Academic Assessment Committee

CCSU

Central Connecticut State University

**Program Summary**

**Department**: Department of Special Education and Interventions

**Report Preparer**: Sally Drew, Ph.D., Director of MAT Program

**Program Name and Level**: Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT): English, Sciences, Spanish, Math

| Program Assessment Question | Response |
|---|---|
| **URL**: Provide the URL where the learning outcomes (LO) can be viewed. | http://web.ccsu.edu/seps/mat/learningOutcomes.asp<br><br>The MAT program was fully redesigned during the 2015-2016 academic year. This included revised learning outcomes and assessments. All curricular changes officially go into effect for the 2017-2018 cohort. However, all members of the 2016 cohort piloted the new learning outcomes and assessments, and the 2015 cohort piloted several of the assessments as well. This assessment report includes 1-2 years of pilot data on all new outcomes and assessments. If available (as in LO #1), data from the past five years was shared. |
| **Assessment Instruments**: Please list the source(s) of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is/are used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, etc.) | **Assessments by Learning Outcome**<br><br>*LO 1. Possess strong knowledge of content, content pedagogy, and learner development (typical and atypical).*<br><br>ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT(S):<br><br>(a) Evidence of basic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics (**Praxis Core exam scores** or State of CT DOE issued waiver)<br>(b) Evidence of content knowledge (**Praxis Subject Test** or American Council of the Teaching of Foreign Languages **Oral Proficiency Interview** and **Written Proficiency Test**); passing standards set by the State of Connecticut for initial educator certificate<br><br>Note, content pedagogy is also assessed within LO 3 (edTPA) and LO 4 (Unit Plan).<br><br>*LO 2. Create an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment.*<br><br>ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT(S): |

| | |
|---|---|
| | (a) Performance on **Student Teaching Evaluation (Rubric)**, specified items measuring inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment<br>(b) Performance on **teacher candidate performance assessment (edTPA),** rubrics from Task 1 Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning and Task 2 Learning Environment<br><br>*LO 3. Use data, content knowledge, and evidence-based pedagogical content knowledge to critically examine practice for the purpose of improving student learning.*<br><br>ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT(S):<br><br>Performance on **edTPA**, rubrics for Task 3, Analysis of Student Learning, Providing Feedback to Guide Learning, Student Use of Feedback<br><br>*LO 4. Design and deliver instructional and assessment strategies that facilitate significant learning for all students including struggling learners and those with disabilities.*<br><br>ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT(S):<br><br>Performance on planning performance task embedded in fall field placement, **Unit Plan Rubric**<br><br>*LO 5. Design, deliver, and assess literacy/language strategies to deepen literacy and content learning within the discipline.*<br><br>ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT(S):<br><br>Performance on video analysis performance task embedded in fall field placement**, Video Analysis Rubric for Disciplinary Literacy Lesson**<br><br>*LO 6. Act collaboratively, ethically, and responsibly to ensure student growth and advance the profession.*<br><br>ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT(S):<br><br>Performance on **Student Teaching Evaluation (rubric)**, specified items measuring collaboration, ethics, responsibility, and professionalism |
| 3) **Interpretation**: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). | There are different parties who interpret the evidence for each outcome/assessment, as described below.<br><br>(a) Evidence of basic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics (**Praxis Core exam scores** or State of CT DOE issued waiver) score provided and interpreted by ETS (https://www.ets.org/praxis/about/core/content/). Students |

| | |
|---|---|
| | provide evidence of a passing score within their application to the MAT program DRF on Taskstream. Program director marks as met or not met in Taskstream prior to application.<br>(b) Evidence of content knowledge (**Praxis Subject Test** or American Council of the Teaching of Foreign Languages **Oral Proficiency Interview** and **Written Proficiency Test**) is interpreted by the testing agency (ETS and ACTFL). Score provided by agency and passing standards established by the State of Connecticut; passing score required for initial educator certification (https://www.ets.org/praxis/ct/requirements). Students provide evidence of a passing score within their application to the MAT program DRF on Taskstream. Program director marks as met or not met in Taskstream prior to application.<br>(c) Data are collected and interpreted from specified items from **Student Teaching Evaluation** measuring inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment. University supervisors record evidence of candidates' ability to create an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment. The Director of the Central Teacher Education Committee (CTEC), the Coordinator of the Office of School and Community Partnerships, in collaboration with the teacher preparation faculty, determine passing standards.<br>(d) Data are collected and interpreted from two **edTPA** rubrics: Task 1, Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning and Task 2, Learning Environment. For the past two years, we have received funding to send our candidates' portfolios out for national scoring. Scoring is conducted by trained professionals through Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) at Stanford University. The scoring protocol allows for valid and reliable interpretations of candidates' scores. SCALE recommends cut scores for beginning teachers, and the state of Connecticut is currently determining the passing score for initial licensure. In the meantime, our School of Education and Professional Studies has set minimal passing standards for program completion. National scores are reviewed by program faculty and the MAT director to determine if candidates meet the passing standards.<br>(e) Data from three **edTPA** rubrics for Task 3 are collected and interpreted: Analysis of Student Learning, Providing Feedback to Guide Learning, Student Use of Feedback. See item "e" above for detail on interpretation.<br>(f) Student performance on a unit planning task is recorded using the **Unit Plan Rubric** within the MAT 539 content methods course. Course instructors record scores on the unit plan rubric and determine if students have met passing standards set by program faculty. The program director reviews all the scores.<br>(g) Student performance on a video analysis task is recorded using the **Video Analysis Rubric for Disciplinary Literacy** within the MAT 533 field experience seminar. Course instructors record scores on the video analysis rubric and examine if students have met passing standards set by program faculty. The program director reviews all the scores.<br>(h) Data from specified items from **Student Teaching Evaluation** measuring student teacher's collaboration, ethical actions, responsibility, and professionalism. University supervisors record evidence of candidates' ability to demonstrate professionalism and collaboration. The Coordinator of the Office of School and Community Partnerships, in collaboration with the teacher preparation faculty, determine passing standards. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 4) **Results**: Since the most recent full report, list<br>a. The conclusion(s) drawn<br>b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s) | As mentioned above, there have been many changes since the most recent full assessment report. In response to a change in national accreditation standards and reporting guidelines, and in response to aligning our MAT program with best practice in the co-preparation of secondary education candidates and special education candidates, we have revised all program outcomes and assessments. The assessments are better aligned to the standards for practicing teachers in Connecticut.<br><br>(a) **Basic Skills/Praxis Core.** The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) changed the required evidence of basic skills, and therefore this assessment has changed. Our new policy for what counts as evidence of meeting basic skills can now be found at: http://www.ccsu.edu/seps/teacherPrep/testingRequirements.html. These data are now being recorded in the SEPS data management system, Taskstream.<br>(b) **Praxis 2/ACTFL.** The passing standards for some of the Praxis Subject Tests and the ACTFL Tests were changed by the CSDE. We keep up to date of these changing standards. The current standards are listed here: http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/PDF/Cert/guides/assess_for_cert.pdf. These data are now being recorded in the SEPS data management system, Taskstream.<br>(c) **Student Teaching Evaluation.** The data shared in this report used the old student teaching evaluation. The SEPS student teaching evaluation (across programs) has since been revised by the Director of CTEC, the Coordinator of Office of School and Community Partnerships, and program faculty to reflect new research in teacher evaluation, to align to the edTPA, and to align more closely to how teachers in Connecticut are being assessed in the field. These data are recorded in Taskstream.<br>(d) **edTPA.** edTPA is a new assessment for our candidates. edTPA is a performance-based, teacher work sample developed by Stanford University faculty and staff at the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE). It is used by teacher preparation programs throughout the United States to emphasize, measure, and support the skills and knowledge that all teachers need in the classroom focused on three tasks: Planning, Instruction, and Assessment. Work created and submitted as a result of this pilot will result in a comprehensive portfolio that demonstrates teacher candidates' ability to teach through lesson plans designed to support students' strengths and needs, engage real students in ambitious learning, analyze impact on student learning, and adjust instruction to become more effective. MAT Candidates' edTPA Portfolio will include artifacts (i.e. lesson plans, instructional and assessment materials, one or two video clips of their teaching, student work samples) and commentaries (i.e. Planning Instruction and Assessment, Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning, Assessing Student Learning) based on a 3-5 lesson unit of instruction referred to as a Learning Segment. The edTPA Portfolio includes the following components: Task 1: Planning Instruction and Assessment; Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning; Task 3: Assessing Student Learning.<br>(e) **Unit Plan Rubric.** The unit plan rubric has been revised by MAT program faculty under the leadership of the director of the program to be consistent across program content areas, with additional items specific to the discipline. The discipline-specific items are informed by SPA standards. The common items on the unit planning rubric reflect best practice in curriculum and instructional design, and align to the edTPA rubrics. Specific items measure candidates' ability to plan to meet the needs of all learners, which is highly emphasized in the revised MAT program (LO 4). These data are recorded in Taskstream. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | (f) **Video Analysis Rubric.** This is a new assessment aligned to the edTPA. It also emphasizes candidates' ability to plan high quality literacy experiences within each discipline, which is an emphasis of our revised program (LO 5). These data are recorded in Taskstream. |
| 5) **Strengths**: List ways in which your assessment process is working well. | The MAT program has begun building an assessment database through Taskstream, the School of Education and Professional Studies (SEPS) data management system. Dr. Mel Horton, our Assistant Dean for Assessment and Partnerships, in consultation with each program director has built the assessment dashboard and organized it by program assessment for accreditation purposes (see attached screen shot of **MAT Data Dashboard**). This database will enable SEPS program coordinators to efficiently and effectively analyze our program outcome data in order to make a determination about program successes and challenges. It will also help us to access pertinent data for assessment and accreditation reports. Most importantly, it will help students track their progress throughout the program, and leave with an assessment portfolio demonstrating their ability to be a successful beginning teacher upon completion of our program.<br><br>Along with the CSDE, SEPS and the MAT program piloted the use of edTPA in the spring 2016 and 2017 semesters. edTPA is a performance-based, teacher work sample developed by Stanford University faculty and staff at the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE). It is used by teacher preparation programs throughout the United States to emphasize, measure, and support the skills and knowledge that all teachers need in the classroom focused on three tasks: Planning, Instruction, and Assessment. With two years of national scores, we are able to identify the strengths and challenges of our MAT candidates, and adjust our MAT curriculum and instruction accordingly.<br><br>Finally, the full redesign of the MAT program allowed us to fully realign program assessments with outcomes that lead to teacher readiness in today's classrooms. We are confident that this new package of assessments comprehensively measures teacher candidates' progress and quality across the program and also at the point of program completion. |
| 6) **Improvements**: List ways in which your assessment process needs to improve (a brief summary of changes to assessment plan can be reported here). | The MAT program was substantially redesigned in the 2015-2016 academic year (see **Modifications to MAT Program** pdf). We face the challenge of implementing several new assessments (edTPA and video analysis) as well as new certification areas (Special Education and History/Social Studies). We need 100% faculty buy-in and follow-through across MAT courses to be successful with full implementation of our new assessment package. Furthermore, we need several years of data with these new assessments in order to make further adjustments to our program. |

**General Education Summary:** N/A

---

**PREAMBLE and Highlights**

The MAT program is a selective graduate-level certification program that prepares qualified students for careers as teachers in the shortage areas. Current specializations include secondary English, History/Social Studies, Mathematics, Sciences, Spanish, and Special Education (K-12), with a focus on the recruitment of prospective teachers from underrepresented groups through the Holmes Master's Program. The MAT program is designed to co-prepare secondary educators and special educators to meet the needs of all learners within the general education classroom, including those at risk and students with disabilities. Candidates experience cross disciplinary preparation wherever possible, building content teaching expertise in their specialization and relating each discipline to the larger school context. Candidates learn how to support students' literacy and language demands within their discipline, which is a particular need in today's secondary classrooms. The MAT program provides an accelerated route into shortage area classrooms while meeting all state and national accreditation standards. The full schedule of classes, field experiences, and full-time student teaching in assigned public school settings will be very demanding; therefore, it is extremely difficult to maintain even part-time employment throughout the program. Candidates complete the program in a cohort that begins in late May of each year and ends in late June of the following calendar year, 13 months later. Extended timeline options of two and three years are also available.

The MAT program went through a major redesign that is going into effect in the 2017-2018 academic year. However, all new outcomes and assessments were piloted during the 2016-2017 academic year. The MAT program modification provides greater efficacy and efficiency in teacher preparation by ensuring CCSU's MAT graduates are ready to meet the needs of diverse learners in Connecticut's classrooms. This program revision adds the additional certification shortage area of Special Education (K-12) to an already robust program, and accounts for a shift in the program design so that secondary education MAT candidates work alongside special education MAT candidates to collaborate in support of struggling learners in the general curriculum. This modification also adds the certification area of history/social studies (7-12), specifically in conjunction with the Holmes' Master's Program to support the recruitment and retention of MAT candidates from historically underrepresented groups. With the addition of history/social studies, all aspects of core secondary instruction will be reflected across the MAT tracks (English, Mathematics, Sciences, History/Social Studies, Spanish). Furthermore, the program redesign includes MAT competencies in disciplinary literacy and academic language, ensuring that all candidates feel prepared to meet secondary students' literacy and language demands specific to their discipline.

The revised MAT program includes an efficient redesign with only two additional credits of study and no additional cost to students (extra credits are taken during the spring semester in which students pay a flat rate for tuition). Candidates complete a structured sequence of courses, field experiences, and teacher research project in their field placement. Secondary education candidates complete a core program of 25 credits and specializations of 18 credits in English, Mathematics, Sciences, Spanish, or History/Social Studies (new). Their capstone sequence includes 6 credits of designing, conducting, and reporting a teacher research project in their host school for a total of 49 credits toward the Master of Arts in Teaching degree and recommendation for initial licensure for a Connecticut teaching certificate in their specialization area (grades 7-12). Special education candidates complete a core program of 19 credits with a 24-credit specialization in Special Education (new). Their capstone sequence includes 6 credits of designing, conducting, and reporting a teacher research project in their host school for a total of 49 credits toward the Master of Arts in Teaching degree and recommendation for initial licensure for a Connecticut teaching certificate in Special Education (K-12). See attached materials detailing the rationale for program revision as well as the comprehensive outline of program revision, including a revision to program outcomes and assessment (see **Modifications to MAT Program** pdf, attached).

## SECTION 1-LEARNING OUTCOMES (LO)

*LO 1. Possess strong knowledge of content, content pedagogy, and learner development (typical and atypical).*

*LO 2. Create an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment.*

*LO 3. Use data, content knowledge, and evidence-based pedagogical content knowledge to critically examine practice for the purpose of improving student learning.*

*LO 4. Design and deliver instructional and assessment strategies that facilitate significant learning for all students including struggling learners and those with disabilities.*

*LO 5. Design, deliver, and assess literacy/language strategies to deepen literacy and content learning within the discipline.*

*LO 6. Act collaboratively, ethically, and responsibly to ensure student growth and advance the profession.*

## SECTION 2-FINDINGS

*LO 1. Possess strong knowledge of content, content pedagogy, and learner development (typical and atypical).*

**Praxis Core Exams.**

Evidence of basic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics (**Praxis Core exam scores** or State of CT DOE issued waiver) score provided and interpreted by ETS (https://www.ets.org/praxis/about/core/content/). Students provide evidence of a passing score within their application to the MAT program DRF on Taskstream. Program director marks as met or not met in Taskstream prior to application. This exam assesses basic skills related to the general content knowledge expected of a beginning teacher in the areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. All candidates are expected to pass this exam prior to entering program.

As can be seen below in Table 1, all MAT candidates (100%) across disciplines met or exceeded the passing standards for the Praxis Core exam, demonstrating content knowledge in the basic reading, writing, and mathematics skills required of all beginning educators. The CSDE has changed the passing standards for all candidates entering teacher preparation programs. The most recent description of the passing standards for this assessment can be found here: http://www.ccsu.edu/seps/teacherPrep/testingRequirements.html. These new changes go into effect with the 2017-2018 cohort.

Table 1

*Passing Rates on Basic Skills Testing, LO #1 for Past Five Cohorts*

| Certification Area | n of Candidates | n of Candidates Passing Exams | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Biology | 15 | 15 | 100 |
| Chemistry | 6 | 6 | 100 |
| Earth Science | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| General Science | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| English | 27 | 27 | 100 |
| Mathematics | 15 | 15 | 100 |
| Spanish | 12 | 12 | 100 |
| *TOTAL* | *78* | *78* | *100%* |

**Praxis Subject Tests.**

Evidence of content knowledge (**Praxis Subject Test** or American Council of the Teaching of Foreign Languages **Oral Proficiency Interview** and **Written Proficiency Test**) is interpreted. Score provided by ETS and passing standards established by the State of Connecticut; passing score required for initial educator certification (https://www.ets.org/praxis/ct/requirements). Students provide evidence of a passing score within their application to the MAT program DRF on Taskstream. Program director marks as met or not met in Taskstream. This exam assesses the teacher candidate's knowledge of content, content pedagogy, and learner development related to disciplinary learning.

As can be seen below in Table 1, all MAT candidates (100%) across disciplines met or exceeded the passing standards for the assessment of subject specific knowledge for their certification area. These exams measure candidates' content knowledge, knowledge of content pedagogy, and knowledge of learner characteristics relative to content learning (LO #1).

Supplemental information on candidate's content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge is provided on the Unit Plan assessment, the edTPA, as well as the student teaching evaluation rubric. The results of these assessments will be discussed below under their primary learning outcome.

Table 2

*Passing Rates on Subject-Specific Testing, LO #1 for Past Five Cohorts*

| Certification Area | n of Candidates | n of Candidates Passing Exams | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Biology | 15 | 15 | 100 |
| Chemistry | 6 | 6 | 100 |
| Earth Science | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| General Science | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| English | 27 | 27 | 100 |
| Mathematics | 15 | 15 | 100 |
| Spanish | 12 | 12 | 100 |
| *TOTAL* | *78* | *78* | *100%* |

*LO 2. Create an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment.*

**Student Teaching Evaluations, Specified Items.**

Data is collected and interpreted from specified items on the **Student Teaching Evaluation,** measuring the teacher candidates' ability to foster an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment. University supervisors record evidence of candidates' ability to create an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment on items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 29, and 30 of the student teaching evaluation following six observed lessons and review of lesson plans, unit plans, and post-lesson reflections. University supervisors are trained in how to use the instrument. The score range is 1-3 or 1-4 ranging from target to unsatisfactory. Analysis of the data trends overtime have led to a common student teaching evaluation across disciplines to be used with the MAT program. All future items will be scored on a 3-pt rubric. The Office of School and Community Partnerships, in collaboration with the teacher preparation faculty, determine passing standards to be "2" or "3" (in the acceptable range). See the existing student teaching evaluation instrument, attached (**Sample Student Teaching Evaluation, MAT 540 Internship Evaluation**). The past two years of data are inputted into our MAT database in Taskstream, and are aggregated below by MAT discipline for those specific items measuring LO 2. Each item listed below captures teacher candidates' ability across the student teaching semester to foster an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment. These data reflect candidates' performance at the culmination of the student teaching experience.

As can be seen below in Table 3, all MAT candidates (100%) across disciplines exceeded the passing standards for the items measuring LO #2.

Table 3

*Student Teaching Evaluation Results, Specified Items LO #2 (2015 and 2016 Cohorts)*

| **Discipline** | Rubric Descriptors | n | Mean | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Passing=2 | |
| **English** | 1. Management of Classroom Learning Environments | 4 | 2.99/3 | 99.58 |
| | 2. Management of Routines | 4 | 2.96/3 | 98.75 |
| | 3. Fostering a Learning Community | 4 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 4 Expectations of Standards of Behavior* | 4 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 5. Monitoring of and Response to Student Behavior * | 4 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 6. Promoting Engagement and Shared Responsibility for Learning | 4 | 2.99/3 | 99.58 |
| | 11. Meeting the Needs of All Learners by Differentiating Instruction | 4 | 2.95/3 | 98.33 |
| | 29. Developing a Positive Self-concept | 4 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 30. Understanding Individual Students | 4 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| **Math** | 1. Management of Classroom Learning Environments | 2 | 2.00/3 | 66.67 |
| | 2. Management of Routines | 2 | 2.50/3 | 83.33 |
| | 3. Fostering a Learning Community | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 4 Expectations of Standards of Behavior | 2 | 2.50/3 | 83.33 |
| | 5. Monitoring of and Response to Student Behavior | 2 | 2.50/3 | 83.33 |
| | 6. Promoting Engagement and Shared Responsibility for Learning | 2 | 2.50/3 | 83.33 |
| | 11. Meeting the Needs of All Learners by Differentiating Instruction | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 29. Developing a Positive Self-concept | 2 | 2.50/3 | 83.33 |
| | 30. Understanding Individual Students | 2 | 2.50/3 | 83.33 |
| **Science** | 1. Management of Classroom Learning Environments | 8 | 2.59/3 | 86.46 |
| | 2. Management of Routines | 8 | 2.84/3 | 94.79 |
| | 3. Fostering a Learning Community | 8 | 2.88/3 | 95.83 |
| | 4 Expectations of Standards of Behavior | 8 | 2.88/3 | 95.83 |
| | 5. Monitoring of and Response to Student Behavior | 8 | 2.88/3 | 95.83 |
| | 6. Promoting Engagement and Shared Responsibility for Learning | 8 | 2.53/3 | 84.38 |
| | 11. Meeting the Needs of All Learners by Differentiating Instruction | 8 | 2.75/3 | 91.67 |
| | 29. Developing a Positive Self-concept | 8 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 30. Understanding Individual Students | 8 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | | | Passing=3 | |
| **Spanish** | 1. Management of Classroom Learning Environments | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |
| | 2. Management of Routines | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |
| | 3. Fostering a Learning Community | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |
| | 4 Expectations of Standards of Behavior | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |
| | 5. Monitoring of and Response to Student Behavior | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6. Promoting Engagement and Shared Responsibility for Learning | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |
| 11. Meeting the Needs of All Learners by Differentiating Instruction | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |
| 29. Developing a Positive Self-concept | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |
| 30. Understanding Individual Students | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |

*Notes*. * indicates NON NEGOTIABLE; less than target performance in this area will mean that the student teacher is unable to earn a letter grade A for the student teaching experience.

