



Evidence Item:	31 Stakeholder contributions to assessment instruments
CAEP Standards:	2 and 5
Referenced in Components:	2.1 and 5.3.1
Locations for the Evidence:	2.1.3 and 5.3.1

The Purpose for the Evidence: The evidence provides examples of how a wide variety of stakeholders have participated in the development of the assessment instruments used by the EPP. Many stakeholders have been involved in Lawshe Method studies, pilot studies, shared feedback, and expertise to help develop and improve the EPP’s assessments. The evidence item also includes EPP faculty responses about using data for continuous improvement.

Administrative Comments: The Table of Contents is intended to help viewers be efficient in locating information quickly and hope to help viewers access what he or she believes is important for their needs.

Table of Contents

Common Metrics Surveys (Entry, Exit, Completer, and Employer)	2
Student Teacher Observation Tool	3
Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) Unit.....	5
Annual Data Sharing Session with Stakeholders.....	6
Disposition Assessment	11

Common Metrics Surveys (Entry, Exit, Completer, and Employer)

The EPP was fortunate to become involved in a Bush Grant-funded opportunity for improving teacher effectiveness in the Midwest. One of the extremely positive outcomes was the Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT) Common Metrics assessments. The fourteen institutions participating in the grant were transitioning from NCATE to CAEP. The EPPs wanted to develop common assessments that are valid and reliable. The NExT EPPs also wanted to be able to communicate with each other using “apple to apple” assessments so they could speak the same language while discussing areas of strength in educator preparation and areas for improvement.

The EPP’s assessment coordinator was engaged in both large group and subcommittee activities that occurred as the assessments were connected to InTASC Standards, increased, reduced, tested for validity and reliability, piloted, and finally approved. The process initially involved EPP representatives along with an external research company in New York and consultants hired by the Bush Grant from Washington, DC. The process became more sustainable relying on the shared expertise of the institutions. The research universities contributed statisticians, other EPPs sent representatives who were deans, assessment coordinators, field experience personnel, and other education personnel who worked with accreditation. The 14 EPPs shared a mutually beneficial purpose. The EPPs were willing to share expertise and input. VCSU was among the EPPs that helped to pilot each instrument so we could learn from our teacher candidates, completers, and P-12 educators from our partner schools. VCSU wanted the input from our stakeholders as well as benefitting from the talent and resources available through NExT. The Exit Survey, Completer Survey, and Employer Survey have been extremely valuable for the EPP to triangulate data and make informed decisions for continuous improvement.

The 14 member institutions of the NExT initiative include the Valley Partnership (VCSU, NDSU, MSU-Moorhead), University of South Dakota, St. Cloud State, University of Minnesota – Twin Cities, Winona State, Minnesota State Mankato, and a consortium of six private universities in the Twin Cities (Augsburg, Bethel, Concordia St. Paul, St. Catherine’s, Hamline, and St. Thomas). Valley City State University, North Dakota State University, and Minnesota State University Moorhead were teamed together in the Bush Grant to form the Valley Partnership.

The EPP’s assessment coordinator was among the NExT representatives to present about the Common Metrics assessment instruments at the 2017 CAEP Conference in St. Louis, MO as well as the AACTE conference in Tampa, FL, and Las Vegas, NV. The assessment coordinator also presented as a NExT Common Metrics representative in 2019 at an annual AACTE conference in Louisville, KY. EPPs from North Dakota and many other states are using the NExT Common Metrics for assessment and accreditation. The experiences of collaborating with representatives from other universities to develop, assess, and improve the assessments used by the EPP have greatly benefitted the quality of the instruments used by the EPP and provided tremendous professional development opportunities for the assessment coordinator to bring to VCSU.

The assessment instruments, along with their validity and reliability evidence, are available in Evidence 87.

Student Teacher Observation Tool

Representatives from the North Dakota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (NDACTE) applied for a grant from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) to support the development of a valid and reliable student teaching observation tool. Representatives from North Dakota State University (NDSU), Valley City State University, Mayville State University, Minot State University, Turtle Mountain Community College, and the University of Mary worked together to develop the form.

Collaboration can be highly productive when the outcome is mutually beneficial for those involved. Collaborative efforts among professional communities can bring challenges, but the experiences also have the potential to develop products that are more powerful than anyone institution may have produced individually. The shared expertise from NDACTE representatives and institutions led to the development of valid and reliable instruments that meet standards set by CAEP.

The experience began at a time of transition when North Dakota Education Preparation Providers were transitioning from NCATE to CAEP standards. **The primary reasons for developing an EPP-created assessment involved a need and the mutual benefit of collaborating with the expertise of other EPP representatives to fulfill that need.** Most of the North Dakota EPPs were searching to find valid, reliable, and practical assessments to gather and analyze data useful for program improvement decision-making and meeting accreditation expectations. We believed we could create an instrument to meet our needs and improve educator preparation.

