-2015	12.5/47.9	52.2/66.0
	2015-2016	69.4	65.6

**Secondary Social Studies**

<b>Academic Years</b>	<b>Number of Candidates</b>	<b>Qualifying Score</b>	<b>EPP Mean</b>	<b>State Mean</b>	<b>Range EPP</b>	<b>% of Candidates Passing</b>
2012-2013 ETS	24	156	170	168	156-187	96%
2013-2014 ETS Pearson (Historical Perspectives)	5 8	156 220	161 226.8	166 228.1	145-176	60% 88%
2014-2015 Pearson – Historical Perspectives	23	220	232	225	172-250	87%
2015-2016	15	220	234.4	224.9	180-288	80%

Pearson						
Domains – S.S. Historical Perspectives				Year	IUPUI Average Percent Correct	State Average Percent Correct
Historical Concepts and Perspectives CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 1				2013-2014	65.6	71.2
				2014-2015	80.4	73.8
				2015-2016	81.7	73.9
Historical Sources & Research Skills CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 2				2013-2014	75.0	76.7
				2014-2015	81.5	77.0
				2015-2016	85.0	77.1
Historical Analysis & Interpretation CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 3				2013-2014	50.0	61.0
				2014-2015	60.9	58.5
				2015-2016	55.6	55.7
World History CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 4				2013-2014	63.2	62.4
				2014-2015	64.7	62.2
				2015-2016	67.8	64.1
U.S. History CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 5				2013-2014	73.5	69.4
				2014-2015	70.1	68.9
				2015-2016	77.3	68.9
Indiana History CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 6				2013-2014	50.0	56.8
				2014-2015	63.8	59.8
				2015-2016	61.1	59.8
History Instruction and Assessment CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 6, 7 & 8-IN Standard 7				2013-2014	67.5	70.9
				2014-2015	70.4	68.7
				2015-2016	58.7	66.6
<b>All-Grade Physical Education</b>						
<b>Academic Years</b>	<b>Number of Candidates</b>	<b>Qualifying Score</b>	<b>EPP Mean</b>	<b>State Mean</b>	<b>Range EPP</b>	<b>% of Candidates Passing</b>
2012-2013 ETS	17	153	160	160	156-168	94%
2013-2014 ETS	13	153	159	158	153-168	100%
2014-2015 ETS	14	153	160	160	139-166	98%



2015-2016 Pearson	10	220	239	*	*	100%
<b>All-grade Visual Arts</b>						
<b>Academic Years</b>	<b>Number of Candidates</b>	<b>Qualifying Score</b>	<b>EPP Mean</b>	<b>State Mean</b>	<b>Range EPP</b>	<b>% of Candidates Passing</b>
2012-2013 ETS	14	159	176	173	164-187	100%
2013-2014 ETS	7	159	180	172	171-190	100%
2014-2015 Pearson	19	220	243	242	205-269	100%
2015-2016 Pearson	12	220	247.1	242.8	217-283	100%
<b>Domains</b>				<b>Year</b>	<b>IUPUI Average Percent Correct</b>	<b>State Average Percent Correct</b>
The Elements and Principles of Art CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 1				2013-2014	71.9	80.1
				2014-2015	82.2	81.7
				2015-2016	91.7	87.8
Media Tools/Techniques/Processes CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 2				2013-2014	78.1	72.1
				2014-2015	72.7	71.0
				2015-2016	75.5	74.3
Art in Context CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 3				2013-2014	68.8	77.9
				2014-2015	74.7	76.4
				2015-2016	77.1	77.9
Visual Arts/Visual Arts Careers CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 4				2013-2014	83.3	75.0
				2014-2015	76.3	77.3
				2015-2016	77.8	76.8
Aesthetics and Art Criticism CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 4-IN Standard 5				2013-2014	70.8	76.1
				2014-2015	78.5	75.9
				2015-2016	75.7	70.8
Visual Arts Instruction/Assessment				2013-2014	68.8	69.9

CAEP 1.1 – InTASC 6, 7 & 8-IN Standard 7	2014-2015	77.6	74.8
	2015-2016	85.4	87.3

















**Licensure Pedagogy Tests – 2013-2016 - CAEP Standards 1.1, 3.5 3.6, 5.1**

**InTASC Categories: Learner Development, Learning Differences, Professional Learning and Ethnical Practice, and Leadership and Collaboration  
Cross Cutting Theme Diversity**

**Pedagogical Knowledge**

Starting in 2013-2014, each student must pass a pedagogical test that is developmentally appropriate prior to licensure. Candidates from the EPP take either the elementary, secondary or all-grade test.

**Findings**

Elementary and secondary majors have performed well on their respective pedagogical tests with over 90% passing the test on the first attempt for both years of testing. All-grade majors do not perform as well on the all-grade pedagogical test when looking at percent passing on the first attempt. However, the percent of students passing on the first attempt has increased 17 percentage points over the two- year period.

For the three years from 2013-2016, the percent of EPP elementary candidates passing the pedagogy test ranged from 92-96%. The EPP average percent correct for the six domain were comparable to the state averages. During the same period, the EPP secondary candidates' pass rates had a range of 90-99% with comparable average percent correct for the questions over each domain to the state averages. The all-grade candidates had an average pass rate that ranged from 86% to 97% for the three-year period. Their average percent of answers correct in each domain were not significantly different from the state averages.

**Using Data**

The EPP feels these results support that candidates have acquired during their programs the pedagogical knowledge deemed by the state to be necessary for a beginning teacher.

Test	Number of Program Completers/	Average Number of Attempts before Passing
------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

	Percent Passing on First Attempt		2013-2014	2014-2015
	2013-2014	2014-2015		
Elementary	52/92%	87/93%	1.1	1
Secondary	42/93%	72/97%	1.1	1
All-Grade	14/71%	24/88%	1.1	1

**Elementary Pedagogy Test – Elementary Education**

Elementary	Number Taking the Test - EPP	Qualifying Score	Program Mean	State Mean	Program Range	Percent Passing
2015-2016	132	220	238.6	244.6	171-277	92%
2014-2015	135	220	241.4	243.1	196-279	96%
2013-2014	79	220	240.2	240.4	197-266	95%
Domains				Year	EPP Average Percent Correct	State Average Percent Correct
I. Student Development and Diversity CAEP 1.1-InTASC 1-IN Standard 1				2015-2016	70.5	70.2
				2014-2015	71.6	72.7
				2015-2016	83.6	83.2
II. Learning Processes CAEP 1.1-InTASC 2-IN Standard 2				2014-2015	74.8	78.7
				2013-2014	70.5	74.4
				2015-2016	66.9	73.4

III. Learning Environment CAEP 1.1-InTASC 3-IN Standard 5	2015-2016	68.2	66.3
	2014-2015	76.4	73.9
	2013-2014	83.7	84.5
IV. Instructional Planning and Delivery CAEP 1.1-InTASC 7-IN Standard 3	2015-2016	77.0	77.7
	2014-2015	73.1	76.1
	2013-2014	66.1	69.2
V. Assessment CAEP 1.1-InTASC 6-IN Standard 4	2015-2016	64.7	61.9
	2014-2015	78.0	76.3
	2013-2014	84.6	81.3
VI. The Professional Environment CAEP 1.1-InTASC 9 & 10-IN Standard 6	2015-2016	69.4	71.5
	2014-2015	77.7	79.2
	2013-2014	62.2	64.1

All Secondary	Number Taking the Test - EPP	Qualifying Score	Program Mean	State Mean	Program Range	Percent Passing
2015-2016	73	220	251.7	252.9	149-288	90%
2014-2015	83	220	251.3	249.7	196-282	99%
2013-2014	55	220	252.4	249.2	208-282	98%
Domains				Year	EPP Average Percent Correct	State Average Percent Correct
I. Student Development and Diversity CAEP 1.1-InTASC 1-IN Standard 1				2015-2016	80.7	83.0
				2014-2015	75.2	75.0
				2015-2016	81.5	82.4
II. Learning Processes CAEP 1.1-InTASC 2-IN Standard 2				2015-2016	82.2	82.0
				2014-2015	75.3	76.5
				2015-2016	78.8	79.6
III. Learning Environments CAEP 1.1-InTASC 3-IN Standard 5				2015-2016	84.3	84.1
				2014-2015	77.5	76.7
				2015-2016	81.2	80.6
IV. Instruction and Assessment CAEP 1.1-InTASC 7-IN Standard 3				2015-2016	78.4	78.8
				2014-2015	78.3	78.0
				2015-2016	75.3	71.8