**edTPA, Specified Rubrics.**

Data are collected and interpreted from two **edTPA** rubrics: Task 1, Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning and Task 2, Learning Environment, as further evidence of LO 2. For the past two years, we have received funding to send our candidates' portfolios out for national scoring. Scoring is conducted by trained professionals through SCALE at Stanford University. The scoring protocol allows for valid and reliable interpretations of candidates' scores. SCALE recommends cut scores for beginning teachers, and the state of Connecticut is currently determining the passing score for initial licensure. In the meantime, our School of Education and Professional Studies has set minimal passing standards for program completion. National scores were reviewed by program faculty and the MAT director to determine if candidates met the passing standards. SEPS has determined the following criteria for passing of edTPA (see Table 4). English, Math, and Science content areas have 15 rubrics, and Spanish has 13 rubrics. The assessment was piloted the past two years, and the data was not deemed consequential during this pilot period. This assessment will be consequential for program completion and recommendation for state licensure in Spring 2018. A sample edTPA handbook, with rubrics, is available upon request. Candidates are given a score of ranging from 1 to 5, with 3 being the score to indicate that a candidate meets the expectations for beginning teachers. SEPS has agreed that a score of "3" represents the target score on each rubric, yet candidates can earn a score of 2 or lower on no more than two or three rubrics, depending on the total number of rubrics in the assessment (see Table 4 below).

Rubric 3 (Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning) analyzes students' lesson plans and lesson planning commentary to determine how the candidate uses knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans with support from principles of research and/or learning theory. Rubric 6 (Learning Environment) analyzes candidates' submitted video segments and instructional commentary and measures candidates' ability to demonstrate a respectful learning environment that supports students' engagement in learning.

CCSU piloted the edTPA beginning in Spring 2016; therefore, we have data to share from the past two MAT cohorts. As can be seen in Table 5, across the past two years of data, 12 out of 15 (80%) of MAT candidates met the overall passing standard of a score of 37 (32 for Spanish). Nine of the 15 (60%) scored portfolios met or exceeded the national average of a score of 44 (or 36 for Spanish). This is a strong starting point from which to build in future years, as MAT faculty, university supervisors, and students become more accustomed to the demands of this assessment. Ten out of 16 (63%) met or exceeded the standard for rubric 3, Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching & Learning. One hundred percent of the candidates (16/16) met or exceeded the standard for rubric 6, Learning Environment.

Table 4

*CCSU edTPA Passing Standards*

| Number of edTPA rubrics | Minimum score required | National performance levels |
|---|---|---|
| 15 rubrics | 37 with no more than three scores of 2 or lower in any of the three tasks | 2015 - 2016 Mean = 44.4 (N = 30,908) |
| 13 rubrics | 32 with no more than two scores of 2 or lower in Tasks 1 and 3 and no more than three scores of 2 or lower in Task 2 | 2015 – 2016 Mean = 36 (N = 815) |
| 18 rubrics | 44 with no more than three scores of 2 or lower in Tasks 1, 2, and 3 and no more than two scores of 2 or lower in Task 4 | 2015 – 2016 Mean = 53.8 (N = 6,292) |

Table 5

*edTPA Results, Specified Rubrics LO #2 (2015 and 2016 Cohort)*

| Program Area | Score for Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching & Learning | Score for Rubric 6: Instruction: Learning Environment | Total Score | Overall Average Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Biology-Secondary | 3 | 3 | 50 | 3.33 |
| Secondary English & Language Arts | 4 | 3 | 50 | 3.33 |
| Earth and Space Science-Secondary | 3 | 3 | 44 | 2.93 |
| Spanish | 2 | 3 | 30 | 2.31 |
| Secondary English & Language Arts | 3 | 3 | 44 | 2.93 |
| Biology-Secondary | 4 | 4 | 53 | 3.53 |
| Chemistry-Secondary | 3 | 3 | 44 | 2.93 |
| General mathematics-Secondary | 3 | 3 | I* | I* |
| Chemistry-Secondary | 2 | 3 | 30 | 2 |
| Biology-Secondary | 4 | 3 | 50 | 3.33 |
| Biology-Secondary | 2 | 3 | 36 | 2.4 |
| Earth and Space Science-Secondary | 2.5 | 3 | 43 | 2.87 |
| Secondary English & Language Arts | 3 | 3 | 48 | 3.2 |
| Spanish | 3 | 3 | 43 | 3.31 |
| Secondary English & Language Arts | 3 | 3 | 47 | 3.13 |
| Trigonometry-Secondary | 2 | 3 | 40 | 2.67 |
| *Mean* | *2.91* | *3.06* | *43.47* | *2.95* |

*Notes.* I* indicates un-scorable portfolio

*LO 3. Use data, content knowledge, and evidence-based pedagogical content knowledge to critically examine practice for the purpose of improving student learning.*

**edTPA, Specified Rubrics.**

Data are collected and interpreted from three **edTPA** rubrics for Task 3: Rubric 11, Analysis of Student Learning; Rubric 12, Providing Feedback to Guide Learning; and Rubric 13, Student Use of Feedback. As mentioned above, for the past two years, we have received funding to send our candidates' portfolios out for national scoring. Scoring is conducted by trained professionals through SCALE at Stanford University. The scoring protocol allows for valid and reliable interpretations of candidates' scores. SCALE recommends cut scores for beginning teachers, and the state of Connecticut is currently determining the passing score for initial licensure. In the meantime, our School of Education and Professional Studies has set minimal passing standards for program completion. National scores were reviewed by program faculty and the MAT director to determine if candidates met the passing standards. SEPS has determined the following criteria for passing of edTPA (see Table 4, above). English, Math, and Science content areas have 15 rubrics, and Spanish has 13 rubrics. The assessment was piloted the past two years, and the data were not deemed consequential during this pilot period. This assessment will be consequential for program completion and recommendation for state licensure in Spring 2018. A sample edTPA handbook, with rubrics, is attached to this report. Candidates are given a score of ranging from 1 to 5, with 3 being the score to indicate that a candidate meets the expectations for beginning teachers. SEPS has agreed that a score of "3" represents the target score on each rubric, yet candidates can earn a score of 2 or lower on no more than two or three rubrics, depending on the total number of rubrics in the assessment (see Table 4 above).

Rubric 11 (Analysis of Student Learning) analyzes students' assessment commentary, student work samples, and evidence of feedback to determine how the candidate analyzes evidence of student learning. Rubric 12 (Providing Feedback to Guide Learning) analyzes students' assessment commentary, student work samples, and evidence of feedback to measure candidates' ability to provide feedback that is specific and related to the focus students' strengths and needs. Rubric 13 (Student Use of Feedback) analyzes students' assessment commentary, student work samples, and evidence of feedback to examine how the candidate supports the focus students in understanding and using the feedback to guide further learning.

CCSU piloted the edTPA beginning in Spring 2016; therefore, we have data from the past two MAT cohorts to share. As can be seen in Table 6, across the past two years of data, 12 out of 15 (80%) of MAT candidates met the overall passing standard of a score of 37 (32 for Spanish). Nine of the 15 (60%) scored portfolios met or exceeded the national average of a score of 44 (or 36 for Spanish). This is a strong starting point from which to build in future years, as MAT faculty, university supervisors, and students become more accustomed to the demands of this assessment. Eight out of 16 (50%) met or exceeded the standard for rubric 11, Analysis of Student Learning. Thirteen out of 16 (81%) met or exceeded the standard for rubric 12, Providing Feedback to Guide Learning. Ten out of 15 (67%) met or exceeded the standard for rubric 13, Student Use of Feedback.

Table 6

*edTPA Results LO #3 (2015 and 2016 Cohort)*

| Program Area | Score for Rubric 11: Analysis of Student Learning | Score for Rubric 12: Providing Feedback to Guide Learning | Score for Rubric 13: Student Use of Feedback | Total Score | Overall Average Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Biology-Secondary | 4 | 4 | 4 | 50 | 3.33 |
| Secondary English & Language Arts | 3 | 4 | 3 | 50 | 3.33 |
| Earth and Space Science-Secondary | 3 | 3.5 | 3 | 44 | 2.93 |
| Spanish | 2 | 3 | 3 | 30 | 2.31 |
| Secondary English & Language Arts | 3 | 3 | 2 | 44 | 2.93 |
| Biology-Secondary | 4 | 4 | 3 | 53 | 3.53 |
| Chemistry-Secondary | 3 | 3 | 2 | 44 | 2.93 |
| General mathematics-Secondary | 2 | 2 | I* | I* | I* |
| Chemistry-Secondary | 2 | 1 | 2 | 30 | 2 |
| Biology-Secondary | 2 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 3.33 |
| Biology-Secondary | 2 | 3 | 2 | 36 | 2.4 |
| Earth and Space Science-Secondary | 3 | 3 | 2 | 43 | 2.87 |
| Secondary English & Language Arts | 2 | 3 | 4 | 48 | 3.2 |
| Spanish | 3 | 3 | 4 | 43 | 3.31 |
| Secondary English & Language Arts | 2 | 3 | 4 | 47 | 3.13 |
| Trigonometry-Secondary | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 40 | 2.67 |
| *Mean* | *2.63* | *3.13* | *3.07* | *43.47* | *2.95* |

*Notes.* * indicates un-scorable portfolio since video was not uploaded properly

*LO 4. Design and deliver instructional and assessment strategies that facilitate significant learning for all students including struggling learners and those with disabilities.*

**Unit Plan Rubric.**

Student performance on a unit planning task is recorded using the **Unit Plan Rubric** within the MAT 539 content methods course. The MAT Unit Plan Rubric was a key assessment that changed based on feedback from faculty, students, and accreditation agencies. The new **Unit Plan Rubric** is attached. Each discipline within the MAT has its own items at the end of the common rubric. It was difficult to make any judgements about MAT candidate performance on the rubric prior to having a common rubric. The current MAT Unit Plan Rubric assesses candidates on two indicators of the description of the instructional context and standards, four indicators of the unit assessment plan, five indicators of the unit instructional plan, and between one and four discipline-specific indicators (varies by discipline). Each indicator is scored from 0 to 3, with a score of 2 as acceptable, and the passing standard. Candidates complete their unit plan during the fall semester, and upload their plan and supporting materials to Taskstream. Each MAT 539 content professor scores the unit plan and provides candidates with feedback. Course instructors record scores within Taskstream and determine if students have met passing standards set by program faculty. The program director reviews all the scores.

Table 7 and 8 below display the unit plan scores from the past two cohorts (two cohorts' scores are available on Taskstream). All but two candidates met the passing score of "2" on all indicators. One candidate from each cohort earned scores of 1 on selection and adaptation of materials (2015 cohort) and unit assessment plan, performance assessment, scoring rubric provided, unit overview/calendar, and connection to other areas (2016 cohort). And, both of these candidates were from the Spanish discipline.

Table 7

*Unit Plan Scores, 2015 Cohort LO #4*

| Program Area | Rubric Criteria | n of Candidates Evaluated | Mean Score *Passing=2* | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English | Unit Plan Introduction | 2 | 2.90/3 | 96.67 |
| | Theoretical Perspective | 2 | 2.90/3 | 96.67 |
| | Progressions | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | Variety of Activities | 2 | 2.90/3 | 96.67 |
| | Technology | 2 | 2.93/3 | 97.5 |
| | Print Media | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | Grammatical Concept | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | Discussion Questions & Writing Prompts | 2 | 2.85/3 | 95 |
| | Assessment Methods | 2 | 2.95/3 | 98.33 |
| | Unit Addendum | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | Unit Addendum Handouts, Etc. | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | NCTE Membership | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| Science | Develop a Coherent Unit Based on Standards | 4 | 2.50/3 | 83.33 |
| | Plan Multiple & Varied Inquiry-Rich Lessons | 4 | 2.80/3 | 93.33 |
| | Design of Inquiry-based Instructional and Assessment Activities | 4 | 2.38/3 | 79.17 |
| | Design of Instruction and Assessment | 4 | 2.20/3 | 73.33 |
| | Developing Science Content Knowledge Multiply x 3 | 4 | 2.28/3 | 75.83 |
| | Scaffolding, Motivating Instruction, and Differentiation Multiply x 3 | 4 | 2.23/3 | 74.17 |
| | Formative Assessments Multiply x 3 | 4 | 2.58/3 | 85.83 |
| | Summative Performance Assessment and Rubric Multiply x 2 | 4 | 2.43/3 | 80.83 |
| | Sci Safety Multiply x 2 | 4 | 2.85/3 | 95 |
| | Core Lesson Plan Elements (Multiply x 2) | 4 | 2.68/3 | 89.17 |
| | Instruction and Assessment (Multiply x 2) | 4 | 2.28/3 | 75.83 |
| | Science Safety | 4 | 3.00/3 | 100 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Spanish | Learning context | 1 | 2.00/3 | 66.67 |
| | Standards | 1 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | Objectives | 1 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | Content | 1 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | Lesson plans | 1 | 2.00/3 | 66.67 |
| | Student diversity | 1 | 2.00/3 | 66.67 |
| | Materials and Use of Technology | 1 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | In lieu of reflection on teaching | 1 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | Understanding of the purposes of assessment | 1 | 2.00/3 | 66.67 |
| | Authenticity of the task | 1 | 2.00/3 | 66.67 |
| | Selection, adaptation of materials | 1 | 1.00/3 | 33.33 |
| | Expected outcomes | 1 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | Criteria | 1 | 2.00/3 | 66.67 |
| | Performance descriptors | 1 | 2.00/3 | 66.67 |
| | Rating scales | 1 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | Prompt | 1 | 3.00/3 | 100 |

*Note.* There were also two mathematics candidates in this cohort. However, the data was never entered for these two candidates in Taskstream. Therefore, there is missing data. This will be discussed further in the data interpretation (Use of Results section) and assessment plan.

Table 8

*Unit Plan Scores, 2016 Cohort LO #4*

| Program Area | Rubric Criteria | # of Students Evaluated | Mean Score *Passing=2* | Mean Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English | Unit Plan Introduction | 2 | 2.85/3 | 95 |
| | Theoretical Perspective | 2 | 2.45/3 | 81.67 |
| | Progressions | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | Variety of Activities | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | Technology | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | Print Media | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | Grammatical Concept | 2 | 2.00/3 | 66.67 |
| | Discussion Questions & Writing Prompts | 2 | 2.75/3 | 91.67 |
| | Assessment Methods | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | Unit Addendum | 2 | 2.90/3 | 96.67 |
| | Unit Addendum Handouts, Etc. | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | NCTE Membership | 2 | 2.50/3 | 83.33 |
| Science | Description of Unit | 4 | 2.90/3 | 96.67 |
| | Unit Standards | 4 | 2.70/3 | 90 |
| | Unit Assessment Plan | 4 | 2.70/3 | 90 |
| | Formative Assessments | 4 | 2.68/3 | 89.17 |
| | Performance Assessment Design | 4 | 2.65/3 | 88.33 |
| | Scoring Rubric Provided | 4 | 2.45/3 | 81.67 |
| | Unit Overview & Calendar | 4 | 2.58/3 | 85.83 |
| | Student-centered Approaches | 4 | 2.65/3 | 88.33 |
| | Lesson Plan Objectives, Development, and Closure | 4 | 2.65/3 | 88.33 |
| | Differentiation & Scaffolding (Lesson Plans, Handouts) | 4 | 2.50/3 | 83.33 |
| | Materials and Use of Technology | 4 | 2.70/3 | 90 |
| | Three-Dimensional Learning | 4 | 2.35/3 | 78.33 |
| | Phenomena and Problems | 4 | 2.65/3 | 88.33 |
| | Safety | 4 | 2.85/3 | 95 |
| Spanish | Description of Unit | 1 | 2.00/3 | 66.67 |
| | Unit Standards | 1 | 2.00/3 | 66.67 |
| | Unit Assessment Plan | 1 | 1.00/3 | 33.33 |
| | Formative Assessments | 1 | 2.00/3 | 66.67 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Performance Assessment Design | 1 | 1.00/3 | 33.33 |
| Scoring Rubric Provided | 1 | 1.00/3 | 33.33 |
| Unit Overview & Calendar | 1 | 1.00/3 | 33.33 |
| Student-centered Approaches | 1 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| Lesson Plan Objectives, Development, and Closure | 1 | 2.00/3 | 66.67 |
| Differentiation & Scaffolding (Lesson Plans, Handouts) | 1 | 2.00/3 | 66.67 |
| Materials and Use of Technology | 1 | 2.00/3 | 66.67 |
| Integration of the standards into planning | 1 | 2.00/3 | 66.67 |
| Integration of products, practices and perspectives, and the three modes of communication | 1 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| Connections to other subject areas | 1 | 1.00/3 | 33.33 |
| Connection to target language communities | 1 | 3.00/3 | 100 |

*Note.* All rubrics were supposed to change to the common MAT Unit Planning Rubric for this cohort. The English cohort was scored on the old rubric, however. This will be discussed further in the data interpretation (Use of Results section) and assessment plan.

*LO 5. Design, deliver, and assess literacy/language strategies to deepen literacy and content learning within the discipline.*

**Video Analysis Rubric for Disciplinary Literacy Lesson.**

Candidate performance on the video analysis task embedded in fall field placement is assessed using the **Video Analysis Rubric for Disciplinary Literacy Lesson.** This assignment is embedded in the MAT 533 field experience seminar. This assignment was added during the program's full redesign, therefore only one year of data has been collected. The goal of this assignment is two-fold. First, it is to assess this learning outcome (LO#5). Second, it is to provide students with a practice opportunity to plan, video record, share their video recorded lesson with their peers and professor, and analyze their lesson via discussion and writing. Students upload their lesson plan, video file, and written reflection to Taskstream. MAT 533 course instructors record scores on the video analysis rubric within Taskstream and examine if students have met passing standards set by program faculty. The program director reviews all the scores.

The Video Analysis Rubric (see attached) assesses candidates on their submitted lesson plan and video, written description of the lesson and insights gained from the group discussion of the lesson, analysis related to the candidate's connections of practice to explanations and citations of research and theory, and three specific future goals based on the reflection of teaching. Table 9 below displays the video analysis rubric scores from the cohort. All but two candidates (5/7 or 71%) met the passing score of "2" on each rubric component. Two of the candidates received a "1" on the first component of the rubric, description of the observed lesson and insights gained. The data is not disaggregated by certification area because the candidates could be identified in the data since there is such a small number of students who completed the 2016 cohort (n=7).

Table 9

*Video Analysis Results (2016 cohort) LO #5*

| Candidate | Description of Observed Lesson and Insights Gained | Understanding of Teaching and Learning | Professional Reflection |
|---|---|---|---|
| *1* | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| *2* | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| *3* | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| *4* | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| *5* | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| *6* | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| *7* | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| *Mean Score* | *2.29/3* | *2.71/3* | *2.71/3* |
| *Mean Percentage* | *76.19* | *90.48* | *90.48* |

*LO 6. Act collaboratively, ethically, and responsibly to ensure student growth and advance the profession.*

Data are collected and interpreted from specified items on the **Student Teaching Evaluation,** measuring the teacher candidates' ability to collaborate with colleagues and demonstrate professional ethics, responsibility, and professionalism. University supervisors record evidence of candidates' ability to do so on items 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33 of the student teaching evaluation following six observed lessons and review of lesson plans, unit plans, and post-lesson reflections. University supervisors are trained in how to use the instrument. The score range is 1-3 or 1-4 ranging from target to unsatisfactory. Analysis of the data trends overtime have led to a common student teaching evaluation across disciplines to be used with the MAT program. All future items will be scored on a 3-pt rubric. The Office of School and Community Partnerships, in collaboration with the teacher preparation faculty, determine passing standards to be "2" or "3" (in the acceptable range). See student teaching evaluation instruments, attached. The past two years of data are inputted into our MAT database in Taskstream, and are aggregated below by MAT discipline for those specific items measuring LO 6. Each item listed below captures teacher candidates' ability across the student teaching semester to collaborate with colleagues and demonstrate professional ethics, responsibility, and professionalism. These data reflect candidates' performance at the culmination of the student teaching experience.

As can be seen below in Table 10, all MAT candidates (100%) across disciplines exceeded the passing standards for the items measuring LO #6.

