

Evidence for InTASC Standard 5

Standard #5 Applications of Content: The program requires an understanding of how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.

Coursework: Teacher candidates gain knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to applying content knowledge throughout the curriculum. Candidates learn broad knowledge and skills in their general education coursework, specific knowledge in the required courses for their major, and teaching skills to apply strategies for their learners to develop their own knowledge and skills related to the content.

Examples of data providing evidence that teacher candidates develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions in relation to InTASC Standard 5

- 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 for student teachers is tagged to InTASC Standard 5.

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 5	Distinguished (4)	(3.5)	Proficient (3)	(2.5)	Emerging (2)	(1.5)	Underdeveloped (1)	Mean	3 or >
Connects core content to relevant, real-life experiences and learning tasks	designs and facilitates challenging learning experiences related to the students' real-life experiences and relevant core content		designs instruction related to the students' real-life experiences and relevant core content		designs instruction related to the core content but learning tasks have only superficial relationships to the students' interests or life experiences		designs instruction related to the core content but learning tasks have no relevance to the students' interests or life experiences		<i>Percent of Ratings at Proficient level of 3 or higher</i>
Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements	29.5% N=146	27.3% N=135	32.7% N=162	8.3% N=41	1.8% N=9	0.2% N=1	0.2% N=1	3.36	89.5%
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	31.1% N=41	26.5% N=35	31.1% N=41	7.6% N=10	3.0% N=4		0.8% N=1	3.36	88.6%
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	27.7% N=54	29.2% N=57	33.3% N=65	8.2% N=16	1.5% N=3			3.37	90.3%
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	30.4% N=51	25.6% N=43	33.3% N=56	8.9% N=15	1.2% N=2	0.6% N=1		3.37	89.3%

InTASC Standard 5	Distinguished (4)	(3.5)	Proficient (3)	(2.5)	Emerging (2)	(1.5)	Underdeveloped (1)	Mean	3 or >
Designs activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives	embeds interdisciplinary connections and multiple perspectives into activities, allowing learners to independently relate these connections to key concepts and themes		designs activities for learners to engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives and to develop interdisciplinary connections		designs activities for learners to engage with subject matter, from a variety of perspectives but no interdisciplinary connections are developed		designs activities related to subject matter but does so from a singular perspective and discipline		
Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements	28.3% N=140	23.6% N=117	36.4% N=180	7.9% N=39	3.6% N=18		0.2% N=1	3.32	88.3%
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	34.8% N=46	18.2% N=24	34.1% N=45	9.1% N=12	3.8% N=5			3.36	87.1%
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	25.1% N=49	25.6% N=50	39.0% N=76	7.7% N=15	2.1% N=4		0.5% N=1	3.31	89.7%
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	26.8% N=45	25.6% N=43	35.1% N=59	7.1% N=12	5.4% N=9			3.31	87.5%
Accesses content resources to build global awareness	seeks out new and innovative ways to access content resources, including digital and interactive technologies, to build student awareness of local and global issues		uses content resources, including digital and interactive technologies, to build student awareness of local and global issues		accesses some content resources, including technologies, to build student awareness of local and global issues		needs regular guidance to determine where and how to access content resources-to build student awareness of local and global issues		
Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements	22.2% N=110	19.2% N=95	41.4% N=205	11.7% N=58	5.3% N=26		0.2% N=1	3.20	82.8%
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	27.3% N=36	14.4% N=19	44.7% N=59	7.6% N=10	6.1% N=8			3.25	86.4%
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	21.0% N=41	20.0% N=39	40.0% N=78	14.4% N=28	4.6% N=9			3.19	81.0%
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	19.6% N=33	22.0% N=37	40.5% N=68	11.9% N=20	5.4% N=9		0.6% N=1	3.18	82.1%
Uses relevant content to engage learners in innovative thinking & collaborative problem solving	creates an environment that encourages higher level thinking, innovative ideas and approaches connected to relevant content		engages students in higher level thinking skills such as critical/creative thinking and collaborative problem solving connected to relevant content		engages students in higher level thinking skills such as critical/creative thinking and collaborative problem solving but skills are not connected to relevant content		instructional strategies do not promote higher level thinking or collaborative problem solving connected to relevant content		
Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements	25.7% N=127	23.6% N=117	37.8% N=187	9.3% N=46	3.0% N=15	0.4% N=2	0.2% N=1	3.29	87.1%
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	30.3% N=40	19.7% N=26	39.4% N=52	8.3% N=11	2.3% N=3			3.34	89.4%
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	23.6% N=46	21.0% N=41	40.5% N=79	11.8% N=23	2.1% N=4	0.5% N=1	0.5% N=1	3.24	85.1%
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	24.4% N=41	29.8% N=50	33.3% N=56	7.1% N=12	4.8% N=8	0.6% N=1		3.30	87.5%