V. Instruction and Assessment CAEP 1.1-InTASC 6-IN Standard 4				2015-2016	78.4	78.1
				2014-2015	84.7	82.2
				2015-2016	79.4	78.6
VI. Reading Instruction CAEP 1.1-InTASC 7-IN Standard 3				2015-2016	78.5	77.1
				2014-2015	78.3	76.9
				2015-2016	79.3	78.0
All-Grade	Number Taking the Test – EPP	Qualifying Score	Program Mean	State Mean	Program Range	Percent Passing
2015-2016	29	220	240.3	246.6	188-279	97%
2014-2015	30	220	244.3	244.9	187-273	97%
2013-2014	22	220	237.9	242.4	201-263	86%
Domains				Year	EPP Average Percent Correct	State Average Percent Correct
I. Student Development and Diversity CAEP 1.1-InTASC 1-IN Standard 1				2015-2016	61.6	68.3
				2014-2015	72.4	76.3
				2015-2016	79.3	81.0
II. Learning Process CAEP 1.1-InTASC 2-IN Standard 2				2015-2016	75.2	75.6
				2014-2015	67.5	72.1
				2015-2016	64.7	66.4

III. Learning Environment CAEP 1.1-InTASC 3-IN Standard 5	2015-2016	81.5	85.0
	2014-2015	63.8	64.9
	2015-2016	79.4	78.2
IV. Instructional Planning and Delivery CAEP 1.1-InTASC 7-IN Standard 3	2015-2016	82.2	80.3
	2014-2015	77.7	75.1
	2015-2016	66.9	71.7
V. Assessment CAEP 1.1-InTASC 6-IN Standard 4	2015-2016	64.6	64.2
	2014-2015	84.2	85.0
	2015-2016	64.2	66.2
VI. Reading Instruction CAEP 1.1-InTASC 7-IN Standard 3	2015-2016	76.9	79.6
	2014-2015	70.8	69.2
	2015-2016	72.4	77.0
VII. The Professional Environment CAEP 1.1-InTASC 9 & 10 -IN Standard 6	2015-2016	70.7	73.8
	2014-2015	63.6	62.5
	2015-2016	72.7	76.6

**Entering and Exiting GPAs -CAEP Standards 1.1, 3.1 , 5.1  
InTASC Categories: Content Knowledge**

Each candidate must have at least a “C” or higher in all degree courses and a minimum 2.50 overall GPA before applying to the teacher education program. If a student is a transfer student, then the GPAs from the other institutions attended are calculated into the overall GPA used by the EPP for admission purposes.

## Findings

Overall cohort GPA data for the last three years exceed the 3.00 minimum for the last three years with a range of 3.154 – 3.326. Individual program GPAs exceed 3.00 all three years for elementary, secondary math, secondary social studies and all-grade visual arts. The program GPAs for secondary English and all-grade physical education exceeded 3.00 two of the three years with overall GPAS averages of 3.17 for secondary English and 3.15 for all-grade physical education for the three years.

## Using Data

These data support that the overall cohort GPA continues to remain above 3.00.

Spring 2014 – Fall 2015			Fall 2014 – Spring 2016			Spring 2015 – Fall 2016		
	Entering GPA	Exiting GPA		Entering GPA	Exiting GPA		Entering GPA	Exiting GPA
Overall Cohort N=56	3.154	3.358	Overall Cohort N=116	3.326	3.440	Overall Cohort N=60	3.249	3.441
Elementary N = 45	3.147	3.370	Elementary N = 74	3.367	3.497	Elementary N = 46	3.284	3.498
Sec. English N= 4	2.998	3.269	Sec. English N= 12	3.318	3.362	Sec. English N= 6	3.203	3.366
Sec. Math N=1	3.416	3.510	Sec. Math N= 2	3.413	3.509	Sec. Math N=1	3.233	3.312
Sec. Social Studies N= 3	3.186	3.400	Sec. Social Studies N= 4	3.235	3.259	Sec. Social Studies N= 5	3.016	3.077
All-grade Physical Education	2.653	3.087	All-grade Physical Education	3.087	3.222	All-grade Physical Education	3.703	3.830



N= 2			N= 11			N= 1		
All-Grade Visual Arts N = 1	3.252	3.427	All-Grade Visual Arts N = 13	3.312	3.420	All-Grade Visual Arts N = 0	*	*

**State Teacher Survey -CAEP Standards 1.1, 4.4, 5.1**

**InTASC Categories: Learner Development, Learning Differences, Learning Environments, Content Knowledge, Application of Content, Assessment, Planning for Instruction, Professional Learning and Ethnical Practice, and Leadership and Collaboration  
Cross Cutting Theme Diversity & Technology**

In 2016, the state adopted a policy whereby teachers would be required to complete a survey on their satisfaction with their teacher preparation program as part of the licensure renewal process. The collected data are then disaggregated by licensing institution (EPP) and the raw data sent to the appropriate institution. The data below are a result of that survey. The teachers are asked to denote what subject are they are teaching but the grade level is not requested. Therefore, the EPPs cannot disaggregate this data by licensing area since someone teaching language arts may have been an elementary candidate or a secondary English candidate. This is a concern that will be brought to the attention of the Indiana Department of Education with hopes that in the future, it can be determined which program the teachers had completed.

The following data represent three groups of graduates. The 2015 group are teachers who were just completing their first year of teaching, the 2014 group is at the end of their second year of teaching, while the 2013 group would be completing their 3<sup>rd</sup> year of teaching.

**Findings**

Overall, graduates were pleased with their teacher education programs at IUPUI and felt they were prepared to be effective teachers. Of the three groups of teachers, between 49-67% rated their overall preparedness by their teacher education program as “Excellent” with the remainder of the 2015 and 2013 group members responding that their preparation was “Good”. Eleven percent of the 2014 group gave a ranking of “Fair” or below. Overall, the second year teachers had the most concerns about their preparation.

When asked about their preparation in the area of learner development (InTASC #1), all but three of the 99 respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were prepared to understand how learners/students develop and grow. When asked about being prepared to provide an inclusive learning environment and work effectively with student with all exceptionalities (InTASC #2), the respondents agreed or strongly agreed between 92-96% of the time across all groups.

When asked about being prepared by their teacher education program to provide appropriate and challenging learning experiences and to use appropriate strategies to effectively manage learning environments (InTASC #3), between 92 – 98% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed

that they were prepared. When asked if they were prepared to meet the content preparation and knowledge level expected of a beginning teacher (InTASC #4 & #5), 93% agreed they were prepared.

For being prepared to develop quality assessments to test for student understanding of lessons and to analyze student assessment data to improve classroom instruction (InTASC # 6), a little over 90% agree across the three groups. For being able to differentiate instruction to meet all students' learning needs (InTASC #7), 97% of the respondents agreed they were prepared. In the area of integrating technological tools as appropriate to advance student learning (InTASC #8), 90% of the respondents agreed they felt prepared.

Several of the questions addressed the teachers' perceptions of how well they were prepared to be part of a professional learning and ethical practice (InTASC #9). On these questions, between 95 – 99% agreed their teacher education program had prepared them. In the area of leadership and collaboration (InTASC #10), the teachers were asked if they were prepared to effectively work with other professionals, parents/guardians, and school leaders, and to work effectively within the school culture. All of the teachers felt they were prepared to work with other professionals. The teachers felt less prepared to work with parent (Disagree - 8%) than the other groups. Between 98-99% of the teacher felt, they were prepared to work within the school culture and with school leaders.

### **Using Data**

Despite the strong results from this survey, the EPP still noted that the areas of integrating technological tools as appropriate to advance student learning, developing quality assessment and analyzing student assessment data, and working with parents were the areas where the teachers overall felt less prepared. These results have prompted discussions about how the area of assessment is addressed in the programs and were supporting evidence for selecting the use of technology as our targeted area for improvement.