Table 10

*Student Teaching Evaluation Results, Specified Items LO #6 (2015 and 2016 Cohort)*

| **Discipline** | Rubric Descriptors | n | Mean | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Passing=2 | |
| **English** | 23. Professional Attitude Toward Teaching and Dependability | 4 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 24. Professional Attire | 4 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 25 Maintaining Confidentiality* | 4 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 26. Professional Collaboration/Communication with Others | 4 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 27. Professional Collaboration in Data Team Setting | 4 | 2.99/3 | 99.58 |
| | 28. Use of Communication Technology | 4 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 31. Continuous Self-evaluation | 4 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 32. Integration of Feedback* | 4 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 33. Professional Growth | 4 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 23. Professional Attitude Toward Teaching and Dependability | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| **Math** | 24. Professional Attire | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 25 Maintaining Confidentiality* | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 26. Professional Collaboration/Communication with Others | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 27. Professional Collaboration in Data Team Setting | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 28. Use of Communication Technology | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 31. Continuous Self-evaluation | 2 | 2.50/3 | 83.33 |
| | 32. Integration of Feedback* | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 33. Professional Growth | 2 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 23. Professional Attitude Toward Teaching and Dependability | 8 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| **Science** | 24. Professional Attire | 8 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 25 Maintaining Confidentiality* | 8 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 26. Professional Collaboration/Communication with Others | 8 | 2.94/3 | 97.92 |
| | 27. Professional Collaboration in Data Team Setting | 8 | 2.75/3 | 91.67 |
| | 28. Use of Communication Technology | 8 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 31. Continuous Self-evaluation | 8 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | 32. Integration of Feedback* | 8 | 2.88/3 | 95.83 |
| | 33. Professional Growth | 8 | 3.00/3 | 100 |
| | | | Passing=3 | |
| | 23. Professional Attitude Toward Teaching and Dependability | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |
| **Spanish** | 24. Professional Attire | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |
| | 25 Maintaining Confidentiality* | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |
| | 26. Professional Collaboration/Communication with Others | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |
| | 27. Professional Collaboration in Data Team Setting | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |
| | 28. Use of Communication Technology | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |
| | 31. Continuous Self-evaluation | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 32. Integration of Feedback* | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |
| 33. Professional Growth | 2 | 4.00/4 | 100 |

*Notes.* * indicates NON NEGOTIABLE; less than target performance in this area will mean that the student teacher is unable to earn a letter grade A for the student teaching experience.

**SECTION 3 – ANALYSIS**

As a reminder, the MAT program was fully redesigned during the 2015-2016 academic year. This included revised learning outcomes and assessments. All curricular changes officially go into effect for the 2017-2018 cohort. However, all members of the 2016-2017 cohort piloted the new learning outcomes and assessments. This assessment report includes one or two years of pilot data on all new outcomes and assessments. Where appropriate, data from the past five years was shared.

*LO 1. Possess strong knowledge of content, content pedagogy, and learner development (typical and atypical).*

MAT candidates' performance reflects passing scores for both the Praxis Core Exam and the Praxis Subject Tests. Both assessments demonstrate candidates' strong content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge. The challenge is that this knowledge is demonstrated broadly at the beginning of the program. Other assessments also measure candidate content knowledge, and certainly pedagogical content knowledge, but the knowledge that is measured is narrower—focused specifically on what the candidate teaches during the student teaching semester. Because these assessments have been required for admissions, there have not been changes witnessed over time across cohorts. However, the CSDE has recently changed the policy for basic skills testing, making the requirement much less stringent. With future cohorts, it may be a challenge to maintain the basic skill proficiency that has supported our MAT candidates' success in the program and as beginning teachers to date.

*LO 2. Create an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment.*

MAT candidates' performance on specified student teaching rubric items demonstrates proficiency, with all candidates across disciplines exceeding the passing standards for the items measuring LO #2. Since only two years of data was accessible within our new SEPS electronic database (Taskstream), only two cohorts' scores were analyzed. The strength observed within candidates' scores is that overall candidates performed well on the items measuring their ability to create an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment by the end of the student teaching semester. This strength is advantageous since this is an important requisite competency of a beginning teacher. The challenges that the data point out are relative to scorer reliability and consistency. It is challenging to determine if scores are consistent across scorers. And, also if there is less variation in the data, is that due to scorer perspective about where candidates should be by the end of the student teaching semester, or really a reflection of candidate performance?

CCSU piloted the edTPA beginning in Spring 2016, and scores were reported for the past two cohorts. These scores allow for valid and reliable inferences, as they were established by trained, external national scorers. The edTPA data for this particular learning outcome point to a strength of candidates' ability to establish a positive learning environment, as evidenced by video recorded instruction (100% of candidates (16/16) met or exceeded the standard for rubric 6, Learning Environment). A challenge can be identified across the entire edTPA data set. Only nine of the 15 fully scored portfolios met or exceeded the national average score

of 44. There is ample room for growth in candidates' overall edTPA scores. With a goal of a score of "3" on every rubric, the only rubrics in which the cohort average met or exceeded "3" in both the 2015 and 2016 cohorts are rubrics 1 (planning for specific understanding), 5 (planning assessments), and 6 (learning environment)--(see raw data tables submitted in appendix). There is room for growth in the remaining 12 rubrics. Overall, candidates in the 2016 scored higher than candidates in the 2015 cohort, yet with such small numbers of candidates, no clear trends have been identified. Furthermore, candidates from the 2016 scored higher than candidates in the 2015 cohorts on rubrics 3 and 6, which specifically measure LO #3.

*LO 3. Use data, content knowledge, and evidence-based pedagogical content knowledge to critically examine practice for the purpose of improving student learning.*

Within the analysis of data for LO #2, an overall challenge was identified across all edTPA rubrics (see above). Within this particular learning outcome, a strength that can be identified is that all but three candidates met or exceeded the standard (score of 3) on the rubric assessing MAT candidates' ability to provide feedback to students related to the learning objective, and guiding students to deepen learning through the use of feedback. A challenge is that only 50% of candidates across both cohorts met or exceeded the standard (score of 3) on the rubric that asks candidates to analyze student learning. This rubric assesses MAT candidates' ability to report their students' assessment results and analyze them quantitatively and qualitatively to identify strengths and challenges related to the content focus of the lesson plan and specific content elements highlighted in the edTPA handbook. The 2016 cohort scored higher than the 2015 cohort on rubrics 11 and 12, yet it is difficult to make any solid conclusions about that increase since there were such small numbers of candidates in each cohort (see raw data tables submitted in appendix).

*LO 4. Design and deliver instructional and assessment strategies that facilitate significant learning for all students including struggling learners and those with disabilities.*

Candidates demonstrate strengths across the planning process, as captured in the Unit Plan data. All but two candidates met the passing score of 2 on all indicators. The challenge is that it is difficult to identify trends, because we only have one year of data using the common MAT Unit Plan Rubric. Without a common rubric, it is difficult to examine growth from one cohort to the next, as well as to clearly identify strengths and challenges regarding unit planning across all disciplines of the cohort. The Spanish candidates from both the 2015 and 2016 cohort were challenged to meet the passing score, but their performance cannot be compared because we changed the rubrics from one cohort to the next. Therefore, it is difficult to interpret if they struggled in the same areas.

*LO 5. Design, deliver, and assess literacy/language strategies to deepen literacy and content learning within the discipline.*

Only one year of data is available for this LO, because it is a new outcome as well as a new assessment. Candidates from the 2016 cohort were able to demonstrate reflection upon their lesson and professional goal setting. Some of the candidates struggled to adequately describe the learning experience and provide evidence in support of their description (i.e. what feedback did my peers and instructors provide on the lesson implementation?).

*LO 6. Act collaboratively, ethically, and responsibly to ensure student growth and advance the profession.*

Candidates showed great overall strength with the professional attributes assessed in LO #6. All candidates met the passing standards, and for all but five indicators across all four program certification areas, candidates scored at the highest level (target). The indicators in which candidates scored a "2" versus a "3" were not

common across certification areas, so it is difficult to identify any patterns of challenge, with the exception of both English and Science groups scoring lower on the indicator measuring professional collaboration in data teams. This is perhaps because candidates at the secondary level having less of an opportunity to participate in data teams because they are not as regular and prevalent as in the elementary schools.

## SECTION 4 –USE OF RESULTS

*LO 1. Possess strong knowledge of content, content pedagogy, and learner development (typical and atypical).*

Changes have been made at the state department of education to the licensure requirements for these two program assessments (Praxis Core assessment and Praxis Subject Tests). All changes have been described above. Therefore, our program has had to be responsive to the changes made at the CSDE, and changed all of our program materials to indicate the new assessments that are required at the time of application.

*LO 2. Create an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment.*

To address the concerns of scorer reliability and the validity of the student teaching evaluation tool, the SEPS faculty, in collaboration with the Office of School and Community Partnerships, have decided to pilot a new student teaching instrument starting in the Fall 2017 semester. This will include a common 3-point rubric and common indicators across disciplines, with certain items specific to each discipline. This student teaching evaluation has met the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards for a proprietary instrument with established reliability and validity. The instrument is also better aligned with the instrument used to evaluate practicing teachers in Connecticut.

Program faculty are working to familiarize themselves with the edTPA task and rubrics, and we have established embedded signature assessments within the program to support candidate readiness for the culminating edTPA during their student teaching experience. In the first summer session in the MAT 510 course (right when their program begins), candidates plan a lesson for their peers in which they learn to use the MAT UDL lesson planning template which has been aligned to the language and expectations of the edTPA rubrics. This assignment is called the Reflective Teaching Lesson Plan and Reflection. Following lesson implementation, candidates reflect on their instructional decisions and the performance of their peers. This task supports candidates in competencies related to rubrics 1, 5, 10, 11, and 15. With future cohorts, we are planning to add a piece of pre-assessment data gathering prior to instruction to address rubrics 2 and 3 as well. The second signature assessment is assigned in MAT 533, the video analysis assignment. This task is described within LO #5 and addresses edTPA rubrics 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. The next embedded signature assessment is the Unit Plan which is assigned in MAT 539, described within LO # 4, addressing edTPA rubrics 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. We are planning to add another signature assessment called Analyzing Student Work. We plan to include that assessment in MAT 533 to address edTPA rubrics 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15. The assignment is still under development.

*LO 3. Use data, content knowledge, and evidence-based pedagogical content knowledge to critically examine practice for the purpose of improving student learning.*

See description above (within LO #2) for how the program has responded to edTPA data analysis.

*LO 4. Design and deliver instructional and assessment strategies that facilitate significant learning for all students including struggling learners and those with disabilities.*

The Unit Plan assignment has changed based on data analysis across the years. We have established a common MAT unit planning rubric that all program certification areas will use to analyze evidence that candidates met LO #4. This will enable us to make clearer judgements about strengths and challenges of unit planning across cohorts and across disciplines. Program faculty have reviewed and discussed the new rubric at several faculty meetings across a two-year span. In the past, we have also had the challenge of some faculty not inputting scores into Taskstream. The program director needs to be very vigilant at the end of the semester to remind faculty to score the unit plans in Taskstream.

*LO 5. Design, deliver, and assess literacy/language strategies to deepen literacy and content learning within the discipline.*

With only one year of data to analyze, we have not made any programmatic changes based on data analysis. However, to complement this LO (#5), we have redesigned the disciplinary literacy course the candidates take (MAT 531) to include assignments more relevant to literacy within the particular discipline. Prior to adopting this outcome, the MAT 531 course was focused on general literacy strategies that support literacy learning across disciplines. Yet, candidates also need to understand how literacy is unique to their discipline, and how to specifically support students' literacy within the content of English, math, science, and Spanish, and this course now does this. This LO also aligns to a strong thrust for candidates to consider academic language in their instruction, as measured heavily in the edTPA. This task as well as the MAT 531 course help to prepare student to meet this competency.

*LO 6. Act collaboratively, ethically, and responsibly to ensure student growth and advance the profession.*

See description above (within LO #2) for how the program has responded to student teaching evaluation data analysis.

**SECTION 5 GENERAL EDUCATION (NOT applicable)**

**SECTION 6- ASSESSMENT PLAN**

See attached Assessment Plan (pdf).

**APPENDIX**

Since Section 2 provides assessment results in summarized format, please include a full tabulation of results as an appendix, as you deem appropriate. *If there are fewer than five students, please consult with Yvonne Kirby as to how to maintain student confidentiality and ensure compliance with FERPA.*

# ASSESSMENT PLAN

As mentioned above, there have been many changes since the most recent full assessment report. In response to a change in national accreditation standards and reporting guidelines, and in response to aligning our MAT program with best practice in the co-preparation of secondary education candidates and special education candidates, we have revised all program outcomes and assessments. The assessments are better aligned to the standards for practicing teachers in Connecticut. Each assessment is described, below, and aligned to particular learning outcome(s). Specific improvements for each assessment are discussed within each section, below, referencing the evidence indicating this need. Programmatic changes are explained in response to the change in assessment method or schedule.

Since the most recent MAT assessment report, SEPS has established an assessment database through Taskstream, the School of Education and Professional Studies (SEPS) data management system. Dr. Mel Horton, our Assistant Dean for Assessment and Partnerships, working in consultation with program coordinators, has built the assessment dashboard and organized it by program assessment for accreditation purposes (see attached screen shot of MAT Data Dashboard). This database will enable program coordinators to efficiently and effectively analyze program outcome data in order to make a determination about program successes and challenges. It will also help us to access pertinent data for assessment and accreditation reports. Most importantly, it will help students track their progress throughout the program, and leave with an assessment portfolio demonstrating their ability to be a successful beginning teacher upon completion of our program.

The MAT program was substantially redesigned in the 2015-2016 academic year (see attached documentation). We face the challenge of implementing several new assessments (edTPA and videotape analysis) as well as new certification areas (Special Education and History/Social Studies). We need 100% faculty buy-in and follow-through across MAT courses to be successful with full implementation of our new assessment package. Furthermore, we need several years of data with these new assessments in order to make further adjustments to our program. As such, this assessment plan will be in place for the next four years in order to establish a database of cohort scores to analyze across time with these new learning outcomes and assessments.

Finally, the full redesign of the MAT program allowed us to fully realign program assessments with outcomes that lead to teacher readiness in today's classrooms. We are confident that this new package of assessments comprehensively measures teacher candidates' progress and quality throughout the program and at the point of program completion.

**Assessment 1: Content Knowledge**
**Measures LO #1**

*State Licensure Examinations: Praxis Core and Praxis Subject Test (Praxis Core prior to admission for all candidates, Praxis Subject for secondary candidates prior to admission and upon program completion for Special Education candidates)*

**A. Description of Assessment**

(a) **Basic Skills/Praxis Core.** The state of Connecticut DOE (CSDE) changed the required evidence of basic skills, and therefore this assessment has changed. Our new policy for what counts as evidence of meeting basic skills can now be found at: http://www.ccsu.edu/seps/teacherPrep/testingRequirements.html. This data is now being recorded in the SEPS data management system, Taskstream.

(b) **Praxis 2/ACTFL.** The passing standards for some of the Praxis Subject Tests and the ACTFL Tests were changed by the CSDE. We keep up to date of these changing standards. The current standards are listed here: http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/PDF/Cert/guides/assess_for_cert.pdf. This data is now being recorded in the SEPS data management system, Taskstream.

MAT candidates must present scores on state required tests of basic skills and passing scores on content knowledge exams prior to admission to the MAT program. Connecticut has established specific passing scores on state licensure tests in each content area. In sciences, math, history/social studies, and English the state requires specific Praxis II tests. In September 2011, the state changed the Secondary English Praxis test requirement, replacing tests #0041 and #0042 with Test #0044. This change is evident in the Secondary English Praxis test data tables provided in this submission. The table below summarizes the relevant state testing requirements. Current Connecticut requirements for content knowledge testing are published in the *Guide to Assessments for Educator Certification in Connecticut* available on the CSDE website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/PDF/Cert/guides/assess_for_cert.pdf

| **Certification Areas** | **CSDE Required Tests of Content Knowledge** | **CSDE Passing Scores** | **Relevant Content Knowledge Standards** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Secondary English (7-12) | ETS Praxis II 0044/5044/5039 English Language, Literature & Composition: Content & Analysis | 173 | NCTE standards for<br>Language development and acquisition including history of the English Language<br>Language structure and skills including grammar systems and semantics<br>Traditional literature study (American, British, World) including literary criticism/theory and literary terminology<br>Multi-cultural literature, young adult literature, literature of diversity including that by women<br>Literacy study including major aspects of written, oral, and visual literacy<br>Reading processes for understanding text including critical analysis and meaning making strategies<br>Writing processes for different purposes, situations, and |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | audiences<br>Media (print and non-print) and communication technology understanding |
| Secondary Mathematics (7-12) | ETS Praxis II 0061/5061 Mathematics: Content Knowledge | 137 | NCTM standards for<br>Knowledge of Number and Operation<br>Knowledge of Different Perspectives on Algebra<br>Knowledge of Geometries<br>Knowledge of Calculus<br>Knowledge of Discrete Mathematics<br>Knowledge of Data Analysis, Statistics and Probability<br>Knowledge of Measurement |
| Secondary Biology (7-12) | ETS Praxis II 0235/5235 Biology: Content Knowledge | 152 | NSTA standards for advanced study in<br>Genetics<br>Ecology<br>Molecular Biology<br>Evolution or Evolutionary Biology |
| Secondary Chemistry (7-12) | ETS Praxis II 0245/5245 Chemistry: Content Knowledge<br>ETS Praxis II 0242 Chemistry: Content Essays | 151<br>140 | NSTA standards for advanced study in<br>Analytical Chemistry<br>Organic Chemistry<br>Biochemistry<br>Mathematics |
| Secondary Earth Science (7-12) | ETS Praxis II 0571/5571 Earth & Space Sciences: Content Knowledge | 157 | NSTA standards for advanced study in<br>Hydrogeology<br>Oceanography<br>Global Climate Change<br>Geologic Age of the Earth |
| Secondary World Languages (7-12) | ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI): French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish, Chinese<br>ACTFL Writing Proficiency Test (WPT): French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish, Chinese [NOTE: Intermediate High is the passing criteria for the Chinese exam.] | Advanced Low<br>Advanced Low | ACTFL-- Knowledge of target language use (listening, speaking, reading, writing) |
| Special Education (K-12) | Praxis II (ETS 0543): Special Ed. Core Knowledge and Mild/Mod Applications | 164<br><br><br><br>240 | CEC standards for<br>Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences<br>Learning Environments<br>Curricular Content Knowledge<br>Assessment<br>Instructional Planning and Strategies |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Pearson Foundations of Reading | | Professional Learning and Practices<br>Collaboration |
| History/Social Studies (7-12) | ETS Praxis II 5081 Social Studies: Content Knowledge | 162 | NCSS standards for Content Knowledge<br>**Element 1:** Candidates are knowledgeable about the *concepts, facts, and tools* in civics, economics, geography, history, and the social/behavioral sciences.<br>**Element 2:** Candidates are knowledgeable about *disciplinary inquiry* in civics, economics, geography, history, and the social/behavioral sciences.<br>**Element 3:** Candidates are knowledgeable about *disciplinary forms of representation* in civics, economics, geography, history, and the social/behavioral sciences. |

In July 2010, the State Board of education published new regulations that allowed candidates in designated shortage areas to "substitute the achievement of excellence scores on the State Board of Education approved subject area assessment(s) appropriate to the certification endorsement sought, in lieu of a subject area major or subject area coursework required in statute, or in the Regulations of State Agencies Concerning State Educator Certificates, Permits and Authorizations (CSDE, 2010)." Given the MAT program's mission to prepare shortage area teachers who meet state standards for content preparation, excellence scores have in some cases allowed us to admit candidates we judge to have mastered the content even though the credits they have earned may not align perfectly with state requirements. This has been especially relevant for candidates educated outside the United States and candidates changing fields (Engineers entering mathematics or science teaching, for example.) The current state publication on excellence scores is available at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/cert/certalert_sept2012.pdf. This assessment addresses the following program outcome: *MAT candidates will possess strong knowledge of content and learner development (special education Praxis only).*

*Oral Proficiency Interview and Writing Proficiency Test: prior to admission*

The state of Connecticut requires that candidates for World Language certification demonstrate their knowledge of the target language by earning scores of at least *Advanced Low* on both the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) and the ACTFL Writing Proficiency Test (WPT). Applicants to the MAT program must submit scores that meet the required Connecticut standard of at least *Advanced Low* prior to admission to the MAT program. However, Mandarin Chinese candidates are required to meet the standard of Intermediate High.

The OPI is a structured interview administered by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). The interview, which is typically completed on the telephone, is scored by certified raters and assesses functional speaking skills in the target language. The scoring criteria are published by ACTFL at http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/ACTFLProficiencyGuidelines2012-Speaking.pdf.

The WPT is also administered by ACTFL. This proctored, standardized test of functional writing skills is also scored by certified raters. Descriptions of the scoring criteria are published by

ACTFL at
http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/ACTFLProficiencyGuidelines2012_FINAL.pdf

**B. Alignment with Standards**
The state licensure tests have been identified by the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) as the tests that most appropriately assess teacher candidates' content preparation. Each MAT candidate completes the state-required content knowledge tests, submitting passing scores as one part of the admission application. The expectations that the state testing standard be met provides one measure of content knowledge in the discipline. All exams meet the preparation standards for each credentialing group (i.e. NCTE, NCTM, NSTA, ACTFL, CEC, NCSS).

**C. Training and Calibration**
These assessments are administered and scored through the various testing companies (ETS, Pearson, ACTFL). As these are proprietary assessments, local faculty training and/or calibration are not required.

**D. Collection and Analysis of Data**
Each MAT candidate completes the state-required content knowledge tests, submitting passing score reports as part of the admission application. The pass rate on state licensure tests must be 100% for the MAT program—applicants are required to pass these tests prior to admission. Applications are tracked and stored through Taskstream (https://www1.taskstream.com), the institution's data management system.

Each MAT language candidate completes the state-required ACTFL exams, submitting passing score reports as part of the admission application. The pass rate on the OPI and WPT must be 100% at or above Advanced Low for admission to the MAT program (applicants are required to pass these tests at Advanced Low or above prior to admission; Mandarin Chinese candidates must pass these tests at Intermediate High or above prior to admission). Applications are tracked and stored through Taskstream (https://www1.taskstream.com), the institution's data management system.