Analysis: The cooperating teacher ratings related to Standard 5 have been extremely consistent. Neither the mean score ratings nor the percentages of candidates with ratings of 3.00 (proficient) or higher have changed significantly over the past three years. On the positive side, the mean score ratings are

slightly higher in 2019-2020 compared to 2017-2018 in three of the four areas. The only area that was lower went from 3.37 to 3.36, but the percentage of proficient or higher ratings increased slightly. Accessing content resources to build global awareness has the lowest ratings from cooperating teachers and the teacher candidates (see the comparative table near the bottom of this page). The positive aspect is that item has improved from 3.18 to 3.25 over the past three years.

Action: The data are shared on an annual basis. This section has been consistent and in the middle of the overall ratings to the point that this section has not been discussed often by K-12 educators and EPP faculty during annual data sharing discussions. The Standard 4 ratings related to effectively teaching subject matter (below) have also been consistent over the past three years. Throughout the professional education sequence, teacher candidates often complete projects and participate in activities in which candidates are asked to visualize and connect their learning experiences to teaching in their own major field. The more opportunities the candidates have to know their learners, the better they can become at applying content in meaningful ways to engage students and help them develop valuable skills.

InTASC Standard 4	Distinguished (4)	(3.5)	Proficient (3)	(2.5)	Emerging (2)	(1.5)	Underdeveloped (1)	Mean	3 or >
Effectively teaches subject matter	displays mastery of content knowledge and learning progressions that allow flexible adjustments to address learners at their current level of understanding to either remediate or deepen the learners' understanding		instructional practices indicate understanding of content knowledge and learning progressions; practices are complete and appropriate for the content		displays basic content knowledge; instructional practices indicate some awareness of learning progressions; practices are incomplete or inaccurate for the content		displays minimal content knowledge; instructional practices indicate little awareness of learning progressions, and practices are too often incomplete or inaccurate for the content		<i>Percent of Ratings at Proficient level of 3 or higher</i>
Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements	31.5% N=156	25.9% N=128	34.9% N=173	5.3% N=26	2.0% N=10	0.2% N=1	0.2% N=1	3.39	92.3%
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	35.6% N=47	22.0% N=29	33.3% N=44	6.1% N=8	2.3% N=3	0.8% N=1		3.40	90.9%
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	25.6% N=50	30.3% N=59	37.9% N=74	4.1% N=8	2.1% N=4			3.37	93.8%
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	35.1% N=59	23.8% N=40	32.7% N=55	6.0% N=10	1.8% N=3		0.6% N=1	3.41	91.6%

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)			
InTASC Standard 5	Mean	% 3 or >	% < 3	Count	Mean	% 3 or >	% < 3	Count
Connects core content to relevant, real-life experiences and learning tasks.	3.42	95%	5%	335	3.36	90%	10%	489
Designs activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	3.34	90%	10%	335	3.32	88%	12%	489
Accesses content resources to build global awareness.	3.09	79%	21%	335	3.20	83%	17%	489
Uses relevant content to engage learners in innovative thinking & collaborative problem solving.	3.39	94%	6%	334	3.28	87%	13%	489
Standard #5: Applications of Content. (Average Calculated)	3.31	89%	11%	1339	3.29	87%	13%	1956

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

B1. Preparation for Teaching: Instructional Practice

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
Effectively teach the subject matter in my licensure area. (Data from 2011-2020) InTASC 4	68.53 %	28.72 %	2.37 %	0.28 %	0.09 %	1055
Help students develop critical thinking processes. (Data from 2013-2020) InTASC 5	59.54 %	37.45 %	2.76 %	0.24 %	0 %	833
Help students develop skill to solve complex problems.	54.09 %	41.71 %	3.85 %	0.36 %	0 %	832
Understand how interdisciplinary themes connect to core subjects.	55.78 %	39.64 %	4.10 %	0.48 %	0 %	830
Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding.	48.31 %	43.22 %	7.75 %	0.73 %	0 %	826
Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.	54.37 %	40.78 %	4.37 %	0.49 %	0 %	824

Analysis: Each area has an “Agree” + “Tend to Agree” percentage of 91% or higher. The item “Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding” is an assessment item that was slightly lower in the student teaching assessment section as well.