The initial pilot returned comments from cooperating teachers for improvement along with reliability concerns about double-barreled items and unclear factor analysis. VCSU was able to pilot the instrument and receive feedback on the instrument from P-12 stakeholders during an annual data-sharing session.

The EPP wanted to work with other EPPs, but the EPP wanted to gather feedback from its faculty and P-12 partners. The examples of positive comments below were gathered at the annual data sharing session in 2017. The stakeholders were seeing the second (revised) version of the new student teaching.

- clear levels of performance for cooperating teacher
- more description than the previous student teacher evaluation form
- liked the option to rate a 1.5 or 2.5 or 3.5 if needed
- the structure was similar to Marshall, Danielson, and Marzano

In addition to positive comments about the new student teaching form for 2017, a request was made that cooperating teachers can make comments.

The revised version produced cleaner feedback as well as enhanced reliability and validity. Collaboration from EPP representatives started the process, but feedback from P-12 stakeholders and statistical analyses led to the final product, a quality assessment instrument.

The EPP's assessment coordinator was a co-presenter with representatives from NDSU and Mayville State at the 2018 CAEP Conference, Kansas City, MO. The co-presenters also shared at the 2018 AACTE Conference in Baltimore, MD, the 2017 North Dakota Fall Educators Conference in Bismarck, ND, and the 2019 Regional Educational Laboratory Central Webinar with Marzano Research. The student teaching assessment instrument is being used by the North Dakota EPPs and many other EPPs in the United States. Upon reflecting on the experience, the following pros and cons lists were created.

Creating assessments versus selecting a proprietary assessment

Pros	Cons
Begin with standards, but have more freedom and independence	Increased responsibility for meeting reliability, validity, and addressing accreditation expectations compared to proprietary assessments
Greater opportunity to develop assessments that are practical and meaningful to an EPP	Increased time and efforts to assess the assessment

Collaboration can be highly productive when the outcome is mutually beneficial for those involved. Collaborative efforts among professional communities can bring challenges, but the experiences also have the potential to develop products that are more powerful than anyone institution may have produced individually. The shared expertise from NDACTE representatives and institutions led to the development of valid and reliable instruments that meet standards set by CAEP.

Collaboration

Pros	Cons
A variety of perspectives contribute the vision and outcome	Takes more time to work with other
Increased potential to add skill and experience in research, statistics, assessment, practicality and/or field expertise	Loss of some autonomy with a probable need for making some concessions
The establishment of common language for compiling aggregate data and identifying educator preparation areas of strength and improvement that can lead to meaningful conversations and actions.	
Improved communication and networking for future collaboration	
A mutually beneficial outcome	

The assessment instrument, along with the validity and reliability evidence, are available in Evidence 87.

Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) Unit

Research for a capstone unit of teaching began in the fall of 2010. The full history for the development of the TLC unit template and rubrics can be found in Evidence 38. The timeline explains all the input from EPP faculty and P-12 partners as well as the initial pilots and changes to the original rubrics over time. Research began through the study of Teacher Performance Assessment outlines (now referred to as edTPA) samples from California and Minnesota, as well as Teacher Work Sample concepts from Oregon and UND that had been reviewed in the past. The resources contributed to the development of VCSU's initial draft of the Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) unit. The TLC unit connected with the VCSU Conceptual Framework and tagged the template to the InTASC Standards. A template was developed to provide a structure and process for a capstone performance experience that captured teacher candidate efforts to impact student learning.

The workgroups met on June 17, 2011, at VCSU to become aware of VCSU plans involving the TPA model and to seek input from P-12 partners on the creation of the EPP's expectations. Local educators from each academic area joined the EPP's faculty members to look at TPA samples and other work samples and to help VCSU develop a structure and template for the TLC process. VCSU began with pilot samples and pilot assessments before settling in on the expectations and rubrics. The input from P-12 educators and EPP faculty members involved practical feedback that helped to shape the TLC project.

In the Fall of 2017 (October 18th at 3 pm), an Assessment Work Group of EPP faculty majors work with field experiences and methods courses met. One of the tasks for the workgroup was to improve the TLC rubrics. The assessment coordinator explained the Lawshe Method. The Lawshe method was applied to identify the strongest areas of content validity in the TLC rubrics. The intent was to improve the validity of the TLC rubrics for the sake of the teacher candidates and those supporting them, as well as improve the reliability and validity of the work done while assessing the TLC unit. The Construct Validity Ratio (CVR) findings from the Lawshe method results were combined with faculty feedback from summer TLC assessment sessions. The goal was to identify or develop a clear, concise descriptor for the proficiency level in each of the 10 rubrics. Once a clear descriptor for proficiency was developed for each rubric, the path for writing the other descriptors at higher or lower performance levels became more evident. The assessment workgroup and faculty feedback aimed at improving the validity of the TLC rubrics and enhancing the inter-rater reliability and rater agreement of the assessment process.