**E. Remediation of Candidates' Knowledge and Skills**
If an initial transcript review suggests that a prospective MAT candidate may lack background in or need to refresh knowledge of a specific area, relevant coursework and other resources are required or recommended; however, these assessments are required to be passed prior to admission. The SEPS Advising Center has study resources and practice books for MAT applicants to check out prior to taking the exams.

**Assessment 2: Planning**

*Unit Plan: completed at the end of the methods course fall semester*

**Measures LO # 4**

## A. Description of Assessment

**Unit Plan Rubric.** The unit plan rubric has been revised to be consistent across program content areas, with additional items specific to the discipline. The discipline-specific items are informed by SPA standards. The common items on the unit planning rubric reflect best practice in curriculum and instructional design, and align to the edTPA rubrics. Specific items measure candidates' ability to plan to meet the needs of all learners, which is highly emphasized in the revised MAT program (LO 4). This data is recorded in Taskstream.

MAT candidates are required to design a standards-based unit (minimum of 5 lessons), which is the capstone assignment for the MAT methods course taken during the fall semester. Students are concurrently placed in their field experience two days a week, and MAT candidates are expected to prepare the lessons in the unit based on diagnostic and formative assessment of their learners. The unit is not intended to be implemented until full-time student teaching in the spring, but oftentimes, students will pilot lessons or gather pre-assessment data in the fall.

This assessment addresses the following program outcomes. MAT candidates will:

- *Possess strong knowledge of content, content pedagogy, and learner development (typical and atypical).*
- *Create an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment.*
- *Design and deliver instructional and assessment strategies that facilitate significant learning for all students including struggling learners and those with disabilities.*
- *Design, deliver, and assess literacy/language strategies to deepen literacy and content learning within the discipline.*

## B. Alignment with Standards

This assessment aligns with the planning requirements of each SPA Standard 2 Content Pedagogy. See below for specific planning requirements of each SPA assessed through the MAT Unit Plan.

| Special Education (K-12): CEC | Sciences (7-12): NSTA | Mathematics (7-12): NCTM | English Language Arts (7-12): NCTE | World Languages (7-12): ACTFL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Select, adapt, and use a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to advance learning of individuals with | Plan multiple lessons using a variety of inquiry approaches that demonstrate knowledge and understanding of how all students learn science (NSTA 2a, 3a) Include active inquiry lessons where students | Apply knowledge of curriculum standards (NCTM 3a)<br><br>Analyze and consider research in planning | Plan instruction and design assessments for reading and the study of literature to promote learning for all students | Evidence of the K-16 student standards in planning, teaching, and assessment (ACTFL 4a) Integration of three modes of communication |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| exceptionalities. (CEC 5)<br>• Consider an individual's profile in selecting, developing and adapting learning experiences (CEC 5.1)<br>• Use technologies including assistive technologies to support instruction (CEC 5.2, 5.3)<br>• Use strategies to enhance language development and communication skills (CEC 5.4)<br>• Incorporate mastery learning promote generalization of learning (CEC 5.6)<br>• Integrate cross-disciplinary knowledge and skills such as critical | collect and interpret data to develop and communicate findings; include technology as appropriate (NSTA 2b, 3b)<br>Design instruction and assessment strategies that confront and address naïve concepts/preconceptions (NSTA 2c, 3c)<br>Plan for science safety procedures and ethical treatment of living organisms (NSTA 3d) | (NCTM 3b)<br><br>Plan lessons and units that incorporate a variety of strategies, differentiated instruction for diverse populations, and mathematics specific instructional technologies (NCTM 3c)<br><br>Provide opportunities to communicate about mathematics and make connections to other content, workplace, and everyday life (NCTM 3d)<br><br>Implement techniques related to student engagement and communication (high quality tasks, guiding discussions, identifying key ideas, identifying and addressing student misconceptions, and questioning (NCTM 3e) | including (NCTE Standard III and IV):<br><br>• Use knowledge of theory and research to plan standards-based coherent learning experiences utilizing a range of texts and/or opportunities to compose through varied instructional strategies to engage all learners<br>• Utilize a range of authentic and diagnostic assessments that inform instruction<br>• Incorporate knowledge of the language and conventions into instruction<br>• Integrate | (ACTFL 4b)<br>Integration of cultural products, practices, perspectives (ACTFL 4b)<br>Connections to other subject areas (ACTFL 4b)<br>Connections to target language communities (ACTFL 4b)<br>Selection, adaptation/creation, and integration of authentic materials and technology (ACTFL 4c) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| thinking and problem solving (5.7)<br><br>Use multiple methods of assessment and data-sources (CEC 4):<br><br>• Select sound assessments that minimize bias (CEC 4.1) | | Plan, select, implement, interpret, and use formative and summative assessments to inform instruction and monitor student progress (NCTM 3f, 3g) | other content as applicable | |

History/Social Studies (7-12): NCSS

Candidates plan learning sequences that draw upon social studies knowledge and literacies to support the civic competence of learners.

- Candidates plan learning sequences that demonstrate alignment with the C3 Framework and state-required content standards.
- Candidates plan learning sequences that engage learners with *disciplinary concepts, facts, and tool*s from the social studies disciplines to facilitate learning for civic life.
- Candidates plan learning sequences that engage learners in *disciplinary inquiry* to develop literacies for civic life.
- Candidates plan learning sequences where learners create *disciplinary forms of representation* to provide opportunities for meaningful civic learning.
- Candidates use theory and research to plan learning sequences that integrate social studies content to foster inquiry and civic competence.

Candidates design instruction and authentic assessments for social studies that promote learning and competence in civic life.

- Candidates design a range of authentic assessments that measure learners' mastery of *disciplinary knowledge*, *inquiry*, and *forms of representation* for competence in civic life and demonstrate alignment with state-required content standards.
- Candidates design coherent and relevant learning experiences and engage learners in *disciplinary knowledge*, *inquiry*, and *forms of representation* for competence in civic life and demonstrate alignment with state-required content standards.
- Candidates use theory and research to implement a variety of instructional practices and authentic assessments featuring *disciplinary knowledge*, *inquiry*, and *forms of representation* for competence in civic life.
- Candidates' exhibit data literacy by using assessment data to guide instructional decision-making and reflect on student learning outcomes related to *disciplinary knowledge*, *inquiry*, and *forms of representation* for competence in civic life.
  Candidates engage learners in self-assessment practices that support individualized learning outcomes related to *disciplinary knowledge*, *inquiry*, and *forms of representation* for competence in civic life.

**C. Training and Calibration**
Program faculty will take several measures to ensure that all assessments exhibit internal consistency and inter-rater reliability. First, faculty will rate each assessment rubric using a "Rubric to Assess Rubrics" to ensure rubric construction is consistent with the literature. Second, training on the use of the assessment and scoring guide will be conducted prior to the start of each semester. In addition, Taskstream (the assessment management software) is able to display blind faculty rubric ratings for all assessments having more than one section. These data will be reviewed on an annual basis for internal consistency by program faculty. Care will also be taken to avoid bias. Program faculty and K-12 school partners will regularly review all assessments using a "Rubric to Assess a Rubric" to ensure assessments are free of racial and ethnic stereotypes and that they use culturally sensitive language. Furthermore, assessments are fair when they have content validity – when they assess what has been taught. To ensure the fairness of the scoring guide, the program provides clear alignment with Connecticut Common Core Teaching Standards, the appropriate SPA Standards, and InTASC Standards (2011). In addition, fairness also includes candidates understanding what is expected of them. As such, the course syllabus clearly states the structure of the assessment, how it is scored, and how it contributes to program completion.

**D. Collection and Analysis of Data**
Data from this assessment will be housed within Taskstream. The scoring guide will be available electronically within the system. The course instructor will enter scores. Data will be compiled by the program director in the form of a report that includes alignment with state and national standards. Program faculty and school partners will review data for strengths, weaknesses, patterns and trends. Based on their analysis, an Action Plan form will be completed. Any changes or revisions that need to occur to the instrument or the scoring guide will be documented within the action plan. The Action Plan will then be shared with the department.

**E. Remediation of Candidates' Knowledge and Skills**
MAT candidates complete their unit in their methods course in the fall semester. They work closely with their methods professor in a small group setting (typically at a teacher: student ratio of 1: 5-10). Methods faculty provide feedback using the unit rubric prior to final submission. The unit must meet the proficiency standard in order to pass the course. In many cases, the unit rubric identifies areas of focus for candidate planning for the internship semester. The methods professor works with the MAT candidate and the assigned university supervisor for the internship to set initial (student teaching) goals based on the rubric feedback.

**Assessment 3: ST/Intern Eval**

*Student Teaching Evaluations: completed spring semester at midpoint and final*
**Measures LO # 2, 6**

## A. Description of Assessment

**Student Teaching Evaluation.** The SEPS student teaching evaluation (across programs) has been revised to reflect new research in teacher evaluation, to align to the edTPA, and to align more closely to how teachers in Connecticut are being assessed in the field. This data is recorded in Taskstream.

Candidate performance in the spring student teaching semester is formally assessed by the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. Although a formative assessment is completed at the midpoint of the semester, the final assessment is completed at the conclusion of student teaching (MAT 540) by the university supervisor and cooperating teacher. The 15-week student teaching is the culmination of the academic year field placement. As noted earlier, the cooperating teachers have been identified by their districts as excellent models and mentors and MAT candidates are carefully matched with these teachers. All cooperating teachers are fully certified in the content area. Candidates must complete student teaching satisfactorily to complete the MAT program and be recommended for certification.

The MAT program's student teaching evaluation includes items that require the candidate be rated as target, acceptable, or unacceptable based on each item's descriptions of performance levels. The items are organized in nine domains: classroom environment, planning, instruction, assessment for learning, communication, professionalism, student diversity, self-evaluation and reflection, and knowledge and skills in the content area.

This assessment addresses ALL of the program outcomes. MAT candidates will:

- *Possess strong knowledge of content, content pedagogy, and learner development (typical and atypical).*
- *Create an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment.*
- *Use data, content knowledge, and evidence-based pedagogical content knowledge to critically examine practice for the purpose of improving student learning.*
- *Design and deliver instructional and assessment strategies that facilitate significant learning for all students including struggling learners and those with disabilities.*
- *Design, deliver, and assess literacy/language strategies to deepen literacy and content learning within the discipline.*
- *Act collaboratively, ethically, and responsibly to ensure student growth and advance the profession.*

## B. Alignment with Standards

The student teaching evaluation items provide information on each candidate's demonstrated knowledge of content pedagogy (see Assessment 2 for specific standards from each SPA).

## C. Training and Calibration

Program faculty will take several measures to ensure that this assessment exhibits internal consistency and inter-rater reliability. Training is done for each new university supervisor and regular updates are provided by the Office of School and Community Partnerships to ensure inter-

rater reliability on the student teaching evaluation. In addition, Taskstream (the assessment management software) is able to display blind faculty rubric ratings for this assessment. These data will be reviewed on an annual basis for internal consistency by program faculty. Care will also be taken to avoid bias. Program faculty and K-12 school partners (including cooperating teachers) will regularly review all assessments to ensure the assessment is free of racial and ethnic stereotypes and uses culturally sensitive language. Furthermore, assessments are fair when they have content validity – when they assess what has been taught. To ensure the fairness of the scoring guide, the program provides clear alignment with Connecticut Common Core Teaching Standards, the appropriate SPA Standards, and InTASC Standards (2011). In addition, fairness also includes candidates' understanding what is expected of them. As such, the course syllabus and student teaching handbook clearly state the structure of the assessment, how it is scored, and how it contributes to program completion.

**D. Collection and Analysis of Data**

Data from this assessment will be housed within Taskstream. The scoring guide will be available electronically within the system. The university supervisor will enter scores. Data will be compiled by the program director in the form of a report that includes alignment with state and national standards. Program faculty and school partners will review data for strengths, weaknesses, patterns and trends. Based on their analysis, an Action Plan form will be completed. Any changes or revisions that need to occur to the instrument or the scoring guide will be documented within the action plan. The Action Plan will then be shared with the department.

**E. Remediation of Candidates' Knowledge and Skills**

MAT candidates benefit from the use of the student teaching evaluation as a formative mid-semester assessment that helps them establish important goals for growth. MAT candidates also benefit from the established remediation plan in place for the student teaching experience per the Office of School and Community Partnerships policy (elucidated in the university supervisor student teaching handbook). If a student teacher is struggling to meet expectations at any point, but certainly following the 4-week or 8-week mark, a student teaching focus plan is implemented. If the focus plan fails to remediate candidates' knowledge and skills, a Teacher Candidate Improvement Plan is implemented. Both the focus form and teacher candidate improvement plan enable the MAT candidate to understand their particular strengths and challenges, with a clear plan and timeline for remediating areas of concern. All handbooks can be accessed electronically via: http://www.ccsu.edu/oscp/.

**Assessment 4: Effect on Student Learning**

*edTPA Plus Local Pre/Post Test and Analysis of Student Work: completed spring semester during the student teaching semester*

**Measures LO # 2, 3**

## A. Description of Assessment

**edTPA.** edTPA is a new assessment for our candidates. edTPA is a performance-based, teacher work sample developed by Stanford University faculty and staff at the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE). It is used by teacher preparation programs throughout the United States to emphasize, measure, and support the skills and knowledge that all teachers need in the classroom focused on three tasks: Planning, Instruction, and Assessment. Work created and submitted as a result of this pilot will result in a comprehensive portfolio that demonstrates teacher candidates' ability to teach through lesson plans designed to support students' strengths and needs, engage real students in ambitious learning, analyze impact on student learning, and adjust instruction to become more effective. MAT Candidates' edTPA Portfolio will include artifacts (i.e. lesson plans, instructional and assessment materials, one or two video clips of their teaching, student work samples) and commentaries (i.e. Planning Instruction and Assessment, Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning, Assessing Student Learning) based on a 3-5 lesson unit of instruction referred to as a Learning Segment. The edTPA Portfolio includes the following components: Task 1: Planning Instruction and Assessment; Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning; Task 3: Assessing Student Learning.

Along with the CT State Department of Education, SEPS and the MAT program piloted the use of edTPA in the spring 2016 and 2017 semesters. edTPA is a performance-based, teacher work sample developed by Stanford University faculty and staff at the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE). It is used by teacher preparation programs throughout the United States to emphasize, measure, and support the skills and knowledge that all teachers need in the classroom focused on three tasks: Planning, Instruction, and Assessment. With two years of national scores, we are able to identify the strengths and challenges of our MAT candidates, and adjust our MAT curriculum and instruction accordingly.

MAT candidates will be assessed with edTPA's performance-based assessment during the student teaching semester. A local measure of a pre unit assessment and a post unit assessment will be added to ensure that candidates demonstrate impact on student learning. Candidates will prepare an edTPA portfolio to demonstrate their preparation and competence with lesson planning, implementation, assessment, and analysis of student work in ways that develop academic language and deep content understanding among their students.

edTPA is a performance-based, subject-specific assessment and support system used by more than 600 teacher preparation programs in some 40 states to emphasize, measure and support the skills and knowledge that all teachers need from Day 1 in the classroom. Developed by educators for educators, edTPA is the first such standards-based assessment to become nationally available in the United States. It builds on decades of work on assessments of teacher performance and research regarding teaching skills that improve student learning. It is transforming the preparation and certification of new

teachers by complementing subject-area assessments with a rigorous process that requires teacher candidates to demonstrate that they have the classroom skills necessary to ensure students are learning. (http://edtpa.aacte.org/faq#51)

This assessment is particularly robust because it does not ask candidates to do anything they would not normally do as quality educational practice. Candidates must document their practice through this process.

**Preparation for Critical Dimensions of Teaching**

The edTPA process identifies and collects **subject-specific** evidence of effective teaching from a **learning segment** of 3-5 lessons from a unit of instruction for one class of students. Teacher candidates submit authentic **artifacts** from a clinical field experience. Candidates also submit **commentaries** that provide a rationale to support their instructional practices based on the learning strengths and needs of students. Candidates' evidence is evaluated and scored within the following **five dimensions of teaching**:

**1. Planning Instruction and Assessment** establishes the instructional and social context for student learning and includes lesson plans, instructional materials and student assignments/assessments. Candidates demonstrate how their plans align with content standards, build upon students' prior academic learning and life experiences and how instruction is differentiated to address student needs.
**2. Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning** includes one or two **unedited video clips** of 15-20 minutes from the learning segment and a commentary analyzing how the candidate engages students in learning activities. Candidates also demonstrate subject-specific pedagogical strategies and how they elicit and monitor student responses to develop deep subject matter understandings.
**3. Assessing Student Learning** includes classroom based assessment (evaluation criteria), student work samples, evidence of teacher feedback, and a commentary analyzing patterns of student learning. Candidates summarize the performance of the whole class, analyze the specific strengths and needs of three focus students, and explain how their feedback guides student learning.
**4. Analysis of Teaching Effectiveness** is addressed in commentaries within Planning, Instruction and Assessment tasks. In planning, candidates justify their plans based on the candidate's knowledge of diverse students' learning strengths and needs and principles of research and theory. In Instruction, candidates explain and justify which aspects of the learning segment were effective, and what the candidate would change. Lastly, candidates use their analysis of assessment results to inform next steps for individuals and groups with varied learning needs.
**5. Academic Language Development (secondary education)** is evaluated based on the candidate's ability to support students' oral and written use of academic language to deepen subject matter understandings. Candidates explain how students demonstrate academic language using student work samples and/or video recordings of student engagement. Special education candidates identify a **communication skill** that the focus learner will need to use to participate in the learning tasks and/or demonstration learning related to the learning goal.

Figure obtained from *Using edTPA* handout (http://edtpa.aacte.org/)

A local portion of the edTPA will specifically focus on **Analysis of Student Learning.** This section includes one or more visual representations (e.g., tables, graphs, charts) that depict student performance (a) for the entire class, (b) for one selected subgroup, and (c) for at least two individual students. Each visual representation is accompanied by a descriptive narrative that summarizes the analysis of student progress and achievement. MAT secondary and special education candidates will also detail their collaborative efforts to meet the needs of all learners

including students with disabilities. Finally, this section includes an explanation of the ways in which student grades or other indicators of student performance have been assigned and recorded as well as how and to whom these results (i.e., grades or other indicators) have been reported.

This assessment addresses ALL of the program outcomes. MAT candidates will:

- *Possess strong knowledge of content, content pedagogy, and learner development (typical and atypical).*
- *Create an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment.*
- *Use data, content knowledge, and evidence-based pedagogical content knowledge to critically examine practice for the purpose of improving student learning.*
- *Design and deliver instructional and assessment strategies that facilitate significant learning for all students including struggling learners and those with disabilities.*
- *Design, deliver, and assess literacy/language strategies to deepen literacy and content learning within the discipline.*

**B. Alignment with Standards**

edTPA was specifically designed to measure discipline-specific student learning and the use of educational research and theory. As such, it is aligned with the:

- Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC)
- Subject matter SPA requirements beginning teacher preparation
- Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) as well as state content standards and national subject matter organizations standards
- 2013 Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teacher Evaluation Instrument
- 2013 Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model

One of our SEPS' consultants has drafted an initial crosswalk between edTPA and the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching Rubric for Effective Teaching, but cursory analysis shows close alignment between the two. As such, the edTPA will support candidate readiness for "learner-ready, day one" competencies (EPAC, 2014).

**C. Training and Calibration**

Candidates upload their edTPA portfolio to via Taskstream. In this way, the university maintains access for local evaluation. The scoring is externally validated and reliability is insured (edTPA Administrative Report, 2014). The additional aspect of impact on student learning will be addressed through local scoring of the submission of a whole set of student pre-assessments, post-assessments, and analysis. Local scoring will follow the same procedures outlined above for other local assessments. Our faculty will be participating in official Local Evaluation Training conducted by representatives from the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE—the creators of the edTPA).

**D. Collection and Analysis of Data**

Candidates will also upload their portfolio to Taskstream for local scoring. Data from this assessment will be housed within Taskstream. Data will be compiled by the program director in the form of a report that includes alignment with state and national standards. Program faculty and school partners will review data for strengths, weaknesses, patterns and trends. Based on their analysis, an Action Plan form will be completed. Any changes or revisions that need to occur to the instrument or the scoring guide will be documented within the action plan. The Action Plan will then be shared with the department.

**E. Remediation of Candidates' Knowledge and Skills**

Since it would be inappropriate for faculty to provide candidates with formative feedback on a pending edTPA submission, we will not do that. We will proactively support candidate success by scaffolding tasks in earlier field experiences and courses that familiarize candidates with the edTPA tasks and language. We will also work with candidates to scaffold a schedule for edTPA submission as early in the internship semester as is reasonable for the candidate and the placement. Once the edTPA submission has been completed, we will ask each candidate to develop a plan for when and how they might (within the internship semester) resubmit for the edTPA if the need arises. If we see specific areas of potential concern, we will work with the candidate to strengthen those areas in the interim. Because the edTPA assesses aspects of teaching that are well aligned with the program outcomes and expectations for MAT interns, this remediation is inherently embedded in the internship experience. If there is a need for more extensive remediation or support, the program director can work with the host teacher and university supervisor to identify and provide additional support. If needed, the internship experience can be extended through the end of the K-12 school year assuming that the candidate's performance in the classroom is acceptable. If there are larger issues with candidate performance that preclude extending the placement, the normal student teaching remediation process will be in use.