Action: While over 91% of teacher candidates agree that they were well prepared, the item “Know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding” is one that could indicate a need for more attention in the future. As faculty read and discuss the report, the EPP will be open to ideas for continuous improvement.

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

The descriptors provide teacher candidates with 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 5

<i>InTASC Standard 5 Learner and Learning</i>	Exceeds Expectations (3)	(2.5)	Meets Expectations (2)	(1.5)	Needs Improvement (1)	Not Observed
<i>The teacher candidate...</i>						
Commits to making learning opportunities accessible to all learners resulting in understanding disciplinary content and skills (InTASC 4.r) (Danielson 3c)(Marzano 2) (MCEE II.A.1,II.A.3; II.C.1; III.B.1)	consistently commits to making learning opportunities accessible to all learners resulting in mastery of disciplinary content and skills.	In addition to score of “ 2” performance, partial success at score of “ 3”	commits to making learning opportunities accessible to all learners resulting in understanding disciplinary content and skills.	In addition to score of “ 1” performance, partial success at score of “ 2”	inconsistently makes learning opportunities accessible to all learners, resulting in inconsequential learning.	
Is committed to linking subject content to real life issues (InTASC 5.q, 5.s)(Marzano 2) (MCEE II.A.1, II.A.3; II.C.1)	links subject content to real life issues, promoting the development of critical and creative thinking.		links subject content to real life issues, resulting in relevant connections for learners.		misses opportunities to link subject content to real life issues, resulting in learners seeing varying degrees of relevance.	

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
4	Commits to making learning opportunities accessible to all learners resulting in understanding disciplinary content and skills (InTASC 4.r) (Danielson 3c)(Marzano 2) (MCEE II.A.1,II.A.3; II.C.1; III.B.1)	13	18	23	3	0	2.36	94.7%
5	Is committed to linking subject content to real life issues (InTASC 5.q, 5.s)(Marzano 2) (MCEE II.A.1, II.A.3; II.C.1)	11	17	23	5	1	2.28	89.4%

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
4	Commits to making learning opportunities accessible to all learners resulting in understanding disciplinary content and skills (InTASC 4.r) (Danielson 3c)(Marzano 2) (MCEE II.A.1,II.A.3; II.C.1; III.B.1)	47	11	15	0	0	2.72	100%
5	Is committed to linking subject content to real life issues (InTASC 5.q, 5.s)(Marzano 2) (MCEE II.A.1, II.A.3; II.C.1)	44	7	19	1	1	2.64	97%

Fall 2019 - Spring 2020 Teacher candidate self-assessment responses (two cycles of data)

InTASC	Disposition Item – SELF ASSESSMENT – rated by teacher candidates <i>The teacher candidate...</i>	3	2.5	2	1.5	1	Mean Score	% at 2 or Higher
4	Commits to making learning opportunities accessible to all learners resulting in understanding disciplinary content and skills (InTASC 4.r) (Danielson 3c)(Marzano 2) (MCEE II.A.1,II.A.3; II.C.1; III.B.1)	59	18	24	1	0	2.66	99%
5	Is committed to linking subject content to real life issues (InTASC 5.q, 5.s)(Marzano 2) (MCEE II.A.1, II.A.3; II.C.1)	54	22	26	0	0	2.64	100%

Analysis: The 2019-2020 data are stronger than the Spring 2019 pilot data throughout each of the ten InTASC Standards. The disposition data related to Standards 4 and 5 clearly follow the same pattern. Cooperating teachers found teacher candidates to be meeting or exceeding the expectations in a high percentage of instances. Teacher candidates had mean score ratings and percentages of ratings at a 2 or higher in a similar manner to the ratings of the cooperating teachers. The ratings for being committed to linking subject content to real life issues had exact mean scores of 2.64.

Action: The data will continue to be analyzed as more cycles of data are obtained, but faculty and university supervisors can be aware that teacher candidates appear to be doing well in this disposition area.

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>							
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?</i> (InTASC 4 and 7; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 5.4)	Designs plans to lead students to connect to the unit’s big ideas, higher levels of thinking, and measurable learning targets.	In addition to rating “3” performance, partial success at rating of “4”	Aligns standards and learning targets with the central focus for the unit.	In addition to rating “2” performance, partial success at rating of “3”	Aligns standards to content and connects most of the learning targets to assessments for the unit.	With assistance, partial success at rating of “2”	Selects standards and learning targets that are not aligned with the central focus for the unit.

