

Valley City State University
School of Education and Graduate Studies
Teacher Preparation Data Sharing and Discussion
August 11, 2016

Educator	School	Academic Area
Heather Anderson	VCSU	SEGS and Special Education
Dave Bass	VCSU	SEGS Faculty (*TE)
Kristi Brandt	Valley City High School	Principal (*TE)
Kelly Callahan	Valley City High School	Art 7-12
Cindy Creviston	Valley City High School	Special Education 7-12
Alvina Deyle	VCSU	Math for Elementary - SEGS
Kathleen Horner	Valley City High School	English 12 th
Kim Knodle	VCSU	SEGS – Director of Field Experiences (*TE)
Dan Larson	Valley City Junior High	Principal
Kathy Lentz	Washington Elementary	5 th grade
Chad Lueck	Washington Elementary	Principal (*TE)
John Letellier	VCSU	Music Education – (*TE)
Troy Miller	Jefferson Elementary	Principal
Sheri Okland	VCSU	Elementary Education Chair (*TE)
Misty Olds	Valley City High School	English 9 th -10 th
Alan Olson	VCSU	SEGS Faculty and Assessment (*TE)
Jackie Owen	VCSU	Elementary & Middle School Methods - SEGS
Natalie Potratz	Jefferson Elementary	3 rd grade
Robert Rohla	VCSU	Elementary Methods -SEGS
Jodi Shorma	VCSU	English Education (*TE)
Waylan Starr	Valley City High School	Social Studies – 10 th
Laurel Westby	VCSU	Elementary Methods - SEGS
Angela Williams	VCSU	Health and Physical Education Methods (*TE)
Tracey Zaun	Director of Sheyenne Valley Special Education	Special Education

(*TE) – member of the SEGS Teacher Education Committee

Review of action taken after feedback from the August 10, 2015 work session

A review and accountability updates were provided to communicate that August 2015 data sharing session comments were listened to and the teacher education program took action to make improvements in the following areas where data and discussions determined VCSU could work to improve teacher preparation.

- ***Differentiated Instruction (summary shared by Heather Anderson)***
- ***Gifted and talented (summary shared by Jackie Owen)***
- ***Workgroup for EDUC 450 assessment course revisions (summary shared by Al Olson)***
- ***English language learners (Joan Aus summary shared by Al Olson)***

These topics for improvement were brought forth through discussions held during the 2015 data workshop sessions and shared at School of Education faculty meetings in August and September of 2015. Data driven decisions were made to organize K-12/VCSU Teacher Education collaborative workgroups and develop strategies to improve teacher preparation of teacher candidates in these areas.

Feedback from the August 11, 2016 data sharing work session

A group of 12 K-12 educators and administrators partnered with 12 VCSU faculty members to combine their experiences and with data while engaging in small group discussions. (August 11, 2016)

Data reports shared:

Student Teacher Data – based on final evaluations of cooperating teachers

Exit Survey Data – gathered from student teachers just prior to graduation

Alumni Survey Data – collected from first-year teachers

Supervisor Survey Data – gathered from administrators of first-year graduates

Educators also received a copy of the new student teacher assessment instrument being developed and piloted by the North Dakota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (NDACTE). Representatives from VCSU, NDSU, UND, Mayville State, Minot State, Mary, and Fort Berthold have been working on a new student teacher final evaluation form that is more descriptive, meets teacher accreditation standards, and provides opportunities for teacher candidate self-assessment and growth. Feedback on the student teacher evaluation was encouraged as the form will be piloted again in the fall of 2016 and decisions made for improvement. The form would be used by most every, if not all, teacher education programs in the state of North Dakota beginning in the fall of 2017.

STUDENT TEACHER FINAL EVALUATION DATA

The data reviewed in this section involved **cooperating teacher final evaluations** of 794 student teacher placements. A student teacher may co-teach with more than one teacher and thus have more than one placement. The final evaluation instrument was created with input from K-12 cooperating teachers and field experience representatives from three universities. The instrument is a common metric administered by all three Valley Partnership institutions (VCSU, NDSU, and MSUM). The data were gathered between the fall semester of 2011 and the spring semester of 2016.