**Assessment 5: Supporting Language and Literacy Development (Program Choice)**

*Video Analysis: completed fall semester during the fall field experience and accompanying seminar*

**Measures LO # 5**

## A. Description of Assessment

**Video Analysis Rubric.** This is a new assessment aligned to the edTPA. It also emphasizes candidates' ability to plan high quality literacy experiences within each discipline, which is an emphasis of our revised program (LO 5). This data is recorded in Taskstream. Both the MAT 533 course, which houses this assignment, and the MAT 531 course which focuses on literacy in the disciplines, were revised to support candidates in meeting the competencies assessed with this task.

Candidates are required to complete the Videotape Analysis assessment to demonstrate their understanding of the standards, functions, objectives, and assessment of language and literacy within the discipline. This assessment requires the MAT candidates to video themselves teaching a segment of a lesson during the fall field experience. Candidates are encouraged to video themselves often, but for this assignment, they will select one ten-minute video segment in which they are instructing a literacy or language objective in the discipline and one five-minute video segment in which students are using literacy and language to support content learning. Candidates must receive scores at or above the Proficient level to pass the MAT 533 field seminar course.

The assignment has three components to it, aligning to formative feedback for the summative edTPA task:

1) Lesson Planning—a complete MAT lesson planning template is submitted
2) Uploaded Video Segments from the implemented lesson (align to lesson plan submitted)
    a. one ten-minute video segment in which MAT candidates are instructing a literacy or language objective in the discipline
    b. one five-minute video segment in which students in the field placement classroom are using literacy and language to support content learning
3) Reflection of the Teaching Experience

Video segments are shared in seminar class, and the assignment is scored by the course instructor, student, and a peer(s). While peer and self-review is required, for the purposes of data collection, only instructor data will be used. The candidates have numerous formal observations by their cooperating teachers and college supervisors, but this assessment allows them to see themselves, to react to their teaching behaviors, and to analyze the impact these behaviors have on student responses. This assessment supports a key outcome of the program: *to design, deliver, and assess literacy/language strategies to deepen literacy and content learning within the discipline.* A portion of the assignment also analyzes the established learning environment, and therefore also addresses the following outcome of the program: *to create an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment.*

## B. Alignment with Standards

This assessment was designed to align to several bodies' standards for beginning teachers:

- Subject matter SPA requirements for beginning teacher preparation (CEC, NCTM, NCTE, ACTFL, NSTA)
- INTASC Standards
- Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) as well as state content standards and national subject matter organizations standards
- Connecticut Common Core of Teaching and the accompanying Rubric for Effective Teaching (2014)

**C. Training and Calibration**

Program faculty will take several measures to ensure that all assessments exhibit internal consistency and inter-rater reliability. First, faculty will rate each assessment rubric using a "Rubric to Assess Rubrics" to ensure rubric construction is consistent with the literature. Second, training on the use of the assessment and scoring guide will be conducted prior to the start of each semester. In addition, Taskstream (the assessment management software) is able to display blind faculty rubric ratings for all assessments having more than one section. These data will be reviewed on an annual basis for internal consistency by program faculty. Care will also be taken to avoid bias. Program faculty and K-12 school partners will regularly review all assessments using a "Rubric to Assess a Rubric" to ensure assessments are free of racial and ethnic stereotypes and that they use culturally sensitive language. Furthermore, assessments are fair when they have content validity – when they assess what has been taught. To ensure the fairness of the scoring guide, the program provides clear alignment with Connecticut Common Core Teaching Standards, the appropriate SPA Standards, and InTASC Standards (2011). In addition, fairness also includes candidates understanding what is expected of them. As such, the course syllabus clearly states the structure of the assessment, how it is scored, and how it contributes to program completion.

**D. Collection and Analysis of Data**

Data from this assessment will be housed within Taskstream. The scoring guide will be available electronically within the system. The course instructor will enter scores. Data will be compiled by the program director in the form of a report that includes alignment with state and national standards. Program faculty and school partners will review data for strengths, weaknesses, patterns and trends. Based on their analysis, an Action Plan form will be completed. Any changes or revisions that need to occur to the instrument or the scoring guide will be documented within the action plan. The Action Plan will then be shared with the department.

**E. Remediation of Candidates' Knowledge and Skills**

MAT candidates complete their videotape analysis in their fall field experience seminar. They work closely with their seminar professor. The seminar instructor watches each candidate's video (10-min segment), and provides clear feedback on strengths and challenge areas. The seminar instructor also reviews the rubric for the assignment ahead of time with candidates, and answers any questions about the expectations. MAT candidates are scored and provided feedback during the fall semester. Candidates can resubmit their assignment if they have not 'passed' the assessment. They need to revise their assessment based on the professor's feedback, prior to course completion. MAT candidates need to meet the proficiency standard for this assessment in order to pass the field experience course. The seminar professor works with the MAT candidate and the assigned university supervisor for the internship to set initial (student teaching) goals based on the rubric feedback.

**MAT DATA DASHBOARD—screen shot**

Taskstream

https://w.taskstream.com/ts/manager286/MasterofArtsinTeachingDataReports

Search

# Master of Arts in Teaching Data Reports

- Home
- CAEP Program Review with Feedback
- Praxis Data (Assessment 1)
- Transcript Analysis (Assessment 2)
- Unit Plan Data (Assessment 3)
- Student Teaching Evaluations (Assessment 4)
- Effect on Student Learning (Assessment 5)
- Language & Literacy Development (Assessment 6)

## Master of Arts in Teaching Data Reports


**Author:** CCSU Manager
**Last modified:** 9/21/2017 10:36 AM (EDT)

# Modifications to the MAT Program

ITEM
Modification of an accredited program leading to a Master of Arts in Teaching degree at Central Connecticut State University

BACKGROUND
Summary
This MAT program modification provides greater efficacy and efficiency in teacher preparation by ensuring CCSU's MAT graduates are ready to meet the needs of diverse learners in Connecticut's classrooms. This program revision adds the additional certification shortage area of Special Education (K-12) to an already robust program, and accounts for a shift in the program design so that secondary education MAT candidates work alongside special education MAT candidates to collaborate in support of struggling learners in the general curriculum. This modification also adds the certification area of history/social studies (7-12), specifically in conjunction with the Holmes' Masters Program (https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid=2142&ref=rl) to support the recruitment and retention of MAT candidates from historically underrepresented groups. With the addition of history/social studies, all aspects of core secondary instruction will be reflected across the MAT tracks (English, Mathematics, Sciences, History/Social Studies, Spanish). Furthermore, the program redesign includes MAT competencies in disciplinary literacy and academic language, ensuring that all candidates feel prepared to meet secondary students' literacy and language demands specific to their discipline.

Need for the Program
The MAT program focuses on certifying teachers in areas in which the state has faced a shortage of qualified teachers. Specific areas of teacher shortages for this academic year (2015-2016) include many of the existing and proposed MAT specializations: Comprehensive Special Education K-12, Mathematics 7-12, Science 7-12, and Spanish 7-12 (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/digest/c-3_teacher_shortage_area_notification_2015-16.pdf). Furthermore, the revised MAT program seeks to recruit and retain teacher candidates from historically underrepresented groups through the Holmes' Masters Program and minority teacher recruitment projects in partnership with Hartford Public Schools and Capitol Region Education Council. Teacher shortages in Connecticut are persistent, and are expected to increase with the growing number of teacher retirements in the next decade. National estimates conservatively forecast a need for 1.5 million new teachers to fill the spots of retiring teachers (American Institutes for Research, 2015). Candidates who complete the revised MAT program will be "learner ready-day one" (EPAC, 2014), and will be in high demand in Connecticut school systems.

Curriculum
The revised MAT program includes an efficient redesign with only two additional credits of study and no additional cost to students (extra credits are taken during the spring semester in which students pay a flat rate for tuition). Candidates complete a structured sequence of courses, field experiences, and teacher research project in their field placement. Secondary education candidates complete a core program of 25 credits and specializations of 18 credits in English, Mathematics, Sciences, Spanish, or History/Social Studies (new). Their capstone sequence includes 6 credits of designing, conducting, and reporting a teacher research project in their host school for a total of 49 credits toward the Master of Arts in Teaching degree and recommendation for initial licensure for a Connecticut teaching certificate in their specialization area (grades 7-12). Special education candidates complete a core program of 19 credits with a 24-credit specialization in Special Education

(new). Their capstone sequence includes 6 credits of designing, conducting, and reporting a teacher research project in their host school for a total of 49 credits toward the Master of Arts in Teaching degree and recommendation for initial licensure for a Connecticut teaching certificate in Special Education (K-12).

*Revised learning outcomes:*

**Graduate students in the program will:**

1. Possess strong knowledge of content, content pedagogy, and learner development (typical and atypical).
2. Create an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment.
3. Use data, content knowledge, and evidence-based pedagogical content knowledge to critically examine practice for the purpose of improving student learning.
4. Design and deliver instructional and assessment strategies that facilitate significant learning for all students including struggling learners and those with disabilities.
5. Design, deliver, and assess literacy/language strategies to deepen literacy and content learning within the discipline.
6. Act collaboratively, ethically, and responsibly to ensure student growth and advance the profession.

*Measured by the following program assessments:*

Assessment 1: Measures Content Knowledge—State Licensure Examinations: Praxis Core and Praxis Subject Test or ACTFL OPI and WPT (Praxis Core prior to admission for all candidates, Praxis Subject for secondary candidates prior to admission and upon program completion for Special Education candidates. Foundations of Reading Test for Special Education candidates prior to program completion.) LO #1

Assessment 2: Measures Content Knowledge—Transcript Analysis: prior to admission; specific content requirements for each area as defined by CSDE and CAEP SPAs. LO #1

Assessment 3: Measures Planning—Unit Plan: at the completion of the methods sequence, end of fall semester. LO #1, 2, 4

Assessment 4: Measures Learning Outcomes in the Field—Student Teacher/Intern Evaluation: formatively assessed during summer and fall field experiences; summative assessment at the conclusion of the student teaching/internship semester. LO #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Assessment 5: Measures Effect on Student Learning—edTPA with local evaluation: assessed at the completion of the student teaching semester. LO #1, 2, 3, 4, 5

Assessment 6: Measures Planning and Instruction to Support Language and Literacy (Program Choice)—Video Analysis: assessed at the completion of the fall semester field experience. LO #3, 4, 5, 6

Students

The revised MAT program will seek to selectively admit approximately 25-30 full-time students each year. Admitted students proceed as a cohort group to complete program requirements. A part-time model for the revised MAT is in development.

Faculty

The revised MAT program will be taught by both full-time as well as adjunct faculty. New certification area courses (Special Education K-12 and History/Social Studies) will utilize existing resources; for example the additional courses will be taught by full-time faculty in the Special Education and Interventions Department and the History Department.

Learning Resources

The revised MAT program will take full advantage of the learning resources available on campus, including, but not limited to: Elihu Burritt Library digital resources and curriculum laboratory (third floor of library). MAT faculty will make use of all supports available through the Instructional Design and Technology Resource Center. Students will benefit from the support of the IT Help Desk. Students and faculty will utilize Blackboard Learn features to supplement face-to-face instruction.

Facilities

Students in the revised program will benefit from the full range of campus facilities. Courses will be held onsite primarily in Henry Barnard Hall and Social Sciences Hall. Course instruction will be supplemented with Blackboard Learn. The program will also benefit from the Elihu Burritt Library facilities as well as library online resources. Students will complete internships in local school districts, with full access to each district's resources for professional development.

Fiscal Note

As described in the table below, the program will generate substantial revenue.

| **PROJECTED Enrollment** | First Term Year 1 | | First Term Year 2 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Full Time | Part Time | Full Time | Part Time |
| Internal Transfers *(from other programs)* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New Students *(first time matriculating)* | 21 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| Continuing *(students progressing to credential)* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Headcount Enrollment | 21 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| **Total Estimated FTE per Year** | 21 | | 28 | |

| **PROJECTED Program Revenue** | Year 1 | | Year 2 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entire program - Revenue | Full Time | Part Time | Full Time | Part Time |
| Tuition *(Do not include internal transfers)* | $194,922 | $0 | $259,896 | $0 |
| Program-Specific Fees | $134,379 | $0 | $179,172 | $0 |
| Other Rev. *(Annotate in text box below)* | | | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Total Annual Program Revenue** | $329,301 | $439,068 |

| **PROJECTED Expenditures*** | Year 1 | | Year 2 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entire program - Expenditures | Number *(as applicable)* | Expenditure | Number | Expenditure |
| Administration *(Chair or Coordinator)* | 0.1 | $11,211 | 0.1 | $11,211 |
| Faculty *(Full-time, total for program)* | 0.71 | $83,087 | 0.71 | $83,087 |
| Faculty *(Part-time -total for program)* | 10.67 | $62,200 | 10.67 | $62,200 |
| Support Staff | | | | |
| Library Resources Program | | | | |
| Equipment *(List as needed)* | | | | |
| Other (e.g. student services) | | $5,000 | | $3,000 |
| Estimated Indirect Cost *(e.g. student services, operations, maintenance)* | | | | |
| **Total ESTIMATED Expenditures** | | $161,498 | | $159,498 |

Review of Documents:

a) Connecticut State Board of Education- Approved 4/6/16
b) Campus Review- Approved by Faculty Senate 2/22/16
c) Campus Budget and Finance- Approved by Provost; spring 2016 academic semester
d) Academic Council- Approved 5/11/16

Accreditation:

The Master of Arts in teaching program is currently accredited under NCATE/CAEP until August 1, 2017. The revisions to the program are authorized by the Connecticut State Department of Education and deemed appropriate until the next accreditation cycle. The program will adhere to best practices with regard to meeting national accreditation requirements for the MAT, when set by CAEP. Additionally, the program will continue to meet Connecticut State Department of Education program approval requirements.

# Student Teaching/Internship Evaluation and Rubric, MAT 540

CENTRAL CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

1615 Stanley Street
Office of School-Community Partnerships
School of Education and Professional Studies

New Britain, CT 06050
Barnard Hall, Room 334
Phone: (860) 832-2067 or 832-2417

# FINAL EVALUATION—MAT 540: INTERNSHIP

| |
|---|
| Certification Program: |
| Teacher Candidate |
| Teacher Candidate Status: ☐ MAT Candidate |
| Major: MAT |
| School/Town: |
| Grade Level: |
| Cooperating Teacher: |
| University Supervisor: |
| Evaluation completed by: |

**Purpose**
The final evaluation provides an overall appraisal of the teacher candidate (TC)'s performance. The evaluation should reflect the TC's present level of development by providing a clear picture of the teacher candidate's progress in relation to the ultimate performance indicators for a beginning teacher.

Please rate progress based on end-of-semester performance expectations. Appropriate goals should be set based on the teacher candidate's evaluation to help ensure continued growth. It is important that the teacher candidate be part of this process. We encourage the TC to self-assess his/her own progress**.**

At the end of the evaluation process, it is important that the TC, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor sign the document. Only the complete document, signed by all parties, should be sent to the Office of School-Community Partnerships. The final evaluation should be completed collaboratively by the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher. As always, we recommend that final grades are shared with the teacher candidate. The final grade earned is awarded by the university supervisor.

**"Non-negotiable" Items**
Items 4, 5, 9, 14, 15, 16, 25, 28, 31 and 32 are "non-negotiable" for earning the letter grade "A". Less than target performance in these areas will mean that the teacher candidate is unable to earn a letter grade A for the student teaching experience.

**Standards**
The numbers on this instrument refer to the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching standards (for a full description, please visit http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2618&q=320862 or the link on the OSCP website http://www.ccsu.edu/page.cfm?p=1349 . The *italicized* numbers in parentheses refer to the School of Education and Professional Studies Conceptual Framework (see the Teacher Candidate Handbook). Alignment to INTASC Standards and the MAT Program Outcomes are documented in the MAT 540 syllabus. Additionally there are specific standards cited for the supplemental items for various disciplines.

## I. Classroom Environment

*How effectively does the teacher candidate promote student engagement, independence, and interdependence in learning by facilitating a positive learning community?*

| **1. Management of Classroom Learning Environments 2.4, 2.5, *(II C)*** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Target | TC consistently managed effective learning groups independently, with all students productively engaged in learning. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | TC managed learning groups with little to no support with most students productively engaged in learning. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With support, TC exhibited an emerging ability to manage learning groups with many students productively engaged in learning. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited an inability to manage learning groups with few students productively engaged in learning. | | | |
| **2. Management of Routines 2.5, *(II C)*** | | | | |
| 4. Target | TC consistently managed routines and transitions to learning tasks and individual student needs; students understood instructional arrangements to maximize time; materials were organized and available and students knew how to access them and used them appropriately with minimal direction. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With little or no support, TC managed routines and transitions to learning tasks and student needs. Little instructional time was lost; instructional arrangements were well planned; materials were available but established routines for their use were not always consistent. | | | |
| 2.Developing | TC exhibited emerging ability to manage routines and transitions to learning tasks and student needs although some instructional time was lost; instructional arrangements were planned but often required modification; materials were available but established routines for their use were not always consistent. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited an inability to manage routines and transitions to learning tasks resulting in loss of instructional time; instructional arrangements were not planned and/or required much support to align with learning tasks; materials were not readily available. | | | |
| **3. Fostering a Learning Community 2.1, *(II B & C)*** | | | | |
| 4. Target | TC independently established a climate of fairness and respect by communicating and modeling these behaviors to students. TC consistently modeled sensitivity to individual differences through interactions which supported a wide variety of learning and performance styles and encouraged students to respect differences. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With little or no support, TC established a climate of fairness and respect by communicating and modeling these behaviors to students. TC modeled sensitivity to individual differences through interactions which supported many types of learning and performance styles and encouraged students to respect differences. | | | |
| 2.Developing | TC exhibited an emerging ability to establish a climate of fairness and respect by beginning to communicate and model these behaviors to students. TC exhibited some sensitivity to individual differences through interactions which supported a some learning and performance styles and encourage students to respect differences. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited an inability to establish a climate of fairness and respect.TC did not model and/or reinforce sensitivity to individual differences. Response to and interactions with students were minimal, negative, and/or inappropriate. | | | |

| **4 Expectations of Standards of Behavior NON NEGOTIABLE 2.3, 2.4, *(II B)*** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Target | TC independently maintained and established standards of behavior that were consistently clear and appropriate. TC effectively addressed individual student needs and consistently reinforced standards of behavior. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With little or no support, TC maintained and reinforced standards of behavior that were generally clear and appropriate. TC demonstrated an awareness of addressing individual student needs. | | | |
| 2.Developing | TC exhibited an emerging ability to maintain and reinforce standards of behavior that were generally clear and appropriate. TC demonstrated some awareness of addressing individual student needs. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited an inability to maintain and/ or reinforce standards of behavior. Standards were unclear, incomplete and/or inappropriate. TC demonstrated limited awareness of individual student needs. | | | |
| **5. Monitoring of and Response to Student Behavior NON NEGOTIABLE 2.3, 2.4, *(II A)*** | | | | |
| 4. Target | TC independently and consistently took a proactive approach in monitoring and reinforcing responsible behavior (verbal and non-verbal) among students, while effectively addressing individual needs. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With little or no support, TC exhibited an ability to take a proactive approach in monitoring and reinforcing responsible student behavior (verbal and non-verbal) among students, and in addressing individual needs. | | | |
| 2.Developing | TC exhibited an emerging understanding of a proactive approach in monitoring and reinforcing responsible student behavior (verbal and non-verbal) among students, and in addressing individual needs. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited inability to utilize a proactive approach in monitoring and/or reinforce responsible student behavior (verbal and non-verbal) among students and/or addressing individual needs. | | | |
| **6. Promoting Engagement and Shared Responsibility for Learning 2.2, (*III B)*** | | | | |
| 4. Target | TC consistently provided students strategies and opportunities to set and monitor their own learning or behavior goals; TC used a variety of strategies and supports to consistently engage or re-engage students in learning experiences. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With little or no support, TC provided students with opportunities to be responsible for non-instructional tasks and some opportunities for instructional tasks; frequent attempts were made to re-engage students who were off-task. | | | |
| 2.Developing | TC exhibited an emerging ability to to provide opportunities for students to develop independence; some students were consistently engaged in the learning experiences and there were re-engagement attempts. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited an inability to manage most tasks and students had few opportunities to develop independence; many students were consistently not engaged in the learning experiences and there were few re-engagement attempts. | | | |

