



Evidence Item: 63 Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) Unit Data

CAEP Standard: 3

Component: 3.2

Location for the Evidence: 3.2.17

The Purpose for the Evidence: This evidence item displays TLC Unit Data since the incorporation of the improved rubrics. Evidence 37 provides the historic background of the capstone project and rubrics as well as data and analysis for improvement over time.

Administrative Comments:

Page 2 displays the EPP's TLC unit data, disaggregated by program, between the Fall of 2017 and the Spring of 2021.

Page 3 provides the analysis, action, and areas of improvement.

Page 4 provide data from the Fall of 2021.

Page 5 provides examples of TLC unit performance disaggregated by race/ethnicity.

Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) Unit Data Fall 2017 – Spring 2021

Data are disaggregated by program for this report

Mean Score for Each Rubric Item	Art N=3	Business N=22	Elementary N=214	English N=29	Health N=17	Physical Education N=21	Math N=8	Music N=7	Social Science N=22	Science N=7	Technology Education N=7	Overall N=357
Rubric 1: Planning for Understanding of Content (InTASC 4 and 7; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.3, 5.4)	3.50	3.30	3.40	3.55	2.79	3.02	2.94	3.57	3.09	2.93	3.57	3.08
Rubric 2: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning (InTASC 1, CAEP 1.1)	3.50	3.27	3.37	3.53	2.76	2.83	2.75	3.14	2.84	2.79	3.57	3.03
Rubric 3: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support to Student Learning (InTASC 6 and 7, CAEP 2.3)	3.33	3.23	3.38	3.53	3.00	3.00	2.88	3.07	2.38	2.86	3.36	3.05
Rubric 4: Planning for Language Development (InTASC 7, CAEP 1.4)	3.50	3.23	3.23	3.53	2.91	3.02	2.44	3.43	2.48	2.79	3.50	2.96
Rubric 5: Scaffolding Language (InTASC 8, CAEP 1.4)	3.50	3.23	3.25	3.60	2.85	3.00	2.44	3.21	2.25	2.71	3.43	2.97
Rubric 6: Classroom Management (InTASC 3 and 8, CAEP 1.4)	3.50	3.14	3.15	3.64	3.09	3.10	2.44	3.07	2.67	2.64	3.43	2.92
Rubric 7: Engagement in Standards Based Instruction (InTASC 5 and 8, CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.4)	3.25	3.14	3.20	3.59	3.09	2.95	2.63	3.07	2.17	2.79	3.36	2.94
Rubric 8: Assessment and Analysis of Student Work (InTASC 6, CAEP 1.1, 1.4, 2.3)	3.50	3.14	3.15	3.53	2.91	2.79	2.50	3.57	2.06	2.79	3.36	2.89
Rubric 9: Using Assessment and Feedback to Inform Instruction and Guide Student Learning (InTASC 6, CAEP 1.1, 2.3)	3.50	3.09	3.28	3.59	3.06	3.00	2.44	3.36	2.23	2.79	3.50	2.99
Rubric 10: Analyzing Teacher Effectiveness (InTASC 6 and 9, CAEP 1.2, 5.4)	3.00	3.09	3.12	3.48	3.03	3.02	2.38	3.21	2.74	2.93	3.29	2.87
Overall	3.41	3.18	3.25	3.56	2.95	2.97	2.58	3.27	2.53	2.80	3.44	2.97

The data below displays the count and percentages for each rating.

	Art N=3	Business N=22	Elementary N=214	English N=29	Health N=17	Physical Education N=21	Math N=8	Music N=7	Social Science N=22	Science N=7	Technology Education N=7	Overall N=357
Ratings of a 4 Distinguished	22.2%	15.5%	32.1%	44.8%	9.4%	12.4%	0.8%	25.7%	7.7%	1.4%	11.4%	26.3%
Ratings of a 3.5	37.0%	10.0%	20.1%	26.2%	17.1%	14.8%	10.8%	17.1%	14.0%	21.4%	64.3%	20.0%
Ratings of a 3 Proficient	40.7%	70.5%	29.3%	26.2%	37.6%	42.9%	26.2%	48.6%	27.1%	48.6%	24.3%	33.5%
Ratings of a 2.5	0.0%	4.1%	7.1%	1.4%	25.9%	15.7%	34.6%	2.9%	13.1%	2.9%	0.0%	8.4%
Ratings of a 2 Emerging	0.0%	0.0%	9.3%	1.4%	10.0%	13.8%	22.3%	5.7%	16.3%	15.7%	0.0%	8.9%
Ratings of a 1.5	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	4.6%	0.0%	8.6%	10.0%	0.0%	1.4%
Ratings of 1 Underdeveloped	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	13.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%
Percent 3 or higher	95.9%	95.9%	81.4%	97.2%	64.1%	70.0%	37.7%	91.4%	48.9%	71.4%	100.0%	79.8%
Total Ratings (*10 per candidate)	*27	220	2140	290	170	210	130	70	*221	70	70	*3568

*Due to COVID circumstances, some teacher candidates had less than 10 ratings in some semesters.