1 – TLC Lawshe Method was used to assess content validity ratios (CVR).

2 – CVR values of 0.50 or greater were rated as “essential” and hence more valid by the group of 16 subject matter experts who completed the survey.

3 – The current TLC template was adjusted to align with changes to the rubrics

The reliability and validity analyses of the TLC ratings are favorable. The primary assessment instruments, along with their validity and reliability information, are available in Evidence 87.

Annual Data Sharing Session with Stakeholders

Evidence 6 provides detailed access to the Annual Data Sharing sessions and the feedback gathered from educators. P-12 stakeholders contribute significantly to the EPP's plans for continuous improvement. The stakeholders include elementary and secondary teachers and administrators, as well as elementary and secondary EPP faculty who work with methods courses, professional education sequence courses, and/or field experiences. University supervisors and cooperating teachers who work with out-of-area placements are also invited for a virtual discussion. Some stakeholders are alumni of the EPP. A handful are educators who are also parents of VCSU teacher candidates or completers. Other stakeholders have no connection to the EPP except for working with teacher candidates in field experiences. The annual data-sharing sessions are part of the EPP's assessment culture. The feedback from this session has been a powerful voice for program improvement. The variety of stakeholders from different schools and different academic areas all have one goal in common, considering ways to make educator preparation as strong as possible.

An example of the attendees from the most recent data-sharing session.

Met at VCSU campus on 8/3/21

Name	Email address	School Location	Education Position
Terri Egan	Terri.egan@k12.nd.us	Enderlin	English 7-12
Kristi Shanenko	Kristi.shanenko@k12.nd.us	Valley City	English 8 th and 11 th (*TE)
Troy Miller	Troy.miller@k12.nd.us	Valley City	Jefferson Elementary Principal (K-3)
Chad Lueck	Chad.lueck@k12.nd.us	Valley City	Washington Elementary Principal (4-6) (*TE)
Kathy Lentz	Kathy.lentz@k12.nd.us	Valley City	Washington Elementary Teacher (4-6) (*TE)
Rhonda Nudell	Rhonda.nudell@k12.nd.us	Valley City	Washington Elementary Teacher (4-6)
David Handt	david.handt@litchvillemarion.com	Litchville-Marion	Math 7-12
Steph McCann	stephanie.mccann@litchvillemarion.com	Litchville-Marion	Social Studies 7-12
Jessica Gregerson	Jessica.gregerson@k12.nd.us	Valley City	Math 7-8
Natalie Potratz	Natalie.potratz@k12.nd.us	Valley City	Jefferson Elementary Teacher (K-3)
Ashley Kellogg	Ashley.kellogg@k12.nd.us	Valley City	Washington Elementary Teacher (4-6)
Waylan Starr	Waylan.starr@k12.nd.us	Valley City	Social Studies 9-12
Cindy Creviston	Cindy.creviston@k12.nd.us	Valley City	Special Education
Matt Nielson	Matt.nielson@k12.nd.us	Valley City	Chemistry/Physics
Liz Lindteigen	Lizabeth.lindteigen@k12.nd.us	Valley City	Elementary Physical Education
Kathleen Horner	Kathleen.horner@k12.nd.us	Valley City	English 11-12
John LeTellier	John.letellier@vcsu.edu	VCSU	Music Education Methods (*TE)
Allen Burgad	Allen.a.burgad@vcsu.edu	VCSU	Dean for VCSU School of Education
David Hanson	David.hanson@vcsu.edu	VCSU	SEGS Faculty
Kaley Mari	Kaley.mari@vcsu.edu	VCSU	SEGS Faculty
Joan Klein	j.m.klein@vcsu.edu	VCSU	SEGS Faculty
Harmony Richman	Harmony.richman@vcsu.edu	VCSU	SEGS Faculty
Jaime Pollert	Jaime.pollert@vcsu.edu	VCSU	SEGS Faculty
Angie Zerface	Angela.zerface@vcsu.edu	VCSU	SEGS Faculty
Scott Klimek	Scott.klimek@vcsu.edu	VCSU	SEGS Faculty
Heather Peschel	Heather.anderson2@vcsu.edu	VCSU	SEGS Director of Special Education
Jamie Wirth	Jamie.wirth@vcsu.edu	VCSU	Mathematics Education Chair (*TE)
Trent Kosel	Trent.kosel@vcsu.edu	VCSU	Mathematics Methods