The educators present were positive in noting program strengths from experience and the data. The following comments relate to suggestions for improvement.

- Have pre-student teaching experience (EDUC 350 or EDUC 351) and student teacher experience with the same teacher. If the match is not working well during the pre-student teaching field experience, a change could be made before student teaching.
- Do more with finding compatibility between cooperating teachers and teacher candidates prior to accepting the placements. A brief personality survey taken by cooperating teachers and teacher candidates. Use a Match.com type programs considering teaching philosophy, personality traits, work habits, etc.
- Continue finding ways to help students with classroom management.

- The student teacher mean scores have been well above the proficient level and positive in even some of the lower rated areas, yet the overall trend for 2015-2016 was lower than the 2014-2015 final evaluation mean scores. The scores for 2014-2015 fit within the context of a 5-year average, but they were overall lower than the previous year.
- Putting knowledge of Bloom's Taxonomy into practice and asking students more higher level thinking questions to help the students develop critical thinking skills
- Teach college students to think outside the box with assessment
- Student teachers should be aware of the teacher evaluation model that the district is using
- Student teachers need to build relationships with students; it will help their classroom management
- A request was made for a disaggregated view of data for elementary and secondary student teachers (these data were presented to the K-12 educators at the session as well as the VCSU methods teachers for k-12, secondary, and elementary who were at the session)
- Intro students (at the secondary level) – is practicum with so many hours necessary? They are not removed from high school themselves. Perhaps restructure with more hands-on experiences.
- Teachers could benefit from UDL to help with differentiating instruction. This could also help with critical thinking/problem solving/engagement cast.org and udlcenter.org
- High ratings in areas such as commitment to the profession, fairness, safety, respect, belief that all students can learn
- Positive comments were shared by multiple educators about the student teacher final evaluation form being piloted in 2016-2017. Feedback was and is encouraged as the instrument will be put into practice in the fall of 2017.
- Goal-setting and self-assessment are important for student teachers
- If student teachers rated themselves compared to cooperating teachers, how close would the two be? (Right now the student teacher data and exit survey data provided VCSU with its best comparison. If student teachers were to officially more with self-assessment, the results could be available.)
- Does VCSU have a higher percentage of teachers staying in the profession compared to national rates? (Bush Grant data would lead a person to believe VCSU would do better than most schools' ratings in the area of teacher retention. The perception is "yes", but VCSU does not track its graduates for five years to compare with data shared by researchers. VCSU does extensive work to track and support its graduates as they start their careers in the teaching profession.)
- Can practicum teachers who are giving a test or providing reading time to students be permitted to arrange for his or her teacher candidate to work with another teacher who is doing something more "hands-on" or interactive during that time?
- Formative assessment and feedback are vital for student teachers, cooperating teachers need to provide honest feedback at four weeks and eight weeks to help guide the student teacher in the right direction
- Student teachers need more practice "working" with parents before and during student teaching.
- VCSU has done considerable work with Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) units and requiring teacher candidates to add depth to their planning. The planning requires teacher candidates to think more deeply about how they can differentiate instruction, assess student learning, and work with English language learners. The process encourages practice and focus in many of the areas where student teacher and first year teachers find most challenging.
- Is there a way to set up a subbing program with the Valley City public schools similar to one being implemented at NDSU?
- Classroom management: How can we better class management?
 - Clear expectations in the class.
 - Class rules, policies, etc.
 - Be consistent in expectations and follow-through.
 - Get to know the students! Get to know their interests and background, make connections and be compassionate.
- Standard 5: Applications of Content: Disconnect in Scaffolding, higher-order thinking
- Standard 6: Assessments: Do our students understand that their future students may test differently. There are many types/ways to assess. VCSU may need to improve this concept w/teacher candidates. MEAN 3.44
 - Another weakness: Critical thinking skills: how do we get our candidates to get their students to a "higher level of thinking and analysis?" Teach our students to EXPLORE.
 - Formulate Targeted areas: don't create 10 objectives- create 4-5 critical objectives/target. Build your assessments on those 4-5 critical areas!
 - Build assessments according to the WAY students learn: Oral presentation of information, written, computer based, projects, information maps, etc.