See Data Below

IUPUI Graduates	Beginning Year 2015 N=6	Beginning Year 2014 N= 83	Beginning Year 2013 N=10
The EPP did an outstanding job of preparing me to... >			
understand how learners/students develop and grow CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 1	SA – 5 A-1 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.83	SA – 38 A-42 D-2 SD-1 Mean = 3.41	SA – 7 A-3 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.7
meet the content preparation and knowledge level expected of a beginning teacher. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 4 & #5	SA – 4 A-2 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.67	SA – 36 A-44 D-2 SD-1 Mean = 3.39	SA – 6 A-4 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.6
adhere to the ethical requirements of the teaching profession. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 9	SA – 4 A-2 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.67	SA – 48 A-33 D-1 SD-1 Mean = 3.54	SA – 8 A-2 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.8
adhere to the legal requirements of the teaching profession. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 9	SA – 5 A-1 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.83	SA – 40 A-40 D-2 SD-1 Mean = 3.43	SA – 7 A-2 D- 1 SD-0 Mean = 3.6
recognize the importance of continued professional development CAEP 1.1 InTASC #9	SA – 4 A-2 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.67	SA – 41 A-37 D-4 SD-1 Mean = 3.42	SA – 9 A-1 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.9
provide appropriate and challenging learning experiences	SA – 5 A-1 D-0	SA – 35 A-44 D-3	SA – 7 A-3 D-0

CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 3	SD-0 Mean = 3.83	SD-1 Mean = 3.36	SD-0 Mean = 3.7
provide an inclusive learning environment. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 2	SA – 5 A-1 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.83	SA –45 A-34 D-3 SD-1 Mean = 3.48	SA – 6 A-4 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.6
provide a rigorous learning environment CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 3	SA – 5 A-1 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.83	SA –37 A-43 D-3 SD-0 Mean = 3.41	SA – 8 A-2 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.8
work collaboratively with school leaders and/or colleagues to promote a safe learning environment CAEP 1.1 InTASC #10	SA – 5 A-1 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.83	SA – 42 A-37 D-4 SD-0 Mean = 3.46	SA – 8 A-2 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.8
differentiate instruction to meet all students’ learning needs. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 7	SA – 4 A-2 D-0 SD-0 Mean =3.67	SA – 39 A-41 D-2 SD-1 Mean = 3.42	SA – 6 A-4 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.6
work effectively with students with all exceptionalities. CAEP 1.1 InTASC #2	SA – 4 A-2 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.67	SA –35 A-42 D-5 SD-1 Mean =3.34	SA – 6 A-4 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.6
develop quality assessments to test for student understanding of lessons CAEP 1.1 InTASC #6	SA – 3 A-3 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.50	SA – 31 A-46 D-4 SD-2 Mean = 3.28	SA – 6 A-4 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.6
analyze student assessment data to improve classroom instruction. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 6	SA – 4 A-2 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.67	SA –31 A-43 D-7 SD-2 Mean = 3.24	SA – 7 A-3 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.7

use appropriate strategies to effectively manage learning environments. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 3	SA –45 A-2 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.67	SA – 30 A-45 D-6 SD-2 Mean = 3.24	SA – 7 A-3 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.7
integrate technological tools as appropriate to advance student learning. CAEP 1.1 & 1.5 InTASC # 8	SA – 2 A-4 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.33	SA – 30 A - 43 D-9 SD-1 Mean = 3.23	SA – 6 A-4 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.6
openly accept suggestions/constructive feedback. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 9	SA – 4 A-2 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.67	SA – 44 A-37 D-1 SD-1 Mean = 3.49	SA – 7 A-3 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.7
exhibit ethical practice CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 9	SA – 5 A-1 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.83	SA –46 A-36 D-1 SD-0 Mean = 3.54	SA – 7 A-3 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.7
work effectively with other professionals. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 10	SA – 5 A-1 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.83	SA – 44 A-39 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.53	SA – 7 A-3 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.7
work effectively with parents/guardians. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 10	SA – 4 A-2 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.67	SA – 30 A- 45 D-8 SD-0 Mean = 3.27	SA – 7 A-3 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.7
work effectively with school leaders. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 10	SA – 4 A-2 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.67	SA – 33 A-48 D-2 SD-0 Mean = 3.37	SA – 8 A-2 D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.8
work effectively within the school culture	SA – 5 A-1	SA –38 A- 43	SA – 7 A-3

CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 10.	D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.83	D-1 SD-0 Mean = 3.43	D-0 SD-0 Mean = 3.7
Overall Assessment of Preparedness by Teacher Preparation Program	67% Excellent 33% Good	49% Excellent 40% Good 10% Fair 1% Poor	60% Excellent 40% Good







### **Principals' Survey -CAEP Standards 1.1, 4.3**

**InTASC Categories: Learner Development, Learning Differences, Content Knowledge, Professional Learning and Ethical Practice, and Leadership and Collaboration**

**Cross Cutting Theme: Diversity and Technology**

Indiana Code (IC) 20-28-11.5-9\* requires principals at each charter school (including virtual schools) and school corporation to "complete a survey that provides information regarding the principal's assessment of the quality of instruction by each particular teacher preparation program located in Indiana for teachers employed at the school who initially received their teaching license in Indiana in the previous two (2) years

\*(c) Not before the beginning of the second semester (or the equivalent) of the school year and not later than August 1 of each year, the principal at each school described in subsection (a) shall complete a survey that provides information regarding the principal's assessment of the quality of instruction by each particular teacher preparation program located in Indiana for teachers employed at the school who initially received their teaching license in Indiana in the previous two (2) years.

The survey shall be adopted by the state board and prescribed on a form developed not later than July 30, 2016, by the department that is aligned with the matrix system established under IC 20-28-3-1(i). The school shall provide the surveys to the department along with the information provided in subsection (b). The department shall compile the information contained in the surveys, broken down by each teacher preparation program located in Indiana. The department shall include information relevant to a particular teacher preparation program located in Indiana in the department's report under subsection (f).

The principal survey was not approved until early summer 2016 and it was not "active" as long as the teacher survey. It is required and will be re-activated starting Feb 1, 2017 and open until August 1, 2017 (dates are in statute). The Indiana Department of Education expects a much better response rate in 2017. The department also will have help from the principals association in reminding principals to complete the survey as required.

#### **Findings**

Principals rated each EPP first-year teacher as either "Agree" = 3 or Strong-Agree = 4 for each of the criteria with the strongest results being for adhering to the legal and ethical requirement of the teaching profession. Averages for the five first-year teachers ranged from 3.0 to 4.0. The ratings for the five second-year teachers from the EPP ranged from 3.2 -3.8. Sixty percent of the principals were very satisfied with the first-year teachers with the remaining 40 % of the principals satisfied. For the second year teachers, 40% of the principals were very satisfied with 60% satisfied. None of the EPP graduates was given ratings below "Agree" which denoted the principals' satisfaction with their skills, knowledge and dispositions.

Because of the low return rate for the first year of this survey, statewide data was not provided for comparison purposes.

**Using Data**

As comparative data is available from the state and more principals respond to the survey, the EPP hopes to be able to use these data to investigate overall principal satisfaction with EPP graduates. IN addition, the EPP would like to investigate any possible connections with program assessment data obtained earlier from the graduates with their success as teachers. This type of longitudinal investigation would require that the identity of each teacher be made available to the EPP. At this time, that type of identification is not possible.

**2016 Data: Four-point Likert-Scale**

IUPUI Graduates	Total N=10	First Year Teachers N= 5	Second Year Teachers N=5
The EPP did an outstanding job of preparing this teacher to... >			
...understand how students learn and develop at the grade level they are teaching. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 1	3.3	3.4	3.2
meet expectations of a beginning teacher for content preparation and knowledge. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 4 & #5	3.4	3.4	3.4
adhere to the ethical requirements of the teaching profession. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 9	3.9	4.0	3.8
adhere to the legal requirements of the teaching profession. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 9	3.9	4.0	3.8
provide an appropriate and challenging learning experience. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 3	3.2	3.0	3.4
provide an inclusive learning environment. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 2	3.4	3.4	3.4
provide a rigorous learning environment.	3.3	3.2	3.4

CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 3			
use a variety of assessment methods to guide, adjust, and improve instruction. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 6	3.3	3.4	3.2
develop content specific assessments to test for student understanding of the lesson CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 6	3.1	3.0	3.2
differentiate instruction to meet all students' learning needs. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 7	3.1	3.0	3.2
work effectively with students with all exceptionalities. CAEP 1.1 InTASC #2	3.5	3.4	3.6
analyze student assessment data to improve classroom instruction. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 6	3.4	3.4	3.4
use effective strategies to manage the learning environment. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 3	3.2	3.0	3.4
integrate technological tools as appropriate to advance student learning. CAEP 1.1 & 1.5 InTASC # 8	3.4	3.6	3.2
openly accept suggestions/constructive feedback. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 9	3.4	3.2	3.6
exhibit ethical practice expected of educators. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 9	3.7	3.8	3.6
work effectively with other professionals. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 10	3.3	3.2	3.4
work effectively with parents/guardians. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 10	3.4	3.6	3.2
work effectively with school leaders. CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 10	3.4	3.4	3.4
work effectively within the school culture CAEP 1.1 InTASC # 10.	3.5	3.6	3.4

Overall, how satisfied are you with the training this teacher received from this EPP? CAEP 1.1	50% Very Satisfied 50% Satisfied	60% Very Satisfied 40% Satisfied	40% Very Satisfied 60% Satisfied
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

### State Teacher Effectiveness Data -CAEP Standard 4.2

#### InTASC Categories: Learner Development, Learning Differences, Content Knowledge, Professional Learning and Ethical Practice, and Leadership and Collaboration Cross Cutting Theme Diversity

In 2011, the state of Indiana passed legislation to require that each school corporation develop a plan for annual performance evaluations for each certified staff member with the plan being implemented beginning with the 2012-2013 school year. Each school corporation was given the opportunity to develop its own evaluation with no one statewide evaluation required. The state legislation did stipulate components that must be included in each evaluation plan. The required components included:

- Student assessment results from statewide assessments for certificated employees whose responsibilities include instruction in subjects measured in statewide assessments;
- Methods for assessing student growth for certificated employees who do not teach in areas measured by statewide assessments
- Student assessment results from locally developed assessments and other test measures for certificated employees whose responsibilities may or may not include instruction in subjects and areas measured by statewide assessments.
- Rigorous measures of effectiveness, including observations and other performance indicators.
- An annual designation of each certificated employee in one (1) of the following rating categories:
  - Highly effective.
  - Effective.
  - Improvement necessary.
  - Ineffective.