Analysis of TLC data:

<p>Overall strengths of the student work</p>	<p>The TLC unit is a rigorous capstone project that requires teacher candidates to apply their learning from every education and methods course in the major. Teacher candidates present their TLC units during finals week prior to graduation. Most of the TLC work has been assessed as proficient (79.8% after the Spring of 2021 and 80.9% after the Fall of 2022) and some teacher candidates are producing work that exceeds expectations. The learning outcome assessment process involved in completing the TLC unit serves as a reminder of the tremendous teaching and learning efforts of the VCSU teacher candidates and faculty. The outcome measures demonstrate that teacher candidates are able to apply what they have learned in the program.</p>
<p>Overall concerns with the student work</p>	<p>The lowest rated TLC scores after the revision of the rubrics in 2018 involved the Analyzing Teacher Effectiveness reflections (2.58), Assessment and Analysis of Teacher Work (2.65), Using Feedback to Guide Student Learning (2.78), and the Classroom Management videos (2.88). Faculty decided to increase their emphasis in these areas and improvements have been made over the past three years.</p> <p>A 2018-2019 weakness was discovered to be in planning language development. This concern was addressed, and improvement was shown in 2019-2020. The planning section has also displayed lower ratings at times. The expectations for the planning portion and expectations in the rubric descriptors are demanding. Teacher candidates are vastly improved at aligning standards and learning targets with their assessments compared to the early years of the TLC units. Changes in the EDUC 450 assessment course have been helpful for teacher candidates to gain more experience prior to student teaching.</p> <p>Faculty commented that the reflective analysis needed to be stronger. Faculty discussed how the candidates communicated more thoroughly in person than when the candidates wrote out the details of their analysis and reflections on the effectiveness of their teaching. Faculty felt the candidates needed reminders to finish their work strong at the end of the experience. The assessment coordinator agreed to share those reminders in EDUC 491 Senior Portfolio and in email messages to all the student teachers as teacher candidates were nearing the completion of their work. The 2019-2020 ratings and the 2020-2021 ratings were progressively higher.</p>
<p>How are the assessment data being used to make changes for the future?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The EPP's data informed decision to add an extra credit to EDUC 240 Educating Exceptional Students is a likely factor in the improvement of differentiation for instruction lesson plans. 2. A greater emphasis is being placed on self-assessment resources for teacher candidates. 3. The EPP has been encouraged to see the improvement in the depth of reflection. Candidates were reminded multiple times to finish strong and not let up in their final reflections. The 2019-2020 ratings and the 2020-2021 ratings had more depth than 2017-2018 reflections. 4. The overall mean score totals have been improved and the percentage of teacher candidates earning a rating of 3 (proficient level) or higher has climbed over 80%. 5. The curriculum and senior capstone instruction changes to address these lowest rated 2018 TLC scores have improved the Analyzing Teacher Effectiveness reflections (from 2.58 in 2018 to 2.85 after the Fall of 2021), Assessment and Analysis of Teacher Work (from 2.65 in 2018 to 2.89 in 2021), Using Feedback to Guide Student Learning (from 2.78 in 2018 to 2.99 in 2021), and the Classroom Management videos (from 2.88 in 2018 to 2.92 in 2021). The improvement is good and there is more room for growth. <p>The TLC assessment day has been extremely beneficial. The faculty time of sharing during the process of assessment can help faculty learn more about the TLC units and the challenges for teacher candidates. The experience in the process and the data help faculty members who teach professional education sequence courses and methods instructors gain insight into ways to better prepare teacher candidates. The assessment coordinator will continue to do more with the teacher candidates to practice with the rubrics and encourage self-assessment. Faculty want teacher candidates to help gain a deeper level of understanding for the expectations and be more effective at writing up the work they do so they can communicate their reflective thoughts more thoroughly.</p>

Fall 2021 Comments and Data Disaggregated by Major

Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) Unit Data Fall 2017 – Fall 2021