- SUGGESTION: Train our teacher candidates in UDL (how learners learn). CAST.org
- Positive comments related to new student teacher form included:
 - 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
 - structure 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 have the ability to make comments.

The data indicate many program strengths and the educators were highly supportive. Not all those positive comments are listed. VCSU asked the educators to identify areas to work on, so that is why the lists in this report include more areas for growth than acknowledgments of strengths. At the end of this segment, we would like to write a note about the positive nature and engaging atmosphere in the classroom. The small groups were excellent and thoughtful. The educators present were positive in noting program strengths from experience and the data. VCSU appreciates the input and partnership in improving teacher preparation.

EXIT SURVEY DATA

The data shared in this portion of the session were gathered from 545 teacher candidates between the spring semester of 2011 and the spring semester of 2016. The teacher candidates are surveyed within the final two weeks before their graduation. Response rates have ranged between 84% and 96% over the five years of administration. The survey instrument was a common metric utilized by all 14 Bush Grant institutions

The educators present were positive in noting program strengths from experience and the data. The following comments relate to suggestions for improvement.

- Continue finding ways to help students with classroom management.
- Technology integration (Smartboard experience prior to student teaching)
- Teaching students with special needs
- Mental health needs
- More coursework on mental health issues and practice in what a teacher can do
- Designing instruction for students with IEPs and 504s (important to know the IEP and 504 laws)
- Differentiated instruction
- Working with English language learners
- Designing and modifying assessments to accommodate students with diverse learning needs
- Working with gifted and talented students
- Emphasize getting to know students, build relationships
- A recommendation was made for teacher candidates to have experience in a special education classroom.
- Help students find quality resources and materials, UDL training was mentioned by multiple educators
- Student teachers need to do more with self-assessment and goal setting
- Incorporate subbing opportunities at VCSU similar to what is being done at NDSU with the Elementary program
- Provide more opportunities for using assessment data and feedback

An Exit Survey item that was shared at the work session: *545 student teachers have responded to this question on Exit Surveys. The results are positive for VCSU teacher education.*

Would you recommend your teacher education program to other prospective teachers?	Total	Percent
Definitely Yes	404	74.1%
Probably Yes	125	22.9%
Probably No	14	2.6%
Definitely No	2	0.4%
Total	545	

Feedback from the August 11, 2016 work session

1st YEAR TEACHER/*TRANSITION TO TEACHING* SURVEY DATA

(Completed by VCSU alumni in their 1st year of teaching)

The data reviewed in this section involved survey feedback from 39 first-year teachers during the 2011-2012 school year, 49 responses in 2013, and 85 responses in 2014. The 2015 response rate was 79% - the highest return rate so far – with 83 responses that were gathered. In 2016, 69/131 (52.7%) of the graduates responded. Not all 131 accepted full-time teaching positions and those graduates do not always complete the survey. The survey instrument was a common metric (titled *Transition to Teaching Survey*) used by all 14 Bush Grant institutions.

The educators present were positive in noting program strengths from experience and the data. The following comments relate to suggestions for improvement.