## II. Lesson Planning

*How well does the TC plan instruction in order to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large?*

| **7. Lesson Objective** | **3.2, *(I C)*** | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Target | TC independently was able to write effective objectives using students' prior knowledge with clear and observable outcomes. Objectives were focused on students' application of skills as well as conceptual understanding to ensure that instruction was consistently at high levels. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With some support, TC was able to write effective objectives using students' prior knowledge, with clear and observable outcomes. Objectives were focused on students' application of skills as well as building toward conceptual understanding to ensure that instruction was at an appropriate level. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With support, TC was able to write objectives using students' prior knowledge to create student learning outcomes. Objectives were focused mainly on students' application of skills and the TC was working towards building conceptual understanding to ensure that instruction was at learners' level. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited an inability to write effective objectives using students' prior knowledge and/or had no clear outcomes. Objectives provided limited focus on students' application of skills and/or on building conceptual understanding. | | | |
| **8. Sequence of the Lesson 3.1, 3.2, *(I C)*** | | | | |
| 4. Target | TC independently planned instruction that built on previous learning, appropriately sequenced the learning objectives and promoted the application of skills with conceptual understanding. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With some support, TC was able to plan instruction that built on previous learning, appropriately sequenced the learning objectives and promoted the application of skills with conceptual understanding. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With consistent support, TC was developing ability to plan instruction that built on previous learning, appropriately sequenced the learning objectives and promoted the application of skills with conceptual understanding. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | Even with support, TC exhibited an inability to plan instruction that built on previous learning and/or appropriate sequencing of learning objectives and promoted the application of skills with conceptual understanding | | | |

| **9. Lesson Planning NON NEGOTIABLE 3.2, 3.6, 3.7, *(I A & C)*** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Target | TC independently and consistently developed lesson plans that effectively facilitated rigorous student learning outcomes and that consistently made real world connections. Lesson planning provided appropriate accommodations for diverse learners. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With some support, TC was developing lesson plans that effectively facilitated rigorous student learning outcomes, and that consistently made real world connections. Lesson planning provided adequate accommodations for diverse learners. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With support, TC exhibited emerging ability to develop lesson plans that worked towards student learning outcomes and that made some real world connections. Lesson planning did not provide adequate and/or appropriate accommodations for diverse learners. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | Even with support, TC exhibited inability or unwillingness to develop appropriate lesson plans that effectively facilitated rigorous student learning outcomes and that made real world connections. Lesson planning did not provide adequate and/or appropriate accommodations for diverse learners. | | | |
| **10. Selecting Appropriate Resources and Assessment Strategies when Planning the Lesson 3.4, 3.5, *(II D)*** | | | | |
| 4. Target | TC effectively used a wide variety of appropriate instructional resources (primary source documents, curriculum materials, manipulatives, technology, etc.) in the lesson planning that consistently supported the instructional objective and facilitated on-going student progress. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With some support, TC used appropriate instructional resources (primary source documents, curriculum materials, manipulatives, technology, etc.) in the lesson planning that generally supported the instructional objective and facilitated on-going student progress. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With support, TC used some instructional resources (primary source documents, curriculum materials, manipulatives, technology, etc.) in the lesson planning that worked to support the instructional objective and facilitate on-going student progress. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited inability to use instructional resources and/or materials used in the lesson planning, which did not support the instructional objective or facilitate on-going student progress. | | | |
| **11. Meeting the Needs of All Learners by Differentiating Instruction 3.7, *(II D)*** | | | | |
| 4. Target | TC exhibited ability to independently consult with special education, unified arts, etc. faculty to select resources and differentiate instruction to help all students construct meaning and demonstrate knowledge. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With little support, TC exhibited ability to consult with special education, unified arts, etc. faculty to select resources and differentiate instruction to help most students construct meaning and demonstrate knowledge. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With support, TC exhibited emerging ability to consult with special education, unified arts, etc. faculty to select resources and differentiate instruction to help some students construct meaning and demonstrate knowledge. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC failed to consult with special education, unified arts, etc. faculty to select resources and differentiate instruction to help all students construct meaning and demonstrate knowledge. | | | |

## III. Instruction

*How well does the TC implement instruction in order to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large?*

| **12 . Material Usage During Instruction 4.2, 4.3, *(II D)*** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Target | TC independently was able to use a wide variety of instructional materials (including but not limited to technology, digital resources, manipulatives, curriculum related materials, etc.) that supported students' ability to construct meaning and demonstrate skills. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With limited support, TC was able to use a variety of instructional materials (including but not limited to technology, digital resources, manipulatives, curriculum related materials, etc.) that supported students' ability to construct meaning and demonstrate skills. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With support, TC was able to use some instructional materials (including but not limited to technology, digital resources, manipulatives, curriculum related materials, etc.) that supported students' ability to construct meaning and demonstrate skills. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC did not utilize a variety of instructional materials (including but not limited to technology, digital resources, manipulatives, curriculum related materials, etc.) that supported students' ability to construct meaning and demonstrate skills. | | | |
| **13. Methods 4.1, 4.3, *(II A & D),* (3.3, 1.0)** | | | | |
| 4. Target | TC independently employed a variety (more than three) of instructional strategies to promote purposeful discourse to enable all students to construct meaning, develop skills, and make connections. These methods included direct instruction, inquiry-based models, cooperative learning, discussion model, etc. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With little support, TC employed at least three varieties of instructional strategies that promoted purposeful discourse to enable most students to construct meaning, develop skills, and make connections. These methods included direct instruction, inquiry-based models, cooperative learning, discussion model, etc. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With support, TC was able to employ two varieties of instructional strategies to encourage purposeful discourse to enable most students to construct meaning, develop skills, and make connections. These methods included direct instruction, inquiry-based models, cooperative learning, discussion model, etc. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC was able to use only one model for all lessons. | | | |

| **14. Communication During Initiation NON NEGOTIABLE 4.1, 4.3, 4.7, *(I B)*** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Target | TC consistently and independently employed effective initiation (set expectations for achievement, made real-world connections, stated and modeled the learning outcome and built on prior knowledge) in order to support students' shared responsibility for the learning process. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With little support, TC exhibited the ability to employ initiation (set expectations for achievement, made real-world connections, stated and modeled the learning outcome and built on prior knowledge) in order to support students' shared responsibility for the learning process. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With support, TC was beginning to exhibit the ability to employ initiation (set expectations for achievement, made real-world connections, stated and modeled the learning outcome and built on prior knowledge) in order to support students' shared responsibility for the learning process. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | Even with support, TC exhibited an inability to employ effective initiation (set expectations for achievement, made real-world connections, stated and modeled the learning outcome and built on prior knowledge) in order to support students' shared responsibility for the learning process. | | | |
| **15. Communication During Closure NON NEGOTIABLE 4.7, (*I B)*** | | | | |
| 4. Target | TC consistently and independently employed effective closure techniques that enabled students to demonstrate their ability to apply new learning and make connections to real-life experiences. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With little support, TC demonstrated an ability to employ closure techniques that enabled students to demonstrate their ability to apply new learning and make connections to real-life experiences. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With support, TC at times demonstrated an ability to employ closure techniques that enabled students to demonstrate their ability to apply new learning and make connections to real-life experiences. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | Even with support, TC exhibited an inability to employ effective closure techniques that enabled students to demonstrate their ability to apply new learning and make connections to real-life experiences. | | | |
| **16. Knowledge of Content Areas NON NEGOTIABLE 1.1, 1.2, *(I A)*** | | | | |
| 4. Target | TC demonstrated a deep understanding of all relevant content taught at this grade level and consistently sought additional resources to better understand the content to be taught. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | TC demonstrated understanding of most of the content taught at this grade level and frequently sought additional resources to better understand the content to be taught. | | | |
| 2.Developing | TC demonstrated basic understanding, although at times limited or incorrect, of some of the content taught at this grade level and at times sought additional resources to better understand the content to be taught. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC possessed insufficient or incorrect knowledge about some or all of the content taught at this grade level and/or did not seek additional resources to better understand the content to be taught. | | | |

| **17. Promotes Independent Thinking through Questioning 3.8, 4.3, 4.4, 4.7, *(II A & D)*** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Target | TC consistently and independently demonstrated ability to engage students to construct meaning through a variety of higher-level questioning techniques (Bloom's taxonomy). TC demonstrated ability to support students by prompting, rephrasing, or probing for clarification. Active discourse was evident throughout the lesson. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | TC demonstrated ability to engage students to construct meaning through a variety of questioning techniques (Bloom's taxonomy). TC demonstrated ability to assist students by prompting, rephrasing, or probing for clarification. Discourse was evident. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With support, TC demonstrated developing ability to engage students to construct meaning through use of a limited variety of questioning techniques (Bloom's taxonomy). TC demonstrated emerging ability to assist students by prompting, rephrasing, or probing for clarification. Some discourse was evident. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited inability to engage students to construct meaning through use of a variety of questioning techniques (Bloom's taxonomy) and was unable to assist students by prompting, rephrasing, or probing for clarification. Little discourse was evident. | | | |
| **18. Monitors Student Learning 4.6, (*II D)*** | | | | |
| 4. Target | TC consistently monitored student learning and appropriately adjusted instruction in response to student performance, engagement, or questions. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With little support, TC monitored student learning and usually adjusted instruction in response to student performance, engagement, or questions. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With support, TC was able to begin to monitor student learning and was beginning to develop strategies to adjust instruction in response to student performance, engagement, or questions.. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC did not monitor student learning or appropriately adjust instruction in response to student performance, engagement, or questions. | | | |

## IV. Assessment for Learning

*How does the TC use multiple measures to analyze student performance and to inform subsequent planning and instruction?*

| **19. Student Learning, Instruction, and Data Collection 5.2, 5.3, (II D)** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Target | TC independently, consistently and effectively analyzed student work on a regular basis, developed and used varied assessment techniques and maintained accurate records that led to appropriate instructional inferences about student learning and subsequent instruction. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With some support, TC demonstrated the ability to analyze student work on a regular basis, develop and use varied assessment techniques and maintain accurate records that led to appropriate instructional inferences about student learning and subsequent instruction. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With structured support, TC demonstrated limited ability to analyze student work on a regular basis, develop and use varied assessment techniques and maintain accurate records that led to appropriate instructional inferences about student learning and subsequent instruction. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | Even with support, TC exhibited a limited ability to analyze student work on a regular basis. TC failed to develop and/or use varied assessment techniques and/or maintain accurate records that led to appropriate instructional inferences about student learning and subsequent instruction. | | | |
| **20. Monitoring Students' Understanding 4.6, *(II D)*** | | | | |
| 4. Target | TC consistently monitored students' strengths and weaknesses related to the learning objective. TC made on-going adjustments while teaching that addressed students' content misunderstanding through the use of instructional strategies. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With some support, TC demonstrated an ability to focus on students' strengths and weaknesses related to the learning objective. TC made some adjustments while teaching that addressed students' content misunderstanding through the use of instructional strategies. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With structured support, TC demonstrated an emerging ability to focus on students' strengths and weaknesses related to the learning objective. TC exhibited some ability to make adjustments while teaching that addressed students' content misunderstanding through the use of instructional strategies. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited inability to focus on students' strengths and weaknesses related to the learning objective. TC did not make adjustments while teaching that addressed students' content misunderstanding through the use of instructional strategies. | | | |

| **21. Providing Feedback that Focuses on Content and Assists Students in Improving their Performance 5.5, 5.6, *(II D)*** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Target | TC consistently and independently provided general and specific feedback to about their content knowledge or skills as well as detailed information about their learning strengths and weaknesses. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | TC demonstrated some ability to provide feedback to students which included mostly general and specific comments about the content knowledge or skills and provided some information about their learning strengths and weaknesses. | | | |
| 2.Developing | TC demonstrated minimal ability to provide feedback to students. Feedback when given was general and not specific and did not provide adequate information about their learning strengths and weaknesses. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited inability to provide feedback to students which included appropriate and/or accurate comments about the content knowledge and/or skills and/or provided appropriate information about their learning strengths and/or weaknesses. | | | |

## V. Communication

*How effectively does the teacher candidate communicate?*

| **22. Oral and Written Language 1.3, *(I B)*** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Target | TC consistently and clearly modeled correct oral and written language and usage appropriate to students' ages and backgrounds with no errors. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | TC modeled correct oral and written language appropriate to students' ages and backgrounds with occasional errors. | | | |
| 2.Developing | TC modeled correct oral and written language appropriate to students' ages and backgrounds with some errors | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited an inability to model effective and/or appropriate oral or written language, which may have included: inaudible or unclear spoken language, inappropriate or incorrect vocabulary usage, sarcasm, or poor written language skills. | | | |

## VI. Professionalism

*How well does the TC maximize support for student learning by developing and demonstrating professionalism, collaboration with others, and leadership?*

| **23. Professional Attitude Toward Teaching and Dependability 6.11, *(III A & B)*** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Target | TC consistently demonstrated a dedicated and professional attitude, met professional responsibilities (promptness, completing work in a timely manner) and made reasonable professional decisions with no reminders. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | TC exhibited a professional attitude, met professional responsibilities (promptness, completing work in a timely manner) and made reasonable professional decisions with occasional reminders. | | | |
| 2.Developing | TC exhibited an awareness of his/her professional attitude and responsibilities, but was at times unable to meet professional responsibilities (including arriving late, leaving early and completing work in a timely manner) and/or did not make reasonable professional decisions. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited an inability to demonstrate a dedicated and professional attitude, was unable to meet professional responsibilities (including arriving late, leaving early and completing work in a timely manner) and/or did not make reasonable professional decisions. | | | |
| **24. Professional Attire 6.4, *(III A)*** | | | | |
| 3. Target | TC adequately followed established dress codes and conventions as directed by the university and/or the school. | | | |
| 1. Unsatisfactory | TC did not follow established dress codes and conventions even with reminders and explicit instructions by the university and/or the school. | | | |
| **25 Maintaining Confidentiality NON NEGOTIABLE 6.7, 6.11, *(III A)*** | | | | |
| 3. Target | TC consistently respected confidentiality of students, including sharing names or information on students only with those who need to know. | | | |
| 1. Unsatisfactory | TC did not respect confidentiality of students. | | | |
| **26. Professional Collaboration/Communication with Others 6.3, 6.4, *(III D)*** | | | | |
| 4. Target | TC independently demonstrated the ability to effectively collaborate and communicate with colleagues, professionals, and parents in ways that benefited the students in his/her class(es). | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With little support, the TC demonstrated the ability to collaborate and communicate with colleagues, professionals, and parents in ways that benefited students in his/her class(es). | | | |
| 2.Developing | With support and reminders, the TC demonstrated beginning ability to work with and communicate with colleagues, professionals, and parents in ways that benefited students in his/her class(es). | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited an inability to effectively collaborate and/or communicate with colleagues, professionals, and parents in ways that benefited students in his/her class(es). | | | |

| **27. Professional Collaboration in Data Team Setting 6.3, 6.4 ,*(III D)*** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Target | TC independently demonstrated the ability to effectively collaborate and communicate with colleagues to review and interpret assessment data to monitor and adjust instruction to ensure students' progress. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With little support, TC demonstrated the ability to collaborate and communicate with colleagues to review and interpret assessment data to monitor and adjust instruction to ensure students' progress. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With support and reminders, TC demonstrated beginning ability to collaborate and communicate with colleagues to review and begin to interpret assessment data to monitor and adjust instruction to ensure students' progress. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited an inability to effectively collaborate and communicate with colleagues to review and interpret assessment data to monitor and adjust instruction to ensure students' progress. | | | |
| **28. Use of Communication Technology NON NEGOTIABLE 6.9** | | | | |
| 3. Target | TC used communication technology in a professional and ethical manner (computer, PDAs, cell phones, etc.) with no reminders. | | | |
| 1. Unsatisfactory | TC did not use communication technology in a professional and ethical manner (computer, PDAs, cell phones, etc.) even with reminders. | | | |

## VII. Student Diversity

*How does the TC recognize and value the diversity of all students?*

| **29. Developing a Positive Self-concept 2.1, 2.3, 5.7, 6.6, *(II B & III B)*** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Target | TC consistently and independently worked to help **all** students develop a productive and positive work ethic and demonstrated a clear belief that all students have the right and ability to learn regardless of racial, cultural, sexual, linguistic or religious diversity or disability (e.g., TC integrates multicultural and diverse content addressing the various backgrounds of all students; TC engaged in prejudice and bias reduction activities when appropriate; TC chooses various instructional strategies to ensure that all students' learning styles are included). TC provides specific evidence of demonstrating his/her ability to address diverse students. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With little guidance, TC exhibited ability to work to help most students develop a positive work ethic. TC demonstrated a belief that students have the right and ability to learn regardless of racial, cultural, sexual, linguistic or religious diversity or disability. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With support, TC exhibited the emerging ability to work to help some students develop a positive work ethic. TC demonstrated an emerging belief that students have the right and ability to learn regardless of racial, cultural, sexual, linguistic or religious diversity or disability. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited an inability to help students develop a positive work ethic. TC did not demonstrate a belief that all students have the right and/or ability to learn regardless of racial, cultural, sexual, linguistic or religious diversity or disability. | | | |

| **30. Understanding Individual Students 6.8, 6.2, *(II A, B & C)*** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Target | TC consistently and independently made accommodations for all students who have exceptional learning needs. TC provides specific evidence of developing and implementing accommodations or modifications for individual students (e.g., modifies specific assignments and activities for individuals and groups to meet their learning levels and to extend their performance levels in various subject areas). | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With little support, TC was able to make accommodations and/or modifications for most students who have exceptional learning needs, with support. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With support, TC demonstrated an emerging understanding of making accommodations and/or modifications for students who have exceptional learning needs. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC was unable to make accommodations and/or modifications for students who have exceptional learning needs. | | | |

## VIII. Self-Evaluation and Reflection

*In what ways does the TC engage in self-evaluation to improve instruction?*

| **31. Continuous Self-evaluation NON NEGOTIABLE 6.1, *(III B)*** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Target | TC independently made accurate appraisals of his/her effectiveness, reflected, and initiated positive changes based on these appraisals. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | With limited prompts related to self-reflection, , TC made accurate appraisals of his/her effectiveness, reflected, and initiated positive changes based on these appraisals. | | | |
| 2.Developing | With prompts related to self-reflection, TC demonstrated beginning ability to make accurate appraisals of his/her effectiveness, and/or to reflect and/or initiate positive changes based on these appraisals. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited inability to make accurate appraisals of his/her effectiveness, and/or to reflect and/or initiate positive changes based on these appraisals. | | | |
| **32. Integration of Feedback NON NEGOTIABLE 6.1, *(II B)*** | | | | |
| 4. Target | TC immediately integrated the feedback provided by the cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor in order to improve his/her practice. | | | |
| 3.Satisfactory | TC accepted the feedback provided by the cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor and generally integrated most feedback in order to improve his/her instructional practice. | | | |
| 2.Developing | TC demonstrated beginning ability to accept the feedback provided by the cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor and listened but did not always integrate that feedback to improve his/her instructional practice. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC exhibited inability or unwillingness to accept and/or integrate the feedback provided by the cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor to improve his/her instructional practice. | | | |
| **33. Professional Growth 6.2, *(III C & D)*** | | | | |
| 3. Target | TC participated in relevant and/or appropriate professional development opportunities offered to enhance skills related to teaching and meeting the needs of all students (department meetings, staff meetings, conferences, etc.) | | | |
| 1. Unsatisfactory | TC did not or inconsistently participated in relevant and/or appropriate professional development opportunities offered to enhance skills related to teaching and meeting the needs of all students (department meetings, staff meetings, conferences, etc.) | | | |

## IX. Supplemental Secondary English/Language Items

| **34. Language (NCTE 3.1)[1]** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Target | TC demonstrated a strong knowledge about, and skills in the use of, the English language. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC was developing a strong knowledge about, and skills in the use of, the English language. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC did not demonstrate knowledge about, and skills in the use of, the English language. | | | |
| **35. Literature (NCTE 2.2, 3.5)** | | | | |
| 3. Target | TC demonstrated a strong knowledge about, and skills in the use of, all relevant literature. TC used literature for the purpose of helping all students become familiar with their own and others' cultures. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC was developing a strong knowledge about, and skills in the use of, all relevant literature. TC used literature for the purpose of helping all students become familiar with their own and others' cultures. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC did not demonstrate knowledge about, and skills in the use of, all relevant literature. TC used literature for the purpose of helping all students become familiar with their own and others' cultures. | | | |
| **36. Oral, Visual and Written Literacy (NCTE 3.2)** | | | | |
| 3. Target | TC demonstrated a strong knowledge about, and skills in the use of, oral, visual and written literacy.<br>Examples of a target use of oral literacy in the classroom might include: uses inclusion activities prompting students to practice their oral literacy, models articulate oral expression effectively, creates constructive rubrics to evaluate students' oral presentations.<br>Examples of a target use of visual literacy might include: use of video or visual clips/art/images to advance lesson/unit objectives; creating and asking students to create original visual images/videos as part of lesson/unit.<br>Examples of target use of written literacy might include: modeling writing and asking students to write for a variety of audiences and in differing modes, using constructive rubrics to evaluate students' written work.<br>Examples of target use of the composing process might include: modeling and understanding individual components of the writing process, including drafting, revising, paragraph structure, topic sentences, mechanics, formats, etc. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC was developing a strong knowledge about, and skills in the use of, oral, visual and written literacy, including the use of different composing processes. Some of these skills may be at the target level, but others may be in need of development—perhaps the TC needs first to model before asking students to perform a task, or perhaps the task itself is not entirely integrated in the lesson/unit objective although it is well designed for the particular skill. But no more than one of these four skills can fall below the acceptable level if the student is judged to have performed acceptably. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC did not demonstrate a strong knowledge about, and skills in the use of, oral, visual and written literacy, including the use of different composing processes. Two or more of these skills were not sufficiently developed in the STs student teaching. | | | |