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
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?</i> (InTASC 4 and 7; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 5.4)	3.21	3.02	3.23	3.30

Analysis: The positive upward trend is encouraging. The primary improvement faculty have noticed is the alignment of the content standards and the assessment of the learning targets. Teacher candidates are doing a better job of planning their assessments and measuring student learning.

Action: The TLC data are shared annually with the SEGS faculty, staff, and methods teachers during Welcome Week in August. The professional education sequence course in assessment, EDUC 450 Trends in Assessment and Educational Issues, has been working with teacher candidates to gain practice planning assessments that measure the content learned by students. The methods instructors have been emphasizing the importance of planning for the understanding of content as well as planning formative and summative assessments.

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

InTASC Standard 5. *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)

Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	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	27	62.8%	16	37.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.63	43
2015	40	65.6%	19	31.1%	1	1.6%	1	1.6%	3.61	61
2016	34	70.8%	14	29.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.71	48
2017	43	71.7%	15	25.0%	2	3.3%	0	0.0%	3.68	60
2018	33	63.5%	17	32.7%	2	3.8%	0	0.0%	3.60	52
2019	36	64.3%	17	30.4%	3	5.4%	0	0.0%	3.59	56
2020	41	71.9%	13	22.8%	3	5.3%	0	0.0%	3.67	57
Overall Total	254	67.4%	111	29.4%	11	2.9%	1	0.3%	3.64	377
Help students develop critical thinking processes.	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	20	46.5%	20	46.5%	3	7.0%	0	0.0%	3.40	43
2015	36	58.1%	23	37.1%	2	3.2%	1	1.6%	3.52	62
2016	28	56.0%	22	44.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.56	50
2017	33	58.9%	18	32.1%	5	8.9%	0	0.0%	3.50	56
2018	33	63.5%	15	28.8%	4	7.7%	0	0.0%	3.56	52
2019	28	50.0%	21	37.5%	5	8.9%	2	3.6%	3.34	56
2020	31	54.4%	23	40.4%	2	3.5%	1	1.8%	3.47	57
Overall Total	209	55.6%	142	37.8%	21	5.6%	4	1.1%	3.48	376
Help students develop skills to solve complex problems.	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	19	44.2%	22	51.2%	2	4.7%	0	0.0%	3.40	43
2015	38	61.3%	21	33.9%	2	3.2%	1	1.6%	3.55	62
2016	26	52.0%	22	44.0%	2	4.0%	0	0.0%	3.48	50
2017	33	58.9%	19	33.9%	4	7.1%	0	0.0%	3.52	56
2018	29	55.8%	16	30.8%	7	13.5%	0	0.0%	3.42	52
2019	28	50.0%	23	41.1%	4	7.1%	1	1.8%	3.39	56
2020	31	54.4%	23	40.4%	2	3.5%	1	1.8%	3.47	57
Overall Total	204	54.3%	146	38.8%	23	6.1%	3	0.8%	3.47	376

InTASC Standard 5. *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)

Make interdisciplinary connections among core subjects.	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	22	51.2%	20	46.5%	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	3.49	43
2015	41	66.1%	19	30.6%	1	1.6%	1	1.6%	3.61	62
2016	32	64.0%	16	32.0%	2	4.0%	0	0.0%	3.60	50
2017	34	60.7%	19	33.9%	2	3.6%	1	1.8%	3.54	56
2018	33	63.5%	14	26.9%	5	9.6%	0	0.0%	3.54	52
2019	29	51.8%	22	39.3%	5	8.9%	0	0.0%	3.43	56
2020	32	56.1%	21	36.8%	4	7.0%	0	0.0%	3.49	57
Overall Total	223	59.3%	131	34.8%	20	5.3%	2	0.5%	3.53	376
Connect core content to students' real-life experiences.	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	27	65.9%	14	34.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.66	41
2015	41	67.2%	17	27.9%	2	3.3%	1	1.6%	3.61	61
2016	38	76.0%	11	22.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.0%	3.72	50
2017	42	75.0%	13	23.2%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	3.73	56
2018	33	63.5%	16	30.8%	3	5.8%	0	0.0%	3.58	52
2019	37	66.1%	16	28.6%	3	5.4%	0	0.0%	3.61	56
2020	38	66.7%	18	31.6%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	3.65	57
Overall Total	256	68.6%	105	28.2%	10	2.7%	2	0.5%	3.65	373
Help students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions.	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	32	56.1%	20	35.1%	5	8.8%	0	0.0%	3.47	57
2018	27	51.9%	19	36.5%	5	9.6%	1	1.9%	3.38	52
2019	26	46.4%	22	39.3%	8	14.3%	0	0.0%	3.32	56
2020	30	52.6%	19	33.3%	7	12.3%	1	1.8%	3.37	57
Overall Total	115	51.8%	80	36.0%	25	11.3%	2	0.9%	3.39	222
Help students work together to achieve learning goals.	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	38	67.9%	17	30.4%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	3.66	56
2018	39	75.0%	12	23.1%	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	3.73	52
2019	37	67.3%	14	25.5%	3	5.5%	1	1.8%	3.58	55
2020	37	64.9%	19	33.3%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	3.63	57
Overall Total	151	68.6%	62	28.2%	6	2.7%	1	0.5%	3.65	220

