

## Evidence for InTASC 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.

**Coursework:** Teacher candidates gain knowledge, skills, and dispositions with learner development through the following professional education courses: PSYC 250 Developmental Psychology, EDUC 400 Educational Psychology, as well as early field experiences and EDUC 490 Student Teaching.

### Examples of data providing evidence that teacher candidates develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions in relation to InTASC Standard 1

- I. Student Teacher Final Evaluation Data – performance-based data gathered from cooperating teacher ratings and student teacher self-assessments
  - II. Exit Survey Data – reflective self-analysis by teacher candidates near the time of graduation
  - III. Disposition Data - performance-based data gathered from cooperating teacher ratings and teacher candidate self-assessment
  - IV. Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) unit data - performance-based data gathered from student teachers and assessed by unit faculty
  - V. Completer Survey Data – first year teacher reflect on their preparation
  - VI. Employer Survey Data – employer responses regarding the preparation of first-year teachers
- I. **Student Teacher Final Evaluation Data** – this section displays the rubric and data gathered from cooperating teachers and self-assessment data from student teachers.

This section of the assessment rubric is for student teacher performance and is tagged to InTASC Standard 1.

**Directions:** For each of the items below, place a rating of 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, or 4 by the number which describes the teacher candidate as a pre-professional. *\*An overall average rating will be calculated by the university for each standard.* Thank you for your time and commitment to the profession.

InTASC Standard 1	Distinguished (4)	(3.5)	Proficient (3)	(2.5)	Emerging (2)	(1.5)	Underdeveloped (1)	Mean	3 or >
<b>Supports student learning through developmentally appropriate instruction</b>	implements challenging learning experiences that recognize patterns of learning and development across cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional and physical areas		implements developmentally appropriate instruction that accounts for learners' strengths, interests and needs		implements grade-level appropriate instruction, but does not account for individual learners' differences		implements instruction that exceeds or does not match a developmentally appropriate level for the students		<i>Percent of Ratings at Proficient level of 3 or higher</i>
<b>Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 total placements</b>	28.9% N=143	26.9% N=133	37.0% N=183	5.3% N=26	2.0% N=10			<b>3.38</b>	<b>92.7%</b>
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	31.1% N=41	25.8% N=34	37.1% N=49	3.0% N=4	3.0% N=4			<b>3.39</b>	<b>93.9%</b>
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	27.2% N=53	29.2% N=57	37.9% N=74	4.6% N=9	1.0% N=2			<b>3.38</b>	<b>95.4%</b>
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	29.2% N=49	25% N=42	35.7% N=60	7.7% N=13	2.4% N=4			<b>3.35</b>	<b>89.8%</b>

InTASC Standard 1	Distinguished (4)	(3.5)	Proficient (3)	(2.5)	Emerging (2)	(1.5)	Underdeveloped (1)	Mean	3 or >
<b>Accounts for differences in students' prior knowledge</b>	accesses student readiness for learning and expands on individual students' prior knowledge		accounts for individual differences in students' prior knowledge and readiness for learning		addresses students' prior knowledge as a class, but individual differences are not considered		does not account for differences in students' prior knowledge		
<b>Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements</b>	25.9% N=128	27.1% N=134	37.6% N=186	7.5% N=37	1.4% N=7	0.6% N=3		<b>3.33</b>	<b>90.5%</b>
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	28.8% N=38	21.2% N=28	42.4% N=56	4.5% N=6	2.3% N=3	0.8% N=1		<b>3.34</b>	<b>92.4%</b>
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	22.6% N=44	31.8% N=62	35.9% N=70	8.7% N=17	1.0% N=2			<b>3.33</b>	<b>90.3%</b>
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	27.4% N=46	26.2% N=44	35.7% N=60	8.3% N=14	1.2% N=2	1.2% N=2		<b>3.33</b>	<b>89.3%</b>

**Analysis:** The data indicate that teacher candidates in their student teaching experiences received a high percentage of proficient ratings from cooperating teachers in the areas of “Accounts for differences in students’ prior knowledge” (over 90% proficient) and “Supports student learning through developmentally appropriate instruction” (over 92% proficient). The Fall 2019-Spring 2020 ratings had the highest mean scores for both the InTASC 1 items. The student teacher self-assessment ratings are aligned fairly closely with the cooperating teacher ratings. The mean score ratings and percentages of scores at the proficient level of 3 or higher are a positive indicator for the reliability of the assessment instrument. The positive news is that the ratings are highly favorable.