School corporations provide the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) the disaggregated results of staff performance evaluations by teacher identification numbers, along with the teacher preparation program that recommended the initial license for each teacher.

The majority of school corporations in Indiana adopted the RISE Evaluation and Development System for their annual performance evaluations. The rubric addresses the following three domains: Purposeful Planning, Effective Instruction, and Teacher Leadership,

Once all the statewide data are collected, the IDOE provides the evaluation data for its graduates to each EPP with overall teacher evaluation ratings for graduates with one, two and three years of teaching experience, along with the statewide results. The IDOE has made available data for the 2014-2015, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 academic years.

The tables below contain the results of teacher evaluations for the three academic years available for IUPUI graduates, along with comparative statewide data.

### **Findings**

During 2014-2015, 86.92% of EPP first-year teachers, 92.62% of EPP second-year teachers, and 94.03% of EPP third-year teachers were rated as either effective or highly effective which exceed the state results of 82.57%, 87.61% and 91.06% respectively. There were similar results for 2013-2014 with 93.33% of EPP first-year teachers, 96.58% of EPP second-year teachers, and 97.73% of EPP third-year teachers receiving rating of effective or high-effective compare to 85.33%, 87.02% and 86.70% statewide. The pattern goes back to 2012-2013 with 84.55% of EPP first-year teachers compared to 83.71% statewide, 90.48% of EPP second-year teachers compared to 88.25% statewide, and 89.60% of EPP third-year teacher compared to 88.15% statewide receiving ratings of effective or highly effective.

### **Using Data**

These data support that candidates leave the EPP teacher education program with the skills, knowledge, and dispositions to be effective teachers in their own classrooms. The EPP will continue to examine these state data and seek to supplement it with case studies and its own observations of EPP graduates.

2014-2015						
Ratings for IUPUI Graduates by Years of Experience						
	1 year Exp.	Percentage	2 Years Exp.	Percentage	3 Years Exp.	Percentage
Highly Effective	22	16.92%	52	29.55%	62	33.70%
Effective	91	70.00%	111	63.07%	111	60.33%
Improvement Necessary	8	6.15%	5	2.84%	1	0.54%

Ineffective	2	1.55%	1	0.56%	1	0.54%
NA/Not Evaluated	7	5.38%	7	3.98%	9	4.89%
Total	130		176		184	
State-wide Results						
	1 year Exp.	Percentage	2 Years Exp.	Percentage	3 Years Exp.	Percentage
Highly Effective	402	15.75%	827	27.70%	876	32.24%
Effective	1706	66.82%	1789	59.91%	1598	58.82%
Improvement Necessary	109	4.27%	71	2.38%	43	1.58%
Ineffective	19	0.74%	11	0.37%	8	0.29%
NA/Not Evaluated	317	12.42%	288	9.64%	192	7.07%
Total	2553		2986		2717	

2013-2014						
Ratings for IUPUI Graduates by Years of Experience						
	1 year Exp.	Percentage	2 Years Exp.	Percentage	3 Years Exp.	Percentage
Highly Effective	29	14.87%	49	23.90%	38	28.79%
Effective	153	78.46%	149	72.68%	91	68.94%

Improvement Necessary	10	5.13%	5	2.44%	3	
Ineffective	3	1.54%	2	0.98%	0	0.0%
NA/Not Evaluated	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	195		205		132	2.27%
State-wide Results						
	1 year Exp.	Percentage	2 Years Exp.	Percentage	3 Years Exp.	Percentage
Highly Effective	692	20.39%	692	27.46%	575	29.10%
Effective	2204	64.94%	1501	59.56%	1136	57.60%
Improvement Necessary	100	2.95%	45	1.79%	40	2.00%
Ineffective	24	0.71%	14	0.56%	9	0.50%
NA/Not Evaluated	374	11.01%	268	10.63%	213	10.80%
Total	3394		2520		1973	

2012-2013						
Ratings for IUPUI Graduates by Years of Experience						
	1 year Exp.	Percentage	2 Years Exp.	Percentage	3 Years Exp.	Percentage
Highly Effective	20	16.26%	12	19.05%	17	22.07%
Effective	84	68.29%	45	71.43%	52	67.53%

Improvement Necessary	4	3.25%	2	3.17%	1	1.30%
Ineffective	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
NA/Not Evaluated	15	12.20%	4	6.35%	7	9.10%
Total	123		63		77	
State-wide Results						
	1 year Exp.	Percentage	2 Years Exp.	Percentage	3 Years Exp.	Percentage
Highly Effective	300	14.12%	287	18.75%	326	20.76%
Effective	1478	69.59%	1064	69.50%	1058	67.39%
Improvement Necessary	65	3.06%	38	2.48%	40	2.55%
Ineffective	15	0.71%	4	0.26%	9	0.57%
NA/Not Evaluated	266	12.52%	138	9.01%	137	8.73%
Total	2124		1531		1570	

### Data Driven Programmatic Changes

#### **Elementary Education**

##### Content Knowledge

All candidates must pass the three sections of CASA, meet or exceed the combined score, or have acceptable scores on the ACT/SAT. However, data reflecting the number of times candidates must retake the math and writing sections before entering the program support that these are two areas where some candidates struggle. In addition, data from Benchmark II as well as a survey completed by candidates at the end of Block III, indicate mathematics is an area candidates feel least prepared to teach. To address this concern with mathematics content and pedagogical content



knowledge, the School of Education in conjunction with the School of Science designed a 12 credit-hour mathematics sequence that all elementary major must complete with grades of “C” or higher in each course before being eligible to enter the elementary teacher education program. Candidates take 9 credit hours of mathematics for elementary teachers through the Department of Mathematics in the School of Science. They then take EDUC N102, which is a 3-hour education course, which serves as a transition into the two mathematics methods courses that are part of the teacher education blocks. There are four major goals of this course. The goals for the course are guided in part by the Principles of Teacher Education (PTEs). The first goal is to deepen the candidates’ own reasoning about mathematics topics that are related to teaching in the elementary school (PTE 1 & 4). Second, we want candidates to listen, appreciate and analyze classmates’ and elementary school children’s solutions of problems (PTE 2). Third, candidates should develop and understand different ways of representing problem situations (PTE 1 & 2). Candidates work on these goals by solving problems, sharing their solutions to these problems with the class, and watching video of elementary grade students’ solving problems. Fourth, candidates should develop a better understanding of the historical aspects of mathematics and the development of mathematical languages over time. The purpose of these goals is to help create an environment in which candidates experience teaching for understanding (PTE 3).

When we reviewed the data related to our students’ content knowledge achieved before they entered the Elementary Teacher Education program (Course Grades and GPA), we noted that the students have been coming with strong GPAs overall, especially in the last three years (3.21-3.36). The highest GPAs are in the area of reading, writing, and oral language and the weakest are in science, although even those have shown improvement in the last couple of semesters. The conversation that ensued after looking at these data has started an inquiry into the possibility of adding another science course to the teacher education program or at least adding the option of earning a certificate in STEM for our undergraduate candidates.

#### Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

The purpose of the Benchmark I Assessment has always been to identify and support our candidates at the end of the first semester of the program so they might complete their program of study and ultimately be successful educators. The Benchmark I Assessment has been a reliable tool that has indeed helped us to identify early struggles in the areas of Knowledge and Habits of Mind, Written and Oral Communication, Interactions with Teachers and Students, and Dispositions and Professional Behavior. However, we came to realize that we needed to consistently use the results of this assessment to support our candidates. In order to make better use of the Benchmark I data, we recently added a policy to follow up more rigorously with a candidate when he/she is displaying a number of negative indicators. Our new policy requires that a candidates with three or more negative indicators be assigned a mentor faculty member. The mentor then works with the candidate to help the candidate remove these negative indicators during the next one or two semesters. All negative indicators must be resolved prior to the start of student teaching. By providing this early intervention support, we hope to insure that candidates are better prepared to enter and be successful in their student teaching experience and then go on to be successful in the teaching profession.