[1] National Council of Teachers of English; http://www.ncte.org/

| **37. Print and Non-print Media (NCTE 3.6) )** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Target | TC demonstrated a strong knowledge about, and skills in the use of, print and non-print media and technology and its effects on contemporary culture. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC was developing a strong knowledge about, and skills in the use of, print and non-print media and technology and its effects on contemporary culture. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC did not demonstrate knowledge about, and skills in the use of, print and non-print media and technology and its effects on contemporary culture. | | | |
| **38. Research Theory and Findings (NCTE 3.7)** | | | | |
| 3. Target | TC demonstrated a strong knowledge about, and skills in the use of, research theory and findings. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC was developing a strong knowledge about, and skills in the use of, research theory and findings | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC did not demonstrate knowledge about, and skills in the use of, research theory and findings | | | |
| **39. Critical Thinking, Judgment, Interpretation, and Meaningful Discussion (NCTE 2.4; 3.3.1; 3.2.4; 4.5; 4.6; 4.9)** | | | | |
| 3. Target | In the design of the lesson plan, the TC chooses among the following sorts of activities in the study of the course content:<br>• close reading<br>• literary analysis<br>• inter-textual connections<br>• evaluation of the literature studied with supporting argument<br>In the actual teaching situation, behaviors in the TC such as the following are observed:<br>• modeling proper close reading skills<br>• giving students opportunities to practice their own close reading skills, both orally (including whole-class and small group discussions) and in written and/or visual forms<br>• encouraging students to respond to each others' ideas both orally and in writing<br>• asking students to support their assertions with textual evidence<br>• offering constructive suggestions to advance students' critical thinking and judgment skills | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | Either the design of the lesson or the implementation of the lesson may demonstrate some weaknesses, but not both. Lesson plans may be lacking detail, with vague objectives or lack of alignment among objectives, activities, and assessment, but in the classroom the TC may demonstrate good understanding of these principles that are not spelled out adequately in the lesson. Conversely, the TC may have an excellent lesson plan but demonstrate weaknesses in the implementation. The TC may successfully model proper skills, but fail to provide adequate opportunities for students to practice their own skills, or may ask students to practice with an inadequate model. The TC may not consistently insist on textual support for ideas, or may not be skilled in offering constructive suggestion to students whose skills need improvement. TC may not consistently engage students in meaningful discussion. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC exhibits clear inadequacies in both lesson design and implementation. | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **40. Ability to engage students in activities that reveal the role of arts and humanities in learning. (NCTE 2.6)** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
| 3. Target | TC engages students in activities promoting the students' own experience with the art of literature. Such activities might be the use of song lyrics to discuss meter, or examining the relationship between a piece of visual art and an ekphrastic poem, or other such connections among various art forms to explore and master their own writing as well as their understanding of the literature they study. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC has planned a promising activity of this sort, but in the implementation demonstrates an as yet imperfect understanding of the connections among the various media discussed, or understands those connections but has not developed entirely effective means of supporting the students' efforts to attain this understanding, or the extra-literary material chosen could be more appropriate. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC does not propose any activities that explore the relationships among writing, literature and other art forms or plans activities that are clearly inappropriate for the material, occasion, or students. | | | |
| **41. Ability to engage students in learning experiences that consistently emphasize varied uses and purposes for language in communication. (NCTE 4.7)** | | | | |
| 3. Target | TC guides students through an investigation of language that varies in register, rhetorical mode, purpose, and audience. Lesson plans include well designed activities to delineate among these variations, and implementation shows the candidate's own understanding of these variations. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC clearly recognizes the need to address language variations in the treatment of the course material, but there are weaknesses in either the lesson plan/activity or the implementation of it. TC may have chosen an inappropriate focus given the particular material, or may not address all the variations in language that appear in the material for that lesson. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC does not recognize the need to address language variation in the treatment of the course material, or addresses it in a way that demonstrates a clear misunderstanding of such variations. | | | |
| **42. Ability to engage students in making meaning of texts through personal responses. (NCTE 4.8)** | | | | |
| 3. Target | TC models, and offers students opportunities to make, text-to-self connections (modeled on such critics as Iser and Rosenblatt) through class discussion and through a variety of written and/or visual forms. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC does model text-to-self connections that are indeed based on rigorous literary method, but may not fully control the discussion to prevent its departure from the actual textual material at hand. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC's text-to-self connections are either merely superficial or absent entirely. | | | |

| **43. Ability to select materials and resources appropriate to ELA curricular requirements as well as to the needs of all students (NCTE 4.1)** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Target | TC always carefully selects materials and resources such as literary works, textbooks, films, artwork, etc., that are appropriate to curricular, unit and lesson objectives and which are highly effective in helping *all* students meet those objectives. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC selects materials and resources such as literary works, textbooks, films, artwork, etc., that are reasonably appropriate to curricular, unit and lesson objectives and which are fairly effective in helping *most* students meet those objectives. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC selects materials and resources such as literary works, textbooks, films, artwork, etc., which are not clearly appropriate or are in fact inappropriate to curricular, unit and lesson objectives and which are ineffective in helping *all* students meet those objectives. | | | |

## IX. Supplemental Special Education Items

| **34. Modifications and Accommodations (II 1 D)** | | **TC** | **CT** | **SUP** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Target | TC consistently planned and implemented modifications* and accommodations** for the diverse needs of students. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC was developing competence in planning and implementing modifications and accommodations for the diverse needs of students. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC did not recognize the need for, nor demonstrate competence in, planning and implementing modifications and accommodations for the diverse needs of students.<br><br>* Modifications: changes in what a student is expected to learn and to demonstrate. These changes may be in the instructional level, the content or the performance criteria.<br>**Accommodations: provisions made in how a student accesses and demonstrated learning. Examples are time, seating, etc. | | | |

| **35. Use communication strategies and resources to facilitate understanding of subject matter for all students (II 1 D)** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Target | TC consistently used appropriate communication strategies to facilitate understanding of material for the diverse needs of students. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC mostly used appropriate communication strategies to facilitate understanding of material for the diverse needs of students. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC did not recognize the need to facilitate understanding of material for the diverse needs of students. | | | |

| **36. Use appropriate adaptations and technology for all individuals with disabilities (II 1 D)** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Target | TC consistently used appropriate adaptations and technology for the diverse needs of students. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC mostly used appropriate adaptations and technology for the diverse needs of students. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC did not recognize the need for, nor demonstrate any appropriate adaptations and technology for the diverse needs of students. | | | |

## IX. Supplemental Secondary Math Items

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **34. Provides learning experiences that allow students to form connections between the specific subject area and other disciplines. NCTM 7.2, 7.3, 7.4** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
| 4. Target | Connections to prior and future learning in other subject areas are routinely made. Inter-disciplinary instruction is frequent. TC creates an environment rich with connections. Students are able and encouraged to find connections independently. | | | |
| 3. Satisfactory | Many lessons contain aspects that enable students to make connections with their prior or future learning in other subjects or disciplines. TC makes obvious connections within the discipline and some connections to appropriate applications. | | | |
| 2. Developing | TC is beginning to provide learning experiences that enable students to make connections with their prior or future learning in other subjects or disciplines. Connections may not always be obvious or appropriate. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | Connections are not made or made infrequently. TC teaches lessons/topics as individual skills and does not help students relate new information to previous topics studied, ideas that will be explored, or applications of the skills in other areas. | | | |
| **35. Develops learning objectives which are appropriate for the subject and grade level and are connected appropriately to the standards. NCTM 8.4** | | | | |
| 4. Target | Objectives are appropriate for the subject area/developmental level of learners and are explicitly connected to the standards. Objectives incorporate multiple domains of learning or content areas. Objectives are measurable and each contains criteria for student mastery. TC looks to the standards to guide planning, organizes lessons around concepts that connect individual standards, and uses the text as a resource to meet these standards. | | | |
| 3. Satisfactory | Objectives are appropriate for subject area/developmental level of learners and are connected appropriately to the standards. Objectives are measurable and most objectives identify criteria. TC in most cases uses the standards to guide planning and incorporates the text as a resource to meet these standards. | | | |
| 2. Developing | Objectives are appropriate for subject area but may lack alignment with the developmental level of learning. Most objectives are measurable. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | Objectives are inappropriate for the subject area/developmental level of learners. Objectives are not stated in measurable terms, do not include criteria, and/or are not appropriately connected to the standards. TC uses the text as the only guide for planning and developing objectives. | | | |
| **36. Participate in professional mathematics organizations and uses their print and on-line resources. NCTM 8.1, 8.5** | | | | |
| 4. Target | TC regularly incorporates strategies (a) explored in methods courses, (b) included in materials from state and local mathematics organizations, (c) modified from appropriate internet or print sources, (d) suggested by the text, cooperating teacher, or supervisor, and (e) self-created activities. | | | |
| 3. Satisfactory | TC incorporates strategies (a) explored in methods courses, (b) included in materials from state and local mathematics organizations, (c) modified from appropriate internet or print sources, (d) suggested by the text, cooperating teacher, or supervisor, and (e) self-created activities. | | | |
| 2. Developing | TC incorporates strategies (a) explored in methods courses, (b) included in materials from state and local mathematics organizations, and (c) suggested by the text, cooperating teacher, or supervisor. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC relies on the mentor teacher, text, and text supplements for designing all lessons. | | | |
| **37. Demonstrate knowledge of research results in the teaching and learning of mathematics. NCTM 8.6** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
| 4. Target | TC explicitly incorporates research results into the teaching and learning of mathematics. | | | |
| 3. Satisfactory | TC demonstrates intentional use of research results into the teaching and learning of mathematics. | | | |
| 2. Developing | TC is beginning to use research results in the teaching and learning of mathematics. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC does not (a) incorporate research results into the teaching and learning process. | | | |

| **38. Demonstrate the ability to lead classes in mathematical problem solving and in developing in-depth conceptual understanding, and help student develop and test generalizations. NCTM 8.8** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Su** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Target | TC incorporates problem solving and conjecturing on a regular basis during classroom instruction, and is able to effectively manage discussions concerning student generated ideas. | | | |
| 3. Satisfactory | TC uses problem solving and conjecturing in classroom instruction, and is able to adequately manage discussions concerning student generated ideas. | | | |
| 2. Developing | TC is beginning to use problem solving and conjecturing in classroom instruction, and is able sometimes demonstrates the ability to manage discussions concerning student generated ideas. | | | |
| 1.Unsatisfactory | TC does not (a) incorporate true problem solving into lessons, (b) effectively manage the use of problem solving to capitalize on student learning, and/or (c) provide opportunities that allow students to make and test conjectures as part of the regular learning process. | | | |

## IX. Supplemental Secondary Modern Language Items

| **34. Language (ACTFL/NCATE 1)** | | **TC** | **CT** | **SUP** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Target | TC demonstrates an Advanced Mid Level or higher or oral proficiency in the target language. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC demonstrates an Advanced Low Level of oral proficiency in the target language. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC demonstrates proficiency in the target language at the Intermediate Level or lower. | | | |
| **35. Cultures, Literatures, Cross-disciplinary Concepts (ACTFL/NCATE Standard 2)** | | | | |
| 3. Target | TC demonstrates knowledge of target culture products, practices and perspective, and consistently provided opportunities for students to interpret authentic oral and printed texts. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC demonstrates knowledge of target culture products, practices and perspective, and strove to provide opportunities for students to interpret authentic oral and printed texts, and is often successful. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC demonstrates limited knowledge of target culture products, practices and perspective, and rarely strove to provide opportunities for students to interpret authentic oral and printed texts, or attempts are rarely successful | | | |
| **36. Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practices (ACTFL/NCATE Standard 3)** | | | | |
| 3. Target | TC consistently engages students in negotiation of meaning with the teacher and with other students in the target language. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC strives to engage students in negotiation of meaning with the teacher and with other students in the target language, and is often successful. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC rarely strives to engage students in negotiation of meaning with the teacher and with other students in the target language, or attempts are rarely successful. | | | |
| **37. Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practices (ACTFL/NCATE Standard 3)** | | | | |
| 3. Target | TC consistently provides opportunities for students to practice the three modes of communication both orally and in writing, in pairs and small groups in the target language. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC strives to provide opportunities for students to practice the three modes of communication both orally and in writing, in pairs and small groups in the target language, and is often successful. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC rarely provides opportunities for students to practice the three modes of communication both orally and in writing, in pairs and small groups in the target language, or attempts are rarely successful. | | | |
| **38. Integration of Standards into Curriculum and Instruction (ACTFL/NACTE Standard 4)** | | | | |
| 3. Target | TC consistently integrates target culture into instruction by engaging students in exploring the relationships between and among cultural products, practices, and perspectives. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC strives to integrate target culture into instruction by engaging students in exploring the relationships between and among cultural products, practices, and perspectives, and is often successful. | | | |
| 1.Unacceptable | TC rarely strives to integrate target culture into instruction by engaging students in exploring the relationships between and among cultural products, practices, and perspectives, or attempts are rarely successful. | | | |
| **39. Integration of Standards into Curriculum and Instruction (ACTFL/NACTE Standard 4)** | | | | |
| 3. Target | TC consistently makes connections between other school subjects and target language/culture. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC strives to make connections between other school subjects and target language/culture, and is often successful. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC rarely strives to make connections between other school subjects and target language/culture., or attempts are rarely successful. | | | |

| **40. Integration of Standards into Curriculum and Instruction (ACTFL/NACTE Standard 4)** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Target | TC consistently provides opportunities for students to interact with target language communities through a variety of means, including technology and authentic materials. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC strives to provide opportunities for students to interact with target language communities through a variety of means, including technology and authentic materials, and is often successful. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | TC rarely strives to provide opportunities for students to interact with target language communities through a variety of means, including technology and authentic materials, or attempts are rarely successful. | | | |
| **41. Assessment of Language and Culture (ACTFL/NACTE Standard 5)** | | | | |
| 3. Target | TC consistently assesses students' performance in the target language through age-and level-appropriate instruments. | | | |
| 2.Acceptable | TC strives to assess students' performance in the target language by implementing purposeful measures, and is often successful. | | | |
| 1.Unacceptable | TC rarely strives to assess students' performance in the target language by implementing purposeful measures, or attempts are rarely successful. | | | |

| **42. Assessment of Language and Culture (ACTFL/NACTE Standard 5)** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Target | TC participates consistently and effectively as a professional in school and community settings and with the larger foreign language profession. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | TC strives to participate consistently and effectively as a professional in school and community settings and with the larger foreign language profession, and is often successful. | | | |
| 1.Unacceptable | TC rarely strives to participate consistently and effectively as a professional in school and community settings and with the larger foreign language profession, or attempts are rarely successful. | | | |

## IX. Supplemental Secondary Sciences Items

***Students must receive a 2 or 3 in each area to pass student teaching***

| **34. Legal / Ethical Responsibilities (NSTA Standard 9a:)[2]** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Target | TC designed, maintained, and implemented a plan to provide an accessible and safe environment for all students both in and outside of the classroom related to instruction, supervision, and maintenance which included a student safety contract completed and signed by students and parents.<br>• Behaved in a safe manner<br>• Modeled ethical and safe behavior<br>• Wore protective clothing and gear as needed<br>• Displayed and taught guidelines for and enforced safe behavior of students<br>• Materials and equipment were properly inspected and labeled for safety<br>• Avoided fire and biological hazards | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | Designed, maintained, and implemented a plan to provide an accessible and safe environment for all students both in and outside of the classroom which includes the above, but was lacking in no more than 2 specified areas which were recognized by the teacher candidate and corrected. A student safety contract was completed and signed by students and parents. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | Had a plan to provide an accessible and safe environment for all students both in and outside of the classroom which included the above, but was lacking more than 2 specified areas which may or may not have been recognized by the teacher candidate and corrected and / or no student safety contract. | | | |
| **35. Maintenance / Disposal of Materials (NSTA 9b)** | | | | |
| 3. Target | Had, practiced, and displayed written documents for the safe practice and proper techniques for the preparation, storage, dispensing, supervision, and disposal of all materials used in science instruction for all science areas which included but was not limited to: MSDS sheets for all common chemicals, student traffic, emergency exit info, eyewash, shower, fire extinguisher, fire blanket.<br>• Knew the rules and procedures for the clean up and disposal of chemical spills. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | Had, practiced, and displayed written documents for the safe practice and proper techniques for the preparation, storage, dispensing, supervision, and disposal of all materials used in science instruction for their science area and MSDS sheets for 20 of the most common chemicals.<br>• Knew the procedure for the clean up and disposal of chemical spills. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | Had, practiced, and displayed written documents for the safe practice and proper techniques for the preparation, storage, dispensing, supervision, and disposal of all materials used in science instruction for their science area, but is incomplete.<br>• Knew the procedure for the clean up and disposal of chemical spills. | | | |

[2] National Science Teachers Association; http://www.nsta.org/

| **36. Know / follow emergency procedures (NSTA 9c)** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Target | Knew, followed, and displayed emergency procedures.<br>• Maintained and demonstrated the use of safety equipment and procedures appropriate for the activities and abilities of the students.<br>• Had, in writing, the emergency precautions, responses, and reporting procedures of the school. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | Knew, followed and displayed emergency procedures.<br>• Maintained and demonstrated the use of safety equipment and procedures appropriate for the activities and abilities of the students.<br>• Had, in writing, the emergency precautions, responses, and reporting procedures of the school.<br>May have had a few minor incidents of not following procedures which did not have a negative consequence in the classroom and was recognized and corrected by the teacher candidate. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | Knew, followed, and displayed emergency procedures.<br>• Maintained and demonstrated the use of safety equipment and procedures appropriate for the activities and abilities of the students.<br>• Had, in writing, the emergency precautions, responses, and reporting procedures of the school.<br>Had several minor incidents of not following procedures which did not have a negative consequence in the classroom or had one major incident with negative consequences. | | | |
| **37. Care and use of animals (NSTA 9d)** | | | | |
| 3. Target | Had a plan and rules for proper treatment, followed that plan, and instructed students to treat all living organisms used in the classroom or found in the field in a safe, humane, and ethical manner.<br>• Respected legal restrictions on their collection, keeping and use.<br>• Was aware of the dangers of animals or hazards of plants.<br>• Provided alternatives to dissection if available.<br>Included national, state, and local laws and included protected and endangered species. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | Had a plan for treatment, followed that plan, and instructed students to treat all living organisms used in the classroom or found in the field in a safe, humane, and ethical manner.<br>• Respected legal restrictions on their collection, keeping and use.<br>• Was aware of the dangers of animals or hazards of plants.<br>• Provided alternatives to dissection if available.<br>Plan was lacking in one area or not followed in one case, but was recognized by the teacher candidate and corrected. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | Had a plan for treatment, followed that plan, and instructed students to treat all living organisms used in the classroom or found in the field in a safe, humane, and ethical manner.<br>• Respected legal restrictions on their collection, keeping and use.<br>• Was aware of the dangers of animals or hazards of plants.<br>• Provided alternatives to dissection if available.<br>Plan was lacking in several areas or not followed, and not recognized by the teacher candidate and corrected. | | | |

| **38. Teacher candidate self-evaluation of safety procedures and student evaluation of safety procedures (NSTA 9a-d))** | | **TC** | **CT** | **Sup** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Target | A safety checklist was developed and completed by the teacher candidate evaluating the classroom environment (inside and outside of the room). Discrepancies found were corrected.<br>Students were given a safety quiz developed by the teacher candidate following the safety guidelines mentioned above. A score of 85% or better was required by each student or additional instruction and retesting was required. | | | |
| 2. Acceptable | A safety checklist was developed and completed by the teacher candidate evaluating the classroom environment (inside and outside of the room). Discrepancies found were corrected.<br>Students were given a safety quiz developed by the teacher candidate following the safety guidelines mentioned above. A score of 75-84% was required by each student or additional instruction and retesting was required. | | | |
| 1. Unacceptable | A safety checklist was developed and completed by the teacher candidate evaluating the classroom environment (inside and outside of the room). Discrepancies found but were not corrected; and/or students scored below 75% on a safety quiz and no further instruction was provided. | | | |

**Final Evaluation – General Comments** (provide attachment if needed):
Please give your frank opinion of the ability, potential, and limitation of this student teacher in terms of teaching capabilities. This statement is important and most helpful to the superintendent considering the person for employment.

Arrive at a recommended grade for the student teaching experience after considering the competencies listed on the Final Evaluation portion of this form. Please keep in mind that the final grade for the experience is based on the professional judgment of both the Cooperating Teacher and the University Supervisor, but it is the sole responsibility of the University Supervisor.

Please note that the cumulative rating from the rating scale on the previous pages should coincide with the recommended grade.

Grades will be given in accordance with CCSU student teaching policy. A grade of C or better is required for program completion and recommendation for certification. **Please refer to the Student Teaching Handbook for the proposed grade profiles.**

A = Superior
B = Above Average
C = Acceptable

A system of plus (+) and minus (-) is in effect for undergraduate and graduate students. Please note the university does **not** award an A+.

