

Valley City State University
School of Education and Graduate Studies
Teacher Preparation Data Sharing and Discussion
August 9, 2017

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
Cheri Anderson	Valley City Public Schools	Art K-6
Cindy Creviston	Valley City High School	Special Education 7-12
Josh Johnson	Valley City Public Schools	Superintendent
Chris Bastian	Casselton Public Schools	Elementary Principal
Kathleen Horner	Valley City High School	English 12 th
Kristi Shanenko	Valley City High School	English 8 th and 11 th (*TE)
Misty Hokana	Valley City High School	English 9 th and 11 th
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
Jill Kvilvang	Jefferson Elementary	2 nd grade
Alan Olson	VCSU	SEGS Faculty and Assessment (*TE)
Joan Klein	VCSU	SEGS Faculty – Field Experience
Tina Bryn	Barnes County North	5 th grade
David Hanson	VCSU	SEGS Faculty – Field Experience
Natalie Potratz	Jefferson Elementary	3 rd grade
Karen Aaskerooth	Jefferson Elementary	K-3 Music
Robert Rohla	VCSU	Elementary Methods -SEGS
Kim Knodle	VCSU	Director of Student Teaching (*TE)
Waylan Starr	Valley City High School	Social Studies – 10 th
Laurel Westby	VCSU	SEGS Faculty - Kindergarten
Kathleen Bennett-Zaun	VCSU	SEGS Faculty – Place and Support
Angela Williams	VCSU	Health and Physical Education Methods (*TE)
Jessica Sanden	Washington Elementary	Elementary Library Media

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

Feedback from the data session are found on pages six and seven of this document.

Summary of the August 9, 2017 data sharing work session

A group of 19 K-12 educators and administrators partnered with 11 VCSU faculty members to combine their experiences and with data while engaging in small group discussions. (August 9, 2017)

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

Summaries were provided to highlight some of the highest and lowest rated areas in each of the four data reports. The educators changed groups four times to invite shared discussions with a variety of colleagues.

Educators also received a copy of the new student teacher assessment developed, piloted, and validated by the North Dakota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (NDACTE). Representatives from VCSU, NDSU, UND, Mayville State, Minot State, Mary, and Turtle Mountain Community College collaboratively. The student teaching form will be used by the majority of 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 included **cooperating teacher final evaluations** of 920 student teacher placements over a six-year time frame. 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 2017.

Cooperating teacher ratings of student teachers over a six-year time span yield a mean score of 3.54 on a four-point scale. The mean score represents a solid value between the proficient (3) and distinguished (4) level ratings. The data set includes the scales used for the ratings, the six-year totals (*N=920 student teacher placements between Fall 2011-Spring 2017*), the trends for ratings over time, and the proficiency ratings.

Highest aggregate ratings from cooperating teachers	Lowest aggregate ratings from cooperating teachers
Demonstrates commitment to the profession 3.74	Engages students in higher level thinking skills 3.41
Seeks and accepts feedback to improve 3.71	Manages classroom activity and behavior effectively 3.43
Exhibits fairness and the belief that all students can learn 3.71	Uses a variety of assessments 3.43

Student Teacher Final Evaluations: 4-point rating scale utilized by cooperating teachers:

(4) Distinguished: The teacher candidate has exceptional knowledge and ability to perform this task without guidance.

(3) Proficient: The teacher candidate has the knowledge and ability to perform this task with limited or no guidance.

(2) Emerging: The teacher candidate has basic knowledge of this concept, and would need guidance to complete the task.

(1) Undeveloped: The teacher candidate lacks basic knowledge of this concept and would need significant guidance to perform this task.

EXIT SURVEY DATA

The data shared in this portion of the session were gathered from over 650 teacher candidates between the spring semester of 2011 and the spring semester of 2017. The teacher candidates are surveyed within the final two weeks before their graduation. Response rates have ranged between 84% and 96% over the six years of administration. The survey instrument was a common metric utilized by all 14 Bush Grant institutions. The North Dakota teacher education institutions now have access to using the same common metrics instruments used by the Bush Grant institutions.

The overall satisfaction ratings from student teachers exiting the VCSU program is high. Over 97% would “definitely” or “probably” recommend the VCSU teacher education program to other prospective teachers.

Fall 2015-Spring 2016 Student Teachers – Exit Survey Results	VCSU mean score
Assessment Item	Count / Percent
Definitely yes	84 / 77.8%
Probably yes	21 / 19.4%
Probably no	3 / 2.8%
Definitely no	0 / 0.0%

VCSU student teachers have been fortunate to work with many excellent cooperating teachers and partner schools; over 97% of the student teachers were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with their placement site. The data shared about student satisfaction reflect positively on VCSU, the School of Education, and the student teacher’s partnering school.

VCSU Exit Survey data indicated many areas of strength. The student teachers were asked to respond using the following prompt: **“To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?”**

Some of the highest rated areas included:

- Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind
- Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected
- Design instruction and learning tasks that connect core content to real-life experiences for students
- Effectively teach the subject matter in my licensure area.