The data from the Principal Survey and the Student Teaching Evaluations indicated that our graduates needed more opportunity to develop the skills and knowledge to work with the community. Although during the four semesters of the teacher education program our candidates participate in eight field experiences and a number of professional development events, there seemed to be a need for more and earlier experiences working with the community and parents. In order to better prepare our candidates to engage with the community around a school, we instituted Service

Learning requirements in two of our prerequisite courses: EDUC F200 and EDUC E201. Now, prior to being admitted to the core teacher education program, each candidates must acquire 30 hours of service to a community organization that is associated with education i.e., a community center. These service hours are woven into both course curricula as either discussion items or writing topics. By providing these additional service experiences, we hope to raise the awareness of the importance the involvement with the larger community that surrounds a school. We believe this type of community involvement will benefit both our future graduates and their future school communities.

Prior to the state-mandated 120-hour degree programs, the School of Education required that elementary candidates complete two 6-credit hour writing courses prior to entering the program. With the need to reduce credit hours and to adhere to the new 30-credit hour core curriculum, it was not possible to require the second writing course. The data from the Benchmark I and PRAXIS I, however, still supported that writing was an area where candidates needed extra experience in order to be successful in the program. More candidates receive a negative indicator in writing for Benchmark I than any other category with between 10 and 17 percent of the Block I candidates receiving a negative indicator in this area since fall 2006 and between 7 and 32 percent of the Block II candidates also receiving a negative indicator for the same time period. The School of Education was able to address this concern and still meet the mandates of the 120-hour degree and 30- hour core curriculum by selecting a core curriculum diversity course EDUC E201 that has a heavy emphasis on writing and has a service-learning component.

### Student Learning

Benchmark IV has provided an opportunity for faculty/coaches to interact with candidates at the end of their program. During the interviews, interviewers take notes and look for patterns of strengths and weaknesses across candidates. Based on these data the faculty have modified aspects of their courses to better address topics of evaluating student learning where candidates seem to have the most difficulty. One of these areas is analysis of the data. The Benchmark II assessment was moved back to an interview format in order to allow candidates to have more opportunities to interact with children and analyzed the children's understanding.

### Assessments

The School of Education Evaluation Committee continues to monitor and evaluate the Unit Assessment System for the elementary program to determine if the data collected continue to answer the key assessment questions developed for this program. Assessments have remained the same as the committee feels the data collected sufficiently inform the committee and the elementary faculty concerning the key goals of the program, which are tied to the skills, knowledge, and dispositions grounded in the conceptual framework (Principles of Teacher Education –PTEs). Minor changes have been made such as moving the Benchmark II to a course assignment instead of an external assessment. This was done because of the amount of time needed to externally assess each benchmark at the end of the semester. The math faculty using the Benchmark II in their classes requested a change to a video case-study format. A pilot test was done but analysis of the results and new process supported returning to the former format.

There is currently an on-going discussion about changing the format of the lesson planning assessment and well as discussions on how to obtain better return-rates on the Principal Survey. As the unit moves to the new CAEP standards, there will be additional changes made to the assessment system. The Evaluation Committee in conjunction with the unit and content faculty will guide all these.

## Secondary English

### Content Knowledge

Data support that candidates have a strong background in their content knowledge with mean content GPAs of candidates entering the secondary program ranging from 3.04 to 3.41 over the last 14 semesters. Over the last few years the state department of education has restructure the licensing framework for many of the teaching education programs. In the past, the secondary English/language arts program included journalism as a licensing area. The new framework made journalism a stand-alone licensing area and incorporated speech into the English/language arts licensure framework. The School of Education and Department of English worked together to redesign a new program to address these changes guided by data from PRAXIS II, grades in content courses, and the new standards. Last year the state mandated that all secondary candidates complete a major in their content area. Review of the new program and relevant data supported that our candidates are completing the equivalent of a major in English/language arts. We also continue to require that candidates obtain a grade of “C” or higher in all content courses used toward program completion.

PRAXIS II test score data also support that candidates possess the content knowledge expected by the state with a range of pass rates from 942% to 100% over the last 7 years. Usually our candidates have higher pass rates based on Indiana cut-off scores when compared to national examinees.

### Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Prior to the state-mandated 120-hour degree programs, the School of Education required that secondary candidates complete two 6-credit hour writing courses prior to entering the program to improve their professional writing skills. This was true even for our secondary English/language arts candidates. With the need to reduce credit hours and to adhere to the new 30-credit hour core curriculum, it was not possible to require the second writing course. Data still supported that writing is an area where candidates needed extra experience in order to be successful in the program. The School of Education was able to address this concern and still meet the mandates of the 120-hour degree and 30-hour core curriculum by selecting a core curriculum diversity course EDUC E201 that has a heavy emphasis on writing and has a service-learning component.

Lesson planning data support that candidate can envision a full semester of learning, gain an understanding of how to sequence content to support student development over that semester, and plan for consistency. The majority of candidates score at the “developing” or “enacting” levels. Candidates who do not successfully complete this assignment and obtain a grade of “C” or higher in the course are removed from the program and must appeal to reenter and repeat the course.

Student teaching data support that candidates possess the skills, knowledge and dispositions during student teaching that are expected of a student teacher with most candidates being evaluated at the “developing” or “proficient” levels by their supervising teachers since fall 2007. Likewise, principals scored the majority of graduates since 2005-2006 as “adequate” or higher in the skills, knowledge and dispositions address in their survey.

### Student Learning

Benchmark IV has provided an opportunity for faculty to interact with candidates at the end of their program. During the interviews, interviewers take notes and look for patterns of strengths and weaknesses across candidates. Based on these data the faculty have modified aspects of their courses to better address topics of evaluating student learning where candidates seem to have the most difficulty. One of these areas is analysis of the data.

### Assessments

From 2009-2013, secondary faculty did not make significant changes to benchmark assessments which provide valuable feedback on the dispositions and professional behaviors of candidates during their first two semesters in the program. The faculty did alter the way they use the data, however. Instructors from Block I continue to meet to discuss the benchmark assessment and determine indicators for each candidate. Instructors from Block II do the same for their candidates. The faculty still receives a report of the indicators and discusses the results at a faculty meeting. Two years ago, the instructors from Block II began attending the benchmark session for Block I so they could learn more about the candidates who would be entering their Block II classes. This additional communication between the Block I and II instructors increased the ability of the Block II instructors to make necessary instructional adjustments earlier and to follow-up with specific candidates who continue to demonstrate negative behaviors within their classes and field experiences. We also added a conference requirement for the candidates who were earning negative indicators on the Benchmark II assessment. Now, these candidates receive a request for a conference with the program chair when they receive their Benchmark II report. The chair is copied on the message and arranges a conference with the candidates prior to or immediately after the start of Block III classes. During the conference, the candidate and chair discuss steps the candidate needs to take in order to be successful in Block III based on the results of the Benchmark II assessment. Often, the candidates acknowledge personal issues (financial shortfalls, family trauma, and poor health) that contributed to their negative performances and advisors are contacted. Occasionally, candidates admit to dissatisfaction with teaching as a career choice so we can help them plan for changes in their program of study. The progress plan developed in the conference is communicated to the Block III instructor as well. These additional changes are intended to increase communication among the faculty so everyone can respond quickly and cohesively when candidates exhibit behaviors that are part of a negative pattern.

The Benchmark III assessment in the program has been one of our least useful assessment for helping us track candidate progress and respond with programmatic changes. It has been an unwieldy assessment for us since it comes late in the semester, takes hours to score, and provides results that are often not communicated to candidates until they are already in their student teaching placements. We have piloted other assessments during the past four years, but we still have not settled on an assessment that provides the information we want without considerable faculty time. We continue to come back to our original assessment, which requires candidates to view a video clip of instruction in their content area and write responses identifying learning outcomes, analyzing instruction, and describing an appropriate follow-up lesson. Candidates have 4 hours in a computer lab to complete the assessment and faculty from the content methods courses score the results.

Over the past four years, the methods instructors have used the results of the assessment as another window into how candidates use resources from the block classes to analyze instruction, how well they recognize potential learning outcomes, and how well they can prepare an appropriate follow-up lesson. This information has been confirming for the program as well as helpful in identifying a few gaps, but its timing limits its usefulness in working with individual candidates.

After we administered the assessment in spring 2013, we collected feedback from candidates about their experience with the assessment. We will use this feedback, as well as the candidates' assessment responses, at our first secondary faculty meeting in September 2013 to inform our revisions to this benchmark assessment. At this time, it is likely we will change the assessment for spring 2014.

We discontinued our former Assessment 8, which was a final assessment project. This assessment was completed during the English/language arts method course. The faculty found the time required to assess the assignment in 2008 and 2009 was too much for the increasing numbers of candidates in the method course each spring and the information acquired from the assessment was not sufficiently different from the information gained from other sources (exit cards, mid-term feedback forms, individual feedback form after Text Set Project submission, and individual reflections on Problems in Practice project).