Lisa Krumwiede	Elisa.krumwiede@vcsu.edu	VCSU	Technology Education Methods
Jodi Shorma	Jodi.shorma@vcsu.edu	VCSU	English Methods (*TE)
Gary Ketterling	Gary.ketterling@vcsu.edu	VCSU	Science Methods (*TE)
Al Olson	Al.olson@vcsu.edu	VCSU	SEGS Assessment Coordinator (*TE)
Haley Jenrich	Haleyjo.jenrich@vcsu.edu	VCSU	SEGS Licensure Certification Officer
Rachel Bopp	Rachel.n.bopp@vcsu.edu	VCSU	SEGS Assistant and Assessment Assistant

Met online through Microsoft Teams on 8/3/21

Name	Email address	School Location	Education Position
Tim Michaelson	timothy.michaelson@vcsu.edu	VCSU	VCSU SEGS Field Experience Placement Coordinator
Karen Lackey	klackey@westernwyoming.edu	Western Wyoming CC	University Supervisor
Sandy Porter	sanraeben@gmail.com	Wyoming	Field Experience Placement Coordinator
Abbie Axtman	Abbie.l.kemp@vcsu.edu	Williston	K Teacher and VCSU Kindergarten Adjunct Faculty
Stephanie Soliz	stephanie7398@mynycsd.org	Verda James Elementary (Casper, WY)	1 st Grade
Alyssa Danielson	alyssa.danielson@northerncassschool.com	Northern Cass	4 th Grade Teacher
Darin Eller	darin.eller@northerncassschool.com	Northern Cass	Technology Coach
Angie Williams	Angela.williams.3@vcsu.edu	Fargo	Health/Physical Education Fargo Davies HS

The VCSU liaison to the Valley City Public schools shared this comment that is available in Evidence 30. An administrator who hadn't yet attended an annual data sharing session at VCSU with P-12 educators asked about the "Day of Data" that VCSU offers each August. (An elementary principal who regularly attends the sessions shared the comment recorded by the VCSU liaison.) Mr. Miller spoke about the benefits of this half-day event. Local public-school teachers and administrators meet to review the data from VCSU student surveys as well as data from cooperating field experience teachers. One of the most important things that happen from this review is that "actual change" takes place from those discussions and from the feedback that is shared during that event. These changes continue to help improve the field experiences for the VCSU students and their cooperating teachers.

The assessment coordinator was a co-presenter on the topic of data sharing with stakeholders and a NExT Common Metrics representative in 2019 at the annual AACTE conference in Louisville, KY. The EPP has dedicated faculty and area educators who make the data-sharing events productive. The 2017 data sharing discussions focused on the lower ratings in the areas of mental health and differentiated instruction. The P-12 stakeholder feedback coupled with the faculty agreement and data gathered from multiple sources over multiple years led to a Teacher Education Committee vote to increase EDUC 240 Educating Exceptional Students from 2 to 3 credits. The decision has been implemented and the EPP is seeing improved data. The data are indicating that the change for continuous improvement is leading to an upward trend. The data-sharing sessions are part of the culture of the EPP and the feedback is making a positive difference.

VCSU faculty members who work with field experiences, teach methods courses, or professional education sequence courses were asked to respond to the following prompt. The responses follow the prompt:

Please identify ways that you have used data to inform decisions for improving your courses. (From Welcome Week discussions, TLC discussions, Annual Data Sharing Sessions, Praxis discussions,)

Data Sharing Sessions, Faculty Discussions, Collaborative Higher Education SPED Workgroups

Students Evaluations and Feedback, SWOT analysis among Instructors, Praxis Scores, Assignment Scores, Standards Changes, Program Learning Outcomes Evaluations and Scores, General Education Learning Outcomes and Scoring

I use the data and feedback from the Annual Data Sharing Sessions, TLC assessment sessions, and Welcome Week discussions to inform where I can improve what I teach and what my students learn. I used TLC unit data from two years ago about TLC units in which the teacher candidates' learning targets weren't effectively aligned to their assessments. I increased the opportunities my teacher candidates have to create learning targets and develop assessments that measure the learning targets. Based on more recent data, I will be spending more time on self-assessment. I will engage my teacher candidates in more self-assessment practices and emphasize the value teaching their future students about the power of self-assessment. I will also be using data to discuss reflective practice with teacher candidates and encouraging them to finish their TLC units strong using thoughtful reflective writing skills and energy.