**Action:** The data are shared with methods teachers on an annual basis. The data were encouraging and serve as a reminder for emphasizing the importance of teaching developmentally appropriate lessons for learning and for teachers to get to know their learners. No action for improvement was initiated at this time based on this specific data set.

4-Distinguished; 3-Proficient; 2-Emerging; 1-Underdeveloped. (3.5, 2.5, and 1.5 are permitted)	TC Self-Assessment Ratings Fall 2018-Spring 2020 (4 cycles)				Cooperating Teacher Ratings Fall 2017-Spring 2020 (6 cycles)			
	Mean	% 3 or >	% < 3	Count	Mean	% 3 or >	% < 3	Count
Supports student learning through developmentally appropriate instruction.	<b>3.45</b>	96%	4%	336	<b>3.38</b>	93%	7%	489
Accounts for differences in students' prior knowledge.	<b>3.37</b>	93%	7%	334	<b>3.33</b>	90%	10%	489
Standard #1: Learner Development. (Average Calculated)	<b>3.41</b>	94%	6%	670	<b>3.35</b>	92%	8%	978

**II. Exit Survey Data** – completed by teacher candidates during the final weeks prior to graduation.

## B2. Preparation for Teaching: Diverse Learners

To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to do the following?

Criteria	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	Does Not Apply	Total Count
Differentiate for students at varied developmental levels.	58.89 %	35.43 %	5.08 %	0.48 %	0.12 %	827

**Analysis:** The program has a large sample set of data that indicates 58.89% marked Agree and 35.43% marked Tend to Agree; a total of 94.32% of the teacher candidates agreed or tended to agree that they were well prepared to address the varied developmental levels of their students.

**Action:** The data have been shared annually through the unit reports. The data are favorable and indicate that preparation related to the developmental needs of students is happening. The program can use the information to continue its success and try to make future results even more favorable.

**III. Disposition Data** – the disposition assessment form was revised and piloted in Spring of 2019 (three cycles of data)

After years of using a checklist-type disposition assessment, the unit switched to a disposition assessment rubric that included a more detailed set of actionable descriptors. The descriptors provide teacher candidates with additional guidance for the expectations. This assessment was piloted in the Spring of 2019. The Valley City State University School of Education developed the disposition assessment items through a pilot process with cooperating teachers and the research and feedback contributions from NDACTE faculty representatives at the University of Mary, Mayville State, Dickinson State, North Dakota State University, and VCSU teacher education faculty.

## Rubric and actionable descriptors related to InTASC Standard 1

InTASC Standard 1 Learner and Learning		Exceeds Expectations (3)	(2.5)	Meets Expectations (2)	(1.5)	Needs Improvement (1)	Not Observed
	<i>The teacher candidate...</i>						
1.	<b>Respects learners' developmental strengths and needs</b> (InTASC 1.h) (Danielson 1b) (Marzano 19,20) (MCEE II.A.3;III B.1, III.B.2-3)	demonstrates respect for all learners by considering diverse perspectives when implementing developmentally appropriate practices to address learners' strengths and needs.	In addition to score of "2" performance, partial success at score of "3"	demonstrates respect for learners by implementing developmentally appropriate practices to address learners' strengths and needs.	In addition to score of "1" performance, partial success at score of "2"	demonstrates minimal respect for learners' developmental needs by displaying behaviors that seem uninformed, intolerant, or biased.	