Sparked by a candidate's comment on one of the class exit cards in 2012, the faculty developed another final assessment to allow candidates to synthesize information about effective practices in ELA secondary classrooms and provide information for the faculty regarding their learning. The assignment was a collaborative activity in 2012. Due to the collaborative nature, the final products did not provide individual level data and since the candidates were assigned to a single focus area and completed their work in class, their products were generally solid and filled with references to their class text (Jim Burke's THE ENGLISH TEACHER'S COMPANION) and activities, but lacked references to other readings. The assignment fulfilled one of the instructional goals for them to synthesize information from the semester, but it did not provide valuable information that could use to make decisions about the course or about individual candidate's progress.

In spring 2013, the assignment was modified to provide candidates choices for the practices they wished to showcase, but it became an individual assessment rather than a collaborative one. In order to keep grading manageable at the end of the semester, the faculty did not use an official rubric for this assignment. Grades were based on candidates' successful completion of two criteria and candidates were expected to use citations to support their claims, an expectation that has been consistent throughout the course. A rubric is now being developed for this assessment and will be piloted during spring 2014 (course is only taught in the spring). We plan to use this new assignment as our eighth programmatic assessment in fall 2014.

Benchmark IV has been one of our most successful. It occurs at the end of student teaching and includes several components – a recording of the student teaching that is peer reviewed in a seminar setting and analyzed in a paper; a unit that was developed and taught by the candidate; samples of student work from the unit; and an “exit interview” session with faculty. Most of the secondary instructors participate in the exit interviews at the end of each semester.

Though we have used this assessment for several years, we revised the rubric to align with rubric descriptors used in other benchmarks. We also focus our interview questions on three specific areas – How the candidate uses an assessment process to inform decision making; how the candidate uses evidence to show that his/her instruction has favorably impacted student learning; and how the candidate has integrated knowledge of students, subject matter, and pedagogy during the student teaching semester. When we began focusing on collecting evidence of impact, many of our candidates were not able to talk about specific assessments they used. As a result, we shifted our Block III methods class to include a heavier emphasis on using formative and summative assessments. We have noticed in recent semesters that our candidates use and talk about assessments more confidently.

The School of Education Evaluation Committee continues to monitor and evaluate the Unit Assessment System for the secondary English/language arts program to determine if the data collected continue to answer the key assessment questions developed for this program. As the unit moves to the new CAEP standards, there will be additional changes made to the assessment system. The Evaluation Committee in conjunction with the unit and content faculty will guide all assessment and accreditation activities

## **Secondary Mathematics**

### **Content Knowledge**

Data support that candidates have a strong background in their content knowledge with mean content GPAs of candidates entering the secondary program ranging from 2.73 to 3.62 over the last 14 semesters with 10 of these semester cohorts having an average content GPA of 3.00 or higher. When the state mandated that all secondary education candidates complete a major in their content area, we did not have to modify the content portion of the mathematics education program as our requirements in mathematics actually exceed those of a mathematics major. Data support that candidates receive a strong preparation in the content areas they will teach. The practice of requiring candidates to repeat any mathematics course for which they do not receive a grade of "C" or higher continues. PRAXIS II test score data also support that candidates possess the content knowledge expected by the state with pass rates of 100% over the last 9 years.

### **Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions**

Prior to the state-mandated 120-hour degree programs, the School of Education required that secondary candidates complete two 6-credit hour writing courses prior to entering the program. With the need to reduce credit hours and to adhere to the new 30-credit hour core curriculum, it was not possible to require the second writing course.

Data still supported that writing is an area where candidates needed extra experience in order to be successful in the program. The School of Education was able to address this concern and still meet the mandates of the 120-hour degree and 30-hour core curriculum by selecting a core curriculum diversity course EDUC E201 that has a heavy emphasis on writing and has a service-learning component. Data from the assignment, which involves the construction and implementation of a lesson plan that uses technology as part of the learning process, has been revised to address standards at the indicator level. Data from this assessment support that candidates perform at the upper two levels of proficiency consistently with only one candidate scoring below level 4.

The Student Teaching Evaluation was completely redesigned to not only address the new 2012 NCTM Standards but to also have the candidates evaluation for their knowledge and skills in planning, teaching, and impacting student learning for each of the indicators. This has provided much more informative data about each candidate and the program in general. Student teaching data support that most candidates possess the skills, knowledge and dispositions during student teaching that are expected of a student teacher with candidates being evaluated consistently at the "Proficient" or "Developing" level. Ratings on planning and teaching aspects of each indicator were normally a little higher than effectiveness in producing the desired student learning.

### **Student Learning**

The new Student Teaching Evaluation has provided another source for evidence about candidates' impact on student learning. Mentor teachers evaluate candidates on whether there is evidence of effectiveness in producing the desired student learning. This new format provides data on a wide variety of aspects of student learning. Benchmark IV has been redesigned to better reflect the NCTM standards at the indicator level. As an oral assessment, it provides an opportunity for faculty to interact with candidates at the end of their program. During the interviews, interviewers take notes and look for patterns of strengths and weaknesses across candidates. Based on these data the faculty have modified aspects of their courses to better address topics of evaluating student learning where candidates seem to have the most difficulty. The faculty are still working to modify courses to address candidates' ability to analysis data.

### Assessments

Because Benchmark III assessment in the program had been our least useful assessment for helping us track candidate progress and respond with programmatic changes, it was redesigned to provide more detailed feedback in terms of candidate skills, knowledge and dispositions. The methods instructors continue to use the results of the assessment as another window into how candidates use resources from the block classes to analyze instruction, how well they recognize potential learning outcomes, and how well they can prepare an appropriate follow-up lesson. Benchmark IV continues to be one of our most successful and informative assessments. It occurs at the end of student teaching and includes several components - a recording of the student teaching that is peer reviewed in a seminar setting and analyzed in a paper; a unit that was developed and taught by the candidate; samples of student work from the unit; and an "exit interview" session with faculty. Most of the secondary instructors participate in the exit interviews at the end of each semester.

### Secondary Social Studies

#### Content Knowledge

Data support that candidates have a strong background in their content knowledge with mean content GPAs of candidates entering the secondary program ranging from 2.93 to 3.44 over the last 18 semesters with 16 of these semester cohorts having an average content GPA of 3.00 or higher. In the past, the program provided a broad social studies content base for all candidates with candidates then specializing in three social studies licensure areas of their choosing.

After reviewing PRAXIS II category scores, content area course grades, and considering new Indiana legislation, the faculty decided to have candidates specialize in only two areas. Data and marketability issues supported that we should require all candidates to complete the historical perspectives area and then a second area of their choosing. Additional areas can be added by either testing or through coursework beyond the state mandated 120- hour degree program.

Candidates must obtain a grade of "C" or higher in all content courses used toward program completion. PRAXIS II test score data also support that candidates possess the content knowledge expected by the state with a range of pass rates from 92% to 100% from 2005 through 2013. Our candidates also have a consistently higher pass rate based on Indiana cut-off scores when compared to the national examinees. The large number of ETS and Pearson tests, which could be used, for licensure in 2013-2014 resulted in very small Ns for each test. In addition, many candidates

delayed taking the test because of concerns denoted by the Indiana Department of Education over the validity of the way the cutoff scores used for the Pearson tests were determined.

### Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Prior to the state-mandated 120-hour degree programs, the School of Education required that secondary candidates complete two 6-credit hour writing courses prior to entering the program. With the need to reduce credit hours and to adhere to the new 30-credit hour core curriculum, it was not possible to require the second writing course.

Data still supported that writing is an area where candidates needed extra experience in order to be successful in the program. The School of Education was able to address this concern and still meet the mandates of the 120-hour degree and 30-hour core curriculum by selecting a core curriculum diversity course EDUC E201 that has a heavy emphasis on writing and has a service-learning component. It has also been approved by the university to count toward the 30-hour general education requirement.

Lesson planning data for the new assessment support that candidate can develop a complete, ready-to-teach unit. The majority of candidates have scored at the "acceptable" or above levels. Candidates who do not successfully complete this assignment resulting in a grade of "C" or higher in the course are removed from the program and must appeal to reenter and repeat the course. The student teaching data for the new instrument support that most candidates possess the skills, knowledge and dispositions during student teaching that are expected of a student teacher with ALL candidates being evaluated at the "Developing" or "Proficient" levels by their supervising teachers. The new instrument provided faculty with data about candidates' ability to plan, teach and impact student learning on each of the NCSS Thematic standards as well as data on each indicator of the History Discipline Standard.

### Assessments

From 2013-2015, secondary faculty did make significant changes to benchmark assessments which included a completely new assessment for student teaching (Assessment 4) and major changes to Assessment 3 (Lesson Planning), Assessment 5 (Benchmark V), and Assessment 7 (Benchmark III). to better, align them with the NCSS Pedagogical Standards.