I use frequent quick surveys in my course to get student input on anything from discussion format, how much time they are spending on my class to adjust my work I give them, or other class features. I have also begun to look at past TLC data and Praxis scores to guide what I cover more of in my social studies methods course, along with student input.

I have used a variety of formative assessment strategies to guide my instruction. I have also used data sharing sessions, PLO results, and Praxis data to support instruction.

Assessment data and student feedback in the form of evaluations are reviewed to improve the content of presentations and organizational meetings.

I use data to make decisions on curriculum, how I teach, and how I assess.

Two data-based activities inform my preparation of teacher candidates--my favorite is the Annual Data Sharing Sessions held with VCSU teachers and high school teachers and administrators within a 2-hour radius of VCSU. I look for the lowest scoring knowledge and skill areas and adjust my instruction to include "special" activities to support development of those underdeveloped skills. One, for example, is mental health understanding to support students' mental health needs. This fall 2021 is my second teaching English methods course where a certified mental health professional trains my methods students about identifying and helping students in a mental health crisis. Since this knowledge and skill area ranked low among all survey groups, the special attention in a methods course should help strengthen those lower ranked skills. My second favorite is the TLC discussions. These conversations are the "flip side" of the data sharing session because the students' statements are what is used to rate knowledge and skill, not surveys or evaluation tools. During my time as a faculty evaluator of TLCs, I see trends of strength and trends of "needs more attention." This data-driven activity brings me outside my English area to a broader range of students inside the VCSU teacher education program. Students' TLC connections in areas like Evaluation of student learning help me help my students with their student teaching TLC projects so yes, the data-driven findings affect my instruction.

Feedback from students, discussion with mentor, and colleagues.

Reliance on survey results from student teachers, first-year teachers, and school administrators about program strengths and weaknesses; TLC review sessions; Annual Data Sharing sessions; and experiences with curriculum changes as a result of the NExT Grant

In my online courses I do keep an eye on grading trends to make sure if I need to reteach something it happens immediately. In the T2T program we do a program review of data by myself, CTE key individuals, and we meet as a whole group (all CTE state supervisors, myself and other VCSU representatives as needed) to make decision on the program and how to keep improving it. This is done on an annual basis (end of May or beginning of June) of each year so changes can be implemented immediately. I also do self-reflection on all online courses at the end of what worked well and what didn't so I can make improvements and changes to better the students' experience in my courses.

Annual sharing session with administrators and teachers, Welcome week discussion and PD

I regularly survey students in my classes to help focus assignments and class logistics - first week surveys include previous experiences, comfort levels, interest in specific kinds of art and assignment types, etc. I check in with student surveys frequently to gauge interest/energy/satisfaction and make modifications as appropriate. I take faculty evaluation very seriously as well - for example when students collectively expressed issues with grading practices, I developed a grading exercise and series of presentations to discuss evaluation in art.

I have used data from school administrators about what they are looking for in trade and industry teachers, I have also used data from the Association for Career and Technical Education to modify several courses.

I try to keep updated on current data, so I can tailor my teaching to best meet the needs of all our learners at VCSU.

Annual Data Sharing Sessions are beneficial because we hear from the P-12 educators, teacher candidates, and cooperating teachers. By identifying gaps, I can modify my course to target those particular skills. The collaborative discussions I have with faculty members are also invaluable, as idea sharing encourages data analysis and revisions.

I am constantly changing my classes. I attend the Annual Data Sharing Sessions to hear about what we are doing right, and to hear about ways we can improve our instruction. I read every survey sent to me by AI to see what our students think about our program. I have made countless changes to my classes based on what I see. I observe our student teachers to see if there is application of what they are learning, or areas we need to improve. I evaluate TLC's every year to see strengths and weaknesses. I develop relationships with my students and listen to what they say about how they are learning.

All the fore-mentioned topics. Data driven decision making!

Welcome Week discussions, course evaluations

I have attended TLC discussions, annual data sharing sessions and Praxis discussions. I have used these sessions to enhance my courses and better prepare my students for the student teaching experience, PRAXIS II test, and help them with the TLC rubric and completion.

This is my second year at VCSU, so I have not done much of work adjusting/improving my course based on the data. Having said that, PE/HE programs have made a lot of improvement using the data. For example, reflecting the program data, Health Education is planning to add a course that bridges content to methods. Personally, I adjusted my methodology for my classes after learning about how students learn better in online learning.

Student evaluations to shape assignment and lecture content

Annual Data Sharing Sessions, Welcome Week discussions.