- This year's data and also data from the past couple of years have indicated that first year teachers have concerns about working parents. The suggestion involves more attention devoted to working with parents in both course and the student teaching experience.
- Long range planning
- Parent communication about student learning
- Teaching students about using self-assessment
- Classroom management appears more positive over the years, but teachers still struggle with their responses to student behavior
- Many correlations with previous data
- Improvements can be made in promoting higher order thinking (gifted and talented need higher level questions and opportunities)
- More variety and creativity in assessments and giving feedback quickly
- Learn more about teacher observation and assessment strategies before entering the profession
- Strengths in technology were noted, but comments were shared about how technology must continue to improve
- Students should have more practice with modifying lessons for ELL, IEP/504 learners, gifted/talented
- Clearly communicating expectations for behavior has a strong mean score, but the percentages for responding to student behavior are quite a bit lower.
- As other surveys have shown, working with students with special needs have lower percentages of agree. Teaching to the "middle" appears to not be a problem, but learning to teach to the needs of all students takes more practice.
- Designing instruction for English language learners
- Gifted and talented
- Using assessment data to diagnose gaps in students' knowledge and skills

SUPERVISOR SURVEY DATA

(Completed by employers/administrators who supervise 1st year teachers)

The data reviewed in this section involved survey feedback from 20 administrators of first-year teachers (VCSU alumni) during the 2011-2012 school year. The numbers dropped to 11 administrators in 2013 and then improved to 27 responses in 2014, and then 60 responses in 2015. (Again, nice improvement has been made in gathering more responses.) In 2016, VCSU did its best work at narrowing down the number of full-time teachers before sending the surveys and 48 of 64 (75%) of the supervisors responded. The survey instrument was a common metric (titled *Supervisor Survey*) used by all 14 Bush Grant institutions.

- The work session time was running short, so the group didn't get to spend as much time with the data from supervisors. The data are favorable. In some categories the supervisors rate the first year teachers higher than the first year teachers

rated themselves. The areas of Learning Differences related to InTASC Standard 2 were specifically noted. While the trends in the data are similar to other surveys, the Supervisor Survey percentages of “Agree” and “Tend to Agree” are as favorable or at times more favorable as a whole than the 1st year teacher survey results.

- The supervisor survey data was not as critical about the preparation of teachers in issues related to InTASC Standard 2 Learning Differences such as working with English language learners, mental health issues, 504 and IEPs as the VCSU student teachers and alumni indicated.
- Teachers could do more to engage students in their own learning.
- Teachers need more ideas for working with gifted and talented students

Another idea shared involved the development of a Science for Elementary Teachers course. Presently, Elementary Education majors complete three science courses in the science department, outside the Teacher Education program, and one Science for Elementary Teachers methods course taught by instructors with a background in teaching elementary science. The three science courses include a course in Biology, Geology, and a Chemistry or Physics. The idea has been suggested by a teacher who has seen candidates with gaps in their science content knowledge, “The candidates lack the confidence and enthusiastic attitude towards science.” The course would be taught in a hands-on format and would include basics in physical, earth, and life science. *VCSU will be incorporating a new STEM course that the state of North Dakota will accept as a science in the Chemistry/Physics area beginning in the spring of 2017.*

These topics will be shared at School of Education faculty meetings in August and September. Decisions will be made about which topics should be areas of emphasis for the upcoming school year. VCSU will then decide which items the unit can integrate curricular changes on its own and which items would best be improved by involving K-12/VCSU Teacher Education collaborative workgroups.

VCSU School of Education and Graduate Studies (SEGS)

Schools/District represented on August 11, 2016:

Valley City Public Schools (Jefferson, Washington, and Valley City High School)

Valley City State University

Sheyenne Valley Special Education

Representatives from many other districts were invited. Some had inservices scheduled or other conflicts. A suggestion was made to try and host this event earlier in the summer, perhaps June in 2017.