Multi-year comparison of VCSU responses for the Exit Survey: To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

Exit Survey Data	2015-2016			2014-2015			2013-2014			2012-2013		
	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
Effectively teach the subject matter in my licensure area.	107	3.70	0.52	103	3.65	0.48	118	3.64	0.498	113	3.60	0.606

Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree

Student teachers exiting the program marked some of their lowest ratings in the area of InTASC Standard 2 Learner Differences.

- Design instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans
- Design instruction for students with mental health needs
- Design instruction for gifted and talented students
- Design instruction for English language learners

The data indicate an upward trend over the past two years, but progress needs to continue to be made.

Exiting student teachers were asked to respond using the following prompt: **“To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?”**

Assessment Item	“Agree” ratings after 2011-2017 compared to 2011-2015
Design instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans	Up to 33.3% after 2017 compared to 30.9% after 2015
Design instruction for students with mental health needs	Up to 28.9% after 2017 compared to 28.3% after 2015
Design instruction for gifted and talented students	Up to 36.4% after 2017 compared to 35.2% after 2015
Design instruction for English language learners	Up to 34.3% after 2017 compared to 33.2% after 2015

“Agree” is the most favorable choice and “Tend to Agree” is the second highest option. The combination of “Agree” and “Tend to Agree” bring the totals for these items to 70-79% favorable, with the remainder of the responses falling largely in the “Tend to Disagree” rating.

These areas of learner differences are challenging for teachers and teacher preparation programs. The table below compares VCSU mean score ratings with aggregate mean score ratings from the 14 ¹NExT institutions and a ²North Dakota aggregate.

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 over 270 first year teachers. The survey instrument was a common metric (titled *Transition to Teaching Survey*) used by all 14 Bush Grant institutions.

Data gathered from first-year teachers indicated many areas of strength. The student teachers were asked to respond using the following prompt: **“To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?”**

Some highly rated areas included:

- Develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement
- Help students work cooperatively to achieve learning goals
- Create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected
- Design instruction and learning tasks that connect core content to real-life experiences for students

First-year teachers were asked to respond using the following prompt: **“To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?”**

<i>First-year teachers, Fall 2015- Spring 2016 graduates, surveyed in the spring of 2017</i>	VCSU mean score
Assessment Item	N = 50
Design instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans	3.12
Design instruction for students with mental health needs	3.00
Design instruction for gifted and talented students	3.16
Design instruction for English language learners	3.04

Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree

SUPERVISOR SURVEY DATA

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

Data gathered from employers of first-year teachers indicated many areas of strength. The supervisors were asked to respond using the following prompt: **“To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher does the following?”**

Some highly rated areas include:

- Creates a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected
- Effectively organizes the physical environment of the classroom for instruction
- Upholds legal responsibilities as a professional educator and student advocate
- Uses developmentally appropriate practices to support student learning

First-year teachers were asked to respond using the following prompt: **“To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?”**

<i>Supervisors of first-year teachers surveyed in the spring of 2017</i>	VCSU mean score
Assessment Item	N = 45
Design instruction for students with IEPs and 504 plans	3.51
Design instruction for students with mental health needs	3.48
Design instruction for gifted and talented students	3.23
Design instruction for English language learners	3.43

Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree

An example of an item comparison across surveys: Effectively teach the subject matter in my licensure area

Assessment Item (source sharing their perspective)	VCSU mean score
Effectively teach the subject matter in my licensure area comparison across assessments: (Exit Survey: student teachers)	3.70
Effectively teach the subject matter in my licensure area comparison across assessments: (TTS Survey: 1st year teachers)	3.71
Effectively teach the subject matter in my licensure area comparison across assessments: (SS Survey: principals)	3.81

Scale: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Tend to Disagree; 3 = Tend to Agree; 4 = Agree

VCSU School of Education and Graduate Studies (SEGS) Data Sharing

Schools/District represented on August 9, 2017:

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

Valley City State University

Sheyenne Valley Special Education

Central Cass Public Schools

Barnes County North Schools

Participants:

Elementary – 5

Middle School – 1

Secondary – 3

K-12 Music/Art - 3

Special Education – 1

Administration – 6

Total K-12 Educators attending = 19

Valley City State University

K-12 Education Methods – 2

Early Childhood Methods - 1

Elementary Education/Middle School Methods Teacher – 2

School of Education – Professional Education Sequence Teachers – 4

Special Education Coordinator – 1

Director of Field Experiences - 1

Total VCSU Educators attending = 11

Feedback from the August 9, 2017 data sharing session

The feedback will be shared during School of Education faculty meetings during Welcome Week in August. 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.