Program Learning Outcome discussion in the Social Science Department

From TLC and Data sharing sessions in the past I have using a comment from a principal who indicated that student teachers lacked the confidence to use a Learning Management System. From this statement, I have added a Learning Management System access point for students to learn an LMS of their choice and report their findings of ease of use and how it could relate to using another LMS (Google Classroom, Canvas and Seesaw are explore). Another way is that students are not confident in their ability to differentiate, we know differentiating doesn't just happen with learners who are on 504's or the high flyers, we

can differentiate for all learners; therefore, I have made a point that anytime in my classroom where I am offering a choice of how my learners can showcase their learning that I specifically state that I am differentiating a particular assignment for the entire class. Additionally, self-evaluation has come up from the Data Sharing Session and I have incorporated a piece of technology self-evaluation based on the ISTE standards that I provided my learners at the beginning of the semester, we will evaluate at mid-semester and the end of the semester to discuss where we are and how we can continually improve.

My students informally evaluate me and the course twice a semester. This is beyond the institutional surveys that are sent out at the end of each semester. The data from both surveys is reflected on and used to make changes to improve my courses. I share the raw data for the surveys I send out with the students. I complete the first survey at mid-term, so I still have time to adjust for THAT class while they are taking the course. I look for patterns and then tell my students what I will do to improve the course before the end of the semester. They evaluate me at the end as to whether I was successful in that improvement or not. This strategy has helped me immensely over the four years I have been at VCSU.

Our latest Annual Data Sharing Sessions helped me refocus my attention of teaching our students to practice and promote the use of self-assessment as both students and as future teachers.

Disposition Assessment

Essential Dispositions August 21, 2018

The North Dakota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (NDACTE), a statewide organization comprised of representatives from every teacher preparation institution in North Dakota, has a subcommittee developing an instrument to assess professional dispositions* of teacher candidates. The items selected for a draft of key disposition items to assess are compiled from Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards and have been crosswalked with the work of Charlotte Danielson and Robert Marzano. InTASC defines dispositions as follows: **The habits of professional action and moral commitments that underlie an educator's performance (InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, p. 6.)*

The C. H. Lawshe method was used to provide evidence of **content validity by gauging agreement among raters or judges regarding how essential a particular item is to assessing a performance or construct**. Lawshe (1975) proposed that each of the subject matter expert raters (SMEs) on the judging panel respond to the following question for each item: "Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item 'essential,' 'useful, but not essential,' or 'not necessary' to the performance of the construct?" If more than half the panelists indicate an item is essential, that item has at least some content validity. Greater levels of content validity exist as larger numbers of panelists agree a particular item is essential. Using these assumptions, Lawshe developed a formula termed the content validity ratio, $CVR = [(E - (N / 2)) / (N / 2)]$.

Procedure

Eighty-three **subject matter experts (SMEs)** reviewed 43 InTASC dispositional items and rated them as "Essential", "Useful, but not Essential", or "Not Necessary". All were involved with education in North Dakota schools. **Teacher Education Faculty and/or University Supervisors (59), PK-12 Cooperating Teachers (16), PK-12 Administrators (7), Other (1)**. The response ratings were tallied, and a Content Validity Ratio (CVR) was established using the following formula, using the total number of experts (N) and the number who rated the descriptor as essential (E): $CVR = [(E - (N / 2)) / (N / 2)]$

The following information is from a CAEP recommendation from a PowerPoint prepared by Dr. Stevie Chepko, Senior VP for Accreditation (Retrieved on October 17, 2017, from <https://www.education.ne.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/NE-ContentValidityReliability.pdf>)

- CVR is calculated for each indicator
- A minimum value of the CVR is based on the number of panelists and is on a CVR Table
- CVR values range from -1.0 to + 1.0 The closer to 1.0 the CVR is, the more essential the object is considered to be. Conversely, the closer to -1.0 the CVR is, the more non-essential it is.
- The more panelists the lower the CVR value
 - 5 panelists require a minimum CVR value of .99
 - 15 panelists require a minimum CVR value of .49
 - 40 panelists require a minimum CVR value of .29
 - **83 panelists (the NDACTE survey total) requires a minimum CVR value of .205**
- The process allows for the retention or rejection of individual items

The number of panelists exceeded the CAEP values provided by Dr. Chepko. Dr. Brent Hill (NDSU) calculated a table for higher "N" values using the work of Ayre and Scally (2014). The calculations are very slightly different from the critical values from Wilson et al. (2012) and Lawshe (1975) but considered to produce even more precise critical values. With 83 panelists, the critical number of "Essential" responses was calculated to be 50 with a proportion of agreement on the "Essential" rating at 0.602 and a CVR of .205.

