

Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) Unit Data Fall 2017 – Spring 2020

	Overall Mean Rating 2017-2020 N=134	Mean Rating 2017-2018 N=30	Mean Rating 2018-2019 N=48	Mean Rating 2019-2020 N=56	Trends in the Mean Score Data
Mean Score for Each Rubric Item					
Rubric 1: Planning for Understanding of Content <i>How well does the teacher candidate plan to ensure the content standards and learning objectives will be met? (InTASC 4 and 7; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 5.4)</i>	3.21	3.02	3.23	3.30	up
Rubric 2: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning <i>How well does the teacher candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students' development and understanding? (InTASC 1 and 7, CAEP)</i>	3.17	3.07	3.11	3.27	up
Rubric 3: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support to Student Learning <i>How are the informal and formal assessments selected or designed to provide evidence of student progress toward the learning targets? (InTASC 6 and 7, CAEP 2.3)</i>	3.20	3.17	3.18	3.24	up
Rubric 4: Planning for Language Development <i>How does the candidate plan to support the students' academic language associated with content learning? (InTASC 7, CAEP 1.4)</i>	2.95	3.05	2.58	3.21	Up in 2020
Rubric 5: Scaffolding Language <i>How does the candidate support language development? (InTASC 8, CAEP 1.4)</i>	3.09	3.05	3.09	3.11	up
Rubric 6: Classroom Management <i>How does the candidate manage the classroom and actively engage students? (InTASC 3 and 8, CAEP 1.4)</i>	3.02	2.88	3.07	3.05	Up, now steady
Rubric 7: Engagement in Standards Based Instruction <i>How does the candidate elicit and monitor students' responses to deepen their understanding? (InTASC 8, CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.4)</i>	3.08	3.10	3.08	3.07	steady
Rubric 8: Assessment and Analysis of Student Work <i>How does the candidate demonstrate an understanding of student performance with respect to learning targets? (InTASC 6, CAEP 1.1, 1.4, 2.3)</i>	2.93	2.65	2.90	3.11	up
Rubric 9: Using Assessment and Feedback to Inform Instruction and Guide Student Learning <i>How does the candidate use conclusions about what students know and can do to provide feedback and plan next steps in instruction to further learning? (InTASC 6, CAEP 1.1, 2.3)</i>	3.11	2.78	3.21	3.20	Up, now steady
Rubric 10: Analyzing Teacher Effectiveness <i>How does the candidate use evidence and change teaching practice to meet the varied learning needs of the students? (InTASC 6 and 9, CAEP 1.2, 5.4)</i>	2.95	2.58	3.01	3.10	up
Overall	3.07	2.94	3.05	3.17	up

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

Rating	Count 2017-2020	Percent 2017-2020
Ratings of a 4 Distinguished	292	21.8%
Ratings of a 3.5	252	18.8%
Ratings of a 3 Proficient	436	32.6%
Ratings of a 2.5	143	10.7%
Ratings of a 2 Emerging	167	12.5%
Ratings of a 1.5	19	1.4%
Ratings of 1 Underdeveloped	28	2.1%
Total	1337	99.9%

Analysis of TLC data:

Overall strengths of the student work	<p>The TLC unit is a rigorous capstone project that requires teacher candidates to apply their learning from every education and methods course in their major. Teacher candidates present their TLC units during finals week prior to graduation. Most of the TLC work has been assessed as proficient and some teacher candidates are producing work that exceeds expectations. The learning outcome assessment process of the TLC serves as a reminder of the tremendous teaching and learning efforts of the VCSU teacher candidates and faculty.</p>
Overall concerns with the student work	<p>The lowest rated TLC scores have been in the planning section. The expectations of the planning portion, as well as the depth of the rubrics, are the most demanding. Increased faculty commitment to the planning of assessments appears to be leading to improvement as planning scores. A 2018-2019 weakness was discovered to be in planning language development. This concern was addressed, and improvement was shown in 2019-2020. 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 Elementary Education senior portfolio instructor agreed to share those reminders in EDUC 491 Senior Portfolio and in email with all the student teachers from every major as candidates were close to completing their work.</p>
How are the assessment data being used to make changes for the future?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data informed decision to add an extra credit to EDUC 240 Educating Exceptional Students is showing up in improved differentiation for instruction lesson plans. 2. The TLC rubrics were revised with the use of the Lawshe Method, and efforts were made on rater agreements in 2018. The 2019 ratings involved improved rater agreement. 3. A greater emphasis is being placed on self-assessment resources for teacher candidates. 4. Teacher candidates' videos of implemented lessons have been fairly consistent over the past years, so this is an area to promote for growth. 5. It was also encouraging 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. Both the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 reflections had more depth than 2017-2018 reflections. <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 methods faculty members gain insight into ways to better prepare teacher candidates. More effort has been emphasized for the teacher candidates to practice with the rubrics and gain a deeper level of understanding for the expectations.</p>