Mean Score for Each Rubric Item	Art N=4	Business N=22	Elementary N=253	English N=31	Health N=17	Physical Education N=21	Math N=8	Music N=7	Social Science N=29	Science N=7	Technology Education N=10	Overall N=409
Rubric 1: Planning for Understanding of Content (InTASC 4 and 7; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.3, 5.4)	3.50	3.30	3.45	3.55	2.79	3.02	2.94	3.57	3.09	2.93	3.45	3.09
Rubric 2: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning (InTASC 1, CAEP 1.1)	3.50	3.27	3.38	3.53	2.76	2.83	2.75	3.14	2.84	2.79	3.40	3.02
Rubric 3: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support to Student Learning (InTASC 6 and 7, CAEP 2.3)	3.50	3.23	3.41	3.50	3.00	3.00	2.88	3.07	2.40	2.86	3.35	3.05
Rubric 4: Planning for Language Development (InTASC 7, CAEP 1.4)	3.50	3.23	3.28	3.53	2.91	3.02	2.44	3.43	2.50	2.79	3.35	2.97
Rubric 5: Scaffolding Language (InTASC 8, CAEP 1.4)	3.67	3.23	3.28	3.58	2.85	3.00	2.44	3.21	2.23	2.71	3.20	2.96
Rubric 6: Classroom Management (InTASC 3 and 8, CAEP 1.4)	3.67	3.14	3.19	3.63	3.09	3.10	2.44	3.07	2.69	2.64	3.35	2.92
Rubric 7: Engagement in Standards Based Instruction (InTASC 5 and 8, CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.4)	3.33	3.14	3.23	3.58	3.09	2.95	2.63	3.07	2.23	2.79	3.30	2.93
Rubric 8: Assessment and Analysis of Student Work (InTASC 6, CAEP 1.1, 1.4, 2.3)	3.63	3.14	3.20	3.50	2.91	2.79	2.50	3.57	2.06	2.79	3.20	2.90
Rubric 9: Using Assessment and Feedback to Inform Instruction and Guide Student Learning (InTASC 6, CAEP 1.1, 2.3)	3.63	3.09	3.32	3.56	3.06	3.00	2.44	3.36	2.24	2.79	3.40	2.99
Rubric 10: Analyzing Teacher Effectiveness (InTASC 6 and 9, CAEP 1.2, 5.4)	3.00	3.09	3.14	3.39	3.03	3.02	2.38	3.21	2.75	2.93	3.20	2.85
Overall	3.49	3.18	3.29	3.54	2.95	2.97	2.58	3.27	2.54	2.80	3.32	2.97

The data below displays the count and percentages for each rating.

	Art N=4	Business N=22	Elementary N=253	English N=31	Health N=17	Physical Education N=21	Math N=8	Music N=7	Social Science N=29	Science N=7	Technology Education N=10	Overall N=409
Ratings of a 4 Distinguished	29.7%	15.5%	33.5%	42.9%	9.4%	12.4%	0.8%	25.7%	7.4%	1.4%	8.0%	27.6%
Ratings of a 3.5	37.8%	10.0%	21.3%	26.5%	17.1%	14.8%	10.8%	17.1%	13.4%	21.4%	51.0%	20.7%
Ratings of a 3 Proficient	32.4%	70.5%	28.1%	27.4%	37.6%	42.9%	26.2%	48.6%	29.4%	48.6%	38.0%	32.7%
Ratings of a 2.5	0.0%	4.1%	6.4%	1.3%	25.9%	15.7%	34.6%	2.9%	13.0%	2.9%	3.0%	7.8%
Ratings of a 2 Emerging	0.0%	0.0%	8.7%	1.9%	10.0%	13.8%	22.3%	5.7%	15.6%	15.7%	0.0%	8.5%
Ratings of a 1.5	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	4.6%	0.0%	8.2%	10.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Ratings of 1 Underdeveloped	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	13.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
Percent 3 or higher	100%	95.9%	82.9%	96.8%	64.1%	70.0%	37.7%	91.4%	50.2%	71.4%	97.0%	80.9%
Total Ratings (*10 per candidate)	*37	220	2530	310	170	210	80	70	*231	70	100	*4028

*Due to COVID circumstances, some teacher candidates had less than 10 ratings in some semesters.

Elementary Education had a total of 39 teacher candidates complete TLC units in the Fall of 2021 and the ratings for each of the 10 rubric areas either stayed the same or increased. Art had one teacher candidate whose ratings were the same or higher than than previous mean score ratings for Art majors.

The majority of the majors have three or fewer teacher candidates per semester and the ratings for the Fall of 2021 displayed mild variations in specific areas that were only slightly higher or lower than previous mean scores. The similarities in the ratings are encouraging for the reliability of the process, but there was not one area of TLC unit data from the Fall of 2021 that raised a red flag for immediate improvement. The “N” indicate that some majors are best suited to look at the data over longer periods of time rather than simply looking at one cycle to inform decision for improvement.

Disaggregation by race/ethnicity

One of the strongest TLC units completed among the 2020-2021 secondary majors was taught by a “non-white” teacher candidate. Two of the ten best TLC units among the elementary majors in 2020-2021 were taught and written up by “non-white” teacher candidates.

There were three teacher candidates who completed their TLC that were “non-white” in the Fall of 2021. One candidate self-selected her race/ethnicity options as Black or African American, another as Hispanic, another Asian, and a fourth teacher candidate as two or more races. All four teacher candidates were Elementary Education majors who student taught in urban school settings in North Dakota or the Twin Cities area in Minnesota.

All four teacher candidates excelled with individual TLC unit ratings higher than the mean score for the group of 39 Elementary Education majors as a whole.

All four teacher candidates received ratings from their cooperating teachers in urban settings that ranged from proficient (3) to distinguished (4) in each area of the 10 InTASC standards.

The TLC unit data and student teaching data continue to demonstrate that teacher candidates of color are doing very well.

Evidence 48 displays additional demographic assessment data.