The "essential" ratings of 83 SMEs indicated a high enough level of agreement among the raters that *a content validity ratio of 0.205 or higher* was identified for 28 of the 43 dispositional items. The 28 items highlighted in light green have the strongest evidence for retention among the 43 InTASC items. Each of the four InTASC categories had items viewed as "Essential": Learner and Learning (InTASC 1-3) had 8 items; Content (InTASC 4-5) 2 items; Instructional Practice (InTASC 6-8) 5 items; Professional Responsibility (InTASC 9-10) 13 items. Any items with CVR ratings close to .205, such as the two items at 0.195, will be discussed by the subcommittee. The

NDACTE subcommittee will consider the data to help narrow down the list of 43 items used to develop a dispositional assessment instrument that is both valid and practical. Additional data from other SMEs will be gathered and discussed before the final decisions are made.

Stakeholders who attended the EPP's August 2018 Annual Data Sharing Session had the opportunity to participate as subject matter experts. The opportunity provided the EPP to receive feedback from P-12 cooperating teachers and administrators.

Essential Dispositions - Lawshe Method August 21, 2018

#	Dispositional Attribute	Essential	Useful, but not Essential	Not Necessary	Total	Content Validity Ratio
Learner and Learning (InTASC Standards 1-3) Please rate the following items as "essential", "useful, but not essential", or "not necessary" for assessing professional dispositions of teacher candidates in a teacher preparation program.						
1	Respects learners' developmental strengths/needs (InTASC 1.h) (Danielson 1b) (Marzano 19,20)	62	20	0	82	0.512
2	Commits to using learners' strengths as a basis for their growth (InTASC 1.i, 1.j) (Danielson 3c) (Marzano 3,15,20)	49	32	1	82	0.195
3	Values input from all stakeholders (e.g., families, colleagues, other professionals) regarding learners' growth/development (InTASC 1.k, 1.j) (Danielson 4c) (Marzano 3)	45	37	0	82	0.098
4	Believes that all students can learn/achieve (InTASC 2.l, 2.n) (Danielson 2.b)(Marzano 19)	75	5	1	81	0.852
5	Responds respectfully to individual needs (InTASC 2.m) (Danielson 2.d) (Marzano 20)	68	12	2	82	0.659
6	Commits to knowing about the cultures and communities that impact their students (InTASC 2.m, 2.n, 2.o, 3.n) (Marzano 19)	54	26	1	81	0.333
7	Displays a commitment to provide equitable learning and development opportunities for all (InTASC 3.n, 3.o) (Danielson 2a) (Marzano 15,20)	63	16	2	81	0.556
8	Believes that the classroom environment greatly affects students' learning (InTASC 3.n, 3.o, 3.p, 3.q) (Danielson 2a) (Marzano 17, 19,20)	64	18	0	82	0.561
9	Displays a commitment to developing a thoughtful/ responsive educational community (InTASC 3.q, 3.r) (Danielson 2b) (Marzano 17,19)	40	34	8	82	-0.024
10	Engages learners in decision-making for purposeful learning (InTASC 3.p)(Danielson 3c)(Marzano 18)	51	29	2	82	0.244
11	Engages learners in collaborative learning (InTASC 3.o, 3.p, 3.q) (Danielson 3c)(Marzano 16)	54	27	1	82	0.317
Content (InTASC Standards 4-5) Please rate the following items as "essential", "useful, but not essential", or "not necessary" for assessing professional dispositions of teacher candidates in a teacher preparation program.						
1	Commits to making learning opportunities accessible to all learners (InTASC 4.r) (Danielson 3c)(Marzano 2)	79	3	0	82	0.927
2	Is committed to engaging learners in critical analysis of multiple perspectives to increase learners' content/skill mastery (InTASC 4.p, 4.q, 4.r)(Marzano 4)	38	42	1	81	-0.062
3	Is committed to engaging learners in critical/creative thinking as a means to solve local/global issues (InTASC 5q)(Marzano 13)	49	32	1	82	0.195
4	Is committed to linking subject content to real life issue (InTASC 5,q, 5.s)(Marzano 2)	56	25	0	81	0.383
5	Values student exploration that encourages new discoveries/ meaning (InTASC 5.r, 5.s) (Danielson 3c)(Marzano 11)	46	33	3	82	0.122