## 2019 VCSU Spring Pilot Disposition Data (one cycle of data)

3 = *Exceeds Expectations*, 2.5 *In addition to rating of 2, partial success at rating of 3*, 2 = *Meets Expectations*, 1.5 *In addition to rating of 1, partial success at rating of 2*, 1 = *Needs Improvement*

InTASC	Disposition Item - Rated by cooperating teachers <i>The teacher candidate...</i>	3	2.5	2	1.5	1	Mean Score	% at 2 or Higher
1	<b>Respects learners' developmental strengths and needs</b> (InTASC 1.h) (Danielson 1b) (Marzano 19,20) (MCEE II.A.3;III B.1, III.B.2-3)	17	15	24	2	0	2.41	96.6%

## Fall 2019 - Spring 2020 Cooperating teacher ratings for teacher candidates during student teaching (two cycles of data)

InTASC	Disposition Item - Rated by cooperating teachers <i>The teacher candidate...</i>	3	2.5	2	1.5	1	Mean Score	% at 2 or Higher
1	Respects learners' developmental strengths and needs	53	10	10	1	0	2.78	99%

InTASC	Disposition Item – SELF ASSESSMENT – completed by teacher candidates <i>The teacher candidate...</i>	3	2.5	2	1.5	1	Mean Score	% at 2 or Higher
1	Respects learners' developmental strengths and needs	65	25	12	1	0	2.75	99%

**Analysis:** The three cycles of data gathered are highly favorable. Cooperating teachers have found teacher candidates to be meeting or exceeding expectations in a high percentage of instances. Teacher candidates mean scores were highly similar ratings to the ratings of the cooperating teachers.

**Action:** The data will be analyzed at a deeper level as more cycles of data are obtained, but faculty and university supervisors can make a point of emphasizing to teacher candidates the importance of getting to know their learners and respecting their developmental strengths and needs.

### IV. Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) Unit Data – faculty ratings of student teachers' capstone units

**Rubric Directions:** This Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) rubric is based on the VCSU Teacher Education Conceptual Framework and learning outcomes. For each of the items below, place a rating of 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, or 4 by the number which describes the evidence of the teacher candidate's performance.

TLC Rubric	Distinguished (4)	(3.5)	Proficient (3)	(2.5)	Emerging (2)	(1.5)	Underdeveloped (1)
<i>Plan - Planning Instruction and Assessment</i>							
<b>Rubric 2: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning</b> <i>How well does the teacher candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students' development and understanding? (InTASC 1, 2, and 7, CAEP)</i>	Considers individual differences using assessment data and awareness of student backgrounds to target support for students' development and understanding.		Considers individual differences in students' prior knowledge to support student development.		Teaches lessons while considering individual differences.		Teaches lessons without regard to students' prior knowledge or backgrounds.

Mean Score for Each Rubric Item	Overall Mean Rating N=134	Mean Rating 2018 N=30	Mean Rating 2019 N=48	Mean Rating 2020 N=56
<b>Rubric 2: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning</b> <i>How well does the teacher candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students' development and understanding? (InTASC 1, 2 and 7, CAEP)</i>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>3.07</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>3.27</b>

**Analysis:** The positive upward trend is encouraging. The assessment data began with faculty members from elementary, secondary, and k-12 programs the rubrics in the summer of 2018 to assess a random sample of 30 elementary education majors. Faculty provided ideas for tiny wording changes and revised rubrics. Since that time the data have included scored TLC units from elementary, secondary, and k-12 programs.

**Action:** The data are shared annually with SEGS faculty, staff, and methods teachers during Welcome Week in August. The data serve as a reminder to help faculty recognize how well teacher candidates use the knowledge of their students' backgrounds and skills while teaching their TLC units.