In the past, the Benchmark III assessment in the program has been our least useful assessment for helping us track candidate progress and respond with programmatic changes. It has been an unwieldy assessment for us since it comes late in the semester, takes hours to score, and provides results that are often not communicated to candidates until they are already in their student teaching placements. We have piloted other assessments during the past four years, but we still have not settled on an assessment that provides the information we want without considerable faculty time. We continue to come back to our original assessment, which requires candidates to view a video clip of instruction in their content area and write responses identifying learning outcomes, analyzing instruction, and describing an appropriate follow-up lesson. Candidates have 4 hours in a computer lab to complete the assessment and faculty from the content methods courses score the results.

Over the past four years, the methods instructors have used the results of the assessment as another window into how candidates use resources from the block classes to analyze instruction, how well they recognize potential learning outcomes, and how well they can prepare an appropriate



follow-up lesson. This information has been confirming for the program as well as helpful in identifying a few gaps, but its timing limits its usefulness in working with individual candidates. The faculty initially feels the changes in the assessment has provided data, which is more informative than in the past.

After we administered the assessment in spring 2013, we collected feedback from candidates about their experience with the assessment. We used this feedback and the feedback from the program review, as well as the candidates' assessment responses, to inform our revisions to this benchmark assessment.

Benchmark IV has been one of our most successful. It occurs at the end of student teaching and includes several components - a recording of the student teaching that is peer reviewed in a seminar setting and analyzed in a paper; a unit that was developed and taught by the candidate; samples of student work from the unit; and an "exit interview" session with faculty. Most of the secondary instructors participate in the exit interviews at the end of each semester.

Though we have used this assessment for several years, we revised the rubric to align with rubric descriptors used in other benchmarks and to better reflect the NCSS Pedagogical Standards. We also focus our interview questions on three specific areas - How the candidate uses an assessment process to inform decision making; how the candidate uses evidence to show that his/her instruction has favorably impacted student learning; and how the candidate has integrated knowledge of students, subject matter, and pedagogy during the student teaching semester. When we began focusing on collecting evidence of impact, many of our candidates were not able to talk about specific assessments they used. As a result, we shifted our Block III methods class to include a heavier emphasis on using formative and summative assessments. We have noticed in recent semesters that our candidates use and talk about assessments more confidently.

As noted earlier, the Student Teaching Evaluation was completely redesigned based on a sample assessment provided by NCSS on their website. It now addressed each Thematic and History Standards for planning, teaching and impact on student learning. It has been used for two semester and been well received by the mentor teachers.

The School of Education Evaluation Committee continues to monitor and evaluate the Unit Assessment System for the secondary social studies program to determine if the data collected continue to answer the key assessment questions developed for this program. As the unit moves to the new CAEP standards, additional changes are being made to the assessment system. The Evaluation Committee in conjunction with the unit and content faculty is guiding these. The unit is also moving all of the assessments to Task Stream to provide better management of the data.

### **Physical Education**

Taken together, we feel our TCs are being well prepared in an intentional and meaningful manner. Evidence of this is revealed in several areas. First, and foremost we consistently have a 100% pass rate on the Praxis II / CASA II test, which is the content area test for licensure. Certainly, there is one year of data that indicated three students did not pass on their first attempt, but there are two things to consider. First, that cohort pass rate average was still above 90%, which is above the national average. In addition, second, those individuals eventually took and passed the test for licensure. Another striking piece of evidence that we are preparing our TCs well is with our employment rate. We are at about 94% of our

students gainfully employed within 2-3 years of graduation. Moreover, in fact, this is typically true within the first year. In fact, I have exhausted our list of recent graduates when contacted by a Superintendent recently, as I had no recent graduate looking for a job!

Those two are the most transparent and powerful data points that we are doing good work. However, we also continually review the data from our assessments and try to note trends or outliers so that we can see how we can improve. The first thing we do is we complete a comprehensive annual report of the NASPE standards and our PETE student learning outcomes. This also helps document student learning for the campus. Therefore, when we enter the data each academic year we can compare to prior years to see if any significant trends are emerging and how we should best address them. The first example of this relates to our PETE majors ability to utilize technology in the teaching and learning environment (sub-element 3.7). Regarding our data collection for this report (which also coincides with our annual campus assessment report), we noted some inconsistent percentages from semester to semester as it related to our technology course (HPER-P 200) and our PETE students accomplishing NASPE 3.7. Upon further investigation, it appeared the focus of the class was a bit Biomechanical within a relative clinical setting (electronic flexible goniometer and force plate usage) and this made sense as many Exercise Science students were also taking the course. Yet, with a quick conversation with the course instructor, areas of emphasis that included Heart Rate Monitor and Accelerometer were emphasized and these are both relative to PETE usage. The second area related to our PETE majors being able to adapt to society's recasting of the PE teacher into a more comprehensive physical activity specialist. This directly relates to sub-element 6.2 and that was an area of concern prior. Yet, upon noting this, the PETE faculty who is a national level trainer with vast experience in utilizing physical education and activity in unattached school time settings helped to embed these principles in a course (HPER-P497) so that our students care in tune with the national dialogue and transformation of PETE into more CSPAP-like responsibilities.

Finally, the documenting of student learning is always an area than anyone can improve upon, so we took the feedback from the most recent submission and then made more robust our scoring tools to better explain and document what was already occurring, just not easily documented. As is the case with most reviews, we had to do a better job documenting the good work we were doing. It was not that we were not doing good work, but the reviewers at the 30,000-foot view could not see it. Certainly, our community partners and schools and all the stakeholders knew the good work we were doing, but we needed to do a better job of putting it on paper. In sum, this submission and response to conditions accurately removes any doubt of the great experiences and training our PETE majors enjoy. One cannot really argue (well sensibly anyway) against the high test scores, Service-Learning rankings, and employment rate numbers as those are direct measures of our program quality

## **Special Education**

### **Content Knowledge**

Over the past two years, we have updated our curriculum to better integrate the most current evidence-based special education practices, ensure teachers are highly qualified, prepare special education teachers to collaborate/co-teach with their general education colleagues, and prepare teachers to work effectively with students with exceptionalities, including those from underrepresented racial and linguistic backgrounds. These efforts have paid off; across assessment, our candidates demonstrated well their understanding of content knowledge related to professional and family collaboration, elements of robust transition planning services, as well as the design of culturally responsive, inclusive, and positive classroom academic and social learning environments. Based on our analysis of assessments from 2014, a day-long retreat in August of 2015, as

well as ongoing monthly program meetings have included our faculty members engaging collaboratively in the examination of current course syllabi, programmatic goals and outcomes, with a distinct focus on improving methods and outcomes for students with exceptionalities. These meetings and analyses will continue because of the current program review. A finding from the review is that although our candidates' design of lessons/units that are universally designed for learning is strong, the assessment rubric itself could provide more specific detail with regard to the specific elements of UDL so that we are better able to assess the strengths and areas of need in our candidates' lesson planning. Moreover, given the importance of cultural responsiveness in all educational settings, but in particular in those urban settings in which our program focuses, our faculty has determined that making explicit the ways in which UDL may be cross-pollinated with Culturally Responsive/Sustaining Pedagogy will further strengthen the content of our program and relatedly, our program assessments. Program coordinator Dr. Thorius has written about this need in an article currently in press in the academic journal *Harvard Educational Review* (Waitoller & Thorius, accepted). Relatedly, while UDL is highly regarded as a curriculum framework, situating UDL within the universal tier of instruction of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) such as Response to Intervention appears to be a program need on the basis of our current review. Further, our analysis of assessments related to classroom management include only one within-coursework criteria related to school-wide positive behavior interventions and supports (SWPBIS). Given the prominence of MTSS including SWPBIS in universal instruction and behavior supports, as well as progress monitoring and provision of increasing intensity of interventions, we are considering additional program content related to how effective classroom management reflects research-based principles of SWPBIS.

#### Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Disposition

Professional knowledge is an area in which we will continue to strengthen our program. Across those assessments which measured professional knowledge, and in particular those which measured knowledge of legislation, federal special education definitions, eligibility and placement procedures, and special educator roles, candidates fared just a little less well than those which assessed curricular design, instruction, assessment, and provision of individualized special education services. Upon our special education program faculty members' consideration of program/course content related to professional knowledge, we have reflected that those readings which present this content are typically from textbooks and may be somewhat dry and dense. We have determined that the addition of activities within two particular classes, K201 Introduction to Special Education and K426 Assessment and Instruction, such as role-plays of the explanation of procedural safeguards to families or mock-presentations to school staff the key features of IDEA, including special education eligibility and placement procedures will allow our candidates to apply professional knowledge in a supportive environment to lead to deeper understanding and knowledge sustained over time. Further, and in relation to our comments in the previous section about additional program content related to SWPBIS, measures of our teacher candidates' application of supports for students' social and emotional learning underscore the need to provide more opportunities to plan for universal procedures and individualized interventions around students' social, emotional, and behavioral functioning. With regard for skills, although our candidates performed strongly on those program assessments related to CEC Standard 4 related to assessment, we have determined that additional focus on making next-step and long-term instructional decisions on the basis of their selection and interpretation of appropriate, non-biased assessment will further strengthen our candidates' capacities. With regard for disposition, our candidates demonstrated their value of all students, and their acknowledgement of the role of culture in development. Yet, as we reviewed our assessments as a whole, it appears that our programmatic focus on disposition and as measured by these assessments could be extended to consider the ways in which views of students' backgrounds mediate teachers' decisions about special education eligibility and placement. This is crucial, given the continued issues of eligibility and placement disproportionality for students of color and students learning English. While we include a considerable amount of reading across our courses

which raise and explore these entrenched equity issue, we believe we could be better assessing our candidates' understanding of such issues and application of such knowledge. Research conducted by program faculty will be consulted to support our continued improvement in relation to this consideration (Thorius, Maxcy, Macey, & Cox, 2014; Graff & Kozleski, 2014).