Analysis: The cumulative mean score ratings related to Standard 5 are well over the 3.00 (tend to agree) on a 4-point scale. It is encouraging to see the overall mean score ratings were higher in 2020 than in 2019 for each area. The lowest rating was in helping students analyze multiple sources of evidence to draw sound conclusions. The positive news is that the mean score went up from 3.32 in 2019 to 3.37 in 2020. The overall mean scores display satisfaction from the completers. The list of items includes some important skills that extend beyond the content. The item “Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives” had 96.8% of the 377 completers state that they “Agree” or “Tend to Agree” that they were well prepared in this area, and the mean score rating on a 4-point scale was 3.64. The data are favorable. Additional analysis offers similar outcomes: “Help students develop critical thinking processes” (93.4% and 3.48); “Help students develop skills to solve complex problems” (93.1% and 3.47); “Make interdisciplinary connections among core subjects” (94.1% and 3.53); “Connect core content to students' real-life experiences” (96.8% and 3.65); and “Help students work together to achieve learning goals” (96.8% and 3.65).

Action: Educators are not only asked to teach subject matter content, but also prepare young people for college and career readiness. Making content relevant and teaching skills in the process makes an education more meaningful for learners. The EPP brought teacher candidates to visit schools in North Dakota, Minnesota, and South Dakota that were progressively using personalized learning, project-based learning, and cross-curricular projects in 2017, 2018, and 2019. (COVID-19 challenges have put a hold on 2020 visits at the point of this writing.) The EPP’s intent is to ensure that candidates are aware of possibilities for teaching content in P-12 schools that is personalized for individual learners and also content that is collaborative in terms of subject matter or for groups of students working together. The EPP will continue these types of conversations and begin field experiences of this nature when the pandemic subsides.

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

InTASC Standard 5. *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)

Connects core content to students' real-life experiences.	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	14	70.0%	5	25.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	3.65	20
2013	8	80.0%	2	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.80	10
2014	19	70.4%	5	18.5%	3	11.1%	0	0.0%	3.59	27
2015	39	67.2%	16	27.6%	3	5.2%	0	0.0%	3.62	58
2016	30	62.5%	17	35.4%	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	3.60	48
2017	31	68.9%	13	28.9%	1	2.2%	0	0.0%	3.67	45
2018	15	55.6%	9	33.3%	2	7.4%	1	3.7%	3.41	27
2019	26	63.4%	13	31.7%	2	4.9%	0	0.0%	3.59	41
2020	24	63.2%	14	36.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.63	38
Overall Total	206	65.6%	94	29.9%	13	4.1%	1	0.3%	3.61	314
Designs activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	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	75.0%	5	25.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%	3.75	20
2013	9	90.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.90	10
2014	16	61.5%	9	34.6%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	3.58	26
2015	40	67.8%	17	28.8%	1	1.7%	1	1.7%	3.63	59
2016	35	72.9%	12	25.0%	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	3.71	48
2017	30	66.7%	15	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.67	45
2018	20	74.1%	5	18.5%	1	3.7%	1	3.7%	3.63	27
2019	27	67.5%	11	27.5%	2	5.0%	0	0.0%	3.63	40
2020	26	68.4%	10	26.3%	1	2.6%	1	2.6%	3.61	38
Overall Total	218	69.6%	85	27.2%	7	2.2%	3	1.0%	3.65	313
Helps students develop critical thinking processes.	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	14	51.9%	10	37.0%	3	11.1%	0	0.0%	3.41	27
2015	32	56.1%	23	40.4%	1	1.8%	1	1.8%	3.51	57
2016	25	52.1%	20	41.7%	3	6.3%	0	0.0%	3.46	48
2017	31	70.5%	13	29.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.70	44
2018	19	67.9%	6	21.4%	2	7.1%	1	3.6%	3.54	28
2019	18	45.0%	20	50.0%	2	5.0%	0	0.0%	3.40	40
2020	23	60.5%	13	34.2%	2	5.3%	0	0.0%	3.55	38
Overall Total	162	57.4%	105	37.2%	13	4.6%	2	0.7%	3.51	282