**V. Completer Survey** - data gathered from first-year teachers

**InTASC Standard 1. Stem:** *To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program prepared you to...*

Agree (4), Tend to Agree (3), Tend to Disagree (2), Disagree (1)

<b>InTASC Standard 1</b> Differentiate at varied developmental levels	Agree Count	Agree %	Tend to Agree Count	Tend to Agree %	Tend to Disagree Count	Tend to Disagree %	Disagree Count	Disagree %	Mean Score	Total Count
2017	29	51.8%	19	33.9%	8	14.3%	0	0.0%	3.38	56
2018	23	44.2%	21	40.4%	7	13.5%	1	1.9%	3.27	52
2019	29	52.7%	17	30.9%	7	12.7%	2	3.6%	3.33	55
2020	31	55.4%	20	35.7%	5	8.9%	0	0.0%	3.46	56
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>51.1%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>35.2%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>12.3%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>3.36</b>	<b>219</b>
Account for students' prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning	Agree Count	Agree %	Tend to Agree Count	Tend to Agree %	Tend to Disagree Count	Tend to Disagree %	Disagree Count	Disagree %	Mean Score	Total Count
2012	15	65.2%	5	21.7%	2	8.7%	1	4.3%	3.48	23
2013	23	65.7%	10	28.6%	2	5.7%	0	0.0%	3.60	35
2014	25	58.1%	18	41.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.58	43
2015	36	59.0%	23	37.7%	2	3.3%	0	0.0%	3.56	61
2016	31	63.3%	18	36.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.63	49
2017	44	73.3%	15	25.0%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	3.72	60
2018	29	55.8%	16	30.8%	7	13.5%	0	0.0%	3.42	52
2019	30	53.6%	23	41.1%	3	5.4%	0	0.0%	3.48	56
2020	37	64.9%	16	28.07%	4	7.0%	0	0.0%	3.58	57
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>61.9%</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>33.0%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>4.8%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>436</b>

**Analysis:** The cumulative mean score for the ratings above are well over a 3.00 (tend to agree rating) on a 4-point scale. Both items have an overall favorable rating. The unit has used the diverse learner data to make an informed decision to add one credit to EDUC 240 Educating Exceptional Students in the fall of 2018. The additional credit allows more time for content and field experiences related to working with diverse types of learners. The unit faculty have included more content related to the use of assessment data FOR learning and the promotion of differentiation.

**Action:** It is encouraging to observe that the 2019 and 2020 ratings are part of an upward trend in the data. The Education Preparation Provider (EPP) will continue to address these topics related to learning and development throughout the program.

**VI. Employer Survey -** data gathered from the supervisors of first-year teachers (typically principals)

**InTASC Standard 1. *Stem: To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher does the following?***

Agree (4), Tend to Agree (3), Tend to Disagree (2), Disagree (1)

InTASC 1 Differentiates for students at varied developmental levels.	Agree Count	Agree %	Tend to Agree Count	Tend to Agree %	Tend to Disagree Count	Tend to Disagree %	Disagree Count	Disagree %	Mean Score	Total Count
2017	28	62.2%	16	35.6%	1	2.2%	0	0.0%	3.60	45
2018	16	57.1%	8	28.6%	3	10.7%	1	3.6%	3.39	28
2019	22	53.7%	17	41.5%	2	4.9%	0	0.0%	3.49	41
2020	24	63.2%	11	28.9%	2	5.3%	1	2.6%	3.53	38
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>59.2%</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>34.2%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>152</b>
Accounts for students' prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning	Agree Count	Agree %	Tend to Agree Count	Tend to Agree %	Tend to Disagree Count	Tend to Disagree %	Disagree Count	Disagree %	Mean Score	Total Count
2014	17	63.0%	10	37.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.63	27
2015	34	58.6%	21	36.2%	2	3.4%	1	1.7%	3.52	58
2016	33	70.2%	13	27.7%	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	3.68	47
2017	33	75.0%	10	22.7%	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	3.73	44
2018	17	60.7%	8	28.6%	2	7.1%	1	3.6%	3.46	28
2019	25	64.1%	11	28.2%	3	7.7%	0	0.0%	3.56	39
2020	21	55.3%	14	36.8%	2	5.3%	1	2.6%	3.45	38
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>64.1%</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>31.0%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>281</b>

**Analysis:** The employer survey ratings are slightly higher than the completer ratings. The mean scores are favorable and the percentages of “Tend to Disagree” and “Disagree” ratings being small.

**Action:** The Employer Survey data set has encouraging results as a whole and doesn't specifically indicate a need for program improvement at this time.