### Student Learning

Our analysis of program assessments reveals consistently positive impact on student learning, including evidence of teacher candidates' understanding of the limitations of assessments, support of students' conceptual learning/higher levels of understanding, as well as the mediating role of primary language in student learning. Only a few candidates require some support in these areas. At the same time, while teacher candidates demonstrated the consideration of their own impact on student learning, we have determined the amount of emphasis on this area in the program assessments should be increased. We have concluded that we are providing ample opportunities for our teacher candidates to critically reflect on their own practice and its impact on student learning, but will add some course content to require them to read about and observe current educators engaged in critical reflective practice. At the same time an increasing focus on the assessment of such critical reflection and related shifts in practice and beliefs for our teacher candidates appears necessary. Relatedly, we will revise slightly assessments 3 and 4 to achieve this focus. We also anticipate that the focus on strengthening course content and related activities which require candidates to apply their selection and interpretation of sound assessment practices to making instructional decisions, addressed in the previous section, will further impact positive educational access, participation, and outcomes to contribute to learning for students with exceptionalities.

### **EPP Created Key Assessments Validity and Reliability Timeline**

All timelines are contingent upon satisfactory results from validity and reliability studies. Results from these studies may warrant major changes to the assessments, which would result in a modified timeline. Minor changes to rubrics based on study results will occur prior to the rubric being used the next semester and will be monitored by the Assessment Committee and program faculty. More detail about stated studies can be found in overviews for each benchmark.

#### **Pre-Admission Survey**

Fall 2017 – Pilot study

Spring 2018 - The quantitative and qualitative data from the pilot study will be reviewed by the Assessment Committee.

Summer 2018- A predicative correlational Pearson R study will be conducted to determine if the responses on the survey are correlated to the respective indicators on the Benchmark I rubric (validity)

Spring 2019 - A content predictive validity study will be conducted comparing survey data to selected indicators on the Student Teaching Final Evaluation – Part A (validity)

Fall 2019 - Candidates completing the survey during fall 2017, will be asked to complete the same survey again.

Spring 2019 - Paired quantitative data examined using a t-test while qualitative data examined using a narrative analysis method during spring 2019.

Spring 2019 - Decision made about the continued use of survey

### **Benchmark I**

#### **Block I**

Fall 2015 - Designed by Assessment Committee – mapping to standards (content validity)

Fall 2015 - Feedback from faculty, PH.D candidates. COTE (content validity)

Spring 2016 - Pilot study

Spring 2017 - Expert panel study (content validity)

Fall 2017 - Pearson R study of Benchmark I score and Block II grades (content predictive validity)

Fall 2017 - Revision to Benchmark I based on results of Expert Panel study

Fall 2017 - Selected cohorts will have all instructor individually complete rubric for each intern and the reliability analysis ratings compared from each member of the instructional team and the consensus rating for each candidate. (inter-rater reliability)

Spring 2018 - Correlation study with Block III grades (content predictive validity)

Fall 2018 - Correlation study with Student Teaching Part A (content predictive validity)

## Block II

Fall 2015 - Designed by Assessment Committee – mapping to standards (content validity)

Fall 2015 - Feedback from faculty, PH.D candidates. COTE (content validity)

Spring 2017 - Expert panel study (content validity)

Spring 2017 - Pilot study

Fall 2017 - Revision to Benchmark I based on results of Expert Panel study

Fall 2017 - Selected cohorts will have all instructor individually complete rubric for each intern and the reliability analysis ratings compared from each member of the instructional team and the consensus rating for each candidate. (inter-rater reliability)

Fall 2017 - Pearson R study of Benchmark I – Block II scores and Block III grades (content predictive validity)

Spring 2018 - Correlation study with Student Teaching Final Evaluation and Benchmark I – Block II scores (content predictive validity)

## **Lesson Planning Rubric**

Spring 2016 - Designed by Assessment Committee – mapping to standards (content validity)

Fall 2016 - Pilot Study

Spring 2017 - Feedback from instructor using the rubric for the pilot study (content validity)

Spring 2017 - Feedback from faculty and COTE (content validity)

Fall 2017 - Expert panel study (content validity)

Fall 2017- Selected cohorts (3 el & 1 sec) will have all instructor individually complete rubric for each intern and the reliability analysis ratings compared from each member of the instructional team and the consensus rating for each candidate. (inter-rater reliability)

Spring 2018 - Correlation study with Block III grades (content predictive validity)

Fall 2018 - Correlation study with Student Teaching Final Evaluation Part A (content predictive validity)

Spring 2018 - Design of Part B to address discipline specific criteria- mapping to SPA Standards

Spring 2018 - Expert panel study for Part B (content validity)

Spring 2018- Pilot of Part B

Fall 2018 - Selected cohorts will have all instructor individually complete rubric for each intern and the reliability analysis ratings compared from each member of the instructional team and the consensus rating for each candidate. (inter-rater reliability)

Spring 2019 - Correlation study with Block III grades (content predictive validity)

Fall 2019 - Correlation study with Student Teaching Final Evaluation Part A (content predictive validity)

#### **Benchmark IV**

Fall 2017 - Assessment committee is revising the rubric to better address desired outcomes

Spring 2018 - Expert panel (content validity)

Spring 2018 - Pilot study

Fall 2018 - Inter-rater reliability study

Spring 2019 - Full implementation of new rubric

#### **Student Teaching Part A**

Spring 2016 - Designed by Assessment Committee – mapping to standards (content validity)

- Spring 2016 - Feedback from faculty and COTE (content validity)
- Fall 2016 - Pilot study
- Spring 2017- Feedback from mentor teachers using rubric during pilot study (content validity)
- Fall 2017 - Panel of External Review (content validity)
- Fall 2017 - Changes made to rubric based on panel review
- Fall 2017 - A random sample of student teachers has been selected across programs. The university supervisor and mentor teacher for each student teacher will complete the rubric independently. A reliability study will be conducted using these paired rubrics. (inter rater reliability)
- Fall 2018 - Correlation study with Benchmark I – Block I (content predictive validity)
- Fall 2018 - Correlation study with Lesson Planning Rubric (content predictive validity)
- Spring 2018 - Correlation study with Benchmark I –Block II scores (content predictive validity)

### **Student Teaching Part B**

Elementary – This timeline is dependent on the development of the new CAEP standards for elementary programs and is subject to change.

Spring 2018 - New rubric designed by faculty and Assessment Committee.

Fall 2018 - Expert Panel study (content validity)

Spring 2019 – Pilot study

Fall 2019 - Inter-rater reliability study using the same approach described for ST Part A.

English



Spring 2018 - New rubric designed by faculty and Assessment Committee.

Fall 2018 - Expert Panel study (content validity)

Spring 2019 – Pilot study

Fall 2019 - Inter-rater reliability study using the same approach described for ST Part A.

### Math

Spring 2018 - New rubric by math faculty and Assessment Committee

Fall 2018 - Panel of Experts (validity)

Spring 2019 - Pilot study

Fall 2019 - Inter-rater reliability study using the same approach described for ST Part A.

Social Studies - This timeline is dependent on the development of the new NCSS standards for social studies programs and is subject to change.

Spring 2018 - New rubric designed by faculty and Assessment Committee.

Fall 2018 - Expert Panel study (content validity)

Spring 2019 – Pilot study

Fall 2019 - Inter-rater reliability study using the same approach described for ST Part A.

### Physical Education

Fall 2018 - New rubric designed by PE faculty and Assessment Committee

Spring 2019 - Expert Panel study (content validity)

Fall 2019 - Pilot study

Spring 2020 - Inter-rater reliability study using the same approach described for ST Part A.

**Exit Module on Ethics and Law**

Fall 2017 - Module developed by faculty and Assessment Committee

Spring 2018 - Pilot Study

Fall 2018 - Data from pilot will be examine by the Assessment Committee and faculty (to determine the appropriateness of the unit and the assessment questions.

Fall 2018 - Content predictability study will be conducted on fall 2018 data and select indicators on ST Final Evaluation Part A.