InTASC Standard 5. *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)

Helps students develop skills to solve complex problems.	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	14	51.9%	8	29.6%	5	18.5%	0	0.0%	3.33	27
2015	32	58.2%	21	38.2%	1	1.8%	1	1.8%	3.53	55
2016	27	56.3%	19	39.6%	2	4.2%	0	0.0%	3.52	48
2017	28	63.6%	15	34.1%	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	3.61	44
2018	19	67.9%	6	21.4%	2	7.1%	1	3.6%	3.54	28
2019	17	45.9%	16	43.2%	4	10.8%	0	0.0%	3.35	37
2020	23	63.9%	9	25.0%	4	11.1%	0	0.0%	3.53	36
Overall Total	160	58.2%	94	34.2%	19	6.9%	2	0.7%	3.50	275
Makes interdisciplinary connections among core subjects.	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%	8	29.6%	1	3.7%	0	0.0%	3.48	27
2015	34	58.6%	19	32.8%	3	5.2%	2	3.4%	3.47	58
2016	26	56.5%	18	39.1%	2	4.3%	0	0.0%	3.52	46
2017	24	55.8%	16	37.2%	2	4.7%	1	2.3%	3.47	43
2018	17	63.0%	8	29.6%	1	3.7%	1	3.7%	3.52	27
2019	20	52.6%	13	34.2%	4	10.5%	1	2.6%	3.37	38
2020	17	53.1%	9	28.1%	6	18.8%	0	0.0%	3.34	32
Overall Total	155	57.4%	91	33.7%	19	7.0%	5	1.9%	3.47	270
Knows where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding	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	16	61.5%	9	34.6%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	3.58	26
2015	33	61.1%	20	37.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.9%	3.57	54
2016	30	65.2%	14	30.4%	1	2.2%	1	2.2%	3.59	46
2017	28	63.6%	13	29.5%	2	4.5%	1	2.3%	3.55	44
2018	16	57.1%	11	39.3%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	3.50	28
2019	23	60.5%	13	34.2%	1	2.6%	1	2.6%	3.53	38
2020	16	47.1%	16	47.1%	2	5.9%	0	0.0%	3.41	34
Overall Total	162	60.0%	96	35.6%	7	2.6%	5	1.9%	3.54	270

InTASC Standard 5. 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)

Helps students work together to achieve learning goals.	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	21	77.8%	5	18.5%	1	3.7%	0	0.0%	3.74	27
2015	41	70.7%	15	25.9%	2	3.4%	0	0.0%	3.67	58
2016	34	70.8%	12	25.0%	1	2.1%	1	2.1%	3.65	48
2017	34	75.6%	11	24.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.76	45
2018	20	71.4%	5	17.9%	2	7.1%	1	3.6%	3.57	28
2019	22	53.7%	18	43.9%	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	3.51	41
2020	25	65.8%	13	34.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.66	38
Overall Total	197	69.1%	79	27.7%	7	2.5%	2	0.7%	3.65	285

Analysis: The cumulative mean score ratings for Standard 5 are all 3.47 or higher. The data gathered from employers are even higher than the data gathered from completers. Some of these items are difficult to assess, so the EPP is appreciative of having hundreds of ratings from an external source. As a whole, the employers of the EPP's completers seem highly satisfied.

Action: The EPP will continue the action plans mentioned in the completer survey section. Teacher candidates complete projects and participate in activities throughout the professional education sequence that require them to connect their learning experiences to teaching in their own major field. The EPP works to prepare educators who effectively teach subject matter content well, but not necessarily in subject matter isolation. The EPP also works to prepare teacher candidates who are open to integrating curriculum and preparing young people with college and career readiness skills.