Instructional Practice (InTASC Standards 6-8) Please rate the following items as "essential", "useful, but not essential", or "not necessary" for assessing professional dispositions of teacher candidates in a teacher preparation program.						
1	Takes responsibility for using student assessment data in teaching and learning (InTASC 6.r, 6.t, 6.v) (Danielson 3.d)	63	19	0	82	0.537
2	Commits to engaging learners in the assessment process* [*assessment process = choice of assessment, interpretation of assessment data, communication of assessment data] (InTASC 6.q, 6.s, 6.v) (Danielson 3d)(Marzano 14)	35	45	2	82	-0.146
3	Commits to making accommodations in testing/ assessments for all learners (InTASC 6.t, 6.u, 6.v) (Danielson 3d)	71	10	1	82	0.732
4	Takes responsibility for aligning assessment and instruction with learning goals/ standards (InTASC 6.r, 6.v) (Danielson 1c)(Marzano 14)	71	11	0	82	0.732
5	Is committed to organizing learning opportunities that will promote student growth (InTASC 7.n, 7.p, 4.r, 9.l)(Danielson 1a)(Marzano 3)	64	17	1	82	0.561
6	Demonstrates flexibility in planning for learner needs (InTASC 7.n, 7.p, 7.q, 8.p)(Danielson 3e)(Marzano 3)	69	13	0	82	0.683
7	Values collaborative planning (InTASC 7.o)	40	43	0	83	-0.036
8	Values the use of reciprocity to adapt instruction for learner needs (InTASC 8.p, 8.s) (Danielson 3a)(Marzano 11,12)	29	50	2	81	-0.284
9	Values the use of new/ emerging technologies that will promote student learning (InTASC 8.r, 8.q) (Danielson 1d)	43	37	2	82	0.049
Professional Responsibility (InTASC Standards 9-10) Please rate the following items as "essential", "useful, but not essential", or "not necessary" for assessing professional dispositions of teacher candidates in a teacher preparation program.						
1	Maintains a positive attitude in academic/ professional settings (InTASC 9.m, 9.n)(Danielson 4d)(Marzano 21)	71	11	0	82	0.732
2	Commits to professional appearance in dress and grooming (InTASC 9.o)(Marzano 21)	50	31	0	81	0.235
3	Commits to upholding the role of educator in all legal/ ethical ways* *honesty, integrity, fairness, confidentiality, FERPA, Code of Ethics (InTASC 9.o) (Danielson 4f)(Marzano 21)	80	3	0	83	0.928
4	Values appropriate interpersonal relationships in all settings (InTASC 3.n, 10.r, 9.o) (Danielson 4.f) (Marzano 23)	58	23	2	83	0.398
5	Is dependable: prepared, on time (InTASC 9.o) (Danielson 4f)(Marzano 21)	76	7	0	83	0.831
6	Values self-assessment reflective practice to overcome limitations and enhance strengths (InTASC 9.l, 9.m, 9.n, 10.t) (Danielson 4.a) (Marzano 22)	58	24	1	83	0.398
7	Initiates self-directed learning/ professional development (InTASC 9.l, 9.m, 9.n) (Danielson 4e) (Marzano 23)	40	43	0	83	-0.036
8	Is committed to life-long learning by disseminating up-to-date knowledge/ research in the field (InTASC 9.n, 10.p, 10.r, 10.s) (Danielson 4.e) (Marzano 1,22)	41	39	1	81	0.012
9	Shows initiative in creating opportunities for positive change with mutual benefit (InTASC 10.p, 10.r, 10.s, 10.t) (Danielson 4.e) (Marzano 23)	30	48	3	81	-0.259
10	Is approachable: nonthreatening, positive (InTASC 10.q, 10.r)(Marzano 23)	72	9	1	82	0.756
11	Receives/uses constructive feedback professionally (InTASC 10.t)(Danielson 4d)(Marzano 22)	77	6	0	83	0.855
12	Contributes professionally to the discussion between stakeholders regarding children's education (InTASC 10.p, 10.q, 10.r, 10.s) (Danielson 4.d) (Marzano 23)	41	39	3	83	-0.012
13	Advocates for the developmental/ academic needs of students during collaboration with stakeholders (InTASC 10.p, 10.q) (Danielson 4c, 4f)(Marzano 23)	47	33	3	83	0.133
14	Listens actively to stakeholders regarding children's education (InTASC 10.p, 10.q, 10.s) (Danielson 4c)(Marzano 23)	51	31	1	83	0.229

15	Communicates professionally through nonverbal means (body language, tone of voice) when working with stakeholders (InTASC 10.p, 10.q, 10.s)(Danielson 4c)(Marzano 23)	57	26	0	83	0.373
16	Communicates professionally through electronic means (email, social media, course mgmt. system) (InTASC 10.q, 10.r) (Danielson 4c)	62	21	0	83	0.494
17	Communicates professionally in oral language when working with stakeholders (InTASC 10.p, 10.q, 10.r, 10.s) (Danielson 4c)	67	16	0	83	0.614
18	Accepts responsibility for personal actions and behaviors (InTASC 9.l, 10.p) (Danielson 4f)	79	4	0	83	0.904