Participants:

Elementary – 2

Middle School – 1

Secondary – 3

Special Education – 2

Administration – 4

Total K-12 Educators attending = 12

Valley City State University

Secondary Education Methods Teachers - 1

K-12 Education Methods – 2

Early Childhood Methods - 1

Elementary Education/Middle School Methods Teacher – 2

School of Education – Professional Education Sequence Teachers – 3

Special Education Coordinator – 1

Director of Field Experiences - 1

Elementary Education Chair – 1

Total VCSU Educators attending = 12

Additional stakeholder comments:

- 38% of the participants are parents who have had at least one child attend VCSU
- 45% are VCSU alumni for at least one of their degrees

VCSU School of Education and Graduate Studies

Topic: Teacher Preparation Data Assessment Sharing and Discussion
Date: August 11, 2016
Time: 8:45 a.m. - 12:15 p.m. (working lunch as part of closing discussion)
Stipend: \$100 to invited participants
Location: VCSU, McCarthy 257 (located east of the VCSU clock tower)
Parking: *The best parking options will be by the walk bridge across from the Science building (driving via Main Street to 3rd Ave SE to College Drive) or by arriving on Viking Drive and parking on the west side of the Student Center (expect a half-block or one-block walk to McFarland 257)*

Goal: To combine VCSU data with feedback from K-12 educators to open communication, gather ideas for decision-making and improvements of teacher preparation at VCSU.

Data reports that will be shared include:

Student Teacher Data – based on final evaluations of cooperating teachers
Exit Survey Data – gathered from student teachers just prior to graduation
Alumni Survey Data – collected from first-year teachers
Supervisor Survey Data – gathered from administrators of first-year graduates
Also shared information related to technology data and an update on the new student teacher final evaluation.

Basic schedule for the session:

8:45-9:00 Paperwork for stipend (Coffee, Diet Soda, Bottled Water, and Banana Bread available)
9:00-9:30 Welcome and a brief overview:

- Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT) Common Metrics efforts through the Bush Foundation
- North Dakota Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (NDACTE) Common Metric efforts in ND
- Student Teacher Evaluation Form and Pilot (NDACTE and CAEP)
- School of Education will share its most recent data driven decisions for change to provide a pulse of what is currently happening at VCSU.
- **Outcomes from last year's data sharing session - summary of 2015-2016 Work Group Efforts**

9:30- 9:35 Move to first group
9:35-10:05 Student Teacher Data (final evaluations completed by K-12 cooperating teachers)
10:05-10:10 *Time for writing and transition to second set of groups*
10:10-10:40 Exit Survey Data (completed by graduating student teachers)
10:40-10:45 *Time for writing and transition*
10:45-11:20 First Year Teacher Survey Data (1st year graduates surveyed about their preparation and readiness as they transition to teaching)
(write additional thoughts at the end of sessions or during the wrap up time from 11:55-12:15)
11:20-11:40 Supervisor Survey Data (employers/administrators of 1st year graduates surveyed about the teachers' preparation and readiness)
11:40-11:55 Working lunch: getting food and continued discussion
11:55-12:15 Wrap up discussion through large group sharing and summary.
VCSU wants to invite continued discussion for improvement.
(We welcome quick breaks during small group discussion time as needed.)
Al Olson will gather the feedback received and share the information with everyone who attended. The School of Education will use its data and the feedback provided to help make informed decisions for program improvement.

During each session, the format will be:

- 1: Data presented will be explained so the context is clear. (2 min – brief explanation so discussion time can be maximized.)
- 2: Small groups of educators will review the data and share discussion. VCSU wants to combine data with the experiences of educators.
- 3: Data will be presented in hard copy form and gathered at the end of the meeting. *Based on data and your experiences, what areas do you see as **strengths, potential concerns, and ideas for improvement of teacher preparation?***

The data assessment instruments are aligned with the national recognized Interstate Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standards

The Learner and Learning

Standard #1: Learner Development. The teacher understands how children learn and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

Standard #2: Learning Differences. The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that allow each learner to meet high standards.

Standard #3: Learning Environments. The teacher works with learners to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Content

Standard #4: Content Knowledge. The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.

Standard #5: Applications of Content. The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical/creative thinking and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.

Instructional Practice

Standard #6: Assessment. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teachers' and learner's decision making.

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

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

Professional Responsibility

Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice. The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, and other professionals, and the learning community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.

Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration. The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.