Ideas for collaborative workgroup:

- 1) The development of a student teacher "Toolkit" and a cooperating teacher checklist for activities and opportunities for a teacher candidate to experience. (assessments, observation instruments, special education, IEP/504, parent-teacher conferences, MTSS, project based learning, activity passes, relationship building time with students) – The checklist with tools concept was mentioned several times.
- 2) A workgroup will be happening this year related to differentiated instruction. (Heather Anderson has a group started)

Themes and topics that were gathered from the August 9, 2017 data sharing session:

Higher Level Thinking and Skills

TC need to engage students in higher level thinking. More real-life projects. More group problem solving, collaborative, or community projects.

Program could emphasize "curiosity, initiative, and the pursuit of knowledge". TCs need "ownership" – the program can't do everything for them.

Curriculum

Teacher candidates (TC) need to be prepared for project-based learning and more community orientated activities.

- RTI could be a separate course. Teacher candidates should be part of an RTI team during student teaching.
- RTI
- More multicultural experiences. (mentioned twice)
- More special needs preparation. (forms, accommodations) – mentioned twice
- TransMath
- Trauma awareness
- Behavior management (course or more time in curriculum)
- Lack of knowledge at interviews
- Universal Design for Learning
- Differentiated instruction strategies
- Liked classes where TCs were expected to come up with multiple ways to teach.

Mental Health Comments

- TC need more class time and training related to mental health.
- TC need to learn more about mental health issues, whether that comes from psychology courses or education courses – the more background they have the better.
- Class focused on mental health
- More mental health training (mentioned multiple times)

Field Experience Comments

Cooperating teachers need to involve TC in IEPs and 504 plans when possible. (Mentioned three times)

University Supervisors can ask the teacher candidate questions such as, "What accommodations are you making for students on IEP or 504 plans?"

TC should spend time with special education units. Perhaps early in student teaching experiences rather than later in the experience. (Mentioned twice)

TC could use more field experience time throughout their college experience to see as many challenges that teachers face as possible.

TC need to learn more about special education during field experiences.

TC could meet with special education teachers in the school early in the student teaching experience, the connection could be helpful in working with students.

TC should get a “taste” of teaching early in the program to see how well they like it.

Cooperating teachers need to model best practice and share ideas for accommodations.

TC need to be involved in assessing students more than just during the TLC unit.

TC need to take time to get to know students. Relationship building, icebreakers, activities with cooperating teacher and student teacher. (time for relationship building was mentioned several times)

Mentoring should continue beyond the first year of teaching. (VCSU offers support to alumni through the first three years of teaching.)

TCs have a diversity practicum, can experiencing an ELL classroom be required?

A concern was expressed about the length of K-12 student teaching experiences. When TCs split time between high school and grade school levels, it is difficult to spend much time at all the grade levels.

Library science could have more practicum or observation hours.

TCs can feel “on display” and feel they need to “show what they know” not what students can do.

Writing Comments

Written communication could be better. Where do the changes for proper conventions and paragraph structure occur?

Where do TCs become more effective at communicating clear, concise thoughts? Programs need to teach writing across the curriculum. TC need to write well and should practice writing on the board.

Classroom Management Comments

Cooperating teachers can make it look easy, but it is not easy to teach AND manage.

Cooperating teachers need to provide opportunities for TCs to participate in ice breakers or other activities to build relationships. The time spent building relationships may help with classroom management.

Behavior management can be very difficult and looks different than a regular classroom.

Observe other teachers, perhaps a teacher with great classroom management skills, early in the student teaching experience with a specific purpose.

Data Comments

“Distinguished” – or any rating on a rubric should be attainable. Cooperating teachers and university supervisors should have this reinforced.

- The overall student satisfaction ratings are high.
- Accepting feedback is rated high, that is positive.
- TC need to use a variety of assessments to help students learn and to measure learning.
- Accepting feedback is high in standard ten.
- Exhibits fairness and belief that all students can learn is high.
- The data indicate a positive rating trend in areas such as working with ELL or gifted and talented students, or mental health concerns or IEPs and 504 plans.
- Managing classrooms, engaging students in higher level thinking skills, using a variety of assessments, and using assessment data to inform planning for instruction are rated in the 3.41 to 3.43 area and lower than the mean for student teachers.

Ethics is rated well in the VCSU data, but ethics are a concern in the profession. One participant shared a resource about North Dakota’s Educator Ethics Program.

Most data specific questions were addressed directly during the session. The data sharing participations had a summary as well as access to full data reports from student teachers and surveys of student teachers, first year teachers, and employers.

Several participants stated the summary provides enough data for the discussion time available. Some participants looked at the full reports and brought up additional points of interest for each data set as thoroughly as they could in the time permitted.

VCSU School of Education and Graduate Studies

Topic: Teacher Preparation Data Assessment Sharing and Discussion
Date: August 9, 2017
Time: 8:45 a.m. - 12:15 p.m. (working lunch as part of closing discussion)
Stipend: \$100 to invited participants
Location: VCSU, McFarland 123

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?***