Recommended Grade:_____

Report completed by:

Signature of Cooperating Teacher:_____Date:_____

Signature of University Supervisor:_____ Date:_____

I have seen this grade:_____Date:_____
(Signature of Student Teacher)

# Unit Plan Rubric, MAT 539

## MAT Unit Plan Rubric

**Directions**: Review the rubric carefully; pay particular attention to the language that differentiates performance levels. *NOTE: Must complete all indicators, any incomplete indicators will result in a failure for the entire unit.*

***PART 1: CONTEXT AND STANDARDS***

| *Indicator* | *3: Target* | *2: Acceptable* | *1: Developing* | *0: Needs Improvement* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Description of Unit***<br><br>***CCT 2.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.6***<br><br>***InTASC 7 a, d, i*** | Candidate fully describes students' relevant personal, cultural and community assets and how unit instruction and assessments are equitable for these learners. Candidate thoroughly describes classroom context incl. prerequisite knowledge for the class as a whole and information on individual differences in prior knowledge or IEP/504 needs. Central focus addresses "big ideas" in an engaging and relevant manner. Candidate provides a unit rationale connected to modern theory and principles of learning and the needs of the class. | Candidate describes some relevant personal, cultural, and/or community assets that students bring to the unit and how unit instruction and assessment is equitable for these learners. Candidate addresses students' prior knowledge generally (for the whole class). Candidate plans for a central focus that addresses big ideas with relevance or interest to students. Candidate provides a unit rationale that is relevant, but may lack clarity or specificity related to learning theory/principles and/or class needs. | Candidate describes the context of the unit and makes some general connections to students' personal, cultural, and/or community assets that. Student prior knowledge is mentioned, but the information provided is limited to the whole class and may be unclear or overly general related to how unit instruction and assessments are equitable for these particular learners. Candidate describes a central focus and mentions a big idea, but the big idea does not effectively focus the unit and/or the unit appears more focused on discrete facts than the big idea. Minimal connection to learning theory provided in the unit rationale. | The candidate describes the context of the unit, but does not provide connections to students' relevant personal, cultural and community assets. Unit instruction and assessment may be inequitable or biased. Central focus is unclear or ineffective in connecting the unit content to a big idea(s). Candidate includes a rationale that is inaccurate, irrelevant to the unit and/or these students, or is substantially incomplete (lack of connection to learning theory/principles of learning). |
| ***Unit Standards***<br><br>***CCT 3.9***<br><br>***InTASC 7 f, g, h*** | Candidate includes standards (content, process, and literacy), learning goals, expected performances, and desired understandings, knowledge and skills that are clearly identified and cohesively aligned; seamlessly integrates unifying themes and processes that advance the learning of concepts and processes. | Candidate includes appropriate standards (content, process, and literacy), learning goals, expected performances, and desired understandings, knowledge and skills that are identified and are generally aligned; unifying themes and processes are identified and developed throughout the unit in an adequate manner. | Candidate includes standards (content, process, and literacy), learning goals, expected performances, and desired understandings, knowledge and skills; however these may be incomplete, poorly aligned, OR the presentation may lack clarity to the alignment between unit outcomes and the unifying themes OR the literacy standard is not specified. | Candidate includes standards, learning goals, expected performances, and desired understandings, knowledge, and skills that are unaligned, inappropriate, or substantially incomplete; unifying themes and processes are missing, unaligned with outcomes, or overly general, or inappropriate. |

## *PART II: ASSESSMENT PLAN*

| *Indicator* | *3: Target* | *2: Acceptable* | *1: Developing* | *0: Needs Improvement* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Unit Assessment Plan***<br><br>***InTASC 6 a, b, j, k*** | Candidate provides a comprehensive assessment plan that includes authentic summative, formative, and literacy assessment tasks and explains how each aligns with the standards, how each will be evaluated, and how the data will be used to drive subsequent instruction. | Candidate provides an assessment plan that includes authentic, summative, formative and literacy assessment tasks. Candidate generally addresses alignment with standards and details on how assessment data will be used. | Candidate provides an assessment plan that includes summative and formative assessments. Authenticity, clarity, or alignment with outcomes may be unclear, incomplete, or partially inaccurate. The use of assessment data is not clearly addressed by the candidate. | Candidate provides an assessment plan that is substantially incomplete, inappropriate, or ineffective in providing relevant and timely formative and summative assessment data for unit outcomes. |
| ***Formative Assessments***<br><br>***CCT 3.1, 3.4***<br>***InTASC 6 d, e, f, g, m*** | Candidate plans formative assessments that assess students' understanding and knowledge of the content, provides opportunities for student self- assessment, and are effectively integrated into the unit instruction. | Candidate plans formative assessments to assess students' developing understanding and knowledge, but some may be partially disconnected from unit activities. | Candidate plans formative assessments, but they may lack clarity, diversity, or alignment with unit activities and outcomes. | Candidate does not plan formative assessments; or plans for formative assessments are substantially incomplete, inappropriate, or ineffective in monitoring student progress. Not well aligned with other unit activities. |
| ***Performance Assessment Design***<br><br>***InTASC 6 b*** | Candidate plans task(s) and student product(s) that are aligned with outcomes, authentic, and relevant for students; candidate plans tasks that will effectively assess intended learning (content AND literacy); candidate plans tasks that offers opportunities for student self-assessment; includes criteria for acceptable performance that are meaningful and appropriate. | Candidate plans task(s) and product(s) that are aligned with outcomes (content AND literacy) and are authentic; plans tasks that will effectively assess intended learning; includes criteria for acceptable performance. | Candidate plans task(s) and product(s) that lack authenticity or alignment with intended learning outcomes (content OR literacy). Criteria for acceptable performance are unclear, inappropriate, or missing. | Candidate plans task(s) and product(s) that are unclear, incomplete, or do not effectively assess intended content and/or literacy learning. |
| ***Scoring Rubric Provided***<br><br>***InTASC 6 n, o*** | Candidate provides a valid scoring rubric that clearly aligns to criteria of acceptable evidence; clearly delineates levels of performance and aligns criteria. | Candidate provides a valid scoring rubric that links the criteria of acceptable evidence and delineates levels of performance generically, but may not focus on the essence of the criteria. | Candidate provides a scoring rubric that loosely links the criteria of acceptable evidence to the assessment of student understandings; generically delineates levels of performance. | Candidate does not include a scoring rubric or provides one that minimally links the criteria of acceptable evidence to the assessment of student understandings. |

***PART III: INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN***

| ***Indicator*** | ***3: Target*** | ***2: Acceptable*** | ***1: Developing*** | ***0: Needs Improvement*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Unit Overview & Calendar***<br><br>***InTASC 7 c*** | Candidate describes the unit overview with WHEREAS+ framework (or other appropriate planning framework) as intended; candidate emphasizes depth over breadth in unit and describes how each activity builds upon the other. Weaves content, process, and literacy lessons together with coherence in ways that make sense for these learners based on research and theory.<br><br>Creates a daily calendar that specifically describes each day's activities and/or lessons. | Candidate describes unit plan and utilizes WHEREAS+ (or other planning) framework, but not always as intended; does not consistently emphasize depth over breadth. Candidate describes how each activity generally builds upon the other. Candidate provides evidence that the unit attends to prior knowledge and/or conceptual development of the whole group with some integration of research and theory.<br><br>Creates a daily calendar that briefly describes most day's activities and/or lessons. | Candidate provides overview of the unit and uses the WHEREAS+ (or another appropriate planning) framework, but uses it superficially; and/or candidate emphasizes breadth of content over depth; and/or some unit activities do not build on one another. Candidate doesn't address appropriate research or theory or such references are general or superficial.<br><br>Creates a daily calendar that does not provide enough information to understand the scope and sequence of the unit. | Candidate generally describes unit; Candidate does not use the WHEREAS+ (or other appropriate planning) framework, or uses it, but does not align with its tenets. Candidate emphasizes breadth of content over depth; and/or activities are isolated and do not build on one another. Candidate's overview does not address appropriate research or theory.<br><br>Creates a daily calendar that is substantially incomplete or does not include a daily calendar. |
| ***Student-centered Approaches***<br><br>***CCT 2.2, 3.8***<br><br>***InTASC 7 k*** | Candidate provides evidence that students will be engaged in predominantly student-centered activities throughout the unit. | Candidate provides evidence to indicate that students will engage in student-centered activities for at least half of the unit. | Candidate provides evidence that indicates that the unit's activities are primarily teacher centered; with minimal student-centered approaches; or student-centered models are utilized but kept teacher-centered. | Candidate indicates that the unit activities are almost completely teacher directed. |
| ***Lesson Plan Objectives, Development, and Closure*** | Candidate's lesson plans have clear, rigorous, measureable objectives. Plans include an initiation, lesson development, and closure that are well developed and appropriate for these specific learners. | Candidate's lesson plans have measureable objectives. Plans include an initiation, lesson development, and closure that are generally appropriate although connections to the needs of these particular learners are not consistently evident. | Candidate's lessons include objectives that are not consistently, clear, appropriate, and/or measurable. Plans include initiation, lesson development, and closure, but these may be unclear, overly general, and/or inappropriate for these students. | Candidate's lessons include objectives, initiations, lesson developments, and /or closures that are not consistently clear and appropriate for these learners and/or the unit outcomes. |
| ***Differentiation & Scaffolding (Lesson Plans, Handouts)***<br><br>***CCT 3.5, 3.7***<br><br>***InTASC 7 b, j*** | Candidate documents the inclusion of well-developed and appropriate differentiation strategies that meet the needs of all identified differences in student abilities, interests, & backgrounds; provides evidence of consistent, deliberate, and effective scaffolding in lesson plans and student materials. | Candidate documents the use of differentiation strategies for specific students with different abilities, needs, interests, & backgrounds. Provides evidence of scaffolding in most lesson plans and student handouts. | Candidate documents some appropriate differentiation and scaffolding to address identified student needs; evidence may be incomplete or inconsistent. | Candidate does not provide evidence of appropriate and deliberate differentiation and scaffolding that will consistently and effectively support student learning. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Materials and Use of Technology***<br><br>***InTASC 7 k*** | The candidate selects, adapts, and develops materials that are aligned to the unit purpose and standards. Materials are authentic and varied (visual, print, oral). Writing is clear and free of errors. Technology, including discipline-specific tools and processes, is used by students and the candidate to support learning. | The candidate selects, adapts, and develops materials that are mostly aligned to the unit purpose and standards. Materials are mostly authentic and varied (visual, print, oral). Writing is clear and free of errors. Technology, including discipline-specific tools and processes, is used by students OR the candidate to support learning in discipline-specific ways. | The candidate selects, adapts and develops materials that are somewhat aligned to the unit purpose and standards. Materials are mostly authentic, but might need some variation (visual, print, oral) or might have some minor design problems. Technology is incorporated by the candidate, but its use might need to be improved for student use to support learning in discipline-specific ways. | The candidate uses mostly materials from textbooks or other pedagogical resources without adaptations to the objectives of the unit/lesson plans or standards addressed. The majority of materials are not authentic, adequate for the students or have serious flaws in design. Technology might be used in limited or inconsistent ways. |

| ***DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC UNIT RUBRIC: WORLD LANGUAGE*** | ***Target (3)*** | ***Acceptable (2)*** | ***Developing (1)*** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Integration of the standards into planning** | The candidate uses SFLL or W-RSLL and State standards as a starting point to design unit and lesson plans. | The candidate creates activities and/or adapt existing instructional materials and activities to address specific SFLL or W-RSLL and state standards. | Candidates apply SFLL or W-RSLL and state standards to their planning to the extent that their instructional materials do so. |
| **Integration of products, practices and perspectives, and the three modes of communication** | The candidate uses the products, practices and perspectives of the target culture to organize the unit around them. The view of the target culture presented in the unit reflects its complexity and diversity, and helps the student to understand his/her own culture.<br>The unit includes all three modes of communication | The candidate uses the products, practices and perspectives of the target culture in the lesson plans, but are not the organizing axis. The view of the target culture presented in the unit might need to be more complex.<br>The unit includes all three modes of communication. | The candidate incorporates some practices, products and perspectives of the target culture, but does it in an isolated way. There is a fragmented and simplistic view of the target culture.<br>The unit does not address the three modes of communication. |
| **Connections to other subject areas** | The candidate designs a content-based unit that requires collaboration with colleagues from other content areas. They assist their students in acquiring new information from other disciplines in the target language) | The candidate designs opportunities for students to learn about other subject areas. They obtain information about other subject areas from colleagues who teach those subjects. | The candidate makes connections to other subject areas whenever these connections occur in their instructional materials. |
| **Connection to target language communities** | The candidate engage learners in interacting with members of the target language community through a variety of means that include technology, as a key component of their classroom practice. | The candidate provides opportunities for students to connect to target language communities through the internet, e-mail, social networking and other technologies. | The candidate introduce target language communities to the extent that they are presented in their existing instructional materials. |

***NOTE: Candidates must average a "2" across cells to pass MAT 539.***

| *DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC UNIT RUBRIC: Mathematics* | *3: Target* | *2: Acceptable* | *1: Developing* | *0: Needs Improvement* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Use of mathematical practices*** | Candidates include instruction that asks students to use mathematics practices to deepen understanding of content and express mathematical knowledge in written and spoken language. | | | |

| *DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC UNIT RUBRIC: SCIENCE* | *Target (3)* | *Acceptable (2)* | *Developing (1)* | *Needs Improvement (0)* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Three-Dimensional Learning (NSTA 2B)*** | All of the lessons in the unit feature the integration of Disciplinary Core Ideas with a wide variety of Science and Engineering Practices and Crosscutting Concepts, both in learning and assessment activities. Practices 2, 6, and 7 are featured prominently. | Most of the lessons in the unit feature the integration of Disciplinary Core Ideas with a wide variety of Science and Engineering Practices and Crosscutting Concepts, both in learning and assessment activities. Practices 2, 6, and 7 are fairly prominent. | Relatively few lessons in the unit feature the integration of Disciplinary Core Ideas with Science and Engineering Practices and Crosscutting Concepts in learning and assessment activities. Practices 2, 6, and 7 are not prominent. | Integration of Disciplinary Core Ideas with Science and Engineering Practices and Crosscutting Concepts is generally lacking in learning and/or assessment activities. Practices 2, 6, and 7 are not prominent. |
| ***Phenomena and Problems (NSTA 2B)*** | Students use all three dimensions to make sense -- develop and refine models and construct evidence-based explanations -- of phenomena throughout the unit (and design solutions to problems, when applicable). Phenomena/problems are authentic, meaningful, and appropriate anchors. | Students use all three dimensions to make sense of phenomena across much the unit (and design solutions to problems, when applicable). Phenomena (and problems) are mostly authentic, meaningful, and appropriate anchors. | Students largely use two dimensions to make sense of phenomena across much the unit (and design solutions to problems, when applicable). Phenomena (and problems) are sometimes authentic, meaningful, and appropriate anchors. | Students rarely use dimensions in combination to make sense of phenomena (and design solutions to problems, when applicable). Phenomena (and problems) are occasionally authentic, meaningful, and appropriate anchors. |
| ***Safety (NSTA 3D, 4A, 4B, 4C)*** | The unit includes explicit, detailed plans throughout for establishing a learning environment and learning experiences for all students that promote chemical safety, safety procedures, and the ethical treatment of living organisms (when applicable). | The unit includes explicit plans throughout for establishing a learning environment and learning experiences for all students. Minor flaws or gaps exist in plans for chemical safety, safety procedures, or the ethical treatment of living organisms (when applicable). | The unit includes explicit plans throughout for establishing a learning environment and learning experiences for all students. Moderate flaws or gaps exist in plans for chemical safety, safety procedures, or the ethical treatment of living organisms (when applicable). | The unit includes little or no explicit planning for safety and the ethical treatment of living organisms (when applicable). |

| ***DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC UNIT RUBRIC: ENGLISH*** | ***Target (3)*** | ***Acceptable (2)*** | ***Developing (1)*** | ***Needs Improvement (0)*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Range of Texts (NCTE III, 1 and IV 1)** | Candidate incorporates a wide range of diverse texts (across genres, periods, forms, authors, cultures, and media) for reading AND writing tasks that drive instruction forward through close alignment to the standards. | Candidate incorporates a range of texts (across genres, periods, forms, authors, cultures, and media) for reading and/or writing tasks that are aligned to the unit standards. | Candidate incorporates a narrow range of text and/or text selections do not match with purposes of unit or unit standards. | Candidate incorporates only one text throughout unit and/or it is not clear how the selected text aligns to the purpose and standards of the unit. |
| **Literacy Assessments (NCTE III, 4 and IV 2)** | Candidate designs or knowledgeably selects appropriate reading and/or writing assessments that provide important data about two of the following: student interests, literacy proficiencies, and literacy processes. | Candidate designs or selects appropriate reading and/or writing assessments that provide important data about (one of the following) student interests, literacy proficiencies, or literacy processes. | Candidate designs or selects reading or writing assessments within the unit, but the assessments may not provide appropriate data on literacy interests, proficiencies, or processes and/or it is not clear how the data will be used to drive instruction. | Specific diagnostic or formative reading/writing assessments are not included in the unit. |
| **Knowledge of Language Structure, History, and/or Convention (NCTE III, 5 and IV, 3)** | Candidate plans instruction that incorporates knowledge of language (structure, history, and conventions) to facilitate student comprehension and interpretation of text and to improve student written communication. | Candidate plans instruction that incorporates one aspect of knowledge of language (structure, history, or conventions) to facilitate student comprehension and interpretation of text or to improve student written communication. | Candidate plans some instruction that begins to incorporate knowledge of language structure, history, or convention, but it is not clear how this instruction helps support students with unit tasks. | Candidate does not plan instruction that incorporates knowledge of language structure, history, or conventions. |
| **Interdisciplinarity (NCTE III, 6)** | Candidate plans instruction that explicitly incorporates interdisciplinary teaching methods and materials that drives the unit forward. | Candidate plans instruction that reflects interdisciplinary teaching methods and materials that align to unit activities. | Candidate plans instruction that reflects interdisciplinary teaching methods and materials, but it is not clear how these activities align to the unit purpose and standards. | Candidate does not make clear how the unit incorporates interdisciplinary teaching methods and materials. |

***NOTE: Candidates must average a "2" across cells to pass MAT 539.***

# Videoanalysis Rubric, MAT 533

# VIDEO ANALYSIS

MAT Candidates, you are required to complete the Video Analysis assessment to demonstrate your understanding of the standards, functions, objectives, and assessment of language and literacy within your discipline.

To this end, you will video yourself teaching a segment of a literacy lesson during the fall field experience. You are encouraged to video yourself often, but for this assignment, you will select one ten-minute video segment in which you are instructing a literacy or language objective in your discipline and one five-minute video segment in which students are using literacy and language to support content learning.

The assignment has three components to it:

1) Plan the lesson—a complete MAT lesson planning template must be submitted for the videotaped lesson
2) Upload video segments from the implemented lesson to BBLearn (align to lesson plan submitted)
    a. one ten-minute video segment in which you are instructing a literacy or language objective in the discipline
    b. one five-minute video segment in which students in the field placement classroom are using literacy and language to support content learning
2) Reflect in writing on the teaching and viewing experience

Video segments will be shared in seminar class, and the assignment will be scored by the course instructor, student, and a peer(s). You may request to borrow MAT videotape equipment for this assignment from the course instructor.

*Candidates must receive scores at or above the Acceptable (2) level to pass the MAT 533 field seminar course.

Following the observation, classmates will share feedback on their specific lens. Data sheets will be provided to the observed candidate to use in the reflection. In the week following the observed video, please write a **written reflection** using the *What, So What, Now Wha*t format.

**What:** Share insights you gained from your own detailed analysis of your video as well as your peers' feedback. Cite specific evidence from the data sheets collected from peers and instructor.

**So What:** How did those insights lead you to a deeper understanding of teaching and learning? Connect your new insights to **theory and research**—especially when considering what you would do differently next time.

**Now What:** What goals do you have for your teaching practice in the last few months of the semester? What goals do you have long term (by the end of the year)?

# Video Analysis Rubric

| Criteria | Target<br>3 | Acceptable<br>2 | Developing<br>1 | Needs Improvement<br>0 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Description of observed lesson and insights gained (WHAT) | Clear, complete, insightful description of the lesson. Consistently cites relevant observable behaviors to support description. Explanation cites numerous examples of specific, relevant, and meaningful evidence gained from peer and instructor feedback (data sheets). | Description fully discloses the lesson although some aspects may lack clarity or detail. Relevant, observable behaviors are included to support the description. Explanation cites a few examples of specific evidence gained from peer and instructor feedback (data sheets). | The description of the lesson is general and lacks clarity and /or relevant details. Some observable behaviors are cited to support the description although these examples may be general, only partially relevant. OR limited to general descriptions of evidence gained from peers' and instructor's feedback. (data sheets). | Brief or general lesson description with few details. Few observable behaviors are included. Information provided may be predominantly irrelevant, inaccurate, and/or incomplete. |
| Understanding of teaching and learning (SO WHAT) | Response is clear and directly addresses important implications of the insights gained or teaching and learning. Clear, ample, and detailed connections to research and/or theory are articulated explaining how the research/theory informed the analysis. | Response addresses relevant implications of the insights gained for teaching and learning At least two relevant and correct connections to research and/or theory are made. | Response includes some insights into the implications for teaching and learning although these insights may lack specificity, clarity, or completeness. . At least one general but potentially correct connection to research and/or theory is made. | Response's explanation of insight gained is inaccurate, unclear, incomplete, and/or not clearly related to teaching and learning. Connections to research and/or theory are superficial, missing, incorrect, or unclear.. |
| Professional Reflection (NOW WHAT) | Clearly articulates a plan for personal growth based on the analysis of video and relevant literature. Plan includes **at least three** important and specific goals for future experiences as a teacher candidate or beginning teacher. Includes several examples of immediate actions that will support and improve teaching and | Shares a plan for growth relevant to video analysis. Plan includes one or two goals for future experiences as a teacher candidate or beginning teacher. At least two examples of immediate actions that will support teaching and learning are provided. Connections between analysis, theory, | Shares a plan for growth that includes at least one appropriate goal for future experiences as a teacher candidate. The goal may be general or loosely related to video analysis. Examples of immediate and appropriate actions that can be taken to support teaching and learning are included but may lack | Plan for growth lacks clarity, specificity, or relevance to video analysis. Examples of actions that can be taken immediately to support teaching and learning may be missing, inappropriate, or irrelevant. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | learning. | goals, and immediate actions may be tenuous or unclear. | specificity, clarity, or relevance to the video analysis. | |
| Writing Quality | Writing is clear and effective. Provides detailed explanations and cites relevant data using appropriate professional terminology. Makes logical connections between data, literature, goals, and immediate actions. Writing is free of distracting mechanical errors (grammar, syntax, spelling, etc.). | Writing conveys key ideas clearly although connections are not always clear and/or logic is not always fully explained . A few random mechanical errors are evident (grammar, syntax, spelling, etc.).. | Writing does not meet minimal expectations for an educator. Writing does not consistently convey important ideas clearly. Logical connections are not explained or consistently unclear. Terminology may be used inappropriately. Numerous and/or patterned mechanical errors distract the reader (grammar, syntax, spelling, etc.). | Writing does not provide evidence that the candidate can analyze professional practice and draw logical connections between data, literature, goals, and immediate actions.<br><br>Writing is incomplete, consistently unclear or illogical, and demonstrates numerous and/or patterned mechanical errors that distract the reader (grammar, syntax, spelling, etc.). |

_____/12